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I. INTRODUCTION

The second edition of the Open European Day took place in Bonn on the 28th of May 2014. The event was jointly organized by ICLEI and EEA, with main support from the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety, support from different organizations including the European Investment Bank, the European Commission, DG CLIMA and DG RTD, European initiatives such as Mayors Adapt, and European projects such as URBES.

This year’s edition was successful in fostering debate and exchanging valuable information between cities and a dialogue with researchers and European institutions. This confirmed and reinforced the organizers’ opinion regarding the necessity and usefulness of the Open European Day, as well as the validity of the interactive methodology applied. The high participation, the open and lively dialogue experienced, the valuable information shared and the positive feedback received by participants clearly signaled the high interest to have a third edition of the conference in 2015, a challenge which the organizers have decided to take on, provided that adequate funding sources are available.

The current report integrates the content findings presented in the official conference report (Annex IV) by highlighting the results obtained by the organizing committee with reference to its targets on participation, organization and participant satisfaction.
II. THE OPEN EUROPEAN DAY - PARTICIPATION

The Open European Day featured 149 registered participants (the list of registered participants can be found in Annex III). Out of these, 106 attended to the event, registering a no-show rate of 29%, in line with the normal rates of conferences.

This section provides some more in depth analysis about the composition of the participants of the Open European Day.

A balance in gender was reached during the event. Out of the 106 attendees, 63 were women while 43 were men (Figure 1). Gender was balanced also amongst speakers and contributors to the day. As figure 2 shows, exactly 50% of the contributors were male and 50% female.

![Gender - Participants](image1)

![Gender - Speakers](image2)
Another important factor to be observed is the presence of several attendees, who also participated in last year’s conference. This is a clear sign of the positive evaluation of the day by participants and of the effectiveness of the methodology used and the value of the contributions made. In this sense, the Open European Day established itself as a platform to foster exchange and to meet to discuss urban adaptation-related issues with relevant actors. Of course, several “new” participants took part in the event, enlarging and enriching the OED community.

Composition of participants during the day

As stated in our proposal, the Open European Day is not only an event on cities, but it is the place where cities are the main protagonists. This appears clear if having a look at the composition of the contributors to the day (a programme of the day can be found in Annex II).

Also the participants’ composition reveals a high share of cities which is normally unusual in European conferences. This figure is very positive especially taking into account the delicate economical situation in Europe. The interest of cities in participating in the event can anyway be considered even stronger than this figure reveals. In fact, during the promotional campaign, several cities highlighted their wish to participate, but flagged the impossibility to do so due to lack of resources.

In order to give the opportunity to participate and share their experience to most cities possible, the organizational team sought ways to finance the attendance of some of the cities that acted as contributors during the conference sessions. Specifically, the European Environment Agency reimbursed the travel and accommodation expenses of three participants:

- The City of Lodz (Poland);
- The City of Venice (Italy);
- The City of Beograd (Serbia).

In its turn, the Directorate-General for Research and Innovation contributed by reimbursing the expenses for other seven participants:

- The City of Almada (Portugal);
- The City of Sfantu Georghe (Romania);
- The City of Padova (Italy);
- The City of Ancona (Italy);
- The City of Bratislava (Slovakia);
- The City of London (United Kingdom);
- The City of Burgas (Bulgaria).

As it can be observed from the composition of the cities financed, this also made possible participation by several cities from Eastern and Southern Europe, which are mostly hit by the economic crisis.

Having a look at the participant composition (please see Figure 3), it becomes clear how some of the most relevant actors for European urban adaptation were present at the event. The European level as well as organizations representing other tiers of government (national, regional) was present. Researchers and consultants joined the day, sharing their knowledge on datasets and technical adaptation measures. The importance of working with the private sector was repeatedly highlighted during the day, therefore it was crucial that private sector representatives joined the conference and could discuss with cities directly.

![Composition Diagram](image)

Figure 3

Considering the above, it can be stated that the Conference target group has been definitely reached.

When having a look at the speakers’ composition (Figure 4), it emerges clearly how the structure of the Open European is unique. Almost half of the contributors to the day were city representatives. This, coupled with an informal and interactive setting created the possibility to have a heads-on exchange between contributors and with the audience.
Geographical coverage

As it is possible to see in the graphic below (Figure 5) all European regions (Northern, Southern, Eastern and Central) were represented at the event. In this occasion, participants from Central\(^1\) and Southern Europe represented the majority groups.

17 of the 28 EU Member States were represented at the event, namely: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, and The United Kingdom.

Furthermore, the presence of organizations such as the EIB, the European Commission, ICLEI, Climate Alliance and Eurocities, which represent and support cities Europe-wide further enhanced the impact of the OED.

---
\(^1\) The groupings were made as follows: Southern Europe: Italy, Portugal, Spain; Central Europe: Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Luxembourg; Eastern Europe: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Poland, Romania, Slovakia; Northern Europe: Denmark, Finland, The Netherlands, and United Kingdom.
III. THE MARKETPLACE

An introduction of this last edition of the Open European Day has been the “Marketplace”, a space thought to help even further the exchange between cities, institutions and stakeholders. The presence of the Marketplace gave an ideal opportunity to participants to exchange and be informed about new publications, projects and initiatives. This setting gave the opportunity to participants to directly access institutions such as the EIB and DG RTD and to ask for clarifications on the potential support initiatives and schemes that they could offer to them. Some impressions of the Marketplace can be found below. If a further edition of the Open European Day were to be organized, this feature could be surely repeated.
IV. COFFEE BREAKS, LUNCH AND FINAL RECEPTION

Social moments during the event catered for networking and exchange. The coffee breaks took place in extended form during the Marketplace. The service and food were appropriate and so was the lunch provided in the cafeteria. A final reception took place to offer a final occasion for participants to mingle and reflect on the outcomes of the day.
V. PARTICIPANTS’ FEEDBACK

As a conclusion of this edition of the Open European Day, Participants were provided with a questionnaire to evaluate the day and give feedback on future steps. The questionnaire was provided both as a printed and an on-line version (the participant feedback form can be found in Annex I).

The questionnaire addressed the Open European Day as a whole, considering logistics and organizations, but also content and approach. Space was left for participants to give open comments and suggestions.

Generally, participants declared themselves very satisfied with the event, both with the overall organization and the outputs. At this stage, feedback forms are being still collected, so that further input can be gathered.

Furthermore, the questionnaire provided input and new ideas to structure the Open European Day more and more around what participants wish.

VI. VISIBILITY OF BMUB

The supporting institutions have been granted visibility during the whole duration of the communication and promotional campaign. The BMUB has been always and consistently indicated as the main sponsor of the event. This has been done particularly through the following channels:

- The OED webpage, in which the supporters’ logos are visible and prominent (http://resilient-cities.iclei.org/bonn2014/open-european-day/)
- The various mass mailings sent, in which the supporters’ role was clearly indicated
- The twitter campaign: a ‘tweet’ was specifically dedicated to the support of the BMUB (#CitiesAdapt2014 German Federal Ministry for Environment #BMUB is Open European Day’s main supporter! http://bit.ly/1te1kOu Join us in Bonn)
- The programme (Annex II) and the slide deck of the event, on which logos and roles of supporters were clearly indicated.

Of course, the support obtained by the BMUB during the day was also clearly flagged by the main facilitator during plenary sessions.
VII. NEXT STEPS

Attached to the present report is the Official Conference Final Report (Annex IV), presenting the findings and key messages of the Open European Day. This will be produced in two versions, a long and a short version. Whereas the longer version presents a more in-detail description of the discussions occurred during the day, the short version will present key findings that can be used as “policy pointers” to identify main challenges and needs and ideas to progress adaptation.

For the event, a dedicated twitter account was created. This will be maintained and it is expected to grow in followers over the next year. A LinkedIn group for the conference will be created and participants will be invited to join. The support of social media will be not only instrumental in better targeting the promotion and communication campaign for the next edition of the OED, but also to respond to participants’ requests for an exchange platform to share information and create a network around the event.

As stated in the report introduction, considering the very positive feedback obtained and the quality of the contributions and discussions which took place during the day, the organization team will very soon start planning for a 2015 edition of the Open European Day.
Dear participant,

Thanks for taking part in the second edition of the Open European Day! In order to help us improving our performance in the future, we would like to ask you to give us your feedback, indicating what worked well and what should be improved.

1. How satisfied are you ...

   -- overall with the Open European Day?
     ○ extremely satisfied ○ very satisfied ○ satisfied ○ somewhat unsatisfied ○ unsatisfied

   -- with the organisation of the conference?
     ○ extremely satisfied ○ very satisfied ○ satisfied ○ somewhat unsatisfied ○ unsatisfied

     Comments and/or proposals for future events (optional):

     Which topics did you miss and propose to discuss at future events?

   -- with the programme content?
     ○ extremely satisfied ○ very satisfied ○ satisfied ○ somewhat unsatisfied ○ unsatisfied

   -- with the interactive style?
     ○ extremely satisfied ○ very satisfied ○ satisfied ○ somewhat unsatisfied ○ unsatisfied
Where the size and number of workshops suitable (if no, specify why)?

Yes  o  
No   o  

—with the facilitation during the conference?

○ extremely satisfied  ○ very satisfied  ○ satisfied  ○ somewhat satisfied  ○ unsatisfied

Comments and/or proposals for future events:

—with the selection of speakers and composition of contributors and participants?

○ extremely satisfied  ○ very satisfied  ○ satisfied  ○ somewhat satisfied  ○ unsatisfied

If you were “somewhat unsatisfied” or “unsatisfied”, please specify why:

—with the outcomes of the conference?

○ extremely useful  ○ very useful  ○ useful  ○ not useful  ○ not at all useful

If „not useful“ or „not at all useful“, please specify why:

Please highlight the most useful learning of the day:

—with the clarity of communication (website, announcements, emails etc.)?

○ extremely satisfied  ○ very satisfied  ○ satisfied  ○ somewhat satisfied  ○ unsatisfied

Comments and/or proposals for future events:
with the venue (place, rooms, equipment)?

- extremely satisfied
- very satisfied
- satisfied
- somewhat satisfied
- unsatisfied

If a similar event was to be organized, it would be important for you that...

- there is no or only a low participation fee
- the meeting is on a normal workday
- the next Open European Day is back to back to the Resilient Cities conference?

Specify which would be the max. participant fee that you would like to pay:

2. Which session was most interesting to you (choose up to three)?

1A Integrated vulnerability assessment
1B Sector-based vulnerabilities & solutions
1C Climate data & projections in practice
2A Decision-making, costs and benefits
2B Nature based and win-win solutions
2C Options for adaptation funding
3A Mayors Adapt: Making adaptation to climate change work
3B Enabling national frameworks
3C Multi-level and regional governance in practice

Please motivate your answer:

and which sessions did you find least interesting (choose up to three)?

1A Integrated vulnerability assessment
1B Sector-based vulnerabilities & solutions
1C Climate data & projections in practice
2A Decision-making, costs and benefits
2B Nature based and win-win solutions
2C Options for adaptation funding
3A Mayors Adapt: Making adaptation to climate change work
3B Enabling national frameworks
3C Multi-level and regional governance in practice

Please motivate your answer:

3. For the continuation, would you be interested in...

- A similar conference in one or two years time?
- Informal networking, e.g. an interest group on LinkedIn?
- Any other form or exchange?

In case you choose “other” please specify:

4. What do you think about the OED Marketplace?

- Extremely useful
- Very useful
- Useful
- Less useful
- Not at all useful

5. Do you have any other comments that did not fit above?
6. What kind of organisation do you represent?

- Local Government  ○
- EU Commission or other organisation  ○
- International organisation  ○
- Research institute  ○
- Business  ○
- Consultant  ○
- Other  ○

In case you choose “other” please specify:

7. Are you participating in one of the partner projects of this event?

- Urban Project  ○
- Majors Adapt Initiative  ○

Your name and email address (optional)

Name ___________________________ Surname ___________________________

e-mail __________________________

Would you like to receive an alert on future publications resulting from the Open Day?

Yes  ○
No  ○

Thank you very much for your time and your contribution!
Annex II

PROGRAMME

Resilient Cities 2014

Open European Day
at Resilient Cities 2014
European Cities Adapt to Climate Change
Gustav-Stresemann-Institut, Bonn, 28 May 2014

Organised by
ICLEI
European Environment Agency

Main Supporter
Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz, Bau und Reaktorsicherheit

Supporters
European Investment Bank

Endorsed by

EUROPEAN CITIES

NEXT STEPS | ICLEI - Europe
PROGRAMME OVERVIEW

09:00-09:30  REGISTRATION

09:30-10:30  OPENING SESSION

Facilitator: Astrid Westerlund Wigström, Senior Adaptation Expert - ICLEI - European Secretariat

- Welcome and Introduction - Birgit Georgi, European Environment Agency and Holger Robrecht, ICLEI - European Secretariat
- Cities talking to cities – which progress did they make? (Rotterdam, Sfantu Gheorghe, Bratislava, Almada, Bologna)
- Interviews with main event supporters and key stakeholders (Mayors Adapt – Andreas Kress, European Commission - DG Research & Innovation – Elef Manoli, European Investment Bank – Abhilash Panda UNISDR (tbc))
- Programme overview

10:30-11:30  THEME 1: VULNERABILITY AND RISK ASSESSMENTS – GETTING STARTED AND CREATING A BASIS FOR TARGETED ACTION

Room: S30-32  Session 1A – Integrated vulnerability assessments

Leading questions:
- How to organise and implement city wide assessments that are useful for planning?
- What information and data is needed?
- How can an assessment look like? Which form is sufficient/helpful?
- How can the process be organised? Who should do it? What is a useful level of participation?

Facilitator: Alistair Ford, Tyndall Centre/ University of Newcastle

Contributors:
Marie Gantois, City of Paris
Griet Lambrechts, City of Antwerp
Nancy Salch, European Investment Bank

Room: S34-35  Session 1B – Sector-based vulnerabilities & solutions

Leading questions:
- How to assess the current adaptive capacity/resilience of priority sectors and systems?
- What practical city examples are there for different sectors and climate impacts?
- How can the relevant sectoral stakeholders get involved? What are the current challenges?

**Facilitator:** Anemie Wickmans, Norwegian University of Science and Technology  
**Contributors:**  
Annette Figueiredo, City of London  
Michele Zuin, City of Padova  
Nuno Lopes, City of Almada

**Room:** S25-26  
**Session 1C - Climate data & projections in practice**  
**Leading questions:**  
- How to make use of and identify appropriate downscaled climate projections?  
- Are there any simple ways/shortcuts one could use?  
- How to deal with the inherent uncertainty?  
- Which expertise is needed and what useful sources are there for end users?

**Facilitator:** Christian Kind, adelphi  
**Contributors:**  
Ton Verhoeven, City of Nijmegen  
Iana Koleva, City of Burgas  
Meinolf Kossmann, DWD - Deutscher Wetterdienst

**11:30-12:10**  
**Room:** S29-31  
**MARKETPLACE EXCHANGE AND COFFEE**

**12:10-13:10**  
**Room:** S25-26  
**Session 2A - Decision-making, costs, benefits and win-win solutions**  
**Leading questions:**  
- Which criteria for assessing alternative options for adaptation are available?  
- How are costs and benefits accounted for and how are they distributed?  
- How to move from “adaptation costs” to “investment in a sustainable and resilient urban future”?

**Facilitator:** Piero Pelizzaro, Kyoto Club  
**Contributors:**  
Corjan Gebraad, City of Rotterdam  
Zuzana Hudekova, City of Bratislava  
Michele Zuin, City of Padova

**Room:** S30-32  
**Session 2B - Nature-based win-win solutions**  
**Leading questions:**  
- How to best work with nature for adaptation?  
- How to take into account benefits created by ecosystem services?  
- How to ensure an active urban-rural interaction?

**Facilitator:** Pamela Mühlmann, ICLEI - European Secretariat
**Contributors:**
Chantal van Ham, International Union for Conservation of Nature
Irma Veniyol, City of Barcelona
Giovanni Fisii, City of Bologna
Sebastian Marcel Witte, City of Arnsberg
Ewa Sobocinska, City of Lodz

**Room: S34-35**
**Session 2C - Options for adaptation funding**

**Leading questions:**
- How can urban transitions and change be used to advancing adaptation?
- How can cities access European EU funding options for financing adaptation?
- Which alternative funding options do exist?
- How to use/integrate different budgets?

**Facilitator:** Peter Bosch, TNO

**Contributors:**
Nancy Sich, European Investment Bank
Sabine Lauxen, City of Oberhausen
Marco Cardinaletti, City of Ancona
Jana Koleva, City of Burgas

**13:10-14:30**
**Restaurant**
**LUNCH**

**14:30-15:30**
**Theme 3: Multi-level governance approaches and cooperation**

**Room: S34-35**
**Session 3A - Mayors adapt - Making adaptation to climate change work**

**Leading questions:**
- How to introduce adaptation in the municipal climate agenda?
- What is needed for concrete local actions?
- What kind of support for cities from the European Commission, from the national or regional governments is needed to enable or reinforce local adaptation action?

**Facilitator:** Andreas Kress, Climate Alliance

**Contributors:**
Natasa Djokic, City of Belgrad
Masimo Gattolin, Province of Venice
Cordine Lippert, City of Potsdam
Veronica Wirth, City of Munich
Rirgit Haupter, Infrastruktur und Umwelt

**Room: S25-26**
**Session 3B - Enabling national and regional frameworks**

**Leading questions:**
- How do different existing national frameworks facilitate or constrain urban adaptation?
- Predefining urban adaptation or enabling self-governance - which approach works better?
• How much and what support is needed?
  **Facilitator:** Michael Klinkenberg, Eurocities
  **Contributors:**
  Sebastian Marcel Witte, City of Arnsberg
  Andreas Vetter, Umweltbundesamt, Germany
  Gergely Buja, City of Manta Gheorghe
  Yann Françöse, City of Paris

**Room: S30-32**

**Session 3C:** Multi-level and regional governance in practice

**Leading questions:**
• What can be learned from concrete examples of multi-level governance?
• What is a successful institutional set-up for regional and multi-level approaches?
• Which arrangements and tools work?
  **Facilitator:** Holger Robrecht, ICLEI - European Secretariat
  **Contributors:**
  Ton Verhoeven, City of Nijmegen
  Maria Berrini, City of Milano
  Claudia Terzi, Lombardy Region

---

**15:30-16:15**

**Room: S29-31**

**MARKETPLACE EXCHANGE AND COFFEE**

---

**16:15-17:15**

**Room: S29-31**

**CLOSING PLENARY: WHAT ARE WE TAKING HOME? LESSONS LEARNED**

  **Facilitator:** Astrid Westerlind Wigström, Senior Adaptation Expert - ICLEI - European Secretariat

• Observers’ feedback on the day and inspirations from participants’ exchange (Lykke Leonardsen, City of Copenhagen; Efren Felu, Tecnalia; Jonathan Perks, Ricardo AEA)
• Outlook: Linking local and European adaptation action (Birgit Georgi, European Environment Agency and Holger Robrecht, ICLEI - European Secretariat)
• Next steps and thank you

---

**From 17:15**

**Foyer/Garden**

**FINAL RECEPTION**
## Open European Day
### European Cities Adapt to Climate Change

**Gustav-Stresemann-Institut, Bonn, 28 May 2014**

### Participant List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Al-Badri</td>
<td>Md. Shamin</td>
<td>Sylhet Municipality, Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>Md. Zulifik</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bahadur</td>
<td>Md. Shofiq</td>
<td>Overseas Development Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ballarin-Denti</td>
<td>Antonio</td>
<td>Fondazione Lombardia per l’Ambiente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Baten</td>
<td>Md. Abdul</td>
<td>Berga Municipality, Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bebikalia M.A.</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Zukunftspionier, GbR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Beckroge</td>
<td>Wolfgang</td>
<td>Regionalverband Ruhr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Beretti</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Agenzia Mobilità Ambiente e Territorio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bobkins</td>
<td>Kerry</td>
<td>Gauing City Region Observatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Borri</td>
<td>Claudio</td>
<td>Birese per Roma, City of Rome municipal agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bosch</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>TNO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bressl</td>
<td>Margherita</td>
<td>Centro Euro-Mediterraneo sui Cambiamenti Climatici (CMCC) / ETC/CCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Bächtler</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz, Bau und</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Buja</td>
<td>Gheorghe</td>
<td>Municipality of Sfântu Gheorghe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Bulmer</td>
<td>Elena</td>
<td>Worldwatch Institute Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Collaro</td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>Nova Gorica University Venice, Italy/IUCN CEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Calussi Angela</td>
<td>DASTI - Politecnico di Milan/ICLIEurope Ltd</td>
<td>Independent researcher/senior partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Cook Rosalind</td>
<td>ESG</td>
<td>Senior Policy Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Cornell Lauren</td>
<td>Climate Alliance</td>
<td>Praktikontio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Davis Donnell</td>
<td>EROPH</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Dedicatore Renato Martin</td>
<td>ICLEI Southeast Asia Secretariat</td>
<td>Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Dinnis Sere</td>
<td>City Council of Almeda</td>
<td>Senior Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Draks Natasa</td>
<td>City of Belgrade/Secretariat for Environmental Protection</td>
<td>Assistant Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Driscoll Patrick</td>
<td>City of Copenhagen</td>
<td>Ph.D. Fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Dworak Thomas</td>
<td>Fresh Thoughts Consulting GmbH</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>England Kit</td>
<td>Newcastle City Council</td>
<td>Policy and Information Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Feliz Briton</td>
<td>Tescoma Research and Innovation</td>
<td>Responsible for Spatial Development and Urban Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Figueiredo Marie Annette</td>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
<td>Principal Programme &amp; Policy Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Figueiredo Annette</td>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
<td>Principal Programme &amp; Policy Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Fici Giovanni</td>
<td>Comune di Bolzano</td>
<td>Coordinator environmental quality unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Flezy Elisabeth</td>
<td>Gemeinde Bürgen</td>
<td>Environmental officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ford Alastair</td>
<td>Newcastle University</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Françoise Yang</td>
<td>City of Paris</td>
<td>Head of Climate and Energy strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Gatto Marie</td>
<td>City of Paris</td>
<td>Project leader for adaptation to climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Gattolin Massimo</td>
<td>Provincia di Venezia</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Gehraad Corin</td>
<td>City of Rotterdam</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Geddes Ian Laursen</td>
<td>Cambridge University</td>
<td>PhD student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Georgi Sigrid</td>
<td>European Environment Agency</td>
<td>Project manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Gottlieb Avi</td>
<td>Tel Aviv University</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Guarnaccia Ugo</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>Research Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Haapala Arvo</td>
<td>City of Helsinki Environment Centre</td>
<td>Project planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Hafroush Reza</td>
<td>Vienna University of Technology</td>
<td>Univ. Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Hansen Rakte</td>
<td>TU München</td>
<td>Research Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization/Position</td>
<td>Role</td>
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EUROPEAN CITIES ADAPT TO CLIMATE CHANGE
OPEN EUROPEAN DAY AT RESILIENT CITIES 2014 – CONFERENCE REPORT

1. The Open European Day 2014

On 28 May 2014, around 110 representatives from mainly local authorities but also research institutions and other stakeholders gathered for the second edition of the Open European Day as a part of the global Resilient Cities conference in Bonn, Germany. City to city, and in exchange with researchers and experts, they discussed climate change adaptation challenges faced by urban areas and potential as well as already implemented solutions across Europe.

This report aims to synthesize the results of the many lively discussions. Having representatives from city administrations on the panel resulted in discussions with a unique, very much down to earth perspective. The event encouraged networking among practitioners, researchers and other experts. In this light, this report can be a source of inspiration for further action at city level as well as help enable regional, national and European authorities and research organisations in planning for climate change adaptation.

The day was filled with many reports on experiences and practice-oriented strategies for kick-starting adaptation, expanding on the expertise provided by more advanced cities on their first steps from design towards implementation of urban adaptation plans. The 2014 event showed that although many city representatives reported being at the very beginning of their adaptation planning, it seems that cities have started to move forward from these preparatory stages, through awareness raising, assessments and strategic planning, towards implementing adaptation action.

The urgency to adapt to climate change in cities was palpable during the day, especially when the news that Serbian and Bosnian cities had been flooded in the days prior to the conference were complemented by reports from Natasa Djokic from the City of Belgrade highlighting the dramatic consequences of the flooding that had caused more than 30 deaths. Also other cities recently faced important damages from river flooding: for example Michele Zuin reported from Padua, where heavy economic losses had been caused by flooding in the past two years.

The present report aims at summarising the discussions during the day. Sections two and three shed light on several emerging themes, strategically questions and on practical solutions. Section four presents some conclusions and recommendations.
2. Emerging themes - opportunities and challenges

2.1 Windows of opportunity

The discussions during the meeting covered a great range of issues connected to starting, planning and implementing adaptation measures.

The impression that (urban) climate change adaptation is still essentially disaster-driven was underlined by different participants. Especially the flooding event experienced in Belgrade was used to illustrate the usefulness of getting ready for climate change by preparing adaptation plans independently from political mandates and well before the manifestation of extreme events. Having a plan in place, therefore, would allow planners to immediately carry out necessary actions once an extreme event is occurring, taking advantage of such “windows of opportunities”, which would help to steer political consensus towards adaptation activities. Cities need to “get prepared” to be able to seize the moment; once an extreme event occurs there is no time for preparing plans and strategies.

Not only actual flooding but also the perception of the imminent risks of flooding can create “windows of opportunity” as Ton Verhoeven from the city of Nijmegen reported. He talked about the period from 1993 to 1995 when the residents in the river region experienced significant uncertainty. The water levels were extremely high and the dikes just managed to hold. A quarter of a million people had to be evacuated. This event triggered the decision to implement the Dutch national programme “Room for the river” at the local level: “we were lucky to have “almost floods” with people being evacuated as part of preventive measures. These events triggered political discussion” on developing a local strategy for implementing this programme.

A further point arising from recent flood events is the necessity to consider adaptation action and disaster risk management as two complementary actions going hand in hand and addressing the same problem, rather than competing strategies. Thus, a convergence of these two sectors is needed within planning for the adaptation to climate risks. Especially in relation to resilience to urban flooding, the importance of integrating physical adaptation measures and institutional arrangements for emergency relief during planning was highlighted, stressing the importance of overcoming existing barriers between disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation. Some participants underlined that complete protection against climate risks is neither possible nor affordable and that politicians will need to decide up to which level protection measures can be afforded; planners need to make sure that if events go beyond this level emergency services must be ready to intervene.

2.2 Assessing and communicating adaptation

A vulnerability assessment is a crucial step in adaptation planning that prepares the ground for the design of specific measures to be adopted in a local context. Nevertheless, it was observed that frequently vulnerability assessments are either not carried out at all or carried out in a sector-based, not integrated way. Requirements for vulnerability assessments as set by funding agencies do not always yield comprehensive and credible analysis of the effective vulnerabilities on the ground.

Those city representatives who had some experience with risk and vulnerability assessments flagged the opportunity of using these as a means of communicating and involving stakeholders, as Sebastian M. Witte from Arnsberg and Marie Gantois from Paris reported, “We can’t raise awareness by telling
people we’re getting four degrees warmer on earth, we need to show people local vulnerabilities.”

Integrated vulnerability assessments pave the way for integrated action. To this end, to allow the best use of vulnerability assessments, city planners need to take into consideration all types of knowledge available, from downscaling of climate models to local knowledge. Marie Gantois for example referred to the positive experiences made in Paris of involving urban service technical and maintenance workers in the vulnerability assessment. Making use of their experience about damages and losses during past events was a great resource for context specific knowledge on risks and on ways to respond.

2.3 Cost-benefit analysis

Cost-benefit analyses were a controversial topic during the day, although the need of considering economic criteria for prioritizing and monitoring adaptation measures was recognized by all participants. Beyond some doubts about the possibilities of quantifying non-monetary benefits like behavioural changes, the improvement of urban living conditions or, as Zuzana Hudekova from Bratislava expresses it, “…the value of hearing a bird singing…”, a major concern was raised about the interest of policy makers to consider the results of these analyses. Some participants reflected on their experience that financial and non-financial benefits of adaptation measures often have only a minor role in overall decision making processes, as these investments normally have long pay-back times well beyond political mandates. “Decision makers often follow different arguments, like immediately visible benefits of a measure that fits into their political agenda rather than long term economic viability” mentioned one participant. In this respect, understanding the specific agendas of policy makers and finding synergies with adaptation plans can be more successful communication strategy compared to cost-benefit analyses.

Furthermore, the exact quantification and monetization of damages beyond flooding or heat waves were considered very difficult to achieve, and assessments of the benefits of single adaptation (and mitigation) measures like green roofs were deemed of utmost importance but very hard to quantify, as Maria Berrini from Milan stated. In addition to uncertain future benefits, the search for short-term (economic) benefits, as for instance savings on water bills, was suggested as a strategy for creating consensus for adaptation measures.

Economic evaluation of single measures and integrated cost-benefit assessments are currently being used by some cities but these exercises were generally not deemed very useful, as they provide incomplete information. As Annette Figueiredo from the Greater London Authority suggested, based on her experience, cost benefit analysis is undoubtedly a useful tool to measure impacts of costs and resultant benefits . However, she cautioned that this tool does not capture qualitative analysis which is equally important when assessing behaviour change impacts. She suggested, adding surveys before, during and after interventions to capture the qualitative data, alongside a cost/benefit analysis. Corjan Gebraad from the city of Rotterdam reported on a cost-benefit tool his administration is using for calculating costs and long term benefits of different sets of measures. Based on the quantification of potential damages, the model allows quantifying benefits of adaptation by calculating the values of avoided damages for different sets of measures. This experience underlined how the application - in addition to the preliminary cost assessment - has shown to be a useful tool for involving stakeholders and discussing possible combinations of different measures.
Despite these difficulties, risk assessments and cost benefit analyses of adaptation options can provide solid evidence for action. As such, they are valid instruments to communicate climate threats in an effective way to politicians and stakeholders, dependant on their willingness to follow economic arguments.

Integrating considerations of economic co-benefits can improve the possibility of ecosystem based or soft solutions for adaptation if co-benefits can be considered adequately. One participant reported on a recent initiative by the city of Cologne to buy land from farmers for flood protection, suggesting that a positive relation between costs and benefits played a role in this measure. In relation to initiatives like this, Michele Zuin from Padova suggested to integrate cash-flow into the assessments of benefits generated in these cases to improve assessments or make them more realistic with regards to co-benefits.

### 2.4 Data and Monitoring

The participants discussed monitoring both the progress of adaptation strategies and climate factors intensively. While providing information on the progress of adaptation strategies can represent a useful way of keeping account of responsibilities defined for the implementation of actions, the collection of climate data and information of impacts can be a useful source of inputs for local climate models and modelling of future impacts. As an alternative to costly measurement facilities, the design of low cost and participative forms of data collection, like shared data platforms and user driven data collections, can generate the positive side effect of increasing citizens awareness about climate change. In addition, the installation of monitoring devices in the context of on-going transformation measures can be a cost efficient strategy for the conventional collection of scientific monitoring data to be used for climate models. Nevertheless, the use of models and climate data has some limits in the human resources available at local level: even if data sometimes is present, the analysis thereof and the creation of a monitoring framework requires an additional step. As a city representative stated: “We have a lot of data but we don’t know how to analyse it”, underlining their need for IT and GIS tools as well as additional human resources.

The same holds for the availability of outputs from downscaled climate models. Regionalized projections of future climate could provide usable information to urban adaptation planners for designing measures rather than tailoring them on the experience of past impacts; nevertheless, models of this type are available only in few of the cities. Some participants underlined that in addition to climate models, urban scale climate models would represent a crucial resource for cities to move forward in adaptation planning, as they would permit simulating interactions between built environment, climate and interrelated effects from adaptation and mitigation measures, such as creating green and blue infrastructures.

In relation to the relatively long timeframes of climate change, the need for long time horizons for adaptation planning was underlined. In fact, considering the uncertainty connected both to long term climate projections and to urban development trends, policy makers often are not ready to think in longer time frames, several participants denounced. Nevertheless, as Christian Kind (Adelphi) put it, bearing in mind the role of uncertainty and the importance of responding to short term needs, “... it is important to think further than 20 years ahead since the infrastructure that cities plan for and implement today will last for at least the next 80 years – therefore we need to look at the climate projections that stretch into the mid-century”. No regret measures or win-win solutions can be a good way of improving the urban environment in the short term and increasing the urban capacity to adapt in the long term at the same time.
2.5 Nature-based solutions

Solutions for climate change adaptation that are based on ecosystem services have the implicit side effect of improving the quality of urban spaces. For this reason, nature-based solutions or green and blue infrastructures are instrumental measures to create win-win situations and are being used by different cities as a cost-effective, co-beneficial and integrated climate adaptation measures. For example, in Barcelona a green infrastructure plan is being developed that aims to increase environmental services and urban green spaces and in Bologna activities for creating green corridors and managing water scarcity are tackled in coordination among different local government levels.

The great potential of nature-based solutions has been well illustrated by Sebastian Marcel Witte from the city of Arnsberg, where a green corridor has been created as a flood protection measure along a river using financial resources provided by the regional level. The short term impacts provided by this project are additional increases in biodiversity as well as tangible increases in tourism providing additional income and thus short term economic benefits to the city. Nuno Lopes from Almada (PT) underlined the importance of spatial planning for strategies involving the use of ecosystem services and pointed at the immense potential of urban parks and vegetable gardens, combining water retention capacities with the creation of resources for irrigation.

Ewa Sobocińska reported from the City of Lodz which is actually attempting to combine its climate change adaptation strategy with plans for an economic and urban revitalization. Working at the metropolitan area level, the city aims at developing a strategy which integrates measures of Greenhouse gas emissions reduction into urban and revitalization strategies, responding thus both to the recently experienced flooding and to the collapse of the industry the city had experienced in recent years. This strategy includes nature-based solutions such as working with green urban areas for different purposes - spaces for biodiversity, flood protection as well as achieving a better quality of life and health for Lodz inhabitants. The general umbrella strategy is gradually being implemented using different complementary policies. This shows how green solutions can be part of and contribute to a wider social and economic revitalization strategy.

In addition to integration efforts, communication with stakeholders and potential actors emerged as a crucial element for promoting greening strategies. This can be achieved through leading by example like green roofs on public buildings, providing financing for greening facades, as Irma Ventayol reported from Barcelona, or using new media like Sebastian M. Witte from the city of Arnsberg, who has used a Facebook climate page since 2014 for unmediated communication with citizens on the city’s developments on adaptation and mitigation. The experience of Barcelona also shows that when trying to implement cross-sectoral communication, the language needs to be tailored to the receiving audience. As a means of facilitating communication, an architect created a visualisation of the measures to be implemented. This created a common language and understanding with the urban planning department, which also started to set value on such measures.

2.6 Funding adaptive actions

Availability of financial resources and access to these resources (in terms of capacity to deal with application processes) are among the most frequently mentioned obstacles to the implementation of climate adaptation. The European Investment Bank, which supported and participated in the OED,
informed participants about their strong engagement in funding public and private projects related to climate change, having dedicated 25% of their total lending to climate projects. Many city representatives flagged access to funding as one of the main challenges for adaptation activities, but some contributors underlined that financing should not be considered the main problem: “What I think is important is to say that it is not always about spending more money, it is about spending it differently (Nancy Saich, EIB)”. One strategy for innovative spending strategies can focus on the introduction measures of climate adaptation into projects that are already financed under other streams.

The European Investment Bank has many engineers and economists offering assistance to local authorities for integrated activities on climate change adaptation. Nancy Saich noted that actually „Mayors tend to present mainly finance requests for big infrastructure projects labelled ‘protection against weather events’”. Talking about protection against extreme weather rather than using the label “climate change adaptation” is not only a communication issue but implies that adaptation measures are considered in other plans. The question of whether a project needs to correspond to a single specific policy agenda, should be seen, according to Nancy Saich, in a pragmatic manner “Once you have carried out your integrated assessment [the preparatory work to assess the need for adaptation], you need to stop being so purist and be more pragmatic”. In this way, new channels for financing and integrating different sources, including private investments, can be opened. Involving urban planning departments in vulnerability assessments and planning of measures can furthermore be seen as an opportunity for horizontal and spatial integration. When applying for national or European funding for adaptation projects, cities should be smart in phrasing their priorities consistently with the programme objectives, unifying different themes and working holistically.

As an alternative to public funding, the use of private funding was discussed in different occasions throughout the day. The example of Copenhagen was given where the vivid public memory of the 2011 flooding was used to gain backing for a charge/levy on bills collected by water companies, which will raise funds for adaptation via water companies. Other representatives suggested the use of public procurement procedures to integrate adaptation measures into infrastructure and public investment projects.

On the other hand, the lack of human resources and of knowledge was seen as a major obstacle in accessing financing by representatives from southern and eastern Europe: Natasha Djokic from Belgrade stated, “… we don’t have capacity because the procedure is too complicated and too big to apply for EU funding.” In, she succeeded in accessing financing for a vulnerability assessment with the help of a German expert.

### 2.7 Multi-level governance

It is generally understood that multi-level governance, i.e. cooperation between the different governmental levels from local to European, is key to planning for adaptation. Cities are not on their own but are rather part of a broader regional context and beyond. Also, especially medium-sized and small cities, having limited resources available, are keen to request support from higher administrative levels as well as from their own administration for starting adaptation. After having taken part in the pioneering EU Cities Adapt project, Gergely Buja from Sfantu Gheorghe (Romania)
reported on a current, urgent need for support from the county and municipal level to be able to proceed with action as the department lacks “...human resources, not having any expert for environmental issues, and not being able to hire new staff because of spending restrictions”. Also, other forms of collaboration between different governance levels and among cities were highlighted by Yann Francoise from the Paris administration, “it is important to share the same data between national and regional levels. We need to create solidarity and cooperation between cities and to receive guidance from national adaptation plans”. Sebastian Marcel Witte of the German city of Arnsberg stated that although being quite satisfied with the institutional context, he would like to have a more regional and cross borderer mentality to think in problem-orientated spaces as a way of dealing with climate change in the future.

Interactions between national, regional and city level are difficult to manage, especially in cases where there is no national plan providing for guidance and attributing competences. Of particular importance is regional collaboration. Maria Berrini from Milan reflected on their water problem, “Retention areas can be created outside the urban area. We have the problem in Milan, but the solution is outside Milan, and this stops implementation. The regional level needs to cooperate with the city.”. In this context, it is important to remember that although impacts can be local solutions frequently need to be managed at a greater scale. Besides the need for cities to direct interact with all administrative levels (from the Regions through the European Commission), the regional level was seen to have a potentially important role in interacting with and assisting small-sized local authorities that have major problems in creating awareness, assessing vulnerabilities, planning and accessing financing. “There should be a regional Vulnerability Assessments, otherwise (small local authorities) cannot access funding”, suggested Maria Berrini.

Some cities highlighted in this context a potential role for national guidelines where good examples for adaptation measures might be illustrated alongside with strategies potentially leading to maladaptation.

New forms of information, for instance in the form of tools and best practice examples made available to city planners, were indicated as a potentially good form of support, but in the same time these tools can be useless, warned Andreas Vetter, if they are not adequately tailored to time and resource constraints experienced by cities, or do not suit the specific local context: “Some cities respond that they don’t have the time to look at our tools and the same holds for good practice examples, which sometimes are quite difficult to be transferred to the local context”.

2.8 Communicating adaptation

According to the experience of Ton Verhoeven from Nijmegen, communication about climate change adaptation “...is achieved mainly through cooperation between people: Through a project you convince people to join a movement. We need politicians believing in the need of action”. Also Maria Berrini from Milan sees a strong role of actions being implemented for the first time to create momentum among local authorities: “We could become a laboratory of green roofs, green areas, and invest in that. In Italy there will be a phenomenon snowball, but actually there is no political awareness on adaptation.”

Participants argued therefore that communicating adaptation requires a tailored approach to streamline the message amongst different audiences. Circumstantiated evidence of risks can help gain support from politicians on the benefits of adaptation. Communication should highlight co-benefits for people, and since implementing adaptation measures is likely to change urban
environments, communication with citizens should start early to foster acceptance and involve them in shaping the design of their communities.

A further element of success was the attention of citizens’ concerns about negative impacts from the projects, especially in relation to the eventual needs of relocating inhabitants. In the example reported by Ton Verhoeven from Nijmegen, the city was able to access funding from the national level to allow for special arrangements and payments.

2.9 Integrating adaptation and mitigation into holistic planning

Local climate action in many countries is still mainly concentrated on mitigation activities; the opportunities of integrating these with activities for climate change adaptation represented a recurrent issue for discussion. Some participants denounced a lack of dialogue between mitigation and adaptation activities and strategies. The city of Paris had already started integrating some adaptation measures in its first climate plan, published in 2007, although this plan focussed essentially on climate change mitigation, Marie Gantois reported. The more recent plan, she said, aims at co-elaborating an extensive adaptation strategy. The next plan will aim instead at fully integrating adaptation and mitigation measures.

3. City actions: how cities are facing coastal hazards, urban heat islands and flooding

Despite the challenges cities are facing in adaptation planning, a number of experiences and examples for adaptation solutions were presented. The fact that many practical and implementation oriented problems and solutions were discussed during the meeting is evidence that cities are actually gaining experience in planning for practical adaptation solutions. From the discussion, it emerged that the most relevant climate change impacts in urban areas are heat waves, intensified in urban areas by the urban heat island effect, flash floods, river and coastal flooding and water scarcity.

Participants frequently underlined the potential of mainstreaming measures both into integrated climate action and into urban policies as a whole. Such integration can generate additional benefits, such as the creation of green and blue infrastructures, the potential of urban planning and design measures for mitigating the urban heat island effect or the use of insurance rules for preventing people from settling in flood prone areas.

Too much or the lack of water arose as a crucial topic for adaptation, as these problems have many implications. Water use, water scarcity as well as flooding phenomena are often intertwined and need to be managed in a smart and integrated fashion. In this context, helpful input came from Annette Figueiredo, who described detailed implementation plans and activities for different water issues undertaken by the Greater London Authority, comprising measures addressing drainage, water efficiency and water catchment alongside design and implementation of behaviour change and education programmes. Her focus was on the GLA’s Water for School’s programme for London which is leading on.

Discussions on planning to prevent flooding raised, inter alia, the point of defining an “optimal” adaptation level with respect to statistical return levels of flood events. For example, the Serbian flood had exceeded what had been defined as a 1 in 1000 year return event. Approaches on how to
set adaptation targets varied widely. Some cities, such as cities in the Netherlands, chose a very high protection level (1:12.500 years return period), whereas cities such as Copenhagen planned for events of 1 in 100 years due to the fact that further protection measures were judged more expensive than the additional damage cost. These findings show that no one-size-fits-all approach can be implemented in different cities and adaptation must be planned according to local conditions.

With regards to coastal hazards, Nuno Lopes from the city of Almada (PT) discussed their breakthrough project on coastal hazards based on a modelling exercise for impacts from sea level rise for a time horizon of 2050/2100. Based on the results obtained, he reported that the city is struggling with implementing a coastal restoration and resilience project that includes a set-back strategy for parts of the urban coastline. This strategy needs to involve illegal settlers, who do not have – like many parts of the population - a thorough perception about the risk of coastal hazards and who are not very responsive neither to legal, nor to market driven instruments like insurance. The municipal strategy aimed at a differentiated approach for the set back strategy, allowing fishermen to stay (because they were originally from there), whereas other settlers were obliged to leave the coastal settlements. “People are doing false documents to have compensations to leave.” Lopes reported, “There is no social perception of risk.” This shows how implementing adaptation measures are not only related to environmental, climatic or technological aspects, but also to how social aspects are closely intertwined with adaptation and resilience planning.

Urban heat islands and the impacts of heat waves on urban population is driving action in southern European cities like Milan or Padova. In these northern Italian cities, heat waves are increasingly perceived as a problem and measures for reducing the overheating of urban areas, in the face of a need of preserving urban density, was underlined by representatives from both cities. For Padova, Michele Zuin reported temperature differences between urban areas and the surrounding landscape up to 5°C, due to a mainly structural problem that needs to be tackled with urban planning, greening and water retention measures. For the city of Milan, Maria Berrini is working on the Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan, aiming at creating a different culture and making urban streets part of usable public spaces by enlarging pedestrian areas, thus generating better conditions for the creation of urban green areas. Beyond increasing urban greening, which is taking place under conditions of constrained space, the plan will implement green walls and roofs. She expects these activities will lead to a cultural switch with respect to mobility patterns, thus allowing urban open spaces and streets to become useable spaces, which will be able to contribute to mitigating the urban heat island effect.

4. Progressing adaptation in European cities

In conclusion, the debates during the Open European Day proved that innovation is needed at different levels, in improving existing practices, introducing greater flexibility in the design and organization of urban transformation processes, integrating between different investment programmes, etc. This does not necessarily imply greater costs, as Annemie Wyckmans put it, stating that “good, resilient design does not cost more than bad design”. There is a great potential in mainstreaming adaptation needs into existing planning processes and regulations, integrating them with climate change mitigation and increasing urban resilience, thus also creating co-benefits, improving the quality of life for citizens and making cities more attractive places to live in.
The lively exchange between city representatives was evidence of the value of exchange, allowing planners and city representatives to start thinking “out of the box” and to trigger innovation from new experiences.

New application oriented knowledge will be promoted also at the level of research funding, as Eleni Manoli (DG Research) declared, announcing financing for the creation of a knowledge platform on innovation and new research programmes oriented to the needs of adaptation policies. During the event, also the new Mayors Adapt – the Covenant of Mayors Initiative on Climate Change Adaptation - was presented. This initiative has been set up by the European Commission, DG Climate Action to engage cities in taking action to adapt to climate change. Cities signing up to the initiative commit to contributing to the overall aim of the EU Adaptation Strategy by developing a comprehensive local adaptation strategy or integrating adaptation to climate change into relevant existing plans. Mayors Adapt aims to increase support for local activities, provide a platform for greater engagement and networking by cities and raise public awareness about adaptation and the measures needed.

Participants stressed the high value of possibilities for a direct exchange between representatives from local authorities about issues, problems and solutions for urban climate change adaptation, such as this Open European Day. Other options can be online forums, webinars, or, if funding allows, city twinning as successfully tested in the finalised EU Cities Adapt project. The just launched Mayors Adapt initiative of the European Commission and also exchange among city networks could provide opportunities for such activities.
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