



# **Appendix 10c: Training and capacity building Peer reviews**

*Adaptation Strategies for European Cities: Final Report*

This is part of the Final Report of the project "Adaptation Strategies for European Cities" which has been compiled by Ricardo-AEA for the European Commission Directorate General Climate Action



### Confidentiality, copyright & reproduction:

This report is the Copyright of EC – Directorate General for Climate Action and has been prepared by Ricardo-AEA Ltd under contract to EC – Directorate General for Climate Action dated 21/12/2011. The contents of this report may not be reproduced in whole or in part, nor passed to any organisation or person without the specific prior written permission of EC – Directorate General for Climate Action. Ricardo-AEA Ltd accepts no liability whatsoever to any third party for any loss or damage arising from any interpretation or use of the information contained in this report, or reliance on any views expressed therein.

### Contact:

Jonathan Perks  
Ricardo-AEA Ltd.  
Gemini Building, Harwell, Didcot, OX11 0QR  
t: +44 (0)1235 753460  
e: jonathan.m.perks@ricardo-aea.com  
Ricardo-AEA is certificated to ISO9001 and  
ISO14001

RICARDO-AEA

I.C.L.E.I  
Local  
Governments  
for Sustainability

ARCADIS

MANCHESTER  
1824  
The University of Manchester

Alexander  
Ballard

adelphi

## Appendix 10c – Peer Reviews

# 1st Peer Review – Mediterranean Region Coastal Cities, Ancona, 19-21 February 2013

## Participants

Participant	Organisation
Ana Bajlo	City of Zadar
Zana Klaric	City of Zadar
Margarita Fernandez	City of Barcelona
Irma Ventayol Ceferino	City of Barcelona
Nuno Cunha Lopes	City council of Almada
Sara Braga Dionisio	City council of Almada
Jana Koleva	Burgas Municipality
Dimitar Sotirov	Burgas Municipality
Catherine Walsh	Gibraltar Government
Janine Galliano	Gibraltar Government
Corjan Gebraad	Rotterdam
Jonathan Perks	Ricardo-AEA
Alberto Terenzi	ICLEI

## Programme

### Day 1

	Time	Session	Description
	<b>Arrive in the morning</b>		
Afternoon Session	14.00-14.45	Welcome	Introduction (Project Team / Host City)
			Objectives of Peer Review meeting (Project Team)
			Introduction to the format of the peer reviews (Project Team)
	14.45-15.30		Overview from host city – (Host City)
			Questions and answers
	15.30-16.00	<b>Break</b>	
	16.00-17.30	<b>Peer Review 1</b>	<p>2 Groups focusing on Peer Cities</p> <p>Group 1: Ancona + 1 representative from each of the 5 training cities</p> <p>Group 2: Rotterdam + 1 representative from each of the 5 training cities</p> <p>16.00-16.20: Presentation from reviewed city (using template provided)</p> <p>16.20-16.55: Questions and answers</p> <p>17.55-17.15: Review by Training cities</p> <p>17.15-17.30: Feedback to Peer city</p>

### Day 2

	Time	Session	Description
Morning Session	09.00-12.30	Technical site visit	<p><u>First Part: Visit to the early warning Headquarter</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>The Early Warning System: How to work for managing and living with the landslide risk.</i> Speaker Dr. geol. S. Cardellini</li> <li>- <i>Brief analysis of the Ancona Landslide Risk.</i> Speaker . Prof. G. Scarascia Mugnozza</li> <li>- Brief demonstration of an early warning procedure and subsequent activation of procedures for ensuring the safety of local communities</li> </ul> <p><u>Second part:: visit to the landslide places (private bus connection):</u></p>

- Visit to the Ancona landslide drainage system
- Visit to the Main Station “Grotte” where will be explained how the control sensors and the integrated system works
- visit to a private building with a brief interview of a citizen
- visit to the station “Golfo” in order to see the entire landslide view.

Feedback discussion

Lunch

Afternoon session

14.00-15.30	<b>Peer Review</b> 2	<p>2 Groups focusing on 2 training cities</p> <p>Group 1: Training City 1 + 1 representative from each of the other cities</p> <p>Group 2: Training City 2 + 1 representative from each of the other cities</p> <p>14.00-14.20: Presentation from reviewed city (using template provided)</p> <p>14.20-14.55: Questions and answers</p> <p>14.55-15.15: Review by Training cities</p> <p>15.15-15.30: Feedback</p>
-------------	-------------------------	--

15.30-16.00 **Break**

16.00-17.30	<b>Peer Review</b> 3	<p>3 Groups focusing on 3 training cities</p> <p>Group 3: Training City 3 + 2 representatives from the other cities</p> <p>Group 4: Training City 4 + 3 representatives from the other cities</p> <p>Group 5: Training City 5 + 3 representatives from the other cities</p> <p>16.00-16.20: Presentation from reviewed city (using template provided)</p> <p>16.20-16.55: Questions and answers</p> <p>17.55-17.15: Review by Training cities</p> <p>17.15-17.30: Feedback</p>
-------------	-------------------------	--

Day 3

	Time	Session	Description
<b>Morning Session</b>	09.00-10.30	Feedback	Peer exchange reflecting on the outcomes of the peer reviews  Introduction to the session (Project Team) Group 1 Self-organized dialogue - Peer cities Group 2 Facilitated exchange of the 5 training cities
	10.30-11.00	Break	
	11.12.00	Wrap-up	Lessons learnt, open issues topics identifies, next steps farewell Evaluation Led by Project Team

**Key points from 1<sup>st</sup> Peer Review**

<b>Turning points</b>	
<p><b>Rotterdam</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political Backing</li> <li>• Research and data to work with</li> <li>• Money</li> <li>• Commitment, regional and national</li> </ul>	<p><b>Zadar</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arrived at thro' mitigation (CoM)</li> <li>• Water supply key</li> <li>• Political commitment</li> <li>• National laws for mitigation / Adaptation planning</li> </ul>
<p><b>Ancona</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major landslide in 1982</li> <li>• Participation n ACT project</li> <li>• Agenda 21 –created awareness</li> </ul>	<p><b>Burgas</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• External projects</li> <li>• Competent and committed Deputy Mayor for Environment</li> <li>• Open for change –strong commitment</li> </ul>
<p><b>Barcelona</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts already felt</li> <li>• This project providing focus on adaptation</li> <li>• Agenda 21 goal for climate change adaptation and resilience</li> </ul>	<p><b>Gibraltar</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commitment of new Government</li> <li>• Establishment of working group</li> <li>• Awareness of existing measures</li> <li>• This project</li> </ul>
<p><b>Almada</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fonte de Telka project</li> <li>• Exposure to many hazards</li> <li>• Research data available</li> <li>• Support from Mayor</li> <li>• Experienced team</li> <li>• Political stability</li> </ul>	
<b>What has the city done well?</b>	

<p><b>Rotterdam</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sea level rise/ extreme rainfall/ drought, water storage</li> <li>• Urban heat island effects - green routes</li> <li>• Identified research needs</li> </ul>	<p><b>Zadar</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Links to sustainable action plan</li> <li>• Team of technicians</li> <li>• Mapping the vulnerabilities</li> <li>• Monitoring public buildings</li> <li>• Hydrogeological assessment</li> </ul>
<p><b>Ancona</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of baseline data</li> <li>• Involvement of wider stakeholders &amp; good comms</li> <li>• Focus on 5 key issues</li> <li>• Strong team spirit and enthusiasm</li> </ul>	<p><b>Burgas</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gathering data – sea level rise</li> <li>• Identification of stakeholders</li> <li>• Inter-department involvement</li> <li>• Existing project for water storage</li> <li>• Adaptation festival – mainstreaming adaptation</li> </ul>
<p><b>Barcelona</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data gathering and forecast modelling</li> <li>• Biodiversity plan</li> <li>• Use of existing drivers</li> <li>• Negotiation powers with other actors</li> </ul>	<p><b>Gibraltar</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good diagnosis</li> <li>• Involvement of all key stakeholders on WG</li> <li>• Linking to eg sustainable transport plan and others</li> <li>• Breaking down internal barriers</li> </ul>
<p><b>Almada</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data research supporting decision making</li> <li>• Well organised city council</li> <li>• Coastal erosion well studied</li> <li>• Holistic approach – long term planning</li> <li>• History of monitoring</li> </ul>	
<p><b>What could the city improve on?</b></p>	
<p><b>Rotterdam</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrating adaptation strategy with planning process</li> <li>• Stakeholder dialogue with citizens</li> </ul>	<p><b>Zadar</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing the process</li> <li>• Strengthen stakeholder involvement</li> <li>• Work with partners at regional national level who have resources</li> <li>• Use existing newsletters etc for communications</li> </ul>
<p><b>Ancona</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts need to be linked to Climate Change</li> <li>• Wider stake holder engagement happens quite late</li> </ul>	<p><b>Burgas</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partnerships with universities</li> <li>• Linking impacts people are experiencing to Climate change – make it intelligible to them</li> </ul>
<p><b>Barcelona</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal comms</li> <li>• Prioritise / focus</li> <li>• Alternative water / electricity supplies</li> </ul>	<p><b>Gibraltar</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need specific research</li> <li>• Doing simple things (eg fire breaks)</li> <li>• Link to ecological issues (protection of rare species)</li> </ul>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify adaptation measures to ensure visibility across departments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build support networks</li> </ul>
<b>Almada</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder engagement</li> <li>Communications</li> <li>Invest more in economic aspects</li> <li>Fonte de Telka – sea port of nature reserve</li> </ul>	
<b>What can other cities learn from this city's experience?</b>	
<b>Rotterdam</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate research</li> <li>Involve all stakeholders at early stages</li> <li>Focussing on key areas</li> <li>Innovative solutions</li> </ul>	<b>Zadar</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate change included in regulations and other aspects eg air quality</li> </ul>
<b>Ancona</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Persistence, focus and enthusiasm</li> <li>Networking and building bridges with other departments</li> <li>Risk assessment process</li> </ul>	<b>Burgas</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enthusiasm</li> <li>Persistence</li> <li>Innovative opportunities</li> <li>Good links at Deputy Mayor level</li> </ul>
<b>Barcelona</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cities need to make the most of their bargaining power eg permissions to operate</li> <li>Awareness of other projects at EU / UN level - networking</li> </ul>	<b>Gibraltar</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder engagement</li> <li>The old model is over – need to change</li> <li>Enthusiasm and drive</li> <li>Ambitious agenda for stakeholder group – laying good foundations</li> </ul>
<b>Almada</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider hazards holistically</li> <li>Importance of data / research</li> <li>Exiting environment plans</li> <li>Proactive approach</li> </ul>	
<b>Final comments</b>	
<b>Rotterdam</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Long time horizon</li> <li>Trees etc are infrastructures</li> <li>Cities are clients for research</li> <li>Need series of wins to maintain commitment</li> <li>How do you measure a win?</li> </ul>	<b>Almada</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge gaps – hydrogeological data/ drainage system scenarios</li> <li>Department started in 1999</li> </ul>
<b>Ancona</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Created technical adaptation team composed of young people</li> <li>Responsibilities help personal development</li> </ul>	<b>Burgas</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key stakeholders uninformed</li> <li>Scattered information</li> <li>Are universities gathering data?</li> </ul>

<b>Barcelona</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Many project underway even before detailed projections</li></ul>	
---	--

# 1st Peer Review – Northern, Northern-Central & Northern-Western Europe, Malmö, 5-7 March 2013

## Participants

Participant	Organisation
Maaïke Breugelmans	Stad Gent
Sofie Custers	Stad Gent
Bieke Mangeleer	Stad Gent
Egle Randyte	City of Vilnius
Vaiva Deveikiene	City of Vilnius
Timo Permanto	City of Lahti
Emmi Leppanen	City of Lahti
Sigrid Glarbo	Albertslund Municipality
Hans-Henrik Hog	Albertslund Municipality
Angela Heaney	Stirling
David Bright	Stirling
Anthony Maguire	Dublin
Michael Curtis	Dublin
Jonathan Perks	Ricardo-AEA

## Programme

---

### Day 1

---

	Time	Session	Description
	<b>Arrive in the morning</b>		
<b>Afternoon Session</b>	13.00- 14.00	Lunch	
	14.00- 14.30	Welcome	Introduction (Project Team / Host City) Objectives of Peer Review meeting (Project Team) Introduction to the format of the peer reviews (Project Team)
	14.30- 16.00		Peer review of Malmo  14.30 – 14.50: Presentation from Malmo (using template provided) 14.50 – 15.25: Questions and answers 15.25 – 15.45: Review by Training cities 15.45 – 16.00: Feedback to Malmo
	16.00- 16.30	<b>Break</b>	
	16.30- 18.00	<b>Peer Review 1</b>	2 Groups Group 1: Dublin + 1 representative from each of the other cities Group 2: Training City 1 + 1 representative from each of the other cities  16.30 -16.50: Presentation from reviewed city (using template provided) 16.50-17.25: Questions and answers 17.25-17.45: Review by reviewing cities 17.45-18.00: Feedback

---

## Day 2

	Time	Session	Description
<b>Morning Session</b>	09.00	Technical site visit	Introduction
	-		
	12.30		Site visit
			Feedback discussion
		Lunch	
<b>Afternoon session</b>	14.00	<b>Peer Review 2</b>	2 Groups focusing on 2 training cities
	-		Group 1: Training City 2 + 1 representative from each of the other cities
	15.30		Group 2: Training City 3 + 1 representative from each of the other cities
			14.00-14.20: Presentation from reviewed city (using template provided)
			14.20-14.55: Questions and answers
			14.55-15.15: Review by reviewing cities
			15.15-15.30: Feedback
	15.30	<b>Break</b>	
	-		
	16.00		
	16.00	<b>Peer Review 3</b>	2 Groups focusing on 3 training cities
	-		Group 3: Training City 4 + 2 representatives from the other cities
	17.30		Group 4: Training City 5 + 3 representatives from the other cities
			16.00-16.20: Presentation from reviewed city (using template provided)
			16.20-16.55: Questions and answers
			17.55-17.15: Review by Training cities
			17.15-17.30: Feedback

## Day 3

	Time	Session	Description
Morning Session	09.00-10.30	Feedback	Peer exchange reflecting on the outcomes of the peer reviews  Introduction to the session (Project Team) Group 1 Self-organized dialogue - Peer cities Group 2 Facilitated exchange of the 5 training cities
	10.30-11.00	Break	
	11.00-12.00	Wrap-up	Lessons learnt, open issues topics identifies, next steps farewell Evaluation Led by Project Team

## Key points from 1st Peer Review

Turning points	
<b>Malmo</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Threats already exist</li> <li>• Focus on sustainability /transformation</li> <li>• Green roofs</li> <li>• Plans for denser city =&gt; innovation</li> <li>• Economic and other benefits of adaptation programmes</li> </ul>	<b>Dublin</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2002 sea flood</li> <li>• Pluvial floods</li> <li>• Recognition of impact and consequences</li> <li>• DCC climate change strategy</li> </ul>
<b>Albertslund</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General recognition survey of population</li> <li>• Cloud burst in 2010</li> <li>• Accumulation of small events</li> <li>• Selling off water utility co.</li> </ul>	<b>Lahti</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Storm water issues</li> <li>• Experience of Heavy rain / storms and heat waves</li> </ul>
<b>Ghent</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Champions</li> <li>• Recognition at Flemish region</li> <li>• Building on existing work</li> <li>• Good evidence at regional level</li> </ul>	<b>Vilnius</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Realisation that current capacity is not sufficient to cope with current heavy rainfall events</li> </ul>
<b>Stirling</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Severe weather in 2004</li> <li>• Inclusion of CCA into Risk register</li> <li>• Individuals realisation that mitigation is not enough</li> </ul>	
What has the city done well?	
<b>Malmo</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political leadership</li> </ul>	<b>Dublin</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proactive and systematic</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open storm water defences</li> <li>• Comprehensive approach (impact on other sectors – health, jobs, social cohesion)</li> <li>• Lifestyle changes</li> <li>• Make the city attractive to live in</li> <li>• Make the “right” choices</li> </ul>	<p>coordination of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning</li> <li>• Dublin flood defence</li> <li>• All sector benefits FAB++</li> <li>• Good base line information</li> </ul>
<p><b>Albertslund</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wet land, flood planes</li> <li>• Maintaining the forest</li> <li>• Altruism – helping the community</li> <li>• Synergies</li> </ul>	<p><b>Lahti</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Storm water planning and associated implemented solutions</li> <li>• Politicians and organisations well motivated</li> <li>• Adaptation measures can be added to existing management plans</li> </ul>
<p><b>Ghent</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “No regret measures”</li> <li>• Connected to city development plan</li> <li>• Building regulations for roofs</li> <li>• Links to regional admin</li> </ul>	<p><b>Vilnius</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Established interdepartmental task group</li> <li>• Involving appropriate people in this group inc scientific community</li> <li>• Bringing together results in to an action plan</li> </ul>
<p><b>Stirling</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategy will be used for further engagement</li> <li>• Identify low cost options</li> <li>• Pulling together work already happening (floods)</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	
<p><b>What could the city improve on?</b></p>	
<p><b>Malmo</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordination between departments – Adaptation Champion</li> <li>• Find synergies between different activities</li> <li>• Improvement for human beings at the centre of Climate adaptation holistic approach</li> </ul>	<p><b>Dublin</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build on existing approaches</li> <li>• Sharing of information</li> <li>• Coordination between departments</li> <li>• Involving citizens</li> </ul>
<p><b>Alberstlund</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication with private citizens</li> <li>• Industries are key stakeholders too</li> </ul>	<p><b>Lahti</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk assessment needs to be done</li> <li>• City owned companies need to be involved</li> </ul>
<p><b>Ghent</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Links to regional activities (Water)</li> <li>• Communications</li> <li>• Lack of clear mandate for CCA</li> </ul>	<p><b>Vilnius</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engaging the public</li> <li>• Develop a communication plan using external agency</li> <li>• Public / professionals / politicians</li> </ul>
<p><b>Stirling</b></p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Political / senior management engagement</li> </ul>	
<b>What can other cities learn from this city's experience?</b>	
<b>Malmo</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gap between municipal approaches and insurance objectives</li> <li>Link mitigation with adaptation eg take revenue from energy efficiency renewable generation etc to invest in adaptation</li> <li>Links to social and economic policy</li> <li>Institute of green roofs (link on internet)</li> </ul>	<b>Dublin</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordination and collection of knowledge</li> <li>Planners adding info on plans to record flood defence</li> <li>Many owners – coordination is key</li> </ul>
<b>Albertslund</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Act and evaluate the actions</li> <li>Biodiversity is an indicator</li> <li>Collaboration with neighbouring municipalities</li> <li>Synergies where possible</li> </ul>	<b>Lahti</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connect public health issues with storm water treatments (eg water quality)</li> </ul>
<b>Ghent</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“No regret measures”</li> <li>SUDs are one of a number of policies</li> <li>Innovation</li> </ul>	<b>Vilnius</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Starting from nothing - a working group – document with 36 actions</li> </ul>
<b>Stirling</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engagement using language they understand - relevant benefits</li> <li>Contingency planning</li> <li>Sharing experiences of common issues eg flood resilience</li> </ul>	
<b>Final comments</b>	
<b>Malmo</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programme for sustainable buildings</li> <li>Recognition of the benefits if adaptation to the local strategy</li> <li>Political leadership</li> <li>Importance of knowledge – evidence base and personal examples</li> </ul>	<b>Stirling</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Society is less resilient</li> <li>Trend to make existing hazards more frequent / extreme</li> <li>Need to consider secondary impacts eg supply chains / food prices</li> </ul>
<b>Alberstlund</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unmanageable size for the municipality</li> </ul>	<b>Dublin</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several examples of good practice</li> <li>Staff and funding are key issue</li> <li>Dynamic process</li> </ul>



**Ghent**

- Innovative approach and examples

# 1st Peer Review – Southern Central Europe (landlocked), Birmingham, 12 – 14 March 2013

## Participants

Participant	City/Organisation
Michelel Zuin	Padova
Daniela Luise	Padova
Laura Campigotto	Alba
Emanuele Biestro	Alba
Bela Gergely Buja	Sfantu-Gheorghe
Ileana Luminita Cornea	Sfantu-Gheorghe
Jose Andres Alonso	Vitoria Gasteiz
Maria Paniagua	Vitoria Gasteiz
Zuzana Hudekova	Bratislava
Heinz Socher	Dresden
Tobias Geyer	Dresden
Nick Grayson	Birmingham
Jonathan Perks	Ricardo-AEA

## Programme

### Day 1

	Time	Session	Description
	Arrive in the morning		
Afternoon Session	13.00- 14.00	Lunch	
	14.00- 14.30	Welcome	Introduction (Project Team / Host City) Objectives of Peer Review meeting (Project Team) Introduction to the format of the peer reviews (Project Team)
	14.30- 16.00		Peer review of Birmingham
			14.30 – 14.50: Presentation from Birmingham (using template)

provided)

14.50 – 15.25: Questions and answers

15.25 – 15.45: Review by Training cities

15.45 – 16.00: Feedback to Malmo

16.00-  
16.30 **Break**

16.30-  
18.00 **Peer Review 1** 2 Groups  
Group 1: Dresden + 1 representative from each of the other cities  
Group 2: Training City 1 + 1 representative from each of the other cities

16.30 -16.50: Presentation from reviewed city (using template provided)

16.50-17.25: Questions and answers

17.25-17.45: Review by reviewing cities

17.45-18.00: Feedback

## Day 2

	Time	Session	Description
Morning Session	09.00- 12.30	Technical site visit	Introduction
			Site visit
			Feedback discussion
	Lunch		
Afternoon session	14.00- 15.30	Peer Review 2	2 Groups focusing on 2 training cities Group 1: Training City 2 + 1 representative from each of the other cities Group 2: Training City 3 + 1 representative from each of the other cities
			14.00-14.20: Presentation from reviewed city (using template provided) 14.20-14.55: Questions and answers 14.55-15.15: Review by reviewing cities 15.15-15.30: Feedback
	15.30- 16.00	<b>Break</b>	
	16.00- 17.30	<b>Peer Review 3</b>	2 Groups focusing on 3 training cities Group 3: Training City 4 + 2 representatives from the other cities Group 4: Training City 5 + 3 representatives from the other cities

16.00-16.20: Presentation from reviewed city (using template provided)  
 16.20-16.55: Questions and answers  
 17.55-17.15: Review by Training cities  
 17.15-17.30: Feedback

**Day 3**

	Time	Session	Description
<b>Morning Session</b>	09.00-10.30	Feedback	Peer exchange reflecting on the outcomes of the peer reviews  Introduction to the session (Project Team) Group 1 Self-organized dialogue - Peer cities Group 2 Facilitated exchange of the 5 training cities
	10.30-11.00	Break	
	11.00-12.00	Wrap-up	Lessons learnt, open issues topics identifies, next steps farewell Evaluation Led by Project Team

**Key points from 1st Peer Review**

<b>Turning points</b>	
<p><b>Birmingham</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “NI188”</li> <li>• Governmental legislative changes introduced opportunity</li> <li>• Bring agendas together</li> <li>• Commercial resilience</li> <li>• Economic challenge (local enterprise partnership)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Dresden</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Extreme weather events (heat , rain events)</li> <li>• REGKLAM project</li> <li>• Political decision on climate protection at City level</li> <li>• Flood event 2002</li> </ul>
<p><b>Padova</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heatwave (c 2003)</li> <li>• Floods (c 2010) - Vicenza &amp; villages, 0.5bn euro damage</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alba</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major flood event (1994)</li> <li>• Increasing heatwaves / droughts</li> <li>• Summer storm - crane fell on to church</li> <li>• “Attention grabbers” for citizens and politicians</li> <li>• Private sector one of loudest voices</li> </ul>
<p><b>Bratislava</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No specific turning points identified</li> </ul>	<p><b>Sfantu Gheoghe</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaboration of city and Environmental protection agency</li> <li>• Ad- hoc projects</li> </ul>
<p><b>Vitoria Gasteiz</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusion of adaptation in City LA21</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional govt adaptation framework</li> <li>Heat wave incidents</li> <li>Flood event severity and frequency</li> </ul>	
<b>What has the city done well?</b>	
<b>Birmingham</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified need for functional integration (Birmingham Energy Savings)</li> <li>Brining mitigation and adaptation together</li> <li>Public Health aspect</li> <li>Baseline data collection “re-understanding the city”</li> <li>Procurement opportunities</li> </ul>	<b>Dresden</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developed Plan (Saxony, and at city level)</li> <li>Abridged version of plan for stakeholder engagement</li> <li>Key projects – action plan</li> <li>Strong connection with Universities (data sharing)</li> <li>Strong stakeholder network in region</li> </ul>
<b>Padova</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 working groups established (internal / external)</li> <li>University based model</li> <li>Sharing information- regional / national</li> <li>Mitigation and adaptation plan</li> </ul>	<b>Alba</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Signed a charter 7/3/2013</li> <li>Established working groups (internal / external)</li> <li>AlbaPower energy grids (50MW)</li> </ul>
<b>Bratislava</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified issue problems knowledge gaps and barriers</li> <li>Identified need for green infrastructure / water management</li> </ul>	<b>Sfantu Gheorghe</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified baseline research</li> <li>Established WG</li> <li>Identified knowledge gaps</li> <li>Vice mayor committed</li> </ul>
<b>Vitoria-Gasteiz</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed vulnerability assessment</li> <li>CoM CO<sub>2</sub> reduction programme</li> <li>Extensive plans for adaptation</li> <li>Created new wetlands area</li> <li>Reorganisation</li> </ul>	
<b>What could the city improve on?</b>	
<b>Birmingham</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Internal organisational development</li> <li>Behaviour change programme</li> <li>Engagement with stakeholders including citizens</li> <li>Threats to consistency and continuity and uniformity for sub-areas</li> </ul>	<b>Dresden</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Political commitment (both at city and national level)</li> <li>Resources / funding</li> <li>Further research to resolve uncertainties on climate development (improve resolution of local level data)</li> </ul>
<b>Padova</b>	<b>Alba</b>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity building process in future</li> <li>• Organisation and politicians</li> <li>• Citizens</li> <li>• Find cities to “twin” on adaptation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Set 20% CO<sub>2</sub> reduction target for public buildings</li> <li>• Improved “cooling” of energy systems</li> <li>• Need new urban green space – blocked by car parking agreements – 15 yrs</li> </ul>
<p><b>Bratislava</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commitment and leadership</li> <li>• General awareness</li> </ul>	<p><b>Sfantu Gheorghe</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Context</li> <li>• City cannot do it alone</li> <li>• Lack of human resources</li> </ul>
<p><b>Vitoria- Gasteiz</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mapping and engaging all stakeholders</li> <li>• Evidence gaps (heat mapping Ecosystem vulnerability)</li> <li>• De -culvert streams and decouple storm water and sewers</li> <li>• Create Inner Green Belt</li> <li>• Refurbishing conference bdg</li> <li>• Additional studies</li> <li>• 2013-2020 Flood relief plan 30m euro</li> </ul>	
<p><b>What can other cities learn from this city’s experience?</b></p>	
<p><b>Birmingham</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integration</li> <li>• Keep responsibility</li> <li>• Methodology of collecting data “9 piece jigsaw”</li> </ul>	<p><b>Dresden</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish links with University</li> <li>• Good engagement with local region</li> <li>• Good examples eg flooding plan, landscape plan</li> </ul>
<p><b>Padova</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uncertainty assessments</li> <li>• Long term strategies</li> <li>• Good quality environmental NGO</li> <li>• Lobbying of politicians eg. EU-LIFE bid on mobility schemes led by 2 national NGOs</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alba</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walking buses for schools</li> <li>• Energy grid</li> <li>• Information – communication plans – neighbourhood committees and citizen engagement</li> <li>• Very wide engagement of stakeholders</li> </ul>
<p><b>Bratislava</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify small projects with large impacts</li> <li>• All cities have organisational / bureaucratic difficulties</li> <li>• Labelling (logo)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Sfantu Gheorghe</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to identify a “vehicle” to drive adaptation</li> </ul>
<p><b>Vitoria- Gasteiz</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vulnerability mapping approach</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little by Little</li> <li>• Knowledge of external experts</li> <li>• Political commitment</li> <li>• Mainstream municipal processes</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Final comments</b></p>	
<p><b>Birmingham</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personal engagement</li> <li>• Balance of personal commitments-learning from European neighbours</li> <li>• Design standards</li> </ul>	<p><b>Dresden</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political commitment really important to align different objectives</li> </ul>
<p><b>Padova</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EU Adaptation strategy - bring to political attention</li> <li>• Civil contingency is a good vehicle - translate to adaptation</li> <li>• Manage expectations to deliver quick wins</li> <li>• Adaptation plans to attract funding</li> <li>• Link to sexy items eg economic innovation and digital technology (Indirect funding)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Alba</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Still allowing development in flood plains - why?!</li> </ul>
<p><b>Bratislava</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Involve mobility /infrastructure health departments</li> <li>• Selling adaptation as cross sector projects</li> </ul>	<p><b>Sfantu Gheoghe</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A strategy for adaptation may help obtain external funding eg from EC</li> </ul>
<p><b>Vitoria-Gasteiz</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Green capital"</li> </ul>	







**EU Cities Adapt  
2<sup>nd</sup> Peer Review – Mediterranean Region Coastal Cities,  
Gibraltar 7-8 May 2013**

**Key points from workshop**



## Attendees

Name	City or partner organisation
Jana Koleva	Burgas Municipality
Dimitar Sotirov	Burgas Municipality
Nikki Kent	Ricardo-AEA
Ana Bajlo	City of Zadar
Zana Klaric	City of Zadar
Maria Ares Gabas	City of Barcelona
Irma Ventayol Ceferino	City of Barcelona
Nuno Cunha Lopes	City council of Almada
Sara Braga Dionisio	City council of Almada
Eric Schellekns	Arcadis
Corjan Gebraad	Rotterdam
Elizabeth Nijhuis	Rotterdam
Astrid Westerlind-Wigstroem	ICLEI
Marco Cardinaletti	Ancona
Raphael Sibille	Ricardo-AEA
Catherine Walsh	Gibraltar Government
Janine Galliano	Gibraltar Government
Karl Netto	Gibraltar Government

## Key points from 2<sup>nd</sup> Peer Review

### Day 1

See presentations from:

- Almada
- Burgas
- Zadar
- Barcelona
- Gibraltar

### Day 2

Coaches' reflections and achievements

#### Barcelona and Almada (coach Astrid Westerlind Wigstroem, standing in for Barcelona)

9 months project not long enough to provide support and training to adaptation policy development process – takes time and should take time.

- Outcome has been an opportunity to identify gaps and begin to respond.
- Acting as pilots so valuable for other cities to understand the challenges experienced.
- Despite all being coastal Mediterranean cities, big differences in issues and approaches.
- Focus has been on:
  - mainstreaming
  - Stakeholder consultation
  - Engaging public figures
  - Managing without access to finance
  - Data availability

#### Burgas (coach Eric Schellekens)

- Much progress has been made
- Seeking opportunities – importance of wetlands to tourism and economic activity can make adaptation actions part of win-win
- Important to respect local politics and work with windows of opportunity.
- EU funding will be critical to delivery because climate change is only one of many local issues.



### Zadar (coach Nikki Kent)

#### Structure

- Focused on developing the vision
- Used vision to draft objectives
- Created a short-medium term work plan
- Focused on integrating adaptation into water and energy plans

#### Achievements

- Got vision agreed by AWG and huge progress in getting it officially signed by the Deputy Mayor
- Tendering for next education awareness projection (mitigation focused) – added in impacts and adaptation to tender during the coaching visit – really seized the moment.

#### Lessons learnt

- Map exercise got people involved, round the table – helped overcome engagement barrier and helped AWG think back to past events and identify the different vulnerable urban systems
- Clear from outset that needed to integrate adaptation into a few urgent plans – especially water – went into details on water master plan, and really had to consider adaptation in the context of off the requirements for joining the EU.

### Gibraltar (coach Nikki Kent)

#### Structure

- Good, solid draft structure, really aware of the gaps that need to be filled.
- Gives the AWG and Minister idea of the goal so they see the purpose of the coaching visits
- Challenge now is how to fill the gaps

#### Achievements

- Set up of the AWG was really rapid, started once Gibraltar knew it was part of the project
- Team had already identified the main stakeholders and had done a presentation to wider CC forum
- Developed a mandate for the AWG so everyone is clear on their role/involvement
- Really used the momentum of the project – got involvement of the Minister and press – so great visibility in Gibraltar

#### Lessons learnt

- Great to repeat the map exercise with new stakeholders – each time everyone learnt something new, the process raised question (such as the height of sea walls/revertments) and started a list of actions for the workplan.

### Overall (coach Nikki Kent)

Very useful to coach two cities – helped refine visits and took learning from both cities to try and improve and tailor the coaching.

## Ideas for Climate-ADAPT case studies

City	Case Study description
Barcelona	Alternative water resources plan (the preferred one of 5 options)
Zadar	Securing the vision for climate change readiness for the City of Zadar, and setting up the Adaptation Working Group.
Gibraltar	How to overcome challenges of baseline data (mapping exercise, weather network, data repository).
Burgas	Linking findings from two EU funded projects on the lake channel and wetlands surrounding Burgas.
Rotterdam	Top 4 from a list of 8: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Waterplatz</li> <li>- Un-embanked area of Rotterdam</li> <li>- Tool for CBA of adaptation measures methodology</li> <li>- Underground water storage.</li> </ul>
Ancona	Activities included in the plan: Early warning system and protection of coastal area.

## Outlook

### What you will be doing after the project finishes – your next steps?

#### Almada

- Almada will face several challenges, internal and external, especially the ones that came from the actual financial context.
- In order to approve Almada’s Local Adaption Strategy to Climate Change we will have to involve in the future more departments and stakeholders. We will gather under the “Adaptation Umbrella” part of the projects that we are already developing. We also want to improve our in-house expertise about Adaption and to reinforce our exchanges with European cities that are building local resilience.

- For us it is important to strengthen the network built by the EU Cities Adapt project, were the municipalities share and discuss technical experiences, knowledge, problems and solutions.

#### Zadar

- AWG every 3 months – discuss results and check progress on short-medium term action plan

#### Gibraltar

- Central data library
- Collect data
- Use draft strategy structure outputs to steer next steps

#### Burgas

- Strategy document – 1 to 2 pages to communicate and integrate adaptation
- Integrate into Urban Development Plan (including adaptation measures)
- Formalise the AWG and contact right partners

#### Barcelona

- Continue with adaptation framework plan

#### What can the EU do to provide support to cities on adaptation after this project ends?

To development our strategy Almada need more information about:

- economic evaluation of environmental services provided by ecosystems
- comparative studies on investments and cost benefits to the adapt
- financing adaptation in the EU
- improve regional climate models (reduce/quantify uncertainty)
- identifying limits for adaptation - what would be the tolerable risk?

It is important for cities to have more data, information, benchmarking studies and practical solutions that were tested and found reliable.

We also think it is important to maintain and reinforce the EU Cities Adapt network, and to give cities, a financial context to apply measures and to address cost-benefits analysis in different European regions.



- Establish direct contacts with other cities more similar in dimension and complexity and facing similar challenges than Barcelona, worldwide (San Francisco, Sidney, Copenhagen...).
- Having the opportunity to have exchange programmes at a technical level with those cities
- Economic resources for vulnerability assessment
- Partnerships with research centres
- Continuing to provide international visibility to maintain political commitment.
- EU funds for the education system/field – to increase knowledge
- Encourage local students to work on adaptation projects
- Q&A for climate skeptics – why adapt?
- Technical visits – exchange at professional level – EC to fund 1 week exchanges
- Covenant of Mayors integration of adaptation plan – could be risky, how will it be integrated, need 3-4 years to make a plan, therefore looking at 2020 onwards?

## Evaluation

### Good things about the second peer review

- Discussions about results and other city experiences
- The site visit and the coach feedback
- Seeing what everybody has achieved, very inspiring, well done!
- Seeing the change in body language – Rotterdam: hesitating, little insecure, Gibraltar: Self-confident
- Team spirit
- The exchange between the cities during the first half-day
- Presentation of results and discussion
- Site visit – desalination plan, visiting the port
- Seeing monkeys
- Good food
- Very nice hotel, nice view, very nice hosting
- The field visit
- The evolution of the cities since the beginning of the project and their commitment to proceed the work already done
- The communication between participants and the possibility to discuss problems and solutions
- Information exchange in similar projects (opportunity to share different approaches in Biodiversity plans)
- Being able to have feedback from the peer cities and the coaches was very helpful, and we'll keep in mind the comments and suggestions they made to work on them internally. However, we missed our coach, we would have liked to hear directly from her and we are wondering why she was the only coach that didn't come to any of the sessions (Rotterdam and Gibraltar)



- The city to city session with Almada was very profitable and gave us the opportunity to exchange experiences and knowledge on the similar management problems we both share.

### Things for improvement in second peer review

- While some cities need to return during the afternoon of the second day, suggest doing the site visit on the morning of the second day – start first with a full day.
- Maybe more exchange between cities e.g. targeted strategy documents – preparing together?
- Make better use of peer cities
- Less talking by the project organisers – more city to city interaction
- After first morning no room for more discussion – pity!
- Two way communication needed between cities not project leaders
- Two days are too long without any kind of practical cases to discuss
- Ask cities what they want to do /see /hear – it’s all determined by the project organisation. Why not check needs?
- Let cities talk instead of coaches
- More group discussion about the “Visions “ developed by the cities
- All the presentations made by the group should be available on the EU Cities Adapt internet page.
- Even though we understand Gibraltar is at an initial stage on their adaptation strategy, we feel that the technical site should have been more focused on adaptation. However, we understand that it may have been helpful for them in order to foster the engagement of their internal stakeholders.

### Peer cities – feedback on how the role of peer cities could be improved

- Professionals from the peer cities could have had a more active role in the coaching of the other cities i.e. in one visit and contact by email / website
- A way of advising other cities by European cities which are ahead after this project, could be thought of
- Share experience! Discuss with peer cities what interesting issues they have to address. Ask instead of determine! People are too polite to start discussing your suggestions. We have so much to share (positives and negatives)!
- As stand-in for the coach during 10 mins, my added value was larger than during a two-day workshop.
- Have peer cities talk about their progress as well
- Use / involve peer cities more – available for questions, available to give presentations in other cities. We have “street cred” – use it!

### Personal highlights from being involved in the Mediterranean/coastal group AND the project

- Visiting other cities – especially site visits
- Meeting climate change experts
- Networking



- A very nice group of people
- Free food and cakes (Ancona)
- Different points of view
- Learning more about other problems – wider views put own issues into perspective
- Sharing experiences – lots of same or shared dilemmas
- Motivation to continue working in the field
- Little bit of insight into organisations and political context
- Good team spirit and the informal approach, contributed to everyone talk about their city problems, experiences and solutions.
- The discussions were made by municipal technicians and for municipal technicians, so it was important to see that, in many situations, cities share the same difficulties and have to face similar situations.
- The technical support given by the project team, specially the coaches, was very important to the work done.
- A great progress shown by the participant cities.



**EU Cities Adapt**  
**2<sup>nd</sup> Peer Review – Mountain Region Cities, Sfantu Gheorghe**  
**14-15 May 2013**

**Key points from the workshop**

## Participants:

Name	City or partner organisation
Piero Pelizzaro	Padova
Marta Piovano	Alba
Emanuele Biestro	Alba
Nick Grayson	Birmingham
Jose Andres Alonso	Vitoria-Gasteiz
<del>Peter Bali</del>	<del>Bratislava</del>
<del>Ondrej Ferenci</del>	<del>Bratislava</del>
Tobias Geyer	Dresden
Bela Gergely Buja	Sfantu-Gheorghe
Ileana Luminita Cornea	Sfantu-Gheorghe
Nanda T'Lam	Arcadis
Cristina Garzillo	ICLEI
Pamela Muehlmann	ICLEI
Efren Feliu Torres	Tecnalia
Raphael Sibille	Ricardo-AEA

Delegates from the City of Bratislava were unable to attend the 2nd peer review workshop in Sfantu Gheorghe and cited a change to a new organizational structure which resulted in a reduction in staff and changes of roles.

## Key points from 2<sup>nd</sup> Peer Review

### Day 1

See presentations from:

- Alba
- Padova
- Vitoria-Gasteiz
- Sfantu Gheorghe

Afternoon field trip around Covasna district including infrastructure sites and meeting with elected municipal officials.

## Day 2

Coaches' reflections and achievements

### Alba (Coach Cristina Garzillo, ICLEI)

Structure

- The project has helped to develop the framework which brings much existing work together
- Structuring the adaptation plan is next steps
- Comms strategy is part of emerging Adaptation Strategy

Achievements

- Identified priorities and challenges
- Work with civil contingencies has led to early warning systems and evacuation plans
- Working with health to identify vulnerable groups
- Building on existing work in education and waste
- Working with farmers to deploy new farming techniques with immediate benefits – taken up voluntarily

Lessons learnt

- Strong political will is helpful
- Missed opportunity to mainstream adaptation into Alba Masterplan

### Vitoria-Gasteiz (Coach Eflen Feliu Torres, Technalia)

Structure

- Developing structure of strategy draft as next step

Achievements

- Integrating existing initiatives into urban planning
- Consolidating the policy making process
- Making use of existing policies and plans that contribute and make existing adaptation work visible

Lessons learnt

- Policy development process over a longer period than project – ambitious goals
- Vulnerability assessment is still a challenge – indicators and approaches something to be developed

### Sfantu Gheorge (Coach Nanda T'Lam, ICLEI)

Structure

- Starting at the very beginning of the policy making process
- Too early to have a structure for the strategy



**Achievements**

- Stakeholder group (internal and external) established
- Church groups becoming involved in health surveillance of the elderly

**Lessons learnt**

- Natural environment and good air quality allow synergies to be made with other priorities
- Lack of staff/resources so it is important not to overcomplicate

**Padova (Coach Pamela Muehlmann, ICLEI)**

**Structure**

- Developed some content for strategy but structure a next step

**Achievements**

- Process orientated – making links and creating networks
- Developing atmosphere and relationships for cooperation
- Mainstreamed some ideas, like integrating green infrastructure with urban mobility
- New links with university

**Lessons learnt**

- Linking into other policy areas like mobility and mitigation important
- Challenges – political will has gone and adaptation stagg have other priorities
- Communicating ‘what is adaptation?’ to stakeholders

**Ideas for Climate-ADAPT case studies**

City	Case Study description
Padova	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Co-operation with university through the adaptation working group</li> <li>2. Padova’s experiences of the EU funded UHI project</li> </ol>
Alba	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Flood early warning system</li> <li>2. Alert game to educate school children</li> </ol>
Vitoria	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Vulnerability assessment – method, approach and outputs</li> <li>2. Wetland recovery project</li> <li>3. Green belt imitative – inner belt and its benefits</li> </ol>
Sfantu-Gheorghe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Process of developing a strategy – unique in Romania</li> <li>2. Increasing green space in the municipality</li> </ol>
Birmingham	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The ‘Birmingham approach’ – lessons and inspiration</li> </ol>



## Outlook

### What you will be doing after the project finishes – your next steps?

#### Alba

- Structuring the adaptation plan
- Assigning responsibilities for implementation
- Preparing timeline for actions
- Integration with the local plan has been limited so far
- Looking for synergies with the covenant of mayors

#### Vitoria-Gasteiz

- Developing structure of strategy draft as next step
- Aiming for a political declaration

#### Sfantu Gheorge

- Risk assessment
- Opportunity to influence the city masterplan
- Aim is to develop vision with stakeholders focus for communication on adaptation

#### Padova

- No political leadership at the moment so challenge will be to keep momentum going
- Further developing content of strategy document

### What can the EU do to provide support to cities on adaptation after this project ends?

- The project period was not long enough to provide support along whole policy development process. Continuing support from coaches would be helpful
- Shortage of municipality staff time and resources is major constraint for some
- Networking through the project and exchange of experiences has been positive, particularly as adaptation is such a new area. More opportunities to convene and regular forums for municipal climate change teams
- In Alba's case, the lack of a national adaptation programme was considered a barrier and meant that there was a lack of policy coherence in some places. EU encouragement and support for the development of national frameworks.

## Evaluation

### What worked well?

- Networking - this was raised by most participants
- Peer workshops
- Having a dedicated coach monitoring out progress and activities
- Communication and transfer of knowledge between project coordinator, coaches and cities

#### What could be improved?

- Project timescales are too short [relative to urban adaptation strategy development process] – this issue was raised by all participants
- Missed opportunity for linkages between outputs of the EU Cites Adapt project and the EU Adaptation Strategy
- Lack of opportunities to network with other cities groups (Mediterranean etc.) during the project
- Lack of opportunity for coaches to digest and learn more about the available tools at the beginning of the project
- Workshops preferred to webinars

#### Personal highlights from being involved in the Mediterranean/coastal group AND the project

- Networking
- Opportunity to visit other cities
- Learning from the experience of other cities and good practice from coaches
- Getting feedback from the other cities on their own work
- Support from coaches
- Networking – good combination of coaches and cities
- Increased knowledge of local authorities and their needs



## Peer Review Visit 2 Sfantu Gheorghe Programme

### Day 1

	Time	Session	Description
Morning Session	09.00-09.15	Welcome	Introduction (Project Team / Host City) Objectives of the meeting (Project Team)
	09.15 - 11.00	Adaptation Strategies - 1	<b>Discussion of draft final output - structure of adaptation strategy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Training Cities</b><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Alba</li><li>○ Bratislava</li><li>○ Padova</li></ul></li></ul>
	11.00-11.30	Break	
	11.30 - 13.00	Adaptation Strategies - 2	<b>Discussion of draft final output - structure of adaptation strategy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Training Cities</b><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Vitoria-Gasteiz</li><li>○ Sfantu Gheorghe</li></ul></li><li>• <b>Feedback from Peer Cities, discussion General discussion good things / things that can be improved</b></li></ul>
		Lunch	
Afternoon	14.00-17.30	Technical visit	Organized by Host City





## ADAPTATION STRATEGIES FOR EUROPEAN CITIES

### Day 2

	Time	Session	Description
Morning Session	09.00-10.00	Reflections & Achievements	Panel discussion – Coaches <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback on strategy structures discussed on Day 1</li> <li>• Reflections on the               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Achievements of the cities during the project</li> <li>○ Lessons learnt from the training / coaching</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	10.00-11.00	Coach-city session	Discussions on the finalization of the final output – including the strategy structure
	11.00-11.30	Break	
	11.30-12.30	Peer perspectives	Q & A Peer cities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How can Peer cities inspire other cities</li> <li>• How have the Peer cities benefitted from the project</li> </ul>
	12.30-13.30	Lunch	
Afternoon Session	13.30-15.15	Case studies and Tools	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify Case studies (30 min.)</li> <li>• Useful tools for developing city adaptation strategies (45 min.)</li> <li>• Climate-ADAPT platform (30 min.)</li> </ul>
	15.15 - 15.45	Break	
	15.45-16.45	Next Steps	Discussion facilitated by project Team Final project activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final conference</li> <li>• Final output</li> </ul> Outlook: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What can cities do?</li> <li>• What can EU do?</li> </ul>
	16.45 - 17.30	Evaluation	Lessons learnt Evaluation Farewell



**EU Cities Adapt**  
**2<sup>nd</sup> Peer Review – Northern, Northern-Central & Northern-  
Western Europe Region**

**Stirling, 21-22 May**

**Key points from workshop**



## Participants

Participant	Organisation
Simon Verledens	Gent
Maike Breugelmans	Stad Gent
Rennat Coene	Stad Gent
Egle Randyte	City of Vilnius
Vaiva Deveikiene	City of Vilnius
Timo Permanto	City of Lahti
Saara Vauramo	City of Lahti
Sigrid Glarbo	Albertslund Municipality
Hans-Henrik Hog	Albertslund
Michael Curtis	Dublin
David Snallfot	City of Malmo
Angela Heaney	Stirling
David Bright	Stirling
Jurga Tallat-Kelpsaite	Adelphi
Eric Schellekns	Arcadis
Bert Smolders	Arcadis
Jeremy Carter	UOM
Jonathan Perks	Ricardo-AEA

## Programme

### Day 1

	Time	Session	Description
Morning Session	09.00-09.15	Welcome	Introduction (Project Team / Host City) Objectives of the meeting (Project Team)
	09.15 - 11.00	Adaptation Strategies - 1	<b>Discussion of draft final output - structure of adaptation strategy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training Cities           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Albertslund</li> <li>○ Ghent</li> <li>○ Lahti</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	11.00-11.30	Break	
	11.30 -	Adaptation	<b>Discussion of draft final output - structure of adaptation strategy</b>



## ADAPTATION STRATEGIES FOR EUROPEAN CITIES

	13.00	Strategies - 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Training Cities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Vilnius</li> <li>○ Stirling</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Feedback from Peer Cities, discussion</b> General discussion good things / things that can be improved</li> </ul>
Afternoon Session		Lunch	
	14.00 – 15.00	Reflections & Achievements	Panel discussion – Coaches <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback on strategy structures discussed on Day 1</li> <li>• Reflections on the               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Achievements of the cities during the project</li> <li>○ Lessons learnt from the training / coaching</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	15.00-16.00	Coach-city session	Discussions on the finalization of the final output – including the strategy structure
	16.00-16.30	Break	
	16.30 – 17.30	Peer perspectives	Q & A Peer cities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How can Peer cities inspire other cities</li> <li>• How have the Peer cities benefitted from the project</li> </ul>

### Day 2

	Time	Session	Description
Morning Session	09.00 – 12.30	Technical visit	Organized by Host City
	12.30-13.30	Lunch	
Afternoon Session	13.30-15.15	Case studies and Tools	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify Case studies (30 min.)</li> <li>• Useful tools for developing city adaptation strategies (45 min.)</li> <li>• Climate-ADAPT platform (30 min.)</li> </ul>



## ADAPTATION STRATEGIES FOR EUROPEAN CITIES

15.15 - Break

15.45

15.45- Next Steps

Discussion facilitated by project Team

16.45

Final project activities:

- Final conference
- Final output

Outlook:

- What can cities do?

What can EU do?

16.45 - Evaluation

Lessons learnt

17.30

Evaluation

Farewell

Led by Project Team



## Key points from 2<sup>nd</sup> Peer Review

### Day 1

Presentations from:

- Alberstlund
- Gent
- Lahti
- Vilnius
- Stirling

### Day 2

Technical visit:

- Edible borders (Kelly Court)
- Edible Wall (Causeway Head)
- Flood Appraisal (Bridge of Allan , Fire Station)
- Flooding Area (Stirling Bridge)
- Edible Borders (Easton Court Raploch)
- Flood appraisal (Riverside)
- Presentation on Edible Borders

## Ideas for Climate-ADAPT case studies

City	Case Study description
Stirling	Edible borders
Vilnius	Scenario planning for climate change
Lahti	Artificial wetlands
Dublin	Pilot Community flood forums
Ghent	Local building legislation – integrated water management and green roofs
Alberstlund	Municipal planning, including adaptation and the impacts of



## ADAPTATION STRATEGIES FOR EUROPEAN CITIES

neighbouring regions