CCP2
SM

Cities and Settlements by the Sea
Supplementary Material

Cross-Chapter Paper Leads: Bruce Glavovic (New Zealand/South Africa), Richard Dawson (UK), Winston Chow (Singapore)

Cross-Chapter Paper Authors: Matthias Garschagen (Germany), Marjolijn Haasnoot (The Netherlands), Chandni Singh (India), Adelle Thomas (Bahamas)

Cross-Chapter Paper Contributing Authors: Jeroen Aerts (The Netherlands), Sophie Blackburn (UK), David Catt (USA), Eric Chu (USA), William Solecki (USA), Stijn-Temmerman (Belgium), Gundula Winter (Germany)

Cross-Chapter Paper Review Editor: Soojeong Myeong (Republic of Korea)

Cross-Chapter Paper Scientist: David Catt (USA)

This Supplementary Material should be cited as:

Glavovic, B., R. Dawson, W. Chow, M. Garschagen, M. Haasnoot, C. Singh, and A. Thomas, 2022: Cross-Chapter Paper 2: Cities and Settlements by the Sea Supplementary Material. In: *Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability.* Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [H.-O. Pörtner, D.C. Roberts, M. Tignor, E.S. Poloczanska, K. Mintenbeck, A. Alegría, M. Craig, S. Langsdorf, S. Löschke, V. Möller, A. Okem, B. Rama (eds.)]. Available from https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg2/.

Table of Contents

SMCCP2.1 Climate Change Risks to Cities and Settlements by the Sea

This section provides an extended review of risks to cities and settlements (C&S) by the sea to complement the summary in CCP2.2.

The dynamic interaction between climate drivers and varied coastal geographies influences a number of physical impacts, including many that are unique to C&S by the sea (Figure CCP2.2). Interactions between climate and non-climate drivers of coastal change are increasing the frequency and intensity of many coastal hazards, with settlement archetypes and the wider coastal zone subject to escalating risk (see Figure CCP2.3 and Table SMCCP2.1 for examples of selected coastal C&S).

Table SMCCP2.1 | Illustrative examples of 31 coastal cities and settlements detailing risks (as a function of hazard, exposure and vulnerability) and adaptation actions. Tabelle angewünschter Stelle verschoben. Bitte prüfen.

Geomorphology	City, country (2020 population, in millions)	CCP2.2 – Risks to coastal cities and settlements			CCP2.3 – Solution space
		Hazard	Exposure	Vulnerability	Adaptation options
Estuary	Monkey River Village, Belize (0.0002; i.e., 200 people)	– Coastal erosion – Tropical cyclones – Fluvial flooding – SLR	– Entire village exposed to hurricanes; 90% of built structures destroyed by Hurricane Iris in 2001 (Karlsson and Hovelsrud, 2015; Karlsson et al., 2015)	– Remote, small village; few livelihood opportunities; outmigration; Creole culture at risk; emotional and spiritual connections to place at risk due to erosion – Weak political voice; expensive to transport goods to village; no local health services; destructive practices upstream negatively impact village life; tensions about options for future (Karlsson et al., 2015)	– ***Protect:*** Ad hoc measures over time; temporary sea defence with tires and wooden stakes built from 2000 to 2010, but erosion due to upstream practices starving river of sediment was not addressed to prevent erosion – ***Accommodate:*** For hurricanes, early warning, evacuation and post-disaster recovery
	Belém, Brazil (1.5)	– Urban heat island – SLR – Flooding	– 40% of urban area is sited in low-lying areas below mean sea level (Mansur et al., 2016)	– Coastal mangrove contraction due to SLR (Mansur et al., 2016) – Large proportion of informal settlements in flood prone areas and inadequate peripheral areas for housing (Szlafsztein and de Araújo, 2021)	– ***Ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA):*** Conservation and restoration of mangrove forests along Para River to reduce coastal erosion (Borges et al., 2017) – ***Accommodate:*** Enhance urban storm water drainage systems to reduce pluvial flood risk; raising of domestic bathroom and shower thresholds to reduce household flooding (Mansur et al., 2018)
	Perth, Australia (2.1)[a]	– Urban heat island – SLR – Drought – Flooding	– Exposure to SLR due to low elevation of densely populated metropolitan area – Strong urban heat island effects (Rogers et al., 2019), heatwaves and air quality (Patel et al., 2019), and exposure to more frequent and intense drought (Radcliffe, 2015)	– Elderly population in urban area – Extensive coastal property and key infrastructure along coastline that potentially leads to conflict if coastal retreat from SLR is implemented (Grace and Thompson, 2020)	– The Western Australian Coastal Planning Policy allows for flexible coastal adaptation for SLR utilising a variety of approaches along a time frame (Grace and Thompson, 2020), including: – **Protect:** Sea walls, groynes, levees and offshore breakwaters – **Accommodate:** Sand nourishment and dune stabilisation for coastal erosion; desalination for drought (Morgan, 2020) – **Retreat:** Long-term planned retreat and expansion of coastal foreshore reserve

Geomorphology	City, country (2020 population, in millions)	CCP2.2 – Risks to coastal cities and settlements			CCP2.3 – Solution space
		Hazard	Exposure	Vulnerability	Adaptation options
Estuary	Shanghai, China (27)[a]	– Fluvial, pluvial floods – Urban heat island – SLR – Land subsidence	– SLR-linked exposure to coastal inundation is very high and exacerbated by land subsidence and socioeconomic development (Du et al., 2020). – Expected damages due to SLR: USD 16 billion–212 billion (RCP 8.5, 2100) (Abadie et al., 2020)	– High intra-city inequality among neighbourhoods, especially based on population age, built infrastructure and migrant status (Gu et al., 2018)	– ***Protect:*** Sea walls with a 200-year coastal flood return level, sea walls with a 100-year; coastal flood return level; flood walls with a 1000-year riverine flood return level along the Huangpu River – ***EbA:*** Lingang Sponge City with green roofs; rainwater harvesting; permeable pavement to store excess runoff (Temmerman et al., 2013; Yu et al., 2018b; Filho et al., 2019; Du et al., 2020)
	Greater London, UK (8.9)[a]	– Fluvial, pluvial floods – Storm surge – SLR – Urban heat island – Drought		– London includes some of the poorest areas in the UK – Considerable amount of ageing infrastructure (Caparros-Midwood et al., 2017)	– ***Protect:*** Maintain current assets and raise existing flood defences when needed; longer term (from 2050): decide and construct the best option for the future of the Thames Barrier and adapt other assets – ***Accommodate (from 2035):*** Reshape riverside through development to improve flood defences, create habitat and improve access to the river; Thames tideway large sewer tunnel to manage sewage and surface water – ***EbA:*** Green infrastructure within the city to manage surface water flooding and urban heat island (Dawson et al., 2011; Pelling et al., 2016; Hall et al., 2019)
	Venice, Italy (0.637)	– SLR – Subsidence – Air pollution	– Without adaptation, potential economic damages of €7 and €17 billion for the 21st century (Caporin and Fontini, 2016) – Closure of lagoon inlets is expected to increase from 2 to 3 weeks per year for relative mean sea level rises of 30 cm, to 2 months per year for 50 cm, and 6 months per year for 75 cm (Box 13.1)	– UNESCO World Heritage Site that is most at risk in the Mediterranean – > 90% of the city is vulnerable to flooding – High dependence on tourism	– ***Protect:*** System of mobile barriers (Modulo Sperimentale Elettromeccanico (MoSE)) that close lagoon inlets during storm surges only – ***Accommodate:*** Locally: wet and dry flood proofing of buildings – ***EbA:*** Present salt marshes also reduce flood risk, but protection is needed (Ch13 Box 13.1)
	Esmeraldas, Ecuador (0.16)	– Flooding – SLR – Landslides – Drought	– 8.4 to 14% of the current population and the airport are at risk of permanent or periodic flooding by 2100.	– Poverty, informal housing and limited-service provision – Mostly informal settlement – Inadequate financial, human or political resources (Gutierrez et al., 2020)	– ***Accommodate:*** Spatial planning to limit urban expansion in at-risk areas; Improvements of sewer systems and water efficiency measures – ***Retreat:*** Relocation of high-risk communities – ***EbA:*** Green infrastructure for urban heat island reduction (UN-Habitat, 2012; Tiepolo, 2016)
	Istanbul, Turkey (15.214)	– Flooding – SLR – Salinization – Subsidence – Drought	– Nearly 15 million people exposed to flood risk – Damages projected to be USD 10 billion yr^{-1} from SLR and flooding by 2100 (Abadie et al., 2016; Istanbul, 2018; Reimann et al., 2018)	– Rapid population growth – Important port – Fisheries – World Heritage Site	– ***Protect:*** Flood protection – ***Accommodate:*** Spatial planning, urban green spaces, building resilience measures. Improvements in sewer systems and water efficiency measures (van Leeuwen and Sjerps, 2016)

Geomorphology	City, country (2020 population, in millions)	CCP2.2 – Risks to coastal cities and settlements			CCP2.3 – Solution space
		Hazard	Exposure	Vulnerability	Adaptation options
Estuary	Bangkok, Thailand (10.6)	– SLR – Land subsidence – Flooding – Urban heat island – Air pollution	– High exposure to SLR; expected SLR damage in 2100 ~USD 312.5 billion (Abadie et al., 2020) – Additional exposure from groundwater extraction for municipal use leading to land subsidence (Jevrejeva et al., 2016; Berquist et al., 2015)	– Rapid urbanisation and population growth with large proportion of informal settlements – Most of the population and key infrastructure contributing to the economy are vulnerable to flooding, and most of Bangkok is < 1.5 m above sea level (Thanvisitthpon et al., 2018).	– ***Protect:*** Flood control infrastructure (canals, drainage pipes) as well as a polder system integrated with drainage tunnels
	New York City, USA (23.5)[a]	– Flooding – Urban heat island – SLR – Land subsidence – Salinization	– Approximately 10% of metropolitan region's population lives in the coastal zone	– High inequality, poverty – Aging infrastructure	– ***Protect, accommodate:*** Rebuild by design integrated protection for high value sites like lower Manhattan; flood proofing and bulkheading, street level raising; minor overflow retention and detention efforts; shutting down salinized wells – ***EbA:*** For heat mitigation, passive cooling solutions along with nature-based solutions
Deltaic	Dhaka, Bangladesh (21)	– Tropical cyclones – SLR – Fluvial, pluvial floods – Heatwaves – Drought	– By 2050, 0.9 million people, and by 2100, 2.1 million people could be displaced by direct inundation due to SLR in the country (Davis et al., 2018)	– Poor public infrastructure – Unplanned urbanisation – ~40% of the population lives in informal settlements; high in-migration and livelihood precarity (Araos et al., 2017; Rahman and Islam, 2019)	– ***Protect:*** Bunds, embankments (Rahman and Islam, 2019; Lázár et al., 2020) – ***Accommodate:*** Autonomous strategies by households such as raising floor height; urban land zoning away from low-lying areas (Araos et al., 2017); improving stormwater drainage infrastructure (Rahman and Islam, 2019)
	Rotterdam, Netherlands (0.651)	– SLR – Fluvial flooding – Subsidence – Salinization – Water scarcity – Urban heat island	– ~60% of the Netherlands is susceptible to large-scale coastal and river flooding, of which 26% is below present mean sea level.	– Majority of the region lives below sea level	– ***Protect:*** Maintaining coastline with (mega)sand nourishment and flood defences (levees and storm surge barriers) – ***Hybrid:*** Alternative solutions are being explored for high SLR, including advance and a combination of protecting city centres and accommodate/retreat. Flushing polders with fresh water; locally experiment with air barriers to reduce salt intrusion. Water storage and water efficiency measure to address drought. – ***EbA:*** Retention and greening in cities to avoid pluvial flooding (Kwadijk et al., 2010; Van Alphen, 2016)
	Can Tho City, Vietnam (0.4)	– Tidal flooding – Pluvial flooding – Extreme rain – Flash floods		– High poverty and limited adaptive capacity; small-shop owners are particularly vulnerable (Huong and Pathirana, 2013)	– ***Accommodate:*** Elevation of housing; canal dredging; upgrading of drainage system to cope with heavy rains and flesh floods. (Sudmeier-Rieux et al., 2015; Radhakrishnan et al., 2018)

Geomorphology	City, country (2020 population, in millions)	CCP2.2 – Risks to coastal cities and settlements			CCP2.3 – Solution space
		Hazard	Exposure	Vulnerability	Adaptation options
Deltaic	Jakarta, Indonesia (10.8)	– SLR – Land subsidence – Pluvial flooding	– Exposure from mean SLR compounded by relatively large land subsidence from groundwater extraction (3.3 m in 2040) (Abadie et al., 2020). Up to 1/6 additional land area will be subject to 1 m floods from extreme rain by 2050 (Takagi et al., 2016)	– Vast majority of population and key infrastructure reside in low-lying areas, with high vulnerability to commercial/ business, industrial and governmental land-use areas (Budiyono et al., 2016)	– ***Protect:*** Engineered sea walls and dikes, e.g., the Giant Sea Wall project (Garschagen et al., 2018) – ***Retreat:*** Moving the new capital city of Indonesia to Borneo Island
Open coast	Accra, Ghana (2.5)	– SLR – Extreme rainfall – Pluvial, fluvial floods – Coastal erosion – Storm surge		– Poor drainage infrastructure – 90% of flood-prone communities are in informal settlements with poor physical and socioeconomic living conditions (Amoako and Inkoom, 2017)	– ***Protect (SLR):*** Reactive measures to reduce the erosion impacts through building sea defence structures on Ghana's coast (e.g., the Ada Sea Defense System in Kewunor fishing village); includes sea walls, land reclamation technology such as groins, and revetments and roads to protect the coastline – ***Protect (pluvial flooding):*** Levees to redirect floodwaters – ***Accommodate/retreat:*** Upgrading storm drains; reinforcement of houses; clearing of gutters; sandbagging and relocation by households (Twerefou et al., 2019)
	Alexandria, Egypt (5.2)	– SLR – Storm surge – Water scarcity – Tsunami	– Regional SLR up to 20 cm (RCP8.5, 2100)	– High poverty and socioeconomic disparity – High geomorphological vulnerability as large parts of the city are below mean sea level; hence, even a 10 cm SLR has significant damage potential	– ***Protect***: Elevated ridges and sea walls, particularly around the depressed areas east of the city – ***Accommodate:*** Rainwater harvesting
	Lagos, Nigeria (14)[a]	– SLR – Urban heat island – Extreme rain – Flash floods	– Expected SLR is 0.9 m (RCP8.5, 2100) – Increasing exposure due to climate change and new settlements in floodplains	– High percentage of population living in slums with informal status and particularly high vulnerability in terms of health impacts, economic impacts and damage to assets – High evidence that women have higher vulnerability (Adelekan, 2010; Ajibade et al., 2013; Ajibade and McBean, 2014; Jevrejeva et al., 2016; Abiodun et al., 2017; Ajibade, 2017)	– ***Accommodate***: Neighbourhood scale adaptation – ***Advance:*** Through the development of new coastal estates, partly through nourishment, particularly in Eko Atlantic (Adelekan, 2010; Ajibade et al., 2013; Ajibade and McBean, 2014; Jevrejeva et al., 2016; Abiodun et al., 2017; Ajibade, 2017)

Geomorphology	City, country (2020 population, in millions)	CCP2.2 – Risks to coastal cities and settlements			CCP2.3 – Solution space
		Hazard	Exposure	Vulnerability	Adaptation options
Open coast	Napier City (0.065) and Hawkes Bay (0.1786), New Zealand	– Tsunami – Coastal erosion – Storm surge – SLR – Flooding – Land subsidence after earthquake	– Critical infrastructure on low-lying shoreline exposed to SLR, including airport, port infrastructure, and small communities in Hawkes Bay	– Low cost of living but generally high standard of living – Low-lying coastal areas prone to coastal hazard risk – Coastal flooding during long-period swell events occurs more often, along with continued erosion in these areas – Peri-urban and holiday settlements built along the coast – Community concern over perceived inaction to ongoing damage at the coast to properties	– ***Protect:*** For assets immediately at risk – ***Accommodate:*** Land-use planning restrictions – ***Retreat:*** Managed retreat, withdrawal of insurance cover in the most exposed coastal areas – ***Protect:*** Infrastructural interventions – ***EbA***: Beach nourishment and wetlands management; realignment
	Happisburgh, UK (0.009)	– Coastal erosion		– Small population limits economic benefits of protection	– ***Retreat:*** Purchase and removal of dwellings at risk; relocation of caravan site and village hall – ***Accommodate:*** Realignment of coastal footpath; business support
	St Georges, Grenada (0.036)	– Flooding – SLR – Urban heat island – Tropical cyclones – Tsunami – Land subsidence – Drought		– Lack of infrastructure; limited financial and human resource capacity – City centre and Grenadian national identity is coastal and subject to SLR-related flooding	– ***Accommodate, protect:*** National planning documents to protect from and accommodate SLR – ***Protect:*** Earthquake and tsunami warning system
	Miami-Dade, USA (6.2)[a]	– Flooding – Urban heat island – SLR – Tropical cyclones – Land subsidence – Salinization	– Most of the region is at low elevation, increasingly subject to flooding	– Extreme income inequality – Inadequate infrastructure to respond to highly dynamic climate risks and urbanization	– ***Accommodate:*** Buy-out programs; elevating buildings and roads to reduce risk of coastal flooding; draining and pumps; elevating buildings to address pluvial flooding – ***Protect:*** Considered, but limited; pathways considered include drainage and pumps to buy time to elevate roads and buildings, and relocate people in some locations
	Utqiagvik (formerly Barrow), Alaska, USA (0.005)	– Storm surge – Coastal erosion – Thawing permafrost – Sea ice melt – Subsidence	– USD 1 billion of infrastructure at risk	– Poverty and inequality; migration and demographic change – Isolation – Disruption to food and fisheries; failing ice cellars	– ***Protect:*** Erosion; flood protection, including beach nourishment – ***Accommodate:*** Sea ice and weather information system; identify and map watersheds, wetlands, and traditional trails important to subsistence; changing hunting and fishing practices; use local environmental observers – ***Retreat:*** New sites for construction, and zoning; creating new ecological areas and/or restoring, enhancing existing ones.
	Nassau, Bahamas (0.275)	– Tropical cyclones – SLR – Flooding – Salinization – Ocean acidification and warming	– 60% tourism infrastructure within 100 m of the coastline and exposed to flooding and SLR (Pathak et al., 2020)	– Tourism is > 50% of the city's GDP; 83% of tourism infrastructure is at risk to storm surge and flooding associated with a Category 5 tropical cyclone (Pathak et al., 2020)	– ***Protect:*** Small-scale sea walls, dykes and groynes with some beach nourishment by communities, individuals and businesses experiencing coastal erosion

Geomorphology	City, country (2020 population, in millions)	CCP2.2 – Risks to coastal cities and settlements			CCP2.3 – Solution space
		Hazard	Exposure	Vulnerability	Adaptation options
Open coast	Kingston, Jamaica (1.2)	– Tropical cyclones – SLR – Flooding – Salinization – Ocean acidification and warming	– Concentration of settlements in flood-prone low elevation areas (Burgess et al., 2015) – Critical transportation infrastructure located in low-lying areas (Monioudi et al., 2018)	– At 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels, critical transport infrastructure faces disruptions due to higher temperatures, rainfall and wind changes, and inundation (Monioudi et al., 2018) – Vector-borne diseases more prevalent in urban areas where human and vector populations are high (Henry and Mendonça, 2020)	– ***Protect:*** Raising and fortifying roads (Monioudi et al., 2018)
	Seychelles (0.1)	– SLR – Rainfall variability – Ocean warming and acidification – Coastal flooding – Extreme weather events	– Densely populated settlements concentrated in low-lying and narrow coastal zones. (Khan and Amelie, 2015)	– Reliance on coastal tourism and fishing (Khan and Amelia, 2014)	– ***Protect:*** Rock armouring; timber piling; sea walls; boardwalks and bollards to prevent removal of beach sediments; shoreline stabilization – ***EbA:*** Sand dune restoration and management; replanting native coastal vegetation; beach nourishment; mangrove restoration; coral reef restoration
	Singapore, Singapore (5.6)	– Urban heat island – SLR – Flash flooding	– SLR-linked exposure is high; mean SLR is 0.9 m (RCP4.5, 2100) to 1.5 m (RCP8.5, 2100) – Vast majority of population resides in low-lying areas (Horton et al., 2018a)	– Key infrastructure contributes to economy (e.g., rail, airport, ports) located < 2 m above sea level and vulnerable to future SLR (Cannaby et al., 2016)	– ***Protect***: Sea walls, polders – ***Accommodate:*** Coastal land reclamation (Chou et al., 2019; Sengupta et al., 2020); Large technological solutions, e.g., desalination of seawater, recycled sewage to reduce drought exposure (Chuah et al., 2018) – ***EbA:*** Via connected urban parks for urban heat island and urban flash flood events (Chow, 2018)
	Manila, Philippines (14)	– SLR – Land subsidence – Flooding – Tropical cyclones	– Exposure from severe tropical cyclones and SLR – Land subsidence from groundwater extraction leads to additional SLR in Manila by 2025 (Jevrejeva et al., 2016) – Risk of more intense tropical cyclones in the West Pacific at 2 C warming (Oppenheimer et al., 2019)	– Low elevation; large proportion of informal settlements lining waterways; groundwater extraction for municipal use (Doberstein et al., 2020) – Most population and key infrastructure vulnerable to flooding and storm surges from tropical cyclones (e.g., Haiyan in 2013)	– ***Protect:*** Breakwaters to protect seaport from tropical cyclone storm surges (Lam et al., 2017) – ***Managed retreat:*** Through small-scale resettlement (Doberstein et al., 2020)
Mixed	Maputo-Matola, Mozambique (3)[a]	– Fluvial flooding – SLR – Tropical cyclones	– Population at risk due to climate-compounded flooding and other perils is ~50,000 people (2016–2017) (Rodrigues, 2019)	– Rapid urbanization, largely unregulated and chiefly informal settlements with high levels of poverty and absence of basic services (Rodrigues, 2019) – Urban sprawl spreading into low-lying coastal areas causing environmental degradation that increases exposure to hazards compounded by climate change (Beja da Costa and Ribeiro, 2019)	– ***Protect:*** For port-related facilities – ***Accommodate:*** Numerous autonomous adaptation actions taken by vulnerable people; collective action to specific measures in face of flooding (Rodrigues, 2019)

Geomorphology	City, country (2020 population, in millions)	CCP2.2 – Risks to coastal cities and settlements			CCP2.3 – Solution space
		Hazard	Exposure	Vulnerability	Adaptation options
Mixed	Florianopolis, Santa Catarina Island, Brazil (1.2)	– Storm surges – Coastal erosion – Flooding – SLR	– West coast of the island assessed as highly variable, with 'nodes' of high exposure (da Silveira and Bonetti, 2019) – ~13.4% exposed to SLR by 2100 (Montanari et al., 2020)	– City Human Development Index (HDI) of 0.847; one of the most liveable and safest places to live in Brazil – High inequality; in informal settlements (favelas) the HDI is 0.390 – Rapid urbanization; poor sanitation and water supply; major raw sewage contamination in coastal environment; extensive unregulated land occupation	– ***Protect:*** ad hoc protect measures to for at-risk property from coastal storms and storm surges.
	Cape Town, South Africa (4.6)[a]	– SLR – Coastal erosion – Extreme waves – Storm surges – Salinization of aquifers – Urban heat island – Drought – Flooding	– 88,000 informal households prone to flooding (Desportes et al., 2016) – 19 sites on open coastlines exposed to impacts of SLR – ~125,000 people displaced by SLR by 2100	– Apartheid legacy – Gini coefficient of 0.59 (the lowest for a South African metropolitan area) – High inequity, unemployment, crime and violence – Inadequate public infrastructure – Poverty	– ***Protect:*** Infrastructure measures to contain flooding; chiefly infrastructure provisions for reducing drought risk (proved inadequate in recent years) – ***Accommodate:*** Emergency management provisions like early warnings for flood and erosion/storm/wave damage
	Mumbai, India (20.4)[a]	– SLR – Extreme precipitation – Pluvial flooding	– By 2100, at 1 m SLR, submergence of ~86.22 km^2 land; ~43 km^2 of built-up area exposed to flooding (Murali et al., 2020) – Expected damages due to SLR: USD 112 billion–735 billion (Abadie et al., 2020)	– Poor public infrastructure – Highest informal settlement population in Asia (42%) – Built on reclaimed land prone to flooding; high environmental degradation (e.g., of urban mangroves that provided mitigated flood risk) (Singh et al., 2021) – Certain social groups (e.g., fishers) highly marginalized	– ***Advance:*** Building new road infrastructure on reclaimed land – ***Accommodate:*** Vulnerable communities are adapting autonomously (e.g., urban fishing villages spread risk by using insurance, diversifying their livelihoods in the face of growing coastal erosion). In flood-affected informal settlements, households are increasing floor height and extending the wall to increase ceiling height and storing valuables on elevated platforms. Micro, small and medium enterprises are building temporary barriers, constructing platforms to elevate machinery and using dewatering pumps to drain floodwater (Schaer and Pantakar, 2018).

Notes:
(a) Population estimates are for the entire metropolitan region.

CCP2 SM

SMCCP2.1.1 Risks to Land and People

Sea level rise (SLR) will increase coastal squeeze (Pontee, 2013), permanently erode or submerge inadequately protected coastal settlements and the surrounding land providing C&S with ecosystem services, and reduce freshwater availability through salinisation (Ellison, 2015; Ha et al., 2018; Oppenheimer et al., 2019). Before being permanently eroded or submerged, coastal C&S could be subject to increased risk of episodic flooding arising from SLR, increasing the frequency and intensity of storm surges and waves (Vousdoukas et al., 2018) and, in estuary settings, increasing rain and river flooding (Moftakhari et al., 2017; Ward et al., 2018). In the Arctic, warming imperils coastal settlements and is increasing geohazard activity along circum-Arctic coasts, which could increase the frequency of tsunamigenic landslides (Fritz et al., 2017; Strzelecki and Jaskólski, 2020), posing a significant threat to Arctic coastal communities and built infrastructure (e.g., Hatcher and Forbes, 2015; Radosavljevic et al., 2016; Gauthier et al., 2018; Jaskólski et al., 2018).

Currently, between 76 million and 310 million people and assets worth between USD 6,500 billion and 11,000 billion are on land in the coastal 1-in-100-year floodplain in C&S of all sizes (Neumann et al., 2015; Muis et al., 2016; Brown et al., 2018; Kulp and Strauss, 2019; Kirezci et al., 2020; Haasnoot et al., 2021b). Across these studies, there is *high confidence* that without further action, by 2100, 158 million–510 million people and between USD 7,919 billion and 12,739 billion of assets under RCP4.5, and 176 million–880 million people and between USD 8,813 billion and 14,178 billion of assets under RCP8.5 would be in the 1-in-100-year floodplain. Recent improvements in digital elevation data indicate that exposure could be at the higher end of these estimates (Kulp and Strauss, 2019). SLR-driven changes in wave characteristics and tides could further amplify risk (Arns et al., 2017). Human-induced subsidence (e.g., through groundwater abstraction) increases relative local SLR in deltaic coastal cities on the same order of magnitude as climate-driven SLR, but in some cases this subsidence can be mitigated or even stopped with appropriate management (Esteban et al., 2020; Herrera-García et al., 2021; Nicholls et al., 2021). There is *limited evidence* but *high agreement* from long-term studies that the rate of increase of land at risk accelerates after 2100 (Brown et al., 2018), with risk doubling between 2020 and 2100 but becoming 1.5 times faster from 2100 to 2150 under RCP8.5 (Haasnoot et al., 2021b).

Nicholls et al. (2018) report a 26 and 38% reduction, relative to RCP8.5, in people experiencing flooding each year by 2095 if global temperatures stabilise at 2 or 1.5°C, respectively. Most people exposed to coastal flooding live in coastal C&S in the least-developed countries (Edmonds et al., 2020; Haasnoot et al., 2021b). Currently, about 17 million people from middle-income countries are at risk of flooding by a 10-year event and about 65 million by a 100-year event; just accounting for SLR (i.e., population and protection stays at 2020 levels) this is projected to increase rapidly to 27 million and 74 million, respectively (a rate of ~0.5 million yr^{-1}). This accelerates after 2050, with the number of people in the 100-year floodplain increasing at a rate of ~0.55 million yr^{-1} under RCP4.5, ~1 million yr^{-1} under RCP8.5 up to 2100 and ~1.4 million yr^{-1} between 2100 and 2150 under RCP8.5 (Haasnoot et al., 2021b).

These impacts are concentrated in cities. For example, Abadie et al. (2020) calculate USD 1,600 billion–3,200 billion in damages in 136 major coastal cities. Impacts vary between regions (Schinko et al., 2020) and are by far the greatest in absolute terms in South and Southeast Asia, with large relative changes in Africa and Small Island Development States (SIDS) and considerable absolute changes in Europe (e.g., Le, 2020; Haasnoot et al., 2021b; Hooijer and Vernimmen, 2021). Furthermore, even small changes (10 cm) in SLR above present can double the frequency of the 1-in-50-year flood event in many regions, especially in equatorial coastal settlements and the Pacific Islands (Vitousek et al., 2017).

Worldwide, around a quarter of sandy beaches eroded at 0.5 m yr^{-1} between 1984 and 2016 (Luijendijk et al., 2018) and as many as 70% of beaches experience erosion, which is expected to accelerate as the global sea level rises (Fitton et al., 2018). Between 1984 and 2015, the overall surface of eroded land was about 28,000 km^2, which is twice that of gained land. This is predominantly driven by construction of coastal or inland water management structures, exploitation of coastal resources or clearing of coastal ecosystems (Mentaschi et al., 2018). Improved understanding of biophysical feedbacks has reduced global estimates of wetland losses (including mangrove and fresh and saltwater marsh) and consequently, by 2100, under RCP8.5, these losses are estimated to be up to 30%, or 61,213 km^2, compared to present day (Schuerch et al., 2018).

Analysis of C&S and infrastructure at risk of coastal erosion are analysed at a local or regional scale. In England, for example, 8,900 properties, of which 1,200 do not have coastal protection, are in areas at risk from coastal erosion, and by the 2080s this could increase to over 100,000 properties (CCC, 2017). There are limited global analyses of future erosion rates, but Hinkel et al. (2013) estimate 6,000–17,000 km^2 of land could be lost due to SLR-driven erosion of sandy beaches, displacing 1.6 million–5.3 million people, with economic impacts between USD 300 billion and 1,000 billion. A more recent analysis by Vousdoukas et al. (2020b) calculates that 13.6–15.2% of the world's sandy beaches could face severe erosion by 2050, increasing to 35.7–49.5% (95,061–131,745 km^2) by 2100 under RCP4.5 and RCP8.5, respectively. Where accommodation space exists (e.g., rural areas), migration of beaches may be possible (Cooper et al., 2020a).

Some observations and modelling of reef islands (including atolls) in the Pacific Ocean indicate they can adapt to SLR by sediment accretion (Kench et al., 2015; McLean and Kench, 2015; Kane and Fletcher, 2020; Masselink et al., 2020). Other studies suggest higher vulnerability to submergence due to SLR (Perry et al., 2018). For beaches and dunes, from 1984 to 2016, an estimated 24% of the world's sandy beaches eroded at rates exceeding 0.5 m yr^{-1}, while 28% are accreting and 48% are stable (Luijendijk et al., 2018). Direct impacts and responses to SLR are difficult to assess, as beach and dune erosion or accretion are affected by several other factors such as sediment availability, wind–wave climate and anthropogenic actions on or near the shore (Perkins et al., 2015; Toimil et al., 2020). A study in the Mediterranean estimated SLR will cause an increase of about 25% in erosion volumes over this century (Enríquez et al., 2019).

SMCCP2.1.2 Risks to Livelihoods and Coastal Activities

There is *high confidence* about regionally differentiated but considerable and tangible climate change-compounded impacts in coastal C&S, including damage and loss to lives and livelihoods (Tessler et al., 2015; Avelino et al., 2018), negative impacts on health and well-being (especially in extreme events) (McIver et al., 2016), and involuntary displacement and migration (Hauer et al., 2016; Hauer, 2017; Davis et al., 2018; Neef et al., 2018). Additionally, there are a number of intangible impacts such as psychological impacts due to extreme events, heightened inequality based on gender/ethnicity/structural vulnerabilities, loss of things of personal or cultural value, and a sense of place or connection, including the existential risk of the demise of nations due to submergence (Allison and Bassett, 2015; Barnett, 2017; Weir et al., 2017).

Risks to key economic sectors: Key socioeconomic sectors critical to coastal C&S—such as coastal tourism, fisheries and shipping—are already experiencing climate-related impacts and are projected to face escalating risk due to climate change (Weatherdon et al., 2016; Becker et al., 2018). Bindoff et al. (2019) noted with *high confidence* that fishery catches in many regions are already impacted by changes to the ocean and stated with *medium confidence* that further ocean changes are projected to reduce the maximum potential catches of fish stocks. Hoegh-Guldberg et al. (2018) note that coastal tourism risks, particularly in subtropical and tropical regions, will increase with climate change due to a loss of beach and coral reef assets (*high confidence*). C&S reliant on coastal tourism are projected to experience reduced destination attractiveness as hazards intensify with climate change, with the potential for negative effects on tourism demand and local economies (Seekamp et al., 2019; Arabadzhyan et al., 2020) as well as greater erosion and flood risk from coastal squeeze (Lithgow et al., 2019).

Livelihoods: SLR, land subsidence and flooding are increasing the rate of change of expected losses in deltaic coastal systems (Nicholls et al., 2021), with the current impacts highest in South Asia and future risk increases greatest in the Rhine and Mississippi (4–8 times increase) and Chao Phraya and Yangtze deltas (1.5–4 times increase) depending on risk-reducing investments and strategies (Tessler et al., 2015). Critically, although risks are distributed across deltaic systems at all levels of economic development, global comparative studies show wealthier countries are more able to limit current impacts through infrastructural coastal protection interventions (Tessler et al., 2015; Olazabal et al., 2019b), highlighting the uneven exposure and adaptive capacities in different coastal C&S archetypes. Ocean-dependent livelihoods of people living in coastal C&S are severely impacted by SLR, changing ocean temperatures and shifts in the intensity and frequency of El Niño-Southern Oscillation events (Allison and Bassett, 2015; Barnett, 2017), with *high confidence* in the severity of coastal hazard risk in particular for geographies such as the Arctic and SIDS (Nunn, 2013; Schmutter et al., 2017; Weir et al., 2017). Ocean warming and acidification are projected to significantly affect communities dependent on fishing, aquaculture and marine tourism through lowered incomes and disrupted livelihoods (Himes-Cornell and Kasperski, 2015; Avelino et al., 2018). Notably, these impacts will constrain coastal livelihoods in Africa, Oceania, and South and Southeast Asia more dramatically because of high exposure to climate-compounded coastal hazards, relatively lower levels of adaptive capacity and higher dependence on fisheries for employment and livelihoods (Tessler et al., 2015; Ding et al., 2017).

The range of climate-compounded hazards affecting coastal settlements also increases risks to livelihoods not directly dependent on the ocean (*medium confidence*). Increased soil salinity because of SLR threatens rice farming in low surface elevation deltas, with potential rice production decreasing substantially from 61 to 34% by 2100 with 1.8 m SLR (upper limit SLR under RCP8.5) in the Ebro Delta in the Mediterranean (Genua-Olmedo et al., 2016). Coastal erosion, cyclones, flooding and drought drive vulnerability for agricultural livelihoods in coastal Bangladesh (Hoque et al., 2019), where insufficient adaptation constrains livelihood options available for the poorest (Islam et al., 2017; Ahmed et al., 2019).

Health and well-being impacts: These include trauma and fatalities from extreme weather events, increased heat-related illnesses and morbidity (Section 6.2.3.1), compromised water and food safety and security, the spread of vector-borne diseases and zoonoses, and psychosocial ill health (McIver et al., 2016; Weir et al., 2017; Storlazzi et al., 2018; Pugatch, 2019). Without effective adaptation, increased intensity of extreme events, particularly tropical cyclones and flooding, are projected to result in increased human fatalities in coastal regions (*medium evidence, high agreement*) (Seo and Bakkensen, 2016; Yu et al., 2018a; Bakkensen and Mendelsohn, 2019; Pugatch, 2019). While there is *medium confidence* that climate change mediates exposure to and bioaccumulation of pollutants through the marine food chain (Bindoff et al., 2019), how this will cascade into impacts on human health and food systems remains less well understood (see Cross-Chapter Box ILLNESS in Chapter 2).

Human mobility: Decisions to migrate or not are mediated by climatic drivers (e.g., coastal flooding and cyclones) and non-climatic drivers (e.g., livelihood opportunities and conflict) (Cross-Chapter Box MIGRATE in Chapter 7; Boas et al., 2019). While ascertaining the projected numbers of migrants at different warming levels is constrained by attribution issues (how much movement is climate-driven) and the paucity of evidence on how multiple climatic risks interact (e.g., SLR, coastal flooding and land subsidence) to drive mobility decisions and outcomes (Boas et al., 2019; Wrathall et al., 2019; McLeman et al., 2021), here we present a summary of the current and projected evidence. While there is growing evidence on projected climate-driven migration in coastal settlements (Hauer et al., 2016; Rigaud et al., 2018; McMichael et al., 2020), there is *low agreement* on the actual numbers given the difficulties in attributing climate changes as a driver (Abubakar et al., 2018; Kelman, 2019) (Cross-Chapter Box MIGRATE in Chapter 7).

There is *high confidence* that climate change is already 'reshaping the comparative advantages of regions, making some places less productive and liveable' (Adger et al., 2020), with impacts on observed migration (Cross-Chapter Box MIGRATE in Chapter 7 summarises this evidence). In coastal C&S, changing configurations of hazards, exposure and vulnerability are already increasing human mobility, necessitating a range of risk management strategies from involuntary displacement and forced migration to planned relocation (see Oppenheimer et al. (2019) for the global context, Maharjan et al. (2020) in South Asia and Koubi et al. (2016) in Vietnam).

There is *limited evidence* but *high agreement* that increased warming and hence accelerated SLR will increase future mobility-related risks in densely populated hazard-prone coastal settlements, in small islands and low-lying coastal zones, and among vulnerable populations (also see RKR H, Chapter 16; Hauer et al., 2020; Bell et al., 2021; Lincke and Hinkel, 2021). Global SLR, which is typically framed solely as a coastal risk, is projected to have cascading risks through inland displacement and migratory effects (Hauer et al., 2016; Davis et al., 2018; Oppenheimer et al., 2019; Robinson et al., 2020). For example, SLR is projected to drive migration from low-lying coastal regions into inland areas with significant changes in regional population distribution (Aerts, 2017; Hauer, 2017). By 2050 in Bangladesh, under RCP 8.5 (0.3 m SLR), 0.82 million people are expected to migrate due to coastal inundation, and this figure is projected to increase to 2.1 million people by 2100 (Davis et al., 2018). This displacement will impact destination locations through additional demands on jobs (594,000 positions), housing (197,000 residences) and food (783×10^9 calories) by 2050 (Davis et al., 2018). Without adaptation, in the USA an SLR of 1.8 m can potentially displace 13.1 million people, reconfiguring state populations (e.g., adding 1.5 million residents to Texas and displacing 2.5 million residents from Florida by 2100) (Hauer, 2017).

Critically, migration is not available or desirable to all (Assaduzzaman et al., 2020; Hoffmann et al., 2020; Bell et al., 2021) and does not necessarily reduce hazard exposure: there is *medium confidence* that people often move from one risk-prone locality into another, with mixed adaptation outcomes (e.g., Weber et al. (2019) in SIDS, Jain et al. (2017) in India and Dasgupta et al. (2016) in Bangladesh). There is *medium evidence* with *high agreement* that for communities with strong place attachment, relocation can often increase vulnerability (e.g., Farbotko et al. (2020) in Fiji, Vietnam, the Solomon Islands and the USA). Most importantly, despite increasing risk, not all people can or will move, leading to involuntarily immobile populations (e.g., Zickgraf (2019) in Senegal and Vietnam; Laurice Jamero et al. (2017) in the Philippines).

Non-material impacts and losses: Climate risks in coastal C&S critically affect people through non-material impacts such as erosion of place-based social values, cultural practices and 'lived values' that provide a sense of belonging, place attachment, esteem and self-actualisation (*high confidence)* (Graham et al., 2013; Barnett, 2017; Ramm et al., 2017; Weir et al., 2017). In areas such as the SIDS, where entire communities and locations are directly and possibly irreversibly impacted by SLR, there is *high confidence* that climate change will challenge peoples' cultural and national identities (Wyett, 2014; Weir et al., 2017). Additionally, there is increasing evidence of non-material impacts of climate change in other diverse geographical locations (e.g., Ramm et al. (2017) in Australia and Tschakert et al. (2017) in Alaska).

SMCCP2.1.3 Risks to the Built Environment

Many coastal C&S have densely built physical infrastructure and assets that are greatly exposed and vulnerable to climate change hazards and hence a very high damage potential (*high confidence*) (Hinkel et al., 2014; Abadie et al., 2016; Diaz, 2016; Abadie, 2018; Abadie et al., 2020). Key sectors of the built environment include housing, transport and industry as well as other critical infrastructure such as for energy and communication systems (Section 16.5.2.3.4). Impacts to the built environment in coastal C&S therefore imply risks for societies and the global economy in general (Section 16.5.4).

SLR, land subsidence, continued infrastructure development in coastal flood plains and the rise of asset values are major drivers of future risk in coastal C&S and, without adaptation, built environment risks in coastal C&S are expected to rise considerably in this century across all RCPs (*high confidence*) (Hinkel et al., 2014; Abadie et al., 2016; Abadie, 2018; Magnan et al., 2019; Oppenheimer et al., 2019). Estimates of future flood losses in 136 of the largest coastal cities (Hallegatte et al., 2013) find that average annual losses will increase from USD 6 billion in 2005 to USD 60 billion–63 billion by 2050 due to SLR, land subsidence and socioeconomic development even if current levels of flood probability are maintained through adaptation. Average annual losses could reach almost 1.5% of city-level gross domestic product (GDP) in Guangzhou and New Orleans (Hallegatte et al., 2013). Abadie (2018) finds, through an assessment of 120 coastal cities, that New Orleans and Guangzhou have the highest expected annual damage by 2100 under RCP 2.6, 4.5 and 8.5 projections, with around USD1.2 trillion in each city. Assessing 19 European cities, Abadie et al. (2016) find that under RCP8.5 average annual flood losses increase between 4- and 7-fold by 2050 for the highest risk cities: Istanbul and Izmir (Turkey), Odessa (Ukraine) and Rotterdam (the Netherlands). Overall, the value of assets below the height of 100-year coastal flood events is USD 17 trillion–180 trillion under RCP2.6 and USD 21 trillion–210 trillion under RCP8.5 in 2100, the majority of which is in cities (Hinkel et al., 2014).

Climate change already has, and is projected to have, increasingly severe impacts on ports, with major geopolitical and economic ramifications from the C&S to the global scale (*very high confidence*) (Becker et al., 2018; Camus et al., 2019; Christodoulou et al., 2019; Walsh et al., 2019; Hanson and Nicholls, 2020; Yang and Ge, 2020; Izaguirre et al., 2021; León-Mateos et al., 2021; Ribeiro et al., 2021). Few ports have implemented actions addressing risks to assets and operations (*medium evidence, high confidence*) (Becker et al., 2018; Randrianarisoa and Zhang, 2019; Panahi et al., 2020). Port expansion may need to double or even quadruple by 2050, relative to a 2010 baseline, with total global investment of USD 223 billion–768 billion (Hanson and Nicholls, 2020). Beyond adapting existing ports to rising SLR, new port development presents opportunities to increase coastal C&S climate resilience (Hanson and Nicholls, 2020). Port responses that go well beyond terminal and operational considerations, and benefit from engagement of stakeholders and governance actors as part of wider C&S adaptation pathways, show the greatest potential for climate-resilient development (CRD) (*high confidence*) (Mat et al., 2016; Becker et al., 2018; León-Mateos et al., 2021). Port cities are thus critical focal points—functioning as enablers or barriers to adapt to climate change and transition towards low-carbon, CRD pathways (*high confidence*) (Mat et al., 2016; Randrianarisoa and Zhang, 2019; Panahi et al., 2020; León-Mateos et al., 2021).

In terms of risks to particular types of the built environment (residential buildings, industry, transportation infrastructure, informal settlements and cultural heritage sites), *limited evidence* is available at the global scale but individual case-study assessments predict with *high agreement* that overall risks will increase with climate change across the built environment of coastal C&S (Hall et al., 2019). The number of seaports in Europe exposed to inundation levels higher than 1 m under RCP8.5 is projected to increase by 80% from 2030 to 2080 (Christodoulou et al., 2019). Global annual damages to road and rail infrastructure from coastal flooding are currently USD 0.4 billion–6.2 billion (Koks et al., 2019) in Vietnam alone; 1 m SLR would destroy 12% of the road network and cost USD 2.1 billion to rebuild (Chinowsky et al., 2015). There are 269 airports at risk of coastal flooding; this increases to 413 under RCP8.5 and the expected disruption to flights increases by a factor of 17 or 69 even if global temperature is stabilised at 1.5ºC or RCP8.5, respectively (Yesudian and Dawson, 2021). Marzeion and Levermann (2014) and Reimann et al. (2018) suggest that at least 79–140 cultural and mixed world heritage sites are at risk of coastal flooding for global warming of 2ºC, with a significant proportion of these concentrated in the Mediterranean, although it is likely this is an underestimate, especially for the African continent (Brooks et al., 2020).

Informal settlements and slums are, in many cities, over-proportionally exposed to flooding; in Mumbai, the flood exposure of slum settlements is 71% above the city average (Hallegatte et al., 2017). These settlements also have increased vulnerability to flooding and coastal storms due to the low building quality, which is mostly of a semi-permanent nature (Roy et al., 2016). Projections or scenario assessments for future risk trends in slums are *limited* to a few case studies. For Ho Chi Minh City (Vietnam), for example, the current exposure differential of 10–20% between slums and non-slums is projected to increase with ongoing climate change (Bangalore et al., 2019).

Lastly, cultural heritage sites in coastal cities are vulnerable to coastal hazards because there is often little to no option for relocation or adaptation. Comprehensive global studies on climate risk to cultural heritage sites are still lacking. An analysis of 49 UNESCO World Heritage sites in the Mediterranean concludes that flooding risks might increase by 50% on average until 2100 under RCP8.5, with much larger increases possible for some sites (Reimann et al., 2018).

SMCCP2.1.4 Risks to Ecosystems and their Services

Coastal C&S depend to a variable extent on ecosystem services provided by nearby habitats and ecosystems, such as shallow lagoons and estuaries, intertidal flats and marshes, mangrove forests, seagrass beds, coral reefs, beaches and dunes. These services include provisioning of materials and food such as wood and fishery habitat (Kok et al., 2021; zu Ermgassen et al., 2021); mitigation of coastal hazards such as attenuation of storm surges, waves, and reducing erosion (CCP2.3.2.3; Godfroy et al., 2019; Zhu et al., 2020); climate change mitigation such as through carbon sequestration (Macreadie et al., 2017; Rovai et al., 2018; Ward, 2020); water quality regulation such as nutrient, pollutant, and sediment retention and cycling (Wilson et al., 2018; Zhao et al., 2018); and recreation and tourism (Pueyo-Ros et al., 2018).

There is *high confidence* that loss of coastal ecosystem services will expose millions of people and associated property to increased coastal hazard risk, particularly flood risk. There is *medium evidence* and *high agreement* that loss of coral reefs and mangroves are expected to contribute to loss of fisheries production in adjacent waters (Mehvar et al., 2019; Sandoval Londoño et al., 2020; Seraphim et al., 2020). The economic value of mangroves, tidal marshes, coral reefs and seagrass beds is typically estimated to be USD 10,000 to 100,000 ha^{-1}, higher than terrestrial or other marine ecosystems (Costanza et al., 2014; Macreadie et al., 2019). The value of services including art, food provision, amenity and recreation in Bangladesh and Indonesia are projected to decrease by 16–40% and 25–90%, respectively (Mehvar et al., 2018; Mehvar et al., 2019); in the USA, benefits are as much as USD 825 million in direct damage reduction and USD 971 million in indirect damage reduction (Storlazzi et al., 2019).

The impact of climate change on coastal ecosystems is significant, but depends on the ecosystem's natural capacity to adapt to change and sustain its functioning; these depend upon local biophysical settings like tidal range, water quality and species composition (Balke et al., 2016; Kirwan et al., 2016; Edmonds et al., 2020; Wiberg et al., 2020). Other climate change factors, such as increasing CO_2 concentrations and temperature effects on plant productivity, may affect the functioning of these ecosystems (Manea et al., 2020).

In many places, marshes and mangroves can adapt to relative SLR rates of 3–10 mm yr^{-1} (Blankespoor et al., 2017; Horton et al., 2018b; Saintilan et al., 2020; Törnqvist et al., 2020) but fail to survive SLR rates of just a few mm yr^{-1} when suspended sediment concentrations are very low (1–10 mg l^{-1}) or where the tidal range is < 1 m (Kirwan et al., 2016; Wiberg et al., 2020). Coastal ecosystem losses could be minor if warming stays below 1.7°C global warming level (GWL), but a higher GWL or an SLR above 0.5 m is expected to lead to large-scale impacts and loss of ecosystem services including their ability to protect coastal C&S (Section 13.4; Key Risk 1; van der Spek, 2018; Jones et al., 2020; Triyanti et al., 2017).

Globally, coral reefs currently provide USD 272 billion flood protection against 1-in-100-year storms (Beck et al., 2018). Yet, coral reefs are considered to be the marine ecosystem most at risk, even under an RCP2.6 scenario (Dasgupta et al., 2019; Díaz et al., 2019; Graham et al., 2020; Cornwall et al., 2021). Under RCP8.5, most coral reefs are predicted to experience mean water depth increases of more than 0.5 m by 2100, which will increase high wave-energy exposure, thus accelerating sediment mobility, shoreline change and island overtopping (Perry et al., 2018). There is *high confidence* that 2ºC or more GWL will lead to significant loss of coral caused by ocean warming and acidification, which induces coral bleaching and reduces coral calcification (Hoegh-Guldberg et al., 2018; Perry et al., 2018; Hughes et al., 2020; Cornwall et al., 2021). The cumulative impacts of SLR, acidification and anthropogenic damage reduce coral effectiveness of adapting to climate change (Hughes et al., 2017b; Perry and Morgan, 2017; Yates et al., 2017).

There is *high confidence* that anthropogenic interventions, such as river damming and coastal engineering interventions pose the greatest immediate risk to coastal ecosystems as they reduce sediment supply (Chapters 3 and 13; Cooper et al. (2020b); Sabour et al. (2020); Ranasinghe et al. (2019);Yang et al. (2020)), and limit lateral inland migration (e.g., blocked by dikes, buildings and roads). Up to 30%

of the global marsh and mangrove area is at risk of disappearing by 2100 under RCP 8.5, with the Gulf of Mexico, Indonesia and the Mediterranean at greatest risk (Schuerch et al., 2018).

In summation, non-climatic anthropogenic drivers have already increased the exposure and vulnerability of coastal ecosystems and low-lying coastal C&S to climate change impacts and to SLR and extreme sea level events in particular; this is expected to continue into the distant future (*very high confidence*). To compound matters, coastal C&S are subject to both compound and cascading risks (see Section 6.2.5, Bevacqua et al. (2019), Lawrence et al. (2020) and Zscheischler et al. (2018) for definitions).

SMCCP2.1.5 Cascading and Compound Risks

Most studies on C&S in this section have focused on adapting to a single or limited set of risks, such as SLR, heat waves or water resources. Some (e.g., Nicholls et al., 2015; Estrada et al., 2017; Yin et al., 2020; Malagon Santos et al., 2017), but comparatively fewer studies, address the combined effects of multiple drivers and clustering of multiple events or assess the consequences of having to adapt to multiple impacts and risks that cascade (Box 15.2).

Coastal C&S are particularly vulnerable to compound and cascading impacts due to severe storms (*high confidence*) that may be exacerbated by climate change. In late October 2012, Hurricane Sandy severely impacted the New York–New Jersey coast. Over 100 people were killed and damages of approximately USD 65 billion in direct impacts were incurred due mainly to storm surge flooding (Rosenzweig and Solecki, 2014). In New York City, the event set off a series of cascading impacts with massive power outages causing extended disruptions of water, gasoline (for vehicles), communication (i.e., mobile phones) and heating, ventilation and air conditioning for hundreds of thousands of residents (Haraguchi and Kim, 2016).

In 2017, parts of the Caribbean and Florida, USA, were devastated by compound and cascading impacts from Hurricanes Irma and Maria, which caused devastation including significant rainfall and inland/street flooding, extreme winds and storm surge flooding that caused cumulative and compounded damage well beyond the storm surge zone (Kishore et al., 2018; Rey et al., 2019; So et al., 2019; Raymond et al., 2020). Severe cascading impacts affected Puerto Rico's settlements in the aftermath of Maria; a public health crisis continued to spread and impacted the well-being of residents for over a year, resulting in thousands of excess deaths significantly greater than the official death toll of 64 (Kishore et al., 2018). Compound impacts from Hurricane Irma resulted in both Barbuda and Ragged Island, Bahamas, being declared uninhabitable, requiring the evacuation of all residents, and leaving these islands without human residents for the first time since being occupied (Look et al., 2019; Thomas and Benjamin, 2020).

The occurrence of compound risks from extreme events exacerbated by climate change can be further complicated by non-climate-related drivers, such the COVID-19 pandemic, that threaten population health and hamper pandemic responses (Salas et al., 2020; Shultz et al., 2020a; Shultz et al., 2020b). In May 2020, Cyclone Amphan brought extensive wind, rain and storm surge damage to Kolkata, India. Storm preparedness and response, including evacuation and sheltering, was considerably compromised by the pandemic crisis. Evacuation and sheltering had to simultaneously respond to the storm impacts and public health guidelines to prevent the further spread of the virus (Baidya et al., 2020; Ebrahim et al., 2020; Majumdar and DasGupta, 2020).

Either separately or individually, compound and cascading risks can significantly alter the climate risk profile and vulnerability of coastal C&S (Edmonds et al., 2020; Eilander et al., 2020; Ghanbari et al., 2021) and population mobility (CCP2.2.2). A better understanding of the probability of these compound events, and the processes driving them, is essential to lessen or adapt to these potentially high-impact risks; however, difficulties in predicting concurrent climate and non-climate risks will make risk reduction and resilience-building difficult (Ebrahim et al., 2020; Cross-Chapter Box COVID in Chapter 7). Individual coastal C&S and regional case studies (particularly for Europe, Australia and the US) illustrate an increasing likelihood of compound risks with accelerating climate change (*likely, medium confidence*) (Wahl et al., 2015; Xu et al., 2019; Kirezci et al., 2020).

Table SMCCP2.2 | Constraints and enablers to adaptation in coastal C&S. Illustrative examples from 25 coastal cities and settlements. Constraints are categorised as economic (existing livelihoods, economic structures and economic mobility); social/cultural (social norms, identity, place attachment, beliefs, worldviews, values, awareness, education, social justice and social support); human capacity (individual, organizational, and societal capabilities to set and achieve adaptation objectives over time including training, education and skill development; governance, institutions and policy (existing laws, regulations, procedural requirements, governance scope, effectiveness, institutional arrangements, adaptive capacity and absorption capacity); financial (lack of financial resources); information/awareness/technology (lack of awareness or access to information or technology); physical (presence of physical barriers); and biological (temperature, precipitation, salinity, acidity and intensity and frequency of extreme events including storms, drought and wind) (categorization based on Section 16.4).

Geomorphology	City, country (2020 population, in millions)	Adaptation constraints							Enablers
		Economic	Social/ cultural	Human capacity	Governance, institutions and policy	Financial	Information/ awareness/ technology	Physical/ biological	
Estuary	Monkey River Village, Belize (0.0002; i.e., 200 people)	– Constrained livelihood opportunities	– Tensions about development pathways	– Limited adaptive capacity or resources to address erosion	– Villagers disconnected from political power; self-reliant	– Very limited	– Limited	– Remote, isolated	– Erosion perceived by all to be a threat to collective interests – Intervention by journalists, researchers and local NGOs (bridging organizations) to secure media attention—especially after hurricane—and use window of opportunity to attract government investment in temporary protective works – Choices about future tourism development will reconfigure constraints and enablers.
	Shanghai, China (27)[a]		– High income inequality can exacerbate differential vulnerability					– Physical location makes it a high-risk city	– Long-term planning up to 2100 – Access to technical expertise – Strong national and municipal focus on climate change
	Greater London, UK (8.9)[a]							– Long-term legacy of development of the city	– Long-term Thames Estuary 2100 planning – Strategic leadership with climate change embedded through the Greater London Spatial Development Plan and London Climate Change Partnership – Access to technical expertise

CCP2 SM

Geomorphology	City, country (2020 population, in millions)	Adaptation constraints							Enablers
		Economic	Social/ cultural	Human capacity	Governance, institutions and policy	Financial	Information/ awareness/ technology	Physical/ biological	
Estuary	Esmeraldas, Ecuador (0.16)				– Institutional capacity and incongruent coordination and planning between multi-level governments – Political resistance to implement and enforce zoning regulations				
	Istanbul, Turkey (15.214)				– Ineffective coordination between institutions – Local and regional implementation plans do not adequately address climate change impacts and adaptation		– Data limited as climate change research relatively new		– Potential for citizen involvement in urban green space adaptation – Develop institutional capacity, including need for training, building inter-institution cooperation, awareness raising, and monitoring and evaluation system
	Bangkok, Thailand (10.6)			– High vulnerability due to difficulties in building adaptive capacity, especially in informal settlements	– Poor implementation and communication of policies; lack of accounting or climate change – Flood risks from pluvial and SLR/land subsidence factors are not coordinated and policies often fail to account for climate change (Saito, 2014)				
	New York City, USA (23.5)[a]		– Underlying social and environmental inequities that encourage distrust and lack of support of planning efforts, and worldview that argues for remaining in high-risk locations and resisting conditions of retreat		– Lack of governance structures to deal with inter jurisdictional issues – Assorted adaptation approaches without any centralized approach across three US states and hundreds of municipalities in the New York metropolitan region		– Lack of financial resources		– Municipal and state governments have attempted to increase the amount of public outreach and community engagement to increase support for resiliency and adaptation efforts

Geomor-phology	City, country (2020 population, in millions)	Adaptation constraints							Enablers
		Economic	Social/ cultural	Human capacity	Governance, institutions and policy	Financial	Information/ awareness/ technology	Physical/ biological	
Deltaic	Dhaka, Bangladesh (21)		– High inequality can lead to inequitable risk management	– Low human capacity for long-term adaptation	– Reactive governance (earlier); somewhat fragmented approach to climate risks		– Inadequate funding (vis-à-vis exposure)	– Low-lying deltaic city with very high exposure and high population density	– Proactive governance with current plans going up to 2100 – Strong focus on technology transfer (e.g., with the Netherlands) to develop long-term delta plans – Climate change is a key national priority
	Rotterdam, Netherlands (0.651)								– Delta program developed adaptive plan to anticipate (uncertain) climate change. The programme has its legislative foundation in the Delta Act and has a Delta Fund with a budget of Euro 1 billion yr^{-1}. This yearly budget is reserved until 2029 (Bloemen et al., 2019b; Haasnoot et al., 2020). – Present plan is able to address 1 m in 2100.
	Can Tho City, Vietnam (0.4)	– Poor households have limited resources to adapt (mostly upgrade and lift their houses)			– Land-use planning is met with such high pressure to grow the city that precautionary adaptation (e.g., flood retention areas) is difficult to implement (Garschagen, 2015)				– Growing domestic policy attention to climate change adaptation and high attention by international donors and research organizations. (Radhakrishnan et al., 2018)
	Jakarta, Indonesia (10.8)				– Reactive risk management that hinders adaptation (Neise et al., 2017)				– Cultural enablers in the community, e.g., mutual assistance, social structures from self-organisation and networking for social-economic support (Surtiari et al., 2017)

CCP2 SM

Geomorphology	City, country (2020 population, in millions)	Adaptation constraints							Enablers
		Economic	Social/ cultural	Human capacity	Governance, institutions and policy	Financial	Information/ awareness/ technology	Physical/ biological	
Open coast	Accra, Ghana (2.5)	– Poorer households and migrant status shapes adaptation action	– People are continually reclaiming lagoons and mining sand leading to more inundation and poor drainage		– Poor waste disposal practices and drainage systems, silting and choking of drains, and land-use change and informal urbanization (Twerefou et al., 2019)	– Inadequate money to undertake flood mitigation at householdlevel (Twerefou et al., 2019)	– Access to information for preparing for floods needs to be improved in all localities (Yankson et al., 2017)	– Inadequate drainage infrastructure	– Locality and government approaches to flood mitigation mediate household adaptation, with more flood protection action occurring in households subject to municipal-level adaptation policy – Better early warnings for floods can reduce flood impacts. – Behavioural change to avoid clogging stormwater drains can mitigate flood risk.
	Lagos, Nigeria (14)[a]	– Low resource base for households to undertake accommodate adaptations				– Widespread lack of housing rights – Lack of integrated, risk-sensitive and forward-looking planning			
	Napier City (0.065) and Hawkes Bay (0.1786), New Zealand				– Vested interests challenge provisions for public safety and sustainability			– Eroding coastline	– Relatively strong information/ technical capacity – Political will, governance capacity and resources available to implement adaptation pathways logic in face of coastal hazard risk – Robust institutional provisions supported by national legislation and guidance – Robust social capital and institutionalised commitment to Māori – Strong environmental ethic
	Happisburgh, UK (0.009)		– Undervalued coastal cultures and icons		– Unclear goals of adaptation			– Uncertainty about coastal change	

Geomorphology	City, country (2020 population, in millions)	Adaptation constraints							Enablers
		Economic	Social/ cultural	Human capacity	Governance, institutions and policy	Financial	Information/ awareness/ technology	Physical/ biological	
Open coast	Utqiagvik (formerly Barrow), Alaska, USA (0.005)				– Absence of a lead entity for adaptation and lack of clear jurisdiction or protocols – Focus of disaster response on rebuilding as opposed to risk-prevention activities – Resource management regimes often ad hoc and fragmented – Lack of integrated strategy and actions often short term or piecemeal and not anticipatory				– Leverage local knowledge and historical precedent of transformative change in the past – Better integration of community and scientific information, e.g., real-time sea ice analysis
	Nassau, Bahamas (0.275)				– Government places responsibility for coastal protection with private sector and individuals while individuals expect government to be responsible for long-term projects	– Very limited national funding provided for adaptation	– Inadequate data on climatic risks inhibits vulnerability assessments – Low perception of climate change risk among population and policymakers (Petzold et al., 2018; Thomas and Benjamin, 2018)		– Increasing knowledge of climate change risks through evidence-based studies – Improving governance systems to identify responsibilities and plans for adaptation and gaining access to funding to supplement limited national budget
	Kingston, Jamaica (1.2)					– Costs of adaptation critical infrastructure is high (Monioudi et al., 2018)			

Geomorphology	City, country (2020 population, in millions)	Adaptation constraints							Enablers
		Economic	Social/ cultural	Human capacity	Governance, institutions and policy	Financial	Information/ awareness/ technology	Physical/ biological	
Open coast	Seychelles (0.1)		– Customary practices such as parking cars in dune areas reduces adaptation effectiveness and increases costs (had to construct bollards to prevent parking)	– Limited decision makers and technical staff with climate change adaptation expertise	– Fragile institutions and inadequate governance related to climate change – Climate change not integrated into development planning	– Lack of national funding to support adaptation strategies – Limited financial support from international agencies	– Limited scientific knowledge that is useful for decision-making – Limited understanding of climate change risks – Little investment in adaptation research – Lack of quality data on impacts – Data gaps at the sub-national scale, particularly for more rural areas	– Land-use patterns inhibit rainwater drainage and lead to flash flooding	– Promote individual behaviour change through constructive and punitive measures – Promote synergies between adaptation and mitigation by connecting EbA projects with community-based adaptation – Promote cross-sectoral and institutional collaboration to avoid duplication of projects – Ensure that climate change policies are coherent with national development strategies – Form direct partnerships between climate scientists and decision makers to co-produce usable information for decision-making – Draw on local knowledge to identify local indicators of climate change impacts – Technology transfer from successful adaptation responses in other similar locales – Cross-sectoral and institutional collaboration to improve efficient use of limited financial resources
	Singapore, Singapore (5.6)							– Small land area with no space for retreat from SLR	– Integrated whole of government approach across ministries committing to long-term climate adaptation (and mitigation) goals by 2030 (Angiello, 2021)
	Manila, Philippines (14)		– Social and livelihood risks		– Jurisdictional conflicts between municipalities, lack of political will and corruption (Meerow, 2017; Doberstein et al., 2020) – Uncoordinated top-down municipal action			– Lack of land availability	– Bottom-up community-based actions that improve adaptive capacity exist and can be strengthened (Porio, 2014) – Institutional reorientation towards metro-wide planning and infrastructure transformations that are climate-resilient and equitable (Meerow, 2017)

Geomorphology	City, country (2020 population, in millions)	Adaptation constraints							Enablers
		Economic	Social/ cultural	Human capacity	Governance, institutions and policy	Financial	Information/ awareness/ technology	Physical/ biological	
Mixed	Maputo-Matola, Mozambique (3)[a]			– Deep poverty and precarity with minimal access to basic services	– Weak government capacity – Self-help is predominant coping mechanism for majority of urban poor	– Weak and inadequate adaptation finance	– Limited capacity and key role played by international donor community	– Mangrove ecosystems and coastal ecosystems in decline compounding climate change risk	– Port city provides foundation for livelihoods – Community do-it-yourself coping mechanisms
	Florianopolis, Santa Catarina Island, Brazil (1.2)	– Strong economy undermined by environmental degradation – Rapid unregulated urbanization	– Inequity but strong tradition of cultural heritage	– Low access to good research capability	– Inadequate government capacity and coordination to regulate development and land-use practices – Poor leadership at federal level – No evidence of preparation for long-term SLR			– 'Pinch point' connection to the mainland where there is densely populated habitation – Ongoing environmentally destructive practices	– Knowledge hub; robust economy; partnerships between the private sector, municipality and civil society – Physical exposure to coastal risks limited to two main areas on the east and northeast coast (Mussi et al., 2018) – Need to attend to short-term basic services and infrastructure and long-term climate goals (e.g., (Bonatti et al., 2019)
	Cape Town, South Africa (4.6)[a]	– Marked inequity – Reliance on key sectors impacted by climate change and COVID-19, e.g., tourism –	– Diverse and divergent sociocultural realities fractured along wealth and racial lines – Legacy of apartheid, poverty and inequity – Divided city: spatial layout distributes climate risks to poor	– Health, education, crime, housing, etc. highly differentiated driving vulnerability to climate change – Rapid spread of informal settlements and population growth	– Well-governed metro but impacted by political turf battles from local to national level – Coordination challenges between sectoral agencies within and between spheres of government and inadequate leadership from central government – Disconnect between municipal authority and people in informal settlements – Underlying challenge of meeting present pressing needs and preparing for future climate realities	– Access to significant finances but unevenly spread – Infrastructure and human development needs exceed available resources	– High capacity, unequally distributed and institutional capacity mismatched with needs	– Variable climate-compounded hazard exposure – High-energy coast with some areas at high risk of SLR – Fragility of water infrastructure – Legacy development exposed to climate change impacts – Distinctive coastal ecosystems adversely impacted by climate change	– Capable leaders; effective interactions between municipal authority and researchers; experience in community-based initiatives

Geomor-phology	City, country (2020 population, in millions)	Adaptation constraints							Enablers
		Economic	Social/ cultural	Human capacity	Governance, institutions and policy	Financial	Information/ awareness/ technology	Physical/ biological	
Mixed	Mumbai, India (20.4)[a]			– Low human capacity to undertake long-term adaptation to floods – Rapid spread of informal settlements and population growth	– Political inertia, reactive risk management – Lack of urban adaptation plan (Araos et al., 2016; Weinstein et al., 2019; Singh et al., 2021)			– Low-lying areas with city built on reclaimed land – Legacy development exposed to climate change impacts	

Notes:

(a) Population estimates are for the entire metropolitan region.

Table SMCCP2.3 | Adaptation options assessed for two selected coastal archetypes. Their soft (surpassable) and hard (unsurpassable) limits indicate reasons for adding more adaptation options or switching to alternative options. For each option, the potential effectiveness to reduce risk to coastal flooding and erosion is assessed in terms of a relative sea level rise: low (e.g., less than 0.3 m), medium (e.g., 0.3–0.8 m) and high (e.g., more than 0.8 m). Trade-offs include synergies and conflicts with social goals, climate mitigation and other hazards.

Geomorphology of small islands with open coasts Illustrative cities: Kingston (Jamaica), Seychelles, Nassau (Bahamas), Singapore, South Tarawa (Kiribati), Funafuti (Tuvalu), Male (Maldives)					
Strategy	Option	Soft/hard limits	Potentially effective to low/ medium/high SLR	Trade-offs and co-benefits	References
Protect	– Sea wall, with possibly a drainage system	– Is already not sufficient to prevent flooding and erosion in several places – In higher places it could delay flooding.	Low	**Trade-offs:** potential for negative ecological impacts and loss of ecosystem services; induced long-term loss of beaches has negative implications for neighbouring sediment cells, but also for coastal tourism and access to beaches for recreational and spiritual uses; has potential to be maladaptive as it could provide false sense of security that attracts developments in risky places and triggers a self-reinforcing protect pathway	SMCCP2.1; Chapter 16; Logan et al., 2018; Brown et al., 2020
Protect-EbA	– Wetland, mangrove (restoration)		Low	**Co-benefits:** provides new livelihood opportunities; supports healthy ecosystems and reliant livelihoods such as fisheries	CCP2.3; Chapter 2; Oppenheimer et al., 2019
Protect-EbA	– Coral reef (restoration)	– Coral reefs can keep up with 0.5 cm yr^{-1}, constrained at 1.5 C and lost at 2 C in many places.	Medium	**Co-benefits:** provides new livelihood opportunities; supports healthy ecosystems and reliant livelihoods such as fisheries	CCP2.3; Chapter 2; Oppenheimer et al., 2019

Geomorphology of small islands with open coasts Illustrative cities: Kingston (Jamaica), Seychelles, Nassau (Bahamas), Singapore, South Tarawa (Kiribati), Funafuti (Tuvalu), Male (Maldives)					
Strategy	**Option**	**Soft/hard limits**	**Potentially effective to low/ medium/high SLR**	**Trade-offs and co-benefits**	**References**
Retreat/avoid	– No-build zones		Low		
Retreat	– Relocate landwards (national)	– Hard limit for SIDS sited on topographically challenged regions	Low in highly urbanized regions	**Trade-offs:** Increased population density in inland areas may lead to strain on resources (e.g., water availability reduced as freshwater lens are salinized due to SLR)	
Retreat	– Relocate international	– Requires receiving location – Long lead time	High	**Trade-offs:** Loss of sovereignty, significant non-economic loss and damage including loss of community, sense of place, traditional livelihoods, locations of cultural and spiritual significance	Laurice Jamero et al., 2017; Magnan and Duvat, 2020
Accommodate	– Elevate infrastructure	– Option for household level – Raising floor and ground of houses and roads has limited height and becomes increasingly unacceptable with higher frequency of flooding	Low	**Trade-offs:** Does not prevent loss of ecosystem services (e.g., salinization of freshwater lenses); loss of land suitable for farming	Laurice Jamero et al., 2017
Protect	– Land raising	– Requires space to temporarily relocate – Material to raise land – Costs	Low		Magnan and Duvat, 2020
Advance	– Land reclamation with ground elevation	– Costs, but can pay back through real-estate revenues – Strong subsidence after construction – Material to build land – Potentially long lead time – High costs; less feasible with large water depth > 30 m	Low	**Trade-offs:** Negative effects on ecosystems and biodiversity	SMCCP2.1; Hinkel et al., 2018; Sengupta et al., 2018; Brown et al., 2020; Wang and Wang, 2020
Advance	– Floating	– Experimental stage, implemented within a city in calm waters – Provides opportunities for developments in land-scarce cities	High		Penning-Rowsell, 2020; Wang and Wang, 2020
Geomorphology of resource rich megacities in deltas, open coasts and estuaries **Illustrative cities:** New York (USA), Greater London (UK), Shanghai (China), Bangkok (Thailand)					
Strategy	**Option**	**Soft/hard limits**	**Potential effectiveness**	**Trade-offs and co-benefits**	**References**
Protect	– Sea wall and drainage/pump system	– With increasing SLR it becomes more difficult to drain excess water, in particular in regions with heavy monsoons or in river deltas – High benefit/cost ratio in urbanized regions, but not affordable for every community	Medium		Chapter 13; Esteban et al., 2020; Vousdoukas et al., 2020a

Geomorphology of small islands with open coasts Illustrative cities: Kingston (Jamaica), Seychelles, Nassau (Bahamas), Singapore, South Tarawa (Kiribati), Funafuti (Tuvalu), Male (Maldives)					
Strategy	**Option**	**Soft/hard limits**	**Potentially effective to low/ medium/high SLR**	**Trade-offs and co-benefits**	**References**
Protect	– Levees and dunes		High		
Protect	– Storm surge barrier (for estuaries and bays)	– Residual risk – Long lead time for planning and implementation – Increasingly closes with higher SLR until permanently closed, hampering connection with hinterland	Medium-high		SMCCP2.1; Chapter 10; Chapter 13; Scussolini et al., 2017; Du et al., 2020; Haasnoot et al., 2020; Yin et al., 2020
Protect-EbA	– Wetland, mangrove restoration	– Mangroves can keep up with 0.5–1 cm yr^{-1}; decreased effectiveness at 2 C Global Warming Level – Space: coastal squeeze; higher benefit/cost ratio than protect and less residual risk. – Time: require time to establish/grow	Low-medium	Livelihood and ecosystem benefits (e.g., fish populations)	SMCCP2.1; Chapter 2, Chapter 10; Oppenheimer et al., 2019; Du et al., 2020; Morris et al., 2020
Accommodate	– Wet-proofing i.e. allowing floodwaters to enter non-living spaces of houses – Dry-proofing of infrastructure and buildings to a specific e.g. 1m of flood depth	– Can be implemented faster and with less cost compared protect	Medium		Scussolini et al., 2017; Du et al., 2020
Retreat	– No-build zones		Medium		Chapter 13; Du et al., 2020; Lincke et al., 2020
Retreat	– Relocate (internal)	– Space constraints prohibiting retreat, sunk costs, lack of planning, time and public and political support – Can help to transform cities	High	Negative impacts on poor, marginalised groups in terms of exposure to new risks and reduced livelihood opportunities	Ajibade, 2019; Haasnoot et al., 2021a; Jain et al., 2021; Lincke and Hinkel, 2021; Mach and Siders, 2021
Protect	– Land raising	– Difficult in existing regions; easier in rebuild or newly build areas – Long lead time	High		Scussolini et al., 2017; Storbjörk and Hjerpe, 2021
Advance	– Land reclamation with ground elevation	– Costs, material, potentially long lead time – Lifetime can be extended with levees – Can experience large subsidence	High		Brown et al., 2019; Sengupta et al., 2020
Advance	– Floating seawards	– Within a city, experiments occur in calm waters	Uncertain		Penning-Rowsell, 2020

Table SMCCP2.4 | Governance challenges, enablers and lessons learned in the face of escalating coastal hazard risk: [This assessment builds upon and extends Oppenheimer, et al., 2019: Sea Level Rise and Implications for Low-Lying Islands, Coasts and Communities. In: IPCC Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate, H.-O. Pörtner, et al., (eds.) and integrates CCP2 assessment of archetypal cities and settlements by the sea (Table SMCCP2.1; Table SMCCP2.2)]

Key governance challenges	Critical enablers and lessons	Illustrative lessons from around the world	Illustrative archetypal cities and settlements
Complexity: **Climate change compounds non-climatic hazard risks facing coastal cities and settlements (C&S) in interconnected, dynamic and emergent ways for which there are no simple solutions** – Complexity grows as change unfolds and intersecting coastal hazards cause cascading and compounding impacts and risks, with responses at times deepening risk – SLR introduces novel compound problems, with complex connections between biophysical and socioeconomic, cultural and political aspects that challenge conventional science and public planning, decision-making and implementation – The rapid pace, complexity and novelty of SLR is already challenging conventional decision-making in some localities, e.g., some Arctic and Pacific Island communities	**Draw on multiple knowledge systems to co-design and co-produce more acceptable, effective and enduring responses** Dannevig and Aall, 2015; Dutra et al., 2015; Sovacool et al., 2015; Desportes and Colenbrander, 2016; Ziervogel et al., 2016; Adger et al., 2017; Betzold and Mohamed, 2017; Onat et al., 2018; Warner et al., 2018; St. John III and Yusuf, 2019; Fayombo, 2020	Lessons learned in C&S from Australia, the Comoros, the Arctic, Canada, Portugal, Brazil and New Zealand to Norway and the USA (Costas et al., 2015; Dannevig and Aall, 2015; Betzold and Mohamed, 2017; Chouinard et al., 2017; Elrick-Barr et al., 2017; Carter, 2018; Flynn et al., 2018; Lawrence et al., 2018; Huntington et al., 2019; Marengo et al., 2019; St. John III and Yusuf, 2019): – Reveal dynamic complexity by drawing on multiple sources of locally relevant evidence – Use and integrate local, Indigenous and scientific knowledge – Create shared knowledge and understanding through storytelling – Bridge gaps between science, policy and practice by experimenting with novel approaches supported by governance actors and stakeholders working across organisational, sectoral and institutional boundaries	– Seychelles (0.1 million): Partnerships being created between science and policy, with local knowledge, to co-produce usable information for decision-making but major awareness and information constraints to overcome – Dhaka (21 million), Bangladesh: Climate change is national priority; partnering with the Netherlands to develop long-term data plans, but challenge to overcome governance and institutional constraints, marked inequity and differential risk, and low human capacity for long-term adaptation given severe escalating risk – Jakarta (10.8 million), Indonesia: Community-based efforts foster mutual assistance and self-organisation but reactive measures predominate and there are severe adaptation constraints.
	Build governance capacity to tackle complex problems Moser et al., 2012; Head and Alford, 2013; Head, 2014; Dewulf and Termeer, 2015; Kwakkel et al., 2016; Termeer et al., 2016; Alford and Head, 2017; Chu et al., 2017; Daviter, 2017; Cinner et al., 2018; McConnell, 2018; Valdivieso and Andersson, 2018; Fink, 2019; Head, 2019; Ndebele-Murisa et al., 2020; Wijaya et al., 2020; Angiello, 2021	Lessons learned in the Dutch Delta Programme to future-proof the Netherlands (Dewulf and Termeer, 2015; Bloemen et al., 2018; Bloemen et al., 2019a): – Joined up visionary leadership is key, e.g., make cabinet- and city-level commitments to long-term policy implementation – Translate political will into substantial dedicated budgets to build government capacity to tackle complex problems – Use flexible approaches that build resilience, e.g., create an independent agency alongside traditional administrative body – Use an adaptation pathways approach to make short-term decisions consistent with long-term goals, given future uncertainty – Translate national requirements into local action by having enabling provisions for tailored local-level policy and practice – Tackle emergent problems by setting up enduring monitoring and lesson-learning processes – Governance arrangements reconcile competing demands in an inclusive, timely and legitimate manner – Counter policy deadlocks due to short-term priorities and vested interests with a long-term perspective (e.g., 100 years), considering plausible scenarios, and incentivising novel solutions	– Singapore (5.6 million), Singapore: Integrated whole of government approach across ministries committing to long-term climate adaptation (and mitigation) goals by 2030 (Angiello, 2021) – Rotterdam (0.65 million), Netherlands: Delta Programme, supported by law, administrative arrangements and Euro 1 billion yr^{-1} budget to 2029 – Florianopolis, Santa Catarina Island (1.2 million), Brazil: Building a knowledge hub through partnerships between the public and private sectors and civil society, but constrained by inequity and challenge of unregulated development and need to reconcile short-term infrastructure and service imperatives with long-term climate goals – Nassau, (0.275 million) Bahamas: Identifying responsibilities, accessing funding and preparing adaptation plans drawing on evidence-based studies to overcome constraints of limited funding, inadequate data and low governance capacity – Shanghai (27 million), China: Combination of long-term planning, political will and national and municipal provisions to address climate change, and strong technical capability, has contained risk in short- to medium-term, but longer-term prospects daunting, given no room to retreat – Can Tho City (0.4 million), Vietnam: Emerging focus on adaptation, engaging international donors and research community, but immense urban growth pressure and poor households have limited capacity to take long-term actions

Key governance challenges	Critical enablers and lessons	Illustrative lessons from around the world	Illustrative archetypal cities and settlements
Time horizon and uncertainty: **The future is uncertain but climate change will continue for generations and cannot be addressed by short-term (e.g., 1–10 years) responses** – Coastal C&S face a dilemma: delayed action imposes a huge burden on future generations but there is a fine line between under- and over-investing in risk reduction, especially for at-risk C&S – SLR is certain to continue for many centuries, with deep uncertainty about the magnitude and timing of SLR beyond 2050 – SLR and coastal hazard risk challenges standard planning and decision-making practices, which strive for certainty and predictability – Coastal hazard risk goes beyond short-term bureaucratic, political, electoral and budget cycles – SLR and coastal hazard risk is dynamic and difficult to address in an adaptive manner given the inflexibility of laws and institutions like private property rights – Given its long time horizon, it is hard to mobilise visionary action through today's business, civic and political leaders	**Adopt a long-term view but take action now and keep options open to adjust responses as SLRs and circumstances change** Haasnoot et al., 2013; Hurlimann et al., 2014; Dewulf and Termeer, 2015; Stephens et al., 2018; OECD, 2019; Fu, 2020	Lessons learned in diverse C&S from Nigeria to Bangladesh, Brazil, the Arctic, Indonesia, China, Netherlands and New Zealand (Termeer et al., 2013; Broto et al., 2015; Tuts et al., 2015; Ajibade et al., 2016; Brown et al., 2016; Butler et al., 2016b; Francesch-Huidobro et al., 2017; Ahmed et al., 2018; Cradock-Henry et al., 2018; Flood et al., 2018; Flynn et al., 2018; Bloemen et al., 2019a; Lawrence et al., 2019; Marengo et al., 2019; OECD, 2019): – Establish national policies and guidance that takes a long-term view (e.g., 100 years) but compels action now – Seek buy-in from key stakeholders in government, the private sector and civil society – Develop a shared medium- (10–50 years) to long-term vision (100+ years) – Meaningfully involve stakeholders in adaptation planning, e.g., by involving representatives in decision-making – Reconcile divergent perspectives through tailored responses – Address power imbalances and human development needs, e.g., in goal setting and process design – Draw on local, Indigenous and scientific knowledge	– Napier (0.065 million), Hawkes Bay (0.178 million), New Zealand: National law compels local authorities to take 100-year perspective and local 2100 Strategy to address coastal hazard risk explicitly accounts for dynamic complexity and uncertain future through adaptation pathways logic – Shanghai (27 million), China: Plans up to 2100, strong national and municipal focus on climate change, and access to technical expertise helps to address escalating risk despite high income inequality and differential exposure and vulnerability. – Dhaka (21 million), Bangladesh: Long-term adaptation plans in place through to 2100, but challenge to translate national prioritisation of climate change into local reality
	Avoid new development commitments in high-risk locations Hurlimann and March, 2012; Glavovic and Smith, 2014; Hurlimann et al., 2014; Tuts et al., 2015; Berke and Stevens, 2016; Butler et al., 2016b; OECD, 2019	Lessons learned in diverse C&S from Australia to the USA (Dyckman et al., 2014; Hurlimann et al., 2014; Kousky, 2014; Tuts et al., 2015; Butler et al., 2016a; Gibbs, 2016; Vella et al., 2016; Koslov, 2019; OECD, 2019; Siders, 2019): – Use spatial planning to regulate coastal development in exposed localities – Take advantage of the window of opportunity created by extreme events – Adopt tailored risk reduction and resilience building measures post-disaster – Understand and address political risks and local opposition to enable managed retreat when risk is intolerable and inundation is unacceptable	– Rotterdam (0.65 million), Netherlands: Delta Programme promotes 'living with water', which simultaneously allows for and manages urban flooding – Napier (0.065 million), Hawkes Bay (0.178 million), New Zealand: Regulatory provisions discourage new development in high-risk locations and addressed through coastal hazard strategy that provides for sequenced adaptation interventions in the face of unfolding climate change impacts – Florianopolis, Santa Catarina Island (1.2 million), Brazil: Unregulated ad hoc development in at-risk locations hampers effective adaptation

Key governance challenges	Critical enablers and lessons	Illustrative lessons from around the world	Illustrative archetypal cities and settlements
Cross-scale and cross-domain coordination: **Decisions bound by jurisdictional and sectoral boundaries fail to address linkages within and between coastal ecosystems and C&S facing interconnected climate change-compounded impacts and risk** – SLR impacts extend across scales and levels of governance – SLR and coastal hazard impacts extend across sectors, policy domains and functional areas of governance (e.g., planning, emergency services, asset management, etc.) – Tackling coastal hazard risk exceeds the capacity of many local governments, communities and property owners – A 'joined-up' response to coastal hazard risk is vital, especially coherence between national policy and local competency	**Develop networks and linkages within and between different governance scales and levels, and across policy domains and sectors, to improve coordination, build trust and legitimise decisions** Glavovic and Smith, 2014; Colenbrander and Sowman, 2015; Dutra et al., 2015; Sowman et al., 2016; Chu et al., 2018b; Forino et al., 2018; Lund, 2018; Pinto et al., 2018; Clar, 2019; Pittman and Armitage, 2019; Reiblich et al., 2019; Kim et al., 2020	Lessons learned in diverse C&S from the Caribbean to Ireland, Vietnam, Uruguay and England (Flannery et al., 2015; Gopalakrishnan et al., 2017; Carro et al., 2018; Chu et al., 2018b; Den Uyl and Russel, 2018; Gopalakrishnan et al., 2018; Huynh and Stringer, 2018; Olazabal et al., 2019a) (Pittman and Armitage, 2019; Reiblich et al., 2019; Berman et al., 2020; Kim et al., 2020): – Collaborative projects involve state and non-state actors – Use multi-lateral agreements, e.g., between neighbouring countries (or between coastal regions and C&S) – Connect people, organizations and communities through boundary spanning organizations—within and between governance levels and scales – Leadership by central actors with capable teams is key – Mobilise the capabilities of communities and non-state actors – Address policy inconsistencies and clarify roles and responsibilities – Secure national and regional resources to support local efforts – Use measures to promote interaction, deliberation and coordination to avoid spill-over effects – Strengthen linkages between formal (e.g., regulatory) and informal (e.g., traditions and rituals) institutions, e.g., through information sharing – Use spatial coordination mechanisms, e.g., land-use planning, to translate national and regional provisions into local competencies	– Seychelles (0.1 million): Cross-sectoral and institutional collaboration being explored to improve effective and efficient use of limited financial resources and community-based adaptation and EbA explored to bridge adaptation and mitigation and improve coordination, but governance constraints are severe and climate change not well integrated into development planning – Florianopolis, Santa Catarina Island (1.2 million), Brazil: Effective local climate action hampered by governance constraints and weak federal leadership – Cape Town (4.6 million), South Africa: Enabling multi-level climate governance is advanced at the local–provincial level, but political turf battles hamper national–provincial–local progress; enabling effective municipal–informal settlement action is challenging given the apartheid legacy and scale of poverty and inequity
	Build shared understanding and enable locally appropriate responses through experimentation, innovation and social learning Dyckman et al., 2014; Glavovic and Smith, 2014; Lassa and Nugraha, 2014; Dutra et al., 2015; Ensor and Harvey, 2015; Chu et al., 2018a; McFadgen and Huitema, 2018; Mazeka et al., 2019; Wolfram et al., 2019	Lessons learned in diverse C&S from India to Brazil, USA, Europe and East Asia (Blok and Tschötschel, 2016; Chu, 2016; Hughes et al., 2017a; Chu et al., 2018a; Bellinson and Chu, 2019; Duvat and Magnan, 2019; Fink, 2019; Marengo et al., 2019; Wolfram et al., 2019): – Take account of local history, culture and politics through engagement, experimentation and innovation – Prioritise social learning and shared understanding, e.g., make information accessible to all irrespective of level of education, language, etc. – Generate socioeconomic, livelihood and climate-development co-benefits – Take advantage of national and trans-national community and local authority networks	– Utqiagvik (formerly Barrow), Alaska, USA (0.04 million): Leveraging local knowledge and historical precedent of transformative change, and better integrating local and scientific knowledge, but severe governance and institutional capacity constraints with ad hoc actions focused on short-term and lack of clarity about responsibilities – Cape Town (4.6 million), South Africa: Capable local leaders together with effective collaboration between climate researchers and municipal authority have initiated range of community-based adaptation initiatives; translating plans into action is challenging given scope of poverty and inequity, and 'everyday' vulnerability challenges exacerbated by climate change – New York City (23.5 million), USA: State and city government reaching out to communities to build adaptive capacity and resilience, and draw on strong technical capabilities, but challenge given available financial resources and challenges of multi-level governance together with marked inequity and differential exposure and vulnerability, and private property rights prioritization

Key governance challenges	Critical enablers and lessons	Illustrative lessons from around the world	Illustrative archetypal cities and settlements
Equity and social vulnerability: **Climate change compounds everyday inequity and vulnerability in coastal C&S, making it difficult to disentangle and address social drivers of risk** – Coastal hazard impacts and responses affect people in diverse ways, with costs and benefits unevenly spread – These responses can compound vulnerability and inequity – SLR and coastal hazards can undermine societal aspirations, like the Sustainable Development Goals – Private responses can cause public harm – Responses can deepen vulnerability, risk and marginalisation through elite capture of coastal resources and assets	**Recognise political realities and address vulnerability and equity concerns to achieve just, impactful and enduring outcomes** Eriksen et al., 2015; Sovacool et al., 2015; Tuts et al., 2015; Adger et al., 2017; Hardy et al., 2017; Holland, 2017; Dolšak and Prakash, 2018; Finkbeiner et al., 2018; Sovacool, 2018; Warner et al., 2018; OECD, 2019	Lessons learned in diverse C&S from Mozambique to Australia, Cambodia, India, Thailand, Pacific Islands, the Arctic and the USA (Archer and Dodman, 2015) (Broto et al., 2015) (Hardy et al., 2017) (Nunn et al., 2017) (Siriporananon and Visuthismajarn, 2018) (Romero Manrique et al., 2018) (Torabi et al., 2018): – Expose the drivers and root causes of injustice, structural inequity and vulnerability – Link human development concerns, risk reduction, resilience and adaptation – Raise awareness and public support for actions that are just and equitable – Address discriminatory drivers (e.g., on racial grounds) of coastal land-use patterns and risk – Address the barriers marginalised groups face in participating in risk reduction and adaptation planning – Use inclusive planning, decision-making and implementation processes to give voice to marginalised people	– Cape Town (4.6 million), South Africa: Adaptation efforts framed by legacy of apartheid and focus on reducing vulnerability, public safety and securing critical infrastructure and community assets; scale of challenge is daunting – Maputo-Matola (3 million), Mozambique: Port city provides coastal livelihood opportunities but compromised by environmental degradation compounded by climate change compelling community do-it-yourself coping mechanisms in face of severe poverty and vulnerability, weak governance and institutional capacity, and reliance on donor support – New York City (23.5 million), USA: Climate change risk and plight of exposed and vulnerable people brought to public attention after Hurricane Sandy (2012), catalysing adaptation action
	Strengthen community capabilities to respond to SLR and coastal hazard risk, drawing on external assistance and government support where necessary Schlosberg, 2012; Musa et al., 2016; Vedeld et al., 2016; Elrick-Barr et al., 2017; Warrick et al., 2017; Dolšak and Prakash, 2018	Lessons learned in diverse C&S from Belize to SIDS in the Pacific and Caribbean, and rural coastal communities in the USA (Karlsson and Hovelsrud, 2015; Joseph, 2017; Robinson, 2017; Warrick et al., 2017; Weir et al., 2017; Jurjonas and Seekamp, 2018; Kelman, 2018; Petzold and Magnan, 2019): – Raise vulnerability and risk awareness and understanding, build community capability and leverage external support by working with professionals, academics, local NGOs, journalists and activists – Where necessary, the rights of vulnerable groups can be secured through court action – Integrate traditional community responses with local government efforts – Ensure gender equity, e.g., through representation on planning and decision-making bodies	– Monkey River Village (200 people), Belize: Remote indigenous community capacity to tackle erosion enabled by interventions by researchers, journalists and local NGOs to secure media and political attention after hurricane damage; enduring action hampered by severe adaptation constraints, limited livelihood opportunities and contested future development pathways based on tourism – Accra (2.5 million), Ghana: Household adaptation mediated by local government approaches to flood mitigation, with need for better early warning system and measures to maintain local stormwater and related infrastructure to prevent flooding. Severe adaptation constraints. – Lagos, Nigeria: Building adaptive capacity to overcome 'everyday' vulnerability and poverty is severely challenging.

Key governance challenges	Critical enablers and lessons	Illustrative lessons from around the world	Illustrative archetypal cities and settlements
– Social conflict: **Coastal C&S will be the locus of contending views about appropriate climate responses and face the challenge of avoiding destructive conflict and realising its productive potential** – As coastal hazard risk gets progressively worse, social conflict (i.e., non-violent struggles over values, interests, resources and influence) could escalate – In addition to exacerbating difficult trade-offs between private and public interests, ecological, social, cultural and economic considerations, and short- and long-term concerns, SLR could increase social tensions over impacted critical infrastructure, cultural connections to the coast, and key livelihood, public health, identity, security and sovereignty concerns – SLR could compound sociopolitical stressors and challenge prevailing legal provisions and processes	**Design and facilitate tailor-made participation processes, involving stakeholders early and consistently through to implementation of agreed responses and subsequent adjustments** Burton and Mustelin, 2013; Berke and Stevens, 2016; Gorddard et al., 2016; Webler et al., 2016; Schlosberg et al., 2017; Chu et al., 2018a; Lawrence et al., 2018; Mehring et al., 2018; Nkoana et al., 2018; Schernewski et al., 2018; Yusuf et al., 2018; Uittenbroek et al., 2019; Kim et al., 2020	Lessons learned in diverse C&S from South Africa to Reunion Island and Australia (Sowman and Gawith, 1994; Celliers et al., 2013; Pasquini et al., 2013; Colenbrander and Sowman, 2015; Leck and Roberts, 2015; Pasquini et al., 2015; Chu et al., 2016; Desportes and Colenbrander, 2016; Ziervogel et al., 2016; Colenbrander and Bavinck, 2017; Glavovic et al., 2018; Magnan and Duvat, 2018; Torabi et al., 2018; Colenbrander, 2019): – Create opportunities for integrative solutions by involving key interests and affected parties in adaptation planning – Use conflict resolution mechanisms in participatory processes – Appoint independent facilitators/mediators and involve officials as 'bureaucratic activists' to improve inclusivity and iterative and reflexive engagement – Align informal participatory processes with statutory processes and government practices – Sustain engagement by securing resources for local use, and aligning activities with political and bureaucratic cycles – Involve historically disadvantaged and socially vulnerable groups, e.g., using accessible meeting locations/venues, local languages and culturally appropriate meeting protocols – Involve local leaders who will champion risk reduction and adaptation and help mainstream findings into C&S decision-making – Inclusive processes help address conflict and drivers of vulnerability, and promote just adaptation	– Napier (0.065 million), Hawkes Bay (0.178 million), New Zealand: Enabling national regulatory and non-regulatory provisions, together with collaboration between local authorities and Indigenous people, involving stakeholders, led to co-designed long-term strategy with commitment to implementation; translating plans into action is challenging given contending interests – Manila (14 million), Philippines: Metro-wide planning and infrastructure provisions for climate change; climate justice and resilience being explored with community-based actions, but severe challenges with extent of exposure and vulnerability, and limited political will, corruption and uncoordinated top-down municipal actions

Key governance challenges	Critical enablers and lessons	Illustrative lessons from around the world	Illustrative archetypal cities and settlements
– Social conflict: **Coastal C&S will be the locus of contending views about appropriate climate responses and face the challenge of avoiding destructive conflict and realising its productive potentia**l – As coastal hazard risk gets progressively worse, social conflict (i.e., non-violent struggles over values, interests, resources and influence) could escalate – In addition to exacerbating difficult trade-offs between private and public interests, ecological, social, cultural and economic considerations, and short- and long-term concerns, SLR could increase social tensions over impacted critical infrastructure, cultural connections to the coast, and key livelihood, public health, identity, security and sovereignty concerns – SLR could compound sociopolitical stressors and challenge prevailing legal provisions and processes	**Create safe settings for inclusive, informed and meaningful deliberation and collaborative problem-solving** Susskind et al., 1999; Laws et al., 2014; Hiwasaki et al., 2015; Susskind et al., 2015) (Glavovic, 2016; Ung et al., 2016; Nursey-Bray, 2017; Sultana and Thompson, 2017; Magnan and Duvat, 2018; Fayombo, 2020	Lessons learned in diverse C&S in villages from Bangladesh to communities in South Africa, Australia, and Louisiana and New England, USA, (Rumore, 2014; Susskind et al., 2015; Glavovic, 2016; Nursey-Bray, 2017; Sultana and Thompson, 2017; Fayombo, 2020): – Use flexible and enabling processes based in local institutions judged to be robust and fair, supported by governing authorities – Pay attention to local social dynamics and reduce elite domination – Use local and Indigenous knowledges and science to inform responses – Encourage institutional improvisation to address local concerns – Use trusted independent facilitators – Incentivise participation of disadvantaged groups – Focus on improving risk literacy, optimism and capacity for joint problem-solving – Use joint fact finding, scenario planning, negotiate trade-offs, facilitate public dialogue and secure institutional support for action – Enable ongoing public deliberation and social learning – Commit to continual adjustments as circumstances change over time, e.g., build shared understanding about locally relevant thresholds beyond which alternative courses of action need to be actioned	– Napier (0.065 million), Hawkes Bay (0.178 million), New Zealand: Active involvement of local communities, Indigenous People (Māori) and research community to co-produce fit-for-purpose long-term coastal hazard risk strategy – Rotterdam (0.65 million), Netherlands: Delta Programme has institutionalised multi-level adaptation governance approach with strong accountability mechanisms – London (8.9 million), UK: Long-term provisions for at-risk Thames Estuary, including major protective works, are embedded in Greater London Spatial Development Plan and London Climate Change Partnership that is championed by strategic leadership and supported by the public and strong technical capability

References

Abadie, L.M., 2018: Sea level damage risk with probabilistic weighting of IPCC scenarios: an application to major coastal cities. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **175**, 582–598, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.11.069.

Abadie, L.M., et al., 2020: Comparing urban coastal flood risk in 136 cities under two alternative sea-level projections: RCP 8.5 and an expert opinion-based high-end scenario. *Ocean. Coast. Manag.*, **193**, 105249, doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2020.105249.

Abadie, L.M., E. Sainz de Murieta and I. Galarraga, 2016: Climate risk assessment under uncertainty: an application to main European coastal cities. *Front. Mar. Sci.*, **3**(265), doi:10.3389/fmars.2016.00265.

Abiodun, B.J., et al., 2017: Potential impacts of climate change on extreme precipitation over four African coastal cities. *Clim. Change*, **143**(3-4), 399–413, doi:10.1007/s10584-017-2001-5.

Abubakar, I., et al., 2018: The UCL-Lancet Commission on Migration and Health: the health of a world on the move. *Lancet*, **392**(10164), 2606–2654, doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(18)32114-7.

Adelekan, I.O., 2010: Vulnerability of poor urban coastal communities to flooding in Lagos, Nigeria. *Environ. Urban.*, **22**(2), 433–450, doi:10.1177/0956247810380141.

Adger, W.N., C. Butler and K. Walker-Springett, 2017: Moral reasoning in adaptation to climate change. *Env. Polit.*, **26**(3), 371–390, doi:10.1080/09644016.2017.1287624.

Adger, W.N., et al., 2020: Urbanization, migration, and adaptation to climate change. *One Earth*, **3**(4), 396–399, doi:10.1016/j.oneear.2020.09.016.

Aerts, J.C.J.H., 2017: Impacts beyond the coast. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **7**(5), 315–316, doi:10.1038/nclimate3279.

Ahmed, F., et al., 2018: Tipping points in adaptation to urban flooding under climate change and urban growth: the case of the Dhaka megacity. *Land Use Policy*, **79**, 496–506, doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2018.05.051.

Ahmed, I., et al., 2019: Climate change, environmental stress and loss of livelihoods can push people towards illegal activities: a case study from coastal Bangladesh. *Clim. Dev.*, **11**(10), 907–917, doi:10.1080/17565529.2019.1586638.

Ajibade, I., 2017: Can a future city enhance urban resilience and sustainability? A political ecology analysis of Eko Atlantic city, Nigeria. *Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct.*, **26**, 85–92, doi:10.1016/j.ijdrr.2017.09.029.

Ajibade, I., 2019: Planned retreat in Global South megacities: disentangling policy, practice, and environmental justice. *Clim. Change*, **157**(2), 299–317, doi:10.1007/s10584-019-02535-1.

Ajibade, I. and G. McBean, 2014: Climate extremes and housing rights: a political ecology of impacts, early warning and adaptation constraints in Lagos slum communities. *Geoforum*, **55**, 76–86, doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2014.05.005.

Ajibade, I., G. McBean and R. Bezner-Kerr, 2013: Urban flooding in Lagos, Nigeria: patterns of vulnerability and resilience among women. *Glob. Environ. Change*, **23**(6), 1714–1725, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.08.009.

Ajibade, I., M. Pelling, J. Agboola and M. Garschagen, 2016: Sustainability transitions: exploring risk management and the future of adaptation in the megacity of Lagos. *J. Extreme Events*, **3**(03), 1650009.

Alford, J. and B. W. Head, 2017: Wicked and less wicked problems: a typology and a contingency framework. *Policy and Society*, 36 (3), 397–413, doi:10.1080/14494035.2017.1361634.

Allison, E.H. and H.R. Bassett, 2015: Climate change in the oceans: human impacts and responses. *Science*, **350**(6262), 778–782, doi:10.1126/science.aac8721.

Amoako, C. and D.K.B. Inkoom, 2017: The production of flood vulnerability in Accra, Ghana: re-thinking flooding and informal urbanisation. *Urban Stud.*, **55**(13), 2903–2922, doi:10.1177/0042098016686526.

Angiello, G., 2021: Toward greener and pandemic-proof cities? Policy response to Covid-19 outbreak in four global cities. *TeMA J. Land Use Mobil. Environ.*, **14**(2), 285–292, doi:10.6093/1970-9870/8097.

Arabadzhyan, A., et al., 2020: Climate change, coastal tourism, and impact chains – a literature review. *Curr. Issues Tour.*, 1–36, doi:10.1080/13683500.2020.1825351.

Araos, M., et al., 2016: Climate change adaptation planning in large cities: a systematic global assessment. *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **66**, 375–382, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2016.06.009.

Araos, M., et al., 2017: Climate change adaptation planning for Global South megacities: the case of Dhaka. *J. Environ. Policy Plan.*, **19**(6), 682–696, doi:10.1080/1523908X.2016.1264873.

Archer, D. and D. Dodman, 2015: Making capacity building critical: power and justice in building urban climate resilience in Indonesia and Thailand. *Urban Clim.*, **14**, 68–78, doi:10.1016/j.uclim.2015.06.007.

Arns, A., et al., 2017: Sea-level rise induced amplification of coastal protection design heights. *Sci. Rep.*, **7**(1), 40171, doi:10.1038/srep40171.

Assaduzzaman, M., T. Filatova, F. Coenen and J. Lovett, 2020: Freedom of choice to migrate: adaptation to climate change in Bangladesh. *Int. J. Sustain. Dev. World Ecol.*, **27**(7), 652–661, doi:10.1080/13504509.2020.1754959.

Avelino, J.E., et al., 2018: Survey tool for rapid assessment of socio-economic vulnerability of fishing communities in Vietnam to climate change. *Geosciences*, **8**(12), 452, doi:10.3390/geosciences8120452.

Baidya, D.K., S. Maitra and S. Bhattacharjee, 2020: Facing post-cyclone disaster in times of COVID-19 pandemic in India: possible testing strategy to reduce further spread of disease. *Asia Pac. J. Public Health*, **32**(6-7), 376–376, doi:10.1177/1010539520944717.

Bakkensen, L.A. and R.O. Mendelsohn, 2019: Global Tropical Cyclone Damages and Fatalities Under Climate Change: An Updated Assessment. In: *Hurricane Risk* [Collins, J.M. and K. Walsh(eds.)]. Springer, Cham, pp. 179–197.

Balke, T., et al., 2016: A global analysis of the seaward salt marsh extent: the importance of tidal range. *Water Resour. Res.*, **52**(5), 3775–3786, doi:10.1002/2015wr018318.

Bangalore, M., A. Smith and T. Veldkamp, 2019: Exposure to floods, climate change, and poverty in Vietnam. *Econ. Disasters Clim. Change*, **3**(1), 79–99, doi:10.1007/s41885-018-0035-4.

Barnett, J., 2017: The dilemmas of normalising losses from climate change: towards hope for Pacific atoll countries. *Asia Pac. Viewp.*, **58**(1), 3–13, doi:10.1111/apv.12153.

Beck, M.W., et al., 2018: The global flood protection savings provided by coral reefs. *Nat. Commun.*, **9**(1), 2186, doi:10.1038/s41467-018-04568-z.

Becker, A., A.K.Y. Ng, D. McEvoy and J. Mullett, 2018: Implications of climate change for shipping: ports and supply chains. *WIREs Clim. Change*, **9**(2), e508, doi:10.1002/wcc.508.

Beja da Costa, A. and L. Ribeiro, 2019: On the coastline: the genesis of green infrastructure towards a future sustainable landscape for the city of Maputo, Mozambique. *Proc. Fábos Conf. Landsc. Greenway Plan.*, **6**(1), doi:10.7275/40vy-7122.

Bell, A.R., et al., 2021: Migration towards Bangladesh coastlines projected to increase with sea-level rise through 2100. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **16**(2), 24045, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/abdc5b.

Bellinson, R. and E. Chu, 2019: Learning pathways and the governance of innovations in urban climate change resilience and adaptation. *J. Environ. Policy Plan.*, **21**(1), 76–89.

Berke, P.R. and M.R. Stevens, 2016: Land use planning for climate adaptation: theory and practice. *J. Plan. Educ. Res.*, **36**(3), 283–289, doi:10.1177/0739456X16660714.

Berman, M., et al., 2020: Adaptation to climate change in coastal communities: findings from seven sites on four continents. *Clim. Change*, **159**(1), 1–16, doi:10.1007/s10584-019-02571-x.

Berquist, M., A. Daniere and L. Drummond, 2015: Planning for global environmental change in Bangkok's informal settlements. *J. Environ. Plan. Manag.*, **58**(10), 1711–1730, doi:10.1080/09640568.2014.945995.

Betzold, C. and I. Mohamed, 2017: Seawalls as a response to coastal erosion and flooding: a case study from Grande Comore, Comoros (West Indian Ocean). *Reg. Environ. Change*, **17**(4), 1077–1087.

Bevacqua, E., et al., 2019: Higher probability of compound flooding from precipitation and storm surge in Europe under anthropogenic climate change. *Sci. Adv.*, **5**(9), eaaw5531, doi:10.1126/sciadv.aaw5531.

Bindoff, N., et al., 2019: Changing ocean, marine ecosystems, and dependent communities. In: *IPCC Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate*. In: *IPCC Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate*. [Pörtner, H.-O., D. C. Roberts, V. Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, M. Tignor, E. Poloczanska, K. Mintenbeck, M. Nicolai, A. Okem, J. Petzold, B. Rama and N. Weyer (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press. In Press.

Blankespoor, B., S. Dasgupta and G.-M. Lange, 2017: Mangroves as a protection from storm surges in a changing climate. *Ambio*, **46**(4), 478–491, doi:10.1007/s13280-016-0838-x.

Bloemen, P., et al., 2018: Lessons learned from applying adaptation pathways in flood risk management and challenges for the further development of this approach. *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Change*, **23**(7), 1083–1108, doi:10.1007/s11027-017-9773-9.

Bloemen, P., M. Van Der Steen and Z. Van Der Wal, 2019a: Designing a century ahead: climate change adaptation in the Dutch Delta. *Policy Soc.*, **38**(1), 58–76.

Bloemen, P. J. et al., 2019: DMDU into practice: adaptive delta management in the Netherlands. In: *Decision Making under Deep Uncertainty* [Marchau, V. A. W. J., W. E. Walker, P. J. T. M. Bloemen and S. W. Popper (eds.)]. Springer, Cham, 321–351.

Blok, A. and R. Tschötschel, 2016: World port cities as cosmopolitan risk community: mapping urban climate policy experiments in Europe and East Asia. *Environ. Plan. C Gov. Policy*, **34**(4), 717–736.

Boas, I., et al., 2019: Climate migration myths. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **9**(12), 901–903, doi:10.1038/s41558-019-0633-3.

Bonatti, M., et al., 2019: Social representations of climate change and climate adaptation plans in southern Brazil: challenges of genuine participation. *Urban Clim.*, **29**, 100496, doi:10.1016/j.uclim.2019.100496.

Borges, R., A.C. Ferreira and L.D. Lacerda, 2017: Systematic planning and ecosystem-based management as strategies to reconcile mangrove conservation with resource use. *Front. Mar. Sci.*, **4**(353), doi:10.3389/fmars.2017.00353.

Brooks, N., J. Clarke, G.W. Ngaruiya and E.E. Wangui, 2020: African heritage in a changing climate. *Azania Archaeol. Res. Africa*, **55**(3), 297–328, doi:10.1080/0067270X.2020.1792177.

Broto, V.C., E. Boyd and J. Ensor, 2015: Participatory urban planning for climate change adaptation in coastal cities: lessons from a pilot experience in Maputo, Mozambique. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.*, **13**, 11–18, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2014.12.005.

Brown, I., J. Martin-Ortega, K. Waylen and K. Blackstock, 2016: Participatory scenario planning for developing innovation in community adaptation responses: three contrasting examples from Latin America. *Reg. Environ. Change*, **16**(6), 1685–1700.

Brown, S., et al., 2018: Quantifying land and people exposed to sea-level rise with no mitigation and 1.5°C and 2.0°C rise in global temperatures to year 2300. *Earth's Future*, **6**(3), 583–600, doi:10.1002/2017ef000738.

Brown, S., et al., 2020: Land raising as a solution to sea-level rise: an analysis of coastal flooding on an artificial island in the Maldives. *J. Flood Risk Manag.*, **13**(S1), e12567, doi:10.1111/jfr3.12567.

Brown, S.I., M. E. Dickson, P.S. Kench and R.J. Bergillos, 2019: Modelling gravel barrier response to storms and sudden relative sea-level change using XBeach-G. *Mar. Geol.*, **410**, 164–175, doi:10.1016/j.margeo.2019.01.009.

Budiyono, Y., J.C.J.H. Aerts, D. Tollenaar and P.J. Ward, 2016: River flood risk in Jakarta under scenarios of future change. *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, **16**(3), 757–774, doi:10.5194/nhess-16-757-2016.

Burgess, C.P., et al., 2015: A macro-scale flood risk model for Jamaica with impact of climate variability. *Nat. Hazards*, **78**(1), 231–256, doi:10.1007/s11069-015-1712-z.

Burton, P. and J. Mustelin, 2013: Planning for climate change: is greater public participation the key to success? *Urban Policy Res.*, **31**(4), 399–415.

Butler, J., et al., 2016a: Scenario planning to leap-frog the sustainable development goals: an adaptation pathways approach. *Clim. Risk Manag.*, **12**, 83–99.

Butler, W.H., R.E. Deyle and C. Mutnansky, 2016b: Low-regrets Incrementalism: land use planning adaptation to accelerating sea level rise in Florida's coastal communities. *J. Plan. Educ. Res.*, **36**(3), 319–332, doi:10.1177/0739456X16647161.

Camus, P., et al., 2019: Probabilistic assessment of port operation downtimes under climate change. *Coast. Eng.*, **147**, 12–24, doi:10.1016/j.coastaleng.2019.01.007.

Cannaby, H., et al., 2016: Projected sea level rise and changes in extreme storm surge and wave events during the 21st century in the region of Singapore. *Ocean Sci.*, **12**(3), 613–632, doi:10.5194/os-12-613-2016.

Caparros-Midwood, D., S. Barr and R. Dawson, 2017: Spatial optimization of future urban development with regards to climate risk and sustainability objectives. *Risk Anal.*, **37**(11), 2164–2181, doi:10.1111/risa.12777.

Carro, I., et al., 2018: Building capacity on ecosystem-based adaptation strategy to cope with extreme events and sea-level rise on the Uruguayan coast. *Int. J. Clim. Change Strateg. Manag.*, **10**(4), 504–522, doi:10.1108/IJCCSM-07-2017-0149.

Carter, L., 2018: *Indigenous Pacific Approaches to Climate Change: Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands.

CCC, 2017: *Managing the Coast in a Changing Climate*. Committee on Climate Change, London.

Celliers, L., S. Rosendo, I. Coetzee and G. Daniels, 2013: Pathways of integrated coastal management from national policy to local implementation: enabling climate change adaptation. *Mar. Policy*, **39**, 72–86.

Chinowsky, P.S., A.E. Schweikert, N. Strzepek and K. Strzepek, 2015: Road infrastructure and climate change in Vietnam. *Sustainability*, **7**(5), 5452–5470.

Chou, L.M., et al., 2019: Chapter 24—Singapore. In: *World Seas: an Environmental Evaluation* [Sheppard, C.(ed).], 2nd edn. Academic Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, pp. 539–558.

Chouinard, O., et al., 2017: The Participative Action Research Approach to Climate Change Adaptation in Atlantic Canadian Coastal Communities. In: *Climate Change Adaptation in North America*. Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands, pp. 67–87.

Chow, W.T.L., 2018: The impact of weather extremes on urban resilience to hydro-climate hazards: a Singapore case study. *Int. J. Water Resour. Dev.*, **34**(4), 510–524, doi:10.1080/07900627.2017.1335186.

Christodoulou, A., P. Christidis and H. Demirel, 2019: Sea-level rise in ports: a wider focus on impacts. *Marit. Econ. Logist.*, **21**(4), 482–496, doi:10.1057/s41278-018-0114-z.

Chu, E., 2016: The political economy of urban climate adaptation and development planning in Surat, India. *Environ. Plan. C Gov. Policy*, **34**(2), 281–298.

Chu, E., I. Anguelovski and J. Carmin, 2016: Inclusive approaches to urban climate adaptation planning and implementation in the Global South. *Clim. Policy*, **16**(3), 372–392, doi:10.1080/14693062.2015.1019822.

Chu, E., I. Anguelovski and D. Roberts, 2017: Climate adaptation as strategic urbanism: assessing opportunities and uncertainties for equity and inclusive development in cities. *Cities*, **60**, 378–387, doi:10.1016/j.cities.2016.10.016.

Chu, E., T. Schenk and J. Patterson, 2018: The Dilemmas of Citizen Inclusion in Urban Planning and Governance to Enable a 1.5 C Climate Change Scenario. *Urban Planning*, 3 (2), doi:10.17645/up.v3i2.1292.

Chu, E.K., S. Hughes and S.G. Mason, 2018b: Conclusion: Multilevel overnance and Climate Change Innovations in Cities. In: *Climate Change in Cities*. Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands, pp. 361–378.

Chuah, C.J., B.H. Ho and W.T.L. Chow, 2018: Trans-boundary variations of urban drought vulnerability and its impact on water resource management in Singapore and Johor, Malaysia. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **13**(7), 74011, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aacad8.

Cinner, J.E., et al., 2018: Building adaptive capacity to climate change in tropical coastal communities. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **8**(2), 117–123, doi:10.1038/s41558-017-0065-x.

Clar, C., 2019: Coordinating climate change adaptation across levels of government: the gap between theory and practice of integrated adaptation strategy processes. *J. Environ. Plan. Manag.*, **62**(12), 2166–2185.

Colenbrander, D., 2019: Dissonant discourses: revealing South Africa's policy-to-praxis challenges in the governance of coastal risk and vulnerability. *J. Environ. Plan. Manag.*, **62**(10), 1782–1801.

Colenbrander, D. and M. Bavinck, 2017: Exploring the role of bureaucracy in the production of coastal risks, City of Cape Town, South Africa. *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **150**, 35–50.

Colenbrander, D.R. and M.R. Sowman, 2015: Merging socioeconomic imperatives with geospatial data: a non-negotiable for coastal risk management in South Africa. *Coast. Manag.*, **43**(3), 270–300.

Cooper, J.A.G., et al., 2020a: Sandy beaches can survive sea-level rise. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **10**(11), 993–995, doi:10.1038/s41558-020-00934-2.

Cooper, J.A.G., M.C. O'Connor and S. McIvor, 2020b: Coastal defences versus coastal ecosystems: a regional appraisal. *Mar. Policy*, **111**, 102332, doi:10.1016/j.marpol.2016.02.021.

Cornwall, C.E., et al., 2021: Global declines in coral reef calcium carbonate production under ocean acidification and warming. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **118**(21), e2015265118, doi:10.1073/pnas.2015265118.

Costanza, R., et al., 2014: Changes in the global value of ecosystem services. *Glob. Environ. Change*, **26**, 152–158, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.04.002.

Costas, S., O. Ferreira and G. Martinez, 2015: Why do we decide to live with risk at the coast? *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **118**, 1–11.

Cradock-Henry, N.A., et al., 2018: Dynamic adaptive pathways in downscaled climate change scenarios. *Clim. Change*, **150**(3-4), 333–341.

da Silveira, Y.G. and J. Bonetti, 2019: Assessment of the physical vulnerability to erosion and flooding in a sheltered coastal sector: Florianópolis Bay, Brazil. *J. Coast. Conserv.*, **23**(2), 303–314, doi:10.1007/s11852-018-0659-0.

Dannevig, H. and C. Aall, 2015: The regional level as boundary organization? An analysis of climate change adaptation governance in Norway. *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **54**, 168–175.

Dasgupta, S., et al., 2019: Quantifying the protective capacity of mangroves from storm surges in coastal Bangladesh. *PLoS ONE*, **14**(3), e214079, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0214079.

Dasgupta, S., M. Moqbul Hossain, M. Huq and D. Wheeler, 2016: Facing the hungry tide: climate change, livelihood threats, and household responses in coastal Bangladesh. *Clim. Change Econ.*, **7**(03), 1650007, doi:10.1142/s201000781650007x.

Davis, K.F., A. Bhattachan, P. D'Odorico and S. Suweis, 2018: A universal model for predicting human migration under climate change: examining future sea level rise in Bangladesh. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **13**(6), doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aac4d4.

Daviter, F., 2017: Coping, taming or solving: alternative approaches to the governance of wicked problems. *Policy Stud.*, **38**(6), 571–588.

Dawson, R.J., et al., 2011: Assessing the effectiveness of non-structural flood management measures in the Thames Estuary under conditions of socio-economic and environmental change. *Glob. Environ. Change*, **21**(2), 628–646, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.01.013.

Den Uyl, R.M. and D.J. Russel, 2018: Climate adaptation in fragmented governance settings: the consequences of reform in public administration. *Environ. Polit.*, **27**(2), 341–361.

Desportes, I. and D.R. Colenbrander, 2016: Navigating interests, navigating knowledge: towards an inclusive set-back delineation along Cape Town's coastline. *Habitat Int.*, **54**, 124–135.

Desportes, I., J. Waddell and M. Hordijk, 2016: Improving flood risk governance through multi-stakeholder collaboration: a case study of Sweet Home informal settlement, Cape Town. *S. Afr. Geogr. J.*, **98**(1), 61–83, doi:10.1080/03736245.2015.1052842.

Dewulf, A. and C. Termeer, 2015: Governing the future? The potential of adaptive delta management to contribute to governance capabilities for dealing with the wicked problem of climate change adaptation. *J. Water Clim. Change*, **6**(4), 759–771.

Diaz, D.B., 2016: Estimating global damages from sea level rise with the Coastal Impact and Adaptation Model (CIAM). *Clim. Change*, **137**(1), 143–156, doi:10.1007/s10584-016-1675-4.

Díaz, S.M., et al., 2019: The global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services: summary for policy makers. In: *Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services* [d. Cunha, M.C., G. Mace and H. Mooney(eds.)]. IPBES Secretariat, Bonn, Germany, pp. 45 (Available at: https://ri.conicet.gov.ar/handle/11336/116171, accessed 01/12/2020).

Ding, Q., X. Chen, R. Hilborn and Y. Chen, 2017: Vulnerability to impacts of climate change on marine fisheries and food security. *Mar. Policy*, **83**, 55–61, doi:10.1016/j.marpol.2017.05.011.

Doberstein, B., A. Tadgell and A. Rutledge, 2020: Managed retreat for climate change adaptation in coastal megacities: a comparison of policy and practice in manila and vancouver. *J. Environ. Manag.*, **253**, 109753, doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.109753.

Dolšak, N. and A. Prakash, 2018: The politics of climate change adaptation. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.*, **43**, 317–341.

Du, S., et al., 2020: Hard or soft flood adaptation? Advantages of a hybrid strategy for Shanghai. *Glob. Environ. Change*, **61**, 102037, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2020.102037.

Dutra, L.X., et al., 2015: Organizational drivers that strengthen adaptive capacity in the coastal zone of Australia. *Ocean. Coast. Manag.*, **109**, 64–76.

Duvat, V.K. and A.K. Magnan, 2019: Contrasting potential for nature-based solutions to enhance coastal protection services in atoll islands. In: *Dealing with Climate Change on Small Islands: Towards Effective and Sustainable Adaptation?* [Klöck, C. and M. Fink(eds.)]. Göttingen University Press, Göttingen, pp. 45.

Dyckman, C.S., C.S. John and J.B. London, 2014: Realizing managed retreat and innovation in state-level coastal management planning. *Ocean. Coast. Manag.*, **102**, 212–223.

Ebrahim, S.H., et al., 2020: Forward planning for disaster-related mass gatherings amid COVID-19. *Lancet Planet. Health*, **4**(9), e379–e380, doi:/10.1016/S2542-5196(20)30175-3.

Edmonds, D.A., R.L. Caldwell, E.S. Brondizio and S.M.O. Siani, 2020: Coastal flooding will disproportionately impact people on river deltas. *Nat. Commun.*, **11**(1), 4741, doi:10.1038/s41467-020-18531-4.

Eilander, D., et al., 2020: The effect of surge on riverine flood hazard and impact in deltas globally. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **15**(10), 104007, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/ab8ca6.

Ellison, J.C., 2015: Vulnerability assessment of mangroves to climate change and sea-level rise impacts. *Wetl. Ecol. Manag.*, **23**(2), 115–137, doi:10.1007/s11273-014-9397-8.

Elrick-Barr, C.E., D.C. Thomsen, B.L. Preston and T.F. Smith, 2017: Perceptions matter: household adaptive capacity and capability in two Australian coastal communities. *Reg. Environ. Change*, **17**(4), 1141–1151.

Enríquez, A.R., M. Marcos, A. Falqués and D. Roelvink, 2019: Assessing beach and dune erosion and vulnerability under sea level rise: a case study in the Mediterranean Sea. *Front. Mar. Sci.*, **6**(4), doi:10.3389/fmars.2019.00004.

Ensor, J. and B. Harvey, 2015: Social learning and climate change adaptation: evidence for international development practice. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Clim. Change*, **6**(5), 509–522.

Eriksen, S.H., A.J. Nightingale and H. Eakin, 2015: Reframing adaptation: the political nature of climate change adaptation. *Glob. Environ. Change*, **35**, 523–533.

Esteban, M., et al., 2020: Adaptation to sea level rise: learning from present examples of land subsidence. *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **189**, 104852, doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2019.104852.

Estrada, F., W.J.W. Botzen and R.S.J. Tol, 2017: A global economic assessment of city policies to reduce climate change impacts. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **7**(6), 403–406, doi:10.1038/nclimate3301.

Farbotko, C., et al., 2020: Relocation planning must address voluntary immobility. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **10**(8), 702–704, doi:10.1038/s41558-020-0829-6.

Fayombo, O.O., 2020: Discursive constructions underlie and exacerbate the vulnerability of informal urban communities to the impacts of climate change. *Clim. Dev.*, 1–13, doi:10.1080/17565529.2020.1765133.

Filho, W.L., et al., 2019: Assessing the impacts of climate change in cities and their adaptive capacity: towards transformative approaches to climate change adaptation and poverty reduction in urban areas in a set of developing countries. *Sci. Total. Environ.*, **692**, 1175–1190, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.07.227.

Fink, J.H., 2019: Contrasting governance learning processes of climate-leading and -lagging cities: Portland, Oregon, and Phoenix, Arizona, USA. *J. Environ. Policy Plan.*, **21**(1), 16–29, doi:10.1080/1523908X.2018.1487280.

Finkbeiner, E.M., et al., 2018: Exploring trade-offs in climate change response in the context of Pacific Island fisheries. *Mar. Policy*, **88**, 359–364.

Fitton, J.M., J.D. Hansom and A. F. Rennie, 2018: A method for modelling coastal erosion risk: the example of Scotland. *Nat. Hazards*, **91**(3), 931–961, doi:10.1007/s11069-017-3164-0.

Flannery, W., K. Lynch and M.Ó. Cinnéide, 2015: Consideration of coastal risk in the Irish spatial planning process. *Land Use Policy*, **43**, 161–169, doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2014.11.001.

Flood, S., N.A. Cradock-Henry, P. Blackett and P. Edwards, 2018: Adaptive and interactive climate futures: systematic review of 'serious games' for engagement and decision-making. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **13**(6), 63005.

Flynn, M., et al., 2018: Participatory scenario planning and climate change impacts, adaptation and vulnerability research in the Arctic. *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **79**, 45–53.

Forino, G., J. Von Meding and G. J. Brewer, 2018: Challenges and opportunities for Australian local governments in governing climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction integration. *International Journal of Disaster Resilience in the Built Environment*, 9 (3), 258–272, doi:10.1108/IJDRBE-05-2017-0038.

Francesch-Huidobro, M., et al., 2017: Governance challenges of flood-prone delta cities: Integrating flood risk management and climate change in spatial planning. *Prog. Plann.*, **114**, 1–27.

Fritz, M., J.E. Vonk and H. Lantuit, 2017: Collapsing Arctic coastlines. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **7**(1), 6–7, doi:10.1038/nclimate3188.

Fu, X., 2020: Measuring local sea-level rise adaptation and adaptive capacity: a national survey in the United States. *Cities*, **102**, 102717, doi:10.1016/j.cities.2020.102717.

Garschagen, M., 2015: Risky change? Vietnam's urban flood risk governance between climate dynamics and transformation. *Pac. Aff.*, **88**(3), 599–621, doi:10.5509/2015883599.

Garschagen, M., G.A.K. Surtiari and M. Harb, 2018: Is Jakarta's new flood risk reduction strategy transformational? *Sustainability*, **10**(8), 2934, doi:10.3390/su10082934.

Gauthier, D., S.A. Anderson, H.M. Fritz and T. Giachetti, 2018: Karrat Fjord (Greenland) tsunamigenic landslide of 17 June 2017: initial 3D observations. *Landslides*, **15**(2), 327–332, doi:10.1007/s10346-017-0926-4.

Genua-Olmedo, A., C. Alcaraz, N. Caiola and C. Ibanez, 2016: Sea level rise impacts on rice production: the Ebro Delta as an example. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **571**, 1200–1210, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.07.136.

Ghanbari, M., et al., 2021: Climate change and changes in compound coastal-riverine flooding hazard along the U.S. coasts. *Earth's Future*, **9**(5), doi:10.1029/2021EF002055.

Gibbs, M.T., 2016: Why is coastal retreat so hard to implement? Understanding the political risk of coastal adaptation pathways. *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **130**, 107–114, doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2016.06.002.

Glavovic, B.C., 2016: Towards deliberative coastal governance: insights from South Africa and the Mississippi Delta. *Reg. Environ. Change*, **16**(2), 353–365.

Glavovic, B.C., C. Cullinan and M. Groenink, 2018: The coast. In: *Fuggle and Rabie's Environmental Management in South Africa* [King, N.D., H.A. Strydom and F.P. Retief(eds.)], 3rd edn. Juta and Co, Cape Town, pp. 653–733.

Glavovic, B.C. and G.P. Smith, 2014: *Adapting to Climate Change: Lessons from Natural Hazards Planning*. Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands.

Godfroy, M., V. Vuik, E. van Berchum and B. Jonkman, 2019: Quantifying Wave Attenuation by Nature-based Solutions in the Galveston Bay. In: *Coastal Structures 2019* [Goseberg, N. and T. Schlurmann (eds.)], Bundesanstalt für Wasserbau, Karlsruhe, Germany, 1008–1019, doi:10.18451/978-3-939230-64-9_101.

Gopalakrishnan, S., C.E. Landry and M.D. Smith, 2018: Climate change adaptation in coastal environments: modeling challenges for resource and environmental economists. *Rev. Environ. Econ. Policy*, **12**(1), 48–68, doi:10.1093/reep/rex020.

Gopalakrishnan, S., D. McNamara, M.D. Smith and A.B. Murray, 2017: Decentralized management hinders coastal climate adaptation: the spatial-dynamics of beach nourishment. *Environ. Resour. Econ.*, **67**(4), 761–787, doi:10.1007/s10640-016-0004-8.

Gorddard, R., et al., 2016: Values, rules and knowledge: adaptation as change in the decision context. *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **57**, 60–69.

Grace, B. and C. Thompson, 2020: All roads lead to retreat: adapting to sea level rise using a trigger-based pathway. *Aust. Plan.*, **56**(3), 182–190, doi:10.1080/07293682.2020.1775665.

Graham, N.A.J., et al., 2020: Changing role of coral reef marine reserves in a warming climate. *Nat. Commun.*, **11**(1), 2000, doi:10.1038/s41467-020-15863-z.

Graham, S., et al., 2013: The social values at risk from sea-level rise. *Environ. Impact Assess. Rev.*, **41**, 45–52, doi:10.1016/j.eiar.2013.02.002.

Gu, H., et al., 2018: A hierarchical pattern of urban social vulnerability in Shanghai, China and its implications for risk management. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **41**, 170–179, doi:10.1016/j.scs.2018.05.047.

Gutierrez, H., et al., 2020: Perceptions of local vulnerability and the relative importance of climate change in rural Ecuador. *Hum. Ecol.*, **48**(4), 383–395, doi:10.1007/s10745-020-00165-1.

Ha, T.P., et al., 2018: Governance conditions for adaptive freshwater management in the Vietnamese Mekong Delta. *J. Hydrol.*, **557**, 116–127, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2017.12.024.

Haasnoot, M., et al., 2020: Adaptation to uncertain sea-level rise; how uncertainty in Antarctic mass-loss impacts the coastal adaptation strategy of the Netherlands. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **15**(3), 34007, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/ab666c.

Haasnoot, M., J.H. Kwakkel, W.E. Walker and J. ter Maat, 2013: Dynamic adaptive policy pathways: a method for crafting robust decisions for a deeply uncertain world. *Glob. Environ. Change*, **23**(2), 485–498, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2012.12.006.

Haasnoot, M., J. Lawrence and A.K. Magnan, 2021a: Pathways to coastal retreat. *Science*, **372**(6548), 1287–1290, doi:10.1126/science.abi6594.

Haasnoot, M., et al., 2021b: Long-term sea-level rise necessitates a commitment to adaptation: a first order assessment. *Clim. Risk Manag.*, **34**, doi:10.1016/j.crm.2021.100355.

Hall, J.W., H. Harvey and L.J. Manning, 2019: Adaptation thresholds and pathways for tidal flood risk management in London. *Clim. Risk Manag.*, **24**, 42–58, doi:10.1016/j.crm.2019.04.001.

Hallegatte, S., C. Green, R.J. Nicholls and J. Corfee-Morlot, 2013: Future flood losses in major coastal cities. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **3**(9), 802–806, doi:10.1038/nclimate1979.

Hallegatte, S., A. Vogt-Schilb, M. Bangalore and J. Rozenberg, 2017: *Unbreakable: Building the Resilience of the Poor in the Face of Natural Disasters*. Climate Change and Development Series. World Bank, Washington, DC.

Hanson, S.E. and R.J. Nicholls, 2020: Demand for ports to 2050: climate policy, growing trade and the impacts of sea-level rise. *Earth's Future*, **8**(8), doi:10.1029/2020EF001543.

Haraguchi, M. and S. Kim, 2016: Critical infrastructure interdependence in New York City during Hurricane Sandy. *Int. J. Disaster Resil. Built Environ.*, **7**(2), 133–143, doi:10.1108/IJDRBE-03-2015-0015.

Hardy, R.D., R.A. Milligan and N. Heynen, 2017: Racial coastal formation: the environmental injustice of colorblind adaptation planning for sea-level rise. *Geoforum*, **87**, 62–72, doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.10.005.

Hatcher, S.V. and D.L. Forbes, 2015: Exposure to coastal hazards in a rapidly expanding northern urban centre, Iqaluit, Nunavut. *Arctic*, **68**(4), 453–471.

Hauer, M. E., 2017: Migration induced by sea-level rise could reshape the US population landscape. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **7**, 321, doi:10.1038/nclimate3271.

Hauer, M. E., J.M. Evans and D.R. Mishra, 2016: Millions projected to be at risk from sea-level rise in the continental United States. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **6**(7), 691–695, doi:10.1038/nclimate2961.

Hauer, M. E., et al., 2020: Sea-level rise and human migration. *Nat. Rev. Earth Environ.*, **1**(1), 28–39, doi:10.1038/s43017-019-0002-9.

Head, B.W., 2014: Evidence, uncertainty, and wicked problems in climate change decision making in Australia. *Environ. Plan. C Gov. Policy*, **32**(4), 663–679, doi:10.1068/c1240.

Head, B.W., 2019: Forty years of wicked problems literature: forging closer links to policy studies. *Policy Soc.*, **38**(2), 180–197, doi:10.1080/14494035.2018.1488797.

Head, B.W. and J. Alford, 2013: Wicked problems: implications for public policy and management. *Adm. Soc.*, **47**(6), 711–739, doi:10.1177/0095399713481601.

Henry, S. and F.D.A. Mendonça, 2020: Past, present, and future vulnerability to dengue in Jamaica: a spatial analysis of monthly variations. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, **17**(9), 3156.

Herrera-García, G., et al., 2021: Mapping the global threat of land subsidence. *Science*, **371**(6524), 34–36, doi:10.1126/science.abb8549.

Himes-Cornell, A. and S. Kasperski, 2015: Assessing climate change vulnerability in Alaska's fishing communities. *Fish. Res.*, **162**, 1–11.

Hinkel, J., et al., 2018: The ability of societies to adapt to twenty-first-century sea-level rise. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **8**(7), 570–578, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0176-z.

Hinkel, J., et al., 2014: Coastal flood damage and adaptation costs under 21st century sea-level rise. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **111**(9), 3292–3297.

Hinkel, J., et al., 2013: A global analysis of erosion of sandy beaches and sea-level rise: an application of DIVA. *Glob. Planet. Change*, **111**, 150–158, doi:10.1016/j.gloplacha.2013.09.002.

Hiwasaki, L., E. Luna, Syamsidik and J.A. Marçal, 2015: Local and indigenous knowledge on climate-related hazards of coastal and small island communities in Southeast Asia. *Clim. Change*, **128**(1), 35–56, doi:10.1007/s10584-014-1288-8.

Hoegh-Guldberg, O., et al., 2018: Impacts of 1.5∘C Global Warming on Natural and Human Systems. In: *Global Warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty*. [Masson-Delmotte, V., P. Zhai, H.-O. Pörtner, D. Roberts, J. Skea, P. R. Shukla, A. Pirani, W. Moufouma-Okia, C. Péan, R. Pidcock, S. Connors, J. B. R. Matthews, Y. Chen, X. Zhou, M.I.Gomis, E. Lonnoy, T.Maycock, M.Tignor and T. Waterfield (eds.)] Cambridge University Press. In press.

Hoffmann, R., et al., 2020: A meta-analysis of country-level studies on environmental change and migration. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **10**(10), 904–912, doi:10.1038/s41558-020-0898-6.

Holland, B., 2017: Procedural justice in local climate adaptation: political capabilities and transformational change. *Env. Polit.*, **26**(3), 391–412, doi:10.1080/09644016.2017.1287625.

Hooijer, A. and R. Vernimmen, 2021: Global LiDAR land elevation data reveal greatest sea-level rise vulnerability in the tropics. *Nat. Commun.*, **12**(1), 3592, doi:10.1038/s41467-021-23810-9.

Hoque, M.Z., et al., 2019: Assessing agricultural livelihood vulnerability to climate change in coastal Bangladesh. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, **16**(22), 4552.

Horton, B.P., et al., 2018a: Mapping sea-level change in time, space, and probability. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.*, **43**(1), 481–521, doi:10.1146/annurev-environ-102017-025826.

Horton, B.P., et al., 2018b: Predicting marsh vulnerability to sea-level rise using Holocene relative sea-level data. *Nat. Commun.*, **9**(1), 2687, doi:10.1038/s41467-018-05080-0.

Hughes, D.J., et al., 2020: Coral reef survival under accelerating ocean deoxygenation. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **10**(4), 296–307, doi:10.1038/s41558-020-0737-9.

Hughes, S., E.K. Chu and S.G. Mason, 2017a: *Climate Change in Cities: Innovations in Multi-Level Governance*. Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands.

Hughes, T.P., et al., 2017b: Coral reefs in the Anthropocene. *Nature*, **546**(7656), 82–90, doi:10.1038/nature22901.

Huntington, H.P., et al., 2019: Climate change in context: putting people first in the Arctic. *Reg. Environ. Change*, **19**(4), 1217–1223, doi:10.1007/s10113-019-01478-8.

Huong, H.T.L. and A. Pathirana, 2013: Urbanization and climate change impacts on future urban flooding in Can Tho city, Vietnam. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, **17**, 379, doi:10.5194/hess-17-379-2013.

Hurlimann, A., et al., 2014: Urban planning and sustainable adaptation to sea-level rise. *Landsc. Urban Plan.*, **126**, 84–93, doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2013.12.013.

Hurlimann, A.C. and A.P. March, 2012: The role of spatial planning in adapting to climate change. *WIREs Clim. Change*, **3**(5), 477–488, doi:10.1002/wcc.183.

Huynh, L.T.M. and L.C. Stringer, 2018: Multi-scale assessment of social vulnerability to climate change: an empirical study in coastal Vietnam. *Clim. Risk Manag.*, **20**, 165–180, doi:10.1016/j.crm.2018.02.003.

Islam, S.N., J. Ferdaush and S. Reinstädtler, 2017: Challenges of climate change impacts on urban water quality management and planning in coastal towns of Bangladesh. *Int. J. Environ. Sustain. Dev.*, **16**(3), doi:10.1504/ijesd.2017.10004754.

Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality, 2018: *Istanbul Climate Change Action Plan: Summary Report 2018*. Directorate of Environmental Protection, Istanbul.

Izaguirre, C., et al., 2021: Climate change risk to global port operations. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **11**(1), 14–20, doi:10.1038/s41558-020-00937-z.

Jain, G., C. Singh, K. Coelho and T. Malladi, 2017: *Long-term Implications of Humanitarian Responses: the Case of Chennai*. IIED Working Paper. IIED, London.

Jain, G., C. Singh and T. Malladi, 2021: (Re)creating disasters. A case of post-disaster resettlements in Chennai. In: *Rethinking Urban Risk and Resettlement in the Global South* [Jain, G., C. Johnson and A. Lavell (eds.)]. UCL Press, London, UKg, pp. 269–289.

Jaskólski, M.W., Ł. Pawłowski and M.C. Strzelecki, 2018: High Arctic coasts at risk—the case study of coastal zone development and degradation associated with climate changes and multidirectional human impacts in Longyearbyen (Adventfjorden, Svalbard). *Land Degrad. Dev.*, **29**(8), 2514–2524, doi:10.1002/ldr.2974.

Jevrejeva, S., et al., 2016: Coastal sea level rise with warming above 2°C. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **113**(47), 13342–13347, doi:10.1073/pnas.1605312113.

Hall, J., et al., 2019: *Adaptation of Infrastructure Systems: Background Paper for the Global Commission on Adaptation*. Environmental Change Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford.

Jones, H.P., et al., 2020: Global hotspots for coastal ecosystem-based adaptation. *PLoS ONE*, **15**(5), e233005, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0233005.

CCP2
SM

Joseph, D.D., 2017: Social work models for climate adaptation: the case of small islands in the Caribbean. *Reg. Environ. Change*, **17**(4), 1117–1126, doi:10.1007/s10113-017-1114-8.

Jurjonas, M. and E. Seekamp, 2018: Rural coastal community resilience: assessing a framework in eastern North Carolina. *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **162**, 137–150, doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2017.10.010.

Kane, H.H. and C.H. Fletcher, 2020: Rethinking reef island stability in relation to Anthropogenic sea level rise. *Earth's Future*, **8**(10), doi:10.1029/2020EF001525.

Karlsson, M. and G.K. Hovelsrud, 2015: Local collective action: adaptation to coastal erosion in the Monkey River Village, Belize. *Glob. Environ. Change*, **32**, 96–107, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.03.002.

Karlsson, M., B. van Oort and B. Romstad, 2015: What we have lost and cannot become: societal outcomes of coastal erosion in southern Belize. *Ecology and Society*, **20** (1), doi:10.5751/ES-07050-200104.

Kelman, I., 2018: Islandness within climate change narratives of small island developing states (SIDS). *Isl. Stud. J.*, **13**(1), 149–165, doi:10.24043/isj.52.

Kelman, I., 2019: Imaginary numbers of climate change migrants? *Soc. Sci.*, **8**(5), 131.

Kench, P.S., et al., 2015: Coral islands defy sea-level rise over the past century: records from a central Pacific atoll. *Geology*, **43**(6), 515–518, doi:10.1130/g36555.1.

Khan, A. and V. Amelie, 2015: Assessing climate change readiness in Seychelles: implications for ecosystem-based adaptation mainstreaming and marine spatial planning. *Reg. Environ. Change*, **15**(4), 721–733, doi:10.1007/s10113-014-0662-4.

Kim, H., D.W. Marcouiller and K.M. Woosnam, 2020: Coordinated planning effort as multilevel climate governance: insights from coastal resilience and climate adaptation. *Geoforum*, **114**, 77–88, doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2020.05.023.

Kirezci, E., et al., 2020: Projections of global-scale extreme sea levels and resulting episodic coastal flooding over the 21st Century. *Sci. Rep.*, **10**(1), 11629, doi:10.1038/s41598-020-67736-6.

Kirwan, M.L., et al., 2016: Overestimation of marsh vulnerability to sea level rise. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **6**, 253, doi:10.1038/nclimate2909.

Kishore, N., et al., 2018: Mortality in Puerto Rico after Hurricane Maria. *N. Engl. J. Med.*, **379**(2), 162–170, doi:10.1056/NEJMsa1803972.

Kok, S., et al., 2021: The potential of nature-based flood defences to leverage public investment in coastal adaptation: cases from the Netherlands, Indonesia and Georgia. *Ecol. Econ.*, **179**, 106828, doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2020.106828.

Koks, E.E., et al., 2019: A global multi-hazard risk analysis of road and railway infrastructure assets. *Nat. Commun.*, **10**(1), 2677, doi:10.1038/s41467-019-10442-3.

Koslov, L., 2019: Avoiding climate change: "agnostic adaptation" and the politics of public silence. *Ann. Am. Assoc. Geogr.*, **109**(2), 568–580, doi:10.1080/24694452.2018.1549472.

Koubi, V., G. Spilker, L. Schaffer and T. Böhmelt, 2016: The role of environmental perceptions in migration decision-making: evidence from both migrants and non-migrants in five developing countries. *Popul. Environ.*, **38**(2), 134–163, doi:10.1007/s11111-016-0258-7.

Kousky, C., 2014: Managing shoreline retreat: a US perspective. *Clim. Change*, **124**(1), 9–20, doi:10.1007/s10584-014-1106-3.

Kulp, S.A. and B.H. Strauss, 2019: New elevation data triple estimates of global vulnerability to sea-level rise and coastal flooding. *Nat. Commun.*, **10**(1), 4844, doi:10.1038/s41467-019-12808-z.

Kwadijk, J.C.J., et al., 2010: Using adaptation tipping points to prepare for climate change and sea level rise: a case study in the Netherlands. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Clim. Change*, **1**(5), 729–740, doi:10.1002/wcc.64.

Kwakkel, J.H., M. Haasnoot and W.E. Walker, 2016: Comparing robust decision-making and dynamic adaptive policy pathways for model-based decision support under deep uncertainty. *Environ. Model. Softw.*, **86**, 168–183, doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2016.09.017.

Lam, J.S.L., C. Liu and X. Gou, 2017: Cyclone risk mapping for critical coastal infrastructure: cases of East Asian seaports. *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **141**, 43–54, doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2017.02.015.

Lassa, J.A. and E. Nugraha, 2014: From shared learning to shared action in building resilience in the city of Bandar Lampung, Indonesia. *Environ. Urban.*, **27**(1), 161–180, doi:10.1177/0956247814552233.

Laurice Jamero, M., et al., 2017: Small-island communities in the Philippines prefer local measures to relocation in response to sea-level rise. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **7**(8), 581–586, doi:10.1038/nclimate3344.

Lawrence, J., et al., 2018: National guidance for adapting to coastal hazards and sea-level rise: anticipating change, when and how to change pathway. *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **82**, 100–107, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2018.01.012.

Lawrence, J., R. Bell and A. Stroombergen, 2019: A hybrid process to address uncertainty and changing climate risk in coastal areas using dynamic adaptive pathways planning, multi-criteria decision analysis & real options analysis: a New Zealand application. *Sustainability*, **11**(2), 406, doi:10.3390/su11020406.

Lawrence, J., P. Blackett and N.A. Cradock-Henry, 2020: Cascading climate change impacts and implications. *Clim. Risk Manag.*, **29**, 100234, doi:10.1016/j.crm.2020.100234.

Laws, D., D. Hogendoorn and H. Karl, 2014: Hot adaptation what conflict can contribute to collaborative natural resource management. *Ecology and Society*, **19** (2), doi:10.5751/ES-06375-190239.

Lázár, A.N., et al., 2020: Contrasting development trajectories for coastal Bangladesh to the end of century. *Reg. Environ. Change*, **20**(3), 93, doi:10.1007/s10113-020-01681-y.

Le, T.D.N., 2020: Climate change adaptation in coastal cities of developing countries: characterizing types of vulnerability and adaptation options. *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Change*, **25**(5), 739–761, doi:10.1007/s11027-019-09888-z.

Leck, H. and D. Roberts, 2015: What lies beneath: understanding the invisible aspects of municipal climate change governance. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.*, **13**, 61–67, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2015.02.004.

León-Mateos, F., A. Sartal, L. López-Manuel and M. A. Quintás, 2021: Adapting our sea ports to the challenges of climate change: development and validation of a Port Resilience Index. *Mar. Policy*, **130**, 104573, doi:10.1016/j.marpol.2021.104573.

Lincke, D. and J. Hinkel, 2021: Coastal migration due to 21st century sea-level rise. *Earth's Future*, **9**(5), doi:10.1029/2020EF001965.

Lincke, D., et al., 2020: The effectiveness of setback zones for adapting to sea-level rise in Croatia. *Reg. Environ. Change*, **20**(2), 46, doi:10.1007/s10113-020-01628-3.

Lithgow, D., et al., 2019: Exploring the co-occurrence between coastal squeeze and coastal tourism in a changing climate and its consequences. *Tour. Manag.*, **74**, 43–54, doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2019.02.005.

Logan, T.M., S.D. Guikema and J.D. Bricker, 2018: Hard-adaptive measures can increase vulnerability to storm surge and tsunami hazards over time. *Nat. Sustain.*, **1**(9), 526–530, doi:10.1038/s41893-018-0137-6.

Look, C., E. Friedman and G. Godbout, 2019: The resilience of land tenure regimes during Hurricane Irma: how colonial legacies impact disaster response and recovery in Antigua and Barbuda. *J. Extreme Events*, **06**(01), 1940004, doi:10.1142/s2345737619400049.

Luijendijk, A., et al., 2018: The state of the world's beaches. *Sci. Rep.*, **8**(1), 6641, doi:10.1038/s41598-018-24630-6.

Lund, D.H., 2018: Governance innovations for climate change adaptation in urban Denmark. *J. Environ. Policy Plan.*, **20**(5), 632–644, doi:10.1080/1523908X.2018.1480361.

Mach, K.J. and A.R. Siders, 2021: Reframing strategic, managed retreat for transformative climate adaptation. *Science*, **372**(6548), 1294–1299, doi:10.1126/science.abh1894.

Macreadie, P.I., et al., 2019: The future of Blue Carbon science. *Nat. Commun.*, **10**(1), 3998, doi:10.1038/s41467-019-11693-w.

Macreadie, P.I., et al., 2017: Can we manage coastal ecosystems to sequester more blue carbon? *Front. Ecol. Environ.*, **15**(4), 206–213, doi:10.1002/fee.1484.

Magnan, A.K. and V.K.E. Duvat, 2018: Unavoidable solutions for coastal adaptation in Reunion Island (Indian Ocean). *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **89**, 393–400, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2018.09.002.

Magnan, A.K. and V.K.E. Duvat, 2020: Towards adaptation pathways for atoll islands. Insights from the Maldives. *Reg. Environ. Change*, **20**(4), 119, doi:10.1007/s10113-020-01691-w.

Magnan, A.K., et al., 2019: Integrative Cross-Chapter Box on Low-lying Islands and Coasts. In: *IPCC Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate*. [Pörtner, H.-O., D. C. Roberts, V. Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, M. Tignor, E. Poloczanska, K. Mintenbeck, M. Nicolai, A. Okem, J. Petzold, B. Rama and N. Weyer (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press. In Press.

Maharjan, A., et al., 2020: Migration and household adaptation in climate-sensitive hotspots in South Asia. *Curr. Clim. Change Rep.*, **6**(1), 1–16, doi:10.1007/s40641-020-00153-z.

Majumdar, B. and S. DasGupta, 2020: Let Bengal be heard: dealing with Covid and cyclone Amphan together. *South. Asian Hist. Cult.*, **11**(3), 317–322, doi:10.1080/19472498.2020.1780063.

Malagon Santos, V., I.D. Haigh and T. Wahl, 2017: Spatial and temporal clustering analysis of extreme wave events around the UK coastline. *J. Mar. Sci. Eng.*, **5**(3), 28.

Manea, A., I. Geedicke and M.R. Leishman, 2020: Elevated carbon dioxide and reduced salinity enhance mangrove seedling establishment in an artificial saltmarsh community. *Oecologia*, **192**(1), 273–280, doi:10.1007/s00442-019-04563-1.

Mansur, A.V., et al., 2018: Adapting to urban challenges in the Amazon: flood risk and infrastructure deficiencies in Belém, Brazil. *Reg. Environ. Change*, **18**(5), 1411–1426, doi:10.1007/s10113-017-1269-3.

Mansur, A.V., et al., 2016: An assessment of urban vulnerability in the Amazon Delta and Estuary: a multi-criterion index of flood exposure, socio-economic conditions and infrastructure. *Sustain. Sci.*, **11**(4), 625–643, doi:10.1007/s11625-016-0355-7.

Marengo, J.A., F. Muller-Karger, M. Pelling and C.J. Reynolds, 2019: The METROPOLE project – an integrated framework to analyse local decision making and adaptive capacity to large-scale environmental change: decision making and adaptation to sea level rise in Santos, Brazil. In: *Climate Change in Santos Brazil: Projections, Impacts and Adaptation Options* [Nunes, L.H., R. Greco and J.A. Marengo(eds.)]. Springer, Cham, pp. 3–15.

Marzeion, B. and A. Levermann, 2014: Loss of cultural world heritage and currently inhabited places to sea-level rise. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **9**(3), 34001, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/9/3/034001.

Masselink, G., E. Beetham and P. Kench, 2020: Coral reef islands can accrete vertically in response to sea level rise. *Sci. Adv.*, **6**(24), eaay3656, doi:10.1126/sciadv.aay3656.

Mat, N., et al., 2016: Socio-ecological transitions toward low-carbon port cities: trends, changes and adaptation processes in Asia and Europe. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **114**, 362–375, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.04.058.

Mazeka, B., C. Sutherland, S. Buthelezi and D. Khumalo, 2019: Community-based mapping methodology for climate change adaptation: a case study of quarry road west informal settlement, Durban, South Africa. In: *The Geography of Climate Change Adaptation in Urban Africa* [Cobbinah, P.B. and M. Addaney(eds.)]. Springer, Cham, pp. 57–88.

McConnell, A., 2018: Rethinking wicked problems as political problems and policy problems. *Policy Polit.*, **46**(1), 165–180, doi:10.1332/030557317X15072085902640.

McFadgen, B. and D. Huitema, 2018: Experimentation at the interface of science and policy: a multi-case analysis of how policy experiments influence political decision-makers. *Policy Sci.*, **51**(2), 161–187, doi:10.1007/s11077-017-9276-2.

McIver, L., et al., 2016: Health impacts of climate change in pacific island countries: a regional assessment of vulnerabilities and adaptation priorities. *Environ. Health Perspect.*, **124**(11), 1707–1714, doi:10.1289/ehp.1509756.

McLean, R. and P. Kench, 2015: Destruction or persistence of coral atoll islands in the face of 20th and 21st century sea-level rise? *WIREs Clim. Change*, **6**(5), 445–463, doi:10.1002/wcc.350.

McLeman, R., et al., 2021: Conceptual framing to link climate risk assessments and climate-migration scholarship. *Clim. Change*, **165**(1), 24, doi:10.1007/s10584-021-03056-6.

McMichael, C., S. Dasgupta, S. Ayeb-Karlsson and I. Kelman, 2020: A review of estimating population exposure to sea-level rise and the relevance for migration. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/abb398.

Meerow, S., 2017: Double exposure, infrastructure planning, and urban climate resilience in coastal megacities: a case study of Manila. *Environ. Plan. A Econ. Space*, **49**(11), 2649–2672, doi:10.1177/0308518x17723630.

Mehring, P., H. Geoghegan, H.L. Cloke and J.M. Clark, 2018: What is going wrong with community engagement? How flood communities and flood authorities construct engagement and partnership working. *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **89**, 109–115, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2018.07.009.

Mehvar, S., et al., 2019: Climate change-driven losses in ecosystem services of coastal wetlands: a case study in the West coast of Bangladesh. *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **169**, 273–283, doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2018.12.009.

Mehvar, S., et al., 2018: Developing a framework to quantify potential sea level rise-driven environmental losses: a case study in Semarang coastal area, Indonesia. *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **89**, 216–230, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2018.06.019.

Mentaschi, L., et al., 2018: Global long-term observations of coastal erosion and accretion. *Sci. Rep.*, **8**(1), 12876, doi:10.1038/s41598-018-30904-w.

Moftakhari, H.R., et al., 2017: Compounding effects of sea level rise and fluvial flooding. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **114**(37), 9785–9790, doi:10.1073/pnas.1620325114.

Monioudi, I.N., et al., 2018: Climate change impacts on critical international transportation assets of Caribbean Small Island Developing States (SIDS): the case of Jamaica and Saint Lucia. *Reg. Environ. Change*, **18**(8), 2211–2225, doi:10.1007/s10113-018-1360-4.

Montanari, F., M. Polette, S. Queiroz and M. Kolicheski, 2020: Estimating economic impacts of sea level rise in Florianópolis (Brazil) for the year 2100. *Am. J. Clim. Change*, **10**, 37–48, doi:10.9734/IJECC/2020/v10i130174.

Morgan, R., 2020: The allure of climate and water independence: desalination projects in Perth and San Diego. *J. Urban. Hist.*, **46**(1), 113–128, doi:10.1177/0096144217692990.

Morris, R.L., A. Boxshall and S.E. Swearer, 2020: Climate-resilient coasts require diverse defence solutions. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **10**(6), 485–487, doi:10.1038/s41558-020-0798-9.

Moser, S.C., S. Jeffress Williams and D.F. Boesch, 2012: Wicked challenges at land's end: managing coastal vulnerability under climate change. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.*, **37**(1), 51–78, doi:10.1146/annurev-environ-021611-135158.

Muis, S., et al., 2016: A global reanalysis of storm surges and extreme sea levels. *Nat. Commun.*, **7**(1), 11969, doi:10.1038/ncomms11969.

Murali, R.M., M.J. Riyas, K.N. Reshma and S.S. Kumar, 2020: Climate change impact and vulnerability assessment of Mumbai city, India. *Nat. Hazards*, **102**(2), 575–589, doi:10.1007/s11069-019-03766-2.

Musa, Z.N., I. Popescu and A. Mynett, 2016: Assessing the sustainability of local resilience practices against sea level rise impacts on the lower Niger delta. *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **130**, 221–228, doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2016.06.016.

Mussi, C.S., J. Bonetti and R.M. Sperb, 2018: Coastal sensitivity and population exposure to sea level rise: a case study on Santa Catarina Island, Brazil. *J. Coast. Conserv.*, **22**(6), 1117–1128, doi:10.1007/s11852-018-0619-8.

Ndebele-Murisa, M.R., et al., 2020: City to city learning and knowledge exchange for climate resilience in southern Africa. *PLoS ONE*, **15**(1), e227915, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0227915.

Neef, A., et al., 2018: Climate adaptation strategies in Fiji: the role of social norms and cultural values. *World Dev.*, **107**, 125–137, doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.02.029.

Neise, T., et al., 2017: Manufacturing firms' adaptations to floods and proposal for integrative adaptive regional development in Jakarta. In: *Disaster Risk Reduction in Indonesia: Progress, Challenges, and Issues* [Djalante, R., M. Garschagen, F. Thomalla and R. Shaw(eds.)]. Springer, Cham, pp. 281–305.

Neumann, B., A.T. Vafeidis, J. Zimmermann and R.J. Nicholls, 2015: Future coastal population growth and exposure to sea-level rise and coastal flooding--a global assessment. *PLoS ONE*, **10**(3), e118571, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0118571.

Nicholls, R.J., et al., 2018: Stabilization of global temperature at 1.5C and 2.0C: implications for coastal areas. *Philos. Trans. Royal Soc. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.*, **376**(2119), 20160448, doi:10.1098/rsta.2016.0448.

Nicholls, R.J., R.J. Dawson and S.A. Day, 2015: *Broad Scale Coastal Simulation: New Techniques to Understand and Manage Shorelines in the Third Millennium*, Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands, 1–398.

Nicholls, R.J., et al., 2021: A global analysis of subsidence, relative sea-level change and coastal flood exposure. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **11**(4), 338–342, doi:10.1038/s41558-021-00993-z.

Nkoana, E.M., A. Verbruggen and J. Hugé, 2018: Climate change adaptation tools at the community level: an integrated literature review. *Sustainability*, **10**(3), doi:10.3390/su10030796.

Nunn, P.D., 2013: The end of the Pacific? Effects of sea level rise on Pacific Island livelihoods. *Singap. J. Trop. Geogr.*, **34**(2), 143–171, doi:10.1111/sjtg.12021.

Nunn, P.D., J. Runman, M. Falanruw and R. Kumar, 2017: Culturally grounded responses to coastal change on islands in the Federated States of Micronesia, northwest Pacific Ocean. *Reg. Environ. Change*, **17**(4), 959–971, doi:10.1007/s10113-016-0950-2.

Nursey-Bray, M., 2017: Towards socially just adaptive climate governance: the transformative potential of conflict. *Local Environ.*, **22**(2), 156–171, doi:10.1080/13549839.2016.1181618.

OECD, 2019: *Responding to Rising Seas*. OECD Publishing, Paris, France.

Olazabal, M., et al., 2019a: Are local climate adaptation policies credible? A conceptual and operational assessment framework. *Int. J. Urban Sustain. Dev.*, **11**(3), 277–296, doi:10.1080/19463138.2019.1583234.

Olazabal, M., et al., 2019b: A cross-scale worldwide analysis of coastal adaptation planning. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **14**(12), 124056, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/ab5532.

Onat, Y., O.P. Francis and K. Kim, 2018: Vulnerability assessment and adaptation to sea level rise in high-wave environments: a case study on O'ahu, Hawai'i. *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **157**, 147–159, doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2018.02.021.

Oppenheimer, M., et al., 2019: Chapter 4: Sea Level Rise and Implications for Low Lying Islands, Coasts and Communities. In: *IPCC Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate*. [Pörtner, H.-O., D. C. Roberts, V. Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, M. Tignor, E. Poloczanska, K. Mintenbeck, M. Nicolai, A. Okem, J. Petzold, B. Rama and N. Weyer (eds.)]Cambridge University Press. In press.

Panahi, R., A.K.Y. Ng and J. Pang, 2020: Climate change adaptation in the port industry: a complex of lingering research gaps and uncertainties. *Transp. Policy*, **95**, 10–29, doi:10.1016/j.tranpol.2020.05.010.

Pasquini, L., R.M. Cowling and G. Ziervogel, 2013: Facing the heat: barriers to mainstreaming climate change adaptation in local government in the Western Cape Province, South Africa. *Habitat Int.*, **40**, 225–232, doi:10.1016/j.habitatint.2013.05.003.

Pasquini, L., G. Ziervogel, R.M. Cowling and C. Shearing, 2015: What enables local governments to mainstream climate change adaptation? Lessons learned from two municipal case studies in the Western Cape, South Africa. *Clim. Dev.*, **7**(1), 60–70, doi:10.1080/17565529.2014.886994.

Patel, D., et al., 2019: Joint effect of heatwaves and air quality on emergency department attendances for vulnerable population in Perth, Western Australia, 2006 to 2015. *Environ. Res.*, **174**, 80–87, doi:10.1016/j.envres.2019.04.013.

Pathak, A., P.E. van Beynen, F.A. Akiwumi and K.C. Lindeman, 2020: Impacts of climate change on the tourism sector of a Small Island Developing State: a case study for the Bahamas. *Environ. Dev.*, 100556, doi:10.1016/j.envdev.2020.100556.

Pelling, M., T. Abeling and M. Garschagen, 2016: Emergence and transition in London's climate change adaptation pathways. *J. Extreme Events*, **03**(03), 1650012, doi:10.1142/s2345737616500123.

Penning-Rowsell, E., 2020: Floating architecture in the landscape: climate change adaptation ideas, opportunities and challenges. *Landsc. Res.*, **45**(4), 395–411, doi:10.1080/01426397.2019.1694881.

Perkins, M.J., et al., 2015: Conserving intertidal habitats: What is the potential of ecological engineering to mitigate impacts of coastal structures? *Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.*, **167**, 504–515, doi:10.1016/j.ecss.2015.10.033.

Perry, C.T., et al., 2018: Loss of coral reef growth capacity to track future increases in sea level. *Nature*, **558**(7710), 396–400, doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0194-z.

Perry, C.T. and K.M. Morgan, 2017: Bleaching drives collapse in reef carbonate budgets and reef growth potential on southern Maldives reefs. *Sci. Rep.*, **7**(1), 40581, doi:10.1038/srep40581.

Petzold, J. and A.K. Magnan, 2019: Climate change: thinking small islands beyond Small Island Developing States (SIDS). *Clim. Change*, **152**(1), 145–165, doi:10.1007/s10584-018-2363-3.

Petzold, J., B.M.W. Ratter and A. Holdschlag, 2018: Competing knowledge systems and adaptability to sea-level rise in The Bahamas. *Area*, **50**(1), 91–100, doi:10.1111/area.12355.

Pinto, P.J., G.M. Kondolf and P.L.R. Wong, 2018: Adapting to sea level rise: emerging governance issues in the San Francisco Bay Region. *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **90**, 28–37, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2018.09.015.

Pittman, J. and D. Armitage, 2019: Network governance of land-sea social-ecological systems in the Lesser Antilles. *Ecol. Econ.*, **157**, 61–70, doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2018.10.013.

Pontee, N., 2013: Defining coastal squeeze: a discussion. *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **84**, 204–207, doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2013.07.010.

Porio, E., 2014: Climate change adaptation in Metro Manila: community risk assessment and power in community interventions. In: *Community Intervention: Clinical Sociology Perspectives* [Fritz, J.M. and J. Rhéaume(eds.)]. Springer New York, New York, NY, pp. 149–166.

Pueyo-Ros, J., X. Garcia, A. Ribas and R.M. Fraguell, 2018: Ecological restoration of a coastal wetland at a mass tourism destination. Will the recreational value increase or decrease? *Ecol. Econ.*, **148**, 1–14, doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2018.02.002.

Pugatch, T., 2019: Tropical storms and mortality under climate change. *World. Dev.*, **117**, 172–182, doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.01.009.

Radcliffe, J.C., 2015: Water recycling in Australia – during and after the drought. *Environ. Sci. Water Res. Technol.*, **1**(5), 554–562, doi:10.1039/C5EW00048C.

Radhakrishnan, M., et al., 2018: Coping capacities for improving adaptation pathways for flood protection in Can Tho, Vietnam. *Clim. Change*, **149**(1), 29–41, doi:10.1007/s10584-017-1999-8.

Radosavljevic, B., et al., 2016: Erosion and flooding—threats to coastal infrastructure in the Arctic: a case study from Herschel Island, Yukon Territory, Canada. *Estuaries Coasts*, **39**(4), 900–915, doi:10.1007/s12237-015-0046-0.

Rahman, M. A. and S. Islam, 2019: Climate change adaptation in urban areas: a critical assessment of the structural and non-structural flood protection measures in Dhaka. In: *Confronting Climate Change in Bangladesh*. Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands, pp. 161–173.

Ramm, T.D., S. Graham, C.J. White and C.S. Watson, 2017: Advancing values-based approaches to climate change adaptation: a case study from Australia. *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **76**, 113–123, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2017.06.014.

Ranasinghe, R., et al., 2019: Disentangling the relative impacts of climate change and human activities on fluvial sediment supply to the coast by the world's large rivers: Pearl River Basin, China. *Sci. Rep.*, **9**(1), 9236, doi:10.1038/s41598-019-45442-2.

Randrianarisoa, L.M. and A. Zhang, 2019: Adaptation to climate change effects and competition between ports: Invest now or later? *Transp. Res. Part B Methodol.*, **123**, 279–322, doi:10.1016/j.trb.2019.03.016.

Raymond, C., et al., 2020: Understanding and managing connected extreme events. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **10**(7), 611–621, doi:10.1038/s41558-020-0790-4.

Reiblich, J., et al., 2019: Bridging climate science, law, and policy to advance coastal adaptation planning. *Mar. Policy*, **104**, 125–134, doi:10.1016/j.marpol.2019.02.028.

Reimann, L., et al., 2018: Mediterranean UNESCO World Heritage at risk from coastal flooding and erosion due to sea-level rise. *Nat. Commun.*, **9**(1), 4161, doi:10.1038/s41467-018-06645-9.

Rey, T., et al., 2019: Coastal processes and influence on damage to urban structures during Hurricane Irma (St-Martin & St-Barthélemy, French West Indies). *J. Mar. Sci. Eng.*, **7**(7), 215, doi:10.3390/jmse7070215.

Ribeiro, A.S., et al., 2021: Flooding conditions at Aveiro Port (Portugal) within the framework of projected climate change. *J. Mar. Sci. Eng.*, **9**(6), 595.

Rigaud, K., et al., 2018: *Groundswell : Preparing for Internal Climate Migration*. World Bank, Washington, DC, https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/29461, accessed 01/12/2020.

Robinson, C., B. Dilkina and J. Moreno-Cruz, 2020: Modeling migration patterns in the USA under sea level rise. *PLoS ONE*, **15**(1), e227436, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0227436.

Robinson, S., 2017: Climate change adaptation trends in small island developing states. *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Change*, **22**(4), 669–691, doi:10.1007/s11027-015-9693-5.

Rodrigues, C.U., 2019: Climate change and DIY urbanism in Luanda and Maputo: new urban strategies? *Int. J. Urban Sustain. Dev.*, **11**(3), 319–331, doi:10.1080/19463138.2019.1585859.

Rogers, C.D.W., A.J.E. Gallant and N.J. Tapper, 2019: Is the urban heat island exacerbated during heatwaves in southern Australian cities? *Theor. Appl. Climatol.*, **137**(1), 441–457, doi:10.1007/s00704-018-2599-x.

Romero Manrique, D., S. Corral and Â. Guimarães Pereira, 2018: Climate-related displacements of coastal communities in the Arctic: engaging traditional knowledge in adaptation strategies and policies. *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **85**, 90–100, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2018.04.007.

Rosenzweig, C. and W. Solecki, 2014: Hurricane Sandy and adaptation pathways in New York: lessons from a first-responder city. *Glob. Environ. Change*, **28**, 395–408, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.05.003.

Rovai, A.S., et al., 2018: Global controls on carbon storage in mangrove soils. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **8**(6), 534–538, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0162-5.

Roy, M., S. Cawood, M. Hordijk and D. Hulme, 2016: *Urban Poverty and Climate Change*. Routledge advances in climate change research. Routledge, Abingdon-upon-Thames, United Kingom.

Rumore, D., 2014: Building the Capacity of Coastal Communities to Adapt to Climate Change through Participatory Action Research: Lessons Learned from the New England Climate Adaption Project. Carolina Planning, 39, 16-23, doi:10.17615/tda7-rh78.

Sabour, S., et al., 2020: Multi-decadal shoreline change in coastal natural world heritage sites – a global assessment. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **15**(10), 104047, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/ab968 f.

Saintilan, N., et al., 2020: Thresholds of mangrove survival under rapid sea level rise. *Science*, **368**(6495), 1118–1121, doi:10.1126/science.aba2656.

Saito, N., 2014: Challenges for adapting Bangkok's flood management systems to climate change. *Urban Clim.*, **9**, 89–100, doi:10.1016/j.uclim.2014.07.006.

Salas, R.N., J.M. Shultz and C.G. Solomon, 2020: The climate crisis and Covid-19—a major threat to the pandemic response. *N. Engl. J. Med.*, **383**(11), e70, doi:10.1056/NEJMp2022011.

Sandoval Londoño, L.A., J. Leal-Flórez and J.F. Blanco-Libreros, 2020: Linking mangroves and fish catch: a correlational study in the southern Caribbean Sea (Colombia). *Bull. Mar. Sci.*, **96**(3), 415–430, doi:10.5343/bms.2019.0022.

Schaer, C. and A. Pantakar, 2018: Promoting private sector engagement in climate change adaptation and flood resilience—a case study of innovative approaches applied by MSMEs in Mumbai, India. In: *Theory and Practice of Climate Adaptation* [Alves, F., W. Leal Filho and U. Azeiteiro(eds.)]. Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands, pp. 175–191.

Schernewski, G., J. Schumacher, E. Weisner and L. Donges, 2018: A combined coastal protection, realignment and wetland restoration scheme in the southern Baltic: planning process, public information and participation. *J. Coast. Conserv.*, **22**(3), 533–547, doi:10.1007/s11852-017-0542-4.

Schinko, T., et al., 2020: Economy-wide effects of coastal flooding due to sea level rise: a multi-model simultaneous treatment of mitigation, adaptation, and residual impacts. *Environ. Res. Commun.*, **2**(1), 15002, doi:10.1088/2515-7620/ab6368.

Schlosberg, D., 2012: Climate justice and capabilities: a framework for adaptation policy. *Ethics Int. Aff.*, **26**(4), 445–461, doi:10.1017/S0892679412000615.

Schlosberg, D., L.B. Collins and S. Niemeyer, 2017: Adaptation policy and community discourse: risk, vulnerability, and just transformation. *Env. Polit.*, **26**(3), 413–437, doi:10.1080/09644016.2017.1287628.

Schmutter, K., M. Nash and L. Dovey, 2017: Ocean acidification: assessing the vulnerability of socioeconomic systems in Small Island Developing States. *Reg. Environ. Change*, **17**(4), 973–987, doi:10.1007/s10113-016-0949-8.

Schuerch, M., et al., 2018: Future response of global coastal wetlands to sea-level rise. *Nature*, **561**(7722), 231–234, doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0476-5.

Scussolini, P., et al., 2017: Adaptation to sea level rise: a multidisciplinary analysis for Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. *Water Resour. Res.*, **53**(12), 10841–10857, doi:10.1002/2017wr021344.

Seekamp, E., M. Jurjonas and K. Bitsura-Meszaros, 2019: Influences on coastal tourism demand and substitution behaviors from climate change impacts and hazard recovery responses. *J. Sustain. Tour.*, **27**(5), 629–648, doi:10.1080/09669582.2019.1599005.

Sengupta, D., R. Chen and M. E. Meadows, 2018: Building beyond land: an overview of coastal land reclamation in 16 global megacities. *Appl. Geogr.*, **90**, 229–238, doi:10.1016/j.apgeog.2017.12.015.

Sengupta, D., R. Chen, M. E. Meadows and A. Banerjee, 2020: Gaining or losing ground? Tracking Asia's hunger for 'new' coastal land in the era of sea level rise. *Sci. Total. Environ.*, **732**, 139290, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139290.

Seo, S.N. and L.A. Bakkensen, 2016: Did adaptation strategies work? High fatalities from tropical cyclones in the North Indian Ocean and future vulnerability under global warming. *Nat. Hazards*, **82**(2), 1341–1355, doi:10.1007/s11069-016-2250-z.

Seraphim, M.J., et al., 2020: Interactions between coral restoration and fish assemblages: implications for reef management. *J. Fish Biol.*, **97**(3), 633–655, doi:10.1111/jfb.14440.

Shultz, J.M., C. Fugate and S. Galea, 2020a: Cascading risks of COVID-19 resurgence during an active 2020 Atlantic hurricane season. *JAMA*, **324**(10), 935–936, doi:10.1001/jama.2020.15398.

Shultz, J.M., et al., 2020b: Superimposed threats to population health from tropical cyclones in the prevaccine era of COVID-19. *Lancet Planet. Health*, **4**(11), e506–e508, doi:10.1016/S2542-5196(20)30250-3.

Siders, A.R., 2019: Managed retreat in the United States. *One Earth*, **1**(2), 216–225, doi:10.1016/j.oneear.2019.09.008.

Singh, C., M. Madhavan, J. Arvind and A. Bazaz, 2021: Climate change adaptation in Indian cities: a review of existing actions and spaces for triple wins. *Urban Clim.*, **36**(March 2021), doi:10.1016/j.uclim.2021.100783.

Siripornanon, S. and P. Visuthismajarn, 2018: Key success factors of disaster management policy: a case study of the Asian cities climate change resilience network in Hat Yai city, Thailand. *Kasetsart J. Soc. Sci.*, **39**(2), 269–276, doi:10.1016/j.kjss.2018.01.005.

So, S., B. Juarez, A. Valle-Levinson and M. E. Gillin, 2019: Storm surge from Hurricane Irma along the Florida Peninsula. *Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.*, **229**, 106402, doi:10.1016/j.ecss.2019.106402.

Sovacool, B.K., 2018: Bamboo beating bandits: conflict, inequality, and vulnerability in the political ecology of climate change adaptation in Bangladesh. *World Dev.*, **102**, 183–194, doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.10.014.

Sovacool, B.K., B.-O. Linnér and M. E. Goodsite, 2015: The political economy of climate adaptation. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **5**(7), 616–618, doi:10.1038/nclimate2665.

Sowman, M. and M. Gawith, 1994: Participation of disadvantaged communities in project planning and decision-making: a case-study of Hout Bay. *Dev. S. Afr.*, **11**(4), 557–571, doi:10.1080/03768359408439772.

Sowman, M., D. Scott and C. Sutherland, 2016: *Governance and Social Justice Position Paper: Milnerton Beach*. City of Cape Town, Cape Town.

St. John, III, B. and J.-E. Yusuf, 2019: Perspectives of the expert and experienced on challenges to regional adaptation for sea level rise: implications for multisectoral readiness and boundary spanning. *Coast. Manag.*, **47**(2), 151–168, doi:10.1080/08920753.2019.1564951.

Stephens, S.A., R.G. Bell and J. Lawrence, 2018: Developing signals to trigger adaptation to sea-level rise. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **13**(10), 104004, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aadf96.

Storbjörk, S. and M. Hjerpe, 2021: Climate-proofing coastal cities: What is needed to go from envisioning to enacting multifunctional solutions for waterfront climate adaptation? *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **210**, 105732, doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2021.105732.

Storlazzi, C.D., et al., 2018: Most atolls will be uninhabitable by the mid-21st century because of sea-level rise exacerbating wave-driven flooding. *Sci. Adv.*, **4**(4), eaap9741, doi:10.1126/sciadv.aap9741.

Storlazzi, C.D., et al., 2019: *Rigorously Valuing the Role of U.S. Coral Reefs in Coastal Hazard Risk Reduction*. Open-File Report, Survey. U. S. G., Reston, VA, http://pubs.er.usgs.gov/publication/ofr20191027, accessed 01/12/20.

Strzelecki, M.C. and M.W. Jaskólski, 2020: Arctic tsunamis threaten coastal landscapes and communities – survey of Karrat Isfjord 2017 tsunami effects in Nuugaatsiaq, western Greenland. *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, **20**(9), 2521–2534, doi:10.5194/nhess-20-2521-2020.

Sudmeier-Rieux, K., et al., 2015: Opportunities, incentives and challenges to risk sensitive land use planning: lessons from Nepal, Spain and Vietnam. *Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct.*, **14**, 205–224, doi:10.1016/j.ijdrr.2014.09.009.

Sultana, P. and P.M. Thompson, 2017: Adaptation or conflict? Responses to climate change in water management in Bangladesh. *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **78**, 149–156, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2017.09.011.

Surtiari, G.A.K., R. Djalante, N.J. Setiadi and M. Garschagen, 2017: Culture and community resilience to flooding: case study of the urban coastal community in Jakarta. In: *Disaster Risk Reduction in Indonesia*. Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands, pp. 469–493.

Susskind, L., D. Rumore, C. Hulet and P. Field, 2015: *Managing Climate Risks in Coastal Communities: Strategies for Engagement, Readiness and Adaptation*. Anthem Press, London, UK.

Susskind, L.E., S. McKearnen and J. Thomas-Lamar, 1999: *The Consensus Building Handbook: A Comprehensive Guide to Reaching Agreement*. Sage Publications, London, UK.

Szlafsztein, C.F. and A.N.B. de Araújo, 2021: Autonomous flood adaptation measures in Amazonian cities (Belem, Brazil). *Nat. Hazards*, doi:10.1007/s11069-021-04720-x.

Takagi, H., M. Esteban, T. Mikami and D. Fujii, 2016: Projection of coastal floods in 2050 Jakarta. *Urban Clim.*, **17**, 135–145, doi:10.1016/j.uclim.2016.05.003.

Temmerman, S., et al., 2013: Ecosystem-based coastal defence in the face of global change. *Nature*, **504**(7478), 79, doi:10.1038/nature12859.

Termeer, C.J.A.M., A. Dewulf, G. Breeman and S.J. Stiller, 2013: Governance capabilities for dealing wisely with wicked problems. *Adm. Soc.*, **47**(6), 680–710, doi:10.1177/0095399712469195.

Termeer, C.J.A.M., et al., 2016: Coping with the wicked problem of climate adaptation across scales: the Five R Governance Capabilities. *Landsc. Urban Plan.*, **154**, 11–19, doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2016.01.007.

Tessler, Z.D., et al., 2015: Profiling risk and sustainability in coastal deltas of the world. *Science*, **349**(6248), 638, doi:10.1126/science.aab3574.

Thanvisitthpon, N., S. Shrestha and I. Pal, 2018: Urban flooding and climate change: a case study of Bangkok, Thailand. *Environ. Urban. Asia*, **9**(1), 86–100, doi:10.1177/0975425317748532.

Thomas, A. and L. Benjamin, 2018: Perceptions of climate change risk in The Bahamas. *J. Environ. Stud. Sci.*, **8**(1), 63–72, doi:10.1007/s13412-017-0429-6.

Thomas, A. and L. Benjamin, 2020: Non-economic loss and damage: lessons from displacement in the Caribbean. *Clim. Policy*, **20**(6), 715–728, doi:10.1080/14693062.2019.1640105.

Tiepolo, M., 2016: *Planning to Cope with Tropical and Subtropical Climate Change*. De Gruyter, Berlin, Germany.

Toimil, A., et al., 2020: Climate change-driven coastal erosion modelling in temperate sandy beaches: methods and uncertainty treatment. *Earth Sci. Rev.*, **202**, 103110, doi:10.1016/j.earscirev.2020.103110.

Torabi, E., A. Dedekorkut-Howes and M. Howes, 2018: Adapting or maladapting: building resilience to climate-related disasters in coastal cities. *Cities*, **72**, 295–309, doi:10.1016/j.cities.2017.09.008.

Törnqvist, T.E., K.L. Jankowski, Y.-X. Li and J.L. González, 2020: Tipping points of Mississippi Delta marshes due to accelerated sea-level rise. *Sci. Adv.*, **6**(21), eaaz5512, doi:10.1126/sciadv.aaz5512.

Triyanti, A., M. Bavinck, J. Gupta and M.A. Marfai, 2017: Social capital, interactive governance and coastal protection: the effectiveness of mangrove ecosystem-based strategies in promoting inclusive development in Demak, Indonesia. *Ocean Coast. Manag.*, **150**, 3–11, doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2017.10.017.

Tschakert, P., et al., 2017: Climate change and loss, as if people mattered: values, places, and experiences. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Clim. Change*, **8**(5), doi:10.1002/wcc.476.

Tuts, R., et al., 2015: *Guiding Principles for City Climate Action Planning*. UN-Habitat, Geneva, Switzerland.

Twerefou, D.K., E. Adu-Danso, E. Abbey and B.D. Dovie, 2019: Choice of household adaptation strategies to flood risk management in Accra, Ghana. *City Environ. Interact.*, **3**, 100023, doi:10.1016/j.cacint.2020.100023.

Uittenbroek, C.J., H.L.P. Mees, D.L.T. Hegger and P.P.J. Driessen, 2019: The design of public participation: who participates, when and how? Insights in climate adaptation planning from the Netherlands. *J. Environ. Plan. Manag.*, **62**(14), 2529–2547, doi:10.1080/09640568.2019.1569503.

UN-Habitat, 2012: *Adaptation and Mitigation Strategy for Climate Change for the Canton of Esmeraldas*. Cities and Climate Change Initiative, United Nations Human Settlements Programme, UN-Habitat, https://unhabitat.org/adaptation-and-mitigation-strategy-for-climate-change-for-the-canton-of-esmeraldas, accessed 01/12/2020.

Ung, M., I. Luginaah, R. Chuenpagdee and G. Campbell, 2016: Perceived self-efficacy and adaptation to climate change in coastal Cambodia. *Climate*, **4**(1), 1, doi:10.3390/cli4010001.

Valdivieso, P. and K.P. Andersson, 2018: What motivates local governments to invest in critical infrastructure? Lessons from Chile. *Sustainability*, **10**(10), 3808, doi:10.3390/su10103808.

Van Alphen, J., 2016: The Delta Programme and updated flood risk management policies in the Netherlands. *J. Flood Risk Manag.*, **9**(4), 310–319, doi:10.1111/jfr3.12183.

van der Spek, A.J.F., 2018: The development of the tidal basins in the Dutch Wadden Sea until 2100: the impact of accelerated sea-level rise and subsidence on their sediment budget – a synthesis. *Neth. J. Geosci.*, **97**(3), 71–78, doi:10.1017/njg.2018.10.

van Leeuwen, K. and R. Sjerps, 2016: Istanbul: the challenges of integrated water resources management in Europa's megacity. *Environ. Dev. Sustain.*, **18**(1), 1–17, doi:10.1007/s10668-015-9636-z.

Vedeld, T., A. Coly, N.M. Ndour and S. Hellevik, 2016: Climate adaptation at what scale? Multi-level governance, resilience, and coproduction in Saint Louis, Senegal. *Nat. Hazards*, **82**(2), 173–199, doi:10.1007/s11069-015-1875-7.

Vella, K., et al., 2016: Voluntary collaboration for adaptive governance: the Southeast Florida regional climate change compact. *J. Plan. Educ. Res.*, **36**(3), 363–376, doi:10.1177/0739456X16659700.

Vitousek, S., et al., 2017: Doubling of coastal flooding frequency within decades due to sea-level rise. *Sci. Rep.*, **7**(1), 1399, doi:10.1038/s41598-017-01362-7.

Vousdoukas, M.I., et al., 2020a: Economic motivation for raising coastal flood defenses in Europe. *Nat. Commun.*, **11**(1), 2119, doi:10.1038/s41467-020-15665-3.

Vousdoukas, M.I., et al., 2018: Global probabilistic projections of extreme sea levels show intensification of coastal flood hazard. *Nat. Commun.*, **9**(1), 2360, doi:10.1038/s41467-018-04692-w.

Vousdoukas, M.I., et al., 2020b: Sandy coastlines under threat of erosion. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **10**(3), 260–263, doi:10.1038/s41558-020-0697-0.

Wahl, T., et al., 2015: Increasing risk of compound flooding from storm surge and rainfall for major US cities. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **5**(12), 1093–1097, doi:10.1038/nclimate2736.

Walsh, C., et al., 2019: Trade and trade-offs: shipping in changing climates. *Mar. Policy*, **106**, 103537, doi:10.1016/j.marpol.2019.103537.

Wang, C.M. and B.T. Wang, 2020: *Floating solutions for challenges facing humanity*. Springer Singapore, Singapore, 3–29. doi:10.1007/978-981-15-5144-4_1.

Ward, P.J., et al., 2018: Dependence between high sea-level and high river discharge increases flood hazard in global deltas and estuaries. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **13**(8), doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aad400.

Ward, R.D., 2020: Carbon sequestration and storage in Norwegian Arctic coastal wetlands: Impacts of climate change. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **748**, 141343, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141343.

Warner, J.F., A.J. Wesselink and G.D. Geldof, 2018: The politics of adaptive climate management: scientific recipes and lived reality. *WIREs Clim. Change*, **9**(3), e515, doi:10.1002/wcc.515.

Warrick, O., et al., 2017: The 'Pacific Adaptive Capacity Analysis Framework': guiding the assessment of adaptive capacity in Pacific island communities. *Reg. Environ. Change*, **17**(4), 1039–1051, doi:10.1007/s10113-016-1036-x.

Weatherdon, L.V., et al., 2016: Observed and projected impacts of climate change on marine fisheries, aquaculture, coastal tourism, and human health: an update. *Front. Mar. Sci.*, **3**, doi:10.3389/fmars.2016.00048.

Weber, E., P. Kissoon and C. Koto, 2019: Moving to dangerous places. In: *Dealing with Climate Change on Small Islands: Towards Effective and Sustainable Adaptation* [Klöck, C. and M. Fink(eds.)]. Universitätsverlag Göttingen, Göttingen.

Webler, T., et al., 2016: Design and evaluation of a local analytic-deliberative process for climate adaptation planning. *Local Environ.*, **21**(2), 166–188, do i:10.1080/13549839.2014.930425.

Weinstein, L., A. Rumbach and S. Sinha, 2019: Resilient growth: fantasy plans and unplanned developments in India's flood-prone coastal cities. *Int. J. Urban Reg. Res.*, **43**(2), 273–291, doi:10.1111/1468-2427.12743.

Weir, T., L. Dovey and D. Orcherton, 2017: Social and cultural issues raised by climate change in Pacific Island countries: an overview. *Reg. Environ. Change*, **17**(4), 1017–1028, doi:10.1007/s10113-016-1012-5.

Wiberg, P.L., S. Fagherazzi and M.L. Kirwan, 2020: Improving predictions of salt marsh evolution through better integration of data and models. *Annu. Rev. Mar. Sci.*, **12**(1), 389–413, doi:10.1146/annurev-marine-010419-010610.

Wijaya, N., V. Nitivattananon, R.P. Shrestha and S.M. Kim, 2020: Drivers and benefits of integrating climate adaptation measures into urban development: experience from coastal cities of Indonesia. *Sustainability*, **12**(2), 750, doi:10.3390/su12020750.

Wilson, B.J., et al., 2018: Declines in plant productivity drive carbon loss from brackish coastal wetland mesocosms exposed to saltwater intrusion. *Estuaries Coasts*, **41**(8), 2147–2158, doi:10.1007/s12237-018-0438-z.

Wolfram, M., J. van der Heijden, S. Juhola and J. Patterson, 2019: Learning in urban climate governance: concepts, key issues and challenges. *J. Environ. Policy Plan.*, **21**(1), 1–15, doi:10.1080/1523908X.2018.1558848.

Wrathall, D.J., et al., 2019: Meeting the looming policy challenge of sea-level change and human migration. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **9**(12), 898–901, doi:10.1038/s41558-019-0640-4.

Wyett, K., 2014: Escaping a rising tide: sea level rise and migration in Kiribati. *Asia Pac. Policy Stud.*, **1**(1), 171–185, doi:10.1002/app5.7.

Xu, H., K. Xu, J. Lian and C. Ma, 2019: Compound effects of rainfall and storm tides on coastal flooding risk. *Stoch. Environ. Res. Risk Assess.*, **33**(7), 1249–1261, doi:10.1007/s00477-019-01695-x.

Yang, S.L., et al., 2020: Role of delta-front erosion in sustaining salt marshes under sea-level rise and fluvial sediment decline. *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, **65**(9), 1990–2009, doi:10.1002/lno.11432.

Yang, Y.-C. and Y.-E. Ge, 2020: Adaptation strategies for port infrastructure and facilities under climate change at the Kaohsiung port. *Transp. Policy*, **97**, 232–244, doi:10.1016/j.tranpol.2020.06.019.

Yankson, P.W.K., et al., 2017: Assessment of coastal communities' vulnerability to floods using indicator-based approach: a case study of Greater Accra Metropolitan Area, Ghana. *Nat. Hazards*, **89**(2), 661–689, doi:10.1007/s11069-017-2985-1.

Yates, K.K., D.G. Zawada, N.A. Smiley and G. Tiling-Range, 2017: Divergence of seafloor elevation and sea level rise in coral reef ecosystems. *Biogeosciences*, **14**(6), 1739–1772, doi:10.5194/bg-14-1739-2017.

Yesudian, A.N. and R.J. Dawson, 2021: Global analysis of sea level rise risk to airports. *Clim. Risk Manag.*, **31**, 100266, doi:10.1016/j.crm.2020.100266.

Yin, J., et al., 2020: Flood risks in sinking delta cities: time for a reevaluation? *Earth's Future*, **8**(8), doi:10.1029/2020EF001614.

Yu, Q., A.K.H. Lau, K.T. Tsang and J.C.H. Fung, 2018a: Human damage assessments of coastal flooding for Hong Kong and the Pearl River Delta due to climate change-related sea level rise in the twenty-first century. *Nat. Hazards*, **92**(2), 1011–1038, doi:10.1007/s11069-018-3236-9.

Yu, R., P. Zhai and Y. Chen, 2018b: Facing climate change-related extreme events in megacities of China in the context of 1.5°C global warming. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.*, **30**, 75–81, doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2018.03.008.

Yusuf, J.-E., B. St. John III, M. Covi and J.G. Nicula, 2018: Engaging stakeholders in planning for sea level rise and resilience. *J. Contemp. Water Res. Educ.*, **164**(1), 112–123, doi:10.1111/j.1936-704X.2018.03287.x.

Zhao, Q., et al., 2018: Effects of water and salinity regulation measures on soil carbon sequestration in coastal wetlands of the Yellow River Delta. *Geoderma*, **319**, 219–229, doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2017.10.058.

Zhu, Z., et al., 2020: Historic storms and the hidden value of coastal wetlands for nature-based flood defence. *Nat. Sustain.*, **3**(10), 853–862, doi:10.1038/s41893-020-0556-z.

Zickgraf, C., 2019: Keeping people in place: political factors of (im)mobility and climate change. *Soc. Sci.*, **8**(8), 228.

Ziervogel, G., J. Waddell, W. Smit and A. Taylor, 2016: Flooding in Cape Town's informal settlements: barriers to collaborative urban risk governance. *S. Afr. Geogr. J.*, **98**(1), 1–20, doi:10.1080/03736245.2014.924867.

Zscheischler, J., et al., 2018: Future climate risk from compound events. *Nat. Clim. Change*, **8**(6), 469–477, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0156-3.

zu Ermgassen, P.S.E., et al., 2021: Fishers who rely on mangroves: modelling and mapping the global intensity of mangrove-associated fisheries. *Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.*, **248**, 107159, doi:10.1016/j.ecss.2020.107159.