

# Evaluation of the EU Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change – Public consultation meeting: report

Place: Brussels, Albert Borschette Congress Centre, Rue Froissart 36

Date: Tuesday, 23 of January 2018

## Welcome and introduction

A welcome address by Yvon Slingenberg (DG CLIMA), Director for International, Mainstreaming and Policy Coordination) underlined the importance of climate adaptation and resilience. The evaluation of the EU Adaptation Strategy started in 2016 and the report from the evaluation is expected to be presented to the European Parliament and the Council by Autumn 2018.

## State of play on actions under the strategy

The presentation by the consultants (Martin Nesbit (IEEP), Richard Smithers and James Tweed (Ricardo), and Matthew Smith (Trinomics) outlined the progress identified under the Strategy's actions (with the exception of Action 5, "Further develop Climate-ADAPT as the 'one-stop shop' for adaptation information in Europe"). André Jol from the European Environment Agency (EEA) then presented results from the separate evaluation of the Climate ADAPT website. Both presentations are available at on the [Commission's EUROPA website](#).

## Questions, comments, and discussion

Audience comments and questions were invited, and covered the following issues:

**Action 4 (knowledge gaps):** One response to a point in the presentation (which noted that although monitoring and evaluation is a knowledge gap, it was not viewed by stakeholders as a high priority to address), was that this is not because M&E is viewed as unimportant, rather it is because in most cases implementation of adaptation strategies is still at an early stage.

**Green infrastructure:** Green infrastructure is highly relevant to climate adaptation; ongoing actions including guidance at international level is very promising, as are the results of a stream of research on ecosystem-based adaptation.

**Paris Agreement:** A question was asked about the evaluation report's references to the global adaptation goal established by the Paris Agreement. It was noted that this can be found at Article 7.1 of the Agreement.

**Copernicus:** The availability of trusted data was important, particularly data developed by Copernicus Climate Change services – have they been included in the evaluation? It was explained that published evidence from Copernicus has/will be considered in the evaluation; however, there is a challenge to ensure that results emerge from Copernicus investment at sufficient speed to feed in to current policymaking processes.

**LIFE projects:** LIFE project implementation in the Central Denmark region is contributing to resilience, through work on risk assessments, and prioritisation through cost benefit analysis (CBA). Financial tools are needed to support climate adaptation services based on the CBA results, and it was suggested that a recommendation for the development of such tools should be included in the evaluation. Other participants noted that funding for adaptation under LIFE is uneven; there is only one LIFE project in Portugal, while Greece and Spain seem to be significant recipients of LIFE funding. DG CLIMA noted that while LIFE has a relatively small budget, under the Cohesion Fund, Thematic Objective 5, there are still significant allocations available for use on adaptation in many Member States; similarly, funding is available under EAFRD.

**EU Habitats Directive:** It was suggested that there are impediments to adaptation action in current EU legislation; that, for example, the Habitats Directive restricts scope for making changes to the landscape, as do the requirements of Good Agricultural and Environmental Conditions (GAEC) under the CAP.

**European Regional Development Fund (ERDF):** Prioritisation of adaptation was considered difficult under the European Regional Development Fund. However, it was noted that it could be valuable to demonstrate economic development co-benefits of adaptation projects; and that the Energy Union governance framework would make decisions on the use of EU funding for adaptation and mitigation more explicit, and more visible.

**Action 8 (“Promote insurance and other financial products for resilient investment and business decisions”):** It was suggested that the focus of the evaluation on insurance may have been too narrow and that other financial mechanisms are also relevant, for example, the regulation in France obliging banks to disclose climate risks associated with their assets.

[Presentation from Andre Jol on Climate-Adapt website](#)

⇒ ([Power point presentation](#))

Audience comments noted that **Climate-Adapt** was a valuable tool; but there was also a suggestion that **data collection** could be more systematic and effective.

## Findings of the evaluation

[Presentation](#) by James Tweed, Richard Smithers, Matthew Smith. The evaluation questions are structured around five criteria: effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence, and EU added value. In the next stage of the evaluation the consultants would look also at the effectiveness of Strategy across the actions in a horizontal manner, as an addition to an action by action overview. The main focus of the evaluation questions is on effectiveness. More evidence is needed in a number of areas, most notably in relation to Action 8 (with regards to all criteria) and also in some respects to Action 3 (“Introduce adaptation in the Covenant of Mayors framework, 2013/14”).

## Questions, comments, and discussion

A wide range of responses to the presentations and outline conclusions were offered. These included:

**Research funding** can be difficult to attain at Member State level because of the need for multi-country coverage. However, research funding was not available under LIFE and is limited to Horizon 2020.

**Cross-sectoral issues:** More collaboration between Member States on infrastructure risks would be valuable, as would a better understanding of cross-sectoral risks (for example, rail transport's dependence on energy systems).

**European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF):** The impact of the ex ante conditionalities applied to programmes in relation to Thematic Objective 5 (resilience, adaptation) was raised. It was noted that, in principle, all programmes had met the ex ante conditionalities, in order for funds to have been committed. However, in practice, confidence that the requirements were fully complied with varied. Nevertheless, the evaluation currently noted that the introduction of the ex ante conditionalities had been effective in encouraging a deeper and more active Member State response.

**Structural barriers in the insurance market:** One reason for a lack of evidence on insurance is that bank risk management products in the EU depend largely on national legal systems. Innovative practice in this field should be shared and encouraged (linking Action 7 on "Ensuring more resilient infrastructure" and Action 8), and Member States could be encouraged to cooperate more closely with insurance sector.

**External impacts:** The lack of adaptation in non-EU countries and the potential for knock-on impact on the EU is relevant. A question was raised and left unanswered as to whether the revised Strategy should tackle the problem, or whether it should be left to sectoral policies?

**Disaster Risk Reduction:** Good work is being done internationally on the integration of adaptation strategies with disaster risk reduction, recognising the importance of harmonised data. A workshop organised with UNFCCC had brought a group together with a common mandate. Common goals need to be formulated and used to address the challenge of a sectorally fragmented response.

**Evaluation methodology:** A description of the evaluation methodology was requested, in particular, the approach taken to the selection of interviewees. The consultants explained that they have sought to consult a range of different groups of stakeholders, with 40-50 interviews covering different objectives, levels of governance, Member States, and stakeholder groups. However, it is recognised that the number of interviews means that they are not representative, are limited in comparison to the breadth of the evaluation questions and are being triangulated with a range of other sources of evidence.

**Action 6 ("Facilitate the climate proofing of the CAP, the Cohesion Policy and the Common Fisheries Policy"):** It was suggested that there is a long way still to go in achieving successful mainstreaming at EU level. One element in achieving this could be development of better awareness among Member States' programme authorities, and sectoral ministries of the wider social and environmental benefits of adaptation spending in addition to improved resilience. Further comments suggested that action in response to extreme weather events was reactive, rather than an adaptation policy success and that there were potential benefits from a focus on innovation in delivering enhanced resilience.

## Panel session

An invited panel of experts from a range of disciplines and sectors was invited to offer brief comments on (i) what had worked well following adoption of the Strategy; and (ii) what action they would like to see in future.

**Simone Borg, Co-Chair, Forum of European Legal Experts on Climate Adaptation, Malta University:**

The Strategy has been useful in building momentum and raising ambition. Complexity and challenges remain in terms of, for instance, linkages between climate action and governance, finance and adaptation, and stakeholders' engagement. Cost-benefit analyses are needed to help with selection of adaptation options. The ex-ante conditionalities associated with ESIF now need to be reviewed to help Member States to implement the Strategy.

**Carole Escolan-Zeno, Head of Sustainable Development Unit, UIC (international union of railways):**

The Strategy has given us some inspiration. Rail is a system of systems with different levels of infrastructure having different lifespans. Performance data is used to assess the impact of weather on the railway network. Different tools are under development, like a database that will allow sharing of case studies on the evaluation of the impacts of climate change, and a guidance document to help members assess the risks.

**Emma Bonnevier, Swedish Association of Local Authorities:** Adaptation choices vary, in one municipality there may be a focus on concrete actions in the buildings sector, in other municipalities the emphasis may be on identifying risks and making strategies. Everyone can be involved in implementing the Strategy but it needs actions, targets, and funding, some of which could be better clarified at EU level. ClimateAdapt is useful but could be improved, for example, by becoming become more user-friendly.

**Rachel Burbridge, Eurocontrol:** From the perspective of the aviation sector, there are many levels of adaptation to climate change and much progress has been made since 2013. To some degree, there is a coordinated approach but more communication is needed to reach the people who can take action. Cross-border perspectives are vital in the transport sector.

**Sara Goddard, Association of Mutual Insurers and Insurance Cooperatives in Europe, AMICE:** There is an agreement that what happens at EU level, Member State level and local level varies to a great extent. Insurance companies want to contribute more to adaptation action and the development of resilience (two recent reports have been released), including through risk knowledge and risk management techniques.

**Miroslav Petkov, Head of Environmental and Climate Risk, Standard and Poor's:** Climate risks are dependent on future adaptation action but a majority of climate action is focused on mitigation. The Strategy is, therefore, helpful in highlighting the need to focus on adaptation as well. The private sector needs to understand the risks; the knowledge gap between high-level projections and more specific information should be bridged.

**Jannes Maes, President, European Council of Young Farmers:** Agriculture faces new consumption patterns and climate change. Climate change risks involve extreme weather conditions. Insurance is an option but only helps to compensate for damage once it has occurred. Adaptive innovation is also needed, e.g. through crop breeding, or wetland conservation.

**Evangelos Koumentakos, COPA-COGECA:** Farmers have a specific role in the implementation of climate policy. We have shown that production growth can be decoupled from emissions but the links with climate adaptation are less sure. The Paris Agreement recognises the fundamental priority

of safeguarding food security and makes clear that it should not be compromised by climate mitigation or adaptation. Agriculture can adapt but the strength and the frequency of climatic events is overwhelming, so we should first look for support at EU level.

**Zuzana Hudeková; Union of Slovak Cities and Towns:** Implementation at national level is problematic: the hierarchy of strategies is unclear, and links between mitigation and adaptation should be clarified. Nature-based solutions seem to be the most promising, as grey infrastructure projects could endanger the environment. Better spatial planning is an important tool to drive sustainable development and adaptation.

**Carlos Campillos, E3G:** The Strategy was successful in putting adaptation on people's agenda, but much has changed since 2013: the knowledge base has increased; the Paris Agreement has been signed. Climate adaptation remains marginalised within the climate policy debate. So progress is needed not only on issues like integration, prevention, and disaster risk management but also in terms of political salience. The Future of Europe debate is encouraging – many of its priorities point to a need for a stronger adaptation strategy.

### Questions, comments, and discussion

**The Committee of the Regions opinion:** The CoR had produced opinion statement on the Strategy following a broad consultation process, which should be taken into account in the evaluation. In particular, it calls for a stronger level of cooperation between the levels of governance, and emphasises that the Covenant of Mayors is a key initiative to support action at subnational level.

**Foresight and projections:** Improved projections could help strengthen links between disaster risk management and adaptation. It was noted that: projections are not always helpful in pointing to links between mitigation and adaptation in agriculture; risk management experts should work together to improve their understanding of long-range weather forecasting options; and the Strategy could focus on initiatives to help the tourism sector to understand risks and to adapt.

**Small firms:** While large companies have more capacity to take action, mobilising sectors dominated by smaller entities (e.g. tourism) is hard. Answers could include: improved dialogue with the insurance industry; better sharing of information (and experience with relevant technologies) among small businesses (including in agriculture); better signposting of expertise, e.g. within municipalities; and improved information for and communication with stakeholders who may not fully appreciate their own risks.

**Data:** A lack of data on issues like sectoral vulnerabilities was noted – rather than expect the EU to provide it, is it more important to discuss how the EU level could coordinate the information? Is there a role for Eurostat in addressing data gaps? It was suggested that it is important to bring high-level projections into sharper focus for users. Greater transparency of information on lakes and coastal pressures would be valuable, and the availability of data on vulnerabilities at city or local level is important to encourage local action.

**Infrastructure investment:** Who should pay for investment in improved infrastructure resilience – current users?

**LIFE:** It was noted that countries with low uptake of LIFE adaptation projects should be encouraged to focus more on the potential of the funding and that work on the rail network could be useful.

## Emerging recommendations from the evaluation

Following lunch, the consultants presented summary information on the emerging recommendations (=> PowerPoint presentation).

### Questions, comments, and discussion

**Disaster risk reduction:** Should there be a message on how public authorities should focus less on post-disaster operations, and more on prevention through developing resilience?

**Vulnerability assessment:** It was suggested that areas such as disaster risk and agriculture are currently singled out by the evaluation and that other sectors not mentioned. In response to a question about whether a systematic vulnerability assessment been carried out in order to develop the recommendations, it was explained that the recommendations were based on the evaluation of the Strategy and that while a vulnerability assessment could be valuable, it was not part of the evaluation.

**Health implications:** It was suggested that the health implications of climate change are insufficiently addressed by the Strategy's current actions, and by the emerging recommendations. It was suggested that a forthcoming WHO report will include recommendations that should be taken into account.

**Agriculture:** It was advocated that there could be more emphasis on synergies in rural development programmes between mitigation and adaptation, rather than on conflicts between the two.

**Sectoral coverage:** It was suggested that the recommendations should mention a wider range of sectors, for example, with links to recommendations on climate adaptation in respect of environmental impact assessment and strategic environmental assessment.

**Public attitude data:** It was noted that the evaluation could make more use of Eurobarometer data on attitudes to climate change and on surveys.

## Collective exercise

The collective exercise provided an opportunity for participants to react to the draft recommendations, to comment on them, and to suggest additional or alternative recommendations. Overall 173 new ideas and comments on the draft recommendations formulated by the consultants were recorded, and are set out in detail in Annex 1.

### Questions, comments, and discussion

An initial summary of the discussion, and of the ideas put forward by participants, was provided by the evaluation project consultants. The summary was considered a fair reflection of the feedback; participants commented that further **follow up** should be ensured. It was also suggested that **Mainstreaming** targets could be misleading, particularly if the available funding was not always taken up in Member States. Monitoring should focus on the money actually spent.

## Conclusions and closing remarks

**Elena Višnar Malinová** (DG CLIMA, Head of Unit for adaptation) thanked participants for a valuable and interesting discussion. The parallel consultation had so far yielded 152 responses, mainly individual contributions, with strong representation from Spain, Belgium, France, Italy, and Germany. Some responses came from non-EU countries, some of these providing more responses even than some individual EU Member States.

Awareness raising and advocacy on resilience would continue, with two events taking place in February (the Covenant of Mayors Investment Forum and 10 years anniversary ceremony on 20-21 February). A major climate change adaptation conference would be organised on 28-31 May 2019 in Lisbon.

Several of the comments during the day had concerned funding. The next Multi-annual Financial Framework (MFF) is under preparation, with a strong focus on EU added value. The current MFF provides golden opportunities for investment in adaptation, and it is important for Member State stakeholders to make use of the funding available.

Management of risk and uncertainty is vital. The presence of stakeholders from the financial sector, particularly from insurers, is therefore encouraging because their awareness is vital to proper private-sector funding of risk mitigation and reduction.

Discussion had identified the availability of a wealth of data but also the challenge of synthesizing it to provide tailored information for users. Work on vulnerability assessments with the EEA would continue.

Policy coherence at all levels is important, including at the macro-regional scale. Both adaptation and mitigation are needed. Spill-over benefits of investment should be taken into account and we should also address new sectors of interest, such as health.

The public consultation is still open, and stakeholders were encouraged to participate. The Commission will finalise the evaluation this year and, based on it, will issue a communication that could identify future avenues for further work. The enthusiasm from the meeting provided a strong

encouragement to continue the work between the Commission, Member States, and regional and local actors.

## Annex 1: detailed results of the collective exercise

### Recommendation 1: Continue promoting action by Member States and cities

Recommendation	Support “Green”	No support “Red”
<b>Recommendation 1.1: EU action could focus on tools to encourage MS strategies and facilitate action</b>	10	0
<b>Recommendation 1.2: CoM should encourage equal emphasis on adaptation and mitigation</b>	3	0
<b>Recommendation 1.3: EC should identify where cross-border cooperation could help MS readiness</b>	7	0
Total	20	0

Generally high levels of support for continued Commission efforts to promote Member State action on adaptation, with a particular focus on Recommendation 1.1 (Tools to encourage Member State strategies and facilitate action, general support for continued attention to the Covenant of Mayors, although with some scepticism about action in specific areas (see below under Recommendation 5 with regard to ecosystem-based adaptation).

#### Comments and new recommendations

Comments identified a gap between national strategies and action at the local level, including the initiatives of cities.

Suggestions focused on governance mechanisms to address that gap, including:

- The need for a structured dialogue between different levels of government
- The importance of greater coherence between Commission action to encourage Member State strategies, on the one hand, and deployment of EU funding on the other
- A better link between demands for action, and the distinct competences of different levels of administration.
- “A dedicated chapter in a strategy on support for local authorities and regions. “
- “Cities being “at the front line” of climate adaptation”
- “Appropriate financing to support local level implementation”
- “More focus on implementation as compared to the focus on plans and strategies”
- “Greater focus on cross-border cooperation encouraged through EU policies”
- “Greater EU commitment to climate adaptation”
- “Link plans and strategies to real competencies/responsibilities of the authority drafting it
- “Adaptation in form of EC directive would be the solution not to keep the implementation on voluntary basis”
- “Promotion of action by Member States should be done more coherently on the side of the Commission and its different funding sources”

One comment indicated that merging adaptation and mitigation action in the Covenant of Mayors had led to a lack of focus on adaptation.

New ideas included:

- A suggestion for an explicit spatial dimension in adaptation policy;
- The need to address rural/urban links, particularly where the need for upstream action in rural areas had benefits which were felt in downstream urban areas.
- A much greater need for vulnerability assessments to be used in European action was identified, either in relation to the EU strategy itself, or to European Territorial Cooperation programmes.
- “More private finance leveraging with the support of the EIB, LIFE, and through public-private partnerships”
- “More promotion of awareness raising and capacity building” 3x, “facilitation of learning, and a challenge forum where one can post an issue and receive advice”  
“Support further capacity-building activities for cities and regions, also through the Covenant of Mayors”
- “Collaboration with the Commission ambassadors of the Committee of the Regions to provide country-focused support to cities and regions”
- “Current EUAS is not a strategy with vulnerability assessment, pressures, drivers, actions etc. but a loose collection of documents and recommendations”
- “Linking adaptation funds with vulnerability priorities of the different areas i.e. INTERREG”
- “Take into account the results of the different partnerships of the Urban Agenda”
- “Climate data from Copernicus framework clarified, officialised, harmonised”
- “Need to further promote adaptation mainstreaming in EU policies”
- “Examples of cross border actions would help such as flood management or halting of species loss”
- “Include local level of production of national climate and energy plans”
- “Establish a structured regular dialogue among Commission, member states, and subnational governments”

## Recommendation 2 Continuing need for EC to work with MS on knowledge gaps

Recommendation	Support "Green"	No support "Red"
Recommendation 2: Continuing need for EC to work with MS to close existing knowledge gaps, address emergent ones and promote knowledge exchange	8	0
Recommendation 2.1: EC should further encourage practical application of results from H2020 projects	2	0
Recommendation 2.2: EC should foster research on: adaptation to high-end climate change; risks to EU from climate impacts elsewhere	8	0
Recommendation 2.3: Establish a community of practice (beyond Climate-ADAPT) to share good practice, particularly for MS groupings that share similar impacts	9	1
Total	27	1

The level of support (from green and red dots) was strong for the overall recommendation and Recommendations 2.2 and 2.3, notwithstanding a single "red dot" for 2.3. Support for Recommendation 2.1 was modest, though no indication that it was not supported.

### Comments and new recommendations

- 2.1. This could include a systematic review of applications of H2020 projects.
- One aspect of encouraging practical application is to provide knowledge of forecast future climate to end users.
- "2.2 EC may be too distant from practitioners to comment on relevant knowledge gaps."
- Cost benefit analysis (relevant to climate change adaptation) was mentioned as a possible additional area where there is a knowledge gap.
- 2.3 There were several comments, covering the sorts of areas identified by EEA for development in their evaluation of Climate-ADAPT. One specific comment was that an initial focus could be on making existing platforms more liked/appreciated.
- More data (Copernicus), knowledge and challenge sharing (**many comments**)
- "We should prepare for the worst case scenario"
- Address "research gap in terms of costs and benefits"
- "Lobby management plan through ESIF, divest in fossil fuel business and transform to green industry"
- Recommendation 2.3 should be clarified as to "who?, at which level?"
- "Look at existing data about public attitudes and behaviour"
- "Develop guidelines on integration of science/ policy/ practice interactions"
- Include health as an area for research, e.g. drinking water quality – groundwater impacted by flooding
- Consider social science research on public attitudes – this may inform approaches to a change in culture
- Support pro-active adaptation [this may be to do with how adaptation is framed rather than necessarily a different approach to adaptation]
- Commission [Commissioner?] to deliver an annual state of the climate union address

### Recommendation 3 Next financial framework should identify added value of EU programmes for adaptation

Recommendation	Support “Green”	No support “Red”
Recommendation 3: Next financial framework should identify added value of EU programmes for adaptation	4	0
Recommendation 3.1: New emphasis on monitoring extent of knowledge transfer and capacity-building across EU	3	0
Recommendation 3.2: EC should investigate tracking separately to clarify EU contribution to climate resilience	0	2
Recommendation 3.3: Future EAFRD programming/monitoring could enhance effectiveness/relevance by distinguishing: mitigation/adaptation; resilience of businesses/society	2	0
Recommendation 3.4: EC should consider improving: future impact of EAGF on adaptation; use of GAEC	2	0
Recommendation 3.5: Assess use of guidance to guide its promotion and inform post-2020 materials	2	0
Recommendation 3.6: EC should identify proportionate approaches to improving adaptation impact of funds <sup>8</sup>	1	0
Total	14	2

The level of support (from green and red dots) was modest with 4 supporting the overall recommendation and no more than 3 supporting any individual recommendation. Even considering all votes across all the recommendations in this area, the support for Recommendation 3 was only about one half of that for Recommendation 4. Recommendation 3.2 attracted no support and two participants did not support it.

#### Comments and new recommendations

- 3.3 There were several comments to the effect that in the agriculture sector, actions can be effective for both adaptation and mitigation. These questioned the practicality and value of seeking to distinguish adaptation and mitigation.
- 3.5 What is the role of the ESF in tracking social issues linked to adaptation?
- “Role of ESF in tackling social issues linked to adaptation (integrated approach)”
- More adequate methodologies are needed to assess/count mainstreaming climate change to ESIF 2020+
- Emphasize that mitigation should be part of strategic planning
- “Does the EU discharge its obligations to pursue climate change adaptation by throwing the ball at local level?”
- “We need industrial symbiosis to be included into the climate adaptation platform”
- “All action (not at a project but programme level) funded by the EU should be climate proofed prior to funding”
- “More adequate methodology to assess/count mainstreaming climate action to ESIF beyond 2020 needed”

- “NOT READABLE that mitigation should be a part of strategic planning and one can’t catch up on mitigation on the project level”
- “I heavily suspect that the vast majority of 20% commitment to climate change is spent on mitigation. That is certainly my experience of ERDF in the UK, England. CCA has no ring fence allocation”
- “New emphasis would overburden individual projects. Better: additional activity on knowledge transfer and on capacity building across EU. Example service contract specific projects”
- “There is an over reliance on LIFE to cover climate change. It’s a fraction of other funding programmes. This should be explicitly recognised in any recommendation for its future contribution to EU adaptation strategy”
- “How can we say that we need a ‘resource based approach from member States’ when it is the EU who has to put ‘more emphasis on knowledge transfer and capacity building across EU”
- “Conflict: EU should track funding to adaptation separately from that for mitigation <> promote synergies”
- “Introduce compulsory monitoring indicators for Climate Change at EU level”
- “In agriculture adaptation and mitigation happen at the same time. Funds are there for mitigation. How come there is more need for funds for adaptation?”
- “EU funding should label as adaptation only action that is additional to existing DRR efforts and measures”
- “It is impossible/difficult to distinguish adaptation and mitigation separately. Agriculture contributes to both, division is difficult”
- “Transferability is often difficult and not always useful to achieve. Many projects would have more added value if they could fully focus on positive impacts on their own area”
- “Raise awareness and demonstration of LIFE projects in CEE region”

#### Recommendation 4 Coherence between DRR and adaptation should be enhanced

Recommendation	Support “Green”	No support “Red”
Recommendation 4: Coherence between DRR and adaptation should be enhanced across all levels of governance via closer vertical, horizontal, cross-border and transnational coordination and collaboration	10	3

Recommendation 4 attracted 3 red dots and was noted as being too broad, too vague, and requiring further development and clarification as to how it could be put into operation.

#### Comments and new recommendations

- Ideas on how to bring DRR and adaptation closer together included integrated horizontal planning, tailored methodologies along the policy cycle including standardised vulnerability assessments and other solutions for climate risk management and risk governance. An “integrated, inclusive, people centred and multi-hazard and landscape approach” has also been suggested.
- In general, an effective intersectoral cooperation, communication, participation should be encouraged. Insurers and SMEs should for instance collaborate closer to improve risk management.

- Two additional suggested elements mentioned as relevant to DRR and adaptation is better use of standardisation tools and reinforcement of political commitment.
- “Should be more than collaboration/coordination e.g. stronger links between CCA and risk assessment in the framework of DRR”
- “DRR should be exemplified also including Risk mitigation in land use. E.g. Fuel management to prevent forest fire”.
- 3x “It means nothing – too broad”
- “Adoption of an integrated, inclusive, people centered, multi-hazard and landscape approach to overcome barriers by sector”
- “Look also at EU placard projects dealing with DRR and CCA linkages and maybe other horizon 2020 projects”
- “Work on climate risk management to operationalise coherence between CCA and DRR”
- 
- “It needs more specific recommendations so more informed decisions are crucial for strategy implementation”
- “Implementation of Ecosystem-based DRR/CCA can be fostered through standardisation of existing principles and political commitment”
- “Better use of standardised vulnerability assessment/ provide framework for combining hot spot identification with adaptation needs measures”
- “We need a deeper understanding of DRR plus climate adaptation overlap/common areas and then to allocate clearer responsibilities on who does what. This runs across finance data in the areas etc. It will require a stronger mandate to promote collaboration”
- “Specific focus on overseas territories because vulnerable to high end events”
- “Ecosystem-based DRR CCA require effective intersectoral collaboration that should include communities and promote participatory processes”
- “Promote in house risk management in businesses (risk identification assessment mitigation)”
- “Promote better collaboration between insurers and SMEs to improve their risk management”
- “Important but requires further development and clarification”
- “Integrated territorial planning is needed”

Two comments were difficult to read, and have not been included.

### Recommendation 5 Mainstreaming ecosystem-based approaches across EC activity

Recommendation	Support “Green”	No support “Red”
Recommendation 5: Greater efforts to mainstream ecosystem-based approaches across EC activity	14	0
Recommendation 5.1: Covenant of Mayors action to promote green infrastructure should be enhanced	9	3
Recommendation 5.2: Mobilisation and market uptake of ecosystem-based approaches need further promotion	2	0
	25	3

There were high levels of support for an increased focus on ecosystem-based adaptation, although a minority (3 votes) were concerned that promotion of green infrastructure through the Covenant of Mayors was inappropriate – either because it was the wrong vehicle, or a wrong focus for its work.

#### **Comments and new recommendations**

- Importance of addressing ecosystem-based adaptation through a range of action, not just through the covenant of Mayors;
- the need to address blue infrastructure as well as green;
- the key role of overseas territories of the EU in protecting biodiversity through adaptation measures;
- a suggestion that the Habitats Directive needed to be more flexible to allow investment in ecosystem-based or other forms of adaptation action.
- “Spatial/urban planning should be addressed”
- “Rural non-rural links should be enhanced”
- “Dedicated chapter on the renewal strategy for cities and regions”
- “Exchanging of experiences on ecosystem based adaptation”
- “Water management and the circulation of water is the key issue in the adaptation”
- “EU Habitat Directive should reflect adaptation and ecosystem based adaptation”
- “CoM already promotes both mitigation and adaptation. Maybe it would be better to say that it should “continue to promote both mitigation and adaptation”.
- “EU should focus on relation between climate agriculture nature water quality and their interactions”
- “Specific focus on overseas territories as a big part of common biodiversity heritage”
- “Don’t just focus on EBA in cities and covenant of mayors. Broader needs”
- “Facilitate access to finance for EBA private households and communities”
- “Take stock of existing EBA projects. There is a lot of work done by Commission and Horizon 2020”
- “Covenant of mayors is not enough. It does not reach all actors at local level. Expand extent of this point”
- “Not only mainstream but put priority to nature based solution”
- “The EU should recognise the learning potential of EU MS actions, such as those in Germany. Focus is always the other way around”
- “Prefer ecosystem based ‘approaches’ to ‘adaptation’. It is a larger concept”
- “You miss the social issue of adaptation policy and the role of citizens (Leipzig Charter)”

## Recommendation 6 Reinforcement of synergies between adaptation and mitigation actions through EU action

Recommendation	Support "Green"	No support "Red"
Recommendation 6: EU action should encourage and facilitate better integration of, and reinforcement of synergies between, adaptation and mitigation actions	6	0
Recommendation 6.1: Renew efforts to identify actions that mutually reinforce adaptation and mitigation in an EU context, drawing on work at UNFCCC level, as a first step to greater coherence	11	0
Total	17	0

There was much enthusiasm for the recommendations but concern that adaptation may lose out to mitigation.

### Comments and new recommendations

- Adaptation and mitigation attract very different communities of interest.
- Use of international standards (ISO) was suggested as means of encouragement.
- "Adaptation will lose influence" and "it can lead to less effort on adaptation"
- "Coherence – yes! But separate budgets to ensure that adaptation will still happen"
- "adaptation vs. mitigation "good practices should be defined to highlight the differences"
- "what about synergies with other policy objectives?"
- "link recommendation 6 to international standardisation at ISO"
- "work together to raise the importance of adaptation together with mitigation"
- "Bringing closer together the adaptation and mitigation communities, i.e. developing and developed countries"
- "Take an example of the integrated approach in urban sustainable development (Leipzig Charter principles) ... coherence between policies (adaptation, mitigation, but also social influence)"

## Recommendation 7: Ensuring more resilient economic sectors

Recommendation	Support "Green"	No support "Red"
Recommendation 7: EU should increase efforts to include climate resilience in economic sectors/infrastructure	16	0
Recommendation 7.1: Requirements for climate risk assessment should be extended to all EU-funded infrastructure projects	13	0
Recommendation 7.2: Review guidelines to ensure accessible language; improve awareness; support capacity building for their implementation	4	0
Recommendation 7.3: Climate resilient investment should be promoted by pursuing 2016 proposal (CRR/CRD IV) to amend capital requirements legislation	1	0
Recommendation 7.4: Explore introduction of political risk guarantees for sustainable (climate-resilient) infrastructure investments	4	0
Recommendation 7.5: EC continue to support development/sharing of disaster loss/damage data, and dialogue with MS and stakeholders on disaster-risk insurance	8	0
Total	46	0

Recommendation 7 attracted a lot of enthusiasm and no criticism.

### **Comments and new recommendations**

- The need for a clear communication of the benefits of investing in DRR and adaptation to encourage ecosystem-based approaches
- Potential benefit of more public-private partnerships focusing on innovation and open to civil society.
- Guidelines on vulnerable investment should be condensed and “factsheet like”.
- The need to take resilience into account at planning level, “without a need for new SEA/EIA guidelines but rather integrating resilience at every step of the decision making”.
- “EIA, SEA climate integration to be clarified, further developed”
- The sectors also to be considered in planning are: construction (through building codes) and land use. “The concept of resilience is too narrow”.
- Better use of spatial data provided e.g. by Copernicus and innovation (e.g. through start up companies) should be encouraged.
- “Role of standards to be further developed”
- Need for better guidance on how to mix different funds available for investment in climate adaptation.
- Amending Solvency II directive (2x) (e.g. in relation to the fiduciary duties of insurers) was proposed as well as distinguishing between disaster risk insurance for individuals and for business.

Suggestions relevant to 7.3-7.5 recommendations include:

- Boosting financing of the mitigation projects,
- Providing a menu of tailored, evidence based options of climate resilient investment such as restoring ecosystems (wetlands) including establishment of “certification scheme” for resilient investment,
- Paying more attention to behavioural aspects of climate adaptation,
- Encouraging public private partnerships and collaboration (including data sharing) between insurers, businesses, academia, and industry,
- Including resilience in EU’s 2030 “agenda” targets
- Introducing climate change as a variable in data analysis
- “Structured dialogue between Commission, Member States, and local authorities”.

## Recommendation 8: Addressing EU vulnerability to impacts outside Europe with non-EU countries

Recommendation	Support “Green”	No support “Red”
Recommendation 8: EC should consider its external climate vulnerabilities and potential synergies between EU domestic adaptation and adaptation needs of others	3	0
Recommendation 8.1: In line with international policy developments, the Strategy should address links between EU and non-EU adaptation actions, including sharing of EU experience and climate modelling, and identification of risks to the EU from climate impacts elsewhere and commensurate actions to improve EU resilience	5	1
Recommendation 8.2: Better to include adaptation in NDC, as would send stronger signal about balance of EU efforts in relation to mitigation and adaptation	0	1
Total	8	2

There was much enthusiasm for Recommendations 8 and 8.1. Recommendation 8.2 only attracted one red dot and no green dots. Whether this indicated widespread disagreement or lack of interest/understanding was unclear. However, two stakeholders commented that it should be subject to agreement by Member States.

### Comments and new recommendations

- Further care required with use of language, e.g. what does “external climate vulnerabilities” mean?
- Suggestion that focusing on the impact on the EU of climate change impacts beyond the EU was quite different from focusing on the impact on the EU of climate change adaptation actions taken by countries beyond the EU. The former was preferred, the latter was viewed as too complex and potentially imponderable.
- “Recommendations 8.1 and 8.2 are a topic discussed by team on UNFCCC negotiations. This is pre-empting their work.”
- “Pay more attention to global diseases, pandemics, species loss”
- “EU should seek cooperation with the new global Centre of Excellence Climate Adaptation”
- “INDCs on adaptation subject to Member States”
- “Strong coordination between focal points for multilateral environmental agreements (Paris Agreement, RAMSAR, UNCCD, CBD)

## Recommendation 9: The Strategy should be aligned with international obligations under the Paris Agreement

Recommendation	Support "Green"	No support "Red"
Recommendation 9: The Strategy should be aligned with international obligations under the Paris Agreement	3	1
Recommendation 9.1: The Strategy's cycle should be aligned with the Paris Agreement cycle of the Global Stocktake in 2023 and every five years thereafter	2	7
Total	5	8

Recommendations 9 and 9.1 attracted eight red dots (the most of any recommendation) plus five green dots.

### Comments and new recommendations

- The EU has no mandate and this should be something for Member States.
- Suggestion that there is a lack of understanding about the Global Stocktake.
- Suggestion that Recommendation 9 was simply a sub-recommendation relating to Recommendation 8.
- "Global green business platform, industry can take a step forward towards recycling and industrial symbiosis"
- "By aligning agriculture only to mitigation, the EC misinterprets the scope of the Paris Agreement"
- "Without this, the strategy will always be out of synch and accused of being out of date – could consider mid-term review as well?"
- "Why 2023, why not 2030 or 2050?"
- ""EU has no mandate to speak as MS. MS report as a party".
- "Commission tried it with the Governance Regulation out of their mandate"
- "Only if easily done otherwise not necessary"
- "Need for structured dialogue among Commission, Member States and local authorities on COP negotiations"
- "Article 2.1b in a manner that does not threaten food production"
- "Alignment on other levels necessary for example ISO"
- "Not only Paris Agreement cycles, but content too, inclusion of climate Overseas Development Aid, disaster and humanitarian efforts"
- "Why is Recommendation 9 needed, Paris Agreement is also part of Recommendation 8"

## Recommendation 10: Maintain internal coherence and further consider how to enhance it

Recommendation	Support "Green"	No support "Red"
Recommendation 10: Maintain internal coherence and further consider how to enhance it	0	0
Recommendation 10.1 <sup>i</sup> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater links between risk management under agriculture policy and EU policy on insurance mechanisms</li> </ul>	0	0
Recommendation 10.1 <sup>ii</sup> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improving understanding of and addressing knowledge gaps that impede progress in MS adaptation policy</li> </ul>	2	0
Recommendation 10.1 <sup>iii</sup> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater links between city-level actions encouraged by CoM and activities to improve national-level actions</li> </ul>	4	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>

There was enthusiasm for Recommendations 10 and 10.1.

### Comments and new recommendations

Comments simply provided many additional examples for consideration, including:

- Harmonisation of the Habitats Directive, Floods Directive, Water Framework Directive, and SEA Directive
- "Links with Overseas Territories."
- "Recommendation 10.1, it is not clear what you mean by EU policy on insurance mechanisms – there is no such single policy"
- "Deploy appropriate resources to implement action locally"
- "Recommendation 10.1: more emphasis on city-level action"
- "Emphasis on state led policy, e.g. building and land codes, planning policy to foster an environment where insurers can help households"

## Annex 2: list of participants

<b>SURNAME</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
<b>AGRILLO</b>	Cristina	EU	Slow Food
<b>AHO</b>	Laura	Finland	Finnish Permanent Representation to the EU
<b>ALVES MARINHO</b>	Bruno	Luxembourg	Ministry of Environment
<b>APPULO</b>	Leorita		Wetlands International EU Association
<b>ARAMAYO</b>	Anna	EU	European Commission DG Joint Research Centre
<b>BAFFERT</b>	Claire	EU	EUROCITIES
<b>BAKARDZHIEVA</b>	Silvia	Bulgaria	Climate Attachés in Perm Rep
<b>BAÑOS DE GUIASOLA</b>	Eva	EU	CCRE-CEMR
<b>BEDHOUCHE</b>	Julien	EU	Federation for European Risk Management Associations (FERMA)
<b>BLONDEL</b>	Lucie	EU	Climate Alliance
<b>BONNEVIER</b>	Emma	Sweden	Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions
<b>BORG</b>	Simone	Malta	University of Malta
<b>BORMIOLI</b>	Francesca		Rina Consulting
<b>BOUWHUIS</b>	Egbert	NL	verbond van Nederlandse verzekeraars
<b>BROZEK- EVERAERT</b>	Stella	EESC	European Economic and Social Committee
<b>BURBIDGE</b>	Rachel		Eurocontrol
<b>CAMPILLOS</b>	Carlos	Belgium	E3G
<b>CHIARETTI</b>	Carla		Eur Eau
<b>CHRELIA</b>	Eirini	Greece	Permanent Representation of Greece to the EU
<b>COLLIN</b>	Claire	Belgium	SPF Environment
<b>COOK</b>	Rosalind	EU	UNISDR - UN office for Disaster Risk Reduction
<b>CREPY</b>	Mathilde		ECOS
<b>DA COSTA</b>	Tomás		Swiss Re
<b>DAVIES</b>	Craig	EU	EBRD
<b>DE HAAN</b>	Erik	Netherlands	Provincie Zuid-Holland
<b>DE BUCK</b>	Abraham	Netherlands	
<b>DE GUSMAO- SOERENSEN</b>	Diogo	EU	European Commission DG Research
<b>DECKER</b>	Bernd	EU	EASME
<b>DEVAUX</b>	Charles		Student
<b>DI PIETRANTONIO</b>	Nicola	EU	Committee of the Regions
<b>EBBEN</b>	Thomas		German Permanent Representation to the EU
<b>EHRLE-MANTHEY</b>	Barbara		Vertretung des Landes Hessen bei der EU
<b>ENGEL</b>	Christian	Germany	Representation of North Rhine Westphalia to the EU
<b>ESCOLAN ZENO</b>	Carole		UIC
<b>ESTOL</b>	Judith	Spain	Catalan government

<b>SURNAME</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
<b>FELIU</b>	Efrén		Tecnalia
<b>FEYEN</b>	Luc	EU	European Commission DG International Development and Cooperation
<b>FIASCONARO</b>	Milo	Italy	Aqua Publica Europea
<b>FREDERIKSEN</b>	Birgitte	EU Chief Adviser	
<b>GAUDART</b>	Delphine	France	
<b>GODDARD</b>	Sarah		AMICE
<b>GRÄS</b>	Tobias	Denmark	Danish Agriculture and Food Council
<b>HAMON</b>	Kevin		DNV GL Group
<b>HARTL</b>	Christoph	Germany	German Insurance Association (GDV)
<b>HAUNER</b>	Oliver	Germany	German Insurance Association (GDV)
<b>HEMPEN</b>	Susanne	Germany	German Environment Ministry
<b>HERAS</b>	Francisco	Spain	MAPAMA- Spanish Climate Change Office
<b>HERTELL</b>	Sirpa	EU	Committee of the Regions
<b>HUDEKOVA</b>	Zuzana		Union of Slovak Cities and Towns
<b>HUTT</b>	Lorraine	UK	
<b>JAKOBI</b>	Reeli	Estonia	Ministry of the Environment, Climate and Radiation Department
<b>JOHNSEN</b>	Rolf	Denmark	Central Denmark Region
<b>JOL</b>	André	EU	EEA
<b>JONES</b>	Gregg		CPMR
<b>JURKEVICIUTE</b>	Ausra		Jaspers-IQR/EIB
<b>KAMPUS</b>	Krista	EU	Council of the Baltic Sea States Secretariat (EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region)
<b>KENDROVSKI</b>	Vladimir	European WHO Region	WHO (Technical Officer for Climate Change and Health)
<b>KLEINENKUHNNEN</b>	Lea	EU	
<b>KLEMMAYER</b>	Inga	Germany	Ministry for Environment - North Rhine-Westphalia
<b>KONITZER</b>	Kerstin	Sweden	Swedish Geotechnical Institute
<b>KORMANN</b>	Christophe	Germany	Permanent Representation of the Federal State of Hessen
<b>KOUMENTAKOS</b>	Evangelos	EU	COPA - COGECA
<b>LAHTVEE</b>	Valdur		CBSS - Permanent Secretariat of the Council of Baltic Sea States
<b>LATINOS</b>	Vasileios-Panagiotis		ICLEI
<b>LAZARO</b>	Gloria		CEPRI
<b>LEFEVRE</b>	Filip		VITO
<b>LEITNER</b>	Markus	EU	PLACARD
<b>LEJA</b>	Linda	Latvia	Climate Attaché in Permanent Representation
<b>LEMESIOS</b>	Ioannis	Greece	National Observatory of Athens
<b>LILJA-ROTHSTEN</b>	Saara	Finland	Ministry of agriculture and forestry/natural Resources Dpt
<b>LINDNER</b>	Marcus	EU	European Forest Institute
<b>LOW</b>	Charles Michael	EU	Insurance Europe

<b>SURNAME</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
<b>LOZANOV</b>	Radoslav		Permanent Representation of Bulgaria to the EU
<b>MACARTHUR</b>	Sara Macarthur	EU	Insurance Europe
<b>MACGREGOR</b>	Judith	UK	Confederation of Scottish Local Authorities
<b>MAES</b>	Jannes		CEJA
<b>MARTINEZ BOTI</b>	Miguel		European Commission
<b>MATTERN</b>	Kati		EEA
<b>MEISTER</b>	Wiebke	Germany	DIN - German Standardization Institute
<b>MELCION</b>	Carme		Barcelona Province
<b>MUTZIG</b>	Xavier		FERMA
<b>NEUMANN</b>	Thomas		Ramboll
<b>NIKOLOV</b>	Krasimir	Bulgaria	The Ministry of Interior
<b>O'NEILL</b>	John	Ireland	Department of Communications, Climate Action & Environment
<b>O'BRIEN</b>	Sarah	EU	Ecofys
<b>O'NEILL</b>	Eoin	Ireland	UCD Planning and Environmental Policy
<b>OPDENACKER</b>	Philippe		ENGIE
<b>PANNIER</b>	Rodolphe		CEPRI
<b>PAULINO</b>	José	Portugal	Portuguese Environment Agency
<b>PEKIN</b>	Ethem	Belgium	CER - Community of European Railway and Infrastructure Companies
<b>PICATOSTE RUGGERONI</b>	José Ramón	Spain	Spanish Climate Change Office, Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment
<b>PLA</b>	Eduard	Spain	CREAF
<b>POČUČA</b>	Žana	Croatia	Ministry of Environment and Energy
<b>POHJANKOSKI</b>	Riikka	EU	ARCTIK
<b>POŠKULKOVÁ</b>	Lada	Czech Republic	Representation of the South Moravia Region to the EU
<b>RABAZAUSKAITE</b>	Jurga	Lithuania	Permanent Representation of Lithuania to the EU
<b>RAKONCZAY</b>	Zoltar		European Commission
<b>RICCI</b>	Simona	Malta	Office of the Permanent Secretary, Directorate For The Environment and Climate Change
<b>ROBLES</b>	Cindy		GFDRR/World Bank
<b>RONCHINI</b>	Mariana	Italy	
<b>ROSS</b>	Stuart		DNV GL Group
<b>RUBINO</b>	Teresa	Italy	Federazione delle Banche, delle Assicurazioni e della Finanza (European Affairs Senior Advisor)
<b>SALAKARI</b>	Matti	EU	Insurance Europe
<b>SAMITIER</b>	Salvador	Spain	director of the Catalan Office for Climate Change
<b>SANTORO</b>	Anna	EU	European Commission DG Joint Research Centre
<b>SCHAFFERER</b>	Frédéric	France	Ministère de l'Environnement, de l'énergie et de la mer

<b>SURNAME</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
<b>SEGURA COBOS</b>	Ieva	Switzerland	Swiss Re
<b>SIMONIC</b>	Barbara	Slovenia	Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning
<b>SJOSTROM</b>	Åsa	Sweden	Swedish Meteorological and Hydrological Institute
<b>SUYKENS</b>	Cathy	Belgium	KU Leuven
<b>TASSER</b>	Marlene	Austria	Austrian Chamber of Agriculture
<b>THOMA</b>	Franz	Belgium	CEPF - Confederation of European Forest Owners
<b>TROELTZSCH</b>	Jenny	Germany	Ecologic
<b>VAN MINNEN</b>	Jelle	Netherlands	PBL
<b>VAN RÜTH</b>	Petra	Germany	Federal Environment Agency
<b>VANNEUVILLE</b>	Wouter	EU	EEA
<b>VETTORI</b>	Andrea	EU	European Commission DG Environment
<b>VOIRIN</b>	Sarah		ONERC
<b>ZAUNBERGER</b>	Karin	EU	European Commission DG Environment
<b>ZIMMERMANN</b>	Stephan		
<b>ZNUTIENE</b>	Stasilė	Lithuania	Ministry of Environment

#### Project team participants

<b>Mootoosamy</b>	Sandra	Belgium	IEEP
<b>Nesbit</b>	Martin	UK	IEEP
<b>Paquel</b>	Kamila	Belgium	IEEP
<b>Reeg</b>	Louise	Belgium	IEEP
<b>Smith</b>	Matthew	Belgium	Trinomics
<b>Smithers</b>	Richard	UK	Ricardo Energy & Environment
<b>Tweed</b>	James	UK	Trinomics
<b>Vaculova</b>	Lucia	Belgium	IEEP

#### European Commission DG Climate Action, Directorate A, Unit A.3

<b>Carmona Yebra</b>	Manuel
<b>Duque</b>	Diana
<b>Kondrup</b>	Claus
<b>Milos</b>	Jelena
<b>Silina</b>	Dina
<b>Slingenberg</b>	Yvon
<b>Toth</b>	Andras
<b>Višnar Malinová</b>	Elena