

# Partnership of European Environmen Research: Climate Projects 2008



**TOLERATE conference**, 19 May 2008

Robbert Biesbroek & Rob Swart (WUR, Netherlands)

## What is PEER?

A network of 7 large European environmental research Centers:

- created in 2001
- covering the full spectrum of natural and social environmental sciences
- combining basic, strategic and applied interdisciplinary research



## **PEER Member Institutes**





# PEER: vision and mission

The vision of PEER is to be a world leader in integrating knowledge and expertise for sustainable development.

#### **PEER Mission:**

- To build a strategic partnership of major European public environmental research centres;
- To lead a European Research Area that strengthens the knowledge base for the sustainable development of a changing world;
- To foster innovative interdisciplinary research and cross-cutting approaches in support of national and European policy-makers, industry and society.



# PEER: Two climate change projects

- Project 1A: comparative analysis of national and regional adaptation strategies
  - project lead: Alterra Rob Swart
- Project 2: policy integration, coherence and governance
  - project lead: SYKE Per Mickwitz
- Timeframe PEER project 1A



# Project 1A: output and objectives

- Policy support
  - Position paper "Acclimatizing Europe"
  - PEER as policy-relevant think tank
- Research agenda
  - Knowledge gaps: "Advancing the PEER Climate Agenda"
  - Scientific Paper: "How does Europe adapt to Climate Change"
  - PEER as innovating research community



# Phase 1: Research strategy

#### Comparative analysis of National Adaptation Strategies (NAS)



- Analyses NAS characteristics with factsheets for a dozen countries
- Use information from earlier assessments to broaden perspective (EEA, IVM/EPA, CIRCLE, UNFCCC)
- Builds upon an earlier framework to categorize and compare adaptation activities developed by IVM for European EPAs



# Phase 1: Research strategy - Factsheet

General information Adaptation level

Example:

•Budget/costs (research programs)

•Timeframe

•Level of implementation

•Science-policy interactions

*Example:* •Adaptation concern

•Adaptation (policy) recommendation

 Adaptation policy measure *Example:* •Building adaptive capacity

•Reduction of risk and sensitivity

Adaptation objective

 Increase of coping capacity *Example:* •Coastal zone management

Adaptation aim

•Water management

•Health and disease management



After Massey and Bergsma (2008)

# Phase 1: Research strategy - NAS

#### **PEER countries**

- Denmark (NERI)
- Finland (SYKE)
- France (CEMAGREF)
- Germany (UFZ)
- Netherlands (Alterra)
- United Kingdom (CEH)

Second NAS (other?) Norway Latvia Spain Austria Portugal Ireland

#### Source of information:

- National policy document(s),
- Interviews
- Sectoral policy strategies



# Phase 1: Research strategy - output

- Comparative analysis of national adaptation strategies from at least 12 countries
- Identification of the 'laggards' and 'leaders'
- Overview of the main similarities and differences (e.g. topdown/bottom-up approach, science-policy interactions, development& and implementation stage, level of policy integration)





Source: adapted from FINADAPT

# Phase 1: Research strategy - output



Source: adapted from Spanish NAP



# Preliminary conclusions (phase 1)





#### Policy document 'Make Space for Climate!'

- •Description of the main strategy for making the Netherlands 'Climate Proof'
- Accepted by the Dutch parliament as NAS
- Very short document (15 p) to create broad political support

#### **Background document**

- •Description/analysis of main problems; suggestions for adaptation options
- •Not an official, commonly agreed-upon policy document, hence more detail (46 p)
- •Follow-up: National Adaptation Agenda for implementation announced







#### Supported by a coalition of national, regional & local governments:

- Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management,
- Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality,
- Ministry of Economic Affairs,
- Interprovincial Cooperation,
- Association of Dutch Municipalities,
- Union of Water Boards
- Coordinated by the Ministry of Housing Spatial Planning and the Environment
- Includes long-term vision; short-term actions
- Advocates an integrated approach on a regional level
- Aims for policy coherence and interaction in and between policy domains
- Proposes links & interaction between science, research and policy
  - Research programs: Climate changes Spatial Planning, Knowledge for Climate
  - Interface: Adaptation for Space and Climate (ARK), 'Routeplanner'
  - Policy: National Adaptation Strategy, National Adaptation Agenda (forthcoming)



 The NAS is the result of evolving interactions between governmental organisations (policy) and scientific research programmes (science) through time and governance levels





#### Challenge

#### Possible solution in NAS



**Divinalgised) Eteelfikeisike witteebrigheesia**mage potential



**Souplinglingurstating tourism (flexible)** 



#### Concluding:

- Based on comprehensive analysis of positive and negative effects of climate change in the Netherlands and suggestions for solutions
- Mostly a top-down strategy, but implementation local/sectoral
- Strong science-policy interactions: research programs (CcSP)– interface (ARK) – policy development (Make Space for Climate!)
- Focus only on spatial/water dimension (health, energy etc. not included)
- No 'SMART' criteria for gauging the progress included (indicators)
- June 2008 National Adaptation Strategy will be made operational -> National Adaptation Agenda (NAA)



## Phase 2: case studies – aim and objective

- Start: May 2008 October 2008
- Research focus to be further developed (during Helsinki workshop)
- Search for collaboration with PEER project 2 (policy coherence and integration)
- Objective: comparative analysis of adaptation strategies at the regional/sectoral scale



## Phase 2: case studies – output

- Good practice guidance: practical examples of (different) approaches to adapt to climate change in specific contexts (e.g. different countries)
- Insights in the key NAS implementation challenges
- Understanding of the links between (European and) national strategies and the regional/local/sectoral scale
- Options for effective science-policy knowledge transfer
- Pros and cons of different balance of top-down and bottom-up approaches
- Search for links with PEER 2: How can NAS be transferred to sector policies?
- Questions for future research



# **Possible research questions**

- What are the pros and cons of a local/regional approach (bottom-up) in terms of effectiveness, public awareness?
- Which scientific information is required for which kind of adaptation and how can it be generated?
- Is spatial planning an attractive way of successfully developing and implementing NAS in an integrated fashion?
- How relevant are synergies and trade-offs with mitigation?

. . . . . .

 What are social, economic, institutional, technological barriers to successful adaptation?

If you have any relevant information on adaptation strategies that we can use, please let us know Robbert.Biesbroek@wur.nl

### PEER

# Thank you!



Alterra, The Netherlands | www.alterra.wur.nl



Joint Research Centre - Institute for Environment and Sustainability, European Commission | http://ies.jrc.ec.europa.eu



CEH - Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, United Kingdom | www.ceh.ac.uk/



Centre for Agricultural and Environmental Engineering Research, France | www.cemagref.fr



Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research - UFZ, Germany | www.ufz.de



NERI - National Environmental Research Institute, University of Aarhus, Denmark | www.dmu.dk

SYKE - Finnish Environment Institute, Finland | www.environment.fi/syke

Robbert.Biesbroek@wur.nl

#### Partnership for European Environmental Research www.peer-environment.eu

#### Other climate related policy recommendations in NAS

- Improve knowledge-action nexus
- Public private partnerships (PPP) to enhance effectiveness of measures
- Stimulate innovation and knowledge development
- Evaluating existing climate sensitive policy strategies
- Re-evaluate policy instruments ('carrots and sticks')
- Aim for a multi-level governance approach in adaptation
- Policy coherence in and between governmental organisations
- Communication strategy (effects of climate change)



#### Dutch National Adaptation Strategy framed in the IVM framework

	Netherlands
Adaptation stage:	
Policy concern	Х
Policy recommendation	Х
Policy measure	-
Adaptation objective:	
Building adaptive capacity	Х
Reduction of risks and sensitivity	Х
Increase coping capacity	Х

	Netherlands
Adaptation aim:	
Coastal zone management	X (e.g. spatial reservations,)
Landscape management	X (e.g. spatial quality,)
Water management	X (e.g. water storage areas,)
Energy / secure power	-
Health and disease management	



# Phase 2: case studies – selection criteria

- Options for research focus second phase:
  - Drivers: laggards and leaders
  - Multilevel governance: institutional organization
  - Science-policy nexus: knowledge transfer arrangements
  - Policy integration and coherence
  - Policy mix: portfolios of options
  - Implementation issues, including socio-economic factors
- Dimensions for comparison:
  - *scale*: local to transnational
  - theme/sector. water management, agriculture, forestry, spatial planning,...
- Five criteria for case study selection:
  - scientific credibility: expertise PEER
  - scientific relevance: innovative research agenda
  - policy relevance: focus in NAS
  - *feasibility:* accessibility of information
  - comparability: combination of dimensions shared by at least 3 partners



# Preliminary conclusions (phase 1)

- Differences in emphasis between NAS
  - comprehensive strategy (e.g., Finland, Netherlands, Denmark)
  - sectoral approach (e.g., Portugal, United Kingdom)
- Differences in timing
  - 'leaders' (U.K., Finland?) and 'laggards' (Belgium, Norway?)
- Differences in organization of science-policy interactions
  - Participatory (Netherlands, Portugal, UK?) or directive (Germany, Spain?)
- Similarity in science policy interactions
  - Research program -> knowledge transfer -> policy making
- Reasons of differences and similarities
  - Specific vulnerability/opportunities, political/institutional culture, individual initiatives, level of participation in international negotiations?

