

S6: From impact and vulnerability assessments to adaptation planning and implementation

Host: **Delphine Deryng** (Climate Analytics, Germany)

Rapporteur: Theresa Rauch (Climate Analytics, Germany)

Summary of themes covered in workshop

The audience was mixed, the majority of participants identifying themselves as being scientists, the remainder identifying as either practitioners or people who considered themselves to belong to both sides. During the first half of the session, five short presentations illustrated challenges and lesson learned related to stakeholder engagement and the use of scientific information for developing vulnerability assessments and planning adaptation measures across different regions, scales and issues. During the second half of the session, two break-out groups identified shared challenges and lessons learned from own experiences in co-developing adaptation projects.

The themes covered included:

- Decision-making under uncertainty and in data-poor environments
- Co-production approaches (participatory scenario development, informal consultation)
- Linkages between sustainable development and climate adaptation strategies
- Barriers to decision-making
- Disconnections between political and scientific arenas
- Capacity building across scale (community, national)

Most controversial question that came up in this workshop? (that could also be posed during the closing plenary)

What role can funding agencies ("financing stakeholders") play in reconciling the discrepancy between stakeholders'/end-users' needs and scientists'/researchers' interests?

Results of the discussion

The most important challenges identified were related to:

- Discrepancy between stakeholders' interests and funders' objectives
- Underestimation of the time needed for co-development (time is a crucial factor for successful stakeholder engagement and is not sufficiently taken into account by funders)
- Discrepancy between scientists' interests (publication, research findings) and stakeholders' needs (application to real-world question, near-term decision-making)
- Framing and contextualising climate change for local communities
- Stakeholder engagement:
 - Lack of trust in the implementation of results,
 - Communication between actors of different backgrounds (interdisciplinarity and transdisciplinarity),
 - Disconnect between demands from stakeholders and feasibility,
 - Dealing with stakeholder fatigue/frustration,
 - Reaching consensus among stakeholders

The following lessons learned were identified:

- Patience and persistence to profoundly understand the various facets of the problem
- Flexibility with the conceptual approach as it evolves through the iterative co-development process
- Iterative interaction is key between stakeholders and knowledge producers
- Stakeholder needs should already be considered at proposal stage

- Storytelling can offer a way to connect to the local context
- Observed risks differ from perceived risks
- Un-focused workshops don't lead anywhere & provoke frustration
- Jointly developed local climate/climate change narrative can facilitate community engagement

Research gaps identified

- How to strengthen the use of scientific knowledge in the formulation of options to inform adaptation planning?
- How to move from the discussion/consultation stage to decision-making and implementation?

Next steps

- Strengthen engagement with social scientists to fill the gap between science and stakeholders
- Diversity, multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary: reconcile diverse interests and 'languages'
- Developing strategies for engaging the private sector
- Mainstreaming NAP process across ministries
- Reconciling vulnerability studies (bottom-up) and implementation (top-down)
- Next project: ensure early-stage involvement of the community at proposal development stage and throughout the project

Other

NA

3-5 keywords that characterize the session

Stakeholder engagement, co-development, scientific capacity building, Vulnerability assessment, Adaptation planning