

SOLidarity in climate change Adaptation policies Towards more socio-spatial justice in the face of multiple RISks (SOLARIS) Final Report

Enabling Societal Transformation in the Face of Climate Change (SOLSTICE)

1. Identification of the project

Project full title: SOLidarity in climate change Adaptation policies: towards more socio-spatial justice in the face of multiple RISks

Project acronym: SOLARIS

Starting date: 1st February 2021

End date: 31st August 2044

Reporting period of this report: (36 months + 6 months extension)

Project website: <https://solaris.univ-tours.fr/>

Lead Project Investigator (name, title and affiliation): **Dr Mathilde GRALEPOIS, full professor** (CITERES – Cités, Territoires, Environnement et Sociétés research center – University of Tours)

Project partners:

Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE) (Dr Johan Munck af Rosenschöld)

Flood Hazard Research Centre – Middlesex University (Dr Sally Priest)

LAB'URBA Research Center- University of Paris Est-Créteil (Prof Corinne Larrue)

CITERES Research Center – University of Tours (Prof Mathilde Gralepois)

CRESC Research Center – University of Antwerp (Dr Ann Crabbé)

GeF Research Center – National Conservatory of Arts and Crafts (Dr Marie Fournier)

2. Objectives of the Project (max. 1 page)

Please summarize the key objectives of the project, indicating if they are still valid.

SOLARIS aims to fill the gap in analysis of justice in relation to climate change adaptation policies. Our hypothesis in the SOLARIS project is that social and spatial inequalities exist and threaten the implementation of climate change adaptation policies and the equitable involvement of affected citizens. This is particularly true for floods, that are among the main climate and weather-related causes of damage in Europe. Through the lens of flood risk management, we will evaluate the attention given to justice issues in climate change adaptation policies and the instruments that they use to reduce the risk from extreme events. Based on multi-disciplinary research grounded in social sciences, based on a case study approach (2 per country) from four countries (Belgium, England, Finland, France), the SOLARIS project SOLARIS aims:

- To fill the gap in analysis of social justice in relation to climate change adaptation policies;
- To develop conceptual and analytical approaches to reveal social justice perspectives of Climate Change Adaptation Policies ;
- To explore the policy and decision-making process for a broad range of stakeholders (e.g. policymakers, practitioners, citizens etc.) to facilitate better participatory processes.

These aims are still valid. To reach them, we organise the results through three research questions:

- Q1: Is fairness brought on the table? To be able to analyse impacts of climate change adaptation policies, this question addresses issues of distributional justice. It aims to identify what mechanisms of distributional solidarity exist or are being implemented within public policies in each country, and more particularly in Flood Risk Management (FRM) and climate change adaptation policies (CCAP). How and when are issues of inequality and justice defined, addressed and concretely implemented in climate change adaptation policies and Flood Risk Management Policies?

- Q2: What participation procedures are in place? This question addresses issues of procedural justice. It aims to identify citizen participation in decision making during the processes of definition and implementation of FRM and CCAP. What participation procedures are in place (legal obligations, legal framework)? What are the cultural and political traditions? What mandatory procedures? What is the intensity of the participation procedures and processes? What ad hoc mechanisms? Who are the target groups? What are the effects of participation?
- Q3: What types of knowledge about inequality and justice are available? In order to address the blind spots in public policy regarding the fight against inequality and injustice, this question aims to analyse the knowledge considered but also missing within the implementation of FRM and CCAP. It also addresses the potential for capacity building on (knowledge on) social inequalities and risk. Is there a requirement for developing and /or compiling data? Are they being used? What are the steps to integrate different types of knowledge, including lay knowledge?

3. Scientific activities and intermediate results (max. 1 page)

Please provide information on the most important scientific activities and technical results from the project, including any collaborations with other projects.

WP1. Results from WP1 (conceptual and empirical framework),

The SOLARIS project focused not only on understanding public policy related injustices but also aimed at comparing them between countries. The triple-dimension of justice was chosen: distributional justice, procedural and recognition justice.

Whilst it was clear that there was significant conceptual complexity associated with the topic of justice, flood risk management and climate change adaptation, it became more obvious (c. late 2021/early 2022) when discussing early empirical results that there was politicising of justice (e.g. equality, solidarity, equity) differently in the SOLARIS countries, which led to concerns in the consortium about using these in a comparative way¹. However, WP1 succeeded in specifying a conceptual framework, adapted to a bottom-up, pragmatic and empirical approach, oriented by three research questions.

1. How and when are issues of equality and justice identified and addressed in flood risk management ? How does it link up with other policies, like climate adaptation policies ?

This research question analysed whether justice was considered, and if so how, within flood risk management policies. Analysis considered how explicitly and implicitly issues of justice were represented and which groups this included. Analysis has been undertaken at both national and case study level and has identified if there were any differences intra-country between the national and case level as well as permitting inter-country and case comparison. Deriving from this research question, we considered whether there was any difference (or not) between the recognition of different groups within flood risk management policy. Finally, this first research question permitted to consider about how justice was addressed differently by flood risk management policies as well as climate change adaptation policies and if they were linked up. We primarily considered issues of **recognition justice**, but also may link to issues of **procedural and distributive justice** in the sense of how justice may be identified and addressed in public policy and implementation.

¹ Similar decisions needed to be made in relation to the assessment framework as there were significant differences between the quality and availability of data between countries.

2. *How is participation in decision making for flood risk management facilitated?*

Analysis associated with this second research question merely focused on the processes of engagement with those involved in both policy development and flood risk management implementation. Focus has been set on intensity of participation processes and their implementation as well as the (in)formality of participation processes: who is involved? Is there the opportunity for participants to genuinely change or impact any decisions? From a justice perspective, it was a key issue to identify the target groups for participation and their representativeness are key sub-questions for considerations. Ultimately, analysis considered whether these processes were able to contribute to reducing any existing vulnerabilities and also considered whether policies which seem to address the issue of justice, achieve this through their implementation. This research question focused principally on procedural justice but, where the fairness of outcome processes were considered, may also touch upon distributional justice.

3. *What is the role of (and access to) knowledge in flood risk management ? How does this support capacity building for addressing social inequalities?*

This final overarching research question considered how knowledge of equality and justice are available in flood risk management decision-making. It also considered the form of knowledge and whether those managing flood risks have the capacities and capabilities to mobilise any knowledge and associated data. Some key sub-questions of interest included whether there are any indicators or criteria which were available to identify different types of vulnerability and whether these are being used. The perspectives of stakeholders has also been examined ; we considered what data is or would potentially be useful and if there were any data which hinders decision-making. This research question also considered different types of knowledge, whether and how, they are used within decision-making. We considered what expert and lay knowledge is needed to address inequalities and what is needed to integrate these different types of knowledge. The SOLARIS team has also integrated injustice and inequality at three different levels: 1) at national level, we have carried out a global context analysis, 2) analogies between national studies, 3) and site-specific understandings at case study level. The aim is to understand to what extent, with what levers or barriers, the policy is being implemented.

WP2. Results from WP2 (national and case-study assessment),

SOLARIS WP2 was based on the conduct of eight case studies, two in each partner country (France, England, Belgium, Finland).

Learn more here : https://solaris.univ-tours.fr/?page_id=1093

More extensively, the country reports (milestone M2.3) are the final set of case study analyses. Currently, they serve as input for several scientific papers on socio-spatial injustice in climate change adaptation policy (CCAP) and flood risk management (FRM). They also served as input for the cross-case analysis in WP3. The country reports reflect the relevant characteristics of the 8 case studies and the main relevant findings on socio-spatial injustice.

WP3. Results from WP3 (comparative report),

The SOLARIS Comparative Report presents the core results from our comparative analysis, focusing on key themes that emerged in our analysis :

1. **Policy makers should question their concrete capacity to plan adaptation and flood management for the future: the data and the type of expertise required, but also the funding capacity, the cost of implementation, human resources and their other resource capacities.** There are different degrees of justice in climate change adaptation policies and flood risk management: is the concept concretely implemented in public policies? Without the capacity to act in practice, both strategies will stay “too little, too slow”. There is a need for research on geographical specificities both on climate and governance. It also calls for the study of tensions between authorities, sectorisation of priorities and consequences of evaluation.
2. In all SOLARIS countries **there is a strong emphasis on technical knowledge.** Even in the case of England where data on risk takes into account aspects of social vulnerability, technical definitions of risk continue to dominate risk management policymaking. What kind of knowledge is available and may be used to better define risk and inequalities? Basing public planning actions solely on a technical approach to risk can lead to bias in participatory processes. Often there are no clear indicators for addressing social equity issues in FRM, which can limit the effectiveness of a particular intervention. Where such indicators exist, they are not used. The notion of vulnerability in flood risk management often refers only to exposure (location) and the characteristics of the building to withstand an event. Local authorities face difficulties in working with lay knowledge because they lack resources and because of some preconceptions. Practitioners often assume that lay knowledge is naive because it does not always agree with the proposed solutions. They also believe that lay knowledge should be homogeneous. The plurality of viewpoints prevents practitioners from using it as a resource. The existing participatory mechanisms are insufficient to collect all the alternative voices concerned by the implemented measures. In civil society organisations power relations can also be a challenge. Not all citizens are equally able to speak and be heard in participatory spaces.
3. **There are always boundary conditions to participation.** Most participation processes are based on “boundary conditions”. They leave aside the very technical dimensions of flood risk management and rather focus on the other aspects of the projects. Hydraulic and hydrological objectives remain in the hands of water and flood managers. This strategy tends to limit conflictual situations, but it undermines debates concerning the flood issue itself and discussions about potential socio-spatial inequalities in face of the flood risk. In most cases, public participation in flood risk management combines participation procedures and processes with the ambition to improve the involvement of inhabitants and local communities. Participation processes often fail to involve all target groups. “Uninvited participation” (Waagenar, 2014) sometimes plays an important (and unexpected) role. Protest and resistance may be considered as relevant and functional forms of participation; giving room to conflicts may be a more productive way of dealing with them, more than trying to enforce consensus.
4. **Justice issues relating to the allocation of investment to manage flooding.** There is often a disconnect between those benefiting from flood risk management and flood risk management investment (both intra and intergenerational solidarity). Overall, there is a lack of recognition of the additional benefit ‘value’ that investment in flood risk reduction can bring. Findings highlighted the importance of justice path dependency and how decisions taken now may relieve or place increasing burden in the future. Many of the cost-benefit analysis approaches in the countries (e.g. Finland, France, Flanders) had policies and guidance which focused almost exclusively on protecting the largest number/highest value of assets at the lowest cost. The focus on cost-benefit analysis may be exacerbating inequalities as it will allocate investment towards

higher asset areas which are likely to have a higher presence of expensive assets and associated wealthy people.

5. **Flood risk management is no longer an exclusive responsibility of governments.** Since the 2010s, the countries studied in SOLARIS are evolving from a primarily flood defence approach towards flood risk management. In flood management a risk-based approach is used, emphasising the need to address both the probability and the consequences of flood and stressing the importance of collaboration between spatial planners, water managers, emergency and recovery actors. The broadening of the actors considered responsible in FRM does not only entail involving multiple policy sectors, but also multiple types of actors like governments, (insurance) businesses, knowledge actors, individuals etc., pushing flood risk management (with competent governments) towards flood risk governance. Across Europe, citizens are also increasingly expected to participate in the implementation of FRM. However, social reality brings about that not all residents have the same capacities and capabilities for self-reliance.

4. Communication and dissemination activities (max. 1 page)

Please provide information on the most important communication and dissemination activities from the project. This may include (but is not limited to) engagement with the public (including media and communication), engagement with policy makers or decision makers (including the private sector), engagement with science communities, and elaboration of policy briefs.

Dissemination activities of the results from SOLARIS started early during the project, with several scientific communications accepted in international and national conferences in 2021 and 2022 (see below). Following these first activities, scientific articles started to be published from 2023 and even more in 2024. A special issue in the *Journal of Flood Risk Management*, entitled “Recognizing justice in flood risk management” and based on articles from both researchers of the consortium and externals, is also about to be finalised. Some articles are still under review.

Articles (from most recent to oldest publication)

- Bonnefond, M., Guevara Viquez, S., & Gralepois, M. (2024). Pluraliser les savoirs pour penser les futurs face à l’incertitude. Le cas de l’effondrement de la falaise d’Ault (Picardie, France). *Nouvelles perspectives en sciences sociales*, 19(2), 67. [\[online\]](#)
- Gralepois, M., Paauw, M., Guevara, S., & Crabbé, A. (2024). Overcoming barriers to integrate more justice into climate change policies. Lessons from adaptation policies and flood risk management in Flanders and France. *Total Environment Advances*, 10, 200098. [\[online\]](#)
- Paauw, M., Smith, G., Crabbé, A., Fournier, M., Munck Af Rosenschöld, J., Priest, S., & Rekola, A. (2024). Recognition of differences in the capacity to deal with floods—A cross-country comparison of flood risk management. *Journal of Flood Risk Management*, e12965. [\[online\]](#)
- Guevara, S., & Cardinal, J. (2023). L’impensé social des pratiques de délocalisation préventive. Ce que les cas de Blois et Ault apportent aux débats sur l’adaptation au changement climatique. *Dynamiques environnementales*, 51, 1-28. [\[online\]](#)
- Fournier, M., Gralepois, M. (2023). Des SfN avant l’heure : Ce que nous en disent les opérations de mitigation urbaine en zone inondable. Le cas des villes ligériennes. *Développement durable et territoires*, Vol. 14, n°2. <https://doi.org/10.4000/developpementdurable.22851> [\[online\]](#)

- Cardinal, J. (2023). Questionner les effets inégalitaires de la mise en place d'une solution fondée sur la nature face aux risques d'inondation. Étude de cas du territoire de La Bouillie, à Blois. *Développement durable et territoires*, Vol. 14, n°2. <https://doi.org/10.4000/developpementdurable.22869> [online]
- Paauw, M., Crabbé, A. (2023). The Social Dimension of Nature-Based Solutions: The Potential of Co-Creation Processes for NBS to Reduce Social Vulnerability to Floods. In: Leal Filho, W., Nagy, G.J., Ayala, D. (eds) *Handbook of Nature-Based Solutions to Mitigation and Adaptation to Climate Change*. Springer, Cham. [online]
- Cardinal, J., Guevara Viquez, S., Gralépois, M., Fournier, M. (2022). Participation et exclusion. La distribution des inégalités socio-spatiales dans la mise en œuvre des politiques de prévention des inondations (Blois). *Bulletin de l'Association de Géographes Français*, 99-3, 417–434. <https://doi.org/10.4000/bagf.9922> [online]

Others dissemination activities

- Please find Conferences with abstracts : https://solaris.univ-tours.fr/?page_id=765
- Medias / Newspaper : https://solaris.univ-tours.fr/?page_id=1328
- Arty experiment: https://solaris.univ-tours.fr/?page_id=1054

5. Comparison of the project progress with the original work plan (max. 1 page)

Please compare the implementation of the project with the original plans concerning the timing of work/work plan/milestones/personnel (researchers, postdoctoral researchers, PhD students, etc.). If applicable, describe difficulties encountered and solutions adopted.

Due to the unprecedented circumstances caused by the global pandemic, which were still affecting travel, work and health conditions in March 2021, SOLARIS research project has experienced delays and encountered unforeseen challenges to meet, and to work correctly. It was difficult for us to travel to conferences, to contact partners on case studies, to investigate case studies in good conditions, and so on. Moreover, one maternity leave and the withdrawal of several colleagues from the project due to personal circumstances have resulted in increased workload and responsibilities for the remaining team members. It has required to re-adjust our plans and redistribute tasks accordingly. Despite these challenges, we have made constantly significant progress in the various work packages, and there are no major delays affecting the overall progress. Nevertheless, it has been necessary to require additional time to ensure the effective dissemination of our findings, particularly through publications. There was no request for additional funding associated with this extension. The purpose was solely to use the initial budget effectively and accomplish the dissemination goals set forth in the research project. While we have made progress in various aspects of the project, the dissemination phase, including the preparation and submission of research papers to reputable journals, requires more time than initially anticipated.

In particular, we encountered difficulties in being selected by an international journal for a special issue on justice in climate change. A first special issue was coordinated with the help of Sally Priest in the Journal of Flood Risk Management. But a second special issue in a wider planning journal such as Cities, Land use Planning, Regional Environmental Change, etc. turned out to be impossible, without any contact with the editorial boards. This just goes to show how complex it is to propose the

coordination of a special issue, on the one hand, in a non-predatory, non-blacklisted journal, and on the other, in an English-language journal with a good academic reputation. Our strategy is therefore to publish the articles separately, also considering top-ranking French-language journals.

6. Social Sciences and Humanities (max. 0.5 page)

Please briefly describe how the inclusion of SSH is contributing to social change in the context of your project. How does this compare to what you expected prior to the project?

First, we would like to highlight and greet the exceptional fact that SOLSTICE has dedicated this programme to social sciences. This is not an inclusion, but a full and complete recognition. Social sciences play a crucial role in understanding climate change, providing insights into its economic, social and political dimensions.

Beyond human behaviour and individual psychological logics of a cognitive or behavioural type, which SOLARIS did not deal with, we want to emphasise the strong need for scientific productions among social sciences on climate change. We believe we need to dedicate and fund research into the effects of breaking down barriers, understanding and resolving conflicts, revealing power relations and in-depth political and ideological rationale.

Understanding social change patterns, climate governance and social and spatial inequalities in exposure to and capacity to cope with climate change must be taken seriously, considering the social sciences that can shed light on them: sociology, geography, political science, law, planning, etc.

7. Pathways to impact (max. 1 page)

How would you assess the take up and use of your project's outcomes? Did the outcomes contribute to expected impact pathways?

- Practitioners' guide

The Practitioners' Guide has stemmed from the comparative phase carried out after empirical work (Work Package 3). Through the comparison of such different national contexts and cases, 5 broad topics appeared to be the most crucial in our results and relevant for practitioners when questioning justice in flood risk management :

- The implementation of the concept of justice in climate change adaptation and flood risk management policies
- Dominant technocratic perspectives on risk and inequalities in flood risk management
- Power (im)balances, participation and recognition
- Justice issues related to the allocation of investment to manage flooding
- Distribution of responsibility between public and private actors in flood risk management and its implications for social justice

Our guide has been composed of these 5 main sections. In each section, readers may find:

- Initial points for attention by practitioners on this topic (identified as "Issues" in the final document)
- Insights from the SOLARIS project to illustrate these points for attention and learn from actual situations (using empirical evidence from our case studies)
- Additional advice to reflect on their current and future practices

At last, the concluding section provides complementary tools for practitioners. By developing the concept of a “Justice Box”, combining special, social and temporal dimensions of justice, we offer several lists of questions that practitioners may address when defining and implementing policies.

- Local Discussion Groups

Stakeholders and local partners of SOLARIS were also invited during **Local Discussion Groups** to participate and contribute to data analysis. **Local Discussion Groups** have taken place during the last year of the project. They were organised in order to present the SOLARIS key results at case study level, obtain feedback from local stakeholders and former interviewees but also contribute to the local on-going debates and reflexions on these issues. **Local Discussion Groups** gathered from 8 to 20 contributors. Depending on local contexts and potential tensions between stakeholders, several meetings have been sometimes organised. For instance, in Ault (France), a first restitution was prepared for institutional stakeholders and policymakers, before a second event specifically dedicated to inhabitants and local NGOs. Some **Local Discussion Groups** have also been combined with events from other research projects (see the case of Beerse in Belgium).

Please read more here: https://solaris.univ-tours.fr/?page_id=1055

- Arty experience

In Finland, within the Kokemäenjoki River watershed case study, we conducted a participatory data collecting method. Outdoor living rooms, which have been developed by a US based artist Matthew Mazzotta, were conducted in cooperation with the artist in Huittinen and Kokemäki during August 2022. For the events a living room was set up in an open public place and passers-by were welcomed to join the discussion based on a semi structured questionnaire. One outdoor living room was held in both cities, with the same pattern of questions. Both events were also advertised in local newspapers. The advisement influenced the stakeholders participating notably in Huittinen, where several members of a local flood committee attended. During the outdoor living rooms, the questionnaire compiled was based on SOLARIS-research questions combined with Mazzotta’s questionnaire, based on the method he has developed. Alongside the collected data, the outdoor living rooms helped to make connections in the area and to find relevant stakeholders for the upcoming focus groups interviews. The focus groups formed based on the data from the outdoor living rooms include i) parties responsible for regulating the water, such as regional authorities and representative of hydropower companies, ii) municipal experts and politicians, and iii) other local stakeholders, such as people who encounter flooding and farmers. Altogether, twelve people were interviewed in this phase of the data collection process.

Please read more here : https://solaris.univ-tours.fr/?page_id=1054

8. Collaboration with non-academic stakeholders (max. 1 page)

Did the involvement of non-academic stakeholders change or improve your plans to address the societal impact of climate change? If applicable, please note any obstacles or challenges you encountered in this regard.

- Student webdoc

Our objective was to make the most of the results of the research through an interactive educational project and offer synergies between research work and teaching activities. With this strategy, a pedagogical support was created from our research findings, for teaching course & non-academic communication. The web documentary was created by students from the Spatial Planning and Environment Department of Polytech Tours. The Planning and Environment Department is part of the

Public Engineering School of the University of Tours. The content was produced as part of a third-year engineering school course, by around twenty students. Please read and discover their analyse on Climate Justice: Vulnerability & Equity in face of floods. The course was organized and coordinated by : Denis Martouzet and Mathilde Gralepois from September 2023 to January 2024. This webdoc was made possible thanks to the teaching and technical support of the FaLab at the University of Tours.

Please read more here : <https://floodjustice.univ-tours.fr/>

- Advisory committee

Two **Advisory Committees** with external partners and experts on climate and floods were organised during and after completion of the fieldwork. This committee was composed of academics and policymakers at national and regional levels. The meetings have been planned and decided from the initial discussions among team members, with the ambition to test and refine the validity of SOLARIS research questions and results. These moments have provided inputs, developed collaboration and dissemination activities and helped the consortium in the outcomes. Some members of the Advisory Committee also directly contributed to the sessions of SOLARIS final conference in July 2024.

Please read more here : https://solaris.univ-tours.fr/?page_id=1160

- Final conference

Within our dissemination strategy, we organised a final conference in France (Paris) in order to present the results of the project and share experiences/expertise with the scientific community. This final conference involved not only the researchers participating to the project but also other research fellows and practitioners to discuss the SOLARIS outcomes and put them in perspective with their own expertise and experiences.

Please read more here : https://solaris.univ-tours.fr/?page_id=1415

9. Availability of new results (max. 1 page)

Did any third-party results become available since the start of the project, which proved relevant for the implementation of the project?

/

10. Outlook (max. 1 page)

Please describe your outlook on the future development of the project's research topic. This can include links with other projects or programmes, but also the sustainability of the network built during the project (including any potential actions you may be considering to keep connections active). You may also include any suggestions for JPI Climate in this regard and in the valorisation of research results from the project.

Eventually, at the end of SOLARIS, several topics have stemmed as relevant for further research and investigation, in order to work on better solutions to mitigate and adapt to climate change effects, but also better recognise issues of justice in environmental public policies.

- Nature-based Solutions

Facing the limits of traditional flood risk management and coastal risk management, Nature-based Solutions have emerged as alternative or complementary solutions to civil engineering works, enabling a convergence of risk reduction, biodiversity preservation and the fight against the effects of climate change. Nature-based Solutions are defined as integrated solutions, going beyond the usual technical discussions (Cohen-Shacham et al., 2016: 5). They are “designed to address various societal challenges in a resource efficient and adaptable manner”. This new perspective on flood risk management through Nature-based Solutions promotes redevelopment projects combining social, environmental, and risk prevention functions; the concept also clearly identifies strong ambitions for local communities and more broadly public participation. However, there is still little evidence of the real capacities of Nature-based Solutions to create just and equitable outcomes. Addressing the social effectiveness of NBS under different conditions and their capacity to be designed in a co-production and, in multi-stakeholder processes may still be a relevant field for research. Sometimes, as in France, Nature-based Solutions are also still struggling to develop and may encounter strong local resistance (for instance in the French context) by local institutions, associations, residents, even engineers, etc. How can these approaches be reconciled?

- Coastal submersion / erosion

The submersion of coastal areas, combined with run-off, erosion and rising sea levels, pose a major threat to coastal areas, which seem to be the first to be hit by the effects of climate change. The urban, economic, heritage and cultural challenges are huge. Today there is the need to better understand how public planning policies are being implemented, whether in terms of risk prevention (such as defence infrastructures) or spatial redevelopment (relocation of activities or large-scale spatial reorganisation). We need to look at the failures and successes, in order to draw up options for territorial reorganisation in the future.

- Restoration, insurance and justice

Restorative justice issues open new dimensions and incorporate notions of insurance, compensation, restitution and cost-benefit approaches. We are at a tipping point when it comes to defining the conditions for insuring territories and populations. We need to look more closely at issues of distributive and restorative justice, both in terms of vulnerability consequences and social costs.

11. General comments

Please add any additional comments you may have. This can also include any positives or challenges that your project faced during its lifetime, so that we can improve in future activities.

First of all, our sincere thanks to the program committee and the SOLSTICE secretariat for supporting social science research. I must thank the SOLSTICE selection committee for agreeing to support the SOLARIS project, led by a two-headed coordination team of two “relatively” young women (at least mothers of young children). We particularly appreciate the links and connections with the EU Adaptation Mission and Climate-ADAPT. More interaction with other projects would have added value to the program.