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| **Title of chapter / section** | **Main Author and co-authors** | **Notes on content** | **Pages** |
| **1. Objective and analysis criteria** | ETC* Mikael started
 | General objective of the scoping paperAnalysis criteria for all the chapters e.g. * Demand for information: what is (really) needed for what purpose. Is there an approved policy relevance?
* Content (Impact, Risk, Adaptation, policy context, …)
* How is the content presented?
* Target groups
* Theory of change (link to chapter 6)
 | **2** |
|  |  |  |  |
| **2. EEA perspective** | Hans-Martin Füssel |  | **4** |
| 2.1 Reflection on 2016 report |  | i) Data sources + relation to other EEA indicatorsii) Press coverage + impact analysisiii) Overview of resources and people involvediv) Reflections on management and processv) What can/should be improved, even in a Business as Usual scenario | *1,5* |
| 2.2 EEA expectations  |  | i) What does EEA want to achieve with this report and how can it be “measured”- Policy relevance and other evaluation criteria for options- Target groups (fairly well defined by EEA)ii) Content: How far to get beyond climate impact assessment with indicators?- Vulnerability and Risk? -Cross-sectoral perspective?- Regional perspective? (e.g. mountains, cities, Scandinavia, Central-, Western-, Eastern-, Southern-Europe)iii) How much on Adaptation (status / success)? | *1,5* |
| 2.3 EEA internal communication strategies |  | i) What is the latest EEA internal communication strategy? New developments on formats? Target groups? | *1* |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
| **3. good examples for presenting CCIV(A) information** | ETC* Willem
 | What do we mean by ‘good presentation of CCIV(A), information?Goodness is to be judged in relation to a specific need/use -> criteriaAnalyze other existing national and international reports (applying analysis criteria above [from chapter 1)]  | **3** |
| **4. The evolving Demand for CCIV(A) information**  | ETC –MH willing to give it a try | Analyze demand for CCIV(A)information. What is needed by whom? Review: * 1. Evolving European Policies (can be largely copied from draft SOER 2020) MH: comment . The policy areas are included in the SOER draft, but there’s not that much of an analysis of what kind of information is actually needed to implement or develop the policies further.
	2. Evaluation of EU Adaptation strategy and a possible review of the strategy (which is the key demand for information from EEA Climate impacts report)
	3. Evolving national adaptation policies and plans
 | **2** |
|  |  |  |  |
| **5. Landscape of related information suppliers** |  |  | **6** |
| 5.1 external | ETC- Marc: C3S | i) C3S- Compare EEA indicators vs. current and planned C3S indicators and variables. What is/will become available through C3S?- IPCC AR6- DG CLIMA tender on adaptation modelling- Others (JRC PESETA III, EU research projects COACCH, …)* Consider to what extent there are possibilities for the EEA to ‘tap into’ these sources of information in an ‘automatic’ or ‘semi automatic’ way when it comes to at least the ‘hard data’ as this would save resources
 | *5* |
| 5.2 EEA internal |  | i) Planned other EEA reports and indicators ii) CLIMATE-ADAPT | *1* |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
| **6. Options and concrete format**  |  |  | **10** |
| 6.0 | ETC & EEA jointly | The options to be explored (these can be mentioned in Ch1, but here they would be elaborated to give the reader a deeper insight into what ‘scenarios’ the paper is exploring. 6.3. would the provide the actual results - could also come before 6.3, or in 6.3 as an intro. The thought of making it 6.0 is that then the reader is oriented to reflect on the set up before entering into the more ‘abstract’ text of 6.1 & 6.2 |  |
| 6.1 Assumptions on how policy relevance is to be achieved (program theory) | ETC – Mikael?  | Based on lessons learnt from chapter 1-5 | *1* |
| 6.2 Criteria for evaluation of options | ETC – who? |  (policy relevance, policy impact, resources needed, cost-effectiveness, comprehensiveness, understandability, ease of access., completeness of scientific evidence, …) 🡪 EEA, see also chapter1 | *1* |
| 6.3 Evaluation of several alternative options for the ’core product’  | ETC - who | i) Business-as-usual ii) Indicators and potential data source (including C3S)iii) Diversified: Condensed report + more extensive WWW-products + other productsiv) Slimmed report only – ‘a reader’s digest’ of available assessmentsv) Evaluation of several options for additional products (policy briefs, websites) | *8* |
|  |  |  |  |