

KE4CAP VKE2: Climate adaptation platforms: supporting and working with local authorities and other local users

23 September 2020

Recording: <https://www.weadapt.org/knowledge-base/climate-change-adaptation-knowledge-platforms/vke2-supporting-and-working-with-local-actors> (available until 23 October 2020)

Summary

Climate adaptation platforms (CAPs) are considered by many to be an integral part of national climate knowledge infrastructure. Discussions at this event highlighted the increasingly important role CAPs can play in engaging with and supporting a diverse range of local actors who have ambitions to climate proof their immediate environment and local neighbourhood.

For example, peer cohort initiatives established by CAPs appear to be a particularly effective approach for promoting collaborative work and knowledge exchange across municipalities. Also, establishing connections and compatibility between platforms across geographical scales (local, regional, national, and international) will help gain the confidence of users and warrants considered action in the near future with local actors expected to play an important role. They are not only the 'end users' of climate information, but they also provide valuable feedback on adaptation measures taken and their impact across society.

Climate adaptation platforms and those operating them play a pivotal role in these areas, as they embody the continuity, the brokerage, the experience and the (international) network to learn from each other. Concerning the latter, it is encouraging to see that climate adaptation platform providers all around the world, as represented in, for example, the KE4CAP project, are working hard to share expertise and to learn from others' experiences.

Introduction

Climate adaptation ultimately takes place on the ground, through concrete measures and behavioural changes. Climate adaptation platforms (CAPs) are expected to play a pivotal role in stimulating, supporting and enabling action by local actors but the WMO stated that "Climate services often do not reach "the last mile", to the people who need them most..." (WMO, 2011, p.8).

This event aimed to explore and share actual practices that have attempted to reach that last mile, successful and less successful experiences, lesson learnt and remaining challenges. Discussions focussed on how to connect and engage with local actors particularly online given the current restrictions, how to encourage and support local users, and how to capture the experiences and lessons learned by local actors to help build knowledge and inspire and inform the wider community.

The agenda is at [Appendix 1](#).

Participants

We welcomed 50 participants working on adaptation platforms in 20 countries and regions (Australia, Belgium, Canada, Estonia, Europe, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Ireland, Mexico, Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Philippines, Scotland, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Taiwan, UK). The

platforms represented varied from those currently being planned to well-established platforms that are now being revised and re-launched.

A full list of participants and links to platforms is included in [Appendix 2](#).

The value of engaging with local actors

During the registration process, participants were invited to respond to the question ‘What does your platform gain from engaging at the local (and regional) level? Whilst CAPs are often perceived as providers of information and tools, there are considerable benefits to platforms in effective two-way engagement and knowledge exchange at the local level:

- Gaining traction with those who are playing a critical role in stimulating climate action, and helping to provide a deep dive into understanding their needs, the local impacts and resource & information requirements.
- Obtaining practical information on the implementation of adaptation measures including the interactions between knowledge, values and policies that are critical in supporting local adaptation.
- Providing opportunities to extend awareness, share experiences and build trust and long-term relationships across the community thereby enhancing the demonstrable value of information provided.
- Eliciting user feedback to help monitor how the information and tools provided are being accessed, interpreted and used, and thereby identifying potential improvements to the scope and delivery of platform outputs.
- Participation in learning and testing labs as platforms seek to identify and develop new tools and services (and seek new investment and funding).

Presentations and reflections

Five short presentations from operators and users of well-established CAPs in Australia ([CoastADAPT](#)), Canada ([ICLEI Canada/BARC](#)), Germany ([KliVO](#)), Netherlands ([Climate Buddy](#)) and Europe ([Climate-ADAPT](#)) were pre-recorded for viewing prior to the event. From the individual platform perspective, these presentations provide valuable examples of how local actors have been engaged, advances that have been made and challenges that remain.

The presentations will remain as a resource on the KE4CAP webspace [here](#).

In response to the content discussed in the five presentations, two national platforms that have been developed more recently were invited to provide a commentary from their perspective of transferable learning that could potentially help meet their own requirements and national situation. South Africa’s national platform ([NCCIS](#)) was launched early in 2020, whilst the Philippines’ platform is currently in advanced development.

Details of the questions asked and the responses received (both during and after the event) are summarised in [Appendix 3](#).

Plenary discussion

The discussion focussed on six questions asked by participants:

1. Are there examples of developing effective peer-cohort models among local actors?
2. Do any participants have experience with embedding providers / researchers within local authorities as a means of better understanding context and of building capacity?

3. How do individual platforms not only provide information to local actors but also capture the experiences and lessons learned by the actors?
4. Do platforms host a chat or 'dating site' for local adaptation practitioners - to facilitate the efficient exchange of ideas and to make contacts?
5. How do you measure the success of a platform, as part of continuous learning and improvement and for demonstrating value?
6. How have platforms responded to COVID-19 restrictions?

Detailed comments are given in [Appendix 4](#).

Overall, the discussions provided a means for rapidly sharing information and lessons learnt with operators from a broad range of platforms. All participants are encouraged to use the KE4CAP community to establish greater connections and to continue these discussions. (Vicky Hayman, vicky.hayman@ouce.ox.ac.uk, or Roger Street, roger.street@ouce.ox.ac.uk, can facilitate introductions as required).

Supported by:



Federal Ministry
for the Environment, Nature Conservation
and Nuclear Safety

of the Federal Republic of Germany

This event has been organised with the financial support of the European Union's Partnership Instrument and the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, and Nuclear Safety (BMU) in the context of the International Climate Initiative (IKI). The opinions expressed are the sole responsibility of the speakers and do not necessarily reflect the views of the funders.

Appendix 1. Agenda

Chair: Kim van Nieuwaal, Climate Adaptation Services, Netherlands.

| | |
|-------|------------------------------|
| 09:00 | Welcome. Aims of the meeting |
|-------|------------------------------|

| | |
|-------|--|
| 09:10 | Introduction of the panellists: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Robyn Birkett, Mackay Regional Council, Australia.• Valentina Giannini, Climate-ADAPT, Europe.• Marit Heinen, Climate Adaptation Services, Netherlands.• Ewa Jackson, ICLEI Canada• Kirsten Sander, Federal Environment Agency, Germany. |
|-------|--|

| | |
|-------|--|
| 09:20 | Commentary: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tsepang Makholela, Department of Environment, Forestry and Fisheries, South Africa.• Perpi Tiongson, Oscar M Lopez Center for Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management Foundation, Philippines. |
|-------|--|

| | |
|-------|--|
| 09.50 | Clarification questions from all participants to the panel and discussants |
|-------|--|

| | |
|-------|---|
| 10.10 | Plenary discussion With sub-questions, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- what approaches to engagement have worked well, and why?- what approaches are considered 'user-friendly' by the various audiences?- how to balance a bottom-up approach (engagement of local users) and top-down approach (science and policy driven)?- how to keep an overview of all relevant local actors, including fluctuations within that network, and to enhance continuity?- How to deal (differently) with frontrunners on the one hand and the less engaged on the other?- what is the role of capacity building in this respect?- what is the covid-19 situation teaching us in this respect?- what can national platforms gain from experiences at the local and regional level?- what would you do differently if you started now? |
|-------|---|

| | |
|-------|---|
| 11.10 | Reflections – from Roger Street, KE4CAP lead researcher, University of Oxford |
|-------|---|

| | |
|-------|------------|
| 11.20 | Next steps |
|-------|------------|

| | |
|-------|-----|
| 11.30 | End |
|-------|-----|

Appendix 2. Participants

| | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|------------------|--|
| Julia | Barrott | UK | weADAPT, https://www.weadapt.org/ |
| Anna | Beswick | Scotland | Adaptation Scotland, www.adaptationscotland.org.uk |
| Robyn | Birkett | Australia | Mackay Regional Council, https://www.mackay.qld.gov.au/ |
| Kinga | Biró | Hungary | National Adaptation Center, http://nakfo.mbfisz.gov.hu/en/node/507 |
| Eva | Boon | Netherlands | Dutch knowledge portal on adaptation, https://ruimtelijkeadaptatie.nl/ and (local) https://kli-maatje.nl/ |
| Sarah | Boulter | Australia | CoastAdapt, www.coastadapt.com.au |
| Carlo | Buontempo | Copernicus | Copernicus Climate Change Service, https://climate.copernicus.eu/ |
| Samantha | Burgess | Copernicus | Copernicus Climate Change Service, https://climate.copernicus.eu/ |
| Joyce | Chang | Taiwan | Taiwan Climate Change Projection Information and Adaptation Knowledge Platform https://tccip.ncdr.nat.gov.tw/index_eng.aspx |
| Valerie | Cote | Canada | Climate Information Portal, https://climatedata.ca |
| Laura | Dalitz | Germany | |
| Anindya | Das | India | https://climatefinanceknowledge.nabard.org/ |
| Jelle | Dehaen | Belgium | https://www.adapt2climate.be/ |
| David | Dodd | Ireland | Dublin Climate Action Regional Office |
| Rafaela Jane | Delfino | Philippines | Platform in development |
| Manas | Dwivedi | India | |
| Sebastian | Ebert | Germany | German climate protection portal, https://www.klivoportal.de |
| Jeremy | Gault | Ireland | Climate Ireland, http://www.climateireland.ie |
| Valentina | Giannini | Europe | Climate-ADAPT, https://climate-adapt.eea.europa.eu/ |
| Geoff | Gooley | Australia | www.climatechangeinaustralia.gov.au , www.pacificclimatechangescience.org , www.rccap.org |
| Catherine | Hartigan-Go | Philippines | Platform in development |
| Clemens | Hasse | Germany | |
| Victoria | Hayman | UK | |
| Marit | Heinen | Netherlands | Dutch knowledge portal on adaptation, https://ruimtelijkeadaptatie.nl/ and https://kli-maatje.nl/ |
| Kevin | Hennessy | Australia | |
| Andreas | Huck | Germany | |
| Ewa | Jackson | Canada | ICLEI Canada, https://icleicanada.org/ including Building Adaptive and Resilient Communities (BARC), https://icleicanada.org/barc-program/ |
| Reeli | Jakobi | Estonia | |
| Stephen | Jones | Northern Ireland | Climate Northern Ireland, https://www.climatenorthernireland.org/ |
| Anna | Jonsson | Sweden | Swedish portal for climate change adaptation, http://www.klimatanpassning.se/en |
| Eleni | Karali | Greece | national platform being developed, https://www.adaptivegreece.gr/en-us/ |
| Dimitra | Konsta | Greece | national platform being developed, https://www.adaptivegreece.gr/en-us/ |
| Cheng-Ting Lin (Wilson) | | Taiwan | Taiwan Climate Change Projection Information and Adaptation Knowledge Platform, https://tccip.ncdr.nat.gov.tw |

| | | | |
|------------|---------------|--------------|---|
| Kate | Lonsdale | UK | UK Climate Resilience Programme, www.ukclimateresilience.org |
| Tsepang | Makholela | South Africa | South Africa National Climate Change Information System, https://ccis.environment.gov.za/ |
| Silvia | Medri | Europe | Climate-ADAPT, https://climate-adapt.eea.europa.eu/ |
| Frank | Mischler | GIZ | |
| Spyridoula | Ntemiri | Greece | national platform being developed, https://www.adaptivegreece.gr/en-us/ |
| Barry | O'Dwyer | Ireland | Climate Ireland, http://www.climateireland.ie |
| Georgia | Panagopoulou | Greece | national platform being developed, https://www.adaptivegreece.gr/en-us/ |
| Gesa | Petin | Germany | www.anpassung.net/tatenbank |
| Neil | Plummer | Australia | |
| Bernadette | Roxas | Philippines | Platform in development |
| Mónica | Sanchez | Spain | Spanish Platform, AdapteCCa, https://www.adaptecca.es/ |
| Kirsten | Sander | Germany | German Climate Preparedness Portal: https://www.klivoportal.de/EN/Home/ (Government) Adaptation Platform: www.anpassung.net (Environment Agency) |
| Darell | Sison | Philippines | Platform in development |
| Roger | Street | UK | |
| Lilla | Taksz | Hungary | National Adaptation Centre: http://nakfo.mbfisz.gov.hu/en/node/363 |
| Perpi | Tiongson | Philippines | Platform in development |
| Madeleine | Tuomi | Sweden | Swedish portal for climate change adaptation: http://www.klimatanpassning.se/en |
| Aseneth | Ureña Ramon | Mexico | Platform under consideration |
| Bárbara | Urtaza Torres | Mexico | Platform under consideration |
| Kim | van Nieuwaal | Netherlands | Dutch knowledge portal on adaptation, https://ruimtelijkeadaptatie.nl/ and (local) https://kli-maatje.nl/ |

Appendix 3. Commentary questions and responses

For CoastADAPT Australia

| | | |
|-------------------|--|--|
| From South Africa | How are the multiple sources of climate data managed to ensure the consistent messaging (one single source of truth)? | The National Climate Change Adaptation Research Facility (NCCARF) was commissioned by the Australian government Department of the Environment to ‘produce a coastal climate risk management tool to ... assist coastal decision makers understand future climate risks and provide practical guidance on how the manage the associated physical, social and economic risks’. Being a National tool, it needed to direct users to authoritative data that had been prepared by data generating organisations such as CSIRO, Geoscience Australia and the Cooperative Research Centre for Spatial Information. NCCARF worked with these organisations to process data into formats appropriate for and useful to coastal managers. CoastAdapt delivers its own data products tailored to user needs and accompanied by guidance material written in clear non-technical language. Refer to the following paper for further information: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10584-018-2200-8 |
| | Should the packaging, communication and dissemination to communities focus mainly on socio-economic impacts (it was easy for communities to understand when the cost of insurance was linked to their risk profile)? | The target audience for CoastAdapt is coastal managers, rather than communities. From a local government experience working with communities and landowners, talking about socio-economic impacts is useful as they can think about how natural hazard risk affects them personally. In the future, if people are unable to insure a property, they will be unable to gain a bank loan to fund the purchase of a property which severely limits the market (eg. self-funded cash buyers only) and property value. Also refer to: https://coastadapt.com.au/sites/default/files/information_manual/IM09_community_engagement.pdf |
| | How can adaptation planning that is usually long term be mainstreamed into strategies, plans and strategies which are normally short term (5 year and reviewed annually)? | As a local government, we are managing coastal hazard risks in our Strategic Risk Register. The threat of coastal hazards will only increase over time so it will always be a risk that requires management in the long-term. Mackay Regional Council’s approach to risk management is based on the Australian/New Zealand Standard ISO 31000:2018 Risk Management – Principles and Guidelines. Our Enterprise Risk Management Framework guides the identification, assessment, and management of strategic risks across the organisation. We undertake annual risk assessments, where risks are reviewed and assessed, and control actions are identified to mitigate risks. Figure 3 shows the spread of our strategic risks by risk category. |
| | How can project ownership be transferred to communities to ensure sustainability beyond the project funding particularly where projects were not funded by communities? | We have local coastal plans which target on the ground activities where interested members of the community are able to participate in activities such as tree planting days, clean-up days, education and art activities. An approach we are starting to use in local government is CoDesign. CoDesign is currently being used in public spaces to improve water quality outcomes. The Co-Design approach encourages governments to work together with their communities to design spaces that include |

| | | |
|------------------|---|--|
| | | local communities and their environmental, cultural, social and economic values of place. By working together, we build stronger, more connected communities, we create spaces that are usable, loveable and appropriate for local community needs and we help protect and maintain those values that locals value. |
| | What informed the classification on avoid, accommodate, protect, retreat and attack (i.e. are there thresholds/tipping points that informed the classification) | These are the options available and these options can be combined to develop a plan of action. The choices need to consider: Cost of response, cost of avoided impact, use of the land and value of the land and its assets and length of protection (short to long-term). We find that the thresholds/tipping points will be different for each coastal community, so they are best prepared at the local 'beach' scale. For further information: https://coastadapt.com.au/sites/default/files/infographics/15-117-NCCARFINFOGRAPHICS-3-Updated.pdf |
| From Philippines | What was the journey to getting to this level of detail and process? What were the major challenges and lessons? Which stage was the most challenging or required the most work/rework and why? What could you have done differently? What features are most/least useful/used? | Refer to the following paper for further information: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10584-018-2200-8 |
| | What are the main challenges encountered by the users in using the tool (i.e. what stage of the process - from identifying challenges to M&E - is the most difficult/challenging) and implementing the adaptation strategies? | Users are often time poor and sometimes decisions are more reactionary or rushed. Other factors are having incentives and/or budgets to undertake adaptation planning and lack of in-house capacity and expertise to know what information may be able to assist. Hopefully in the future when there is an improved understanding of the benefits of adaptation, more investment will be made into ongoing adaptation planning and research. |
| | Who are the main users of the platform? How do the actors engage with the platform? What are the metrics used to measure user engagement? | The main users are coastal managers seeking to adapt. As it is a public and free resource, users may also come from the community, private or public sectors; essentially anyone with an interest in climate change and sea-level rise, whether professionally or as a concerned citizen. |
| | How were consultations conducted? | Extensive engagement was undertaken with practitioners before commencing the design and at all stages of the build, in order to ensure usefulness and usability. This included a number of activities to understand what was wanted from CoastAdapt in terms of content and mode of delivery and comprised a national meeting, 13 regional workshops in all state capitals and some large regional centres, and an online survey. Letters were sent to all coastal local councils in Australia to inform them of opportunities to participate, and activities were publicised through the NCCARF website and newsletter. The survey was completed by 313 individuals. The workshops were attended by 330 people. There will be some crossover between the two categories. A Tool Development Partnership was established to provide feedback on the content throughout the process. This comprised individuals from eight local councils, one regional grouping of councils and one small business. |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>Workshops (16) were held across Australia to introduce potential users to CoastAdapt and seek comment.</p> <p>Refer to the following paper for further information: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10584-018-2200-8</p> |
| | <p>How did developers ensure consistency/alignment with national frameworks/processes and participation of stakeholders in the process?</p> | <p>The Funding Agreement for CoastAdapt dictated that the framework should be national in scope and should address the needs of coastal managers from the public and private sectors. It was to focus on less well-resourced entities, especially local councils with small revenues and, to a lesser extent, small businesses operating in or dependent on the coastal zone. The Funding Agreement outlined governance arrangements that ensured, through three committees, that there was input from all levels of government, key potential users, such as the infrastructure and water resource sectors, and technical experts.</p> |
| | <p>Do the tools address the cascading of strategy, operations, implementation from national policies to local actors? If so, how is this achieved?</p> | <p>To ensure <i>accessibility</i>, CoastAdapt was designed with different entry points, intended for users across the spectrum of knowledge, roles, and needs. Thus, the ‘Getting started’ webpages provide role-specific suggestions for users ranging from community groups to elected council officers. Web pages are stratified into ‘skimmer’, ‘wader’, and ‘diver’ information of increasing detail and complexity.</p> <p>Information Manuals provide additional detail and greater insights on key topics of relevance to adaptation practitioners and decision makers. The ten topics were identified in consultation with potential users of CoastAdapt. The Manuals were peer-reviewed and provide the scientific and technical underpinning and authoritative nature of CoastAdapt. The Manuals are extensively referenced from within CoastAdapt.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Building the knowledge base for adaptation action 2. Understanding sea-level rise and climate change, and associated impacts on the coastal zone 3. Available data, datasets and derived information to support coastal hazard assessment and adaptation planning 4. Assessing the costs and benefits of coastal climate adaptation 5. Adapting to long term coastal climate risks through planning approaches and instruments 6. Legal Risk. A guide to legal decision making in the face of climate change for coastal decision makers 7. Engineering solutions for coastal infrastructure 8. Coastal sediments, beaches and soft shores 9. Community engagement 10. Climate Change Adaptation Planning for Protection of Coastal Ecosystems |

For Climate-ADAPT, Europe

| | | |
|-------------------|---|--|
| From South Africa | What are the key issues and lessons learned that emanated from the session on improving complementarities and connecting needs and practices? | Content duplication is certainly one major issue. We have discussed about how to connect the existing platforms so that a user could be guided to the relevant information. However, this interoperability is not trivial, from an IT perspective, since the platforms have been created independently. |
| From Philippines | How do you manage/curate the multiple data sets, and the potential platform functionalities that may result from these data sets, to ensure cohesive integration? | Data we store in our database is made of qualitative information, so there is no need to have standardization. We publish information for several types of data, using a fixed template. Please see here: https://climate-adapt.eea.europa.eu/data-and-downloads/ . However, at the European level there is discussion on how to establish links to enable cross-harvesting among platforms: in this sense it would be advisable that we find a minimum data interchange standard. |
| | Do the multiple datasets also trigger continuous updating or development of platform features and functionalities in response to the data, and/or in creating more value for the user? How is this managed? | Updating of the database is carried out continuously by about 15 sectoral experts, who upload knowledge thought templates. Two of the managers of the platform perform a quality check on the database items uploaded. More information can be found in the profile here https://climate-adapt.eea.europa.eu/about/climate-adapt-profile-final_2019.pdf |
| | Can a platform like yours be scaled down to a more local level? Being an archipelago of over 1,700 islands, with over 150 regional languages and cultures, what might be our unique challenges? | Climate-ADAPT was created to provide information useful at the European level. Nevertheless, information on local level is also provided, e.g. though the case studies (https://climate-adapt.eea.europa.eu/knowledge/tools/case-studies-climate-adapt/) or adaptation options (https://climate-adapt.eea.europa.eu/knowledge/adaptation-information/adaptation-measures). We only provide information in English, and, thus, have been asked many times to provide content in national languages. It would be very resource intensive to translate all content, and it would take longer for the content to be available online. |

For Climate Buddy, Netherlands

| | | |
|-------------------|---|--|
| From South Africa | Does the expertise exist to maintain and update the platform by the end of the 3-year contract on maintenance or are there processes/mechanism to capacitate the municipality to maintain the platform? | No. It is a small municipality, and the expertise does not exist to maintain and update the platform. After the 3 years we have to evaluate the collaboration and see how we will continue the platform. |
| | How is the knowledge exchange and connections achieved between different platforms (i.e. soft or hard integration) and what are the lessons learned? | The municipality of Rhenen is part of a broader region Vallei and Velluwe and therefore part of the regional collaboration. All municipalities in the Netherlands are part of the national collaborations in the Dutch Delta plan and therefore stakeholder in the national platform. Climate Adaptation Services as an organisation is involved in the national, regional and local platforms so all of which are linked through personal working connections. This approach can help the flow of information in both directions e.g. creative ideas coming from the local level can be implemented at the national level. |
| | Clarity on whether the downscaling has been done at household level as the information on risk and vulnerability can be accessed by entering the address? | <p>For this tool we align with the stress tests that municipalities use to assess their climate risk and vulnerability. Two types of climate related information are used: risk of pluvial flooding and risk of heat stress during hot summer days.</p> <p>For indicating pluvial flooding, they look at the water depth of an extreme rain event (reoccurrence time of 250 years) by 2050. This is based on data from the KNMI (Met. Office) that has used regionally downscaled projections for the national reports.</p> <p>For heat stress, model calculations have been performed that indicate what locations in the municipality are likely to warm up during hot summer days, this includes variables like paved surfaces and the nearness of cooling elements like green, trees and water bodies.</p> <p>The maps values are translated to qualitative indicative measures because we don't want to provide false details. So, for example, the tool states: 'on your location you have a higher risk of flooding'. Or 'you are likely to experience heat stress during hot days because of a lack of cooling elements in your environment'.</p> <p>In the tool we don't focus so much on risk information. We just highlight why it is important. We've experienced that citizens are more likely to react given a positive perspective.</p> |
| | What mechanisms/processes are in place to ensure that measures that informed the climate label are implemented (particularly where no pictures are uploaded)? | <p>There are no mechanisms like this in place. At least not yet. It is really based on trust.</p> <p>The municipality is still working on a strategy on how to further stimulate the use of the tool. For example, by also providing financial incentives like subsidies or discounts in garden shops.</p> |

| | | |
|------------------|--|---|
| | | The municipality could require citizens to fill in the tool and upload a photo, in order to receive the discount or subsidy. |
| | What are the plans to sustain the platform beyond the funding support from national? | No plans yet. We will evaluate then and see how we will continue the platform. |
| From Philippines | How was the climate label feature developed? How is the climate label “computed” for? | <p>First of all: the label is used to give a general indication; it is not super precise as it does not use input data from the specific gardens and house.</p> <p>The label includes three themes: Decreasing flood risk, Decreasing heat risk , Increasing biodiversity</p> <p>For each of the themes a very broad and diverse set of measures is available in the measure data base. And these measures contribute in different levels to the theme. For a house and garden, the system assumes the ideal situation for the garden and the roof of the buildings. This represents the 100% score for the theme. This 100% score can be achieved in various ways by selecting a variety of measures.</p> <p>Each measure also represents points that contribute to the overall label. The measures that contribute to multiple themes, count as double. This means that if you choose integrated measures, your label will increase faster.</p> |
| | Since it the tool is targeting households, how will it attract citizens to use it? How will it track or monitor usage at the household level? | <p>We are still working on a strategy. But one idea is to use it in combination with projects by the municipality in public spaces. So, for example, when they are doing maintenance or construction works in a street or neighbourhood. When informing the local people about the work, they want to simultaneously stimulate the citizens to work on their private gardens and houses. They can then use the tool, to see what the citizens actually do.</p> <p>They may combine this with providing discounts on plants or making available gardening material at the time of the construction works.</p> |
| | With the goal of raising awareness and changing behaviors at the household level, how will it track or monitor usage, and success? What are the target indicators and/or metrics to ensure impact? | <p>Still working on a strategy. In general, monitoring of progress of adaption is becoming an important theme in the Netherlands. Most municipalities have now assessed their risks and have come up with general adaptation strategies. Now the question arises: how can we monitor if it actually works? And when do we regard ourselves as climate robust?</p> <p>The objective of the tool is to increase awareness and invite action. Increasing awareness is difficult to measure without using big surveys. The municipalities will probably look at specific neighbourhoods that are most problematic, to see if any improvements are made.</p> |

For KliVO, Germany

| | | |
|-------------------|--|---|
| From South Africa | Who does the quality proofing of the information that goes to the portal? | An external project team does the quality proofing for each service. Beforehand, the provider completes a questionnaire, in which specific questions on different quality criteria are asked. The final approval of a service is done by the Inter-ministerial Working Group on Adaptation, which is the steering committee for the portal. |
| | How are the dynamics and different perspectives managed between users and providers in the user provider network? | As one of the goals is to connect users and providers and facilitate learning, the different perspectives are really welcome and enhance the understanding for each other. Providers have the chance to improve their services while learning from the practical experiences by practitioners. The other way around, local users get to know more background on specific services, can ask individual questions and learn from other examples, how services were implemented. It is helpful to have a mandate from a specific committee for the tasks of the network, as well as for the general direction of the platform. All the work done should be in accordance with this mandate. Thereby, you can pre-select issues to be discussed and the results can feed into a overall process. |
| | Can you please expand more on open formats and limited pre-structuring? | We tried different forms of group work, for example we presented climate services from the provider and user perspective. During another event, participants developed own ideas for measures against heat stress and discussed possible climate services that could be helpful in developing and implementing those measures. During another meeting on tools for climate change communication, people presented instruments they have applied and exchanged their experiences with climate change communication. This hands-on approach worked out well. We often conceptualized the workshops with a specific overarching question in mind and an idea, how the results of the discussion should be structured and documented. However, discussions cannot be planned or structures beforehand easily and often it turned out, that people wanted to exchange their experience and learn from each other. It is a bit of a challenge to stick to your goals and go out of a workshop with a specific result or food for thoughts, and on the other hand you want to facilitate learning and exchange. |
| From Philippines | How and in what stage of development were the members chosen and the network assembled? Are there defined roles or responsibilities? | The network was planned from the beginning on, and portal and network were conceptualized together. Thus, when we conducted the interview with users and requested the services from the providers, we ask those persons if they were interested in participating in the network. Other people were asked directly, as we had established contacts to specific stakeholders from former events and stakeholder dialogs. Of course, the network members are rather representatives of |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | <p>specific groups of actors, regions or sectors and it is not possible to include all users and providers in the network.</p> <p>The network has a mandate from the Inter-ministerial working group on adaptation, that works on the adaptation strategy and is the steering committee for the portal.</p> <p>We did not implement roles or responsibilities, as we want every member to bring in as much capacity as he or she is capable of. Of course, some persons are more active than others.</p> |
| | <p>How does the user network enhance platform development? What value and inputs does the network provide? What are the limitations of such a network, if any?</p> | <p>Before the launch, we talked about the expectations of the members for the network itself and the portal. We considered this in the further planning of the meetings and development of the portal. After the launch, we discussed the first experiences with the portal on a workshop and what kind of improvements are desired. The operating and technical team screened, clustered and discussed all feedback regarding the implementation of the recommendations for improvement. Every meeting we give a short feedback on what we have improved and changed, and participants can give new feedback.</p> <p>It is really valuable to have the possibility to collect feedback from an experienced group of people. The network gives new input in terms of new services or contact to users. Also, the people are great multiplier for the portal as they are kind of ambassadors, e.g. they link the logo and website on their website. However, the network members have limited capacity in supporting the network and the main responsibility to further develop the portal is still in the hand of the operators.</p> |
| | <p>What strategies have been most effective in (1) managing diverse, or even conflicting, needs of stakeholders in the network, particularly as far as platform development is concerned? (2) managing meetings and discussions to ensure highly productive sessions? Is this where open format with limited pre-structuring is useful? How does this work?</p> | <p>(see answers to South Africa above)</p> |

For ICLEI Canada/BARC:

This presentation was not available in time for questions to be sent in by the discussants. Contributions and responses from our Canadian colleagues are included within the plenary discussion (Appendix 4).

Appendix 4. Plenary discussion

1. *Are there examples of developing effective peer-cohort models among local actors?*

ICLEI Canada: we tend to group local authorities into peer-cohorts depending on specific commonalities. e.g. geography, demography, common climate impacts, stage of adaptation action etc. This allows municipalities to work collaboratively and support each other as they progress over a period of time. We also have collaborative implementation groups helping peer-groups share knowledge at the action stage. Here cohorts are based on thematic sectors depending on what they are trying to accomplish e.g. green and natural infrastructure, community outreach and citizen engagement, and communications and KE within local government. We find peer-cohort models are great for making it easier for people to communicate online (see Q4); where people are already grouped into cohorts they are more likely to use email list-serves etc. as the conversations tend to be more tailored and focused.

Climate Northern Ireland: we have launched a new initiative for our 11 local authorities. This has been developed to achieve the maximum support for our very limited time/resource, and takes a dual-approach. We have established a Local Government Climate Action Network (involving local councils, central government & NGOs) which offers authorities the chance to learn from each other and to converse with key partners. We then support this with a web platform which provides the framework and information for adaptation at a very practical level, including agendas and sector factsheets (still partially under development, <https://climatenorthernireland.org.uk/NIAdapts/>).

Adaptation Scotland: we have several projects that bring people together to address adaptation collectively, e.g. a benchmarking working group of major organisations working together to track their adaptation progress and apply the Adaptation Capability Framework <https://www.adaptationscotland.org.uk/get-involved/our-projects/benchmarking-working-group>. We also have a workstream that supports place-based adaptation work - from cities, regions and islands through to locality projects. These projects bring stakeholders together to develop a business case for joined-up action to adapt. The most well-developed example of this is the Climate Ready Clyde initiative: <http://climatereadyclyde.org.uk/> which focuses on engagement in the Glasgow city region (involves 8 LAs and a high urban population, brings together sectors and communities to drive forward action and is now used as a blueprint for work in other areas of Scotland). We have also set up an adaptation and funding finance expert working group where we have adopted a very formal governance approach (chair, vice-chair, application process for membership etc.) and which has been very helpful as sector experts who are members lead the conversation and act as advocates to help focus engagement.

Climate Ireland: in 2018, the Irish National Adaptation Framework required the 31 local authorities to develop adaptation plans. Within the guidelines published to support the LAs, peer-learning is considered to be key both within and between LAs; the framework required the setting-up of four climate action regional offices (CAROs) which promote peer-learning, including at the local level, and help ensure a coordinated approach to adaptation planning across the country. The Dublin CARO focusses on urban impacts, the south CARO covers coastal erosion, the north CARO focusses on flooding, and the central CARO concentrates on inland flooding. Climate Ireland now works primarily with the CAROs to provide capacity building programmes, expertise and training, and sectoral links.

CoastAdapt, Australia: we used champions to represent groups of likely users as part of a Tool Development and Implementation Partnership. This worked as a 2-way exchange. We learnt a lot from these working groups and tested our ideas and format of delivery with these partners. They

then worked as mentors to their peers and real champions of the platform. More information is given in Robyn Birkett's presentation; CoastAdapt is a common reference in the recent Coastal Hazard Adaptation Strategies being developed by local governments in Queensland through the QCoast2100 program (www.qcoast2100.com.au).

2. Do any participants have experience with embedding providers / researchers within local authorities as a means of better understanding context and of building capacity?

UK Climate Resilience Programme: We have just started funding a set of embedded researchers - they will work in a range of organisations to develop capacity (both of the organisation and the researcher), share knowledge, understand constraints etc. For example, one of this first cohort will be working in a city council to help develop public facing material and initiatives on heat stress.

3. How do individual platforms not only providing information to local actors but also capture the experiences and lessons learned by the actors?

Netherlands: Climate Adaptation Services as an organisation is involved in the national, regional and local platforms so all of which are linked through personal working connections. This approach can help the flow information in both directions e.g. creative ideas coming from the local level can be implemented at the national level.

CoastAdapt, Australia: in rolling out CoastAdapt we worked with about 10 test cases - mostly local government, but also businesses - and each developed case studies of their experience that were then included on the platform. More broadly, we also called for case studies for adaptors to share information about their adaptation work.

Climate-ADAPT: we have a section on projects (<https://climate-adapt.eea.europa.eu/knowledge/adaptation-information/research-projects>) where we provide information and links to the project themselves. We also have a section where we provide information on how public authorities have used the knowledge on the Platform (<https://climate-adapt.eea.europa.eu/knowledge/climate-adapt-use-cases>). Whilst this is primarily focused on providing the information, but we are trying to collect information on uptake and use so we can identify why information was used and how.

KliVO, Germany: in the near future, we will include short reports from users of specific climate services about their experiences in using the service and implementing adaptation action. They will also give recommendations for the further development of the service.

Netherlands: we also have a section on examples. How have others tackled similar issues and how have others used certain tools and data. <https://ruimtelijkeadaptatie.nl/english/examples/>.

Sweden: there is a section with examples/case studies <http://www.klimatanpassning.se/en/cases>. We have about 50 cases in English at the moment but many more in Swedish.

ICLEI Canada: sharing of knowledge generated within LAs is challenging but very important. We have tried to create and share useable fact sheets, case studies and check lists that share both the action and lessons learnt (what worked and also what didn't work to help users avoid the same mistakes. We also act as a broker to allow LAs to discuss issues between themselves (which does help overcome the problem of champions moving on).

4. Do platforms host a chat or 'dating site' for local adaptation practitioners - to facilitate the efficient exchange of ideas and to make contacts?

KliVO, Germany: we have been hesitant in the past as it could be perceived to be yet another forum etc. but we are looking to providing opportunities of people to meet virtually. We tend to find that people like a more open forum without too much structure to allow peer-group learning.

ICLEI Canada: We have done this at in-person events where we have 'speed-dating' sessions where people can sit and exchange on a specific topic. We also attempted to run this approach via online chats but with limited success in getting users to post questions (they tend to surf only) and it's even more challenging to get people to respond. Most success comes from email which is easy to use, already on, and allows on-going conversations e.g. via a listserv. This tends to suggest that significant investment by platforms in hi-tech hubs, online fora etc. is not sensible.

Netherlands: similar experience as in Canada. Very difficult to get people to interact and also difficult to engage people who have experience to respond. We are now trying a match-making approach – a user poses a question and is then matched with a respondent with suitable experience. One challenge is how to collect this information for dissemination beyond one-to-one discussions.

Adaptation Scotland: We have run 'adaptation hour' events during lockdown restriction which are limited to 20 people to allow for more informal discussion. We facilitate the debate and pick a general topic to start discussions. The aim is to provide support across colleagues.

Sweden: we have often found it difficult to get people to be active on online chats etc., and they can require significant administrative resources to run.

CoastAdapt, Australia: we started 'CoastExchange' which was intended to be a virtual community of practice. We also found we had a lot of 'watchers' but few initiators suggesting keen interest but we had to encourage partners to feed information. We also set up an 'Ask the expert' forum as part of that and took suggested questions each month and then asked members of a college of experts to respond. We also posted regular stories to try to encourage more conversations. I think we didn't have enough time to really build momentum. Our biennial conferences were a great way to initiate networks but in general we found that informal email exchange was more useful.

CFKN, India: our climate finance knowledge platform was launched in 2019 and aims to provide knowledge to local actors. We have an online space for local actors to contribute to discussions on common issues but it is a challenge to encourage actors to engage - email has worked.

Germany: some good examples of participation approaches especially at the local/regional level can be found at: <https://www.umweltbundesamt.de/publikationen/adapting-to-climate-change-good-participation>. These are aimed at interested stakeholders from administrative and civic organisations at the local and regional level to help inspire the design and implementation of successful participation events (from "GoApply – Multidimensional Governance of Climate Change Adaptation in Policy Making and Practice", a project funded by the EU Alpine Space Programme).

Taiwan: we also find email a useful, simple approach. We have done a lot of user interactions and similar activities but can find it resource-intensive and not always effective as different actors have such different expectations. The flexibility of email allows respondents' time for reflection and consideration rather than a quick reply.

5. How do you measure the success of a platform, as part of continuous learning and improvement and for demonstrating value?

Climate Ireland: we are currently being evaluated by our funders who are interested in understanding how we have empowered users. In general, we feel it's good to be reviewed regularly as it forces you to consider the approaches used, actions and value etc. And it can be very interesting and informative to look at impact achieved, e.g. references in, and input to, adaptation plans at local and sectoral levels, responses to users, uptake, etc. One issue is that it can be difficult if reviewers only look at the online aspects of a platform (i.e. the website), and don't always appreciate the offline efforts (personal meetings, response to enquiries, building of communities, development of guidance etc.).

CARO, Ireland: To support the comment above, we (Dublin CARO) are being interviewed as part of the Climate Ireland review. We have emphasised the work Climate Ireland have done with local authorities and CAROs that is not necessarily reflected on the platform/website; any assessment of a platform should be qualitative and quantitative in terms of platform services and work areas.

Germany: We had an online questionnaire running for some months on the website, asking about the background of users, their interests and how they like different elements of the portal. Unfortunately, it was only answered by a few visitors. We found it much more helpful to directly talk to user groups, to present at events etc. as they can try out the portal and give direct feedback.

ICLEI, Canada: there is a general temptation to use quantitative indicators such as no. of users, no. of downloads, no. of resources etc. But these types of metrics do not necessarily give an indication of the impact of those indicators. Rather, it can be more useful to reflect on what those users have done with the information. We have tried to document what is the range of impacts that have been identified, what (and how many) adaptive actions have been implemented, what has enabled the implementation, what is the diversity of community partners that have been engaged? These metrics are far harder to collect but can give a much better sense of what has been accomplished. We have had some success with our annual National Measures Survey where we ask people to complete a questionnaire addressing these questions annually. We also do this through entry surveys (when someone joins the platform) and exit surveys (what has improved when they finish with a particular project or program of the platform). In general, we need to educate funders that this qualitative information is meaningful and useful for evaluating the work of a platform.

CoastAdapt, Australia: as part of the funding we had an external M&E program. This meant we had a set of objectives from the start, a log frame etc. This approach showed early promising results in terms of up-take and behavior change. But without on-going funding the evaluation wasn't continued. Monitoring google analytics showed clear spikes in activity following specific activities (e.g. training events, roll-out workshops etc.), but, again, not the impact.

Netherlands: Our national portal has been running since 2014. One measurement we use for success is visitors of the website. We have 600 visitors on a weekday. We also have a helpdesk where questions are asked and can be monitored. Offline we organise user groups to get feedback. We also have an online feedback form but it is poorly used.

Taiwan: our platform has been running for a decade now. We track the number of researchers that have applied for and used our climate data for relevant applications, and the number of publications that used/cited our data is one solid indicator for us. We also send out regular questionnaires and host activities to interact with users. In addition, we are trying to explore ways of tracking how

adaptation policy, strategy, actions etc. have progressed because of our platform but agree this is very difficult to monitor effectively.

Sweden: we use Google Analytics and look at user statistics/data (what are the most popular content etc.) and evaluate this every year. And then every second or third year we do more qualitative interviews with users to gain feedback.

UK: the UK Climate Resilience Programme is a research programme so not platform but as the outputs need to be useful and usable, we are developing evaluation criteria to reflect this. Criteria include research excellence, positioning of the outputs for use, impact (what has changed as a result), building of networks, engagement of users in the research process. These are then scored base on a scale from 'unacceptable' to 'very good'.

Climate-ADAPT: Have been evaluated internally recently looking to address questions focused both on our objectives and also addressing question that were being used at the time to evaluate the EU Adaptation Strategy. A major outcome from evaluation was a restructuring of the website to help people better access information. But it is very difficult to evaluate whether the decision-making process has been improved.(Self)-evaluation outcomes and process are available at: EEA Report 3/2018 'Sharing adaptation information across Europe'

<https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/sharing-adaptation-information-across-europe> complemented by the ETC/CCA Technical Paper 2/2018 'Sharing adaptation knowledge across Europe: Evidence for the evaluation of Climate-ADAPT' https://www.eionet.europa.eu/etcs/etc-cca/products/etc-cca-reports/tp_2-2018.

Philippines: we agree that's there's that tendency to focus more on the quantitative indicators, if only by virtue of convenience, but this is not necessarily measuring impacts. But besides the data from the annual report and entry/exit surveys, we are seeking advice on maybe looking at proxy qualitative indicators (if any) and how best to monitor indicators over time.

6. How have platforms responded to COVID-19 restrictions?

ICLEI Canada: the need to work online has certainly opened up events to wider audiences without the need for time and resources to support travel. Technical issues can still be a problem with live online activities and for large parts in Canada connectivity is still an issue which limits the ability of some to interact virtually, hence the need for recordings and links online to allow for retrospective viewing. Face-to-face connections including via video links really does boost personal connections so one benefit may be that the enforced use video links may promote enhanced personal connections which can then be developed later.

Netherlands: hope for a positive outcome in that the need to work online has emphasised the value of knowledge platforms and of investing in the technical side of platforms which can allow knowledge exchange to continue.