The CLIMSAVE Project

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

Summary of the 3rd European stakeholder workshop held in Edinburgh, UK on 3-4 December 2012

Contact: marjan.maes@prospex.com

The third European stakeholder workshop was organised in parallel with the third regional CLIMSAVE workshop in Edinburgh on 3-4 December 2012.

Climate change adaptation strategies per scenario

After a short reintroduction to the project and an overview of the workshop, the participants were split in to four scenario groups and familiarised themselves again with their scenario. During the two previous workshops participants had developed four scenarios. The most prosperous future scenario, combining high levels of innovation and gradual economic development is *We are the World*, where effective governments change the focus from GDP to well-being, which leads to a redistribution of wealth, and thus to less inequality and more (global) cooperation. In comparison, governments in the *Icarus* scenario focus on short-term policy planning, which together with a gradually stagnating economy, leads to the disintegration of the social fabric and to a shortage of goods and services. The *Should I Stay or Should I Go* scenario is characterised by actors failing to address a rollercoaster of economic crises, which leads to an increased gap between rich and poor, to political instability and to conflicts. In this scenario most citizens live in an insecure and unstable world. *The Riders on the Storm* scenario is equally hit hard by continual economic crises. However, actors successfully counter the situation through investment in renewable energies and green technologies. In this scenario Europe is an important player in a turbulent world.

In their scenario groups participants discussed the outcomes from the CLIMSAVE Integrated Assessment Platform (IAP), reviewed the adaptation options identified during the 2nd workshop and identified those options which should be applied in the IAP. Through testing the IAP and discussing the results, the scenario groups developed the following output that was presented to the other groups: a main strategy line, a selected set of adaptation options, limits on the scope of adaptation, remaining key issues within the scenario, and feedback on the IAP. The stakeholders had the opportunity to comment on the work of the other groups during this presentation. A full discussion on the points raised can be found in the full report on the 3rd European stakeholder workshop (Deliverable 1.4a).

Workable adaptation options across scenarios

The presentations on the selected set of adaptation options and scenario-specific strategies provided the basis for the stakeholder panel to identify those policy options that could be considered robust. These robust options should be valuable in all scenarios. After further exploration of these adaptation options within the scenario groups and a presentation of the outcomes to the plenary, the individual groups settled on a shortlist of robust options applicable to all scenarios. Reducing consumption of resources, increasing alternative use of resources and spatial planning were found to be robust adaptation options across the four scenarios. Active citizenship and building social trust were mostly robust, but highly context-dependent.

After teaming up a European scenario group with a regional (Scottish) scenario group in order to let them explore each other's scenario, a comparative analysis of the CLIMSAVE process and results for Europe and Scotland was presented to the entire group (European + regional stakeholders). In this presentation the focus was mainly on the comparison of robust adaptation options, feedback on the IAP and general conclusions.

Learning points from CLIMSAVE

Before the end of the workshop the participants from the European and regional level discussed together in small groups how they experienced the CLIMSAVE process and what applications they see for the process and results. They answered the following two questions: 'How was the CLIMSAVE experience for you?' and 'How should the CLIMSAVE material be used from here onwards?'. All answers, ideas and comments are captured in the full report on the 3rd stakeholder workshop (Deliverable 1.4a).

To conclude the workshop, the CLIMSAVE team had prepared a short presentation covering the next steps towards finalisation of the project.

Workshop evaluation by stakeholders

Finally stakeholders were asked to share their comments on the 3rd CLIMSAVE workshop, as well as on the full workshop series on a feedback form. The results of this written evaluation are captured exhaustively in the full report. All participants (European + regional) rated the workshop as very good or good. The work of the facilitators and content supporters / IAP experts was also rated very positively. On the IAP stakeholders were slightly more critical, but they still saw great potential.

Stakeholders also filled in a more detailed questionnaire covering the full workshop series. All participants indicated that they gained knowledge during the CLIMSAVE workshop that is relevant for their work. The finalised storylines and the set of adaptation options were rated positively. Stakeholders also agreed that the scenario-building process is useful for climate change and that the adaptation options and strategies developed are useful for the debate on climate change. They claimed the workshops had also helped them to find novel linkages between factors affecting climate change adaptation.