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Agenda


Agenda

Monday 18 January

• 9:00-9:30 Registration and Coffee

• 9:30-9:35 Welcome words - Laura Höijer, Finnish ministry of the Environment, Research Director

• 9:35-9:45 The aim of the seminar - Pekka Harju-Autti, Finnish ministry of the Environment, Senior Advisor, Life+ National Contact Point

• 9:45-10:05 Climate Change and the new Commission. LIFE+ and Climate change challenges
  Timo Mäkelä, European Commission, DG Environment, Director of Directorate E – International Affairs

• 10:05-10:50 Current situation after Copenhagen. Main challenges coming from science to practice, main gaps. How this instrument helps fighting the Climate Change?
  Martin Petryl, European Commission, DG Environment, LIFE Environment & Eco-Innovation Unit, Thematic correspondent for Energy and Climate Change

  Questions and answers

• 10:50-12:15 Lunch (at the same time Press Event)

• 12:15 - 17:00 Presentations of the LIFE+ climate change projects: Idea here is, that everyone gets a good overview on what kind of climate change projects are on-going in LIFE+. No need to go into technical details, so each presentation will last maximum 8 minutes (max. 12 pwp-slides).

• Coffee break included

• 17:00 - Free Programme. Our suggestions for the evening:

• 18:30 - Cocktail in the Finnish Ministry of the Environment

• 20:00 - Skating in the outdoor ice rink nearby
Agenda

Tuesday 19 January

9:00 - 9:10  What should be achieved in this workshop? Pekka Harju-Autti (Finnish ministry of the Environment); Martin Petrýl (European Commission)
9:10 - 10:45  Workshop discussions, part I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local planning and decision-making</td>
<td>Communication and dissemination</td>
<td>Impacts and adaptation</td>
<td>Urban environment, Local construction, Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Chairman: Björn Grönholm (CHAMP)</td>
<td>Group Chairman: Juha A Karhu (CCCRP)</td>
<td>Group Chairman: Martin Forsius (VACCIA)</td>
<td>Group Chairman: Susanna Kankaanpää (JULIA2030)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions, which could be answered by all participants in the Workshop part I:
1. Adaptation and mitigation of Climate Change after Copenhagen 2009 - How should it be reflected in the EU/World Climate Change Policy? Do you have any specific proposals?
2. Any comments to the ideas presented by the keynote speaker?
3. Climate Change and LIFE+ - are there any gaps, which LIFE+ should cover? Are there any new specific areas where LIFE+ should focus in your Group's field? Are there any specific projects, which should be implemented in LIFE+ or with help of another financial instruments?
4. What would you emphasize in the future programme after 2013 also with regard to 20,20,20 policy objectives? (Programme period 2014-2020)
5. Are we doing some mistakes in Life+? Is the scientific knowledge of Climate Change sufficient for demonstrating in LIFE+?
6. What do you think about possible two-phase selection process of LIFE+? Would it help you in the project preparation?
7. Other?
# Agenda

**Tuesday 19 January**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13:45-14:00</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00-15:15</td>
<td><strong>Plenary session + discussion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:15-15:30</td>
<td><strong>Concluding words:</strong> Martin Petřýl (European Commission).</td>
<td><strong>Impacts and adaptation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Urban environment, Local construction, Energy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Closing of the Seminar:</strong> Pekka Harju-Autti (Finnish ministry of the Environment).</td>
<td><strong>Local planning and decision-making</strong></td>
<td><strong>Energy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• taking local conditions into account</td>
<td>• using web tools</td>
<td>• Local construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• examples of good participatory decision making</td>
<td>• successful communication cases</td>
<td>• Other challenges for urban environment: transportation etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• from local to creating EU-effect?</td>
<td>• how to measure awareness raising?</td>
<td>• Energy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• how to make projects truly more 'European'?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Full name of the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Marco Cardinaletti</td>
<td>Municipality of Ancona</td>
<td>Adapting to climate change in Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>AdaptFor</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Vassiliki Chrysopolitou</td>
<td>The Goulandris Natural History Museum / Greek Biotope/Wetland Centre</td>
<td>Adaptation of forest management to climate change in Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AGRICARBON</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Emilio Gonzales-Sanchez</td>
<td>Asociacion Española Agricultura de Conservacion</td>
<td>Sustainable agriculture in Carbon arithmetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BOREAL</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Madis Metsis</td>
<td>Tallinn University of Technology</td>
<td>Elaboration of novel metagenomic method for environmental monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BOSCOS</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Agnès Canals Bassedas</td>
<td>Agència Menorca Reserva de Biosfera</td>
<td>gestion Forestal sostenible de Menorca en un contexto de cambio climatico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CARBOMARK</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Silvia Stefanelli</td>
<td>Friuli Venezia Giulia region</td>
<td>Improvement of policies toward local voluntary carbon markets for climate change mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CARBOMARK</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Elena Dalla Valle</td>
<td>University of Padua</td>
<td>Climate Change Adaptation Tools for Environmental Risk Mitigation of Acid Sulphate Soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CATERMASS</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>Kari-Matti Vuori</td>
<td>SYKE</td>
<td>Climate Change Response through Managing Urban Europe-27 Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CHAMP</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>Pekka Salminen</td>
<td>Union of Baltic Cities</td>
<td>Climate Change Response through Managing Urban Europe-27 Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CHAMP</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>Björn Grönholt</td>
<td>Union of Baltic Cities</td>
<td>Climate Change Response through Managing Urban Europe-27 Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CHAMP</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Esther Kreutz</td>
<td>Union of Baltic Cities</td>
<td>Climate Change Response through Managing Urban Europe-27 Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CHAMP</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>Maija Hakanen</td>
<td>Kuntaliitto</td>
<td>Climate Change Response through Managing Urban Europe-27 Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CHAMP</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>Lotta Mattson</td>
<td>Kuntaliitto</td>
<td>Climate Change Response through Managing Urban Europe-27 Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CHAMP</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>Anu Kerkkänen</td>
<td>Kuntaliitto</td>
<td>Climate Change Response through Managing Urban Europe-27 Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Full name of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CHAMP</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Hannah Kegel</td>
<td>ICLEI - Local Governments for Sustainability European Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CLEANTRUCK</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Björn Hugosson</td>
<td>Environment and Health Administration</td>
<td>CLEAN and energy efficient TRUCKs for urban goods distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ClimaBiz</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Xenogiani Fotini</td>
<td>Piraeus Bank</td>
<td>Financial Institutions: Preparing the Market for adapting to Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eco-Animation</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Luigi Petito</td>
<td>Business Solution Europa</td>
<td>A cutting edge cartoon to raise awareness on climate change and sustainable use of natural resources among European children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eco-Animation</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Sian Hughes</td>
<td>Business Solution Europa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FACTOR20</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Valentina Sachero</td>
<td>Regione Lombardia</td>
<td>Forwarding ACTions On a Regional and local scale to reach UE targets of the European Climate Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FACTOR20</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Mauro Alberti</td>
<td>CESTEC SpA</td>
<td>Developing green products in the financial sector and reducing environmental impact of bank services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>GREENbanking4Life</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Xenogiani Fotini</td>
<td>Piraeus Bank</td>
<td>Industrial Symbiosis as an Innovative Method in Tackling Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ISIM-TCC</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Kristóf Vadovics</td>
<td>IFKA, Public Foundation for Development of Industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ISIM-TCC</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Paul Knuckle</td>
<td>International Synergies Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ITEST</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Eva Hjälmered</td>
<td>municipality of Oskarshamn, Sweden</td>
<td>Increased total efficiency in sewage treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JEREZ + natural</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Pilar Mairal Medina</td>
<td>Pascual Presa Asociados</td>
<td>New Management Model of Urban Green Areas City of Jerez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JEREZ + natural</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Africa Becerra</td>
<td>Ayuntamiento de Jerez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JEREZ + natural</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Miguel Barragan</td>
<td>Ayuntamiento de Jerez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>JEREZ + natural</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Nieves Cabello</td>
<td>Pascual Presa Asociados</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Julia2030</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>Silja Huuhitanen</td>
<td>HSY Seututieto</td>
<td>Mitigation of and Adaptation to the Climate Change in the Helsinki Metropolitan Area - From Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Julia2030</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>Leena Mikkonen-Young</td>
<td>HSY Seututieto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Julia2029</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>Susanna Kankaanpää</td>
<td>HSY Seututieto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Julia2030</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>Marika Visakova</td>
<td>HSY Seututieto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LACRE</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Giovanna Rossi</td>
<td>Provincia di Livorno</td>
<td>Local Alliance for Climate Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LACRE</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Nicoletta Rossi</td>
<td>Provincia di Livorno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LACRE</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Piero Nocchi</td>
<td>Provincia di Livorno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LACRE</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Mauro Bigi</td>
<td>Indica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LAKS</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Sara Iori</td>
<td>Municipality of Reggio Emilia</td>
<td>Local Accountability for Kyoto Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LAKS</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Nicoletta Tranquillo</td>
<td>Indica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LAKS</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Grzegorz Boron</td>
<td>City of Bydgoszcz, Poland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LAKS</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Bozena Katarzyna Napieralska</td>
<td>City of Bydgoszcz, Poland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Full name of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PesticideLife</td>
<td>Fi</td>
<td>Sanni Junnila</td>
<td>MTT</td>
<td>Reducing environmental risks in use of plant protection products in Northern Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PesticideLife</td>
<td>Fi</td>
<td>Paulina Laitinen</td>
<td>MTT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RENEW BUILDING</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Robert Wimmer</td>
<td>Gruppe Angepasste Technologie</td>
<td>Demonstration and Dissemination of Climate and Environmental Friendly Renovation and Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rozas por el clima</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Vanessa Sánchez Ortega</td>
<td>Fundación Global Nature</td>
<td>Local Action Plan for Fighting Climate Change in Las Rozas de Madrid: Application and Evaluation of Municipal Management Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Seq-cure</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Marco Ligabue</td>
<td>Centro Ricerche Produzioni Animali</td>
<td>Integrated systems to enhance sequestration of carbon, producing energy crops by using organic residues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Seq-cure</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Elena Bortolazzo</td>
<td>Centro Ricerche Produzioni Animali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SMART-CHP</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Zissis Samaras</td>
<td>Aristotle University</td>
<td>Demonstration of a Small scale Mobile Agricultural Residue gasification unit for decentralized Combined Heat and Power production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SnowCarbo</td>
<td>Fi</td>
<td>Jouni Pullainen</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Monitoring and assessment of carbon balance related phenomena in Finland and northern Eurasia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SnowCarbo</td>
<td>Fi</td>
<td>Ali Nadir Arslan</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Soilpro</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Edoardo A.C. Costantini</td>
<td>Research centre for agrobiology and pedology Piazza</td>
<td>Monitoring for soil protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Soilpro</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Sergio Pellegrini</td>
<td>Research centre for agrobiology and pedology Piazza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>VACCIA</td>
<td>Fi</td>
<td>Martin Forsius</td>
<td>SYKE</td>
<td>Vulnerability assessment of ecosystem services for climate change impacts and adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>VACCIA</td>
<td>Fi</td>
<td>Irina Bergström</td>
<td>SYKE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>VACCIA</td>
<td>Fi</td>
<td>Jussi Vuorenmaa</td>
<td>SYKE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>WATERCHANGE</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Laurent Pouget</td>
<td>CETaqua</td>
<td>Medium and long term water resources modelling as a tool for planning and global change adaptation. Application to the Llobregat Basin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>WATERCHANGE</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Pierre-Antoine Versini</td>
<td>CRAHI (Research Center on Hydrometeorology)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Chris Ennis</td>
<td>Clean Environment Management Centre (CLEMANCE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Panu Kontio</td>
<td>SYKE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Tönnes</td>
<td>HSY Seututieto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants for the 1st day only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karoliina Kinnunen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohr YM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riikka Lamminmäki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jukka Mustonen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiste Oy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ari Nissinen SYKE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niko Karvosenoja SYKE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirkka Koskela SYKE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapio Reinkainen YM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiia Yrjölä MMM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjatta Aarniala TEKES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adriana Craciun Life INF&amp;TCY Coordinator, Astrale GEIE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikko Ylääsi Tekes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesa Lepistö Tiedekeskus Heureka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jussi Rautsi YM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Perälä YM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ville Sohn Heureka, the Finnish Science Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasi Ivonen YM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markku Niinioja Ulkoasiainministeriö</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raisa Mäkipää Metsäntutkimuslaitos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harri Hautala Academy of Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanne Lohilahti Regional Council of North Karelia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuula Pehu Maa- ja metsätalousministeriö</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taija Sinkko MMM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pia Tynys HSY Seututieto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannes Lounasheimo HSY Seututieto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leena Maidell-Münster Vantaan kaupunki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reija Ruuhela Ilmatieteen laitos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olli Alanen Demos Helsinki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ihalainen Laura MaaseudunTulevaisuus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eriksson Hanna Vihréä lanka</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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LIFE+ Climate change seminar

Plenary discussion
Workshop discussions, part I

Chairman: Pekka Harju-Autti

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local planning and decision-making</td>
<td>Communication and dissemination</td>
<td>Impacts and adaptation</td>
<td>Urban environment, Local construction, Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Chairman: Björn Grönholm (CHAMP)</td>
<td>Group Chairman: Juha A Karhu (CCCRP)</td>
<td>Group Chairman: Martin Forsius (VACCIA)</td>
<td>Group Chairman: Susanna Kankaanpää (JULIA2030)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions, which could be answered by all participants in the Workshop part I:

1. Adaptation and mitigation of Climate Change after Copenhagen 2009 - How should it be reflected in the EU/World Climate Change Policy? Do you have any specific proposals?
2. Any comments to the ideas presented by the keynote speaker?
3. Climate Change and LIFE+ - are there any gaps, which LIFE+ should cover? Are there any new specific areas where LIFE+ should focus in your Group’s field? Are there any specific projects, which should be implemented in LIFE+ or with help of another financial instruments?
4. What would you emphasize in the future programme after 2013 also with regard to 20,20,20 policy objectives? (Programme period 2014-2020)
5. Are we doing some mistakes in Life+? Is the scientific knowledge of Climate Change sufficient for demonstrating in LIFE+?
6. What do you think about possible two-phase selection process of LIFE+? Would it help you in the project preparation?
Answers to the questions

1. Adaptation and mitigation of climate change after Copenhagen 2009 - How should it be reflected in the EU/World Climate Change Policy? - Any specific proposals?

**Group 1**
- focus on EU policies in our group, basing on results from Copenhagen
- focusing on the future: include more forestry and agriculture in EU climate policy discussion
- effects of agriculture is so huge that those should be included, so far have not been recognized enough
- soil conservation as a mitigation measure
- EU policies in general have to be more integrated, huge fragmentation today
- mainstream climate change issues in all EU policies
- highlighting climate change policies
- there are a lot of resources, better coordination and monitoring is needed
- EU policy needs to be coherent and go to the same direction in climate change issues
- focus on concrete solutions
- decisions on local level are of the those that lead to results
- more focus on dissemination and the use of existing systems and technologies
- public oriented processes is a need for the EU
- holistic view on climate change is needed

**Group 2**
- better coordination for better utilizing existing projects and research bottom-up approach was missing in COP 15
- better commitment from DG Environment in Copenhagen, so that existing projects could be used better in the future
- more research and LIFE demonstration projects for regional planning

**Group 3**
- Role of forests as carbon sinks is of great importance, and should be better considered.
- Role of agricultural soils as carbon sinks or sources should be much more emphasized.
- European leadership in CC issue, there is need to work in local and regional scales
- The low rate of mitigation implemented will increase the need of adaption work
- Policy should be considered in the implementation of EC white paper on adaption and WFD

**Group 4**
- Current European Union climate policy is quite good and in the future, EU should continue in the same direction, with the 20-20-20 reflecting the policy
- EU should pursue its climate policy targets irrespective of what happened in Copenhagen
- EU should take a strong role in international climate policy and have a stronger role in the future
- In Copenhagen, EU failed to take a clear and strong position and there is a lesson to be learned
- For the next Conferences, EU has to reconsider negotiation strategies and form new alliances (with developing countries; e.g. research cooperation with China concerning energy issues would open new opportunities for development of energy efficient and energy saving solutions in China)
Answers to the questions

2. Any comments to the ideas presented by the keynote speakers?

**Group 2**
- all the presented four ideas were basically good and worth supporting. However, we do not see a need to identify these ideas as the most welcome ones, since it could restrict the potential applicants' multitude of creative ideas.
- emphasize a better dissemination and communication so that results of projects would be better used in the society and work in EU policies
- broad context for climate resilience and proofing
- adaptation strategies should be looked upon from resilience point of view

**Group 3**
- This was considered to be mitigation oriented, group feels that the ideas presented are out of the scope of Group 3
- Synergies between funding instruments should be better, the question is how to increase the connections? (FP7, Life+)
- Research and demonstration should always be closely connected. We don't see it as a big problems, because there is always overlapping
- Possibilities for close connections between different funding instruments (e.g. Life+ and regional Interreg funding) should be created.

**Group 4**
- was not really answered, merged with question 3
- to make an impact we should concentrate on most important areas, transport, building, urban planning

**Group 1**
- missing: local level actions, that's where for example materials are tested...
- all ideas are important, EU is financing innovations, for LIFE+: mainstreaming of innovations on local level
- all technical solutions and ideas are there, but information is too fragmented and badly communicated
- innovations exist but are not known to the public
- Focus has to be done on procurement!!!
3. Are there any gaps between climate change and LIFE+ that should be covered? Are there any new specific areas where LIFE+ should focus in your group’s field? Are there any specific projects, which should be implemented in LIFE+ or with help of other financial instruments?

Group 3
• More emphasis and focus on agricultural systems, e.g. relation between agriculture and environment: e.g. biomass production, GHG emissions.
• How to implement climate change issues to real world, e.g. for industry and connections to business
• Possibilities and environmental impacts of renewable energy (of great importance in EU policy)
• Role of wetlands in relation to climate change
• Use of new materials for adaption and mitigation work, e.g. nanomaterials
• More dissemination of Life+ results is needed

Group 4
• If we want to create an impact then we should concentrate on the areas that have the greatest impact on climate and climate change mitigation. These are: transport and building sectors, and urban structure/planning. There are few projects on these topics in LIFE+ currently.
• Also, there is a lack of projects on approaches and applications and demonstrations of new and existing technologies and materials to promote energy saving and energy efficiency.

Transport is a growing sector in energy consumption all over Europe. Issues and topics that should be covered:
New technologies for transport sector to reduce the emissions and enhance energy efficiency of vehicles
Heavy vehicles (trucks) are a key target for mitigation actions
New fuels, renewable energy sources, natural gas and biogas solutions
Electrification of vehicles
Better vehicle technologies/ energy efficiency

Buildings consume a lot of energy, especially during their lifetime (50 – 100 years or more). Issues and topics that should be covered:
• energy efficient solutions in construction: new buildings and renovation of existing building stock
• review of regulations, standards and the need for new ones
• new technologies and materials in construction
• demonstrating and promoting existing technologies that have not been taken into use (because of variety of reasons: techno-economic, socio-cultural, attitudes, risk-averse behaviour, etc.)

Energy production and use are the major sources of CO₂ emissions. Issues and topics that should be covered:
• Bio-energy, biomass and new technologies, 2nd generation biofuels
• Biogas and natural gas
• Electrification of road transport and its impacts on energy production/infrastructures
• Decentralised energy production and renewable energy sources, new technologies and their impacts on energy infrastructure, and land use planning
• Smart grids
• Carbon capture and storage - CCS

Urban structure and planning is the integrating link between transport, building and energy sectors. Issues and topics that should be covered:
• integrated transport and urban planning
• urban sprawl
• energy efficient solutions in urban structure (e.g. district heating) and planning

Group 1
new methods of dissemination could be developed in LIFE
energy savings and efficiency of industry and manufacturing

Group 2
dissemination as a main thing to improve LIFE impact towards society
Answers to the questions

4. What would you emphasize in the future LIFE programme after 2013 also with regards to 20/20/20 policy objectives?

Group 4
If we want to create an impact and serve the 20-20-20 targets, we should concentrate on the areas that have the greatest impact for climate – transport and building sectors, urban structure/planning

• LIFE+ could be a stronger instrument in promoting approaches and applications and demonstration of new and existing technologies and materials for energy saving and energy efficiency
• Give more emphasis on dissemination and implementation, demonstration of new technologies and materials for energy saving and energy efficiency
• Allow different funding rules for different organisations depending on the size and type of the organisation. This has great importance for companies and NGOs
• Make it easier for enterprises to join: funding rules, reporting rules, possibility to get benefits from results of projects (technologies, approaches developed during project), also overhead – few organisations have overheads with only 7%
• Bring transfer of technologies from theory to practice => need to identify the missing links and the barriers to implementation of innovations and application of new or existing technologies
• Support innovative approaches, solution and investments for companies, and allow innovative approaches more generously
• Campaigning for energy saving and efficiency, including also finance sector, demonstration
• After LIFE: Maintenance of the project – projects should be self-sustainable, end of LIFE strategy to allow return of investments
• A new Theme for the call: climate change mitigation and adaptation?

Group 1
sustainability of biomass is very important

Group 2
nothing to add

Group 3
• More emphasis on assessing financial costs for impacts and adaptation
• More industrial involvement, emphasis on most polluting industry, potentially including quotas for participation of industrial partners
• SME (small and medium sized enterprises) participation should be encouraged
Answers to the questions

5. Are we doing some mistakes?

Is the scientific knowledge of climate change sufficient for testing in LIFE+?

Group 1
- more attention should be given to dissemination
- common LIFE+ projects dissemination would help
- mistake: that there is no monitoring after the project, due to lack of financing
- dissemination should be enabled after the project duration, funding needed for those actions
- knowledge and technology transfer should be sharpened
- climate change knowledge will never be complete
- EC has externalised the expertise, this can be both good or bad → should be thought of at least
- it’s sufficient, but scientists are always suspicious

Group 2
- of course some small mistakes always happen, but did not find any huge mistakes
- the needed level of scientific certainty depend on the application for the project
- depends on the case

Group 3
- Own financial contribution should be less than 50%, so it is easier for NGOs etc.
- shorter timeline for writing proposals and possibility to update the proposal
- uncertainty is there but it can be dealt with
- Financial reporting is heavy and complicated, it should be simplified
- Indicators of the evaluation-tables should simplified/clarified
- Scientific uncertainty cannot be avoided, but can be treated with proper methods in model exercises, joint calls between EU/FP7 and Life+ could be a possibility, where uncertainty is dealt with in the scientific products.
- Spatial downscaling of results is an issue of uncertainty

Group 4
- The scientific knowledge of climate change as a phenomenon is sufficient as a basis for planning measures, new technologies and actions
- The knowledge about the solutions, for example how to act in a more energy efficient manner and be more energy efficient, is still partly not sufficient.
- About the basics we however do know enough: we spend too much energy and we need to act to reduce energy use
- Knowledge about the solutions is provided by other (research) programmes as well
6. What do you think about possible two-phase selection process of LIFE+? Would it help you in the project preparation?

**Group 2**
- in favour
- better support for inexperienced applicant
- it's possible for EC to hint if there are two similar projects, that could be combined into a better one
- concept should be really short, no detailed budget should be required or very general otherwise it could be a hindrance
- better instructions for applying

**Group 3**
- Majority's opinion was that two-phase selection process is useful, if the first phase is simple and short, and response time from Commission is short
- There are also advantages in one-phase selection process, if the proposal is very complex and many partners are involved.

**Group 4**
- The majority of the group were in favour of the 2 step process
- Some problems (in 2-step) were also identified: selection process could become longer, it might be difficult to adequately present a good idea in a short proposal template (evaluators might not understand too short proposal) and this could lead to unnecessary refusals; some felt that 2-step could also increase work amount in preparation of proposals
- 2-step is preferable for public bodies and NGOs but the time frame of the process should not be extended from the current one; it might be sensible to evaluate the possibility to partly finance the development of the full proposal (2nd step) for proposals selected in the 1st step

**Group 1**
- in favour
- clear information needed
- save of time and resources

**Group discussion for the audience:**
discussion of agriculture and soil conservation in connection to climate change has to be centred
Reports from the afternoon workshops
Reports from workshops

Group 1: Local planning and decision-making

- focusing on local authorities and their responsibilities
- how local authorities can combat climate change in a good way
- we started with discussing about local authorities and their mandates in different countries, that is an important issues
- Climate change is crucial issue, clear visibility of climate change effects
- has been identified as a big impact causing a lot of expenses
- CHAMP tries an integrated way to handle climate change related issues, including more groups NGOs etc.
- giving tools for the city leadership
- IMS should be promoted to local authorities in Europe
- assisting local authorities to organise their work more effectively
Reports from workshops

**Group 2: Communication and dissemination**

- Communication and dissemination
- how to make a project more European?
- best practices should be made known in whole Europe if they are applicable
- in many cases projects should be more European
  - by partnership (European partners in one project)
  - improved Communication and dissemination
  - project-by-project assessment of applicability for project results
  - translating results may be a good tool, but in a sensible way ad the costs should be reflected in the commission
- ECO-ANIMATION as a good example
- better communication and dissemination plans, there should be more emphasis on those plans in evaluations
- user-centred approach for e.g. web tools
- make the sure as a centre point for communication
- teenagers as importance audience that has been missing in LIFE projects
- mechanism of applying for After-LIFE dissemination funding has to be more simple and perhaps more resources could be directed to that

- How to measure awareness rising?
- there is a need to do that. However, often this is not possible since this is a complicated issue.
- requirement by EU about LIFE awareness
- also of the project key measures
- 2-way survey could be used
Reports from workshops

Group 3: Impacts and adaptation

1. Uncertainties in the scientific knowledge (e.g. scenarios, extreme weather events, climate variability)
   - Uncertainty in rate of change and downscaling of scenarios
   - Should use wide range of scenarios, both climate warming and cooling (Gulf stream turning?) scenarios.
     Latter (Gulf) may be rapid, but unlikely, should however include to scenarios
   - Standardize scenarios
   - Give answers on rate of change to stakeholders; probability of extreme events, adaptation measures for these;
   - Adaption should be started now, with wise use of models

2. Knowledge gaps in adaptation (e.g. sectors, spatial scales)
   - Lack of data for biodiversity change due to climate change
   - Lack of size effects assessments of different adaption tools
   - Short-term vs. long-term effects (e.g. forest burning effects)
   - Spatial scaling; guidelines needed

3. How to communicate information to stakeholders and policy makers?
   - Communication with open media is important, TV and printed media shoube targeted,
   - Local key people should also be targeted, clear, simple and concrete dissemination is needed
   - Simplify information, linking to daily work, make stakeholders/people to understand, more resources for dissemination
     in Life+ projects. National languages are important, but the main results also available in English,

4. Possibilities to assess costs of inaction and costs and benefits of adaptation
   - Socio-economical factors are important. There is a lack of economical values for ecosystem services, but are difficult to
     evaluate, and overall is a complex issue. Cost-benefit-analyses will be made at several projects, and should be an
     integral part of studies. In some sectors this is easy, but overall there is a lack of criteria how to valuate. However,
     socio-economic items are

5. Links between mitigation, adaptation and effects
   - useful to consider in action in the project, this information is requested.
   - Always have to mitigate, following with the best possible adaption measures, win-win-situations, after Copenhagen CC
     related ecosystem effects are increasing, and will need more adaption tools in the future. Identification of the
     threshold values is important.
Reports from workshops

Group 4: Urban environment, Energy

In the Factor20-project, regional decisions and solutions are sought, how the different regions can contribute to national targets. For example in the south of Italy there is large potential for renewable energies (especially wind and solar energy). There is however, also local resistance to wind energy/mills and possible controversy between agriculture and energy production. In the project, also land use strategies and local politics are taken into account. In Northern Italy there is not so much potential for renewable electricity generation, and thus the focus is on energy saving and energy efficiency, especially in civil sector and also on the potential for biomass residues and other renewable heating systems (e.g. heat pumps). Action is promoted on local and regional levels, according to the burden sharing principle. Biomass is also a delicate issue, as the country has a quite convenient feeding tariff for (< 1MW) biomass plants and this could boost import of bio-fuels from other countries, also overseas. Measures for achieving the EU targets on bio-fuels are still to be defined in a national plan and then be allocated to the regions.

Biomass is an important energy source in Europe. The issues include problems in logistics: how to reach the sources, transport the biomass and diminish the burden of transport. Also, decentralised approaches have difficulties in finding markets. Determining the appropriate size for biomass production (big is not always beautiful) is a central question also. Looking for these solutions could be something unique for LIFE.

Biofuels is an area where LIFE+ should be more active. There are already projects dealing with it, but LIFE could be a good vehicle in looking at the issue on a larger scale, demonstrating and developing. 2nd generation biofuels are coming (waste, such as agricultural waste, residues) and this is a challenge that LIFE+ needs to address. In the projects, an integrated approach is needed, and the agriculture sector needs to be involved. Sustainability of biomass is an important issue and needs to be tackled. For LIFE+, distribution and getting people to use biofuels would be good areas to promote. Also technology development and use are areas where LIFE+ could have a stronger role.

New approaches for LIFE+ are needed. For example marketing, and enabling smaller producers to enter the markets and the role of public procurement could be new areas to promote.

In the RENEW BUILDING project, a new approach has been adopted. Previously in LIFE you had a dirty (= environmental) problem and you solved it. But in the project a new type of house was built, but there was no problem to start with. Creating new solutions and allowing innovative approaches more generously should be a new approach for LIFE+.

LIFE+ should have a strong role in demonstrating new and existing technologies and solutions in the energy, building and urban structure sectors. Subsidy systems could be changed. Demonstration could start form a small scale, where the technology/approach could be tested and then expanded to larger scale. For example, construction has one of the biggest potentials in reducing CO2 emissions and has long time frames. Life cycle consumption of energy of buildings is more important that the construction time consumption = emissions. However, the building branch as it is very risk averse, and builders are very conservative in adopting new technologies and solutions. There is a great need for show cases where they see the new technologies. Also, the technologies need to be available, and it is important to bring the enterprises to the market.

It is also very important to monitor, evaluate and report the progress in adopting new technologies – also problems need to be reported and analysed.

Refining information is important: currently there is quite a lot of information about for example new technologies in energy efficiency, but the information is not concise, and it is not well demonstrated, not evaluated, and quite difficult to find. It would be good to have a registry of technologies where searching and finding solutions would be easy. We are using a lot of time now by searching for the information.

Discussion: climate change includes everything, if you want to have concrete action, there should be identified essential climate change adaptation areas. EC made a good job with addressing on sustainability of liquid biofuels but not of solid biomass that needs to be discussed, we hope that this discussion will go on.
Concluding words
Concluding words  (Martin Petrtyl)

• the seminar was very useful and important
• Some of the most important things in the discussion:

1. dissemination especially after the project is finished → sustainability of the projects, after LIFE, perhaps it need to be stressed more, further dissemination should be widened could be reflected in the future regulations
2. each region and countries has its own rules, all projects produce some kind of guidelines for transferability, sometimes even transboundary – this know-how should be consolidated
3. interesting to hear about what is European: simply everything that is in Europe!
   But this has to better specified for clarity of the LIFE+ programme itself.
4. further dissemination of good practices, perhaps the system need to be improved.
   sometimes the projects do not have enough forces to disseminate further on
5. teenagers: very important for EU, so we have to ensure that this target group understands us
6. we gather a lot of information and how to “digest” those could be topic in the projects as well
7. it seems that the flexibility of the programme is good
8. perhaps more demonstration is needed
9. projects that think about how it is in 50 years, these projects are welcome
10. Easier access to LIFE+ for especially SMEs is clear, too.
    Forms should be simplified as much as possible.
11. all the groups were well in favour of two-step procedure in Life proposal evaluation
PowerPoint slides presented (1-5)

Participating 30 Life+ climate change projects
**ACT - Adapting To Climate Change in Time** (Beneficiary is Municipality of Ancona) focuses on the development of a process capable of resulting in an effective municipal strategy for local climate change adaptation. This will be achieved by involving (and increasing awareness among) local stakeholders in a consultation process to help determine proportionate, appropriate and cost-effective measures to be included in the adaptation strategy.

**AdaptFor** (The Goulandris Natural History Museum/ Greek Biotope Wetland Centre) This project aims to demonstrate that forest management can be adapted to climate change, while enhancing the capacity of forest services. The project will also inform all stakeholders why it is necessary to adapt forest management to climate change.

**AGRICARBON** (Asociación Española Agricultura de Conservación / Suelos Vivos) This project aims to encourage the progressive establishment of sustainable agricultural techniques to new climatic conditions resulting from global warming. The research will assess CO2 emissions and energy consumption on farms based on climatic characteristics, type of crops, and type of farming.

**BIOGRID** (Naturgas Energía Distribución S.A.): This project will demonstrate the feasibility of producing a substitute natural gas (bio-methane) from biogas, for injection into the natural gas grid and use as vehicle fuel. To achieve this goal, coupling biogas production with an innovative biogas upgrading system will be carried out combining biological and cryogenic technologies to capture and store the CO2 in the biogas and to remove other contaminants (SH2, volatiles, moisture, etc).

**Boreal Peatland Life** (Metsähallitus) Boreal Peatland Life aims to improve the habitat quality of 54 Natura 2000 sites in the unique Finnish peatland network. The project will concentrate on the restoration of priority habitats, including three of the most threatened priority habitat types: aapa mires, bog woodlands and active raised bogs.
The City of Ancona, placed in the centre of Italy is the capital of the Marche Region. The City counts slightly more than 100,000 inhabitants.

Ancona hosts, in the old part of the city, one of the most important ports in the Adriatic region for passengers, freights and fishing.

The urban environment is characterized by a not very high density of population (814,97 /km²), and a very faster and spread building development.

The City is a complex, dynamic, culturally-active reality, which is gradually changing, presenting various criticalities and issues, from the social and environmental point of view.

Even though Ancona is a small/medium city, either for number of inhabitants or dimensions, it has to manage the typical issues of the big cities.

2000: started up of LA21 PROCESS
2002: established of LA21 AGENCY for MONITORING implementation of ANCONA 2012 - LOCAL ACTION PLAN
2004: signed AALBORG COMMITMENTS
2005: Partner in MUE25 project (www.mue25.net)
2006: signed ADRIATIC ACTION PLAN 2020 SHARED WITH 24 ADRIATIC CITIES
2006: implementation of ANCONA SUSTAINABILITY REPORT
2007: Lead Partner in EASY project (IEE - www.easyaction.eu)
2008: PARTNER of the SUSTAINABLE ENERGY CAMPAIGN
2009: signed THE COVENANT OF MAYOR
2010: ACT PROJECT
ACT PROJECT ID

- **PROJECT NAME:** ADAPTING TO CLIMATE CHANGE IN TIME
- **PROJECT ACRONYM:** ACT
- **COUNTRIES INVOLVED:** ITALY, GREECE, SPAIN
- **TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET:** 1,752,258 €
- **EXPECTED START DATE:** 01/01/2010
- **EXPECTED AND DATE:** 30/11/2012
- **PROJECT POLICY AREA:** CLIMATE CHANGE

THE PROJECT ACT

Aims to demonstrate that through an inclusive and participatory process, shared by all the local actors involved, it is possible to develop a local adaptation plan able to forecast and mitigate environmental, social and economic impacts of climate change on the most vulnerable sectors of the European cities in the Mediterranean basin.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

- Defining of a standard methodology to create local adaptation strategies, by means of a participatory approach within the local communities.
- Involving (by increasing their awareness) local actors (local industries, citizens, health system, civil protection, etc.) in development of local adaptation strategy.
- Enhancing the competence of local authorities in understanding the effects of climate change, and hence in planning and implementing policies and actions to adapt to them.
- Straightening synergies between adaptation and mitigation policies at local level.
- Providing the Mediterranean Cities, characterized by different territorial, socio-economic and climatic conditions, with a shared methodology for local impact assessment.

PARTNERSHIP

- MUNICIPALITY OF ANCONA (IT) – Lead Partner
- MUNICIPALITY OF BULLAS (ES)
- MUNICIPAL ENTERPRISE FOR PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT OF PATRAS (GR)
- FORUM OF ADRIATIC AND IONIAN CITIES (IT)
- ISPRA – INSTITUTE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND RESEARCH (IT)
**WORK ACTIONS**

- **Project Management:**
  The project involves start-up management, coordination and management of the partners, monitoring, reporting and auditing.

- **Baseline scenario and capacity building:**
  Collecting and analyzing all the information on an expert model and climate forecasting scenarios and on international experiences in local adaptation plans.

- **Local impact assessment:**
  Defining a shared methodology for local impact assessment. Local impact assessments will be developed by each city taking into account economic, social and environmental aspects. At the end of this action a road map for local adaptation strategies will be created to guide local authorities in developing a local adaptation strategy.

- **Local adaptation strategies:**
  The three Cities involved will establish their own LOCAL ADAPTATION BOARD (including the main stakeholders involved) and will develop their LOCAL ADAPTATION PLAN officially approved within the end of the project.

- **Evaluation of project results:**
  Evaluating project results through a peer review that aims at developing guidelines that can be implemented by other Municipalities willing to develop local adaptation plans.

- **Communication and dissemination of results:**
  Communicating to a wide range of public, social, private, economic sectors, national and EU Institutions the results of the project.

---

**PROJECT TIMETABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTION 1: Project management and monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION 2: Baseline scenario and capacity building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION 3: Local impact assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION 4: Local adaptation strategy by Ancona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION 5: Local adaptation strategy by Patras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION 6: Local adaptation strategy by Bullas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION 7: Evaluation of project results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION 8: Communication and dissemination of results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**CLIMATE CHANGE IS...**

**PROJECT ACT**

**ADAPTING TO CLIMATE CHANGE IN TIME**

MARCO CARDINALETTI

PROJECT MANAGER

MUNICIPALITY OF ANCONA

Environmental and EU Program Department
carmar@comune.ancona.it
+39 071 222 2673
+39 328 92 66 073
Project’s basic information

PROJECT BUDGET AND REQUESTED EC FUNDING
Total project budget: 1,719,112 €
Total eligible project budget: 1,666,712 €
EC financial contribution requested: 833,356 € (=50 % of total eligible budget)

PROJECT’S DURATION
Start Date: 01/01/2010          End Date: 30/06/2013

BENEFICIARIES
Coordinating beneficiary: The Goulandris Natural History Museum / Greek Biotope Wetland Centre
Associated beneficiary: General Directorate for the Development and Protection of Forests and Natural Environment / Ministry for the Environment, Energy & Climate Change

Project objectives:

a) Demonstration of the approach of adapting forest management to climate change

b) Enhancement of the capacity of forest services to adapt forest management to climate change

c) Dissemination of the need for adaptation of forest management to other stakeholders and to the general public

Actions and Means:

Demonstration of the approach of adapting forest management to climate change

4 pilot sites
where changes in vegetation have already been observed (dying out of fir, invasion of conifers in evergreen broadleaved forests)

Integration of the findings to give guidance and training
**Four Pilot Sites**

**Actions and Means:**

a) **Demonstration of the approach of adapting forest management to climate change**

- Production of time series of temperature and precipitation:
  - a) 1950–2009 and b) 2010–2050
- Examination of:
  - soil condition
  - vegetation growth and age structure
  - forest health

  = assessment of the impacts of climate change (CC) on the 4 forest ecosystems

  revision of the forest management plans in the 4 pilot sites

**Actions and Means:**

b) **Enhancement of the capacity of forest services to adapt forest management to climate change**

- Circulation of the experience to a wider audience
- Implementation of a training course targeted to forest managers
- Drafting and publication of guidelines for the adaptation of Greek forest management to climate change

Thus, the project results and recommendations for forest adaptive management will be widely applicable.

**Actions and Means:**

c) **Dissemination of the need for adaptation of forest management to other stakeholders and to the general public**

- Communication and dissemination will be conducted via a web page, leaflets, the opening and closing meetings, press releases, media work etc.

At the end of the project, an ‘After-LIFE Communication Plan’ will be produced setting out how dissemination of the project results will continue over the coming years.
Expected results

◊ Assessment of the effects of climate change in selected forest ecosystems in Greece

◊ Incorporation of climate change considerations in selected forest management plans

◊ Production of guidelines on the adaptation of forest management to climate change in Greece

◊ Wide dissemination of the need to adapt forest management to climate change and the approach to do so

◊ Training of the personnel of the forest services to incorporate climate change considerations in their forest management
LIFE + AGRICARBON
Sustainable Agriculture in Carbon Arithmetics
LIFE 08 ENV/E/129

Duration of the project:
48 months (01/01/2010 – 31/12/2013)

Total budget in euro:
2,674,653.00

EC contribution in euro with %:
1,237,262.00 (46.26%)

Generic Theme:
Reduction of emission of greenhouse gases

Coordinating beneficiary:
AEAC.SV (Spanish Association for Conservation Agriculture . Live Soils) – Non profit making association. www.aeac-sv.org

Associated beneficiaries:
University of Córdoba (Spain)
IFAPA (Spain)
European Conservation Agriculture Federation – ECAF (Belgium)

Climate change and Agriculture
Agriculture is the 3rd activity emitting more GHG in Spain, MAINLY DUE TO SOIL TILLAGE:
- Losses of 50% Soil Carbon related to Organic Matter.
- When tilling there are high CO₂ releases from soil to atmosphere, due to burning of Soil Carbon…C+O₂ = CO₂
- High ENERGY consumptions due to excessive and intensive tillage.

Erosion: also a big environmental problem
EUROPE: 157 M de Hectares are seriously affected by erosion (3 times as large as France)
SPAIN: More than 50% of agrarian surface is also affected.
Conservation agriculture: a holistic approach

Conservation agriculture, based in NO TILLAGE systems, with PERMANENT SOIL COVER with CROP ROTATIONS offers:
- Mitigation of the Climate Change.
- Crops adaptation to the Climate Change
- Control of erosion and desertification.
- Increased energy saving and efficiency.
- At least same yields for European farmers.

Conservation agriculture…. YES, WE CAN!!

Precision Agriculture: let's play & save in Agriculture

Precision Agriculture is a concept relying on the existence of in-field variability. It requires the use of technologies, such as global positioning (GPS), sensors, satellites or aerial images, and information management tools (GIS) to assess and understand variations.

Proyecto LIFE + AGRICARBON

- This project aims to encourage the progressive establishment of sustainable agricultural techniques (Conservation Agriculture and PA), contributing to GHG emission decreases and the adaptation of the agricultural system to the new climate conditionants found in global warming.
**Proyecto LIFE + AGRICARBON. Main actions**

- Verification and demonstration of adaptive capacity of CA and PA to the expected climate change variations by the evaluation of grain yields and quality parameters, and of the moisture content in the soil (Objectives 1 and 2).
- CO₂ emission and energy evaluation of farms via a virtual management digital platform through a web page. (Objective 3).
- Verification of the sink effect of CA, by the study of carbon sequester rates from laboratory analyses of the organic matter content evolution in soil samples taken at different depths (Objective 4).

**Proyecto LIFE + AGRICARBON: Sinergies**

**MITIGATION AND ADAPTATION TO CLIMATE CHANGE**

- Conservation Agriculture:
  - Use soil as carbon sink.
  - Reduces CO₂ emissions due to the no tillage of the soil.
  - Need much less fuel in farms.
  - Promotes a better water use by crops, specially important in drought conditions.

- Precision Agriculture:
  - Helps better tractor driving, avoiding overlaps, meaning less inputs needed in farms.
  - Optimise the use of agrichemicals.

---

**Thank you!**

**Contact:**
Emilio González-Sánchez
Agronomist
Manager of LIFE+ Agricarbon project
egonzalez@aeac-sv.org
Project website available soon, meanwhile:
www.aeac-sv.org (only Spanish version) – www.ecaf.org
The LIFE BIOGRID Project

Dr. Angel Mª Gutierrez

Helsinki, 18-19 Jan. 2010 Climate Change Seminar
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an integrated energy group

Naturgas Energia is a Spanish energy group whose aim is to supply natural gas and electricity to businesses and individuals

transmission and distribution of natural gas

- third rank gas transmission operator in Spain 400 Km
- second rank Spanish gas distribution operator 6,000 Km

commercialization of natural gas and electricity

- gas leader on the Cantabrian Coast & Murcia 1 million clients
- second rank in electricity in the Basque Country 50,000 clients

project opportunity

Biogas injection into natural gas grid and use as vehicle fuel by upgrading it with a novel CO₂ capture and storage technology

Creativity and Innovation European Year 2009

Environmental European Innovative Project
**places, timetable, backing**

**PROJECT LOCATION:** Bilbao and Tineo

**DURATION:** Start: 01/01/2009 - End: 31/12/2011

**BUDGET INFO:**
- Total amount: €1,956,111
- % EC Co-funding: €896,781 (nearly 46%)

---

**partners**

**PROJECT'S IMPLEMENTORS:**
- Coordinating Beneficiary: NE Distribución (ES)
- Associated Beneficiaries: NE Grupo (ES), NE Transporte (ES), Biogas Fuel Cell (ES), Gas Treatment Services (NL), Ingrepro (NL)

---

**main objective**

The goal of this project is to demonstrate the feasibility of producing a substitute natural gas (bio-methane) from biogas. To achieve this goal, coupling biogas production with an innovative biogas upgrading system will be carried out. This system is based on the combination of biological and cryogenic technologies to capture and store the CO₂ in the biogas and to remove other contaminants (H₂, volatiles, moisture, ...). This upgrading process would be an alternative to the CO₂ capture technologies currently available, which have substantial capital and operating costs.

---

**process**
**description**

- **Biogas production plant** from an anaerobic digestion (240 m³/d) will be used to test different types of residue and to study their potential for the production of biogas.
- **Biogas upgrading plant** will consist in the integration of two prototypes:
  - *Pilot Algae Plant (PAP)* where the biogas is firstly upgraded by the fixation of CO₂ through photosynthetic algae for natural CO₂ sequestration. Besides the CO₂ from the biogas, the digestate produced in the anaerobic digestion process will also be used as a nutrient for growing the algae. As a by-product, the process generates algae biomass with many applications.
  - *The Gastreatment Power Package (GPP) system* upgrades the biogas coming from PAP capturing the residual CO₂ and removing the rest of the contaminants. In this plant, the biogas is chilled in four steps to obtain a high quality biomethane and liquefied CO₂ also as by-product which is stored for further uses.

**expected results**

- Define the best conditions for biogas production.
- Prove a novel technology for upgrading biogas to biomethane with CO₂ capture and storage based on the combination of a biological and cryogenic process.
- Produce biomethane as a CO₂-negative-fuel at a competitive cost.
- Improve the economics of biogas via grid injection and as vehicle fuel.
- Perform an environmental and economic analysis.
- Promote the use of anaerobic digestion of wastes as an alternative source of renewable energy and also as a route for waste management.
- Replicate the process in other plants, favouring the off-farm uses of biogas and improve their environmental impact and their economy.
- Duplicate the process in other activities which generates CO₂ containing flue gas.

Many thanks for your kind attention!

www.lifebiogrid.eu
Main aim of the project

Restoration of hydrology of peatland complexes in 54 Natura 2000 sites
- Target habitats formerly afforested mires
- Mire types ranging from Bog woodlands to open aapa mires
- Total restoration area 4,250 ha

Key figures
- LIFE Nature
- Coordinating beneficiary: Metsähallitus
- Associated beneficiaries: Central Finland Regional Environment Centre and University of Jyväskylä
- Duration 5 years (1.1.2010 – 31.12.2014)
- Budget 6,726 million €
- EC contribution 50 %

Key preparatory actions
- Preparation of restoration plans (29), management plans (3)
- Education of restoration workers
**Key restoration measures**

- Filling in 1,078,696 m of ditches in 54 sites covering 4,250 ha
- Clearing trees from 43 sites from an area of 3,143 ha

*Then we have a cup of coffee and we wait…*

*Meanwhile…*

**Disseminate**

- Press, website, brochures, DVDs, mire exhibition,
- Nature trail, mire tours for various target groups

*And monitor…*
**Mires and climate change**

- Peatlands are significant stock for carbon dioxide and source for atmospheric methane
- Drainage affects the balance: carbon dioxide fixes to trees and methane release decrease, overall outcome dependent on mire type
- After restoration rapid negative effects: increased methane release as the water level is increased
- After a few years carbon dioxide starts accumulating to the peat
- Overall outcome highly dependent on mire type and other circumstances
- More information is needed
- Restoration enhances the biodiversity!!!