



18. Österreichischer Klimatag 2017-05-24, Vienna



GOAL - Governance of local climate adaptation: agenda-setting pathways and implementation modes in municipalities

Daniel Buschmann Judith Feichtinger Wolfgang Lexer Reinhard Steurer





- Project GOAL
- WP2: International case studies
- WP3: Austrian case studies
- Preliminary conclusions













Key data

Funding programme: ACRP (KLIEN), 05 / 2016 – 04 / 2018 **Partnership:**

- Lead Partner: Umweltbundesamt
 Environment Agency Austria (UBA/EAA)
- Institute of Forest, Environmental and Natural Resource Policy, University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences Vienna (BOKU-InFER)
- Centre of Social Innovation (ZSI)
- Climate Alliance Austria (KBÖ)

Duration: 01.05.2016 - 30.04.2018 (2 years)

Total budget: € 297.995











Problem and starting situation

- Municipalities: the crucial level for successfully managing the consequences of climate change
- Convergence of climate change-related problems and opportunities to take action on the local level:
 - Vulnerabilities to climate change, damage potentials and climate risks
 - Immediate and tangible adaptation needs
 - (Austrian) Municipalities are responsible for a range of adaptation-relevant competencies, tasks and fields of activities:
 - statutory municipal responsibilities
 - optional specific activity fields (e.g. tourism)
 - role of municipalities as provider of community services; construction, maintenance and operation of infrastructure (water, energy, transport, etc.)
 - Important cooperation partner of higher-level authorities in a range of sectors
 - Local knowledge (problems, experiences, actions)
 - Direct local benefit of adaptation measures













Thematic focus und general objective

Analyzing, identifying und **co-designing** feasible **municipal adaptation pathways** for Austrian municipalities within a **multi-level governance setting** in order to support implementation of the Austrian adaptation strategy and action plan and bottom/up action.

Research foci:

- Agenda-setting pathways: entry points, policy diffusion, mainstreaming of adaptation as a field of action on the local level
- Implementation modes: ways of integrating, institutionalizing and implementing adaptation in a durable way in the organization, structures and processes of municipalities
- Embedding of municipal climate adaptation into an enabling and facilitating multilevel policy and governance framework

Scope: Municipalities with less than 30.000 inhabitants (99% of all Austrian municipalities with 66% of the population)













Project structure



WP Leads:

- WP1: UBA (W. Lexer)
- WP2: BOKU (R. Steurer)
- WP3: ZSI (J. Feichtinger)
- > WP4: UBA (W. Lexer)
- > WP5: KBÖ (P. Schön)













Project GOAL

WP2: International case studies

- WP3: Austrian case studies
- Preliminary conclusions













WP2: Comparing local adaptation policy making in different countries (WP-L: BOKU-InFER)

Goals: Learning from climate-active municipalities in other countries (Europe, OECD) and drawing lessons on how to improve local adaptation policy making in Austria

- Review of international literature
- Developing analytical framework
- **Empirical case studies** in other countries
 - Determining case study design
 - Conducting interviews
 - Within-case analysis
 - Cross-case analysis

ENVIRONMENT umweltbundesam

- \rightarrow 11 case studies, more than a dozen articles
- \rightarrow 3-stages policy cycle analysis
- \rightarrow 11 small municipalities in Bavaria, Germany
- \rightarrow 21 semi-structured expert interviews
- \rightarrow 11 single-case analyses
- \rightarrow 1 cross case analysis
- **Synthesis** of findings of literature review and international case studies
- Drawing policy conclusions and summarizing lessons that Austrian municipalities can learn from international experiences







WP2: Findings on agenda-setting

Question: How and why did adaptation policies enter the local agenda?

- **Extreme weather** events in all 11 municipalities
 - Torrential rain (10x), floods (7x), drought (6x), summer heat (5x), storms (2x)
- **Uncertainties** in climate change projections did not play a role \rightarrow reactive
- Little to no distinction between adaptation and mitigation
- Key actors: mayors and municipal officials
- Little to no controversies due to a non-political character of adaptation, lacking public interest, broad pro-environmental consensuses → reactive













WP2: Findings on implementation

Question: Which measures were implemented and how?

- Adaptation is an issue of water (16 measures) and heat (8 measures)
 - Drainage (6x), flood protection (5x), retention (5x), forest / trees (4x), heat (4x)
- **No clear responsibilities** for adaptation
 - Young, well-educated climate change managers foster process
- NAS not known / not relevant on local level
- Municipalities highly appreciate **autonomy** in implementation
 - Little to no support used, mainly local cooperation, no information or data needed
- Missing: local capacities, expertise on practical alternatives and funding opportunities













WP2: Findings on evaluation

Question: How was policy change possible?

Little to **no conflicts**: mainly local, related to property or finance

Success factors:

 local administration, non-party consensus, pragmatism, committed agenda-setters, mayor, wealth, local cooperation

Recommendations:

 Avoid top-down approaches, awareness, be patient but stubborn, do small steps, involve external experts, integrative concept, act, show financial benefits, dialogue

Expected support:

 Better financing for local adaptation projects without excessive steering, funding of permanent local capacities, prioritize topic in national politics













- Project GOAL
- WP2: International case studies
- WP3: Austrian case studies
- Preliminary conclusions













WP3: Understanding local adaptation policy making in Austria (WP-L: ZSI)

Goal: Learning from previous experiences of Austrian municipalities with local policy integration in other environmental policy fields and identifying suitable agenda-setting and mainstreaming pathways for environmental policy in Austrian municipalities

- Policy diffusion on local level (municipal/regional) in Austria
 - Climate mitigation (CM)
 - Sustainable development (SD)
- Literature review of existing research findings about local policy integration in Austria

Instruments/ Networks and Processes :

Local or Regional Agenda 21, Dorferneuerung, LEADER, KEM (Climate and Energy Model Regions), e5, E-GEM (Upper Austria), Climate Alliance

- In-depth interviews (n=10-14, CM: n=7, SD: n=6)
- Regional focus group discussions (n=3)













WP3: Findings on diffusion and the policy agenda-setting

Question: How and why did CM and SD policies enter the local agenda?

- Initiated/started with single project (solar collectors, biomass heating power plant)
- Support structures mainly from federal state level (expertise, funding, process support)
- Reactive to regional or local problems (i.e. outward migration (SD), decline of farming, high oil prices)
- Imitation of neighbor communities
- Political prestige / forerunner as motivation
- Key actors: mayors and municipal officers, a caretaker ("Kümmerer")
- Controversies in municipal council, persuasive efforts & lobbying, depending more on individual priorities, awareness and knowledge than on political affiliation











WP3: Findings on implementation

Question: Findings on the dynamics? Which measures were implemented and how?

- Implementation dynamics differ a lot between instruments and municipalities/regions, continuity is not ensured (dependent on key actors, support structures, regulatory framework)
 - LA21: many processes end after 3 years
 - CM: topic energy became more important , activities intensified

So far "easy" measures: direct benefit for citizens visible (gain of energy self-sufficiency, local food supply, etc.), rather inexpensive, hardly tackling system change, measures complementary to existing structure (inconsistencies in policies/laws are criticized, i.e. funding of thermal energy and fossils)













WP3: Findings on evaluation

Question: How was policy change possible?

Success factors:

- Caretakers and engaged agenda-setters
- Political commitment (continuity)
- regulatory framework and funding schemes (continuous revision and adaptation)

Expected support:

- Clear information system (low-threshold , focused, easily assessable)
- clear support structures (process support & financial support, access to pool of external experts, trust in permanence and continuity)













- Project GOAL
- WP2: International case studies
- WP3: Austrian case studies
- Preliminary conclusions













Preliminary conclusions

WP2: International case studies

- Municipal adaptation
 (research) is still nascent
- Size matters

ENVIRONMENT umweltbundesam

Decentral governance approaches (e.g. CCM) may suit best for countries with many small municipalities

WP3: Austrian case studies

- Awareness raising: focused informing on options to be active
- Framing: stress positive effects for the municipality, show financial benefits ("true-cost pricing")
- Integrate CCA in SD/CM work
- Use existing SD/CM structures and networks: no further parallel structure

InFER





Many thanks for your attention!

Contact

Wolfgang Lexer

wolfgang.lexer@umweltbundesamt.at

Daniel Buschmann

Daniel.buschmann@boku.ac.at

Reinhard Steurer

reinhard.steurer@boku.ac.at

Judith Feichtinger

feichtinger@zsi.at













Outlook on expected key results

- Journal paper manuscripts
- Policy briefs with lessons learned and conclusions
- Recommendations / policy options for local adaptation pathways and related multi-level governance designs for Austrian municipalities
- Local adaptation governance booklet (incl. inspiring examples, success stories, take-off points, key messages)
- Module for training program for municipal climate officers
- Dissemination activities (science & practitioners communities)







