

JPI Climate Workshop on Outreach and Engagement

5 November 2015, 09.00 – 15.00

*Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM), Island of San Giorgio Maggiore,
Venice, Italy*

Summary Report

Aim

To explore engagement opportunities with funding agencies and researchers in countries not currently linked with JPI Climate, with a view to expanding access to knowledge and evidence from research across Europe to better inform policy and practice initiatives.

Participants

Kreso Pandzic (*Croatian Meteorological and Hydrological Service, CROATIA*)

Jiri Kolman (*Global Change Research Centre, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, CZECH REPUBLIC*)

Ioannis Souliotis (*Athens University, GREECE*)

Maris Klavins (*University of Latvia, LATVIA*) (*via Webex*)

Dina Carrilho (*Foundation for Science and Technology, PORTUGAL*)

José Paulino (*Portuguese Environmental Agency, PORTUGAL*)

Roxana Bojariu (*Head of Climate Section, National Meteorological Administration, ROMANIA*)

Petra Zagar (*Ministry of Education, Science and Sport, SLOVENIA*) (*via Webex*)

Jacopo Crimi (*JPI Climate/FEEM, CMCC*)

Fabio Eboli (*JPI Climate/FEEM, CMCC*)

Francesco Bosello (*FEEM, CMCC*)

Ralph Lasage (*JPI Climate*)

Roger Street (*JPI Climate*)

Alexandre Fernandes (*JPI Climate*)

General feedback from the participants

Three countries participating in the ERA-NET COFUND (ERA4CS) briefly described the reasons to get involved in this ERA-NET:

Portugal: to establish contacts with other countries, **promoting capacity-building at the national level:** support the community in order to give them capacities and skills to apply to large Horizon 2020 projects (start with small projects to create the community needed to apply to bigger projects).

Romania: to **get synchronised with the European community and keep up with the European landscape.** Keen to convince the authorities (funders within Romania) to invest in this area. A national research strategy was put forward, but it has not yet been implemented. There is already research going on based on the demands of the end users – disaster risk management communities, for example. There are a lot of requests, but the research cannot effectively respond to all of them.

Greece: there is also a **need to make the research that is funded at the national level usable by the different stakeholders.**

The question of **how to narrow the gap between the climate research community and the end users was discussed.** This is a great challenge. Many of the major events dedicated to climate change are focused on research only. Why aren't there more end users (non-researchers) involved? Why was there only one non-research funder present at this workshop? How is JPI Climate planning to address that?

Some participants suggested that **JPI Climate should have an active role in approaching their national governments and presenting the added value of participating in this JPI Climate initiative.**

The participants agreed that **their national governments would like to input into the development of the JPI Climate Strategic Research Agenda (SRA) and that they will be analysing the final version of the SRA before taking any decision about joining JPI Climate.**

JPI Climate representatives highlighted the public consultation on the updated SRA as an opportunity to inform and compare national research priorities with those included in the JPI Climate SRA.

The **added value of joining JPI Climate versus participating only in the ERA-NETs** was also discussed with the participants. The possibility of influencing the broader set of JPI Climate activities and shaping the agenda was highlighted as two important points that are reserved only to JPI Climate members.

Some participants also recognised that national institutions, such as their respective met services, do not have the resources nor the skills to provide the climate services expected from them. There was a general agreement that **the private sector also needs to be engaged in providing climate services** in these countries.

Feedback from participants' presentations

Only a few of the participant countries have adaptation strategies for climate change. They are in preparation. Most of them included **energy and environment as priorities in their national research agendas.**

One major issue discussed is the **lack of harmonisation between the different strategies at the national level** – national strategy for adaptation, national strategy for research and education, national strategy for energy.

The role of research infrastructures (ESFRIs) in producing knowledge relevant to climate research was highlighted, but they miss the component of linking the science with the demands from the policy and decision-makers. Some participants encouraged **JPI Climate to play a role in linking the knowledge produced by ESFRIs with the demands from the users.**

Feedback from the discussion (based on the guidance questions)

- 1) *What are the areas of the JPI Climate research agenda (using the existing SRA summary we have sent you as supporting document in the previous e-mail) that are of particular interest to your country?*

There was a general interest on **how to engage different disciplines (especially social sciences, such as economics) in the questions of climate services**. **Module 3** was very interesting for these participants.

The module on **connecting climate change research to decision-making** was also interesting for most of the participants. Decision-making should be considered not only at the national level, but also at the local level.

Research on adaptation to climate change was also mentioned under this question.

- 2) *Which of the instruments for collaboration are potentially appealing and which are less appealing and why?*

Some of the instruments that the participants considered appealing include **instruments related to exploration and assessment** (mapping, workshops and synthesis/white papers), as well as **alignment to enable strategic alliances** (joint strategy papers and institutional alliances/pooling capacities). These were considered opportunities to influence the national programmes.

Some participants saw utility in **engaging in the ERA-NET**.

Several participants mentioned that **activities involving large financial commitments were not appealing to them**, given their limited ability to provide funding, including mobilising new research funding.

The possibility of using the **European Structural Funds** (from where most of the research in these countries is funded) to support these activities was discussed.

- 3) *What do you see as potential enablers and barriers to your country's participation within JPI Climate?*

The possibility of **influencing the European political agenda** in the area of climate was considered an enabler for some participants.

Since some of these countries do not have targeted research programmes for climate change, their involvement in JPI Climate could open up **specific funding opportunities for climate change research**.

The new rules of participation and involvement in JPI activities via **in kind contributions** were also considered an enabler.

The belief within some national governments that **participation in JPIs is too costly and that the added value of this participation is not clear** was considered a barrier.

4) *Do you have specific suggestions as to actions that JPI Climate could take that would facilitate engagement of your country?*

Some participants encouraged **JPI Climate to approach their national ministries and discuss with them the benefits of the participation in JPI Climate**. Other participants recognised that this approach (engagement of new ministries) is an internal work that has to be developed at the national level.

Comments and recommendations:

All the participants were very satisfied with the workshop. They acknowledged that the meeting was very productive, given that it was a small informal meeting, with several interactive sessions, where the participants had the opportunity to ask questions and present their expectations regarding JPI Climate. Furthermore, a number of participants scheduled to participate in the workshop in Vienna (and who were not able to participate in the one in Venice) have expressed an interest in being kept informed about JPI Climate activities and opportunities. Given that engagement with new member countries is a long and hard process, **we recommend the organisation of more workshops like this to build trust and relationships with these countries**.

Several participants suggested that JPI Climate should have an active role in approaching their national governments and presenting the added value of participating in this initiative. **We therefore recommend that this network of contacts be expanded (in close cooperation with the participants from the workshop) in order to reach out to the national relevant ministries**.

We regret that no member of the JPI Climate Governing Board was able to attend this workshop. Several participants expressed interest in hearing about the value of being involved in JPI Climate from a country's perspective. **We recommend that the JPI Climate Governing Board is represented at future workshops like this to demonstrate the engagement of this initiative in its widening efforts**.