

**AdMit it!**  
**Climate change responses  
can be systematic and successful;  
but require more collaborative  
governance systems**

Karen Anderton, University of Oxford  
Emily Boyd, Reading University



ECCA, Hamburg, 19<sup>th</sup> March 2013



TRANSPORT STUDIES UNIT  
SCHOOL OF GEOGRAPHY AND THE ENVIRONMENT



# Outline

- Introduction
- Adaptation and mitigation
- Methodology
- Governing climate change
- Case studies
- Discussion



# Introduction

- Potential synergies between adaptation and mitigation policies
- Fragmented institutions/lack of interaction?
- Different discourses
- Large scale decarbonisation and resilience: win:win:win

# Adaptation and mitigation

**ADAPTATION:** adjustment to the continued warming caused by current and future GHG in the atmosphere

**MITIGATION:** reduction of GHG in the atmosphere

(Based on McNall, 2011)

- Focus on mitigation continues to dominate
- Scalar differences over-emphasized: mitigation strategies *implemented* at local level too
- Need for consolidated approach acknowledged (Stehr and Rhomberg, 2011; Klein et al., 2007; Martens and Chang, 2010; McNall, 2011)
- Not reflected in policy responses

# Methodology and Approach

- Policy/concept document review
- Key informant interviews
  
- Adaptive governance
- Nature of innovation
- Salience, acceptability, legitimacy

# Governing climate change

- Complexity
- Experimentation
- Adaptiveness
- Collaboration
- Leadership

# Case studies

- Conceptual
- Sector-based (energy, transport, agriculture)
- Partnership
- Barriers

# Yare Tidal Barrier

- Concept
- Tidal flow (not range)
- Wave power generation
- (Bridge)
- Energy cover operating costs
  
- 4NRG: engineering R&D
- Broads authority
- Mott McDonald
- (Defra)

## Barriers:

- Planning process
- Proof-of-concept
- Defra appetite





# Modieslab

- Proof-of-concept
- Modular, Intelligent, Energy Slab
- Concrete (not asphalt)
- Porous; robust in extreme weather
- Roll-resistant; lower noise and CO<sub>2</sub>



- 1998: Roads to the Future
- Dutch Road Authorities (highest level)
- Partnership: Beteson, Heijmans, Arcadis
- 2 sites established

## Barriers:

- Lack of widespread adoption
- Asphalt lobby connections
- Different mindsets
- Ministerial focus: *“Very nice, but our focus is not saving fuel”*

# Great Fen

- In process - experimental
  - Historically neglected wetlands
  - Integrated restoration/nature conservation, landscape approach
  - 50-year time frame (3700 hectares)
  - Buying and restoring farmland
- 
- 1999: WWF (7.2 M Heritage Lottery Fund)
  - 50% Great Fen owned Great Fen partners
  - 5 partners (Collaborative Agreement, Steering Committee, Community Forum)



## Barriers:

- Long-term opportunity costs/ transferring property rights
- Scale up beyond the 'experiment'
- Fit with RDP?

# Discussion

- Both mitigation and adaptation multi-scalar, compatibilities can be found for action
- Complexity appreciated: "pockets" of success
- Research/science initiated: experimentation
- Partnership driven: Government buy-in and funding - success/scale up
- Issues of salience
- Longer term perspective present/required: ideas of resilience
- Context/sector specific but potential for replication
- Implications for wider planning: how to link these experiments to development planning?
- Mainstream AdMit?

# New approaches?

- Diffusion and "learning by doing"/tweaking
- Radical/'disruptive' change
- More fluid/dynamic; less hierarchical/formal - new actors/entrepreneurs
- Clear roles
- Salience and legitimacy
- "Good" governance is not implicit: awareness of inherent issues

