The CLIMSAVE Project

Climate Change Integrated Assessment Methodology for Cross-Sectoral Adaptation and Vulnerability in Europe

Summary of the 2nd European stakeholder workshop held in Prague, Czech Republic on 6-8 February 2012

Contact: marjan.maes@prospex.com

Scenario development

After a short reintroduction to the scenario development, the process of reviewing and adapting the storylines started. In the European case study participants developed four scenarios:

- *We are the World* is characterised by gradual economic development and effective solutions by innovation to the depletion of natural resources.
- *Icarus* is characterised by gradual economic development and ineffective solutions by innovation to the depletion of natural resources.
- *Should I Stay or Should I Go*[1] is characterised by a rollercoaster of economic development and ineffective solutions by innovation to the depletion of natural resources.
- *Riders on the Storm*[2] is characterised by a rollercoaster of economic development and effective solutions by innovation to the depletion of natural resources.

The following tasks were attributed to the stakeholders for the scenario development process. The participants reviewed the storylines and identified gaps and inconsistencies. The groups answered specific questions in order to fill in these gaps and expand the storylines. The participants specified their scenario in view of the main drivers and uncertainties, and they clarified the dynamics of their scenario. Finally, the stakeholders identified the unique character of their scenario and had the opportunity to comment on the other scenarios. These comments were mostly focused on similarities and differences between the scenarios. All comments were taken up in the scenario groups to further differentiate the scenarios.

The CLIMSAVE team developed the refined and adapted written version of the storyline as developed by the participants in this workshop. This version takes account of the presentations and discussions during the workshop, including the background notes of

[1] *Rollercoaster to Armageddon* was renamed *Should I Stay or Should I go* by the scenario development group.
[2] *I-Ticket to Ride* was renamed *Riders on the Storm* by the scenario development group.

scenario supporters. The revised storylines are presented in the full report, including the revised tables of driving forces and uncertainties. The changes made to the first version of the storylines developed in workshop 1 are clearly marked.

Quantification of selected key variables and capitals

After finalising the scenarios, each scenario group had the opportunity to revisit the values for key drivers used as input to the set of meta-models within the CLIMSAVE Integrated Assessment Platform which participants quantified in the 1st workshop. This included six model variables (GDP, population, food import ratio, arable land used for biofuels, oil price and household size)[3] which were selected by the CLIMSAVE team to provide guidance on the quantification of a much wider range of socio-economic variables used within the meta-models. In addition to these six variables, a further set of seven variables were specified, five capitals (natural, human, social, manufactured and financial) and two variables that were not discussed in workshop 1 (labour costs and electricity production). Two time scales were distinguished: the first from the present to the 2020s and the second from the 2020s to the 2050s. Stakeholders were asked to specify how the variables would change for these two time scales for the EU as a whole. They were also asked to provide a graph of the evolution of each variable over time, which is also shown in the full report.

Adaptation options

Furthermore, the stakeholders were asked to determine specific adaptation options for their scenario. These adaptation options were clustered and enriched with reviews and further suggestions. The options are listed exhaustively in the full report.

As a further step the panellists were asked in their scenario groups whether a table consisting of those adaptation options that are represented within the Integrated Assessment Platform were of low, medium or high importance in their scenario.

Conclusions and next steps

There was widespread satisfaction with the results that were produced. The scenarios were finalised, specific adaptation options were developed and for a selected set of options the importance was indicated. The results of the qualification exercise provide an excellent basis as input for the CLIMSAVE Integrated Assessment Platform. During the next workshop participants will be able to develop strategic adaptation approaches to the challenges and vulnerabilities specified for each scenario and receive direct feedback on the consequences of these approaches from the Platform.

Workshop evaluation by stakeholders

At the end of the workshop stakeholders were asked to share their comments on the process so far. All participants rated the workshop as good or very good. The scenario

[3] In workshop 1 there were seven. *Protected areas for nature* was dropped from the list as this is considered in the adaptation options list.

development process was seen as interesting and positive, but there were some concerns on the scientific legitimacy. The quantification session was seen as useful, but difficult.