Homeland Economics & Climate Change: The Need for Localized Sustainability Strategies

Diva Muhammad Alfirman * and Rajiv Ghimire

Posted Date: 17 April 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202504.1433.v1

Keywords: homeland economics; sustainable development goals (SDGs); climate change solutions; local institutions; governance capabilities

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.1433.v1

Article

Homeland Economics & Climate Change: The Need for Localized Sustainability Strategies

Diva Muhammad Alfirman * and Rajiv Ghimire

University of Michigan, 500 S State St, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA; divalfrm@umich.edu

Abstract: This paper critically examines the limitations of "homeland economics"—a protectionist response to globalization that prioritizes national industrial policy and economic sovereignty—arguing that it falls short in addressing the complex challenges of climate change, inequality, and sustainable development. Utilizing the Five R Governance Capabilities framework (reflexivity, resilience, responsiveness, revitalization, and rescaling), this study analyses the climate action and Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) implementation strategies of six countries: France, Uganda, Nigeria, Uruguay, Nepal, and Indonesia. The findings reveal that countries which empower local institutions and adopt adaptive, multi-level governance are more effective in advancing sustainability goals. In contrast, homeland economics often reinforces top-down, siloed approaches that weaken cross-sectoral integration and international cooperation. The paper underscores the pivotal role of local institutions in fostering context-sensitive, community-based climate solutions—such as Nepal's Climate-Smart Villages and Indonesia's ProKlim program—which enhance resilience, participation, and implementation capacity at the ground level. It calls for multidimensional, cross-scale strategies that move beyond business-as-usual approaches to achieve the 2030 Agenda and ensure equitable, climate-resilient development.

Keywords: homeland economics; sustainable development goals (SDGs); climate change solutions; local institutions; governance capabilities

Introduction

In recent years, a growing number of governments have responded to the limitations of globalization by embracing "homeland economics"—an inward-looking approach characterized by protectionist industrial policies, strategic subsidies, and reduced dependence on global supply chains. While this approach promises economic sovereignty and resilience for each country, it fails to address the growing complexity of climate change, inequality, and sustainable development. Homeland economics tends to centralize power and neglect the importance of environmental justice, local institutions, and multidimensional policies, and intergovernmental collaborations.

This paper argues that homeland economics, despite its intentions, lacks the necessary governance capabilities to address complex, cross-cutting issues such as climate adaptation and SDG implementation. Instead, this study proposes a more effective alternative: adaptive, multi-level governance that empowers local institutions while maintaining alignment with global sustainability frameworks. For this study, we applied the Five R Governance Capabilities framework developed by Termeer et al. (2016), which identifies five institutional and strategic capacities essential for dealing with "wicked problems" like climate change: reflexivity, resilience, responsiveness, revitalization, and rescaling.

Through an analysis of case studies from France, Uganda, Nigeria, Uruguay, Nepal, and Indonesia, this paper compares how national governments, and local actors implement SDG and climate strategies. The findings highlight that countries which embrace reflexive and locally integrated policies—often overlooked by homeland economics—are more likely to succeed in creating sustainable, inclusive development pathways.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.1433.v1

Moreover, the paper emphasizes that local institutions and community-based initiatives play a pivotal role in enabling context-sensitive climate solutions. By iterating examples such as Nepal's Climate-Smart Villages, Indonesia's ProKlim program, and Tanzania's agroforestry efforts, the study illustrates how decentralized governance, and institutional innovation can help with climate mitigation and adaptation. These localized actions not only build resilience on the ground but also demonstrate how national and global goals can be most effectively scaled and realized when grounded in place-based knowledge and participatory governance.

1.1. Globalization and Its Implications

The idea of neoliberal globalization was to promote political, economic and social transformations, especially in peripheral and semi-peripheral countries, from the neocolonial processes that overlap the sovereignty of these governments. This seemed especially prevalent in the economic sector, especially with the idea and process of mass industrialization promoted the mass migration of workers to "opportunity centers", promising a better life achieved through work (Abdalla & Faria, 2019). Another key characteristic of the globalization project is the idea of mass privatization. This was done as a result of growing debt due to mass industrialization over the Cold War, which was to be solved by debt management and restructuring. This consequently led to the implementation of the "market rule", through acts of restructuring policies and standards across nations, which included governments selling their public assets as a condition of debt resettlement, leading to the previously mentioned mass privatization (McMichael and Weber, 2020). Overall, this project pushed the agenda of globalization to be the next era and the answer to all economic, environmental, and social issues.

The globalization project, despite its initial promising start, was deemed a failure that caused more harm than good, resulting in many setbacks. These include economic destabilizations, political crisis due to counter movements, and perhaps worst of all, environmental and social issues. Many argue that fallacy of job and income creation promoted by globalization tends to only favour large corporations, leading to a phenomenon known as "Market Oriented Cities" (Abdalla & Faria, 2019). The concentration of businesses and people, in addition to the natural attraction of local workers, promotes an influx of migratory labour, resulting in a strong gentrification dynamic (in addition to urban sprawls). From a social perspective, this increases exposure to impoverishment and misery. Other unintended consequences exploitation, job insecurity, and the erosion of labour rights (Tisdell & Sen, 2004).

The concept of a neoliberal "free market", aligning with Market-Oriented Cities, that empowers private sectors because of governments being in debt, not only reduced public capacity in development planning, but also allowed for foreign actors to more liberally and effectively extract resources from the global South. As a result, trade regulations were made to be less constraining to allow for more private investment. Other policies such as corporate outsourcing and relocation of factories to countries with cheap labor, only did more to worsen the economic state of these countries (McMichael and Weber, 2020).

One of the drivers of globalization from an environmental perspective is the commodification of land or nature, which also leads to environmental degradation, as mentioned earlier, as well as more severe ecological crisis. According to Brand et al. (2019) in their piece on Overcoming Neoliberal Globalization, nature is meant to be seen as an unlimited resource for societies. Treating nature as a commodity implies getting maximum economic revenue from it, which itself was the result of high mass consumption brought upon the globalization project (Mc Michael and Weber, 2020). That process can progress to the point that the reproduction of nature or certain elements of it is threatened (climate change, destruction of small-scale farming, eroding soil, etc.). These unsustainable patterns are based on an – in principle – unlimited appropriation of the resources and labor power of both the global North and the global South, and of a disproportionate claim to global sinks (such as forests and oceans, in the case of CO_2).

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.1433.v1

One of the solutions that was proposed to counter this is homeland economics. However, homeland economics itself was deemed as far from the best solution, due to how it ignores implications of sustainability. Perhaps to counter this, and to remake globalization, a new alternative was established, known as "homeland economics". An article in the Economist gave rise to the idea of homeland economics by explaining how it was brought by a shift in global economic power, mainly triggered by events such as the Cold War. This article explains how homeland economics was a response to the negative impacts of globalization and free-flowing capital markets, despite proven to reduce poverty and inequality. Homeland economics was also seen as a response to global challenges such as the 2008 financial crisis, various geopolitical tensions, the race for dominance in green technology and artificial intelligence (AI), and perhaps most recently, the Covid-19 pandemic (Agaki, 2023).

1.2. Counter-Movements: Introducing Homeland Economics

In a way, the homeland economics (or sometimes called "de-globalization") initiative seems like a fair alternative for countries to improve their own economy while not solely relying on other nations. Homeland economics seeks to maintain globalization, with an emphasis on efficiency and low prices, while minimizing the downsides of uncertainty of the previous system (collapsing economies, political insurgence, etc.). Therefore, national security and economic policy must be combined. Seeing as how privatization was the main element of globalization, leading to a downplay in public initiatives and assets, this would seem like a step in the right direction, wherein governments are allowed to take charge of their development once more. However, this success is as of now nothing more than a theoretical approach.

Through homeland economics, governments are more focused on developing strategic industries such as computer chips, electric vehicles, and AI. This includes a high emphasis and funding in green energy sectors, as countries everywhere are joining the "green movement" to reduce GHG emissions and promote renewable energy. After all, the need to reconnect economic and ecological relations is becoming increasingly urgent, further backing their pledge for their support of clean technologies to combat climate change. Countries all over the world are using industrial policies to compete in energy and technology manufacturing (including green energy), throwing subsidies and splashing cash here and there to meet their goals. In the USA, for example, homeland economics involves substantial government subsidies and initiatives such as the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) and the CHIPS and Science Act, with the intention to improve domestic industries and reduce reliance on global supply chains (Jiulin, 2023).

1.3. Evaluation of Homeland Economics: Sustainability and Effectiveness

But is this, or will this, be sustainable? According to the article on Homeland Economics by The Economist (2023) , most likely not. First, one critique regarding homeland economics is how the notion itself lies on flawed assumptions. For example, during the Covid-19 pandemic, global supply chains remained relatively resilient, with markets swiftly adapting to unprecedented demand surges. According to an analysis 17,000 imported commodities in the U.S. revealed that supply chain failure rates in 2020 were only slightly above the historical average from 1989 to 2022, even amidst significant global disruptions (Moutii, 2023).

Secondly, other than decreasing global output (global GDP is estimated to decrease by 5%), homeland economics is not a proper solution for combatting climate change, in which the return to protectionism may not yield the same benefits as they did in the past, especially in a world facing climate uncertainty Therefore, these new industrialization policies will do little to reduce climate change and inequalities. Unfortunately, governments are implementing such policies at a rate over ten times higher than in 2010-2015, with subsidies in the first quarter of 2023 surpassing pre-pandemic levels by 40%. This significant policy shift raises concerns about potential inefficiencies and unintended consequences associated with protectionist measures (Moutii, 2023). Job opportunities

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.1433.v1

will still be scarce, and the cost of green industries that seek to improve the nation's economy will arguably outweigh the benefits.

De-globalization also meant for countries to retreat from global interdependence to strengthen internal resilience. However, this inward turn raises concerns about the absence of a global economic stabilizer. Traditionally, leading powers like the United States have played pivotal roles in maintaining global economic stability. With the USA now less inclined to assume this role and China focusing on its domestic priorities, there's a potential void in global economic leadership. In short, the trend of homeland economics may inadvertently contribute to global instability by weakening internation cooperation (Kuper, 2023).

Green subsidies, a product immensely promoted by homeland economics, also come with a high risk, in which foreign companies are blocked from supplying domestic markets. The benefits of green subsidies for the fight against climate change are also, to this day, still unclear. They may also lose imports that have been directed at domestic markets. What's more, the "green industry" and greening in general as seen today is a tricky concept. For example, biofuels labeled as "green energy" are also deemed unsustainable, due to the production being carbon intensive. The biofuel industry also has a major effect on the world agricultural market, in which it heavily reduces food supplies in favor of more biofuel. Therefore, industries operating in the green sector should be careful of the costs and benefits of implementing such initiatives.

2. Materials and Methods

This study critically evaluates the limitations of homeland economics in responding to the challenges of globalization, climate change, and sustainability. While homeland economics promotes national industrial policies and economic protectionism, it often fails to mitigate environmental and social inequalities. A central objective of this study is to assess how such inward-looking strategies fall short in achieving long-term sustainability and how alternative approaches—such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and localized climate governance—offer more viable pathways for economic resilience and environmental mitigation.

Specifically, this study explores the intersection of SDG implementation, climate change adaptation, and economic policy. It aims to identify how different national and regional contexts influence sustainability outcomes, and to examine the role of local institutions in driving inclusive, cross-sectoral climate action. Through comparative analysis, the research highlights how localized initiatives and multilateral cooperation can outperform rigid, state-centric economic models.Another key focus is the role of local institutions in driving sustainable development, particularly in contrast to state-centric approaches embedded in homeland economics. Many governments, particularly in the Global South, struggle to coordinate and align national policies with local governance structures, resulting in fragmented and inefficient SDGs implementation. This study examines how decentralized governance, community-based adaptation (CBA), and collaborative decision-making processes can serve as more effective alternatives to rigid, protectionist economic policies. By analyzing case studies from various countries, this research highlights how local climate initiatives can enhance economic and environmental resilience, providing insights for policy frameworks that balance national and local priorities. This study employs a qualitative analysis of secondary data, including policy reports, case studies, academic literature, and sustainability assessments. By comparing homeland economics with alternative sustainability-driven models, this research identifies key policy trade-offs, synergies, and implementation challenges. The findings contribute to the broader discourse on climate policy and economic development by illustrating how governments can shift from protectionist economic models toward more integrated, collaborative, and locally adaptive sustainability solutions.

We analysed the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) of each country represented in this study, derived from the Paris Agreement that was ratified in 2015. Each country's NDC consist mainly of their long-term commitments to reduce GHG emissions, mitigation and adaptation commitments to increase resilience in various sectors (e.g., agriculture, forestry, health, risk

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.1433.v1

management), and adaptation strategies regarding their respective commitments (e.g., climate finance, tax incentives, etc.) A deeper understanding of each country's targets and strategies to achieve those targets would also help us understand the route in which they choose to implement SDGs, along with the remaining challenges and areas that still need to be addressed.

To further analyse the effectiveness of sustainability strategies across countries, as mostly stated in their respective NDCs, this study adopts the Five R Governance Capabilities framework as proposed by Termeer et al., (2016), which includes **reflexivity, resilience, responsiveness, revitalization, and rescaling**. This framework offers a structured lens to evaluate how governance systems cope with complex challenges like climate adaptation and SDG implementation Each country's NDC and relevant SDG strategies were analyzed through the Five R lens, focusing on policy content, institutional mechanisms, and programmatic interventions. The analysis identifies which governance capabilities are present or lacking in each case and assesses how well these strategies align with adaptive and inclusive sustainability goals. The framework also helps surface policy trade-offs, implementation gaps, and synergies across scales and sectors.

While this study offers valuable comparative insights, it is limited by its reliance on secondary data. The absence of field-based data or stakeholder interviews means that some informal institutional dynamics or implementation barriers may be underrepresented. Future research could extend this work through mixed methods, including participatory assessment, stakeholder interviews, or on-the-ground case studies to gain a deeper understanding of on-the-ground realities.

3. Results

3.1. Alternatives to Homeland Economics - The Sustainability Project

Overall, much evidence points to the failure of homeland economics in effectively addressing the challenges facing the global economy. Attributing economic and geopolitical shocks solely to globalization is misguided. Internal factors, such as financial sector greed leading to the 2008 crisis and U.S. foreign interventions causing geopolitical tensions, are significant contributors. Even the economic growth itself was criticized for benefitting only a small group of elites, while leaving the majority without access to opportunities (Agaki, 2024).

Energy policies were supposed to be seen as the forefront of homeland economics, through initiatives such as green subsidies and mass development of the green industry. Most energy policies, however, merely serve as political tools rather than genuine efforts to promote sustainability and the fight for climate change (Jiulin, 2023). The whole predicament of economic growth itself, brought upon projects such as homeland economics and even globalization, is how it fails to address environmental hardships and even exacerbates them. As renowned author and scholar Yuval Noah Harari once iterated in his book "21 Lessons for the 21st Century" (Harari 2018), "[…] economic growth will not save the global ecosystem--just the opposite, it is the cause of the ecological crisis. And economic growth will not solve technological disruption—it is predicated on the invention of more and more disruptive technologies"

So, what would be the better solution in place of homeland economics, especially regarding the fight against climate change and inequality? Instead of mass local industrialization policies, governments should focus on more direct policies that promote sustainability. One of which is through public green initiatives, which seeks to revalue state agencies in implementing sustainable practices. We've learned that innovation to reduce GHG emissions and promote sustainability relies a lot on public infrastructure and policies, therefore handing over energy problems to be solved by the market will prove questionable. Private sector monopolies also tend to not prioritize emission reductions. Hence, new policies and programs that focus on reintegrating human activity with its ecological foundations is at a new level of urgency. One of the main approaches of these is through recognizing community-based practices in developing local wealth and security. Furthermore, a proper systems approach is recommended for policymaking, integrating various sectors and stakeholders to create sustainable solutions (Agaki, 2023).

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.1433.v1

Thankfully, many believe that we are now approaching a new era which many have dubbed "the Sustainability Project" (McMichael and Weber, 2020), in which we aim to eradicate all forms of inequality and vulnerability (something that was brought upon by the globalization project). One of the main elements of the sustainability project is sustainable development, which is further reflected in the establishment of the Sustainable Development Goals or SDGs.

3.1.1. Case Studies on SDGs Implementation through Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC)

The SDGs seems like an idealistic approach to resolve inequality while tackling other major issues such as climate change and loss of ecosystems. Unfortunately, different countries are bound to face different challenges, most of which were spurred by the long-lasting effects of colonialization, leaving them impoverished and at a comparative disadvantage. For this study, we will discuss how the SDGs are implemented in several countries around the world, with varying results. This specific selection of countries represents a spectrum of development levels, socioeconomic conditions, and geographic regions, enabling an exploration of SDG implementation challenges and successes in various contexts. The countries' respective Gross Domestic Product (GDP) was considered in this selection, providing a variety of development levels, from low-income, high-income, and developed. In addition, this selection of countries helps capture both successes and shortcomings in SDG implementation, providing a nuanced understanding of global trends. They reflect the interconnectedness of socioeconomic and environmental challenges, as well as the varying capacities of governments and institutions. The analysis we conducted for each country's sustainability strategies and policies were derived from their respective Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC)

Table 1. Summary of Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) in some countries.

Country	NDC Establishment	Long-Term Commitment	Adaptation Commitments	Implementation Strategies
European Union (EU)	2015	Climate neutrality by 2050, at least 55% GHG reduction by 2030	**not applicable**	ETS reform, renewable energy targets, carbon border adjustment mechanism (CBAM), Social Climate Fund
Uruguay	2017	Net CO_2 removal recorded in 2022, transitioning to low-emission development	Enhancing energy system resilience, coastal area climate risk management, strengthening city climate resilience, sustainable farming promotion	Sustainability-linked bond, afforestation, green finance, climate-smart agriculture, tax incentives for renewable energy, carbon pricing
Nigeria	2017	20% (unconditional) and 47% (conditional) GHG	Climate resilience strategies in water, agriculture, health, and	Renewable energy, methane reduction, electric mobility, afforestation

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.1433.v1

		reduction by 2030	coastal protection	
Uganda	2022 (Updated)	24.7% (unconditional) and 47.3% (conditional) GHG reduction by 2030	Climate resilience strategies in water, agriculture, forest & biodiversity, infrastructure	Climate finance mobilization, carbon markets, low-carbon transport, waste management, public-private partnership
Nepal	2020	Net-zero emissions by 2050, 90% electric vehicle sales by 2030	Sustainable land management, climate Resilience Measures in agriculture, forestry, water resources, health, and infrastructure	Renewable energy expansion, afforestation, electric vehicles, climate-smart agriculture, community-based forest management
Indonesia	2022 (Enhanced)	Net-zero emissions by 2060 or sooner, FOLU Net Sink by 2030	Strengthening climate resilience in food, water, and energy systems, improved disaster risk reduction and resilience strategies.	Carbon pricing, green financing, electric vehicles, ProKlim (Climate Village) adaptation program

All countries mentioned here are in the sustainability race, but with differing progresses in different sectors. France, considered a developed country, is currently ranked 6th out of 166 countries in the SDG Index. Different countries and their place in the world economy will face different challenges than other countries who are more "marginalized". According to a report by the OECD in 2021, France's high level of redistribution achieved through taxes and transfers have contributed to low-income inequality. France also appears to have good performances regarding GHG emissions and educations and education to sustainability. On the other hand, the country still struggles with disparities in education outcomes and faces pressure on human health and biodiversity preservation.

Interestingly, the EU's NDC lacks any relevant information regarding adaptation strategies, unlike the other countries mentioned in this list. This is due to the majority, if not all of the EU countries having better infrastructure, governance, and financial capacity to handle climate risks compared to developing nations like Uganda or Nepal. The EU also prioritizes mitigations strategies over adaptation since it is known to contribute significantly to historical emissions. Instead, adaptation policies are outlined in separate strategies like the EU Adaptation Strategy (2021), which is not part of the NDC. Other countries in this list, being developing countries, are also considered more vulnerable to climate change due to their geographical and socioeconomic conditions.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.1433.v1

a. Africa

Uganda, on the other hand, is massively trailing behind France in terms of SDGs achievement, being ranked 144th (data retrieved from SDG Index). Uganda is evidently struggling with much more of the goals compared to France, who are on track to moderately improving most of their goals. Uganda, being a third-world country, faces far greater and more challenges in SDGs achievement in comparison to France, perhaps the biggest one being inequality due to stagnant economic growth. This is, unfortunately, a problem that most African nations are far too familiar with. African cities and countries are considered enclosed to the world, due to the urban economies that are limited to non-tradable goods and services, spurred by fragmented and inequal physical development. Thus, a focus on improving economies to reduce inequalities must be of priority to these countries. Uganda, in particular, is ranked 13th (as of 2024, according to statista.com) out of 20 observed African countries in terms of GDP. Fortunately, several programs have been implemented to support these focuses, an example being a joint program with the UNDP in digitalizing informal market vendors in Uganda. As a result, countries with poorer economies tend to focus more on improving their well-being by eradicating poverty and inequality first (something France has achieved based on their SDG index), while putting on hold other factors such as clean energy and biodiversity conservation, despite their NDC having implementation strategies relating to climate finance and decarbonization

Another country in Africa, Nigeria, despite having the fourth highest GDP among African countries (as of 2024[1]), are still significantly lagging in SDGs achievements, being ranked 146th overall in SDG Index Rankings. According to the SDGs dashboard, however, Nigeria has had some progress in goals such as Climate Action and Responsible Consumption and Production. Responses to climate vulnerability could be seen through programs such as the Nigeria Erosion and Watershed Management Project (NEWMAP), which collaborates with the World Bank to rehabilitate degraded lands and reduce erosion and climate vulnerability in 23 states. This program involves investments in erosion and watershed management infrastructure, development of information services in monitoring, strengthening Nigeria's strategic framework, and supporting project management at federal and state levels with financial, social, and environmental safeguards.

Challenges thus remain within sectors such as poverty and inequality, as well as clean energy. As a response to their NDC regarding renewable energy targets, Nigeria released their Energy Transition Plan in 2022, to achieve their 2060 net zero emission target (based on the country's commitment at COP 26). However, The Climate Action Tracker website has evaluated this plan and its comprehensiveness as "Average", with improvements to be made in their carbon reduction and removal targets, as well as transparent assumptions on carbon dioxide removal.

b. South America

In South America, countries such as Uruguay are also implementing their own programs and policies to meet the SDGs. Some companies based in South America recognize and actively engage with the SDGs as an integral system in which all aspects are connected: people, planet, prosperity, peace, and partnerships.

Uruguay currently ranks 32nd overall in the SDGs Index Rankings, with notable achievements in poverty reduction and clean energy. The Joint SDG Fund has assisted in the Renewable Energy Fund for Uruguay, in which the government of Uruguay plans to implement its second energy transition. This is done through decarbonizing the industry and transportation sectors, securing universal access to renewable energy, and spurring innovation and competitiveness in the energy sector. This program is also seen as a blended finance window for green transition projects coupled with a technical assistance facility. In addition, this program also promotes social and gender inclusivity, through increasing access to energy for vulnerable groups and women's participation in renewable energy economy.

c. *Asia*

Despite being ranked 95th overall in the SDGs Index Ranking, with notable achievements in Climate Action, Nepal still faces considerable challenges in the SDGs. This country is highly

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.1433.v1

vulnerable to climate change due to its fragile topography, climate-sensitive livelihoods, and limited adaptive capacity. The majority of its commitments and implementation strategies, as reflected in its NDC, are mainly geared towards renewable energy expansion and electric vehicle development. In addition to this, Nepal has also implemented Climate-Smart Agriculture, as also reflected in its NDC. This initiative was done as a response to the frequent climate-related disasters this country experiences, including floods, landslides, and glacial lake outburst floods (GLOFs). Climate-Smart Agriculture (CSA), part of the Climate-Smart Villages (CSV) initiative, is seen as an organized approach to design location-specific adaptations strategies as a response to climate change and how it affects rural agricultural systems (Ghimire et. Al, 2022). CSV in Nepal could serve as a blueprint for institutional innovation, where collaborations among institutions from different levels play a significant role in forming adaptation strategies and policies. The role of institutions will be further discussed in the following sections of this study.

Indonesia is another considerable country in Asia with notable SDGs implementation strategies. Currently ranked 78th in the SDGs Index, Indonesia's strategies are reflected in their NDC, with commitments regarding strengthening climate resilience and improving disaster risk management. Most of these implementation strategies related to the SDGs are embedded in their National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN), despite even though analysis on synergies and tradeoffs between SDGs targets still lacking. The Climate Village Program (ProKlim) is a community-based climate adaptation and mitigation initiative launched by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry in 2012. This program aims to enhance local awareness and action on climate change while integrating traditional knowledge and local practices. ProKlim provides recognition and incentives to village governments implementing sustainable practices such as disaster risk reduction, waste management, renewable energy use, sustainable agriculture, and ecosystem restoration. Other initiatives include the Forest Restoration and Rehabilitation (FRR) program (Evans, 2023; Fisher et. Al, 2023), which underscores Indonesia's commitment to preserving biodiversity (which includes mangrove restoration), mitigating greenhouse gas emissions, and enhancing the livelihoods of its forest-dependent population.

Tying back to the notion of how homeland economics is unsuitable for solving the challenges of climate change, most if not all NDCs emphasize the need for international cooperation and frameworks, something that is implicitly discouraged by homeland economics through the act of de-globalization. One common element found in most NDCs above, particularly for developing countries, is the reliance on international finance and technical assistance. Countries such as Uganda, Nepal, Nigeria, and Indonesia emphasize the need for climate finance from developed countries or multilateral funds (e.g., Green Climate Fund), along with technical assistance from UN agencies, the World Bank, or other multilateral donors. Nepal also explicitly seeks global cooperation for expanding electric vehicles and renewable energy, which exemplifies the need for global cooperation and technology transfer. This reflects the principle of Common but Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities (CBDR-RC), which underlines that while climate change is a global concern, countries possess varying levels of responsibility and capacity to respond. In addition, these NDCs also align themselves with global frameworks such as the Paris Agreement and the SDGs, reinforcing that their national actions contribute to broader international objectives.

Table 2. Summary of SDGs implementation in each respective countries.

Country	Rationale	SDGs Implementation
France	Developed country with high redistribution policies	Programs in GHG reduction and education
Uganda	Low-income country facing significant SDGs challenges, prioritization of socioeconomic development over environmental sustainability	Poverty eradication through digitalization of informal market vendors
Nigeria	Middle-income country with moderate SDGs progress	Climate action and energy transition policies

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.1433.v1

Uruguay	Priority of renewable energy projects	Energy transition policies through decarbonization and increased access to renewable energy
Nepal	Highly vulnerable to climate change, fragile topography	Climate-Smart Villages and Climate-Smart Agriculture to enhance resilience in rural communities
Indonesia	Emerging economy with strong SDGs integration into policy	Climate Village programs and forest restoration program to enhance local climate adaptation and mitigation

3.1.2. Governance Capabilities in NDC Implementation: A Five R Framework Analysis

In order to analyze how different countries operationalize sustainability and climate goals, this paper applies the **Five R Governance Capabilities** framework, as developed by Termeer et al. (2016). This specific framework offers a valuable lens for understanding how governance systems respond to the complex, multi-level, and often conflicting demands of climate change and sustainable development, which are referred to as "wicked problems" due to their high levels of complexity, uncertainty, and interconnectedness (Jordan et. Al, 2010). The capabilities—**reflexivity, resilience, responsiveness, revitalization, and rescaling**—highlight whether a country's climate governance is adaptive, inclusive, and aligned across scales. Here is a more detailed breakdown of the capabilities as explained by Termeer et al. (2016), followed by an analysis of the six countries' Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and SDG-related strategies through the 5R Governance Capabilities lens:

Table 3. Table of General Characteristics and Strategies regarding the 5R Capabilities (Termeer et. al, 2016; Termeer & Dewulf, 2014).

Capability	Focus	Key Strategies
Reflexivity	Addressing multiple problems and perspectives	Reframing problems, connecting different viewpoints
Resilience	Navigating uncertainty and change	Experimentation, flexible measures
Responsiveness	Addressing shifting demands and attention	Timely reaction to public/political demands, sensitive communication
Revitalization	Risks of stagnations and postponement of important decisions	Motivating key actors, addressing dysfunctional interactions
Rescaling	Mismatches between problem and governance scale	Linking cross-level interactions in the problem scale with cross-level interactions in the governance scale

Each case study is analysed using this framework to determine which governance capabilities are most developed and which are still lacking. Through this approach, we will undertake a more systematic evaluation of both the strategies used (e.g., policy interventions, local partnerships) and the institutional enablers or barriers (e.g., decentralization, financial access, cross-sectoral coordination).

a. France: Reflexivity and Responsiveness through Promoting Social Equality

France demonstrates **reflexive governance** through integrated approaches that connect education, redistribution, and emissions reduction. Its strong emphasis on social equity, seen in tax and transfer systems, shows an awareness of the intersectionality between environmental and socioeconomic goals.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.1433.v1

In addition, France's high SDG Index ranking and alignment with EU policies indicate a strong **responsiveness to climate goals**, both at the national and regional levels. However, current challenges in biodiversity and education equity suggest areas where feedback mechanisms must be strengthened to respond more dynamically to internal disparities.

b. Uganda: Rescaling and Resilience through Local Empowerment

Uganda's NDC and SDG programs attempt to **bridge national priorities with local vulnerabilities**—particularly in efforts related to agriculture, forestry, and water management. However, weak coordination between central and regional governments continues to limit effective rescaling.

Programs by the Ugandan government like the digitalization of informal market vendors, and climate-smart agriculture initiatives, indicate efforts to build adaptive capacity through a bottom-up approach. Despite structural constraints, Uganda is slowly institutionalizing **resilience across sectors**, particularly through partnerships with UNDP and multilateral development partners.

c. Nigeria: Realizing Revitalization and Responsiveness through Climate Action and Energy Transition

Through programs such as the Nigeria Erosion and Watershed Management Project (NEWMAP), in collaboration with the World Bank, Nigeria aims to **revitalize stagnant policy areas** through large-scale infrastructure and environmental rehabilitation. These projects bring together technical, financial, and policy tools to overcome stagnancy in climate adaptation planning.

Moreover, Nigeria's Energy Transition Plan (ETP) that launched in 2022 and efforts to reduce methane emissions and increase electric mobility reflect Nigeria's growing **responsiveness to international climate expectations and domestic energy accessibility**. However, gaps remain in carbon reduction targets and in equitable implementation across regions and income levels.

d. Uruguay: Rescaling and Revitalization through Energy Transition Strategies

Uruguay manages to effectively **rescale global sustainability goals with localized energy strategies** through their programs. Its implementation of the Renewable Energy Fund, for example, supported by the Joint SDG Fund, demonstrates the integration of global financing mechanisms with local infrastructure development, enabling the rescaling of NDCs into on-the-ground policies. The decarbonization of transportation and industry also links global commitments with sector-specific policies at the national and regional levels.

The country's shift into a second energy transition phase showcases an attempt of **revitalization** of earlier sustainability efforts. By promoting innovation, competitiveness, and inclusivity in the energy sector—including a focus on gender equality and vulnerable groups—Uruguay shows how governments can unlock stagnant systems through institutional innovation.

e. Nepal: Implementing Reflexivity, Resilience, and Rescaling through Climate-Smart Agriculture

Nepal's adaptation strategy reflects a strong degree of **reflexivity**—through recognizing that climate challenges require location-specific responses. The Climate-Smart Villages (CSV) initiative and the broader Local Adaptation Plans of Action (LAPA) exemplify a governance approach that embraces multiple approaches to sustainability by incorporating local knowledge, scientific expertise, and community insights.

Nepal also builds **resilience** through its agricultural strategies that focus on increasing the adaptive capacity of rural communities that are vulnerable to floods, landslides, and food insecurity. The use of participatory assessments and interventions in CSVs demonstrates a learning-by-doing model central to adaptive governance.

Lastly, the country also implements **rescaling strategies through the integration of local climate actions within national frameworks** and linking these with international targets. Nepal's emphasis on electric vehicle adoption and renewable energy expansion shows efforts to scale community-based efforts up to national mitigation goals, while seeking international finance and cooperation to strengthen implementation.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.1433.v1

f. Indonesia: Building Responsiveness, Resilience and Revitalization through Localized Climate and Forest Restoration Programs

Indonesia's climate policies show **responsiveness** through programs like ProKlim (Climate Village Program), which are designed to mitigate local climate risks while aligning with national and international targets. ProKlim's participatory nature allows the government to adapt national policy to local needs, promoting legitimacy and community participation.

By incorporating disaster risk reduction, ecosystem restoration, and climate-smart agriculture into village-level initiatives, Indonesia can **build resilience within its rural and vulnerable populations**. These approaches allow for **incremental learning and adaptive action**, which are crucial in a country with significant climate hazards.

The Forest Restoration and Rehabilitation (FRR) program, aided by international support, demonstrates how **revitalizing degraded landscapes** can go hand-in-hand with climate mitigation, biodiversity protection, and livelihood enhancement.The table below summarizes each country's capabilities as seen through the 5R Governance Capabilities analysis framework, along with their respective policies and/or programs that respond to said capabilities:

Table 4. Performance of each country's capabilities based on the 5R Governance Capabilities Framework.

Country	5R Capabilities	Key Policies/Programs
France	Reflexivity, Responsiveness	Link between social equity and climate goals
Uganda	Rescaling, Resilience	Digital inclusion and agriculture resilience, building coordination between national and local levels
Nigeria	Revitalization, Responsiveness	Launching of Energy Transition Program, revitalizing environmental planning through NEWMAP
Uruguay	Rescaling, Revitalization	Promoting innovation and inclusivity in clean energy, second energy transition and green economy
Nepal	Reflexivity, Resilience, Rescaling	Promoting traditional knowledge through CSVs and LAPAs, adaptive planning, integration of local efforts in national frameworks
Indonesia	Responsiveness, Resilience, Revitalization	ProKlim and FRR implementation to build rural adaptive capacity, village level climate strategies

Based on the analysis conducted above, cross-country comparison using the Five R framework reveals that no country successfully manages to fully incorporate all five capabilities. After all, the way climate change presents itself as a "wicked" problem is unique, and the specific complexities of climate adaptation, such as its long-term character and its fragmented multi-level context, give rise to some restraint and cautiousness (Rittel & Webber, 1973). However, countries such as Nepal and Indonesia that display more capabilities, tend to show greater progress in locally grounded and globally aligned sustainability efforts. Meanwhile, countries with fragmented institutional structures or over-centralized strategies (e.g., Uganda, Nigeria) often struggle with effective implementation, highlighting the importance of multi-level coordination and institutional innovation.

Overall, the analysis on each country's strategies as shown in this study, combined with the idea of the needs for collaborations between governments, show that integrated sustainability strategies may serve as better solution to climate change. These innovative policies contrast one-size-fits-all, top-down, protectionist approach adopted by homeland economics, with the adaptive, multi-level strategies observed in more successful examples. Homeland economics itself lacks several key capabilities in the 5R Governance Framework, namely lack of local-global links (rescaling), and limited reflexivity (rigid and traditionalist economic strategies).

4. Discussion

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.1433.v1

4.1. Climate Change and Sustainable Development

The comparative analysis of NDCs and SDGs implementation across the six countries reveals a wide range of strategies, institutional capacities, and varying degrees of local engagement. While some countries demonstrate alignment between national goals and local adaptation strategies, others struggle with mismatches in scale, sectoral disparities, or limited institutional responsiveness. These patterns raise critical questions about the broader governance mechanisms required to effectively integrate climate action with sustainable development.

To explore this further, this section examines the interconnections between climate change and the SDGs, emphasizing how local institutions, cross-sectoral policies, and community-based solutions can serve as crucial drivers of transformation. By moving beyond top-down approaches—such as those embodied by homeland economics, governments can begin to build more integrated and robust strategies that not only reduce emissions but also promote equity, resilience, and inclusive development, combined with proper multilateral cooperations.

In addition to the ones discussed in the previous section, there are many other countless examples of countries recognizing and implementing the SDGs to reduce inequality, most notably through climate change mitigation and adaptation plans. Climate change itself most notably reflected in the SDGs through its own goal, being SDGs #13: Climate Action. Specifically, indicator 13.a of this goal calls for the implementation of the commitment of developed countries to address the needs of developing countries through meaningful climate mitigation actions and the full operation of the Green Climate Fund. This further underpins the urgency of international collaboration, as stated before, to solve global crises through comprehensive policies and frameworks that homeland economics failed to address.

Interestingly, impacts of climate change are known to hinder the achievement of some SDGs targets (Nerini et. Al, 2019; Denton et. Al, 2014). Climate change can and will affect the achievability of goals relating to material and physical well-being such as prosperity and welfare (hampering agricultural production), poverty eradication and employment, food, energy and water availability, and health (increase of health risks through distribution of disease vectors). Conversely, SDGs can help with climate change adaptation through implementation of multidimensional approaches on the ground. The integration of SDGs and climate change into policies can help escape the trap of one-dimensional national planning (Sanchez et. Al, 2018).

Despite moving away from the notion of homeland economics, governments are still expected to be at the frontline of fighting climate change and achieving the SDGs. The examples from countries mentioned above seem to emphasize this, with most of the programs being government-led. However, this could also lead to consequences in which the government's policies might even hamper climate change action and SDGs implementation. According to Sanchez et al. (2018), one of the main challenges is the lack of cross-sectoral approaches from the government. Based on most countries' cases, governments tend to separate policy design and implementation in silos (health, environment, housing, infrastructure, etc.), when in fact all these targets should be integrated with each other to avoid tradeoff between the goals themselves. Many discourses still tend to separate climate change and sustainable development, seeing the former as more of an environmental issue, thus paying little attention to the socioeconomic, ethical, cultural, and political dimensions (Eriksen et. Al, 2011).

The sustainable development paradigm recognizes three main aspects that interconnect to realize development: ecology, economy, and social. This is something that most policymakers fail to recognize, seeing particularly the environment and social aspects as different entities. Folke et al. (2002) state that this couldn't be further from the truth: natural and social systems behave in non-linear ways and are more integrated than we would believe. Therefore, a system that separates human and ecological aspects tends to undermine resilience, which includes resilience towards climate change impacts.

Another challenge in SDGs implementation lies in the existence of tradeoffs between the goals themselves (Kroll et. Al, 2019). This is especially prevalent in the alignment of SDGs with climate

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.1433.v1

efforts, as observed in Halsnæs et Al. (2024)'s study. According to the study, while climate change mitigation strategies often align with sustainability objectives in many cases, they also introduce trade-offs that must be carefully managed, which manifest in the form of costs, equity, and implementation barriers. Similar studies have shown that climate action can enable and reinforce building prosperous, equal and peaceful societies (IPCC, 2018), and while equity is an important piece of this puzzle, climate action can also exacerbate inequity issues if implemented improperly (Roy et. Al, 2022). An example of this in Halsnæs et Al's study includes Electric Vehicles (EVs). While this growing technology is seen as a growing solution for air pollution reduction, challenges remain related to high cost, inequitable access to charging infrastructure (mainly in lower-income countries), and resource-intensive battery production (Hardman et. Al, 2021; Romero-Lankao et. Al, 2022).

Ultimately, trade-offs between separate SDGs remain inevitable. The challenge today is beyond achieving the goals themselves, but also how to minimize said tradeoffs while increasing synergies between the goals, hence the need for collaboration across different scales, as mentioned numerous times in this study. Fortunately, a large share of trade-offs was converted into synergies in the recent years, due efforts to reduce emissions per capita and reconcile climate action with economic and social outcomes. An example can be seen in synergies between climate change (SDGs #13: Climate Action) and infrastructure development (SDGs #9: Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure), in the form of climate-friendly infrastructures (Kroll et. Al, 2019).

One way to minimize said tradeoffs is to analyse policies that would likely go together and give rise to more synergies than tradeoffs. Fortunately, many studies have demonstrated how due to adaptation and mitigation policies relying on the same tools, synergies could also rise in addition to tradeoffs. A prime example is shown through Viguie and Hallegate (2012)'s study, where they demonstrate how three different urban planning policies, if implemented simultaneously, can mitigate the consequences of each individual policy (i.e., public-transport subsidies decrease the real-estate pressures caused by a greenbelt or a flood-zoning policy). Therefore, building win-win solutions by combining policies is possible and leads to more efficient outcomes than if policies were to be implemented independently.

Circling back to the idea of linking climate change and SDGs, climate policies, if not properly designed can be socially and economically regressive, exacerbating inequality and poverty, an example being how it could impact land and food prices (Nerini et. Al, 2019). Many countries, as seen in the examples above, are in the race for securing and promoting universal access for renewable energy, such as Peru with their Renewable Energy Fund. However, renewable energy is still considered, as of today, more expensive than fossil fuels.

As countries manage to lift millions out of poverty and provide much-needed health care and other basic needs, the demands on affordable and clean energy currently rise at a rate that jeopardizes progress regarding the 2030 Agenda (Kroll et. Al, 2019). This calls for better research and policymaking to solve the SDGs tradeoffs and increase synergies among the SDGs targets, primarily research on interaction between SDGS and climate change adaptation pathways, with a better understanding of the social sciences aspect. Effective policy implementation requires a holistic approach that integrates stakeholder perspectives, financial mechanisms, and regulatory frameworks (Halsnæs et Al, 2024). Identifying the synergies between climate adaptation and sustainable development has become increasingly important, especially when considering the environment and poverty challenges at play (Eriksen et. Al, 2011).

4.2. The Role of Local Institutions in Climate Change and SDGs

One particular problem observed in homeland economics is how it emphasizes the rule of central government. Agaki (2023), in their article on Homeland Economics and Climate Change, has stated how the former concept leans towards authoritarian development models, which would prioritize expertise over individual rights, and has historically led to economic inequality, environmental degradation, and food insecurity. To remedy this, we should, in addition to expanding the roles of central government, strengthen the roles of local institutions, which are just as

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.1433.v1

important in tackling issues such as climate change. Despite climate change being a global issue, adaptation itself is contextual and local. Hence, there is no "one size fits all" approach when it comes to adaptation strategies (Eakin et. Al, 2014).

Sanchez et al. (2018) has stated that another challenge in SDGs implementation and climate change adaptation is the lack of coordination between regional governments and the central government, which is especially prevalent in most Global South countries. This boils down to the issue of how governments, particularly central governments, are expected to be at the frontline of climate change and SDGs. This leads to local governments and institutions being sidelined, when in fact, their contributions to climate change mitigation and adaptation must also be acknowledged.

Localization of SDGs and climate change efforts have recently garnered popular attention in academic discourses. Some discourses agree that local institutions, such as private sectors, NGOs, local communities, as well as national and international organizations, are ideally placed to promote inclusive sustainable development within their respective localities. These local institutions also help in generating and implementing integrated cross-cutting and sectoral strategies, which straddle the public sector for the post-2015, post-development agenda (Reddy, 2016). Local stakeholders are also critical to the process of the promotion of key values of culture (notably, heritage, creativity and diversity) and the transmission of knowledge as drivers and enablers of sustainable and inclusive development. The idea of local institutions and their contribution to climate change and SDGs is based on the flaws and failures of the previous Millenium Development Goals (MDGs), being the initial lack of grassroots consultation and support and community ownership. Putting local institutions in the forefront of tackling climate change and the SDGs promotes the importance of strong governance systems born from local institutions, leading to a "bottom-up" approach instead of the conventional "top-down" we mostly see today (McSweeney and Coombes, 2010). Moreover, since the effects of climate change are most pronounced among poor and marginal populations, whose livelihoods are primarily natural resource-based, it would make sense for local-based institutions to be at the forefront of climate change adaptation efforts (Rodima-Taylor et. Al, 2012).

Local efforts to combat climate change can be seen through the application of Community-Based Adaptation (CBA), which is based on participatory assessment of climate risks (done by local communities) and emphasizes the development needs of vulnerable communities. The implementation of CBA is built off the premise that local institutions have the local skills, knowledge and experience to increase resilience and reduce vulnerability towards climate change, therefore increasing their own sustainability (Forsyth, 2013). However, due to the nature of CBA being seen as a "local solution to a global problem", this must be coupled with strong institutions. In the fight against climate change, local institutions are crucial in influencing how households are impacted by climate change, shaping how communities respond to climate change, and acting as intermediaries for external support (Agrawal et. Al, 2008).

The role of institutions, according to Agrawal, could still be improved through partnerships and linkages between informal institutions, which could help garner support from external public institutions and governments. Research has shown that most local organizations have limited adaptive capacity, limited by factors such as lack of financial resources, limited technical expertise, and weak partnerships with climate-related organizations. Conversely, institutions such as NGOs and governmental bodies tend to have better resources and operational capabilities, yet lack institutional rigidity, effective bureaucratic processes, and knowledge on integrating climate adaptation into their policies (Baudoin & Ziervogel, 2017).

An example of how linkages between institutions help in fostering adaptation can be found in Mexico (based on UNFCCC's Coping Strategies database), where it was observed that a community was found to be engaged in a more diverse set of productive activities, intensified their involvement in non-farm work including public works programs, and emergency food distribution campaigns. Compared to the other communities that were primarily engaged in extensive labor and selling livestock, the community in question had institutions that facilitated connections between officials in public works programs and local households, helping in diversifying products and income. The role

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.1433.v1

of local institutions was also observed working with The Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism to establish a natural resource management system based on indigenous knowledge, as part of a restoration program for the Shinyanga region in Tanzania. Working through local institutions, farmers were engaged in agroforestry using degraded croplands and rangelands, employing traditional village guards, and conserving vegetation by closing off certain areas for regeneration. Another case study in Nepal also highlights the role of local institutions, notably through institutional innovation (Ghimire and Chhetri, 2022), as previously mentioned. Collaboration of multiple institutions here gave birth to Climate Smart Villages (CSV), an organized approach to designing location-specific interventions in response to changes in the agricultural system, whether it be climate change or any other changes. Based on the evaluation of this practice by scholars including Ghimire and Chhetri (2022), policies should focus on strengthening these local institutions, particularly in the agricultural sector, which is crucial for achieving climate change mitigation targets, especially in the long term. The agriculture sector also offers an opportunity to enhance sustainable food production on several fronts besides GHG emissions (Gil et. Al, 2019), perhaps to solve the challenge of rising food prices as an unintended consequence of climate mitigation strategies, but this is a discussion for another day.

This phenomenon, backed by good communication and dissemination of information, helps shape proper vertical and horizontal interconnections between institutions, which can help shape adaptation. Institutions ultimately determine how resources are distributed within societies, which can determine the outcomes of adaptation, for better or worse (i.e., subsidization of flood and crop insurance could instead increase exposure to flood damage and crop failure risks) (Dilling et. Al, 2015).

One flaw observed in homeland economics and de-globalization is how it shifts focus away from multilateral cooperation and instead focuses on internal development through increasing competitive advantage. Intergovernmental organizations such as the World Bank an UN, especially in today's climate, remain key in facilitating sustainable development and climate change adaptation strategies, both on a global and local level. While historically speaking, climate adaptation was considered a local issue, the Paris Agreement marked a shift by incorporating it into global governance. Some still see adaptation as a local response to climate change, when in reality local adaptation and innovations are increasingly interlinked with global policies (Termeer et. Al, 2016), as seen in the implementations of the Paris Agreement. Currently, international organizations, including those with non-climate mandates, such as the UN Environment Programme (UNEP), the World Health Organization (WHO), and the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), are integrating adaptation into their policies (Dellmuth et. Al, 2020).

To reiterate, intergovernmental collaborations play a crucial role in climate governance by facilitating policy integration and reducing institutional fragmentation. This is seen through the various examples in countries' NDC, as mentioned in the previous section. However, the effectiveness of these issues varies across issue areas, due to factors such as efficacy in integrating adaptation strategies into their operations, and poorly implemented adaptation policies (Dellmuth & Gustafsson, 2021). Dellmuth & Gustafsson also argue how the lack of adaptation-specific funding is another challenge, as most of these organizations still rely on voluntary contributions from member states, limiting their ability to develop sustained adaptation initiatives. Therefore, strategies such as improving collaboration between organizations, securing dedicated funding, and mainstreaming adaptation into sectoral policies is paramount for better adaptation strategies. Relating to the shortcomings of homeland economics and economic growth, developing economies should also ideally revalue their own resources and adjust global trade policies to ensure just wealth distribution (Agaki, 2024). Of course, this calls for better and more integrated policies, such as multidimensional livelihood programs. Conclusion: Moving Beyond Homeland Economics and Towards Multidisciplinary Solutions

5. Conclusions

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.1433.v1

This study demonstrates that while homeland economics may offer a politically attractive response to the shortcomings of globalization, it ultimately lacks the governance capabilities needed to address the complex and interconnected challenges of climate change, inequality, and sustainable development. The rigid, top-down nature of homeland economics often sidelines local institutions, undervalues cross-sectoral collaboration, and weakens international cooperation—three elements that are essential for effective climate change mitigation and adaptation.

Through a comparative analysis of six countries using the Five R Governance Capabilities framework, this paper shows that countries which exhibit strong reflexivity, resilience, responsiveness, revitalization, and rescaling capabilities such as Nepal, Uruguay, and Indonesia, are better equipped to implement sustainability strategies that are both locally grounded and globally aligned. These countries highlight how adaptive, participatory governance and community-driven initiatives, like Nepal's Climate-Smart Villages or Indonesia's ProKlim programs, can transform sustainability from abstract goals into tangible, inclusive action.

To truly realize the Sustainable Development Goals, governments must shift away from isolated, protectionist policies and embrace integrated, multi-level strategies that strengthen both local and national institutions, which includes investments in leveraging local capacities and fostering institutional collaboration. Moreover, the urgency of climate change demands renewed international solidarity and resource-sharing mechanisms that homeland economics often undermines. Moving forward, the path to sustainability lies not in economic isolation, but in collaborative, adaptive, and just governance that recognizes the vital role of local agency in shaping global outcomes.

Climate change and the SDGs, being a global issue, is not something that can be solved by one nation alone, therefore we must work with each other instead of against each other.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, D.A., R.G.; methodology, D.A., R.G.; formal analysis, D.A.; writing—original draft preparation, D.A., R.G.; writing—review and editing, D.A., R.G. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding Information: N/A

Acknowledgements: I express gratitude to the Mary A. Rackham Institute for supporting my work through their funding program. In addition, I am also grateful to Professor Arun Agrawal whose academic insights regarding climate change and local institutions were invaluable in my research and helped refine key arguments in this paper. Lastly, I extend my gratitude to my friends and family for their unwavering support.

Conflict of Interest: None

References

1. Abdalla, M. M., & Faria, A. (2019). Local development versus neoliberal globalization project: Reflecting on market-oriented cities. *Revista de Administração Pública, 53*(1), 84–100. https://doi.org/10.1590/0034-761220170088
2. Agaki, S. (2024, March 7). Homeland economics: Transition to an economy of well-being and climate resilience. *LinkedIn*. https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/homeland-economics-transition-economy-well-being-climate-agaki
3. Agrawal, A., Perrin, N., Chhatre, A., Benson, C. and Kononen, M., 2008. Local institutions and climate change adaptation. The Social Dimensions of Climate Change, No. 113, July 2008. World Bank.
4. Alfirman, D. (2025). Homeland economics and its implications for climate change and sustainable development: Why it may not be the solution, and other alternatives. *Proceedings of Indonesia Focus, 1*(1). Washington, D.C., USA. October 5th, 2025.
5. https://procournal.indonesiafocus.net/PIF/article/view/121
6. Baudoin, M.-A., & Ziervogel, G. (2016). What role for local organisations in climate change adaptation? Insights from South Africa. *Regional Environmental Change, 17*(3), 691–702. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-016-1061-9

7. Brand, U., Görg, C., & Wissen, M. (2019). Overcoming neoliberal globalization: Social-ecological transformation from a Polanyian perspective and beyond. *Globalizations, 17*(1), 161–176. https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2019.1644708
8. Dellmuth, L. M., & Gustafsson, M.-T. (2021). Global adaptation governance: how intergovernmental organizations mainstream climate change adaptation. *Climate Policy*, *21*(7), 868–883. https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2021.1927661
9. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH, & United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2019). *Strengthening community level climate change adaptation and mitigation actions: Indonesia's Climate Village Programme (ProKlim)*. https://www.ndc-cluster.net/good-practices
10. Dilling, L., Daly, M. E., Travis, W. R., Wilhelmi, O. V., & Klein, R. A. (2015). The dynamics of vulnerability: why adapting to climate variability will not always prepare us for climate change. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, *6*(4), 413–425. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.341
11. Eakin, H. C., Lemos, M. C., & Nelson, D. R. (2014). Differentiating capacities as a means to sustainable climate change adaptation. *Global Environmental Change*, *27*, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.04.013
12. Eriksen, S., Aldunce, P., Bahinipati, C.S., Martins, R.D., Molefe, J.I., Nhemachena, C., O'brien, K., Olorunfemi, F., Park, J., Sygna, L. And Ulsrud, K. (2011). When not every response to climate change is a good one: Identifying principles for sustainable adaptation. Climate and Development, [online] 3(1), pp.7–20. doi:https://doi.org/10.3763/cdev.2010.0060.
13. Evans, M. (2023). Sustainable forest management: Indonesia navigates a paradigm shift. *CIFOR-ICRAF Forests News*. https://forestsnews.cifor.org/80592/sustainable-forest-management-indonesia-navigates-a-paradigm-shift?fnl=en
14. Fisher, M. R., Daulay, M. H., Wicaksono, S. A., Bisiaux, A., & Arthalina, E. C. (2023). *Forest restoration and rehabilitation in Indonesia: A policy and legal review*. European Forest Institute & Sebijak Institute.
15. Folke, C., Carpenter, S., Elmqvist, T., Gunderson, L., Holling, C. S., & Walker, B. (2002). Resilience and sustainable development: Building adaptive capacity in a world of transformations. *Ambio, 31*(5), 437–440.
16. Forsyth, T. (2013). Community-based adaptation: a review of past and future challenges. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 4(5), pp.439–446. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.231.
17. Fuso Nerini, F., Sovacool, B., Hughes, N., Cozzi, L., Cosgrave, E., Howells, M., Tavoni, M., Tomei, J., Zerriffi, H. and Milligan, B. (2019). Connecting Climate Action with Other Sustainable Development Goals. Nature Sustainability, [online] 2(8), pp.674–680. doi:https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0334-y.
18. Ghimire, R. and Chhetri, N. (2022). Challenges and prospects of Local Adaptation Plans of Action (LAPA) initiative in Nepal as everyday adaptation. Ecology and Society, 27(4). doi:https://doi.org/10.5751/es-13630-270428.
19. Ghimire, R., Khatri-Chhetri, A. and Chhetri, N. (2022). Institutional Innovations for Climate Smart Agriculture: Assessment of Climate-Smart Village Approach in Nepal. Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems, 6. doi:https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2022.734319.
20. Gil, J.D.B., Daioglou, V., van Ittersum, M., Reidsma, P., Doelman, J.C., van Middelaar, C.E. and van Vuuren, D.P. (2019). Reconciling global sustainability targets and local action for food production and climate change mitigation. Global Environmental Change, 59, p.101983. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2019.101983.
21. Halsnæs, K., Some, S., & Pathak, M. (2023). Beyond synergies: understanding SDG trade-offs, equity and implementation challenges of sectoral climate change mitigation options. *Sustainability Science, 19*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-023-01322-3
22. Hardman, S., Fleming, K., Khare, E., & Ramadan, M. M. (2021). A perspective on equity in the transition to electric vehicles. *MIT Science Policy Review, 2*, 46–54. https://sciencepolicyreview.org/wp-content/uploads/securepdfs/2021/08/A_perspective_on_equity_in_the_transition_to_electric_vehicles.pdf
23. Indonesia Ministry of National Development and Planning/BAPPENAS. (2016). *Indonesian biodiversity strategy and action plan (IBSAP) 2015–2020* (ISBN 978-602-1154-49-6).
24. IPCC. (2018). Chapter 5 – Sustainable development, poverty eradication and reducing inequalities. In V. Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, H.-O. Pörtner, D. Roberts, J. Skea, P. R. Shukla, A. Pirani, W. Moufouma-Okia, C. Pean, R. Pidcock, S. Connors, J. B. R. Matthews, Y. Chen, X. Zhou, M. I. Gomis, E. Lonnoy, T. Maycock,

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.1433.v1

M. Tignor, & T. Waterfield (Eds.), *Global warming of 1.5°C: An IPCC special report* (pp. 445–538). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157940.007

25. Jiulin, G. (2023, November 30). Homeland economics is not the right medicine for the US. *China Daily*. https://global.chinadaily.com.cn/a/202311/30/WS6567ebc7a31090682a5f0b63.html
26. Jordan, A., Huitema, D., van Asselt, H., Rayner, T., & Berkhout, F. (2010). *Climate change policy in the European Union: Confronting the dilemmas of mitigation and adaptation?* Cambridge University Press.
27. Kroll, C., Warchold, A. and Pradhan, P. (2019). Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): Are We Successful in Turning trade-offs into synergies? Palgrave Communications, [online] 5(1), pp.1–11. doi:https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-019-0335-5.
28. Kuper, S. (2023). The decline of global stability and rise of 'homeland economics'. *Defence Connect*. https://www.defenceconnect.com.au/geopolitics-and-policy/12966-the-decline-of-global-stability-and-rise-of-homeland-economics
29. Maria, D. L., Maria-Therese, G., & Ece, K. (2020). Global adaptation governance: Explaining the governance responses of international organizations to new issue linkages. *Environmental Science & Policy*, *114*, 204–215. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2020.07.027
30. McMichael, P. and Weber, H. (2020). Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective. 7th Edition. Sage Publications.
31. McSweeney, K. and Coomes, O.T. (2011). Climate-related disaster opens a window of opportunity for rural poor in northeastern Honduras. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 108(13), pp.5203–5208. doi:https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1014123108.
32. Moutii, M. (2023, March 7). Homeland economics: Is the end of the age of globalization? *IREF Europe*. https://en.irefeurope.org/publications/online-articles/article/homeland-economics-is-the-end-of-the-age-of-globalization/
33. Reddy, P.S. (2016). Localising the sustainable development goals (SDGs) : the role of local government in context. repository.up.ac.za, [online] 9(2). Available at: http://hdl.handle.net/2263/58190.
34. Rittel, H. W., & Webber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, *4*, 155–169.
35. Rodima-Taylor, D., Olwig, M.F. and Chhetri, N. (2012). Adaptation as innovation, innovation as adaptation: An institutional approach to climate change. Applied Geography, 33, pp.107–111. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2011.10.011.
36. Romero-Lankao, P., Wilson, A., & Zimny-Schmitt, D. (2022). Inequality and the future of electric mobility in 36 US cities: An innovative methodology and comparative assessment. *Energy Research & Social Science, 91*, 102760. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2022.102760
37. Sanchez Rodriguez, R., Ürge-Vorsatz, D. and Barau, A.S. 2018. Sustainable Development Goals and climate change adaptation in cities. Nature Climate Change, 8(3), pp.181–183. doi:https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0098-9.
38. Shrivastava, P., 2018. Business not-as-usual to achieve SDGs under climate change. In: P. McIntyre, ed. CSR and climate change implications for multinational enterprises. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 21-27.
39. Sustainable Development Solutions Network. (n.d.). *Target 13.a: Implement the commitment undertaken by developed country Parties to the UNFCCC*. https://indicators.report/targets/13-a/ (Accessed April 9, 2025)
40. Termeer, C. J. A. M., Dewulf, A., Karlsson-Vinkhuyzen, S. I., Vink, M., & Vliet, M. van. (2016). Coping with the wicked problem of climate adaptation across scales: The Five R Governance Capabilities. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, *154*, 11–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2016.01.007
41. Tisdell, C., & Sen, R. K. (Eds.). (2004). *Economic globalization: Social conflicts, labour and environmental issues*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
42. United Nations. Development Programme. 2012. Realising the Future We Want for All. Report of the Secretary General: UN System Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda. United Nations: New York. June
43. United Nations Development Programme. 2023. Lessons in Scaling: UNDP's Role in Digitalizing Informal Market Vendors in Uganda.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.1433.v1

44. Usigbe, L. (2023). Nigeria prioritizes climate action to mitigate natural disasters. [online] Africa Renewal. Available at: https://www.un.org/africarenewal/magazine/august-2023/nigeria-prioritizes-climate-action-mitigate-natural-disasters.
45. Van Lieshout, M., Dewulf, A., Aarts, N., & Termeer, C. J. A. M. (2014). The power to frame the scale? Analysing scalar politics over, in and of a deliberative governance process. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908X.2014.936581
46. Viguié, V., & Hallegatte, S. (2012). Trade-offs and synergies in urban climate policies. *Nature Climate Change, 2*(5), 334–337.
47. Williams, C. (2023). Governments across the World Are Discovering 'Homeland Economics'. [online] The Economist. Available at: https://www.economist.com/special-report/2023/10/02/governments-across-the-world-are-discovering-homeland-economics