

## WORKSHOP NOTES

Joint CIRCLE-2 and DG CLIMA project “Support to the development of the EU strategy for adaptation to climate change”

### SHARE Workshop

Supporting the development of the EU strategy for adaptation to climate change – Views and Challenges in Eastern Europe

MORNING\_I: 09:00 – 10:30

Duration: 1,5h / Chair: Sabine McCALLUM (Environment Agency Austria, EAA)

#### 09:00– 09:15 WELCOME ADDRESSES

**Michael STAUDINGER** – Director Central Institute for Meteorology & Geodynamics, Austria (ZAMG)

Michael Staudinger started with welcome words and an introduction of [ZAMG history](#) and its activities in climate change. ZAMG is, besides observing the weather and climate as well as climate modelling, also focussing on integrated climate change impact assessments (including adaptation) together with several other institutions (like EAA).

**Irene GABRIEL** – Austrian Federal Ministry for Science and Research (BMWF)

The BMWF has been involved in EU cooperation mechanisms like ERA-Nets (CIRCLE, CIRCLE-2 and JPIs like JPI CLIMATE) for several years. CIRCLE-2 has established a very good platform for cooperation (e.g. workshop series, Climate Adaptation Research Agenda) allowing for a fruitful exchange of knowledge on adaptation. On the national level, the [Climate Change Centre Austria \(CCCA\)](#) is a good example of national climate change research and policy cooperation as it is an association that consists of more than 20 Austrian institutions and universities.

**Sabine McCALLUM** – Environment Agency Austria (EAA)

Sabine McCallum welcomed all participants on behalf of the EAA and expressed her appreciation to ZAMG for offering their facilities for the workshop. The EAA is also a member of the CCCA and will contribute to the further development, engaging in linking science and policy-making. Besides work on the national level, EAA is leading the support project for the EU Adaptation Strategy (together with Fresh Thoughts, AEA-T, Alterra and FEEM), financed by DG CLIMA. EAA, in the frame of the DG CLIMA project and CIRCLE-2, is delighted to provide the exchange opportunity for colleagues from Central and Eastern European countries.

#### 09:15 – 09:30 **Markus LEITNER** - CIRCLE-2 AND DG CLIMA PROJECT - SCOPE OF THE DAYS AND OBJECTIVES (EAA)

Markus Leitner presented the CIRCLE-2 network and DG CLIMA project joint effort to collaborate, organising this workshop. CIRCLE-2 (coordinated by FFCUL in Portugal and a WP lead by EAA) and DG CLIMA project (lead by EAA). Additionally the links between ZAMG and EAA activities were shown. The CIRCLE-2 structure and objectives were presented. Already a lot of work related to adaptation strategies has been carried out by CIRCLE-2 and thus [supporting a continuous exchange of knowledge across different countries](#) has been the main aim of the CIRCLE-2 workshop series from 2011 onwards.

A tour-de-table where the participants introduced themselves and their expectations for this 2-day workshop followed the presentation.

09:30– 10:30 EUROPEAN ADAPTATION EFFORTS

Juan PÉREZ LORENZO – [State of Development of the EU Adaptation Strategy – Brief Overview](#) (DG CLIMA)

The presentation focussed on the general aim of the EU Adaptation Strategy (climate preparedness at multi-level) and the basis (White Paper 2009) for the current work. The identified needs for additional EU action and the objectives of the EU Adaptation Strategy are:

- i) Knowledge objective: Syntheses existing knowledge; Question on how to deal with uncertainties; Gaps in knowledge and facilitating access; Climate-ADAPT as the main tool for further work, etc.
- ii) Policy objective: Review policy instruments at EU level; Mainstreaming into policies; etc.
- iii) Markets objective: capturing the market potential for adaptation, including insurance, work on standards, etc.
- iv) Cooperation and facilitation objective: Working in partnership with the Member States and relevant stakeholders and supporting their work, including guidelines and standards

Mr. Perez Lorenzo presented the EU added value for the EU Adaptation Strategy – contribute to a climate resilient EU, promote cooperation among MS, better balance mitigation with adaptation agenda, address knowledge gaps and transboundary issues, internal issues (e.g. solidarity, markets, budgets, and instruments).

Furthermore Mr. Perez Lorenzo presented some relevant projects and reports like the economic instruments project (completed), the climate-proofing project (completed) and on-going projects like climate-proofing investments and measures under cohesion and regional policy and CAP and Adaptation Strategies in European Cities.

The roadmap and way forward until 2013 was presented: the Impact assessment to IA Board (Oct2012); Public consultation is open until August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2012 at [http://ec.europa.eu/clima/consultations/0015/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/clima/consultations/0015/index_en.htm)

### Q/A

What about the involvement and support of business?

- There are several levels: awareness raising and dissemination of Climate-ADAPT; EC has been talking to different sectors (standards revision support to MS - technical level)

What will be the nature of the EU level framework (Directive?)

- Several ideas are being considered from doing nothing all the way to a Directive. But still only ideas and not necessarily in the same timeline as of the adoption of the strategy.

Stéphane ISOARD – [Knowledge sharing through the new Climate-ADAPT platform – online](#) (EEA)

Climate-ADAPT has been presented online that is currently the highest ranking view page of the EC/EEA (30.000 visits/month). Especially the page on countries and other areas covering the EEA 32 countries is mostly viewed, see Annex.

The online tour took the participants to the EU Sector Policy page and the different sectors covered in the adaptation information pages and different sections as well as research projects and information on uncertainties. Also various tools provided have been shown such as: database for information search; map viewer as a tool to start thinking about the adaptation issue; case-study selection tool; Adaptation support tool for policy-making cycles. Further, the “Share your information” tool to learn from the

community activities allows for information to be submitted directly to the [Climate-ADAPT platform](#) (only in English and quality controlled by EEA staff).

The EEA is currently working on several reports such as the EEA 2012 report on Climate Change Impacts and Vulnerability Indicators. This will be an update the [2008 EEA report](#). It will very likely include 40 indicators and aims also to support the 2013 EU strategy. Final draft is going under consultation on 12<sup>th</sup> July and [will be open for comments](#) until August 15<sup>th</sup> 2012.

Stéphane Isoard presented the [EEA 2012 Adaptation in Europe report](#) and its draft table of content. The report should provide a clear view on how the EU can support adaptation at different levels. In the presentation, some examples of the on-going type of work currently being carried out (summary tables, adaptation pathways among others) were highlighted.

### Q/A

How do you collect information and review from MS?

- Tables based on what is submitted to Climate-ADAPT by MS and will be open to public review.

Slovenia example shows that it is quite difficult to put the information forward (using the template restricts information and the map is also a bit reductive, meaning that e.g. sectoral adaptation strategies exist, but no overall national one or the national adaptation strategy is not being followed or is not going to be implemented)

- Template was intended to ease the processes although it is not perfect. The map is indicative and based on information provided by the MS not an assessment by the EEA.

10:30 – 11:00 Coffee break

MORNING\_II: 11:00 – 12:30

Duration: 1,5h / Chair: Markus LEITNER (EAA)

11:00 – 12:30 STATE OF ACTION ON ADAPTATION IN EASTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES – ACTIVITIES AND NEEDS

A brief overview of activities in non EU countries, Croatia, FRY Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia was given by:

**Austrian Red Cross – Katarina BANICEVIC**

The European Union co-funded project called [South East European Forum on Climate Change Adaptation](#) (CCA Forum) directed to South East European (SEE) Countries has started and the link to European Activities, taking into account that Croatia will be the next EU Member State, is important.

### Q/A

Stéphane Isoard described that the EEA has some support plan for pre-accession countries that could be used in the frame of CCA Forum!

**Bulgaria – Diana TODOROVA**

Bulgaria is now in the process of developing their National Adaptation Strategy (NAS). It has two phases. First phase preparation of an impact assessment and framework document is on-going. Several sectors (to be described) and a risk assessment exercise, including scenarios, will be developed. The main driver was the UNFCCC, the EU policies such as the White paper and in a practical view the increase of extreme weather events was experienced and the other driver for NAS development. The integration of regional

*Reference: Leitner M., Prutsch A., McCallum S., Nilsson C., Lourenco C.T. 2012. Summary of the Workshop: "Supporting the development of the EU strategy for adaptation to climate change - Views and Challenges in Eastern Europe", Vienna 27-28 June, 2012*

perspectives has not started yet. The second phase is the preparation of a more detailed document, which will contain all the information in the framework document and also an analysis of the economic dimensions of adaptation and adaptation measures. The support by the EU in the form of guidance would be welcomed helping e.g. on the following questions:

- What scenarios will be used? Update the current ones!
- Are you working with neighbouring countries?
- There are some projects on water, but not in relation with the NAS.

### Czech Republic – Jakub HORECKY

Current state of play is the strategic document approved in 2004 and updated in 2007, mainly related to mitigation. The Ministry of Environment (MoE) prepared a draft of a NAS driven by the EC White Paper. All Ministries were asked to analyse the potential climate change impacts on their operations and sectors. During preparatory work all stakeholders were involved and the strategy includes legislative and economic assessments. The text is under a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) process in the MEnv and is expected to be approved soon. Key driver was the EC White Paper, but several flood events also helped to raise awareness. Some regions started suffering droughts (not very intensive), but they have pushed the government to move towards a NAS. Biggest challenge has been the lack of political will. The MoE has changed a lot in the last years and this has been a barrier. The NAS is ‘on the table’ since 2009, but hasn’t ‘moved’ that quickly. There are certainly challenges to involve regional/local stakeholders.

#### Q/A

Is there any ‘fear’ of monetary issues attached with any kind of NAS?

Crisis can bring about cuts in areas (e.g. research) that will have an impact on the adaptation issues, because of insufficient funds.

Something that would be appreciated by countries would be awareness raising approaches and voluntary guidelines on how to move into adaptation.

Why an SEA to the strategy – is it mandatory in Czech Republic?

In the extended consultation it was deemed necessary, but it is not mandatory.

### Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania - Baltic Environmental Forum Germany – Matthias GRAETZ

Project BaltClim (Nov 2011 – Jan 2013) activities (interviews with Ministries of Environment (MoE) in all 3 countries – March 2012), report due in June 2012, seminar in Tallinn about selected issues in May 2012.

**Estonia** – No NAS. Exchange between projects and Estonian MoE not sufficient, difficulty to assess impacts. Adaptation is still a low priority in terms of organisational challenges since the focus has been placed on Mitigation. MoE is responsible for coordinating NAS.

**Latvia** – No NAS, but preparation are underway. Expected to have two Working Groups, one ministerial and one scientific. Knowledge: expected impacts on infrastructure, regional models are missing, previous project’s data is not bundled and European Economic Area GRANTS (EEA GRANTS by Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway) are expected. Organisational challenges: Coordination lies in the MoE; no institution coordinates research and info on climate change (this role could be taken by a third party, not necessarily the ministry).

**Lithuania** – National Strategy for climate change Management Policy will cover 2013-50, subcontracted to COWI. Knowledge – MoE is aware of the projects, but mentions that data generated is very specific; knowledge on options and how to handle uncertainty is missing; Organisational: MoE is the coordinating body, the parliament is also involved; at the moment the issue enjoys a lower political priority.

General needs – broaden the knowledge base and stakeholder involvement, stronger coordination role of Ministries of Environment, regionalisation of climate change scenarios.  
Matthias will send an extra slide with website.

### Q/A

Why was the Baltic Environmental Forum involved?

- Work funded by the German Federal Environment Agency, based on a proposal by DEF and the support by the Baltic Ministries of Environment.

How much is the EEA GRANTS funding?

- Not known.

Currently there is a LIFE+ ENV project on Cyprus to support the development of a National Adaptation Strategy (2010), called [CYADAPT](#) – it is on the LIFE database.

Why is Lithuania more advanced? Why is it different?

- Have made a step forward, but the reality is that it is not easy to implement afterwards. This is for example the current situation with a regional adaptation strategy in Latvia that they have been developing on a small regional level.

Any thoughts on the Latvian inter-ministerial working group?

- It is currently on hold and its continuation is uncertain. The key driver to the adaptation process was the White Paper.

12:30 – 13:30 Lunch

13:30 – 14:00 **WEATHER BALLOON DEMONSTRATION OUTDOOR – WORTH SEEING**

AFTERNOON\_I: 14:00 – 15:45

Duration: 1,75 h / Chair: Markus LEITNER (EAA)

14:00 – 15:00 CONTINUATION - STATE OF ACTION ON ADAPTATION IN EASTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES – ACTIVITIES AND NEEDS

### [Hungary](#) – Sándor SZALAI

Mr. Szalai presented geographical situation of Hungary (flat, surrounded by the Carpathians from all sides except South and similar to South European countries). He mentioned the Adaptation Strategies that is being in the Danube River Basin (DRB). Hungary has a National Climate Change Strategy (NCCS, 2008 under update), National Energy Strategy 2030, Renewable energy action plan for 2010-2020, National Drought Strategy (several of these Drought strategies have been ready but none has been ratified so far). Hungary does not have an official NAS, but often the NCCS (including a NCC Plan for every 3 years) is called that because it has a chapter on adaptation. Update of NCCS – increase drought tendencies, 35% of the territory is vulnerable (22% of the population), >50% endangered in water related effects. Presented climate data for observed and scenarios. Increases in precipitation and temperature in winter time are not significant. NCCS action1, 2, and 3: all are water related measures.

### Q/A

When will the NAS be ready?

- Probably next year

What about [Danube Climate Adaptation Strategy](#)?

- Danube adaptation strategy was supported by Munich University.
- Several project on going: CARPIVIA, CARPATCC

Results from EU projects (ESPON, PESETA, RESPONSES) all show different gradients of vulnerability. This reflects on NAS?

- Information from those projects is not optimized to serve different countries.

### Poland – Anna ROMANCZAK

NAS is under development since October 2011. At present Inter-ministerial work and consultation process are underway. Work is organised in 3 stages (1) vulnerability and impact assessment (2) elaboration of NAS for two timelines: until 2030 and the end of the century (3) cost estimation. Work should be ready by 2013. It has to undergo a SEA. The Institute for Environmental Protection – National Research Institute has prepared a list of adaptation measures that have been forwarded to the Ministries for consultation. They have been working through seminars on the Science-Policy Interface.

### Q/A

Costing methodologies?

- Very difficult and needs a lot of stakeholder engagement. Each sector has its own methodologies

What triggered the SEA on the NAS?

- Legal requirement.

How did you get to the measures?

- Preparatory work by teams of experts, there is already a list of measures.

### Romania –Markus LEITNER

Markus Leitner highlighted the reply to the questionnaire, since no representative from Romania was participating on the first day of the workshop.

### Slovakia – Pavel STÁSTNÝ

Three initiatives are currently ongoing:

- 1) Preparation work for a NAS,
- 2) SMHI project on CC impacts and adaptation (December 2011),
  - CCI on human natural systems until 2050
  - Main basis of work for NAS development, Included economic evaluation
- 3) Governmental program on revitalisation of the landscape and integrated river basin management
  - Basis for creating a conceptual approach to the prevention of floods, drought and some symptoms of natural disasters
    - Temporarily suspended because of changes in government (Mar 2012) but should be picked up again in 2012; adopted Oct 2010 after huge floods spring/summer); basis for conceptual approach to flood prevention; timeframe 6-10 years (currently in 2<sup>nd</sup> phase; strong SE aspects (>500 villages involved; has issues of transparency. Shows practical examples (see photos)

### Q/A

Job creation and economic costs are related to the practical water holding projects?

- No. It's part of the overall studies and prep-work

The water holding projects: How long did it took and was it public access?

- It was public areas and it took quite some years to prepared

### Slovenia – Barbara SIMONIC

Slovenia has a similar situation as Hungary with different regions having different scenarios for impacts and vulnerabilities making the analysis for NAS very complex. For forest and agriculture, national adaptation strategy has been adopted in 2008; Adaptation Action plan for those 2 sectors (2010-2011)

developed and in July its report confirmed by the government (project based activities carried within this Action plan have amounted to € 1.436.298,26). 2009 was the year of establishment of a Government office of climate change which prepared a long term low-carbon strategy (document covering both CC mitigation and adaptation) via a process involving *inter alia* organising sectoral workshops with experts. The NAS part of the climate strategy contains a vision and guidelines for various sectors for the timeline until 2060. Forest and agriculture action plans were concluded, but highlighted the lack of knowledge base (collection of other projects with a new ‘label’ called adaptation). Expectation from the EU level is an external ‘push’ for action (EU setting the example for action).

### Q/A

Mismatch between the science basis and the decisions?

- NAS as a wish list and possible difficulties for future implementation

Awareness raising?

- Got a push with Dr Lučka Kajfež-Bogataj, who was the Vice-President of the IPCC WG2 (Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability) during the years 2002 – 2008 (for which she got the Nobel prize in 2007), but what is needed is more action (recognition of the problem is high however there is a mismatch between this recognition and everyday behaviour)

Coffee break

15:00– 15:45 EU GUIDANCE FOR NATIONAL ADAPTATION POLICIES - DRAFT

Andrea PRUTSCH – [Outline for EU Guidance for National Adaptation Policies](#)

(Environment Agency Austria) Presentation and general discussion

Presented the aim of the session: to describe the draft outline and get input to key issues.

The guidance will be released in March 2013 as part of the strategy package that also includes other guidance on CAP, Cohesion policy, and for project managers/developers.

MS can contribute to the guidance by completing the practical examples questionnaire. As the guidance will be in English only, there was an offer that countries could help translate the guidance.

The guidance should support all MS with adaptation planning as it runs through the whole policy cycle.

Draft Table of Content (ToC):

- 1) Background;
- 2) Key principles for adaptation;
- 3) Guidance for Adaptation policy at national level (core of the guidance):
  - a) Prepare the ground;
  - b) Identify priorities;
  - c) Collect and assess options;
  - d) Prepare action plan and implement;
  - e) Monitor and evaluate;
- 4) How to set up a stakeholder process;
- 5) References;
- 6) Annex

Screening process = 55 guidelines; objective is to base on existing knowledge. Lessons learned: follow a pragmatic approach; draw on experiences and evidence base; involve target groups; address adaptation

as a dynamic process; address possible barriers; establish link to real policy processes and structure; suggest simple and widely applicable monitoring and evaluation.  
 Further relevant issues: case-studies and good practice examples; highlight the European context; link to Climate-ADAPT.  
 One example on the use of the guidance was presented. It was requested to workshop participants to provide real case studies to be included in the guidance.

### Q/A

Is this request the same of the inspiration book?

- No. Inspiration book is on practical examples (that can be photographed) and this is a request for examples which have been conducted as part of the policy development process.

There is guidance on the Climate-ADAPT plus EU guidance? Shouldn't it be the same?

- This EU Guidance will later be used to update the Climate-ADAPT adaptation support tool

What about cost effectiveness of measures? Will it be included?

- Not sure if there is going to be a specific document on this but there will be many supporting documents and this could be included (i.e. financing options)

Is it guidance on Nat. Adaptation Strategy or Nat. Adaptation Policies? Does it also address sector policies?

- Should be generic enough to cover strategies and actions plans (both nationally and sectorial)

If the objective is to guide through the policy cycle all the way to implementation, sets of tools (not prescriptive) should be included (suggestion is to make use of Climate-ADAPT to showcase that).

- That is intended.

National focus? What about regions?

- EU Guidelines for regions are already available (<http://3ea.eu/files/attachments/Projects/1926/1926-ras-final-report.pdf>)

Take care of international agreements and laws that have to be considered (my neighbour's' adaption policy is 'messaging mine').

Take care that the funding distribution framework in EU will change in 2 years or so and it can affect the guidance outcomes (including mainstreaming CC into other areas).

AFTERNOON\_II: 16:15 – 17:45

Duration: 1,5 h / Chair: Carin NILSSON (SMHI)

16:15 – 17:15 INTERACTIVE WORKINGS GROUP ON POTENTIAL KEY ISSUES FOR THE EU GUIDANCE

Working Group 1a: Interactive discussion on prepare the ground for Adaptation

Based on the presentation on the work of EU guidelines for national adaptation policies the late afternoon was spent to further discuss the first step "Preparing the ground". This was done by addressing the following question:

There are several possible ways to create a good path for sustainable adaptation in a country. Which key issues do you consider the most important in order to start up and develop work on adaptation policies in a country?

To fully grasp the question we first stated that we were going to talk about start up and development of adaptation policies in a broader sense - which encompasses more than an adaptation strategy.

Discussions were held in small groups, of 3 to 5 people. After 20 minutes the groups reposted back in plenum, with their key issues written down on cards.



*Which key issues do you consider the most important in order to start up, and develop work on adaptation policies in a country?*

Political will and commitment is needed to start work on adaptation policies. As clear drivers' on the one hand natural/anthropogenic climate change events (suffering from impacts, experiencing negative effects like floods) and on the other hand policy drivers like the white paper on adaptation, were mentioned. Funding is seen as a very important issue to get work on adaptation policies started.

When it comes to facts, the state of play, using hard facts and sound science information (e.g. data on extremes) and present science discussions, aiming to speak the same language (science-policy) as well as bring together science and policy (science-policy interface) is very important to start up and develop work on adaptation policies in a country.

Awareness raising, making the case for adaptation and capacity building at diverse levels (Ministries – Regions) were seen as key issues. Public information via media, news, etc. is of importance, having broader societal implications and this motivates for adaptation.

Of high importance is a coordination body that also builds and develops the policy/strategy and defines or allocates responsibilities. Learning from others experiences (using good examples), looking at international cooperation is of importance as well as generating and sharing the knowledge (gather and capitalise knowledge).

There needs to be a policy consistency (supported by tools, like guidelines, models, methods) and early mapping and involvement of relevant groups and departments (identify, educate, support and involve target groups). Smooth communication channels shall be used focussing on the positive communication of climate change, as an opportunity.

It is important to be realistic about the timing and use cost-benefit assessment to prioritise adaptation actions, avoiding maladaptation.

When planning and taking practical steps the connection to local authorities, providing of funding and the match of the objectives with the means is very relevant. Monitoring and Evaluation is seen as essential to support successful adaptation.

17:15 CLOSURE OF DAY 1 (Sabine McCallum)

Day 2 - Morning III

Wrap-up Day 1 (Carin NILSSON)

Carin Nilsson gave a short wrap-up of day 1, highlighting the sharing of information from ongoing activities at EU level (EU adaptation strategy and Climate-ADAPT) and the wide spectrum of all the work that is planned or going on in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. In particular interesting to learn was that many countries are facing similar barriers in terms of financial and practical constraints. Day 1 ended with a session gathering feedback on issues to take into account when drafting the EU guidance for national adaptation policies with the focus on the first step in the policy cycle “preparing the ground”.

09:30 –10:00 Interactive Workings Group on potential key issues for the EU guidance  
 Working Group 1b: Interactive discussion on prepare the ground for Adaptation –  
 Specific focus on stakeholder involvement

Stakeholder involvement can be performed from two sides, bottom-up and top down. It is important that one player takes the lead, when it comes to stakeholder involvement and organised groups like Ministerial Steering group on the national level or a task force for adaptation on regional/local level shall be seen as starting points for the adaptation process. The lack of funds can seriously impact a successful stakeholder involvement and participation of experts in this field, thus reducing the acceptance and make the adaptation policy implementation more difficult.

In general, the first step is related to a mapping exercise on what types of stakeholders are out there. As a next steps, the question is related to what types of stakeholders are out there, be it sectoral decision makers (within ministries, regions, municipalities - multilevel governance), groups of experts (within ministries, universities, etc.) and others, like representative bodies, businesses.

Following that, it is important to involve stakeholders, be it passive (information) or active (jointly develop the strategy, consultations) ways. The way, how information and knowledge shall be transferred is of importance as well as the communication used to transfer. It needs to be taken into account that climate change adaptation is a new topic, where still lots of information are needed.

This leads to the building of trust, which takes time and here adaptation needs to be seen as a long-term process, where many efforts like working group meeting, exchange and consultations are needed also to deliver information to stakeholders.

Since adaptation is a local issue, bottom-up approaches are necessary, like alliances of municipalities, when it comes to stakeholder involvement.

Interactive Working groups - Splitting up in two Working groups

Working Group 2: Identify key concerns

**Thomas DWORAK** – Introduction to the topic (Fresh Thoughts)  
 Moderated Interview with **Roxana BOJARIU** (National Meteorological Administration, Romania) and **Tiago Capela LOURENCO** (FFCUL, Portugal)

Chair: **Thomas DWORAK** (Fresh Thoughts)

Rapporteur: **Markus LEITNER** (EAA)

- I. What are the key issues to take into account?  
 Key issues are priority sectors, which are country specific ,taking into account past experiences (e.g. extreme events like floods, heat) and future projections are as well as sectoral drivers

Reference: Leitner M., Prutsch A., McCallum S., Nilsson C., Lourenco C.T. 2012. Summary of the Workshop: “Supporting the development of the EU strategy for adaptation to climate change - Views and Challenges in Eastern Europe”, Vienna 27-28 June, 2012

(related to funds/money and scale), which are closely linked to political relevance and development. Also the major impacts and concerns like costs are key issues and good examples and information/knowledge are helpful.

A conceptual framework (clear aims, objectives, what to adapt to, what to monitor and evaluate) is needed taking into account different time horizons (e.g. 2030, 2070). It takes time to build trust!

## II. What are your experiences with identifying key concerns?

The key concerns from experience are related to methodological (e.g. uncertainty chain) and financial concerns. The socio-economic part is still very weak. Depending on the country/region and specific impacts, some sectors are well prepared, but adaptation needs to be mainstreamed into all relevant sectors that might be impacted.

Knowledge sharing is of high importance aiming at its institutionalisation (e.g. centralising information), thus avoiding the loss of knowledge and information when staff and knowledge have high fluctuation.

The policy cycle (prepare the ground - identify key issues - collect and assess options – prepare an action plan and implement – monitoring and evaluation) takes time and several loops are often needed, especially since adaptation is seen as a long-term process. In order to reach movement regional support and initiatives are of high importance!

## III. How can the EC support these efforts?

The guidance shall especially provide a concept and if possible metrics for success and if feasible include socio-economic (vertical integration). Funding is not the priority, but links to possible funding sources shall be provided.

The guidance shall focus on national adaptation policy (e.g. strategies, plans) and take into account tools for decision support. The guidance shall built up and facilitate experience exchange.

The guidance shall be connected to Climate-ADAPT and here Climate-ADAPT shall provide a helpdesk for support (e.g. how to use tools and platforms). Additional Climate-ADAPT shall provide a summer school for adaptation strategies/policies and the platform shall focus on useful tools.

## Working Group 3: Collect and assess adaptation options

**Andrea PRUTSCH** –Introduction to the topic (EAA and Austrian Experience)

Moderated Interview with **Sándor SZALAI** (Szent Istvan University, Hungary) and **Hans SANDERSON** (Coordination Unit for Research in Climate Change Adaptation, Aarhus University, Denmark)

*Chair: Stéphane ISOARD (EEA)*

*Rapporteur: Carin NILSSON (SMHI)*

### I. What are the key issues to take into account?

The Danish started the process with a bottom-up approach based on needed scientific information. The scope was provided from the top and the technical aspects were dealt with at the municipal level. A change of law in Denmark made local planners more “powerful” to be able to adapt. The national adaptation portal asked every municipality to present themselves to gain movement.

In Hungary, the top down approach was the first step, together with a bottom-up process as a “joint” development. To move forward in a country depends on the sector with the most economic “influence”, which is very country specific.

In Austria, the focus was on collecting additional options from stakeholders from interest groups, NGO’s, Ministries, etc, in a way that the options “can” be implemented in the next stage of the process.

It was stated that the speed of the work depends on the politicians and coordination as well as web information is of high importance.

In a first step, it needs to be assessed, what is done on the national level, before it comes to the work on an implementation plan. It was asked whether the national adaptation strategy shall really include the actions.

## II. What are your experiences with identifying key concerns?

It is better to discuss several solutions than only one option, which also avoids the risk that the options identified at the end are too costly. The options might be limited by organisational structures within countries. Additionally the **time** we are planning for is not fully clear, since we have a moving target and also politics is moving.

It is important to have a scoping assessment, framing the time, etc. looking at health and long-term development. Too strong top-down approach might be dangerous when looking at the options. Maybe it is more important to look at the “gardener”, the professional at the local level, then the scientist, which might allow more flexibility.

The Austrian example shows that options were collected and in the next step, options that are suitable to address the problem were selected. This was followed by the assessment of costs, stakeholder involvement and based on sound science.

In Lithuania, the time dimension was looking at 2020, when the options were addressed and a review will take place in 2013.

Risk plans are often in place, so it needs to be assessed what can be learned from these.

**Flexibility of options** is of high importance, since a lot of the time, we do not know what we adapt to and flexible measures do response to uncertainties, also in time scale. We need to differentiate on what should be done now and what can be done later.

Key barriers can be of financial, social, technical, environmental, etc. nature and we need to acknowledge different perspectives and agendas. We also need to take into account that people do not call what they do adaptation and are not aware of “adaptation”.

As a solution, firstly awareness raising on what adaptation is and secondly convince people to report to you on the options was suggested. It needs to be acknowledged that certain actors are powerful meaning that starting with a policy network analysis and see what their agendas are is of importance.

It is important to move to action meaning that it is a challenge for municipalities to get what the scope is – height of sea-level rise, looking at downscaling and relate it to local issue. It is then a challenge to coordinate and adjust available information to decision makers. As the next point the question about the costs is of importance (there is still a lack of knowledge about damage costs). To understand the options on the point of view from financial aspects is important. As an example, technical solutions on water protection can be good in one place, but make things worse downstream. Therefore, an integrated ecosystem services approach is seen as very useful.

### III. How can the EC support these efforts?

In general the guidance can play a role, highlighting additional costs and the role of insurance. Information and knowledge sharing is of importance and Climate-ADAPT can play an important role here. The mainstreaming of climate proofing into directives (will take time and is a transitional process) is necessary.

Options shall be collected as well as good examples shared. Financial help shall be provided in terms of workshops, training at local level, etc. Additional technical guidance is seen as useful. The EU must not fund maladaptation and rethink e.g. subsidising agriculture that overuses water. Also mitigation shall be included in the guidance as well as linkages to green economy strategy 2020 and roadmap 2050 provided. This takes time, but is important.

Data is currently mostly a task of the MS, but sometimes data is needed from another country and the data-exchange process across borders can be improved. A more institutional based way from information exchange between countries is seen as desirable (e.g. climate services).

From a legal point of view it is unlikely that cities will be formally obliged to have adaptation strategies. From the EU level, the options, a directive or other instrument are being considered. The EU can e.g. assist in calculating or using an ecosystem service approach. Also support on roll out adaptation helping to support tools down to the local level can be a role of the EU. Additional a pool of information to what is happening outside Europe, measures from other continents (e.g. precipitation harvesting), adaptation of urban areas linked to water management is important! Is there behaviour in Europe that decreases the resilience outside Europe (and also inside)?

## Working Group 4: Prepare an action plan and implement

**Andrea PRUTSCH** –Introduction to the topic (EAA and Austrian Experience)

Moderated Interview with **Clemens HASSE** (UBA, Germany) and **Hans SANDERSON** (Coordination Unit for Research in Climate Change Adaptation, Aarhus University, Denmark)

Chair: **Markus LEITNER** (EAA)

Rapporteur: **Thomas DWORAK** (Fresh Thoughts)

### I. What are the key issues to take into account?

In Germany a framework for adaptation was provided by the strategy, but concrete action was not included. The National Adaptation Plan collected measures on federal level and a timeframe, which is renewed from time to time. Communication was done early and climate change adaptation seen as a process.

In Denmark, the national adaptation plan was not really proscriptive, calls for action on municipal level and focuses on the short term. There is a support system for municipality level from the national level (e.g. meetings, training) and via the web portal on adaptation, different municipalities show what they are doing which also increases the motivation. Unspecific actions are a problem, but being realistic on what you can achieve, set clear responsibilities and assess the costs can avoid maladaptation or no action.

### II. What are your experiences with identifying key concerns?

The communication of a country stage is important and can engage others. The available regional (climate) data needs to be provided to stakeholders (easy access) for their own risk assessment, but the data needs to be explained and they need to be taught on how to use and interpret the data.

The linkages between national and regional strategies are not always clear. The focus shall be placed on big cities, since the values are there and on resources where they are most needed.

It is important to get politics to agree on flexible timetables and mainstreaming into existing policies and budget is crucial.

### III. How can the EC support these efforts?

The EU guidance shall focus on how to prepare a plan and how to implement it.

Also the EU mainstreaming has to reflect on national adaptation policies (strategies and plans) in order to avoid conflicts or even lead to maladaptation in certain areas.

Sources of funding shall be mentioned (e.g. cost-sharing examples) as well as case studies for adaptation plans (e.g. timing, budget, level of detail).

## Working Group 5: Monitoring and Evaluation

**Patrick PRINGLE** – Introduction to the topic (AEA, UK and UK Experience)

Chair: **Carin NILSSON** (SMHI)

Rapporteur: **Tiago Capela LOURENCO** (FFCUL, Portugal)

### I. What are the key issues to take into account?

Adaptation is a continuous process with reflection points. Therefore planning is tied with Monitoring and Evaluation. The adaptation outcomes are tied with climate change and socio economics, meaning a double learning.

It needs to be identified what works under what assumption and for what reason. Are we doing the right thing? Or are we doing things right?

We need to deal with uncertainties in long time scales and estimate what would have happened. The attribution issue is of relevance, is it policies or society?

We need to evaluate the success and measure it (who defines that? And who evaluates?) – is it science that later communicates, policy or society?

### II. What are your experiences with identifying key concerns?

Developing countries driven experiences and contrast objectives of the NAS with country objectives. We also need to differentiate between adaptation actions and adaptive capacity. The use of indicators was highlighted. These indicators shall build on existing data and new indicators shall track adaptation, which is seen as a very difficult task as well as formal requirements for indicators.

In the UK, the impacts of adaptation were assessed and then broad questions on outcomes like are we getting more (less) vulnerable were asked.

In the Czech Republic, for example, no monitoring and evaluation for the NAS is foreseen, only the risk and adaptation approach. In Poland there is a need for data and indicators at the national level.

### III. How can the EC support these efforts?

We need to define what we monitor, be it the process or the measures. The EU shall give examples of adaptation indicators and shall initiate a working group that looks at examples with links to OECD and others. The focus shall be placed on support of measures that are “good for all” also take into account equity.

*Reference: Leitner M., Prutsch A., McCallum S., Nilsson C., Lourenco C.T. 2012. Summary of the Workshop: “Supporting the development of the EU strategy for adaptation to climate change - Views and Challenges in Eastern Europe”, Vienna 27-28 June, 2012*

Information shall be provided by the guidance on why monitoring and evaluation matters. On who (scale) should monitor and evaluate (responsibility) and on monitoring and evaluation definition(s). Indicators shall be coupled with integrated development that reflects climate and socio-economic development.

When it comes to aggregation of information, the question on how much is useful was addressed.

A very informal, statistically unproved and uncertain, quick round of questions within the last group led to the following results: Of the total of 8 countries present Around 6 countries are talking about Monitoring and 5 about evaluation 2 would like EU support for monitoring, 4 are unsure and 1 does not want EU support.

## Outlook Discussion and Follow-Up (Carin NILSSON, Tiago Capela LOURENCO)

What happens next?

- ❖ The proceedings from this workshop will include as much of our discussions as possible. Before it is sent further to the EU, and put on the webpage (<http://www.circle-era.eu>) the texts will be sent out to all of you for review, and comments.
- ❖ The presentations, information and Annex, containing the joint work on the pin-board and flip charts and will be made available to you through the webpage - <http://www.circle-era.eu/np4/464.html>.
- ❖ The discussions we have had during these two days will be used by the team assigned to work on the EU guidelines for national adaptation policies, led by the EAA

Further work within CIRCLE-2; some networking – Please come and see us at different places

- Present abstract at Helsinki conference in August; [www.nordicadaptation2012.net](http://www.nordicadaptation2012.net)
- Present abstract at EMS/ECAC in Łódź, Poland in September; <http://www.ems2012.eu/>
- Planning for hosting a session on Adaptation Strategies/Policies at the conference in Hamburg march 2013; <http://eccacnf.eu/>

Further work within DG CLIMA project "Support to the development of the EU strategy for adaptation to climate change" (CLIMA.C.3/SER/2011/0026):

- Chairing two sessions at the Nordic Climate Change Adaptation Conference
- Release of Guidance jointly with the EU Adaptation Strategy in March, 2013
- Collect good practice examples from Member States (please see template and provide input)

## WRAP UP AND CLOSURE (Sabine McCallum)