

## Main discussion elements

### Break-out group 1, 14 June, 'Monitoring, reporting and evaluation of climate change adaptation at national level'

*10<sup>th</sup> EIONET workshop on Climate Change Impacts, Vulnerability and Adaptation, 14-15 June 2016, EEA, Copenhagen*

**Participation:** Switzerland, Portugal, Germany, Austria, the Netherlands, Latvia, Italy, Spain, Czech Republic, Slovak Republic, European Commission, ECMWF, EEA.

#### 1. **What are your views on the relevance, scope and timing of the EEA work on MRE so far?**

- EEA 2015 MRE report was very useful to **understand and learn** from other countries experiences.
- The report was also used in some countries as **inspiration** to organize their MRE governance approach.
- Communication and **clarification of terminology** and use of bottom-up (monitoring) and top-down (reporting and evaluation) approaches is very helpful for national MRE needs.
- The **timing** of the EEA 2015 MRE report was very good since various countries were/still are in the process of developing MRE systems.
- The EEA **expert meeting** was very important, possibly even more than the report as such.

#### 2. **How did the EEA work support member countries and their MRE activities?**

Many issues that were identified in the EEA report as important and/or key challenges were confirmed during the discussion, including:

- Need to recognise **different national circumstances** (political, administrative, cultural, and also regarding climate risks)
- Learning from risks and approaches that are common across countries is important focusing on **transferability**.
- Data availability can be problematic, but use of **existing data** is actually feasible.
- The **long time frame** for developing adaptation indicator sets is not because of lack of data or the need for complex new data collection, but mainly **due to 'buy-in' of the many involved stakeholders** (e.g. both vertical and horizontal collaboration). Developing and maintaining a **national network** is essential for engaging stakeholders and longer term acceptance of a stable MRE approach.
- **Involve sectors** since they have the knowledge, e.g. for self-assessment, and also the data.
- Start with a **broad scope** for indicators, then try to **prioritise** and narrow down in a transparent way. Identify knowledge and data gaps that should be addressed to improve the MRE.
- A **mixed approach** is needed, including process-based indicators and self-assessments, to avoid too much focus on only quantitative information that can be misinterpreted.
- Need for **measurable objectives** in the NAS/NAP although for political reasons this is difficult.
- Learn from **applying** the national MRE approach and **revise and improve** in a stepwise way.
- Connecting **local MRE with national MRE** is important since most action is at local level.
- **Collaboration** between **environment agencies and civil protection agencies** is important to cover properly both DRR and CCA aspects.
- Address different **time scales** of MRE (short-, medium- and long term).

3. *How can EEA work in 2017 be prioritised, taking into account recent and expected policy developments?*

Options mentioned include:

- **Guidance on the MRE process** and how to evaluate (e.g. a step wise approach), while taking into account some guidance already exists (e.g. GIZ, focusing on developing countries); consider how to re-use existing guidance for European countries. More knowledge on methods for assessing effectiveness of adaptation measures is needed (quantitative, but also qualitative).
- **Network events** should continue and are essential to learn across countries and regions.
- **Inventory** of currently available **national adaptation indicators** and currently existing or expected **EU and international demands** (SF DRR, EU scoreboard, possible future European quantitative indicators).
- Comparing and **linking national MRE** with **local MRE** (developed by the Covenant of Mayors).
- More use of **Climate-ADAPT** to share methods and assessments on MRE.
- More use of **'case studies'** of countries for more in-depth analysis of practices, experiences, lessons learned.
- **EEA** to take over in future the **Commission scoreboard** and **develop this further**.