

---

# Methodologies for Climate Proofing Investments and Measures under Cohesion and Regional Policy and the Common Agricultural Policy

## Publication

[Report](#)

## Citation

Hjerp, P., Volkery, A., Lückge, H., Medhurst, J., Hart, K., Medarova-Bergstrom, K., Tröltzsch, J., McGuinn, J., Skinner, I., Desbarats, J., Slater, C., Bartel, A., Frelih-Larsen, A., and ten Brink, P., (2012), Methodologies for Climate Proofing Investments and Measures under Cohesion and Regional Policy and the Common Agricultural Policy, A report for DG Climate, August 2012.

This study developed a detailed assessment of the potential threats, risks, damage costs, and existing adaptive capacities of Member States in the realm of the CAP and Cohesion Policy, as well as an appraisal of options and strategies through which the CAP and Cohesion Policy can adapt to a changing climate. The study makes recommendations and offers guidance to public authorities in Member States on how to mainstream climate into and climate proof expenditures and measures under Cohesion Policy and the CAP. The study findings are of direct relevance for the programming of CAP and Cohesion Policy expenditures under the next EU Multi-Annual Financial Framework from 2014 to 2020. The final report is available for download.

The Cohesion Policy and the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) account for the large majority of EU spending and have a major impact on the development of EU's urban and rural economies, infrastructures and ecosystems and their services. These two policy areas can substantially support adaptation in the EU by ensuring that investments and spending under both policies are robust in their effectiveness and value under different climate change scenarios, i.e. they are "climate-proof".

The study drew on a variety of information sources, including numerous interviews with policy - makers and public stakeholders at the EU and national level and three dedicated workshops that took place in different parts of the EU.

The Ecologic Institute was responsible for the economic assessment of adaptation options, as well as contributed to the assessment of opportunities under CAP and technical guidance for the CAP.

The final report [in English] is available on this website for download.

Infographic above taken from: Medarova-Bergstrom, K. and Volkery, A. (2012): Practical Options for Climate Change Mainstreaming in the 2014-2020 EU Budget report, Brussels/London

## Language

English

## Authorship

[Jenny Tröltzsch](#)  
[Dr. Ana Frelih-Larsen](#)  
[Peter Hjerp](#)  
[Axel Volkery](#)  
[Helen Lückge](#)  
[James Medhurst](#)  
[Kaley Hart](#)  
[Keti Medarova-Bergstrom](#)  
[Jennifer McGuinn](#)  
[Ian Skinner](#)  
[Jane Desbarats](#)  
Charlotte Slater  
A. Bartel  
[Patrick ten Brink](#)

## Funding

European Commission, [Directorate-General for Climate Action \(DG Climate\)](#), International

## Year

2012

## Dimension

273 pp.

## Project

[Climate Proofing of Cohesion Policy and Common Agricultural Policy \(CAP\)](#)

## Project ID

[2369](#)

## Table of contents

Key findings and recommendations

Executive Summary

GLOSSARY

1 Introduction

1.1 Background and policy context

1.2 Main intervention logic of the work carried out under the project

1.3 Key conceptual approaches

1.3.1 Defining Vulnerability

1.3.2 Defining climate proofing and mainstreaming

1.4 Structure of this report

2 Climate Change Threats, Impacts and Damage Costs

2.1 Introduction

2.2 Important methodological issues

2.2.1 Defining regions

2.2.2 The relative importance of direct and indirect expenditure

2.3 Overview of climate change threats and impacts and associated damage costs

2.3.1 Most significant threats from climate change

2.3.2 Regional variation of most significant threats from climate change

2.3.3 Damage costs of most significant climate change threats on regional development

2.3.4 The indicative impacts of threats on receptors

2.3.5 Affected Cohesion Policy and CAP expenditures

2.3.6 Summary of the main impacts and conclusions

2.4 Assessing the adaptive capacities of Member States

2.4.1 Approach to assessing adaptive capacity

2.4.2 Results on adaptive capacity

2.5 Baseline: Development and assessment

2.5.1 Methodological approach

2.5.2 Summary of baselines

3 Options and instruments for climate mainstreaming and proofing of CAP and

Cohesion Policy

3.1 Introduction

3.2 Appraisal of adaptation options

3.2.1 Typology of adaptation options

3.2.2 Overview of relevant options

3.2.3 Adaptation options: Cost and benefits (including analysis of impacts) and their role for mainstreaming and climate-proofing CP and CAP

3.2.4 Overall conclusions and success factors and barriers for the implementation of options

Appraisal of instruments 3.3 to better integrate climate-proofing concerns into funds programming

3.3.1 Introduction

3.3.2 High level assessment of EU policies and instruments

3.3.3 Detailed assessment of short-listed policies and instruments

4 Policy assessment of 2014-2020 Cohesion Policy

4.1 Background and policy context

4.2 Ex-ante appraisal: Analysis of the relevance of EU Cohesion Policy to climate change adaptation and scope for integration of climate change adaptation

4.2.1 Needs for climate proofing future expenditure under Cohesion Policy

4.2.2 Opportunities and constraints for climate change proofing future expenditure

4.2.3 Barriers and success factors for climate proofing future Cohesion Policy

4.3 Solutions and policy recommendations

5 Policy assessment of the 2014-2020 CAP: addressing Climate Adaptation priorities and Needs

5.1 Background and Policy Context

5.1.1 The CAP 2007-13

5.1.2 The CAP post 2014

5.2 Ex Ante Appraisal

5.2.1 Funding provisions for adaptation options

5.2.2 Procedural / implementing requirements and provisions

5.2.3 Summary of gaps and opportunities

5.3 Common barriers and issues affecting the successful integration of climate adaptation needs within the CAP

5.3.1 Political barriers

5.3.2 Institutional barriers

5.3.3 Financial barriers

5.3.4 Integrated planning and delivery

5.3.5 Information availability

5.3.6 Knowledge transfer

5.4 Solutions and policy recommendations

6 Capacity needs and guidance

6.1 Background and approach

6.2 Cohesion Policy: Capacity needs assessment and conclusions

6.2.1 Shortcomings and capacity needs for Cohesion Policy

6.2.2 Conclusions for Cohesion Policy

6.3 CAP: Capacity needs assessment and conclusions

6.3.1 Shortcomings and capacity needs for CAP

6.3.2 Conclusions for CAP

7 References

8 Annex 1: Summary of Receptor Reports

8.1 Climate impacts on economic sectors and systems

8.1.1 Agriculture

8.1.2 Forestry

8.1.3 Transport

8.1.4 Construction and buildings

8.1.5 Energy Supply

8.1.6 Tourism

8.1.7 Insurance

8.2 Climate impacts on environmental systems

8.2.1 Soil and biodiversity

8.2.2 Water infrastructure

8.3 Climate impacts on key geographical areas

8.3.1 Coastal zones

8.3.2 River Flooding

8.4 Social issues

8.4.1 Health

8.4.2 Employment

9 Annex 2: Assessing the adaptive capacities of Member States

9.1.1 Approach to assessing adaptive capacity

10 Annex 3 Adaptive capacity for Cohesion Policy

11 Annex 4 Adaptive capacity indicators for CAP

12 Annex 5: Baseline – Approach and results by Member State (Move to supplementary report)

12.1 Methodological approach

12.2 Baseline assessment for the Mediterranean

12.2.1 Baseline for Spain

12.2.2 Baseline for Portugal

12.2.3 Baseline for Italy

12.2.4 Baseline for Cyprus

12.2.5 Baseline for Malta

12.2.6 Baseline for Greece

12.3 Baselines for Central and Eastern Europe

12.3.1 Baseline for Poland

12.3.2 Baseline for Hungary

12.3.3 Baseline for Czech Republic

12.3.4 Baseline for Slovakia

12.3.5 Baseline for Slovenia

12.3.6 Baseline for Bulgaria

12.3.7 Baseline for Romania

12.3.8 Baseline for Austria

12.3.9 Baseline for Germany

12.4 Baselines for North-Western Europe

12.4.1 Baseline for Denmark

12.4.2 Baseline for the Netherlands

12.4.3 Baseline for France

12.4.4 Baseline for Belgium

12.4.5 Baseline for the UK

12.4.6 Baseline for Ireland

12.5 Baselines for Northern Europe

12.5.1 Baseline for Finland

12.5.2 Baseline for Sweden

12.5.3 Baseline for Lithuania

12.5.4 Baseline for Latvia

12.5.5 Baseline for Estonia

13 Annex 6 Detailed explanation of five steps on Decision tree for prioritising adaptation options

14 Annex 7 Overview of Selected Adaptation Options Assessed

14.1.1 Early warning systems

14.1.2 Cooling of hospitals using passive cooling systems

14.1.3 Storm retention reservoirs

14.1.4 Sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS)

14.1.5 Awareness raising for companies regarding adaptation to climate change

14.1.6 Setting up Anti-hail nets

14.1.7 Buffer/vegetation strips

14.1.8 On farm harvesting and storage of rainwater

14.1.9 Enhance floodplain management

14.1.10 Plant winter cover

14.1.11 Improvement of animal rearing conditions under increasing temperature

14.1.12 Improved forest management: Forest Thinning Practices

14.2 Overview of Options with Qualitative Estimation of Costs and Benefits

14.2.1 Hydropower stations

14.2.2 Adaptation of tourism services and infrastructures

15 Annex 8 Methodology Applied by the ClimateCost Project

16 Annex 9 Summary Assessment of Instruments

17 Annex 10 Overview of Commission proposals on the 2014-2020 EU Cohesion Policy

18 Annex 11: Overview of potential barriers, success factors and enabling conditions

19 Annex 12: Boxes with examples of climate proofing

20 Annex 13 Overview of barriers to integrating climate adaptation within the CAP and solutions identified

## **Keywords**

[Adaptation](#)

[Agriculture](#)

[Climate](#)

Mediterranean, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Cyprus, Malta, Greece, Central and Eastern Europe, Poland, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Bulgaria, Romania, Austria, Germany, North-Western Europe, Denmark, Netherlands, France, Belgium, UK, Ireland, Northern Europe, Finland, Sweden, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia

---

**Source URL:** <https://www.ecologic.eu/8665>