

National Dialogue Meeting for Municipalities and National Authorities on the Implementation of the Sendai Framework with a focus on Climate Change Adaptation

CASCADE

7 October 2020, Online

Participants

Please see the attached participants list.

Welcoming words & Introduction

Janet Edwards, MSB introduces herself to the panel and opens the meeting by welcoming the participants.

The agenda is read out and organisational aspects mentioned before starting with the session's first speaker.

Incorporating Climate Change into Risk Management: The "Cascade" EU project and Sendai Framework in the Baltic Sea Region

Katie Goldie-Ryder, Project Coordinator, CBSS (*see presentation*)

The Council of the Baltic Sea States (CBSS) is a project partner in the CASCADE project and responsible for the policy dialogue. This presentation briefly presents the CASCADE project and two of its reports.

The CASCADE project aims to mapping the state of play in the Baltic Sea Region – so far captured in two reports ('The Sendai Framework in the Baltic Sea Region', 'The Role of Local Governments in Adapting to the Climate – An Overview of Regulatory requirements and Support mechanisms in the Baltic Sea Region') and a first transnational policy dialogue meeting in 2019. The conclusions serve as national consultation in countries around the Baltic Sea. Sessions are held to present the findings and discuss them on a national/local level. Also, one of the goals of the project is ensuring sustainability, so among others a concept on criteria for a certification system and curricular for HE level will be developed, and the policy dialogue is aimed to continue within the existing networks. In connection with this, the Sendai Framework has two important functions, namely coordinating the national implementation through national focal points, as well as national platforms.

The **Sendai Framework in the Baltic Sea Region** report informs about the current state of play of the implementation of the Framework in the region and paves the way on how to improve and coordinate

disaster risk reduction work between the participating countries. Methodology-wise it builds on interviews with members in the focal point countries, asking questions on the increased targets (IFNG). The report also looks at how the work on DRR was structured, involvement, legislation and political support and whether there was a mandate for the coordination.

From the interviews and its comparative data analysis come 11 conclusions and four recommendations, based on common challenges, good practices and potential ways forward.

Conclusions:

1. Disaster Risk Reduction not being a political priority in the Baltic Sea Region is a problem.
2. Making DRR a political priority (or not) determines how well organised the Sendai implementation work is.
3. Data collection and coordination between countries works better with a clearly defines mandate.
4. The Sendai Framework is a global framework, not all objectives apply or are equally important to the BSR.
5. All countries recognise the need to work more actively with climate change risks in their national risk assessments, however knowledge on methodology work missing.
6. It is difficult to distinguish between risk reduction and emergency preparedness – shift from preparedness to prevention has been difficult when it comes to practical work.
7. Very limited awareness of the impact of prevention measures used (such as information campaigns).
8. Reporting to Sendai Framework is time consuming and difficult.
9. National risk assessments are conducted in all BSR countries but collecting all necessary information for a thorough assessment is difficult.
10. International or regional cooperation is not commonly used to strengthen national DRR capacities.
11. All countries in the BSR have early warning systems but those systems have not been put to a test.

Recommendations:

1. Strengthening political and public support, improving quality of the national risk assessment
2. Tailoring of the Sendai Framework to specific BSR contexts needed – relevance
3. Strengthening multilevel and cross-sectoral cooperation to enable a common approach (DRR, CCA and sustainable development activities...)
4. Strong coordination mechanisms needed to enable effective planning of implementation, cooperation and flow of information.

The second report – **The Role of Local Governments in Adapting to the Climate – An Overview of Regulatory requirements and Support mechanisms in the Baltic Sea Region** – aims to give an overview of climate adaption related regulations and activities at the (sub)national levels in the BSR. It derives from desk studies based on e.g. country specific reports, national and local authority websites and it results in four conclusions and three recommendations.

Conclusions:

1. Legislation: all nine countries in the Baltic Sea Region have climate adaptation related legislation but how this legislation translates into local level implementation differs.
2. Strategies and plans: most countries have either formally or informally defined the role of local governance in terms of adaptation (but only three countries have a mandate defined on national level, only 1 on local level)
3. Support: local governments are often involved in networks which support their adaptation related work, country support differs when it comes to different other resources (funding, information portals and guidance in local languages)
4. Risk assessments: national assessments are completed or under way, some include even future climate risks, but the assessment and its extent of local level risks are sometimes unclear

Recommendations:

1. Increasing systemic support from national level authorities for local authorities on adaptation planning
2. Improving guidance and access to stable funding, as well as information to local adaptation
3. Integrating climate and disaster risk assessments in sharing information across sectors

The two reports and the policy dialogue were followed by a policy brief titled 'Joining Forces to effectively work with DRR and CCA'. The conclusions were put forward by local level (city) representatives. Many outcomes were similar to the findings in the reports with some additional ones. There is a need to take note of the good examples brought forward and share them among the different parties. Implementation tools, political support and resulting coordination would be appreciated by the city representatives. A need is identified, to increase awareness and knowledge of the Sendai Framework and the way it can be used as practical guidance and tool. They also want cooperation across sectors to be increased.

Questions/Comments

- Participants ask about and discuss whether the report does or should include specific disasters. While the report does not build on specific disasters, it does not say that there are no disasters. Reasons for this are that the region has comparatively less or less severe disasters, as well as the difficulty of dealing with a region whose focal point's mandate is not as defined or building on different definitions.
- The question about whether CBSS does cooperation with the Nordic Council of Ministers is answered with the councils being sister councils.

Introduction and Importance of the Sendai Framework

Mette Lindahl Olsson, Head of Department for natural disaster and decision-making support, MSB

Mette Lindahl Olsson introduces and explains the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, which MSB is a national contact point for. The framework is globally coordinated by the UN's

department for disaster risk reduction (UNDRR) and considers all kind of disasters apart from armed conflicts/war.

Its aim is:

- to guide the management of combined disaster risks,
- to develop the work on all levels and between sectors,
- to better understanding and handling of, and the resilience and reaction to disaster

One of today's biggest challenges regarding disaster risks is considered to be climate change. Lindahl Olsson underlines the urgency of this issue and the need for reducing climate impact, as well as for climate adaptation in our society. Direct, noticeable consequences from climate change are among others: extreme weather, more floods, warmer temperatures, drought or the rising sea level.

On a local level, authorities and municipalities are working towards climate adaptation through mapping risk, networking and identifying the country's most at risk areas (SGI, MSB). Sweden is considered to be on the right way when it comes to climate adaptation work, but more work and more (local) cooperation is needed. Awareness and funding are two challenges, according to Lindahl Olsson. While government and EU might direct high sums to climate transition, less is invested in adapting society and cities – which is one of the reasons to meet and coordinate among (more) municipalities.

Questions/Comments

- Municipalities agree (in line with the speaker) that it is difficult to get the state to recognise certain risks on lower levels as risks, and to consequently get the funding needed to counteract or prevent disaster.
- Participants discuss funding option, Swedish Agency for Economic and Regional Growth (Tillväxtverket) (without a clear outcome)

Making Cities Resilient Network – Sendai Framework at the Local Level

Janet Edwards, MSB KC-GS, Robust Society and Geographic Information Section

The international Making Cities Resilient campaign includes 12 Swedish municipalities, of which six participate in this meeting (Arvika, Ängelholm, Jönköping, Karlstad, Kristianstad and Malmö). It allows participants to network and work on preventive and damage reducing measurements in the area of DRR and CCA.

Next steps for the network include:

- The UNDRR office will further develop this MCR campaign to run up until 2030.
- Swedish researcher in the United Kingdom are working on a gap-analysis, to be finished in March 2021 and the results being presented in a seminar by MSB.
- The gap-analysis will serve as a base for a national action plan in accordance with UNDRR's criteria – at the same it will fulfil the global goal E1 (national strategy) from the Sendai Framework.

- After fulfilling global goal E1, MSB continues with E2 on local strategies.
- UNDRR's handbook **Words into Action: Implementation guide for local disaster risk reduction and resilience strategies** (2019) can be accessed via PreventionWeb.
- Risk analyses should be revised under consideration of UNDRR's **Disaster Resilience Scorecard for Cities**.

What's new in climate change adaptation?

Emilie Gullberg, Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions (Sveriges Kommuner och Regioner)

SKR is an interest organisation, meaning it works towards the interests of its members, it is self-governed and operates through for example conferences and networks. SKR works nationwide with the different municipalities – representatives from the different regions and municipalities gather and build the SKR. They function as an employer organisation as well.

Emilie Gullberg talks about climate adaptation in the work Sveriges Kommuner och Regioner is doing:

- climate adaptation is of importance in SKR areas of work, such as: construction planning (PBL), legislation, infrastructure, health care, crisis response, ...
- Action and activities in those areas can more specifically be petitions to the government, articles, conferences, participation in working groups or cooperation with different actors.
- SKR aims to reduce emissions but to get more resilient at the same time.
- The aim is to have a long-term perspective, good overview over current questions (- mapping climate issues can be one way to deal with those questions), as well as cooperation and dialogue within and between municipalities.

Questions/Comments

- Emilie Gullberg recommends their report/ article on local effects, which is requested and a link is said to be send out.

EU CASCADE Project: Purpose of the Dialogue Meetings

Janet Edwards, Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB)

The EU-project Baltic Sea Region CASCADE is about training local actors about climate risk analyses and implementation of the Sendai Framework.

One work package of the project deals with policy development for the Sendai Framework and every participating country in the Baltic Sea Region commits to organising their own dialogue meeting with the goal to identify challenges and come up with potentially corresponding solutions.

Organisational and technical aspects of the group discussions

Janet Edwards, MSB, explains how the upcoming group discussions are organised: namely all participants being divided in four groups, discussing the given questions and reporting back on the outcome later in the main session.

The discussion aspects have to be noted down and send to Janet Edwards **by 16 October 2020 the latest** to serve as meeting documentation in the project report.

Julia Syrén, CBSS, explains technical details for the usage of zoom breakout rooms

Breakout Sessions

(see Compiled Discussion Notes)

Reporting back from group sessions

While the extensive notes can be found in the above-mentioned document, some of the key aspects are summarised as follows:

- Research, information and knowledge exist but need to be shared better.
- (Financial) support is available but is not always communicated well.
- It is important to work even more closely together, both among municipalities as well as across levels and sectors.
- Sometimes it is not so clear which mandates municipalities/organisations/... have.
- Application processes can be excessive.

Climate Change Adaptation Measures taken in Karlstad – Municipality of Karlstad

Daniel Palén & Malin Hedlund, Municipality of Karlstad (Karlstads kommun)

Karlstad is placed by many watercourses, both the lake Vänern (Sweden's and the EU's largest lake) and the river Klarälven. Both watercourses pose large risks, as many people and property are placed in close proximity to these.

- Karlstad is midsized municipality, with 94 000 inhabitants and has an archipelago with 25 000 isles, islets and skerries. Thus, water is very present in Karlstad which brings both resources and challenges.
- Karlstad is also a municipality which lies close to both the Swedish capital Stockholm and the Norwegian capital Oslo.
- Karlstad is growing, Karlstad is predicted to have 125 000 inhabitants by the year 2050. 10 000 new housings are planned, new bus lines, bike lanes etc.
- Palén and Hedlund show a presentation on the planned borough Jakobsberg, which is planned as a sustainable district with a lot of green areas etc.

- Jakobsberg is close to the Klarälven river and it is necessary to build embankments to protect from flooding.
- Embankment and pumps were deemed the best solution in order to protect the vegetation (as explained in this [YouTube video](#)).
- Embankments have previously been used in the work to prevent flooding near Karlstad Central Hospital (Centralsjukhuset).
- Areas where the risk of flooding or other risks is elevated:
 - Norsälven – an area where landslides are common, so Karlstad municipality have offered buyouts of property and made it more difficult to grant building permits as well as built new roads better adapted to risk prevention.
 - Karlstad lacks green areas that could reduce the risk of sky falls or extreme heat (as vegetation reduces outside temperatures). Thus, Karlstad is getting hotter and during the exceptionally warm summer of 2018, it became apparent that heat causes most public organisations such as healthcare and working environment in general (both hard and soft problems).
 - An investigation and mapping of the ecosystem services has been ordered by the municipality.
- Various types of flooding protections and preventions:
 - **Skåre** – a large risk of flooding, one protection is built to protect an underpass below the railway (as pedestrians starting to walk on the railway when the underpass was flooded, causing life-threatening risks to themselves).
 - **Karlstad city centre** – protects the above-mentioned hospital (essential service) by embankment, day water park and pumps all installed ([YouTube video](#))
 - **68.4 million SEK** was the total budget and both the region, the municipality and MSB contributed. Today, it is the region responsible for maintenance costs.
 - **Vänern lake** – temporary flooding protection, incl. two pumps, which needs both cranes and divers to be put into place.
 - A warning system put into place, to signal when the water levels starts to rise, and the protection should be put into place. The lake rises much slower than the Klarälven river.
 - 47.3 m high embankment, and it is used 3-4 times per year.
 - **Skyfall protection near motorway E18** with “stenkista” (a type of drain) and “lerbädd”.

Concluding Remarks

Janet Edwards & Katie Goldie-Ryder

Short summation of the program points up until this point as well as a big thank you to all the moderators in the break-out sessions, and those who presented.

Parallel Meeting: Municipalities’ Making Cities Resilient Network (open for all)

Host municipality of Karlstad leads round table discussion on current topics

The purpose of this round table session is for the six participating municipalities to give an overview of one's work for each other and discuss the latest developments. Questions can be asked and discussed to learn with and from each other.

1. **Karlstad kommun**

As the host of the meeting, Karlstad kommun gave an extensive presentation earlier (please see information above).

2. **Arvika kommun**

Presented by Ida Svensson

- Arvika has experienced a big flooding in e.g 2000. The municipality has since calculated and made assessments about what has happened and how flooding is dealt with (building guidelines, information about building basements, etc.)
- As a preventive measure, Arvika now has a dam in place which was about 20 years in the planning and took 4 years to build.
- There were more floodings (e.g. 2019) when the dam was not finished yet – the experiences and data gathered from such near-flooding were used to improve information and can be seen as a test.

- Comments/ Questions raised and discussed:

- the costs
 - = direct costs were split, renovation costs running
- whether the planning could have been better considering the 20+ years
 - = MSB helped but there was not much political interest or support otherwise, partly still questioned whether one should spend that much money
- whether the assessment can be shared
 - = potentially yes, better via taking up contact directly, not everything can be shared outside of the management functions
- who took the decisions
 - = the public was not involved in Arvika, it was a decision by authorities/political levels

3. **Kristianstads kommun**

Presented by Fredrik Billsten

- The municipality conducts vulnerability analyses in which they include municipal companies.
- However, one of the weakest links is the lack of measuring tools to measure potential risks, which affects the work on DDR.
- Wishes for further cooperation and coordination with (in particular) the County Administrative Board, MSB, the Swedish Transport Administration (Trafikverket) and private actors, as well.
 - For instance, if the water level rises – it is the motorway E22 that gets heavily affected which in turn effects the entire region. Thus, good communication with the Swedish Transport Administration is very important.

- Important that there is a concrete readiness at the Swedish Transport Administration.
 - However, there is much to learn within municipalities as well – for instance, based on the previous presentation from Arvika, there are possible synergy effects to explore.
- Currently working on a new layout plan on risk- and vulnerability assessments.

4. **Malmö kommun**

Presented by Pär Svensson

- Malmö just produced the actionplan 'Kuststaden'
 - Cooperation with Stadsbyggnadskontoret on latest questions
 - mapping on temperature issues started but met with little political interest
 - different level of experience with different risks (most worked with downpours)
 - next steps are mapping and looking for financial support
 - difficulties are questions regarding mandates, political support, paperwork
- Comments/ Questions raised and discussed:
- Other municipalities agree that the decision-making process is difficult, especially considering the political level, good results were made where one municipality had a board/management for decision-making
 - What are the plans when it comes to densification? Will climate issues have an impact on that?
= Karlstads kommun saw that heat is enclosed more easily in cultivated areas than natural ones, but since this is a known issue one hopes to work and deal with it instead of seeing it as a (new) risk

5. **Ängelholms kommun**

Presented by Geraldine Thielen

- Ängelholm aims to work in three steps: cooperate, act and develop
 - progress is made in certain areas but can take a long time
 - Ängelholm works with sub-teams internally to divide work on different risks while exchanging information at the same time, as well as with newest technology where possible
 - a focus is set on early risk assessment
 - detailed plans are one step towards having well founded arguments and knowledge and serve as future reference too, while being updated continuously
 - approval processes are difficult and time consuming
- Comments/ Questions raised and discussed:
- Ängelholm was successful with combining climate work (sand fences) and artful information about climate adaptation to raise awareness of the issue

6. Jönköping's rescue services (räddningstjänst)

Presented by Erik Holgersson

- Most pressing risks: flooding, avalanches/landslides especially in low territories
- These were also identified as risks through MSB and more focused work started in 2015/16 with some money being left to continue but the project being time consuming and stretching funds at the same time.
- Flood risks are monitored through e.g. mappings (ÖP since 2016), similar to downpour strategies – the problem is said to be the little support or progress from the municipality's side.
- New risks through climate change: temperature related – the problem is that responsibilities are unclear
- Drinking water is not such a pressing issue due to the Vättern lake (Örebro can potentially serve as an example).
- There is also cooperation and networking with different actors, e.g. when it comes to the municipality network for natural catastrophes and climate adaptation.

- Comments/ Questions raised and discussed:
 - How does one get the Länsstyrelse to participate in climate adaptation work?
= Sometimes the MSB mediates, but sometimes it might simply be the 'luck' of being affected by enough catastrophes for the länsstyrelse to recognise the need of cooperation.
 - Water sources
= groundwater, drinking water and looking for potential other solutions

AOB

Questions/ Comments

- The general opinion among participants is that it was good to have had this meeting, especially with the last session where one can have direct information and knowledge exchange. The question is brought up whether such meetings (at least short ones) could be held more regularly.
- While meetings in person would be appreciated (and are needed sometimes for site visits), the idea is that online meetings are easier to organize, less costly for the municipality and ideal for quick sessions/ questions.
- Janet Edwards offers sending out a suggestion to all involved/interested parties, if someone were to draft a suggestion.

Closing of the meeting

Janet Edwards closes meeting by thanking the participants