

# WP 4

# C2C Paradigm in Practice

Coordination Group Meeting (CGM)

02 June 2021 (Online)

Erwin Nugraha and Gül Özerol



## C5a

Cluster for Cloud to Coast Climate  
Change adaptation

**Interreg**  
North Sea Region  
C5a



European Regional Development Fund

EUROPEAN UNION

# C2C Paradigm in Practice

*A cross-comparison of case studies results in the identification of issues and enablers for putting the C2C approach into practice, and key areas for follow up activities are synthesised.*

- *Issues/barriers are obstacles that can impede or hinder the adoption of the C2C approach into practice.*
- *Enablers are contributing factors that can inform and facilitate the adoption of the C2C approach into practice.*

*The goal of the reflection workshop(s) is to analyse and evaluate the **relevance and applicability** of the C2C concept note and/or approach from the practitioners' perspectives.*



# Inputs



Workshop report



Feedback form



Workshops (Oct 2020)



CGM meetings



Bilateral meetings with CSLs

# Insights from (reflection) workshops (*work-in-progress*)

	Whole-system approach	Adaptive approach	Inclusive approach	Continuous dialogue
1) RWS-Dordrecht case study	<i>Facilitate analysis into elements of system-thinking: spatial limits, temporal limits and drivers of system change</i>	<i>Emphasise the processes change and inter-temporal complexity using pathway thinking and scenarios</i>	<i>Allow for a shared language beyond siloes, but further require integration of science-policy (policy, impact)</i>	<i>Improved process beyond workshops is needed, to allow for dialogue to continue and science-policy integration</i>
2) VCAB-Klaralven case study	<i>Facilitate analysis into elements of system-thinking: spatial limits and drivers of system change</i>	<i>Facilitate evaluating change with future climate scenarios but with a limit to the extent of the study</i>	<i>Emphasis the value of cooperation across different interest and perspectives (process)</i>	<i>Benefited from the process of workshops as well as the role of intermediary group</i>
3) Drenthe-Coevorden case study	<i>Integrate flooding analysis and spatial process</i>	<i>Facilitate discussion on adaptation with climate scenarios</i>	<i>Initiate wider participation but limited with governmental bodies</i>	<i>Depend on the integration into organisational planning and across boundaries</i>

# Identification of barriers in the concept note

- 1. Institutional barriers:** i) siloes and the challenge to build synergies across different organisations; ii) cross-boundaries responsibilities.
- 2. Actor related barriers:** contesting responsibilities between different actors, governmental bodies and individual landowners (conflicting goals and priorities and ineffective governance).
- 3. Barriers concerning regulations:** policies and highly regulated regulations, challenges of conducting the implementation and enforcement of climate policies as a voluntary measure.
- 4. Barriers around climate information and communication:** i) climate science communication to policymaking and practitioners, political commitment; ii) different timescales (short, medium, long-term)
- 5. Planning barriers:** i) evaluation between long-term and short-term planning, ii) understanding of long-term costs and benefits of adaptation, relevant tools and capabilities and funding for perceived 'additional' costs or 'future' investments.



# Cross-comparison of case studies (*initial findings*)

Mainstreaming strategy	Description	Issues/Barriers	Enablers
1) Programmatic mainstreaming	<i>Modification of core work to ensure the C2C approach presented in practice</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Defining goals to achieve resilient society</li> <li>- No guidance and challenge in understanding the approach, e.g., adaptive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Combination of the process of analysing climate impacts with other goal and issues</li> <li>- Measures that facilitate the most acceptable and cost-effective choice</li> </ul>
2) Organisational mainstreaming	<i>Institutionalisation of the C2C approach to assure integration at programme level</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The alignment to project development to allow step-by-step guidance</li> <li>- The upscaling into practice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Understanding the approach and finding vision and motivation, in a short and long-term effects</li> </ul>
3) Internal mainstreaming	<i>Modification of an organization's way of operation with the C2C approach</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overlap between internal organisation and partners' work to overcome institutional barriers to collaboration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Integration into existing spatial planning process and cycle, e.g., Spatial Risk Assessment (Kent), Delta Plan for Spatial Adaptation (Coevorden), planning (Ringkobing)</li> </ul>
4) Interorganisational mainstreaming	<i>Promotion of cooperation between actors with the C2C approach</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sensitive setting between stakeholders</li> <li>- No existing group</li> <li>- Public communication</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meaningful participation and process to build a common vision</li> <li>- Build upon ongoing partnership</li> <li>- Consider across borders commitment</li> </ul>
5) Educational mainstreaming	<i>Improved science-policy integration and support conceptual shift with the C2C approach</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Transformational change, e.g., urban development rather than flood management silo</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Science-policy integration to sustain continuous dialogue and incorporation into practice</li> </ul>

# Follow up questions

1. Do the insights capture your experience for applying the C2C approach into your workshop(s)?
2. Do the initial findings reflect your experience for putting the C2C approach into practice?

