**EEA Expert workshop on climate change adaptation platforms (EEA, 23 June 2014)**

Breakout Group 3: Links between national climate change adaptation platforms and Climate-ADAPT (Chair: Kati Mattern (EEA); Rapporteur: Silvia Medri (CMCC))

**Summary of results**

The following points summarize the main outcomes of the discussion.

**How to work complementarily on cities:**

• national platforms should be the place where detailed cities information should be, but there are benefits to also make aggregated cities information available through Climate-ADAPT; cities are also linked to international cities networks;

• as Climate-ADAPT is going to be populated with further urban adaptation information within a specific section on cities, this information should make use of and refer to the original national source, preferably to specific documents/projects/initiatives (vs the portal homepage);

• language is an issue for the presentation of information: Climate-ADAPT provides information in English (via the quality assessed database) and links to (external) national pages (in national language and with responsibility of the countries); one transnational portal (for alpine space) translates into English title, abstract and keywords and provides links to original source (internal) in their DB (provided that it’s public information); national platforms are mainly in national languages, some of them have an English version that generally covers just the main pages (not all for budget limitations);

* technically, a “web catalogue service” could be included in Climate-ADAPT to allow better and easier linking and sharing of metadata with databases in national platforms;

• currently the new case studies presented at Climate-ADAPT are being extracted mainly from EU projects; for case studies development and implementation (that require identifying and consulting (local) adaptation practitioners ) it is proposed that the EEA establishes a formal process through Eionet to avoid duplication of efforts and to ensure that countries are informed of the inclusion of a case within their country (it was noted that one country discovered on Climate-ADAPT a national case study they were not aware of); this process can e.g. include the possibility that a country can comment on the selection of the case and a possibility to propose cases;

• there’s a wish from users to have the information collected and customized for specific users groups (e.g. city planners) at national level, but not so at the European Level, that should provide a broad knowledge and fill national knowledge gaps.

**How to get users feedback and evaluate the platform:**

• taking opportunity of large events to get user feedback; organizing an event specifically aimed at getting user feedback could also be considered, combining this with short user surveys

• inviting people participating to a planned workshop to discuss the theme of the workshop in advance through a forum on the platform can be successful to get user feedback (a lesson learned by Finland);

• using the platforms to exchange information on the platform itself through a forum (with registered users; issue of authorship of posts), social networks, on-line workshops, webinars, etc. (these options are being considered by countries, but not yet implemented except to some extent in a few countries)

• at the national level creation of personas (profile of target users) can be useful (experience of a few countries); but the usefulness at European level is not so clear;

• a helpdesk is in principle useful also to get user feedback, but considered too expensive; furthermore it was reported that feedback from users is often limited; one country’s portal has a forum that allows to give some feedback that can be considered a minimal helpdesk; some portals have feedback forms (e. g. Climate-ADAPT), that can be used to better understand user needs;

• including at the bottom of every section (vs the homepage) of the portal a link allowing the user expressing if visiting it was useful (did the user find what he/she was looking for);

• for one country (Poland) an informal working group on adaptation (comprising people from cities, regions and people that are actually using the portal in daily work) is responsible for evaluating the portal as they are its main users.

**Joint collaboration:**

• consistency in content (e.g. presentation of scenarios) between national and European platforms would be needed; a possible harmonization could be sought when possible, through e.g. periodic comparison; however it should be noted that national portals contents reflect specific national needs;

• consideration of potential use and role (to be clearly defined) of national CCA platforms for future reporting on adaptation;

• to enhance adaptation mainstreaming, (cross)linkages between Climate-ADAPT and EU-wide sectoral platforms (e.g. energy) could also be considered;

**Added value of Climate-ADAPT for Countries compared to national platforms:**

• having European, own and other countries information on Climate-ADAPT is considered by participants really an asset for national CCA platforms, the added value is the availability of a good overview of national information and the possibility to show initiatives at national level to others;

• linking and not duplicating information between European and national level is important;

• case studies are considered especially helpful; coverage of sectors and regions have been substantially improved in the last year

• assessment of cost/benefit, effectiveness of adaptation policy implementation and case studies are themes that would benefit from joint collaboration;

• a list of contacts for national adaptation platforms would be appreciated.