

EEA/CIRCLE2 workshop 'Adaptation Platforms in Europe:
Addressing challenges and sharing lessons', Vienna, 7-8 Nov. 2013

Main outcomes expert meeting on platforms 19 June 2013 (EEA, Copenhagen)

André Jol

Head of group vulnerability and adaptation, EEA



Objectives

- Understanding the adaptation platform landscape across Europe, sharing experiences and the main challenges
- Opportunity for countries to present their platforms, the main challenges and the development plans
- Opportunity for countries and the EEA to learn from each other and explore relationships with each other and Climate-ADAPT
- Identify follow-up activities by the European Commission, EEA and/or CIRCLE2



Participants

- 17 EEA member countries (Austria*, Belgium, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark*, Germany*, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Netherlands*, Norway*, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain*, Sweden*, United Kingdom*)
 - EEA
 - European Commission (DG CLIMA)
 - ETC/CCA
 - CIRCLE-2 project
 - ECDC
 - Pyrenees Climate Change Observatory (OPCC)
 - Alpine Convention
- * = country with an existing climate change adaptation platform



Presentations by each country

- objectives, scope and perceived target audience
- governance; responsibilities and roles for delivery and management
- information on the use and the nature of users
- links to national climate (change) services
- lessons learnt and challenges, e.g. on presentation of scenarios, guidance on adaptation actions, adaptation case studies, engagement with target audiences/stakeholders; evaluation of the platform; improvements needed
- challenges and development plans for the coming years



Some main conclusions (1)

- Differences in scope, depending on objectives (e.g. some closely linked to NAS, others less; focus on sectors differs, only few include the private sector)
- Funding commitment is difficult, possibly easier if linked to NAS
- Structuring of the information is different
- Updating of the information by the data delivering entities and promoting the platform to be used by others can be successful
- Balance is needed between ambition level and costs of updating
- Important to evaluate if user needs are met and consider their perspective in development and improvement
- Some are moving from informing to encouraging taking action
- Occurrence of extreme events can help to enhance dissemination
- Case studies can be inspiring and promote adaptation mainstreaming ('e.g. 'champions'). Need also to assess why good practices are not taken up by implementers/planners.
- Need processes to learn ('learning cases') through direct interaction (example: cities)



Some main conclusions (2)

- Climate-ADAPT national pages should be kept up to date on a voluntary basis (by ministries)
- Climate-ADAPT can be useful e.g. for countries that do not have funding and people available to develop and maintain a national portal
- Climate-ADAPT should be limited to include EU-wide indicators and vulnerability/risk maps and provide links to national/local maps available elsewhere (differences should be explained)
- Climate-ADAPT should provide a summary of data, assumptions and interpretations of outputs from the many EU funded research projects. The European Commission could encourage closer coordination between EU-funded projects
- Case studies in Climate-ADAPT should not include all details but focus on the aspects most relevant for a wide audience
- Climate-ADAPT's national pages should be taken into account when considering streamlining of the reporting processes by countries



Thank you for your attention

Meeting documents:

<http://forum.eionet.europa.eu/nrc-climate-change-adaptation/library/workshops-meetings/eionet-workshop-climate-change-impacts-vulnerability-and-adaptation/agendas>

