



## Report on first set of stakeholder workshops

### Deliverable D6A.2

February 2016

Katharina Zellmer, Marc Gramberger and Stefan Haenen

*Prospex bvba, Vlugestal 6, 3140 Keerbergen, Belgium*



---

**Prepared under contract from the European Commission**

Contract n° 603416  
 Collaborative project  
 FP7 Environment

Project acronym: **IMPRESSIONS**  
 Project full title: **Impacts and Risks from High-end Scenarios: Strategies for Innovative Solutions**  
 Start of the project: 01 November 2013  
 Duration: 60 months  
 Project coordinator: University of Oxford  
 Project website: [www.impressions-project.eu](http://www.impressions-project.eu)

Deliverable title: Report on the first set of stakeholder workshops  
 Deliverable n°: D6A.2  
 Nature of the deliverable: Report  
 Dissemination level: Restricted

WP responsible: WP6A  
 Lead beneficiary: Prospex bvba

Due date of deliverable: Month 28 (February 2016)  
 Actual submission date: Month 28 (February 2016)

Deliverable status:

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)
1.1	Final	29 February 2016	Katharina Zellmer, Marc Gramberger, Stefan Haenen, Paula Harrison
1.0	Draft	20 February 2016	Katharina Zellmer, Marc Gramberger and Stefan Haenen

The content of this deliverable do not necessarily reflect the official opinions of the European Commission or other institutions of the European Union.

---

## Table of contents

Preface .....	4
Summary .....	4
1 Background to the stakeholder workshops in IMPRESSIONS .....	5
2 Objectives and design of the first set of workshops .....	6
3 Participants in the first set of workshops.....	7
3.1 Mapping of Stakeholders .....	7
3.2 Stakeholder invitation process .....	9
3.3 Stakeholders attending the first set of workshops .....	10
4 Outcomes of the first set of workshops .....	11
5 Stakeholder evaluations .....	13
6 Next steps .....	13
7 Acknowledgements .....	14
8 References .....	14
Annex 1: Detailed overview of stakeholder evaluations for the 1 <sup>st</sup> set of IMPRESSIONs workshops ..	15

## Preface

This Deliverable Report has been prepared for the project “Impacts and Risks from High-end Scenarios: Strategies for Innovative Solutions” (IMPRESSIONS). The report describes the first set of IMPRESSIONS stakeholder workshops and outlines the outcomes. This report is mainly directed at project partners of the IMPRESSIONS consortium and is therefore restricted in its dissemination level. In describing the first set of stakeholder workshops, it will inform any future stakeholder engagement activity in the project’s lifetime. This report should therefore be regarded as an important stepping stone for the further implementation of the IMPRESSIONS project.

## Summary

The first set of IMPRESSIONS stakeholder workshops took place in 2015 in 4 out of the 5 case studies<sup>1</sup>. The specific objectives for the first set of workshops were:

- To introduce stakeholders to the IMPRESSIONS project, the stakeholder engagement process and case study specifics;
- To identify driving forces and uncertainties;
- To develop scenario storylines;
- To explore high-end climate change effects on scenarios;
- To quantify storylines (this objective applies to the Scottish case study within limits, as they have been quantified in another project (CLIMSAVE) already).

Stakeholders were identified to participate in the workshops through a stakeholder mapping process that matched stakeholder characteristics to selection criteria (i.e. key sectors, geographical scope of activity, organisational affiliation, age, gender) and quota for each criteria. This informed the stakeholder invitation process. Overall, only 4 out of 143 quota were not fulfilled (2.5%), mainly relating to last minute cancellations.

The outputs generated from the first set of workshops in each case study have been reported in individual detailed reports which provide an almost literal transcription of the materials produced by the stakeholders (in the form of e.g. plenary presentations, flip chart notes and post-its) for each step of the workshop process. These reports have been sent to the respective stakeholders and to all concerned IMPRESSIONS partners as key input for tasks under WP2 (development of multi-scale integrated scenarios) and WP3 (Advancement of CCI/AV methods and models). The workshops are being followed-up by online engagement activities before the second set of workshops.

Evaluation of the first set of workshops by stakeholders indicates a high approval rating for all the workshops in general, with the majority of responses ranging from “good” to “very good”. All evaluation comments are being used to improve the workshop process and inputs for the second set of workshops.

---

<sup>1</sup> The European case study did not have a first workshop (see section 1)

## 1 Background to the stakeholder workshops in IMPRESSIONS

The FP7 project IMPRESSIONS (“Impacts and Risks from High-end Scenarios: Strategies for Innovative Solutions”) aims to provide empirically grounded, transformative science that quantifies and explains the consequences of high-end climate scenarios for both decision-makers and society. The project will do so by developing and applying a novel participatory methodology that explicitly deals with uncertainties and strong non-linear changes focussing on high-end climate change. Details of the methodology and its implementation can be found in the project’s Description of Work and on its website ([www.impressions-project.eu](http://www.impressions-project.eu)) and will therefore not be the focus of this deliverable. However, an integral part of the approach is the close interaction and direct engagement of stakeholders in the research process. This will be achieved through a series of in-depth professionally facilitated workshops that aim to maximise active stakeholder participation in defining high-end scenarios, adaptation and mitigation pathways, as well as analysing the inherent risks and opportunities of new policy strategies.

Within IMPRESSIONS stakeholders will be engaged in all five linked multi-sectoral case studies at the global, European and regional/local scales (Scotland, Iberia and Hungary). The engagement is set-up as two components: (i) direct stakeholder engagement; and (ii) complementary online engagement. Originally the former was planned to be implemented with the help of a decision-maker survey and a series of 3 workshops in each of the five case studies (15 workshops in total), with each series focusing on:

- The development of integrated scenarios (workshop set I)
- The development of adaptation and mitigation pathways (workshop set II)
- The development of risks/opportunities and exploration of new strategies/policies (workshop set III).

Although the overall set-up of this engagement remains as described in the project’s Description of Work, the project team jointly decided that four adaptations are beneficial to the overall outcome of the stakeholder engagement process in particular and the project in general:

- Workshop set I: It was decided to replace the workshops for the Scottish and European case studies, as scenarios have been developed for those case studies as part of a previous project (CLIMSAVE). Both case studies will fully step into the engagement process during workshop set II.
- New: Extension of EU workshop (in workshop set 2) and holding of 1-day mini-workshop for the Scottish case study. The 1-day mini-workshop in Scotland enabled stakeholders to comment on the merging of the CLIMSAVE storylines with the SSPs adopted in IMPRESSIONS and to work out an additional scenario where storylines could not be merged. The extension of the EU workshop in workshop set 2 was necessary in order to enable stakeholders to explore the storylines more extensively, as contrary to the other cases, these have not been developed by them.
- New: Cross-scale workshop: Not envisioned in the original planning the project team has decided to bring stakeholders from all five case studies together in a final workshop at the end of the project. The cross-scale workshop compares and analyses results across the case studies, thereby truly aiming for cross-scale interaction and comparability. This is possible due

to the savings made by no longer needing Workshops I for the Scottish and European case studies.

- Global case study: The global case study consists of two parts: (i) global modelling to provide boundary conditions for the European and regional/local case studies; and (ii) an assessment of indirect effects from outside of Europe on the EU. The project decided to focus the latter part of the global case study around the Central Asian region (comprising Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan); this decision was taken after consultations with key stakeholders in Brussels, more specifically from various parts of DG CLIMA and the European External Action Service. The impacts of climate change in this region are of strategic importance for Europe because of the strong ties to Russia and (increasingly) China. Stakeholder engagement for the global case study will focus on this Central Asian region and, thus, the case study is called “EU External”, addressing external indirect effects on the EU. This shift in focus necessitates a different approach to the workshop series, where the focus will lie less on pathway development and more on policy implication analysis of the scenarios.

It is important to note that the integration of stakeholders in the methodologies developed within all the IMPRESSIONS work packages is systemic and integral. This is reflected in the many internal discussions and decision-making on methodologies within the project.

## 2 Objectives and design of the first set of workshops

Within the overall research and application process and the stakeholder engagement process, each workshop set is mainly linked to the work in a specific WP. The first workshop set is particularly linked with WP2, specifically the development of the socio-economic scenarios (the overall methodology for which is given in Deliverable D2.1; the description of the final set of socio-economic scenarios will be written up as Deliverable D2.2).

The first workshop set has the following building blocks:

- Introductions: IMPRESSIONS project, stakeholder engagement process and case study specifics;
- Driving forces and uncertainties;
- Scenario storyline development (cross- and downscaling);
- Exploring high-end climate change effects on scenarios (modelling input);
- Quantifying storylines (fuzzy sets).

The following outputs are to be achieved by the end of the workshop:

- Draft scenario storylines down-/cross-scaled to the specific case study;
- Short narratives on how high-end climate change affects the scenario storyline;
- Quantifiable statements and translation keys to support the quantification of model variables.

**Table 1: Overview of IMPRESSIONs workshop as part of workshop set 1.**

Case study	EU external	Iberia	Hungary	Scotland	EU
Location	Almaty, Kazakhstan	Lisbon, Portugal	Szekszard, Hungary	Edinburgh, Scotland	No first workshop for the EU case study
Date	16-17 February 2015	24-26 June 2015	13-14 July 2015	22 September 2015	
Number of participants	23	17	27	17	

A team of IMPRESSIONS representatives, each with a specific role, supported each workshop:

- Project leadership;
- Case study leaders and supporters;
- Representatives of work package 2, 3, 4 and 5;
- Resource persons;
- Note takers;
- Facilitators;
- Logistical support;
- Reporter.

Whereas the first three roles in practice have been combined with another role, the latter five categories are mutually exclusive.

The lingua franca of IMPRESSIONS is English. English is also the workshop language applied in the European and Scottish case studies. The need to work with additional languages next to English in workshops has been addressed separately for each of the other case studies: EU-external, Iberia and Hungary. In the EU-external case study, it has been opted to work with English only. In Iberia and Hungary, interpretation between Hungarian and English (Hungarian case study) and between Portuguese, Spanish and English (Iberian case study) was provided.

### 3 Participants in the first set of workshops

#### 3.1 Mapping of Stakeholders

Details on the actual mapping of the IMPRESSIONS stakeholders can be found in D6A.1 (Stakeholder mapping report) and will not be discussed here. However, in short the mapping - following the Prospex-CQI approach (see: Gramberger et al. 2014) - can be summarised as follows:

1. Identification of selection criteria, i.e. key sectors, geographical scope of activity, organisational affiliation, age, gender.
2. Agreement of criteria per case study, because due to the different nature of the case studies not all criteria are relevant for each of them (e.g. the forestry sector is relevant in the European, Scottish and Hungarian case, but not in the Iberian and EU external case).

### 3. Mapping of individual stakeholders against the criteria.

The mapping process was undertaken in close collaboration with case study leaders and with the leaders of the decision-maker survey in WP1. The mapping was done with the help of an online stakeholder database per case study allowing entry and registration of potential stakeholders. In order to obtain a database with an adequate number and diversity of stakeholders, a minimum number of individuals for each case study were defined (between 40 and 80 individuals). Table 2 shows the initial identification of individuals per case study, which will be further elaborated as the project evolves (see also section 5).

**Table 2: Number of initially identified individuals per category and case study.**

Criteria	EU external	Europe	Scotland	Iberia	Hungary
<b>Organisational affiliation</b>					
- Government	36	33	12	32	37
- Economy/Enterprise	5	16	12	6	19
- Civil society	7	15	8	8	13
- Research	6	16	8	25	9
<b>Level of operation of the organization</b>					
- Municipal	-	-	18	-	17
- Local	17	33	26	10	45
- Regional	48	42	23	36	38
- National	49	48	36	48	31
- European	30	38	8	7	8
- International	43	15	8	-	-
<b>Function of the stakeholder</b>					
- Politician	1	4	0	9	4
- Policy makers/ experts/advisor	20	23	6	20	14
- Regulators	1	7	3	5	34
- Practitioners	14	8	9	5	40
- Technical expert	19	32	15	34	4
- Advocacy/lobbyists	2	10	14	7	6
- General public	0	15	2	0	4
- Other	0	5	1	0	0
<b>Level of operation of the stakeholder</b>					
- Municipal	-	-	-	-	21
- Local	17	29	26	10	48
- Regional	48	37	23	36	41
- National	48	47	37	48	23
- European	16	42	5	7	7
- International	37	18	6	-	-
<b>Sector</b>					
- Water	23	37	6	27	25
- Infrastructure	22	34	9	6	22
- Energy	22	25	5	7	13
- Finance/Insurance	4	8	1	3	4
- Agriculture	12	2	3	-	24
- Food & Nutrition	-	-	8	5	8
- Whisky	-	-	5	-	-
- Forestry	-	11	12	-	2
- Biodiversity conservation	-	27	-	18	-
- Tourism	-	-	10	-	-



Criteria	EU external	Europe	Scotland	Iberia	Hungary
- Health	-	3	4	3	10
- Land use/land use management	-	2	6	28	-
- Land owners	-	-	11	-	-
- Trade	10	-	-	-	-
- Security	22	13	-	2	6
- Migration	7	-	-	0	-
- Disaster risk reduction	35	-	-	-	-
- Humanitarian relief	24	-	-	-	-
- Other	8	27	17	14	22
<b>Age</b>					
- 30 years and under	1	6	0	4	3
- 30-50 years	45	43	31	46	27
- 50 years and above	8	9	8	6	22
<b>Gender</b>					
- female	19	26	16	30	23
- male	35	51	23	37	51
<b>Relevance for</b>					
WP1	45	34	28	32	48
WP2	54	72	39	61	71

**Note:** Numbers indicate the number of identified individuals for each criterion per case study; dashes indicate non-relevance of the criterion for the case study.

In total the following numbers of individuals could be identified per case study:

- EU external: 54 individuals
- Europe: 77 individuals
- Scotland: 39 individuals
- Iberia: 67 individuals
- Hungary: 74 individuals

The difference in number is due to the different set-up as well as the different level of evolution of the case studies. The Scottish case study for example can build on a dense stakeholder network that has been working with the project partners in the past and has already indicated their commitment to the IMPRESSIONS workshops. As mentioned above the “EU external” case study has a slightly different, more evolving set-up compared to the other case studies, therefore instead of focusing on identifying individuals for the entire workshop series, this initial stakeholder mapping focused on the identification of participants for the first workshop and the decision-maker survey.

### 3.2 Stakeholder invitation process

Due to process design and budget limitations, a small number of participants will attend each workshop (between 20 and 25 participants). This restriction introduces a key methodological challenge for stakeholder selection. In order to be inclusive of different views and perspectives, systematic and consistent sets of minimum quotas of participants from each stakeholder category have been established - following the Prospex-CQI method (see Gramberger et al. 2014).

Based on the original mapping conducted (as described in Section 3.1), specific quota for each of the criteria per case study were agreed. The aim of the quota is to reduce the biases and distortions that

could derive from over-representation of certain typologies of participants or societal sectors. Whereas quota for general criteria will be the same in all case studies, i.e. 30% of male and female participants per workshop; other quota differ amongst case studies, e.g. government representatives are highly relevant for the first workshop in the Hungarian case study (minimum 20% of stakeholders should fulfill this criterion), but less so for the first workshop of the EU external case study (minimum 10% of stakeholder should fulfill this criterion) (see Table 3).

Once the quota for each criterion are set, the case study leaders and/or workshop organisers compiled a list of potential invitees that is subdivided into priority groups and started the invitation process with the highest priority group, moving down the list in case invitees decline the invitation.

During each phase of the invitation process the case study leaders and/or workshop organisers keep a close eye on the quota and make sure that once an invitee declines the invitation, he/she is substituted with someone that fulfills the same criteria. This continuous exercise ensures a maximum adherence to the quota in terms of the stakeholders represented at the workshops.

### 3.3 Stakeholders attending the first set of workshops

For each of the four workshops of the first set a target in terms of number of participants was fixed: 15 for Scotland, 20 for Iberia, 25 for Hungary and EU external. Each of these targets was fulfilled during the invitation process. All workshops experienced some last-minute cancellations leading to the number of participants as indicated in the Table 3.

Table 3 also highlights the individual quota set for each criterion and case study in the first workshop and if (yes/no) this quota has been fulfilled looking at the actual group of participants (not invitees). Overall, only 4 out of 143 quota were not fulfilled (2.5%), mainly relating to last minute cancellations.

**Table 3: Matching of quota of stakeholders per category and case study.**

Case study	EU external	Iberia	Hungary	Scotland	EU
Number of participants	23	17	27	17	No first workshop for the EU case study
Number of invitees	80	53	60	51	
<b>Quota per criteria/fulfillment</b>					
<b>Organisational affiliation</b>					
- Government	10%/yes	15%/yes	20%/yes	15%/yes	-
- Economy/Enterprise	10%/yes	15%/yes	15%/no	15%/yes	-
- Civil society	10%/yes	15%/yes	15%/yes	10%/no	-
- Research	20%/yes	15%/yes	5%/yes	10%/yes	-
<b>Level of operation of the organization</b>					
- Municipal	-	-	0%/yes	15%/yes	-
- Local	0%/yes	15%/yes	20%/yes	15%/yes	-
- Regional	0%/yes	15%/yes	15%/yes	15%/yes	-
- National	10%/yes	15%/yes	5%/yes	15%/yes	-
- European	10%/yes	5%/yes	0%/yes	5%/yes	-
- International	30%/yes	-	-	5%/yes	-
<b>Function of the stakeholder</b>					
- Politician	0%/yes	10%/no	10%/yes	0%/yes	-
- Policy makers/experts/advisor	20%/yes	10%/yes	10%/yes	5%/yes	-

Case study	EU external	Iberia	Hungary	Scotland	EU
- Regulators	0%/yes	10%/yes	10%/yes	5%/yes	-
- Practitioners	10%/yes	10%/yes	10%/yes	5%/yes	-
- Technical expert	20%/yes	10%/yes	10%/yes	10%/yes	-
- Advocacy/lobbyists	0%/yes	10%/yes	10%/yes	10%/yes	-
- General public	0%/yes	5%/yes	10%/yes	5%/yes	-
- Other	0%/yes	0%/yes	0%/yes	0%/yes	-
<b>Level of operation of the stakeholder</b>					
- Municipal	-	-	-	-	-
- Local	0%/yes	15%/yes	20%/yes	15%/yes	-
- Regional	0%/yes	15%/yes	15%/yes	15%/yes	-
- National	10%/yes	15%/yes	5%/yes	15%/yes	-
- European	10%/yes	5%/yes	0%/yes	5%/yes	-
- International	30%/yes	-	-	5%/yes	-
<b>Sector</b>					
- Water	10%/yes	5%/yes	5%/yes	10%/yes	-
- Infrastructure	5%/yes	0%/yes	5%/yes	10%/yes	-
- Energy	10%/yes	5%/yes	5%/yes	5%/yes	-
- Finance/Insurance	5%/yes	5%/yes	0%/yes	5%/yes	-
- Agriculture	10%/yes	5%/yes	5%/yes	-	-
- Food & Nutrition	-	5%/yes	5%/yes	0%/yes	-
- Whisky	-	-	-	5%/yes	-
- Forestry	-	5%/yes	5%/yes	10%/yes	-
- Biodiversity conservation	-	5%/yes	-	-	-
- Tourism	-	-	-	10%/yes	-
- Health	-	0%/yes	5%/yes	5%/yes	-
- Land use/land use management	-	5%/yes	-	-	-
- Land owners	-	-	-	5%/yes	-
- Trade	5%/yes	-	-	-	-
- Security	10%/yes	0%/yes	5%/yes	-	-
- Migration	5%/yes	0%/yes	-	-	-
- Disaster risk reduction	5%/yes	-	-	-	-
- Humanitarian relief	5%/yes	-	-	-	-
- Other	0%/yes	0%/yes	0%/yes	0%/yes	-
<b>Age</b>					
- 30 years and under	5%/yes	5%/yes	5%/no	5%/yes	-
- 30-50 years	30%/yes	30%/yes	30%/yes	30%/yes	-
- 50 years and above	10%/yes	10%/yes	10%/yes	10%/yes	-
<b>Gender</b>					
- female	30%/yes	30%/yes	30%/yes	30%/yes	-
- male	30%/yes	30%/yes	30%/yes	30%/yes	-

## 4 Outcomes of the first set of workshops

The first set of workshops in general (with the exception for the Scotland case study) had the following objectives:

- Draft scenario storylines down-/cross-scaled to the specific case study;
- Short narratives on how high-end climate change affects the scenario storyline;
- Quantifiable statements and translation keys to support the quantification of model variables.

The outputs generated from the first workshop for each case study vis-à-vis these objectives have been aggregated into respective individual reports with the help of the IMPRESSIONS partners present at these workshops. These reports provide an almost literal transcription of the materials produced by the stakeholders (in the form of e.g. plenary presentations, flip chart notes and post-its) for each step of the workshop process. Specifically, the following has been covered in each report:

- A list of clustered future contextual driving forces and factors;
- Selected driving forces, their key uncertainties and polarities;
- A mapping of key uncertainties and polarities onto the IMPRESSIONS input scenarios (based on the Shared Socio-economic Pathways, SSPs);
- Draft storylines, including an indicative timeline of events;
- Quantification of future trends and storylines through an individual and group survey;
- A first assessment of high-end climate change effects on the draft storylines.

Once finalised, the reports detailing these outputs were transferred to the respective stakeholders and to all concerned IMPRESSIONS partners as key input for tasks under WP2 (development of multi-scale integrated scenarios) and WP3 (Advancement of CCIAV methods and models).

Highlighting one output from the first set of workshops, Table 4 presents how the selected driving forces compare across three case studies, of which key uncertainties and polarities were defined in a next step in the workshop process:

**Table 4: Example output: Selected driving forces across the case studies.**

Case study	EU external	Iberia	Hungary
<b>Selected driving force 1</b>	Politics	-	Political situation
<b>Selected driving force 2</b>	Water management	Development model (local)	Energy supply & safety
<b>Selected driving force 3</b>	Demographics	Demography & territory	Demographic changes
<b>Selected driving force 4</b>	Governance	Governance	Education & qualification
<b>Selected driving force 5</b>	Economic development	Global Impact	Health & lifestyle

All the outcomes of the first set of stakeholder workshops are currently being analysed by WP2 and will be presented in detail in deliverable D2.2. They also inform WP3 in terms of quantifying the socio-economic scenario variables that are needed as inputs to the climate change impacts, adaptation and vulnerability (CCIAV) models, which will be run under each scenario to provide input into the stakeholder workshop set 2.

## 5 Stakeholder evaluations

After each workshop, an evaluation form was distributed to all the participants, in order to get general feedback, including on the overall workshop and practical arrangements, but also on more specific parts of the workshop process and the research produced by the IMPRESSIONS team as input to the workshop. The questions presented to the stakeholders in the evaluation forms were identical for each workshop, save for the necessary adaptations as per the case study specifics. A detailed overview of the responses received per question across the case studies is given in Annex 1.

In total, 64 responses were received, out of a total of 84 participants across the four workshops. The evaluation forms indicate a high approval rating for all the workshops in general, with the majority of responses ranging from “good” to “very good”. In addition, the work of the IMPRESSIONS team (resource persons and note takers) and the facilitators received similar high ratings from the respondents. The IMPRESSIONS input scenarios (based on the SSPs) as basis for the case study specific scenarios received more mixed results, but in general still a medium to high rating in terms of their suitability for the future of the respective region. On the other hand, several parts of the workshop process proved to be more difficult across the case studies, with divergent ratings for the quantification questionnaire which provides inputs for the CCIAV modelling (question 12), but still well above-average. As for their suitability for the further development of the scenarios (question 13), notable differences emerged between the case studies.

The summary results of the evaluation sheets per workshop were attached to the individual workshop reports, and also circulated to all IMPRESSIONS partners. All points of attention were taken up in internal post-workshop debriefing meetings, in order to improve those processes where needed.

## 6 Next steps

After each workshop a detailed factual report was written, giving an accurate account of the discussion and input provided by stakeholders. These reports formed the basis for the IMPRESSIONS research team to re-visit the scenario storylines as well as the models and harmonise them with the stakeholder input. In this process it became evident that a second round of iteration with stakeholders around the storylines and the quantification was needed in order to allow for more solid links between stakeholder input and scientific work. It was therefore decided to organise an in-between engagement activity in the form of online surveys (EU external, Iberian and Scottish case study) or a face-to-face meeting (Hungarian case study). These in-between engagement activities take place in the first quarter of 2016 and the results will be again taken back to the IMPRESSIONS project team to be elaborated before the second round of workshops.

In summary the following steps will have to be completed by the IMPRESSIONS team for each case study during the first and second set of workshops:

- Result reporting on workshop set 1 (completed);
- In-between engagement (ongoing);
- Finalise case-specific scenario storylines and modelling (ongoing, depending on in-between engagement);

- Survey among participants on their vision, i.e. a desirable future for 2100 (ongoing, to prepare for workshop set 2);
- Preparation of published vision presentation and comparison with vision elements resulting from survey (ongoing, to prepare for workshop set 2);
- Preparation of CCIAV model outputs for the case-specific scenarios (ongoing);
- Identification and stress-testing of existing policies in the scenarios (ongoing);
- Preparation of examples of elements of adaptation / mitigation actions / pathways (good practice) to inform pathway development in the 2<sup>nd</sup> workshop (ongoing);
- Finalisation of methodologies for pathway development (ongoing);
- Develop and prepare process for workshop set 2, differentiated by case studies as needed (ongoing);
- Logistical preparation and follow-up for workshop set 2 (ongoing);
- Stakeholder invitations and registration (ongoing).

The second set of workshops are scheduled as follows:

- EU case study: Venice, 17-19 February 2016 (this is the first workshop for this case study);
- Scottish case study: Stirling, 11-12 April 2016;
- EU external case study: Baku, 23-24 May 2016;
- Hungarian case study: Veszprém, 30 June-1 July 2016;
- Iberian case study: Toledo, 29-30 September 2016.

Deliverable D6A.3 will report on this set of workshops.

## 7 Acknowledgements


The writers of this deliverable greatly appreciate the contributions of the IMPRESSIONS project team, in particular the work package leaders, the case study leaders and the Project Steering Committee that have significantly contributed to the design and implementation of the stakeholder workshops reported on in this deliverable

## 8 References


Gramberger, M., Zellmer, K., Kok, K. & Metzger, M. (2015). Stakeholder Integrated Research (STIR): A new approach tested in climate change adaptation research. *Climatic Change*, 128: 201-214, DOI 10.1007/s10584-014-1225-x.

## Annex 1: Detailed overview of stakeholder evaluations for the 1<sup>st</sup> set of IMPRESSIONs workshops


### Question 1) How do you rate the workshop in general?




### Question 2) How much were you enabled to contribute to the discussion?




### Question 3) Were the objectives of the workshop clear?




**Question 4) Was the composition of the group of participants adequate for the objectives of the workshop?**



**Question 5) Were you able to develop insights and knowledge relevant for you and your work?**




**Question 6) How do you rate the process of the workshop?**







**Question 7) How do you rate the work of the facilitators?**




**Question 8) How do you rate the work of the resource persons and note takers?**




**Question 9) How do you rate the case study specific input at the workshop?**




**Question 10) How much do you think the four socio-economic input scenarios are suitable for developing scenarios on the future of your region/Europe?**




**Question 11) How much do you think the scenarios you developed cover the range of possible and relevant developments in your region?**



**Question 12) How do you rate the process to provide input to modelling (group and individual questionnaires)?**



**Question 13) How useful do you think the results of providing input to modelling (group and individual questionnaires) will be for developing the case study scenarios?**



**Question 14) How do you rate the practical arrangements (invitation, travel, venue, hotel, catering)?**

