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Introduction

Several recent international agreements have put climate change and resilience at the forefront of the international community. For example, the 2015 Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction and the 2015 Paris Agreement negotiated under the auspices of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) have strengthened and formalized commitments to addressing adaptation, mitigation, and disaster risk reduction (DRR). The Sendai Framework recognizes the central role of national governments in substantially reducing natural and climate change-related disaster risks and the associated losses. The Paris Agreement focuses on multiple issues, including greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction, financial-flow increase for climate change programs, and technology transfer.

In response to these internationally negotiated frameworks and agreements, national governments have created additional plans, acts, or strategy documents. The UNFCCC, for example, has supported 49 least developed countries (LDCs) in formulating a national adaptation plan of action (NAPA). These plans were based upon participatory processes that prioritized the most relevant and important adaptation actions that these countries could then use to apply for adaptation funding. Others have created adaptation or climate change action plans even without external support. Similarly, governments have also created separate DRR and management plans. There has also been a push to integrate or ‘mainstream’ concepts of climate change adaptation (CCA) and DRR into official socio-economic development or growth plans. In 2011, the UNFCCC established the national adaptation plan (NAP) process that counsels countries to tailor adaptation planning to their needs and explicitly recommends the integration of these concepts into national development planning processes. Such integration faces several challenges, including the need to re-think current design, plan implementation processes across multiple sectors, sustain frequent inter-ministerial coordination, and provide adequate financial resources to support such activities in already resource-constrained environments.

It thus appears that international and national goals are finally aligning around the threat of climate change and disaster risks. However, this alignment has not been adequately studied. Prior empirical fieldwork in several countries, including Bangladesh, Uganda and Nepal, indicate that despite this semblance of emerging synergy, there remain significant gaps between the objectives and resources embedded in international agreements and those crafted at the national level.

While international agreements garner close scrutiny by the global media and epistemic community of climate change scholars and advocates, there is a significant need to more carefully examine how action plans around CCA and DRR are being crafted and implemented at the national level. Specifically, how and by whom are national governments’ and key international actors’ disaster risk reduction and climate change agendas designed? What sectors do they target? What are challenges and gaps in their approaches? More critically, to what extent do these national plans converge with international goals and resource commitments? Are national plans and strategies commensurate in ways that are necessary to ensure the effective mobilization and absorption of global funds in national programs? Do these national plans in turn have the political will and capacity to implement CCA and DRR programs? Answering these questions helps evaluate current national and international CCA and DRR policy, planning, and implementation processes and highlights where improvements could be beneficial.

This brief is the first of two in a series that address questions related to CCA and DRR policy and its implementation. This first analysis outlines our methodological approach and summarizes our overall findings, building upon structured document analysis and semi-structured interviews in Bangladesh and Nepal. We find that countries, in general, have multiple planning and strategy documents that refer to climate change and/or disaster risk reduction. We find that CCA and DRR agendas are placed under different ministries’ jurisdictions and responsibilities, complicating implementation. The second brief provides a more detailed look at each country’s vulnerabilities, relevant policy documents, donor activities, and challenges to
implementation. Together, these briefs provide insight into the region’s relevant policies and plans, thus informing future CCA and DRR policy.

The Methodological Approach

Document Analysis

In an effort to begin exploring these questions, we reviewed national and donor disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation strategies and agendas published over 2004 – 2016 for 11 countries, as well as five major development aid donors in South and South East Asia. These eleven countries are chosen because of their high degree of vulnerability to climate change and related natural disasters and their relative degree of dependence upon foreign assistance in addressing these challenges. These selected donors constitute anywhere between 40% (Bhutan) to 87% (India) of these countries’ aid receipts, are often the source of funding for national climate change programs, and most likely have some influence on country approaches. These are the World Bank, Asian Development Bank (ADB), United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA), and the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID). Aid, here, refers to grants, concessional loans, and technical assistance.

In several instances, more than one ‘current’ policy document exists for a theme – in these cases, all versions are reviewed. We also reviewed general economic planning documents, where available, to assess the integration or mainstreaming process (Tables 1 and 2 summarize analyzed information). In this work, our objective was to compare the central goals of disparate strategies and to assess the degree to which they have contained feasible implementation plans that would enable countries to move beyond rhetoric in addressing climate change and disaster risks.

Table 1: Number of Documents Reviewed by Topic and Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Climate Change</th>
<th>Disaster Risk Reduction</th>
<th>National Development Plans</th>
<th>Number Reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>3¹</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>1²</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>1³</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>3⁴</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>3⁵</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Currently formulating a NAP and updating the Bangladesh Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan (BCCSAP).
² Counted as one document as the second is an update on progress of the NAPA.
³ Currently formulating a NAP.
⁴ Documents are in five-year increments.
⁵ We could not find these documents online and thus were not able to analyze.
These strategy documents were analyzed with respect to several dimensions, including the main elements of the strategies (e.g., preparedness, preparation), areas of focus, stated challenges and gaps, and ministries (or departments) in charge. These elements fundamentally shape the reach and implementation of the document. We further analyzed key elements of each country’s strategy documents as well as donor DRR and CCA strategies. Further details about these documents can be found in an accompanying annotated bibliography, available online and in part two of this series. As Table 1 indicates, most countries had multiple relevant documents for each topic. The Global Climate Legislation Database from the Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment was a useful guide in narrowing our search for relevant documents. However, original versions (i.e., not previously summarized or annotated) of these policies and strategies were not easy to find. In many instances, they were accessible only after multiple concentrated searches. In the case of Thailand, none of their climate change related documents could be found online. This underscores the difficulties in conducting this type of original research.

### Table 2: Availability of Strategy Documents by Country, Donor, and Theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Climate Change</th>
<th>Disaster Risk Reduction</th>
<th>DFID</th>
<th>USAID</th>
<th>JICA</th>
<th>World Bank</th>
<th>ADB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No operations</td>
<td>Has a presence, no official strategy available</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No strategies, 2 active projects</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No strategies though there are ongoing projects</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No strategies though there is 1 ongoing project</td>
<td>No strategies though there are ongoing projects</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No strategies though there are ongoing projects</td>
<td>No strategies though there are ongoing projects (and 1 specifically for DRR)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No operations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Not available online</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No operations</td>
<td>No strategies or official programming in Thailand; support regional cooperation activities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No CPS exists currently. Expected sometime in 2017.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Semi-structured Interviews

We selected two countries, Bangladesh and Nepal, for further exploration of their approaches and programs through semi-structured interviews. Bangladesh has often been portrayed as ground zero in addressing climate change and disaster risk reduction, and analysis of its governmental and donor strategies, approaches, and activities shed light on current practices and challenges. Similarly, Nepal faces significant CCA and DRR related challenges. The March 2015 earthquake and subsequent aftershocks also heightened the country’s awareness of and need to address DRR.

Over May – November 2016, we conducted semi-structured interviews with 56 representatives from key ministries, donor partners, and civil society organizations (CSOs) in Bangladesh and Nepal. The questions targeted the representatives’ understandings and practices of CCA and DRR, their policy formulation, and the extents to which strategies and actions were coordinated and integrated into other development plans. Additionally, we explored organizational capacities to program and implement these strategies. These conversations shaped our analysis of the strategy documents – underscoring the importance of ministerial ownership and leadership and challenges posed by document proliferation.

Regional Vulnerabilities

There is little doubt that most, if not all, countries in our study region are experiencing climate-related hazards and extreme events more frequently. In Pakistan, EM-DAT, the most commonly used database for disaster statistics, recorded 16 flooding events and eight extreme temperature events since 2000. Additional research through the Complex Emergencies and Political Stability in Asia (CEPSA) program indicates that parts of northwestern of India and southern Pakistan are experiencing chronic water scarcity and that almost all of Pakistan, southeastern India, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Cambodia, and southern and central Vietnam experienced significant deviations in rainfall over 1980-2009. These regional and national vulnerabilities are further explored in the second part of this series and in other CEPSA program work.

Climate-related hazard exposure is not the sole determinant of vulnerability to climate change. Population pressures, household capabilities, and governance contribute to determining vulnerability. From our analysis of strategy and policy documents, we find that some countries, like Nepal, India, and Bhutan, are also wary of non-climate related hazards like earthquakes. These experiences are further raising awareness of governments and associated actors of the need for a more coordinated and strategic approach to understanding risks, vulnerabilities, and options for preparedness and response. As a result, we observe increasing attention from governments and donors to crafting responses to CCA and disaster risks at a relatively high level of strategic planning.

Key Challenges

Our interviews focused on understanding climate-related governance issues. They explored the process of translating climate and disaster risk reduction policy into practice. In Bangladesh, we interviewed 33 individuals from across government, multilateral/bilateral donor agencies, and non-governmental organizations involved in climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction activities. This included representatives involved in general planning processes, allowing us to understand ‘mainstreaming’ (i.e., integration) of these issues. In Nepal, we interviewed 23 representatives across similar organizations. Here, we also consulted individuals involved in the post 2015-earthquake reconstruction and rehabilitation of the Kathmandu Valley.

Bangladesh, often cited as one of the countries most vulnerable to climate change, has experienced several major cyclones, floods, and droughts. The country’s low-lying deltaic regions are susceptible to sea-level rise, water logging, and increased salinization. Germanwatch’s Global Climate Risk Index 2016 ranks Nepal in its top ten most vulnerable countries in the world. Floods and landslides are common in the country and its rugged terrain and the remoteness of its population complicate emergency response. Figures 1 and 2 provide further insights into these countries’ vulnerabilities.
implementation, and challenges, provides insights into how these strategies are turned into action plans that can be fully implemented, monitored and enforced at the national level. We identify three main challenges that complicate policy implementation.

1) Lack of Inter-Ministerial and Institutional Coordination

While these countries have passed acts and devised plans and strategies for climate change and DRR, our analysis and qualitative interviews with subject matter experts show that it is still very difficult to implement, monitor, and evaluate these plans. Many of these strategies require a holistic rethinking of current practices and significant buy-in from departments and ministries that may not be amenable to ceding some of their regulatory or administrative powers. Several strategies reviewed have also indicated that coordination is often a challenge.

Through our interviews, we found that inter-ministerial power struggles often hamper the cooperation (i.e., other than in name or strategies) between government agencies and between the ministries and external donors needed to implement these strategies. For example, in Bangladesh, we found that while the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF) and the Ministry of Disaster Management and Relief (MoDMR) are both mandated to address climate change and disaster risk reduction issues, actual cooperation and collaboration between the two is rare. Both Ministries may finance and support similar projects, leading to overlap and redundancy. Such duplication may be counterproductive, especially if initiatives undercut each other. Interviewees from the government, donor partners, and practitioners, repeatedly stated that these Ministries are protective of their “turf” climate change is specifically the MoEF’s responsibility and DRR is the MoDMR’s. For example - these Ministries lobbied for separate sections, despite similarities in approaches and agendas, in the country’s latest 5-year plan, but ultimately, the Planning Commission presented their contributions as a single chapter.

Likewise, in Nepal, we found that the Ministry of Home Affairs (MoHA), the current authority on disaster response, has hindered the passage of the 2009 draft strategy as it dilutes some of their power and authority to other ministries, like the Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development (MoFALD). The 1982 Calamity Relief Act, the current legal framework, covers emergency response and relief activities but does not address DRR. The draft strategy covers both the spectrum of disaster response and risk reduction activities. However, the draft strategy does not call for coordination with climate change relevant actors. Representatives from the government, DPs, and CSOs all agreed that this reluctance to approve the 2009 strategy hindered a comprehensive approach to DRR in Nepal. MoHA’s inability to delegate and coordinate with other agencies severely restricts current abilities to implement DRR programs.

Further, it should be noted that the Ministry of Population and Environment (MoPE), the focal agency for CCA activities, is not involved in these DRR discussions, operating their own program of action. Donor partners support MoPE activities in creating local adaptation plans of action (LAPAs) but neither these activities nor plans are in coordination with centrally based MoFALD officials. In addition, donor partners and practitioners also support MoFALD’s local disaster risk management plan process (LDRMP). While LAPAs include disaster risk reduction activities, LDRMPs do not include CCA activities. Both of these plans are, in practice, to be implemented and managed by (MoFALD controlled) local disaster officers – but as different authorities oversee these plans and processes, coordination is absent. Further, MoPE’s conspicuous absence from DRR discussions further impacts the integration of DRR-CCA agendas.

Our document analysis and interviews indicated that significantly more attention needs to be paid to the underlying power and institutional structures that dictate and shape how programs and strategies are actually implemented in practice. The documents examined indicate that in several instances, new authorities, committees, and ministries have been established to address CC and DRR issues. While this can indicate that governments are taking these issues seriously, it also burdens relatively new institutions with a significant portfolio that requires inter-ministerial coordination. The creation of specific institutions for cross-sectoral challenges like climate
Figure 1: Rivers and Historically Flooded Regions

Figure 2: Climate-Related Vulnerability of Bangladesh
change could unintentionally hinder integration and implementation if these institutions do not also have the right to enforce and penalize non-compliance by other ministries. Ministries of environment, climate change, and disaster risk reduction have historically been weaker institutions, as they are not often given adequate budgets, prestige, or acknowledgement for their significant portfolios. This lack of support for these institutions, combined with the difficult task of enforcement and inter-ministerial coordination, is an issue that needs to be addressed in future CC and DRR strategies and institutional structures.

(2) Lack of Capacity and Knowledge to Pursue CCA and DRR Programs

All countries, regardless of their political status, economic growth trajectories, or income level, communicate the need for greater capacity and technical knowledge — for both climate change and disaster risk reduction. All donor and country strategies have called for better climate-relevant indicator monitoring and collection systems, including rain gauges, river flow monitoring systems, and early warning systems. In addition, strategies communicate the need for greater technical capacity — within governments, donor partners, and practitioners. Such capacities are needed to understand and further analyze collected data, disseminate warnings accordingly, and provide inputs into decision-making. Government representatives, in particular, emphasized improving technical capacities of their bureaucratic cadre.

Better data collection, analysis, and dissemination, and greater technical capacity, would support a research community that could further develop collective understandings of the risks faced, probable impacts, and solutions. In Bangladesh and Nepal, interviewees across government, donor partners, and practitioners were united in their call for supporting local climate- and disaster-related research. Developing such external expertise and a supportive community is considered to be a vital part of addressing the knowledge lacunae in these countries.

In Bangladesh and Nepal, interviewees stressed the need for longer-term programs that integrated CC and DRR issues into government staff colleges, technical colleges, and university curricula. Some government representatives interviewed suggested building a specific bureaucratic cadre that would concentrate only on these topics within larger administration. As both countries’ administrative staff rotates through different ministries and departments, such trained cadre would only be transferred to similar technical positions in other ministries. Government, donor partners, and practitioners’ representatives cited frequent bureaucratic transfers as a challenge to retaining relevant knowledge and reaping the benefits of training. In addition, these same interviewees lamented the lack of coordination between and within Ministries, donor partners, and CSOs in knowledge and capacity building activities. For example, in Nepal, the local development officers responsible for helping implement LAPAs and LDRMPs are also responsible for implementation of 127 other rules and regulations from other line ministries and are under considerable burden.

While interviewees from government appreciated workshops, trainings, and knowledge exchange trips, donor partners and CSOs cited the need to ensure that such training recipients were asked to impart acquired knowledge to departmental colleagues upon their return. Further, while technical consultants and external expertise are necessary, these were viewed as temporary and not the kind of longer-lasting capacity building necessary to truly address gaps within agencies. These insights indicate that knowledge and capacity building programs need to be designed as sustainable, multi-year longer-term strategies that equip administrative and technical staff with the sufficient skills and knowledge. It also requires better knowledge exchange practices between relevant Ministries and partners.

(3) Challenges in Mainstreaming CCA and DRR

International and national policy statements call for integration or mainstreaming of CCA and DRR activities into general economic development strategies. In addition, these statements also call for coordination and integration of CCA and DRR strategies where possible. Our review shows that current strategies have not, thus far, integrated their approaches. This is in line with our other findings, namely inter-ministerial
hesitancy to and lack of cooperation and coordination and weak capacities.

Most countries do not address climate change and disaster risk reduction simultaneously. While climate change-related documents quite prominently address disaster risk reduction needs, the reverse is not true. This, of course, could be related to the wider agenda of disaster-related documents, including the need to address non-climate related events like earthquakes or epidemics. Only Cambodia has an additional and separate plan to integrate CCA into DRR activities, which guides the use of terminology, aligns both agendas, and calls for training on both. The general lack of integration at a policy level impedes the mainstreaming process. Here, our first observation of lack of ministerial coordination and ownership plays a key role in impeding integration. For example, by placing DRR and CCA agendas within specific Ministries with particular mandates, other line ministries (e.g., water or education) are not directly involved in the national CCA or DRR planning and implementation process. In Nepal, for example, this has led to duplication of DRR processes: the Ministry of Education, with help of donors and practitioners, has developed and integrated its own DRR curriculum and approach to training teachers and students, but without direct involvement of MoFALD and MoHA. So while mainstreaming has taken place in some regard, this could lead to future parallel or contradictory directives for these stakeholders.

Limited technical knowledge, financial and human capacity further hinders the mainstreaming process. Several reviewed documents pointed to the difficulties in understanding how to integrate these considerations. For example, how should CCA principles be integrated into the DRR space? How should climate-risk related information be integrated into DRR planning? Or vice versa, how can experiences from previous disasters and lessons learned be integrated into CCA planning? In Bangladesh, our interviews indicated relatively high levels of relevant knowledge in certain sections of Ministries; however, lack of ministerial coordination meant that such knowledge could not be effectively exercised.36 In addition, interviewees communicated that frequent transfers of these individuals meant that such knowledge was often lost. Regarding DRR activities, several interviewees across government, donor partners, and practitioners, stated that the MoDMR appears to specialize in post-disaster response, that its preparedness activities appear to focus on constructing cyclone shelters, and that its programming needs to more holistically address DRR. This particular experience points to the need for more widespread technical training of administrators in relevant Ministries, greater cooperation between line ministries, and a more holistic approach to DRR and CCA.

In Nepal, the parallel and uncoordinated planning systems for CCA and DRR complicate mainstreaming. While the LAPAs consider DRR issues, the LDRMPs do not consider CCA and are primarily concerned with post-disaster response. These two planning processes, involving consultations with similar local-level stakeholders and administered by local development officers, are not jointly implemented as one. In addition, MoPE and donor partners support the LAPA development process, whereas MoFALD administers the LDRMP process. Again, inability to coordinate at a central level impedes local level cooperation. For example, no central agency houses all LAPAs created, as these plans can be created without MoPE involvement,31 which led some of our government and practitioner interviewees to question the possibilities for CCA mainstreaming.

Concluding Thoughts

Countries in South and South East Asia are struggling to address climate change and disaster related challenges, in addition to promoting socio-economic development. While these countries are aware of the risks faced and challenges ahead, translating strategy and policy documents into practice has been challenging for a number of reasons. Inter-ministerial coordination and cooperation is key to implementing policies. Our document review and supporting interviews indicate that ministerial coordination is not the norm and that it seriously impedes policy implementation. CCA and DRR portfolios are placed within smaller ministries (of environment or disaster management) who typically do not have inter-ministerial enforcement powers further complicating implementation.
We find that while knowledge and capacity may exist, these are limited in scope and size; constrained by institutional placements of staff, frequent bureaucratic rotation, and limited formal training programs. Further, interviewees and reviewed documents stressed the need to improve primary data collection, analysis, research, and dissemination practices. Lastly, limited inter-ministerial coordination and knowledge combine to prevent effective integration of CCA and DRR considerations into line ministries and general planning processes. Further, it hinders the translation of policy into practice.

Our findings point to several implications. First, governments need to think carefully about where (within their institutional structures) to place these key portfolios. While creating new authorities may be appropriate, these new authorities need to be given the necessary authority and financial, human, and technical resources to be able to implement CCA and DRR policies. Second, governments need to critically engage the appropriate planning and financial authorities to ensure that CCA and DRR priorities are reflected in the larger socio-economic development plans. Third, we find that significant resources are required for improving technical capacity. Capacity building is required at every level of administration and practice, including in CSOs and donor partner organizations. Further, all our interviewees echoed the need establishing long-term capacity building programs that were integrated into existing curricula.

Government officials, donor partners, and practitioners are generally aware of CCA and DRR-related priorities. However, existing institutional and political characteristics interfere with translating policy into practice. Such ingrained characteristics are not easily addressed; however, it will be necessary to do so to appropriately address the challenges ahead. The majority of strategies, policies, and action plans reviewed are less than a decade old – indicating that these particular policy agendas are relatively young and evolving. This first foray into understanding CCA and DRR policy designs, their associated processes, and implementation challenges is an important step to understanding how to design more appropriate policies.
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Due in large part to high population densities along rivers and low-elevation coastal zones, Asian countries have among the highest numbers of people exposed to the impacts of climate-related hazards and, thus, at greatest risk of mass death. Floods, droughts, and storms have always tested civilian governments and international humanitarian aid agencies. However, climate change threatens to make the problem worse by increasing the intensity and possibly the frequency of climate-related hazards.