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1. Introduction

Increasing resilience is a goal shared by both the climate change adaptation (CCA)\(^1\) and disaster risk reduction (DRR)\(^2\) communities. Consequently, a closer collaboration between these two scientific and practice communities can, in principle, lead to several mutual benefits.

CCA and DRR have been described as 'two sides of the same coin', 'synonyms' and as intersecting. Some may argue that the difference between the two concepts is rather irrelevant from a practical perspective. Yet in terms of implementation, policy and programming, professional and conceptual boundaries still remain in many governments, organisations and agencies. This contrast raise legitimate questions about why two such similar risk management approaches are not always addressed together.

The historical development of these two disciplines has had an impact on how institutions are organised and how they communicate and collaborate today. As they have been developed separately by communities with different backgrounds, CCA and DRR sit within different European and national governmental institutions, agencies, research groups and knowledge platforms. Despite the efforts to increase communication and collaboration across the disciplines in the last decade, significant fragmentation still persists, with notable inefficiencies and incoherence across activities, communication and knowledge exchange. It is thus important to strengthen collaboration between CCA and DRR institutions with the aim of improving societal responses to the challenges of climate change, taking into account the potential increase of climate and weather related extremes events.

Strengthening institutions strengthens society itself. Institutions work best when they fulfil their functions strategically, connect with key allies and partners, and expand to serve a broader public.

---

1. This report uses the IPCC WGII definition of Climate Change Adaptation (CCA): The process of adjustment to actual or expected climate and its effects. In human systems, adaptation seeks to moderate or avoid harm or exploit beneficial opportunities. In some natural systems, human intervention may facilitate adjustment to expected climate and its effects (IPCC, 2013).

2. This report used the UNISDR definition of Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR): the concept and practice of reducing disaster risks through systematic efforts to analyse and manage the causal factors of disasters, including through reduced exposure to hazards, lessened vulnerability of people and property, wise management of land and the environment, and improved preparedness for adverse events (UNISDR, 2009).
Institutional strengthening is about increasing the capacity or ability of institutions to perform their functions with particular focus on improving governance. In a broader definition, institutions cover a rather wide range of individuals, groups, communities, NGOs, associations and government bodies. Strong institutions not only serve their communities but also drive meaningful change at the local, regional, national, and even international level. This multi-level cooperation and governance needs good management and organisation.

In the fields of CCA and DRR, institutional strengthening may refer, first and foremost, to seizing opportunities for cooperation and collaboration, reducing weaknesses in networks, avoiding duplication of efforts, improving common understanding and implementing legislation and policy as well as improving knowledge management and sharing.

The PLACARD (PLAtform for Climate Adaptation and Risk reDuction) project aims to share knowledge and enhance collaboration between the multiple CCA and DRR research, policy and practice communities. This is currently underway through the creation of a coordination and knowledge exchange platform that supports multi-stakeholder dialogues and consultations, across all levels of governance. In order to achieve its goal, PLACARD has set up a common and safe ‘space’ for discussion where CCA and DRR communities can meet, share experiences and create opportunities for collaboration.

1.1. Background

This guidance is one of the main outputs of the PLACARD project, and builds upon previous work carried out within the scope of the project’s activities. These include, amongst others, a mapping exercise of the existing landscape of CCA and DRR networks and partnerships – SPINE (Stakeholder and boundary organisations, knowledge Platforms, policy and research Initiatives, existing Networks/partnerships and End users) – and the implementation of a targeted Social Network Analysis (SNA) protocol, which provides information and a better contextualisation of the network actors and how they communicate and coordinate across such a complex landscape.

As an example, the SPINE exercise has listed 137 actors and 27 key activities including at international, regional, EU-wide and national scales. This mapping exercise was based on an extensive desktop research, and participation in key CCA and/or DRR events. The share and spread of CCA and DRR agents identified in the exercise is depicted in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Stakeholder and boundary organisations, knowledge Platforms, policy and research Initiatives, existing Networks/partnerships and End users (SPINE) stakeholders

---

3 PLACARD is a Coordination and Support Action funded by DG Research and Innovation under the H2020 Programme. PLACARD aims to strengthen integration, coordination and cooperation between CCA and DRR in Europe.
While the SPINE exercise maps and depicts “who is who” in these areas, the work carried out in the SNA protocol sought to contextualise the relationships between and across the identified agents. In this PLACARD work, a social network graphic was obtained using the Haren-Korel Fast Multiscale layout algorithm, provided by NodeXL. It particularly addressed the following question: “I am aware that this actor exists, but to my knowledge, we do not have any contact with them” (see Figure 2).

Figure 2: Social Network Analysis (SNA) of 35 actors. Ties present connections marked by 2-5 on the connection intensity scale. For the three actors that did not participate in the survey, we considered relationships that other actors specified to have with them.

1.2. Aim and target groups

Climate change is changing the risk profile of Europe. The expectation is for more frequent and intense extreme weather events such as heatwaves, drought or heavy precipitation, in locations traditionally less prone to such events. Such changes need to be reflected accordingly in institutional arrangements, capacities and multi-agent coordination.

This guidance report has been prepared within PLACARD Task 4.2 (Guidelines to strengthen CCA and DRR institutional coordination and capacities). It aims to support and strengthen institutional coordination and the development of a more robust interface between CCA and DRR research communities, decision-makers and other associated stakeholders.
The document guides interested actors on how to take advantage of the synergies between CCA and DRR in order to further strengthen institutions, their networks and their respective capacities in their efforts to reduce impacts of extreme events triggered by climate change.

The core result presented in this report is a set of recommendations on how European, national and sub-national institutions that are responsible for the planning and implementation of adaptation and disaster risk reduction strategies and action plans, can properly cooperate and/or incorporate the other community’s typical policies and measures.

Additionally, these guidelines are relevant to all kind of experts in fields associated with climate change and/or disaster risk at International, European, national, sub-national and local levels, who want insights into and be inspired by current activities targeting cooperation, collaboration, increased coherence, and capacity sharing between CCA and DRR.

1.3. Methodological approach

The guidance is based on a literature review, and an assessment of existing guidance documents on institutional strengthening, capacity building and their use at different scales. Different interactions with stakeholders from CCA and DRR in workshops, conferences, working groups and other type of event pinpointed areas where capacities for knowledge and information sharing can be increased, and where cooperation and overall strengthening of institutional linkages can be particularly relevant.

In close collaboration with stakeholders and users, different workshops such as the Joining forces: PLACARD CCA and DRR workshop were organised, some by PLACARD and others with significant contribution from the PLACARD team. The full list of events can be found in Annex I – List of events organised and attended by the PLACARD team.
2. Rationale – the need for strengthened institutions

Europe’s geographical interdependence, shared physical infrastructures, and close social and institutional integration requires close regional cooperation in the management of disaster risk in general, and climate change in particular.

A recent Joint Research Centre study showed that weather-related disasters could affect around two-thirds of the European population annually by the end of this century. This could result in a 50-fold increase in fatalities compared to today, if no measures are taken (Forzieri et al., 2017).

Just recently, the Executive Director of the European Environment Agency noted at the launch event of the EEA report on Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction in Europe (EEA, 2017) that:

“...The extent of devastation in the wake of forest fires, floods, storm surges not only in Europe but also elsewhere has shown that the costs of not acting on climate change, as well as adaptation and prevention are extremely high. Mitigation (n.b. DRR) is crucial as is ensuring effective action before, during and after a disaster. He further added that the EEA report (EEA) “shows that European countries have started preparing, but there is still much to gain from better coherence to improve resilience and reducing the risks. This should be the main goal for experts working in the adaptation and disaster risk reduction fields.”

Both studies provide an overview on past and projected weather- and climate-related events and hazards in Europe. Parts of the main findings for a selected number of extreme events is summarised in Figure 3.

In addition, adaptation measures that are intended to support efforts in dealing with the most severe impacts and risks of a changing climate also have transnational, regional, national and local requirements, making them prone to complexity both in terms of policy decisions as well as practical implementation (EC, 2007).

Given the reasons noted above, integrating CCA and DRR may well constitute a requirement that, despite its local specificities, is also European in nature, and one that requires closer attention.
2.1. Overlapping institutional realities

Diverse literature as well as policy documents highlight the need to better link and “join forces” between disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation in specific areas of overlap.

As highlighted by the recent EEA Report (No 15/2017):

“The impacts of weather- and climate-related hazards on the economy, human health and ecosystems are amplified by socio-economic changes and environmental changes (e.g. demographic development, land use change and climate change). Efforts to reduce disaster risk and at the same time adapt to a changing climate have become a global and European priority.”

In order to adapt to climate-related risks, for instance, the aim of any implemented action is to increase resilience, i.e. a system’s ability to function no matter what stresses happen, prepare for a crisis, maintain its critical functions in the face of crises, and return quickly to an equilibrium. Thus, there is an effort to harmonising DRR and CCA where resilience is common to both. The aim to reduce climate-related losses through more widespread implementation of DRR measures linked with adaptation is also common to both.
Additionally, financial, human and natural resources can be used more efficiently. This leads to increased effectiveness and sustainability of both adaptation and DRR approaches (ProAct Network, 2008).

Figure 4 provides a tentative overview on the rationale for why CCA and DRR should be linked (green box) and the current obstacles or challenges (red box).

Figure 4: Rationale for linking CCA and DRR

- Consistent understanding & approaches
- Opportunities & improving practice
- Enhanced learning
- Improving efficiency & effectiveness
- Better use of resources
- New perspectives on the ‘wicked issue’ of climate change
- A clear map of who does what

• Weak coherence & consistency
• Conflicts and barriers between CCA & DRR
• Missed opportunities for learning & cooperation
• Inefficient communication (misinterpretation / conflicts)
• Messy landscape of actors, risk of repetition & confusion for stakeholders
• Reduced effectiveness of CCA & DRR

Figure 5: Terms and meanings in CCA and DRR: commonalities and differences. Figure provided by Ian Davis

Geo-physical hazards:
- Earthquakes
- Tsunamis
- Landslides
- Volcanic eruptions

Risk assessment
Based on hard historical evidence as part of disaster risk assessment

High levels of certainty (in disaster planning)
- Average to low political commitment
- Long history (over 1,000 years)

Climatic hazards:
- Storms / floods / landslides / temperature extremes / droughts / fires / rising sea levels / avalanches / climate change following volcanic eruptions

Impacts of climate hazards:
- Population shifts / international conflict / impacts on health services, agriculture and fisheries, economies on human settlements / institutional adaptation

Joint DRM & CCA programmes to create resilience

Non-disaster aspects of CCA:
- (including the positive benefits from climate change)

Risk assessment
Based on climate risk assessment and climate models

Wider aspects of adaptation:
- Political / social / economic / environmental

Low levels of certainty (in climate change)

High political commitment (since about 1985)
DRR and CCA are both cross-cutting issues and it is critical to involve a broad spectrum of stakeholders for successful cooperation. This can be a large number of different types of stakeholders which often makes it difficult to find a common language and understanding. As DRR and CCA involve a range of very diverse actors, different stakeholders define DRR and CCA concepts in relation to their knowledge spectrum. This has created many diverse terminologies, for example, the understanding of risk, impacts, vulnerability and resilience. Beyond a lack of a shared understanding of key terminology, the lack of aligned interests and common understanding of the objectives, aims and strategies of DRR and CCA stakeholders has also been noted as an issue.

About 60% of the terms currently used in the CCA and DRR communities overlap (see Figure 5). While the words are used in both fields, they can have quite different meanings, depending on the context and person involved, and resulting in numerous misunderstandings.

DRR and CCA share the objective of reducing the impact of natural hazards and climate change on people, ecosystems and infrastructure. Because of the potential for synergies, considering their mandates and complementary scope and activities, closer collaboration between the respective scientific, practice and policy communities will have significant benefits. Realising these synergies, however, can be challenging. For example, risks, vulnerabilities and solutions are framed differently in the different communities of practice, resulting in diverging policy, planning processes and practices in Europe.

Thus the common goal of CCA and DRR is to reduce risk and vulnerability resulting from impacts of weather related natural hazards. Thus measures and actions aim at strengthening resilience (Mitchell et al., 2010; Permanent Secretariat of SELA, 2010; GIZ, 2012, p. 3).

### 2.2. Management approaches

As previously stated, an important overlap is that both DRR and CCA are cross-cutting issues. It is increasingly recognised that CCA and DRR must be integral components of policies, programmes, plans, projects and implementation in order to increase sustainability.

Until now, the relationship between DRR and CCA has been addressed mostly through the concept of mainstreaming. As result, all of these issues are in the early stages of being mainstreamed into European, national and sub-national policies, strategies, plans and other tools and techniques, as well as slowly being incorporated into practice. However, mainstreaming DRR into CCA, or vice-versa, is also a matter of mainstreaming in terms of reducing social inequalities, increasing ecosystem protection or supporting good governance. Hence effective disaster risk governance requires well-planned and comprehensive coordination efforts across the traditional disaster risk management phases. Therefore, a promising approach is the linkage of the adaptation policy cycle (steps) and the disaster risk management cycle (phases) which is well accepted in both communities. Both “cycles” and the steps/phases are defined as follows and are shown in Figure 6.
2.3. Main challenges for integration

The current lack of integration is widely cited in the academic literature. This can reach from issues related to capacities, with no clearly defined authority and responsibility (Giordano et al. 2011), capacity constraints (UNISDR, UNDP, 2012), financial constraints limiting certain scales’ ability to take effective adaptation actions (Giordano et al. 2011), as well as limited knowledge.

Limitations within and across institutions are cited in the literature, such as CCA and DRR being affiliated to different ministries/authorities (UNISDR, UNDP, 2012, Amarantunga et al., 2017), a lack of regulatory quality in terms of legislation, and also norms and standards are not effectively put into practice in low and middle-income countries (BMZ, 2012).

Furthermore, the approaches taken are separate in terms of global and regional frameworks for CCA and DRR (UNISDR, UNDP, 2012), there is a lack of strategic long term plans to integrate CCA into DRR (Amarantunga et al., 2017) and DRR often focuses only on disaster response rather than on precaution (Amarantunga et al., 2017).
Lack of, and gaps in, communication and information are cited inter alia between researchers and decision-makers and the general public (UNISDR EUR, 2011), lack of communication between institutions and communities (Amarantunga et al., 2017), lack of communication, transparency and coordination between the different scales and sectors (Giordano et al. 2011), as well as language barriers and different use of terminology and definitions (European Commission, 2017).

Other barriers which are not mentioned above exist, such as the lack of direct funding to support integration of DRR and CCA, the difficulty of quantifying the benefits of DRR and CCA (UNISDR, UNDP, 2012) and mainstreaming fatigue (ProAct Network, 2008).
3. Relevant frameworks

This section will showcase several different frameworks from the international to the national level. These are frameworks that contain key elements for both CCA and DRR communities and under which stronger institutions may emerge through enhanced connectivity and coherence.
4. Recommendations for strengthening institutions

This chapter will serve as the core of this guidance document and provide a set of key stand-alone recommendations. These will be developed along the topics that have been identified in the literature review, results from the PLACARD workshops, interviews and other type of interactions with researchers, decision-makers and stakeholders across CCA and DRR communities.

Each recommendation will be designed so it can be used as a stand-alone file. First the topic is described, followed by a recommendation, how to achieve this recommendation and by whom (who is has the authority to deliver this recommendation) this can be delivered.

Table 1 below provides an overview of the current list of topics that have been selected for recommendation, based on literature review and internal discussions within the PLACARD project. The events and workshops undertaken in developing the guidance can be found in Annex I – List of events attended by the PLACARD team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Overview on table for content for recommendations from PLACARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreseen topics for recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Risk Management (CRM) to facilitate climate-resilient decision-making at the intersection of DRR and CCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sovereign Climate insurance (or European Climate Insurance Pool) in the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change-induced human migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem-based climate adaptation and risk reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast-based financing to anticipate disasters, and reduce human suffering and losses in a changing climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Transfer and data collection by using Blockchain technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering dialogue and learning on monitoring, reporting and evaluation (MRE) of climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction and sustainable development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening interactions among climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction community actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and knowledge management to foster stronger CCA-DRR institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foreseen topics for recommendations (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreaming through education: Bring DRR including CCA into the classroom and vice versa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing decision-making processes involving both CCA and DRR actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional learning as a key element of DRR in a changing climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of stakeholder engagement into DRR and CCA decision-making processes at different scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of online platforms and portals for CCA and DRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger focus on self-precaution or individual prevention and preparedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing of DRR and CCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger focus on funding for prevention, mitigation and resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative disaster risk awareness campaigns in a changing climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of adaptation and disaster reduction strategies and plans at municipal level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing a better knowledge base of current loss and damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using strategic narratives to support CCA and DRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint exercises to strengthen collaboration on various levels between CCA and DRR actors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Knowledge gaps

This chapter will provide additional information about key research and knowledge gaps on the current topics, but also on other CCA and DRR science and practice issues areas were we would like to see additional recommendations for institutional strengthening developed in the future (e.g. next version of this report).
6. Reflections and conclusions

This chapter will provide a discussion and reflection on the information and knowledge developed during this work, as well as on the challenges and limits that were identified for cooperation and integration of CCA and DRR research and practice. It will conclude with a systematic analysis of ways forward with regard to the implementation of the selected recommendations.
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Annex I – List of events organised and attended by the PLACARD team

Table 2: List of events relevant for the development of this Milestone report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>PLACARD Partners involvement</th>
<th>Main goal of the event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECCA 2015 – Session: What do have climate change action and disaster risk management in common? Explore it!</td>
<td>12–14 May 2015</td>
<td>Copenhagen, Denmark</td>
<td>Organiser of session: EAA FFCUL, UOXF, UFZ, RCCC</td>
<td>Presentation of PLACARD and exchange with stakeholders from JRC and UNISDR. Relevant output and knowledge gained from the project know4drr for PLACARD were assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference: Our common future under climate change Session: CCA and DRR: international and urban approaches”</td>
<td>07–10 June 2015</td>
<td>Paris, France</td>
<td>Organiser of session: EAA FFCUL, RCCC, UFZ</td>
<td>Explore experiences at different governance scales on how CCA and DRR are implemented as well as how they are mainstreamed or mismatched.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLACARD Connecting CCA – DRR workshop</td>
<td>19–20 April 2016</td>
<td>Brussels, Belgium</td>
<td>Organiser partner: UOXF FFCUL, SEIO, RCCC, UFZ, ALterra</td>
<td>Consultation with policymakers and networks from across Europe to consider how to better integrate CCA DRR in both policy and practice and what could be the role of PLACARD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>PLACARD Partners involvement</td>
<td>Main goal of the event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation Futures. Two sessions: How to integrate Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction policy and practice at different governance scales</td>
<td>10–13 May 2016</td>
<td>Rotterdam, The Netherlands</td>
<td>Organisers of session 1: FFCUL and UNIGE 2: FFCUL and EAA</td>
<td>Focus on the processes to enable collaboration between CCA and DRR at different government levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Risk Conference – side event: Learning across communities of practice: risk assessment for disaster risk reduction and climate risk management Technical Session: Climate extremes and economic derail</td>
<td>16–20 May 2016</td>
<td>Venice, Italy</td>
<td>Organiser of the side event and technical session: CMCC EAA, UFZ</td>
<td>Collaboration with the project ENHANCE and JRC covering the topics including environmental risk, economic risk and impact analysis, risk management and institutional challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRMKC 2nd Annual Scientific Seminar – Session: Climate Change Adaptation</td>
<td>09–10 March 2017</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Co-organisation of the session with DG CLIMA: FCID</td>
<td>Discuss the relevance of CCA for DRR. Opportunity to increase awareness within DRMKC network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Workshop on the Strategy on adaptation to climate change</td>
<td>05 April 2017</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>FCID, EAA</td>
<td>Participation in the discussion and on the evaluation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECCA 2017 –Sessions: Guidance for EU and national bodies in identifying options for innovative solutions to increase resilience Integration of climate change adaptation (CCA) and disaster risk reduction (DRR) at the European and national level 4</td>
<td>6-9 July 2017</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Session 2: ALTERRA Session 2 in collaboration with H2020 projects RESIN, EU-CIRCLE, RESCCUE and BRIGAID: FC.ID Session 3 in collaboration with EAA: EEA</td>
<td>Opportunity to explore a few relevant issues in a major conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>PLACARD Partners involvement</td>
<td>Main goal of the event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLACARD Workshop: Joining forces</td>
<td>24 October 2017</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>Organiser: EAA FCID, RCCC, SEIO, WERN</td>
<td>To support and boost CCA and DRR institutional strengthening efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA and DRR 1st ESPResSO Think Tank Meeting</td>
<td>12 October 2017</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>FCID, UFZ, EAA</td>
<td>Participation in the discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Stakeholder Workshop for the EU Adaptation Strategy</td>
<td>23 January 2018</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>EAA</td>
<td>Participation in the discussion and on the evaluation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working group 6 on Climate Change Adaptation</td>
<td>24 January 2018</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>EAA</td>
<td>Break-out group work was carried during a meeting of the Working group 6 on adaptation under the Climate Change Committee, with representatives from EU Member States focussing on the interface between CCA and DRR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th European Civil Protection Forum – Session:</td>
<td>5–6 March 2018</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>Co-organisation of sessions with DG CLIMA: EAA FCID</td>
<td>Discuss the relevance and increase the awareness of CCA for DRR in a major forum in Civil Protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert workshops on National Climate Change Impacts and Vulnerability Assessments and the EIONET workshop 2018</td>
<td>5–7 June 2018</td>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>EAA contributing</td>
<td>Contributions from the European Environment Agency (EEA) and EEA Member countries supported the guidance development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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