



DISCUSSION PAPER SEPTEMBER 2020

DEVELOPMENTS IN CLIMATE RESILIENCE GOVERNANCE IN THE EU

A REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH AND EMERGING RECOMMENDATIONS

TAYLOR DIMSDALE & RONAN PALMER

This discussion paper has been produced by E3G for EIT Climate-KIC as an input to the Deep Demonstration project on “Forging resilience in some of Europe’s most vulnerable regions”.

Summary

- > This discussion paper provides a review of recent developments and thought leadership in resilience and adaptation policy and governance in Europe, with selected international examples. It is based on the authors’ own expertise and experiences as well as reports, case studies and resilience strategies and plans.
- > More attention is being paid to resilience globally in part due to growing climate impacts and scientific understanding. Important new research and evidence has been produced recently, for example from the work of the Global Commission on Adaptation.
- > Countries, cities and regions are making important progress on climate resilience and adaptation planning. However, most city and regional resilience frameworks focus on adapting to a narrow set of direct climate impacts that threaten a limited number of key sectors. This approach is insufficient and raises the risk of maladaptation. The problem is compounded by the fact that local governments face capacity constraints from inadequate data and lack of funding and guidance from national policymakers.
- > In fact, regions are facing a complex web of interconnected systemic risks from the low carbon economic transition as well as direct and indirect physical impacts that will strain political, economic and social institutions. Resilience cannot be delivered through downstream technical solutions at the project level alone. It requires fundamental institutional and governance

reforms including much greater authority and mandates and clarity of responsibility for managing risks. Given that all infrastructure will need to be resilient to a range of climate scenarios, innovative approaches to financing will be required.

- > The paper offers an emerging set of recommendations for how European regions can approach the task of reforming the governance of climate resilience. A comprehensive review of different approaches to regional resilience governance was beyond the scope of work. One of our key recommendations is that the case for governance reforms would be greatly strengthened by systematic analysis of the strengths and weakness of different approaches.

Introduction

Climate change is redefining the concept of resilience for cities and regions. The political and socio-economic effects of a rapid shift to a low carbon economy combined with both slow and sudden-onset geophysical impacts represent a complex set of risks that local authorities must manage to ensure security and economic prosperity for their citizens. It is not an easy task.

Coordination with national government and in some cases international institutions will be critical. But regions, cities and communities are on the front lines of climate impacts and have knowledge of the local context including local approaches to resilience governance as well as political economy barriers and opportunities to improving resilience.

The aim of this briefing is to provide an overview of recent developments in research and thought leadership on resilience policy and governance in Europe, with a few selected international case studies, and to offer an emerging set of key lessons that could be useful in informing the Deep Demonstration project including any current or future regional partners and problem owners.



Our definition of resilience is the ability to prosper in the face of shocks and stresses brought on directly or indirectly from climate change. Flexibility is critical to climate resilience given the uncertainty, wide range of potential impacts and complex interaction of systems.

Stockholm Resilience Centre

SRC defines resilience as the capacity of a system, be it an individual, a forest, a city or an economy, to deal with change and continue to develop. They have developed seven principles of a resilient system that has relevant to building resilience for regional governments: maintain diversity and redundancy; manage connectivity; manage slow variables and feedbacks; foster complex adaptive systems thinking; encourage learning; broaden participation; promote polycentric governance.

The first section provides an overview of how thinking about climate resilience has evolved in recent years. We then review some of the key challenges in strengthening resilience governance, followed by an overview of recent research and thought leadership. The paper concludes with a set of emerging recommendations for how regions can approach the task of strengthening their climate resilience. A short list of other tools and data sources that are available is provided in the annex.

The challenge of strengthening regional resilience

The term “resilience” has been applied to socio-ecological systems for decades. However, the term has taken on new meaning and urgency in recent years as the direct and indirect impacts of climate change hit harder and faster than expected. Neither the status quo nor incremental improvements will be adequate as communities, ways of life and even entire countries in some cases face an existential risk from climate change.

Resilience is often thought of in technical terms, for example in the context of individual infrastructure projects being able to survive a specific shock. However, the ability to withstand direct impacts like heatwaves, droughts or floods on agriculture or infrastructure is only one element of climate resilience. Climate impacts include slow-onset events like sea level rise, and bring second or even third order impacts, including systemic risks to food or financial systems¹.

Cities and regions will need to find ways to manage not just geophysical impacts, but also the social and economic challenges that follow from systemic risks related to the financial system, climate-sensitive industries, supply chains and human health. They must do this with limited resources; it will not just be accomplished through the

¹ <https://www.theccc.org.uk/publication/indicators-of-climate-risk-china-uk/>



E3G



Climate-KIC is supported by the
EIT, a body of the European Union



building of more infrastructure, but will require better infrastructure, and better governance and institutions.

Cities and regions in Europe will struggle to improve their climate resilience on their own. A well-documented set of barriers to improvements in adaptation and resilience exist, including political, economic, behavioral and technical challenges.

- > Adaptation and resilience have historically been low political priorities. Partly this is due to the disconnect between political or policy cycles, which occur over months or years, whereas the payoff from investments in resilience are much longer term.
- > A lack of data on climate risk leads some local authorities to systematically underestimate their city's risk level². There can also be a lack of institutional capacity at local level to assess or manage risks. This is only now changing.
- > In most countries infrastructure policy and regulation is too fragmented to effectively manage the interlocking risk driven by climate change. Uncertainty often exists over who is responsible for investing in resilience, and the relative role of private actors and the state (national, regional and local) in managing risk. There is often no clear "social contract" for who should bear the costs of climate damage or be helped to manage its risks.
- > National planning assumptions are often inconsistent and ignore worst-case scenarios. A focus on project by project cost-benefit assessment in planning and financing undervalues infrastructure *system* resilience as an objective.
- > Regional governments and local authorities often have very limited resources and are forced to make difficult trade-offs. It is often easier to focus on the potential benefits of a low carbon economic transition than to devote time and attention to building resilience to the impacts and costs of climate change. This problem is compounded by the fact that most governance frameworks are not designed to address problems like climate that cut across environmental, economic and social dimensions.
- > Even where the political will and resources are available, there are risks associated with acting on climate risk. For example, a better understanding of climate risks through risk assessment and disclosure could trigger capital flight from vulnerable areas already struggling to attract investment.

² <https://climate-adapt.eea.europa.eu/metadata/publications/underfunded-underprepared-underwater-cities-at-risk/11258790>

-
- > Developing metrics for measuring success is difficult. For example, how would a city or region know if resilience had been increased or adaptation had been effective? There is a need to support the development of tools and metrics that can capture the benefits of adaptation actions.
 - > There is a reality or, in some cases, a perception, of low returns from investment in adaptation or resilience. Additionally, the benefits or return from adaptation investment can in many cases only be realized in the medium-long term which is perceived as unacceptable by investors and administrators. Adaptation is seen as unaffordable by many financial sector actors and investors. Critically the findings from the GCA included evidence that the overall rate of return on investments in improved resilience is very high, with benefit-cost ratios ranging from 2:1 to 10:1³.

There is evidence in some cases that even when a region has put in place adaptation or resilience plans and/or strategies, successful implementation does not follow. In the case of the Lombardy region in Italy for example, this was due to many factors including the fact that the plans were not legally binding, the lack of a dedicated budget, minimal influence or guidance from the national level, and limited scope for the agencies that were not actually tasked with implementing the policies⁴. Important sector-based actions are taking place largely due to the need to respond to climate impacts, but they are not being integrated into an overall strategy. One of the findings of this case study was that the success of a mainstreaming process depends on the governance structure put in place – including clarity on which institutions are involved and what are their responsibilities.

Key lessons from recent developments in resilience and adaptation

The landscape on adaptation and resilience has shifted markedly over the past year, with far greater attention now paid to the role that resilience will need to play in climate policy going forward. In this section we explore the reasoning behind this shift and some of the lessons from new evidence and thought leadership.

Recent extreme weather events across the world are clearly one driver of the attention to resilience. But the new focus can be attributed in part to developments in scientific understanding; including the recent special reports from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), on climate change and land, on 1.5 degrees and the Ocean and Cryosphere have contributed greatly to understanding

³ https://cdn.gca.org/assets/2019-09/GlobalCommission_Report_FINAL.pdf#page=8

⁴ https://www.alpine-space.eu/projects/goapply/results/results_revised/goapply_d.t2.1.1_wp2_case-study-report_italy_lombardy_fla_dec-2018.pdf

of the risks involved and the need to improve governance mechanisms for managing them. Collectively the reports demonstrate that many of the impacts on the environment, land and oceans are accelerating. The report on 1.5°C for example shows clearly that global warming of 2°C compared to 1.5°C would substantially increase extreme weather events but will also lead to high risks for entire ecosystems including potentially irreversible impacts. The upcoming AR6 report on Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability which will be released in October 2021 will be another key input to the debate.

The launch of the Global Commission on Adaptation, led by Ban Ki-moon with the mandate to encourage the development of measures to manage the effects of climate change through technology, planning and investment, has also given the issue increased political and public urgency. The flagship report of the initiative was released in September 2019 to coincide with the UNSG Climate Summit and lends new evidence and thought leadership. The report calls for revolutions in understanding, planning and finance of adaptation; within the planning recommendations there is a call for better governance including enhancing system-wide policy and investment decisions.

Think tanks and other civil society organizations in Europe and beyond have contributed to a better understanding of climate resilience. Many focus on particular sectors or more on technical or project-level solutions but some have conducted research and analysis on system change and governance issues. The Overseas Development Institute (ODI)⁵ released a working paper in August 2017 which focused on national and sub-national political institutions as a critical context in which risk governance takes place. It emphasizes the complexity of the relationship between the political system and resilience governance and need for understanding the political context when considering governance reforms in resilience. Key lessons from ODI's analysis include the need to invest in building trust with local institutions and acknowledging trade-offs between different social groups as well as between short- and long-term outcomes.

While beyond the scope of this paper, it is worth noting that many multilateral institutions including the Multilateral Development Banks are doing work on resilience in the developing country context which could also have lessons for European regions. The World Bank for example recently launched an Action Plan on Adaptation and resilience that includes a target of direct adaptation climate finance to reach \$50 billion over FY21–25⁶. Alongside the financial commitment the Bank has pledged to support countries to mainstream approaches to systematically manage climate risks at every phase of policy planning, investment design, and

⁵ <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/11699.pdf>

⁶ <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2019/01/15/world-bank-group-announces-50-billion-over-five-years-for-climate-adaptation-and-resilience>

implementation. Several other MDBs incorporate resilience into their climate strategies including the European Investment Bank (EIB) and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB).

At the EU level, a range of initiatives and pilot projects have emerged in recent years aimed at strengthening regional resilience in Europe through better governance, some of which receive support from EU institutions. These include:

- > *EU Resilience to cope with Climate Change in Urban Areas (RESCCUE)*⁷ project: the project suggests following a process of 1) better risk assessment and prioritization of the most material risks a region faces; 2) **analysis of interdependencies between different sectors**; and 3) development of resilience action plans.
- > *EGOKI: integrating adaptation to climate change in spatial and urban planning in municipalities in Navarre*⁸: Reducing the vulnerability of municipalities in Navarre is the main objective of EGOKI, and its ultimate outcome will be a set of recommendations aimed at integrating criteria for adaptation to climate change into urban planning procedures. The project has a modest amount of funding but is well designed and ambitious. **Political, technical and financial commitment across many levels of government including key national ministries, regional government and several pilot municipalities was key in success of the project. Priority was given to learning and knowledge sharing including transferring lessons learned.** The project is contributing to development of the regional climate change roadmap.
- > *Climate adaptation strategy for the Grimsel area in the Swiss Alps*⁹. This project is innovative for several reasons: 1) it considered not just geophysical impacts but existing **socio-economic conditions** and how they would interact; 2) gradually widened and shifted from an initially rather narrow focus on natural hazard management to **broader perspectives of climate-resilient regional development**; and 3) it institutionalized the governance of strategy implementation by establishing a steering group responsible for coordination and monitoring.

⁷ http://www.resccue.eu/sites/default/files/eureau_20092016_pmalgrat.pdf

⁸ <https://climate-adapt.eea.europa.eu/metadata/case-studies/egoki-integrating-adaptation-to-climate-change-in-spatial-and-urban-planning-in-municipalities-in-navarre>

⁹ <https://climate-adapt.eea.europa.eu/metadata/case-studies/climate-adaptation-strategy-for-the-grimsel-area-in-the-swiss-alps>



E3G



Climate-KIC is supported by the EIT, a body of the European Union



-
- > *Using local initiatives to envision sustainable and resilient food systems in the Stockholm city-region¹⁰. The study explored transformation towards more sustainable and resilient food systems in a specific regional context – the Stockholm city-region in Sweden. The approach used is based on a new methodology for bottom-up, participatory narrative scenarios. **The project found that governance features contributing to resilience are, for example, the capacity for complex systems thinking, inclusivity and adaptation.***

There are other national level case studies that contain some mapping of regional governance and policies that provide interesting lessons for the Deep Demonstration project. One example is the **Interreg Alpine Space Programme** which includes case studies on regions like Kempten / Allgäu region in Germany and the Lombardy region in Italy, which was the first subnational government in Italy to adopt a comprehensive climate adaptation package including both a strategy and an adaptation planning document. It is notable that a key takeaway from both case studies was that despite the best intentions, in neither case has a focus on adaptation resulted in a coherent and integrated regional approach to resilience. Overall the Alpine Space Programme found that **“Governance has a key role in the transition from adaptation strategies to implementation in practice, but capacities for multilevel and cross-sector governance of adaptation processes are lacking in all countries.”¹¹**

The UK’s Economic and Social Research Council funds **P-CAN**, the Place-based Climate Action Network, which describes its vision as “to produce a replicable model that delivers climate policies on a global to local scale, facilitating and inspiring places

Non-EU case study: Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program (California)

In 2015 the California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) was directed to form the Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resilience Program. The program’s website states that “The Program is designed to develop a cohesive and coordinated response to the impacts of climate change across the state. Through its activities, the Program will develop holistic strategies to coordinate climate activities at the state, regional and local levels, while advancing social equity.”

The program has two components, the State Adaptation Clearinghouse and the Technical Advisory Council (TAC). The State Adaptation Clearinghouse is a resource hub to help policymakers in planning for and implementing climate adaptation projects to promote resiliency across California. The Technical Advisory Council brings together local government, practitioners, scientists, and community leaders to help coordinate adaptation activities.

¹⁰ <https://stockholmresilience.org/publications/artiklar/2020-01-10-using-local-initiatives-to-envision-sustainable-and-resilient-food-systems-in-the-stockholm-city-region.html>

¹¹ <https://www.wsl.ch/gov-vis-cca/>



across the UK.” It supports climate change commissions in three cities, modelled on the UK Committee on Climate Change. For example, the city of Leeds has a **Climate Change Commission** that acts as an independent voice to help Leeds to “make a positive choice on issues relating to energy, carbon, weather and climate.

Cities and regions can also draw on a range of useful initiatives that address resilience in specific sectors or policy areas, and apply their insights to local circumstances, including in health¹² and infrastructure¹³.

There is also a wealth of new thinking on involving citizens and stakeholders in addressing resilience, such as those proposed by groups like **DemSoc**¹⁴ (supported directly by Climate KIC) and **TASC**¹⁵.

Financing of adaptation and resilience is a key concern for regional or local governments and there is an emerging body of research and evidence on this topic. One of the key challenges is that the upfront cost of building climate-resilient infrastructure can be high while the benefits only accrue over time. There is widespread recognition that while public funding for resilience must increase, it will not be sufficient given that all infrastructure and all economic sectors will need to be resilient to a range of climate scenarios. The Global Commission on Adaptation has released a report with the United Nations Environment Program Finance Initiative (UNEP-FI) and Climate Finance Advisors with recommendations for unlocking private and public capital for resilience and adaptation¹⁶. In addition to its recommendations for the financial sector, which include better climate risk management approaches for all financial system actors and the adoption of new metrics and standards, the paper reviews promising new financial instruments that could be relevant for regional resilience including Social Impact Bonds and Resilience Bonds. Some countries, as well as states and cities, have established Green Banks or similar institutions as a way of catalyzing investment in clean energy and climate resilience¹⁷. Public-private partnerships and risk-sharing mechanisms have been proposed as other means of catalyzing private finance.

In conclusion, there is a rapidly growing body of literature as well as pilot projects and initiatives that cities and regions can draw upon to inform their own strategies. However, evidence of transformative system-wide resilience governance reforms is limited.

¹² https://www.who.int/phe/climate/conference_briefing_1_healthresilience_27aug.pdf

¹³ <http://www.oecd.org/environment/cc/policy-perspectives-climate-resilient-infrastructure.pdf>

¹⁴ <https://www.demsoc.org/projects/climate-kic-deep-demonstrations/>

¹⁵ <https://www.tasc.ie/researchpolicy/tasc-just-transition-centre-.html>

¹⁶ <https://www.unepfi.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/GCA-Adaptation-Finance.pdf>

¹⁷ <https://www.e3g.org/showcase/green-investment-bank>

Emerging recommendations

Based on our review of recent developments and research in the field of climate resilience and adaptation, we conclude that while a significant amount of progress is being made a critical gap is evidence and analysis on best practices on reforms to national and regional governance. Below we present a set of key emerging recommendations and conclusions with the aim of supporting regions in Europe and elsewhere that are trying to strengthen their resilience:

- > Resilience requires *system reform* not just better downstream management. Experience of attempting to integrate climate risks – both physical and economic – in existing infrastructure governance systems has demonstrated that this requires fundamental institutional reforms rather than incremental policy change¹⁸.
- > Barriers to better resilience are not just technical and economic. In many cases they are social or political and depend on the interests and entanglements of local stakeholders including political actors or businesses. Early stages of developing a new approach to resilience governance should involve better *political economy analysis* of the region to identify barriers and intervention points¹⁹.
- > Measuring climate risk exposure or climate vulnerability is critical but insufficient; *delivering resilience at the local level depends on addressing a wide range of social, economic and political indicators* including progress on broader sustainability goals²⁰.
- > Cities and regions need to be part of *a comprehensive climate risk management process* that brings together the EU, national, and local levels. National governments, together with local authorities, should be clear about who is responsible for managing what kind of risk. The division of responsibility will be different in every country, but the central question is the same: *Who is responsible?* The answer may result in structural reforms and changes in risk governance with increased devolved powers or mechanisms to ensure greater participation of local authorities in decision making processes.
- > There are important opportunities to be seized from links to *international networks*. The act of joining knowledge sharing or other platforms or

¹⁸ See result of US National Climate Risk Assessment <http://nca2014.globalchange.gov/highlights/report-findings/infrastructure#intro-section-2>. UK Climate Change Risk Assessment: <https://www.theccc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/UK-CCRA-2017-Synthesis-Report-Committee-on-Climate-Change.pdf>. Case studies of EU city resilience https://www.e3g.org/docs/E3G_Underfunded%2C_underprepared%2C_underwater._Cities_at_risk.pdf

¹⁹ <http://www.oecd.org/dac/Resilience%20Systems%20Analysis%20FINAL.pdf>.

²⁰ <https://resilientcities2019.iclei.org/wp-content/uploads/Data-speak-report-web-final.pdf>

networks in and of itself can strengthen resilience as it serves as a counterweight to potential shocks or fragility risks.

- > There must be a *holistic assessment of resilience issues and interdependencies*. Cities and regions need high quality local level climate risk assessments. These assessments should consider the full range of climate risks under different climate scenarios – including a 2, 4 or 6 degree global average rise in temperature. They should be comprehensive and consider direct and indirect impacts as well as the implications of cascading system failures.
- > These assessments then need to inform *climate risk management at the heart of policymaking*. Regions should focus on the entire system, not just the risks themselves²¹.
- > Delivery of a more resilient system may require *fundamentally different approaches to infrastructure* including prioritizing demand side management and energy efficiency or microgrids for example above supply side. This would likely require new regulatory frameworks and early stage demonstration projects to ensure buy-in from local stakeholders.
- > Cities and regions should be given *greater direct capacity and budgetary support* to deliver these local climate risk assessments and implement local resilience planning. They currently do not have the capacity or the financial means to build and budget for a substantially warmer world. Local authorities will need direct financial support from national governments and the EU to do climate risk assessments in collaboration with local partners. They also need capacity support to ensure that best practice approaches are employed, shared and that they are joined up to regional and cross-border resilience planning.
- > Regions need to link adaptation and resilience plans and strategies with *regional climate financing strategies*. This requires an assessment and quantification of regional needs for resilience. By creating a plan, a clear pathway is established to raise finance at the scale and response required. In this context regions can consider the potential of new financial approaches like Resilience Bonds or Green Banks. It will be helpful to also quantify the benefits of adaptation actions²².
- > Regions, as opposed to cities, may also need *more coordinated political leadership*. There are many city-level partnerships on adaptation or resilience,

²¹ <http://www.oecd.org/dac/Resilience%20Systems%20Analysis%20FINAL.pdf>.

²² <https://resilientcities2019.iclei.org/wp-content/uploads/Data-speak-report-web-final.pdf>



E3G



Climate-KIC is supported by the
EIT, a body of the European Union 

for example, **C40 cities** and the **Global Covenant of Mayors for Climate & Energy**. Some are open to regional stakeholders for example the **European Urban Resilience Forum**. Regions are members of groups such as **the Climate Alliance** and **Local Governments for Sustainability (ICLEI)** and climate change is a major issue for groups like the **Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions**.



E3G



Climate-KIC is supported by the EIT, a body of the European Union 

Annex: Tools and resources

Name	Type	Summary	Link
Climate-ADAPT	Knowledge platform	Sharing information on expected changes, climate risk data, case studies and best practices and other tools and resources.	https://climate-adapt.eea.europa.eu/
REGIOCLIMA Regional cooperation towards adaptation to climate change		The REGIOCLIMA project aims at enhancing cooperation among selected EU regions to facilitate the elaboration of climate change adaptation strategies and to implement policy guidelines.	http://www.interreg4c.eu/projects/project-details/index-project=19-regional-cooperation-towards-adaptation-to-climate-change&.html
ICLEI “Data speak louder than words”	Report	Findings from an initial stocktake of climate change adaptation and urban resilience efforts (2018) The findings in this global report are meant to give voice to cities and regions in the 2018 national stocktaking exercises on climate change and sustainable development. It targets local and regional governments with the aim to enhance understanding of planning, implementing, measuring, and reporting on climate change adaptation.	https://iclei.org/en/publication/data-speak-louder-than-words
GIZ: Multi-Level Climate Governance Supporting Local Action (2018).	Study	The study explores how can different instruments for multi-level climate governance support the realisation of local climate mitigation and adaptation potentials. It provides recommendations for the improvement of local climate action by employing multi-level climate governance approaches on information and knowledge, finance, coordination and cooperation, and institutional capacities	https://citiesalliance.org/sites/default/files/giz2018-0318en-cpmud-multi-level-climate-governance.pdf .
(OECD) Guidelines for Resilient Systems Analysis (OECD)	Report	A step by step approach to resilience systems analysis, a tool that helps field practitioners to: prepare for, and facilitate, a successful multi-stakeholder resilience analysis workshop; design a roadmap to boost the resilience of communities and societies; integrate the results of the analysis into their development and humanitarian programming.	http://www.oecd.org/dac/Resilience%20Systems%20Analysis%20FINAL.pdf .



E3G



Climate-KIC is supported by the EIT, a body of the European Union 

LIFE Master-Adapt MAinSTreaming Experiences at Regional and local level for adaptation to climate change	Project	The project aims to identify and test innovative tools of multilevel governance to support regions and local authorities in defining and developing adaptation strategies and policies. The project will develop an operative and scalable methodology to optimize and make effective the targeting and integration of sectoral regional policies with respect to the climate change adaptation	https://masteradapt.eu/?lang=en
Climate Change Adaptation Practices Across the EU	Report	The report represents the results of a local and regional authority survey carried out by the MASTER ADAPT project, and provides a snapshot of the current state in the development and implementation of adaptation policies on regional and local levels in various locations in Europe. The survey spans over the following main aspects of the adaptation cycle: planning, implementation, governance and evaluation. It also includes several practice examples of mainstreaming adaptation in various relevant sectors> Includes best practice overview of three countries.	https://masteradapt.eu/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Master-Adapt-report-A2_v2.pdf
Resilient Cities Report 2018 - Tracking local progress on the resilience targets of SDG 11 (2018)	Forum / Report	Resilient Cities is the annual global forum on urban resilience and adaptation convened in Bonn, Germany. The congress series provides an international platform to share the latest knowledge, good practices, challenges, and innovations for creating more resilient cities. It also serves as an annual meeting point to track local progress on the resilience targets of Sustainable Development Goal 11 to make cities inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable. The	https://resilientcities2018.iclei.org/wp-content/uploads/RC2018_Report.pdf



E3G



Climate-KIC is supported by the
EIT, a body of the European Union 

About E3G

E3G is an independent, non-profit European organisation operating in the public interest to accelerate the global transition to a climate-safe world. E3G builds cross-sectoral coalitions to achieve carefully defined outcomes, chosen for their capacity to leverage change. E3G works closely with like-minded partners in government, politics, business, civil society, science, the media, public interest foundations and elsewhere.

More information is available at www.e3g.org

Copyright

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.0 License.

© E3G 2020