

## **Session DD 6.1: The governance of climate adaptation: international comparison**

<b>Chairs</b>	Prof.dr. Katrien Termeer, Wageningen UR, the Netherlands and Elizabeth Wilson, Oxford Brookes University, United Kingdom
<b>Speakers</b>	Dr. Francois Gemenne, IDDRI - Sciences Po Paris, France Dr. Arjen Ruijs, Royal Haskoning, the Netherlands Valentin Przluski, CIRED, France
<b>Rapporteur</b>	Dr. Kirsten Hollaender, Knowledge for Climate, the Netherlands

Elisabeth Wilson and Katrien Termeer opened the session, stating that spatial planning needs to become less of special planning and to incorporate more future thinking in its further development. The close relations between agricultural sciences, rural development and climate adaptation governance become especially salient in an international developmental perspective, as the presentations and posters showed.

Francois Gemennes presentation threw a fresh light on climate related migration with a more positive tone on it as an option to cope with the impacts of climate change, instead of frequent victimization of climate migrants. The EACH FOR project, supported by the European Commission, found that often the most vulnerable populations do not have migration opportunities, since this requires social and economic capital, concluding that better governance of climate induced migration is needed. This would be better than negative interpretations of migration which hamper migrants' ability to adapt. Self perception of (seasonal) climate migration is quite different, he found. A view, that the next presentation could support.

Arjan Ruijs presented results of a World Bank study on adaptation strategies and support of extension institutions work. This study of Mali and Ethiopia found that adaptation strategies varied considerably, depending on household wealth, willingness to participate in communal strategies and extension offers available. Poor rural households face the most climate change hazards. As to vulnerability, the sensitivity and coping capacity of households was more important than their exposure. More tailored interventions are thus needed. He confirmed Gemennes findings that migration is viewed as a traditional diversification strategy (for instance, some household members migrate). He stressed the role of human capital in adaptation, for communal strategies long term commitment is essential.

Valentin Przluski focused on the case and experiences of Bangladesh. He stressed the contribution of Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) with enabling a focus on the long term and indirect effects. His suggestion is to look at the indirect benefits of DRR instead of its indirect costs. He was critical of the general view of no regret measures. To manage Adaption to climate change only as a risk tends to overview its complexity and uncertainty. He argued for inclusion of indirect costs in measures and for an integrated view on measures, which takes into account their flexibility or maintenance costs. He challenged the use of the no regret notion, for instance if this leads to capital intensive measures. The crucial question for him was, who decides what is no regret? This is relevant in infrastructural projects being advocated where it also is important to look at direct and indirect benefits of DRR strategies.

The session ended with poster pitches presented by:

- Heleen Mees, Utrecht University, the Netherlands: Climate Greening Rotterdam, London and Toronto.
- Pieter Jong, Delft University, CAW the Netherlands: Adaptive water legislation: What can the Dutch learn from the United Kingdom
- Judigh Hobse, Van Hall Larenstein University of Applied Sciences, the Netherlands: F:ACTS! Forms for adapting to climate change through territorial strategies – Bulgaria, Spain, Greece, Portugal, Belgium
- Dr. Art Dewulf, Wageningen University, the Netherlands: "Climategate"- a controversy between "deniers" and "alarmists"?