

Metrics for assessing adaptive capacity and water security: common challenges, diverging contexts, emerging consensus

Gregg M Garfin^{1,2}, Christopher A Scott³, Margaret Wilder⁴, Robert G Varady⁵ and Robert Merideth⁵



The rapid pace of climate and environmental changes requires some degree of adaptation, to forestall or avoid severe impacts. Adaptive capacity and water security are concepts used to guide the ways in which resource managers plan for and manage change. Yet the assessment of adaptive capacity and water security remains elusive, due to flaws in guiding concepts, paucity or inadequacy of data, and multiple difficulties in measuring the effectiveness of management prescriptions at scales relevant to decision-making. We draw on conceptual framings and empirical findings of the thirteen articles in this special issue and seek to respond to key questions with respect to metrics for the measurement, governance, information accessibility, and robustness of the knowledge produced in conjunction with ideas related to adaptive capacity and water security. Three overarching conclusions from this body of work are (a) systematic cross-comparisons of metrics, using the same models and indicators, are needed to validate the reliability of evaluation instruments for adaptive capacity and water security, (b) the robustness of metrics to applications across multiple scales of analysis can be enhanced by a 'metrics plus' approach that combines well-designed quantitative metrics with in-depth qualitative methods that provide rich context and local knowledge, and (c) changes in the governance of science-policy can address deficits in public participation, foster knowledge exchange, and encourage the co-development of adaptive processes and approaches (e.g., risk-based framing) that move beyond development and use of static indicators and metrics.

Addresses

¹ School of Natural Resources and the Environment, The University of Arizona, Environment & Natural Resources 2, 1064 E. Lowell St., N419, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA

² Institute of the Environment, The University of Arizona, Environment & Natural Resources 2, 1064 E. Lowell St., N419, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA

³ School of Geography and Development, Udall Center for Studies in Public Policy, The University of Arizona, USA

⁴ School of Geography and Development, Center for Latin American Studies, Environment & Natural Resources 2 Building, OFFICE S-419, The University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA

⁵ Udall Center for Studies in Public Policy, The University of Arizona, USA

Corresponding author: Garfin, Gregg M (gmgarfin@email.arizona.edu)

Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability 2016, 21:86–89

This review comes from a themed issue on **Environmental change assessments**

Edited by **Gregg M. Garfin, Margaret Wilder and Robert Merideth**

For a complete overview see the [Issue](#) and the [Synthesis](#)

Received 3 November 2016; Accepted 10 November 2016

Available online 28th November 2016

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2016.11.007>

1877-3435/© 2016 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Introduction

Societal response to the global-change grand challenge must increasingly recognize diverse and mutually interacting drivers (climate change, extreme events, urbanization, and human-induced water scarcity, to name a few drivers) and gaps in the assessment of human and ecological vulnerability, the effectiveness of adaptation, and the robustness and equity of outcomes (here taken as water security based on the framing of this special issue). The introductory article [1] poses questions of (a) measurement of adaptive capacity and water security as well as the usefulness of their quantification at different scales, in diverse settings, and within various governance modes; (b) the implications for the robustness and quality of the knowledge produced by metrics; (c) the performance of metrics and assessment instruments; and (d) the accessibility and value of metrics and related instruments to practitioners and public stakeholders. Here we reflect on these challenges shared in common across multiple contexts globally.

Taken together, the papers in this special issue provide insights on — but do not fully resolve — common challenges of the assessment of adaptive capacity and water security. The authors in general take adaptation as a process in which individual, collective, and institutional capacities may vary but are subject to enhancement, or indeed, reduction. By conceptual contrast, water security is understood in normative terms as an end goal — a result or outcome of adaptation accompanied by sufficiently favorable conditions. No authors in this special issue consider the linkages between adaptation as process

and security as outcome to be static; that is, water security may ultimately be an elusive goal.

Adaptive capacity – water security linkages

A significant contribution of this collection of articles is to define the conceptual linkages between adaptive capacity (in water governance) and water security. This relationship is frequently implied in the literature but insufficiently examined. Yet the articles included here have distinct understandings of these key concepts. Four groups of authors [2–5] grapple with the inter-relationship of these. Kirchhoff *et al.* argue for the inter-dependency of the two concepts and understand adaptive capacity as a process on the path toward the goal of water security, where higher adaptive capacity is linked to more adaptive management and increased water security [3]. They make a case for building suites of capacity to deal with distinct challenges. They demonstrate the efficacy of adaptive capacity based on evidence from case studies in Argentina, Mexico, and the U.S.-Mexico border. Lemos *et al.* assert that the two concepts are connected because water security may be dependent upon adaptive capacity, but a more dynamic understanding of capacity is needed, one that (in keeping with [3]) emphasizes combinations of capacities (e.g., generic versus specific capacities) in a fluid policy making environment [5].

De Grenade *et al.* understand adaptive capacity in two ways, as it affects systems' vulnerability and capacity to respond to stresses and as it affects the resilience of social-ecological systems [4]. They argue that adaptive capacity needs to be better integrated into the water-energy-food nexus framework, with development of metrics instruments that embrace the nexus approach. In contrast, Varady *et al.* characterize adaptive capacity as 'a link between vulnerability and resilience frameworks,' while locating adaptive management as a governance approach concerned with managing risk and uncertainty [2]. Based on what they argue is greater empirical evidence, they view adaptive management as a more promising framework that provides for iterative and systematic experimentation in water management to address uncertainty.

Several articles argue for the positive value of metrics and assessment in the cases studied; several are skeptical or even critical of such approaches, deeming them of little value as currently designed and implemented. Virtually all the articles acknowledge a need for cross-comparisons that are facilitated by the use of quantitative measures, however imperfect; at the same time, most of the authors here are wary of approaches that may be overly-reductionist in simplifying complex problems. Overall, a 'metrics plus' approach that favors the development and use of well-designed quantitative metrics, coupled with in-depth qualitative methods that provide rich context and local knowledge, may on balance be the ideal.

Presently too little is known about how reliable or useful such instruments are. Thus, metrics and assessment instruments should increasingly be routinely tested and gauged for validity, robustness, and utility to enhance the reliability of these instruments and engender confidence in stakeholders and decision makers who may rely on them. Doing so may help enhance stronger index designs over weaker ones and encourage the use of more standardized approaches to index design. The special issue provides some evidence that practitioners and decision makers are increasingly reliant on metrics and assessments. But frequency of use does not necessarily suggest satisfaction with the metrics, and little is known about how metrics are used and employed. This dearth of knowledge suggests this is an area ripe for more research. Technological advances in GIS, mapping, and visualization have made metrics instruments more user-friendly, and scenario planning and other visually-based planning frameworks may be able to integrate multidimensional composite indices into public planning activities.

The importance of scale, uncertainty and context

Virtually all of the articles in this issue raise the problems of scale, uncertainty, and context with regard to metrics instruments. Romero-Lankao and Gnatz make a compelling case for developing metrics instruments to address urban water security [6]. While most indices are designed at a national scale, metrics approaches at the increasingly-important urban scale have lagged behind. They propose some adaptations of traditional indices approaches to correspond to the drivers and dynamics of urban water security. Thapa *et al.* shed light on a second analytical scale that is largely-neglected in the development of measures to assess water security and adaptive capacity, that of farmer-managed irrigation systems [7]. The authors offer insights on specific capacities to improve climate-risk management and generic capacities needed by small-scale irrigators to achieve long-term development goals.

Uncertainty about future states of the climate, water resources, environmental, and societal systems motivates concerns about selection, measurement, aggregation, and weighting of indicators of water security and adaptive capacity [2,5,6]. Conceptual understanding and incorporation of uncertainty is essential for the framing of integrated resource management and adaptation plans, and for social learning and scientific knowledge generated by surprises from the implementation of strategies [2]. Implicit in de Grenade *et al.*'s proposed expansion of the nexus concept to include society and the environment, is the examination of system change and dynamism, which, they argue leads to improved characterization and incorporation of uncertainties in management perspectives [4]. Similarly, Kirchhoff *et al.* and Lemos *et al.* note the importance of examining system dynamics and the time evolution of factors related to adaptive capacity and water

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5115477>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/5115477>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)