

## **EMS2011 - CE1 - Adaptation Strategies**

**Session Report [Draft 04.10.2011]**

**Author: Tiago Capela Lourenço (FFCUL/CIRCLE-2)**

**Tuesday, 13 Sep 2011**

**Room: Princeton**

**Chairperson: T. Capela**

**14:00–14:05 Introduction to the session by Tiago Capela Lourenço**

**14:05–14:35 Matteo Rini: European Overview on Adaptation efforts related to the White Paper, EC DG CLIMA**

Matteo Rini presented the latest developments and a European overview on Adaptation efforts related to the EC White Paper on Adaptation in Europe. He mentioned the outlines and the action plan on each of the four pillars of the White Paper, calling the attention to the fact that there is a need to ensure coherence between EU level and national activities. He referred to the fact that the implementation phase of this European framework for Adaptation, i.e., 2009-2012, includes 33 long-term actions and that 29 actions are on-going or already completed. He stated that there will be a progress report by the end of 2011. We reminded that the development of a comprehensive Adaptation Strategy is foreseen to be adopted in 2013. He then moved on to present the state of play in each of the four pillars. Regarding Pillar I (Strengthening the knowledge Base) he mentioned that the key output will be the EU Clearinghouse Mechanism on Adaptation - CHM. The basis (Water, Agriculture) of the first prototype of this CHM was delivered end of April 2011; the second prototype is expected in Sept 2011 and the fully operational system in March 2012. This is a tool that will be hosted and updated by the EEA. Regarding the Pillar II (Mainstreaming of Adaptation into Key Policy Areas) he referred that the main objectives were influenced by the process towards a Multiannual Financial Framework, namely: Climate Action via Mainstreaming; alignment to EU 2020; and an objective of 20% of climate related expenditure. Still regarding the Pillar II, he mentioned that current key issues for DG CLIMA are: Cohesion policy; Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) - “greening of the CAP”; and Innovation, Research, Development. Regarding Pillars III (Adaptation Financing/Economics) and IV (External Dimension on Adaptation) he pointed respectively to the Climate-proofing of EU-funded investments and development of innovative market based instruments; and to the contributions to the UNFCCC and Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA), as key on-going work.

**14:35–15:05 T. Capela Lourenço, D. Avelar, and A. Gomes: Climate Adaptation in Europe - the CIRCLE-2 Role (solicited)**

Tiago Capela Lourenço presented the role of the CIRCLE-2 ERA-Net project in the development of a European framework on Adaptation. He pointed out to the trans-national nature of the challenges ahead and to the fact that that is the scale at which the project develops its activities. He mentioned that the CIRCLE-2 main goal is to DESIGN a long-

term, collaborative programme able to FUND and SHARE knowledge on Climate Adaptation. In order to achieve such a goal, he highlighted several of the past and on-going activities of the project, including joint calls and other joint initiatives for research projects. He presented the structure of CIRCLE-2, reflected on the success and interest of the developed activities (including a workshop series on adaptation and the support of sessions such as the present one, as well as the publishing of policy briefs and other documentation) and highlighted the CIRCLE-2 Climate Adaptation InfoBase, a tool to be further connected to the Clearinghouse Mechanism. He went on to reflect about the challenges and lessons of the adapting Europe to climate change, referring to the need to further develop research on Uncertainties, to develop common research agendas across member-states and to keep supporting the development of National Adaptation Strategies (NAS). He gave the example of the Belgium NAS and the support CIRCLE-2 activities provided to its development. He concluded by urging the need for stronger adaptation-related transnational science-policy networks that are: able to operate across scales; share national experiences (like the present session); and support practical research funding activities.

**15:05–15:20 M. L. Leitner, A. Prutsch, T. Grothmann, I. Schauer, S. Otto, and Sabine McCallum: Guiding principles for adaptation to climate change in Europe**

Andrea Prutsch gave an overview of the 2010 EEA/ETC-ACC report “Guiding principles for good adaptation to climate change in Europe”. She explained that the main objectives of this report are to support adaptation for a wide range of situations and actors; to bridge the gap between comprehensive guidelines and abstract adaptation principles; and to provide assistance to adaptation planners and decision makers when dealing with the challenges of adaptation. She presented the methodologies behind the report, including an expert survey (252 experts from 35 countries plus the EC). She moved on to present the final 10 guiding principles for good adaptation and highlighted that their use and importance depends on: the level of decision-making; the specific (e.g. regional) conditions; and the planning stage of a strategy or adaptation framework.

**15:20–15:35 I. Schauer, A. Daschkeit, A. Vetter, and P. Mahrenholz: The German Adaptation Strategy: lessons learnt at the science policy interface during the implementation process**

Inke Schauer started by explaining the Governance structure of the German adaptation process along with the tasks and activities carried out by the KomPass Competence Centre. She moved on to depict the 2008 adopted German Adaptation Strategy (DAS), as a Top-down process led and coordinated by the Environment Ministry, and further explained this setup of a national framework for adaptation in Germany, along with its aims, principles and fields of action. She highlighted that the next steps include Action Plan for Adaptation already in 2011 (adopted by Federal Cabinet on the 31<sup>st</sup> August 2011). She referred to the aim of this APA as to carry on with the DAS process by naming running/short term future (federal) adaptation measures and identifying adaptation activities as support and orientation for other actors. She mentioned the main outputs and results up to the present and reflected on the fact that the DAS has been up to now a process-related mainstreaming framework. She identified the success factors and lessons learned referring to the need of specific work to identify measures and patience, time, money, engagement and a lot of meetings to overcome sectoral interests.

**15:35–15:50 P. Pringle, M. Gawith, and K. Lonsdale: Monitoring and Evaluation of Climate Adaptation Activities: Identifying Challenges to Find Appropriate Solutions**

Patrick Pringle started by giving a brief explanation of the setting up of the UK Climate Impacts Programme (UKCIP) and depicted the Programme's work on Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E). He mentioned that in the Programme's perspective Adaptation happens for a determined reason (business, services, etc...) and not just for the sake of Adaptation. He reflected that this creates the need for M&E since it is important to learn what works (or not) in what circumstances and for what reasons: "Are we doing the right things and are we doing things right?" He then moved on to explained the main lessons learned, including the identification of six Tricky Issues - common challenges associated with M&E and adaptation: uncertainty; measuring success; attributing cost and benefits; what would have happened?; timescales; and learning. He finalised by identifying some key messages highlighting the need to develop flexible options, by avoiding the 'one size fits all' solutions and rather supporting a toolbox of responses.

**15:50–16:05 E. Vasileiadou, C. Betgen, I. de Hoog, M. Hisschemöller, and A.C. Petersen: Adapting to extreme weather events: the importance of perceptions**

Eleftheria Vasileiadou reported on a paper that is the first stage of a broader collaborative project which aims to bring together climate modellers as well as social actors from different sectors in co-defining adaptation measures for different extreme weather events. She explained that at this first stage the team looked into how social actors perceive extreme weather event, which events they identify as priorities, and why. She depicted the project's methodology and explained the main research questions proposed. The sectors analysed were: Immediate response to extreme weather (public health; crisis management; and water sector); Economic sectors for urban areas (horeca/ accommodation; recreation; transportation); and Vulnerable individuals. The total interactions summed 41 in-depth interviews and used a Repertory Grid Technique (a social psychology method) to tap into the different perspectives on extreme weather events, previously identified as bipolar constructs (e.g. dangerous vs. not dangerous; wet vs. dry). She explained that the methodology then used a Principal Components Analysis to prioritise adaptation related to extreme weather events and results showed, for example, that feeling concerned about extreme weather events, and feeling informed about them are not necessarily related. She highlighted other main findings of the study, in particular those related to the determining factors (e.g. level of informedness; level of concernedness, participation in relevant events) that may answer to the question "Which are the most important perspectives for adaptation to extreme weather events?"

**16:30–17:00 A. Prutsch: The role of stakeholder engagement in the making of the Austrian National Adaptation Strategy: Lessons learned (solicited)**

Andrea Prutsch presented the role of stakeholder involvement in the making of the Austrian National Adaptation Strategy alongside with some of the lessons learned in that process. She explained how the Austrian National Adaptation Strategy (NAS) was developed since 2007 and how a final strategy is to be expected by mid-2012. She presented the overall aims and main characteristics of the Austrian NAS, specifying how a broad stakeholder

engagement was fundamental to this development. She mentioned that this engagement took the form of interconnected informative, consultative and decisional processes, and she explained some of the main methods and outcomes of each process (e.g. web-site, newsletter, online-survey and workshops). She further explained the use of a participation process with “organised public” and its results in supporting to the development of the Austrian NAS. She depicted the main “lessons learnt” from this process, highlighting the fact that the stakeholders were more concerned about the discussion of “what is the NAS for”, rather than if climate change is happening or not, revealing a good level of understanding of the underlying climate change science. She finalised by reflecting about those lessons and in particular the challenges to move the strategy forward by means of making it a substantial contribution to adaptation in the country.

**17:00–17:15 R. B. Street, M. Gawith, K. Lonsdale, and P. Pringle: Providing User-Informed Guidance to Support Adaptation Assessments and Policy**

Megan Gawith provided the session with an account of the UKCIP’s work in providing user-informed guidance in support of the countries adaptation actions. She explained the origins of the Programme and mentioned how the government’s perception that top-down research was not delivering information to facilitate decision-making on adaptation, led to its establishment in 1997 with the objective of placing decision-makers at the heart of the research process. She depicted the UKCIP as a boundary organisation that has as a key service the provision of support, tools and guidance for adaptation assessments. She reflected on some of the lessons about the kind of support users need to adapt, and what that means for providers. She moved on to exemplify such support through detailing two of UKCIP’s tools: the Adaptation Wizard and the UKCP09 climate change projections. In terms of lessons learnt she mentioned that in the Programme’s perspective climate risk assessments must be linked to a particular decision-making event or question to result in practical actions on adaptation, and that the importance of “getting started” should not be underestimated in all this process. She further complemented these lessons by stating that there is a need to anchor assessments in an understanding of current vulnerability, and that it is positive not to start with the climate projections in itself but rather by scoping the problem and setting objectives, later making the adaptation process an iterative one (learn, monitor, evaluate). She concluded by mentioning the Programme’s experience that decision-relevant guidance and support cannot be developed without a close collaboration with its end-users.

**17:15–17:30 S. Kankaanpää: Urban climate change adaptation in the Helsinki Metropolitan Area**

Susanna Kankaanpää presented the context of Urban Climate Change Adaptation in the Helsinki Metropolitan Area, by detailing the vision, structure processes and central issues dealt by the greater Helsinki Region adaptation region. She put forward the idea that in the Finnish case it is still easier to plan adaptation at the national level rather than the local. She mentioned the background studies of the draft Helsinki Metropolitan Area Adaptation Strategy currently under revisions and that is expected to be released by the end of 2011. She then concluded by referring to the implementation phase and the expected next steps of this strategy, and mentioned the mechanisms that are being deployed to coordinate it with other actors on the field.

**17:30–17:45 M. Hagemeyer-Klose, S. Hasibovic, and S. Deppisch: The contribution of scenario-planning to research and practice of adaptation to climate change: Theoretical and practical findings from a case study in Rostock, Germany**

Maria Hagemeyer-Klose presented the Contribution of Scenario Planning to Research and Practice of Adaptation to Climate Change by showcasing the main findings from a case study in Rostock, Germany. She introduced and explained the research background of this case study conducted through the research project “plan B:altic” - Climate Change and Spatial Development: Adaptation strategies of urban and regional planning in urban regions of the Baltic Sea Coast. She depicted the theoretical background of the study, mainly routed on Social-ecological resilience concepts and on Scenario-Planning-Process forms. She moved on to detail how this Scenario-Planning-Processes were applied to the peri-urban region of Rostock and how this are expected to contribute to the future spatial development of the region in light of its stakeholders views. She finalised by explained some of the main research questions tackled by the project that is running between 2009 and 2013.

**17:45–18:00 Butzengeiger, Köhler, Stadelmann, and Michaelowa: Policy instruments for the promotion of adaptation to climate change**

Michael Köhler presented the background of a study entitled “Overview of potential economic instruments for adaptation”. He further presented the selected instruments and reflected on some of the questions faced by the study. He depicted the objectives of the study and the shortlisted economic instruments that have been selected for further evaluation (i.e. Adaptation market mechanism; Water markets/pricing; and Concessional loans). He mentioned the justification, working principles and challenges of each instrument. In the case of the Adaptation market mechanism we proposed that it may be a cost-effective and economically efficient approach since in theory “the market identifies the most efficient activities over all participating “sectors”. Reflecting on this he stated that, among other challenges, under uncertain climate change projections, a consistent estimate of adaptation units across projects of strongly differing design and lifetime is very difficult and may actually lead to inefficient spending.

**18:00–18:15 T. Cegnar: From words to deeds - a long and winding road**

Tanja Cegnar concluded the session by giving some words on the Slovenian Adaptation Strategy process. She mentioned that many of the studies and research projects on impacts in her country are narrow focused and mostly without policy-makers summary which makes the use of existing information difficult in practice. She further mentioned the Slovenian National adaptation strategy for agriculture and forestry consisting of 5 pillars (Education; Knowledge; Capacity building; Regulation; and International) and explained that a Governmental Office for Climate Change was established in 2009 mainly focused on climate mitigation. Recently the mainstreaming of adaptation by creating links with existing legislation has gained terrain, but that several problems still subsist such as the fact that research is not well coordinated with policy maker’s needs, and that cooperation between climatologists/meteorologists and other sectors should be strengthened.

### **18:15–18:30 Discussion**

Discussion and remarks were made directly after each presentation and allowed for a couple of questions to each presenter. The report of the above presentation tries to incorporate to the extent possible the focus of each presenter's replies.

### **POSTER SESSION**

**Display Time: Monday, 12 Sep 08:00–Friday, 16 Sep 13:00**

**Attendance Time: Tuesday, 13 Sep 18:30–19:30**

**Poster Hall (Ground Floor)**

**Chairperson: T. Capela**

Two posters were displayed in the poster session room:

**R. B. Street, V.J. Hayman, and A. Mylona: Research to Inform Adaptation Planning and Policy in the Built Environment**

**WL Lexer: CLISP - Climate Change Adaptation by Spatial Planning in the Alpine Space**

## Programme:

**Tuesday, 13 Sep 2011**

Room: Princeton

Chairperson: T. Capela

14:00– **Introduction**

14:05

14:05– **Matteo Rini: European Overview on Adaptation efforts related to the White Paper,**

14:35 **EC DG CLIMA**

14:35– [EMS2011-660](#)

15:05 **T. Capela Lourenço**, D. Avelar, and A. Gomes



Climate Adaptation in Europe - The CIRCLE-2 Role (solicited)

15:05– [EMS2011-856](#)

15:20 M. L. Leitner, **A. Prutsch** and the [ETC/ACC Technical Paper 2010 Team](#)



Guiding principles for adaptation to climate change in Europe

15:20– [EMS2011-308](#)

15:35 **I. Schauser**, A. Daschkeit, A. Vetter, and P. Mahrenholz



The German Adaptation Strategy: lessons learnt at the science policy interface during the implementation process

15:35– [EMS2011-408](#)

15:50 **P. Pringle**, M. Gawith, and K. Lonsdale



Monitoring and Evaluation of Climate Adaptation Activities: Identifying Challenges to Find Appropriate Solutions

15:50– [EMS2011-724](#)

16:05 **E. Vasileiadou**, C. Betgen, I. de Hoog, M. Hisschemöller, and A.C. Petersen



Adapting to extreme weather events: the importance of perceptions

**Coffee Break**

Chairperson: T. Cegnar

16:30– [EMS2011-307](#)

17:00 **A. Prutsch**



The role of stakeholder engagement in the making of the Austrian National Adaptation Strategy: Lessons learned (solicited)

17:00– [EMS2011-406](#)

17:15 **R. B. Street**, M. Gawith, K. Lonsdale, and P. Pringle



Providing User-Informed Guidance to Support Adaptation Assessments and Policy

17:15– [EMS2011-235](#)

17:30 **S. Kankaanpää**



Urban climate change adaptation in the Helsinki Metropolitan Area

17:30– [EMS2011-576](#)

17:45 **M. Hagemeyer-Klose**, S. Hasibovic, and S. Deppisch



The contribution of scenario-planning to research and practice of adaptation to climate change: Theoretical and practical findings from a case study in Rostock, Germany

17:45– [EMS2011-115](#)

18:00 **Butzengeiger**, Köhler, Stadelmann, and Michaelowa



Policy instruments for the promotion of adaptation to climate change

18:00– [EMS2011-808](#)

18:15 **T. Cegnar**



From words to deeds - a long and winding road

18:15–

**Discussion**

18:30