

Open Public Consultation for the new European climate resilience framework

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Disclaimer

This document is not an official European Commission document nor reflects an official European Commission position. Nothing in this document commits the European Commission nor does it preclude any policy outcomes.

Introduction

Consent and how to complete this survey

The European Commission will protect any personal data you provide during this consultation.

You can save your replies as a draft and return later to complete the survey.

Some questions are mandatory, especially at the start, while others in thematic sections are optional – answer only those relevant to you.

Please keep free text comments concise.

At the end of the questionnaire, you may upload a document with further comments and views.

For reasons of transparency, organisations and businesses taking part in public consultations of the European Commission are asked to register in the EU's Transparency Register. If already registered, you can skip this step.

Thank you for your contribution!

Introduction

In recent years, Europe has been facing growing damages and costs from climate-related weather extremes. How we act on climate change will shape Europe's future competitiveness, security and prosperity. How we adapt and build climate resilience and preparedness now will determine our quality of life for years to come.

The European Climate Risk Assessment identified 36 key climate risks in Europe that interact to result in fundamental system-wide challenges. If climate change, along with other risk factors, is not properly addressed, it can compromise food and water security, energy and defence capabilities, supply chains, pricing, economic and financial stability, fiscal sustainability and public health more severely. In turn, this affects social cohesion and stability, with vulnerable groups particularly affected.

The assessment also found that European economy and society are not sufficiently prepared for current and future climate risks, with several risks already at critical levels. Without urgent action to cut emissions and build climate resilience, many risks could reach catastrophic levels by the end of this century. Hundreds of thousands of people could lose their lives to heatwaves, and economic losses from coastal floods alone could exceed EUR 1 trillion per year.

Responding to these challenges and in line with the Commission President's Political Guidelines, the Commission is preparing a new and impactful European integrated framework for climate resilience scheduled for adoption in Q4-2026.

Its key objective is to drive transformational change to make Europe significantly better prepared for and more resilient to climate impacts. The new framework will empower all stakeholders to gain control in the increasingly uncertain future, manage climate risks more effectively, seize emerging economic opportunities, and strengthen the EU's position as a global leader in producing and exporting climate resilience technologies, products, services and innovations.

The objectives of the framework include:

- protecting people's health, well-being and livelihoods;
- anticipating and significantly reducing exposure to high-impact risks and losses when conceiving policies, investments and other measures;
- ensuring robust and regular science-based risk assessments as basis for action;
- promoting a shared understanding of future climate conditions among decision-makers in Europe;
- supporting EU Member States, EU candidate countries and the EU neighbourhood – including the regional and local levels – while empowering their societies;
- promoting coordinated and effective action across all levels of government and the private sector;
- and reducing losses, destruction and costs from climate-related impacts by increasing (re)insurance cover.

An open call for evidence was held over the summer. Respondents broadly agreed with the Commission's analysis of the key problems: EU and national policy frameworks for climate resilience are inadequate, missing in many sectors, or poorly implemented. The feedback also showed that regional and local authorities, businesses, households and individuals are not sufficiently aware of climate risks, which significantly limits their preparedness.

As a result, respondents expressed strong support for robust action in this area. They most often called for: (i)

integration of 'resilience-by-design' criteria into all public spending, procurement and key sectoral policies; (ii) harmonised risk-assessment standards with shared climate scenarios; (iii) nature-based solutions as default first line of defence; (iv) stable long-term funding for adaptation and resilience; and (v) a systematic integration of climate-related health considerations.

This open public consultation, building on the call for bold and urgent action, offers all interested parties the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed aspects of the new EU framework for climate resilience, and to share any additional views and suggestions.

About you

* Language of my contribution

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech
- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Irish
- Italian
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Maltese
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Romanian
- Slovak
- Slovenian

- Spanish
- Swedish

* I am giving my contribution as

- Academic/research institution
- Business association
- Company/business
- Consumer organisation
- EU citizen
- Environmental organisation
- Non-EU citizen
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Public authority
- Trade union
- Other

* First name

Roman

* Surname

Mauroschat

* Email (this won't be published)

roman.mauroschat@petite-graine.org

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

Association Petite Graine

* Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)

- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

Check if your organisation is on the transparency register. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

106538799765-71

*Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

This list does not represent the official position of the European institutions with regard to the legal status or policy of the entities mentioned. It is a harmonisation of often divergent lists and practices.

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti | <input type="radio"/> Libya | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Dominica | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg | <input type="radio"/> Samoa |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa | <input type="radio"/> Egypt | <input type="radio"/> Macau | <input type="radio"/> San Marino |
| <input type="radio"/> Andorra | <input type="radio"/> El Salvador | <input type="radio"/> Madagascar | <input type="radio"/> São Tomé and Príncipe |
| <input type="radio"/> Angola | <input type="radio"/> Equatorial Guinea | <input type="radio"/> Malawi | <input type="radio"/> Saudi Arabia |
| <input type="radio"/> Anguilla | <input type="radio"/> Eritrea | <input type="radio"/> Malaysia | <input type="radio"/> Senegal |
| <input type="radio"/> Antarctica | <input type="radio"/> Estonia | <input type="radio"/> Maldives | <input type="radio"/> Serbia |
| <input type="radio"/> Antigua and Barbuda | <input type="radio"/> Eswatini | <input type="radio"/> Mali | <input type="radio"/> Seychelles |
| <input type="radio"/> Argentina | <input type="radio"/> Ethiopia | <input type="radio"/> Malta | <input type="radio"/> Sierra Leone |
| <input type="radio"/> Armenia | <input type="radio"/> Falkland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Marshall Islands | <input type="radio"/> Singapore |
| <input type="radio"/> Aruba | <input type="radio"/> Faroe Islands | <input type="radio"/> Martinique | <input type="radio"/> Sint Maarten |
| <input type="radio"/> Australia | <input type="radio"/> Fiji | <input type="radio"/> Mauritania | <input type="radio"/> Slovakia |
| <input type="radio"/> Austria | <input type="radio"/> Finland | <input type="radio"/> Mauritius | <input type="radio"/> Slovenia |
| <input type="radio"/> Azerbaijan | <input checked="" type="radio"/> France | <input type="radio"/> Mayotte | <input type="radio"/> Solomon Islands |

- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- Barbados
- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan
- Bolivia
- Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
- Brunei
- Bulgaria
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
- French Guiana
- French Polynesia
- French Southern and Antarctic Lands
- Gabon
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland
- Grenada
- Guadeloupe
- Guam
- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Honduras
- Hong Kong
- Mexico
- Micronesia
- Moldova
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Montserrat
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar/Burma
- Namibia
- Nauru
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Niue
- Norfolk Island
- Northern Mariana Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
- South Korea
- South Sudan
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- Syria
- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand
- The Gambia
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
- Tokelau
- Tonga

- Cambodia
- Cameroon
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba
- Curaçao
- Cyprus
- Czechia
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jersey
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos
- Latvia
- Lebanon
- North Korea
- North Macedonia
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Russia
- Rwanda
- Saint Barthélemy
- Saint Helena
Ascension and
Tristan da Cunha
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Türkiye
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States
Minor Outlying
Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
- Vietnam
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara
- Yemen
- Zambia

- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Denmark
- Lesotho
- Liberia
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia
- Zimbabwe

Fields of activity:

- Agriculture
- Forestry and fishing
- Mining and quarrying
- Manufacturing
- Energy
- Water and waste
- Construction and real estate
- Wholesale and retail trade
- Hotel
- Food services
- Publishing
- Broadcasting
- Content production and distribution
- Telecommunication
- IT
- Computing
- Financial and insurance
- Public administration
- Defense and security
- Education and training
- Research
- Health, care and social services
- Arts, sports and recreation
- Biodiversity and nature protection
- Climate mitigation and adaptation
- Other

The Commission will publish all contributions to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. **For the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, 'business association, 'consumer association', 'EU citizen') country of origin, organisation name and size, and its transparency register number, are always published. Your e-mail address will never be published.** Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

* Contribution publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

Only organisation details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.

Public

Organisation details and respondent details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published. Your name will also be published.

I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

General Questions

How well informed do you consider yourself about the potential impacts of climate change that could affect you now and in the future?

	Fully informed	Slightly informed	Neutral	Slightly uninformed	Totally uninformed
* Answer	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Optional: Please explain why?

I consider myself very well informed, because my work as Climate Advocacy Lead at Association Petite Graine combines lived experience, field research, and policy analysis across several frontline contexts.

In Bagnères-de-Luchon, in the French Pyrenees, I experienced the June 2013 flood and have since documented the governance gaps it exposed, including failures in anticipation and risk communication. A key issue is that the Vigicrues station in Luchon is observation only, and the Pique valley remains outside the national forecasting network, which contributed to delayed warnings and reduced time to prepare and evacuate safely when the 2013 flood struck. The lack of prevention measures from public authorities defies logic in my opinion because it is common knowledge that floods are recurrent (there were two important ones, one in 1925, and one in 2013) and that the valley is particularly exposed to these risks.

In Caramany, also in the French Pyrenees, but in the Eastern part, I follow the impacts of prolonged drought on daily life and livelihoods, especially on young people. The area has faced a severe drought since 2022, reaching “crisis” level on VigiEau in 2025, with strict restrictions and major pressure on agriculture, smallholders, and households.

In Kibera (Nairobi, Kenya), our research and interviews with youth document how floods and water insecurity translate into displacement, destruction of homes and businesses, and health risks from sewage-contaminated water, while an implementation gap and systemic exclusion of youth in decision-making reduce community preparedness and resilience.

How prepared do you consider yourself to face the potential impacts of climate change?

	Fully prepared	Slightly prepared	Neutral	Slightly unprepared	Totally unprepared
* Answer	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Optional: Please explain why?

Personally, I can take basic precautions, but preparedness in the community I come from and work with in Bagnères-de-Luchon is constrained by systemic gaps documented in the policy brief. The Pique valley is not covered by the Vigicrues forecasting service (the station in Luchon is observation only), which contributed to late and incomplete warning during the June 2013 floods. For communes under surveillance, Vigicrues alerts were issued on 17 June, but Luchon only received an orange flood alert via Météo-France at 18:25, and the public was informed by a prefectural press release at 09:00 on 18 June, after floods had already begun around 06:30. This breakdown in the alert chain reduced precious hours for households and services to secure property and evacuate safely.

Having lived the 2013 flood, it is clear that individuals are quickly overwhelmed by torrential floods. Public authorities must step up preparedness at valley scale. The policy brief (sent to Ms Gilstrom Forgaard by email) points to practical measures that can be implemented: include Luchon and the Pique valley in the Vigicrues prediction system as soon as possible; improve risk communication through SMS and e-mail alerts and install sirens in sensitive areas; organise regular evacuation drills; and implement preventive works such as restoring riverbanks, redesigning ditches, and preventively lowering mountain lake levels after heavy snowfall to increase retention capacity.

Several key preparedness strategies and plans exist but are not easily accessible to residents: PPRN (Plan de Prévention des Risques Naturels, Natural Risk Prevention Plan), PCS (Plan Communal de Sauvegarde, Municipal Safeguard Plan), ORSEC (Organisation de la Réponse de Sécurité Civile, departmental civil security response plan led by the Prefect), and STePRiM (Stratégie Territoriale de Prévention des Risques en Montagne, Territorial Risk Prevention Strategy in Mountain Areas). The brief notes that key documents (such as the local risk prevention plan) are not accessible online, and that neither the PCS nor ORSEC is public, which fuels uncertainty about who does what and what will happen in a future flood. Other risk-communication tools exist, such as the DDRM (Dossier Départemental sur les Risques Majeurs) and the DICRIM (Document d'Information Communal sur les Risques Majeurs), but the brief underlines their low visibility and the lack of participatory approaches in prevention planning, despite commitments on public participation in the European Climate Law and in France's PNACC 3.

In Caramany, the climate risk profile is the reverse: severe drought since 2022 and "crisis" level restrictions on VigiEau. The brief highlights that management still relies mainly on restrictive decrees, while long-term measures remain limited. Priority solutions include a structural shift from reaction to anticipation through community-led water solutions (rainwater collection, grey-water reuse, natural filtration), restoring and maintaining canals, improving infiltration into soils, supporting climate-resilient farming and less water-intensive crops, and tackling pollution in catchment areas, which becomes more concentrated as water volumes drop. The brief also notes how decisions such as approving a new golf course in a drought-stressed territory lacks ecological common-sense and exacerbates water tensions.

The EU Climate Adaptation Strategy and the EU-Africa Global Gateway package promise scaled-up adaptation support, yet in Kenya the MIP headline figures (€324 million for 2021–2024, including €147 million for green transition and resilience) still do not translate into a clearly traceable pipeline of deliverables for vulnerable urban communities like Kibera. Our mapping of publicly visible, directly relevant actions only identifies about €30.65 million, with support appearing skewed toward drought management and with dedicated, easy-to-track flood preparedness and slum resilience interventions remaining hard to pinpoint, which is why transparent project tracking and explicit programming for informal settlements are urgently needed.

Who do you consider to be primarily responsible for preparing for the physical impacts of climate change?

- Individual citizens
- Businesses and private actors
- Local and regional authorities
- National governments
- The European Union
- All of the above
- other

Which of the following would help you become better prepared for the impacts of climate change?

- Easier access to data and information relevant to my area/situation
- Expert support to prepare/protect my home/family/company etc. against possible risks, based on this data/information
- Easier access to funding or financing for my/our actions
- Greater local ownership of planning, implementing measures, and monitoring success
- Better planning and preparation by public authorities
- Other

Please name the three policy actions that would most help you improve your risk awareness and preparedness for climate change impacts:

Fix early warning and alerts (Vigicrues + local sensors + multi-channel communication).

Extend Vigicrues (France's national flood forecasting and vigilance system) to cover Luchon and the Pique valley, and couple it with water-level sensors and clear, actionable alerts sent early via SMS and e-mail, complemented by sirens in risk areas. This directly addresses the documented gap that the Pique valley remains outside the forecasting network and that the alert chain failed to warn residents in time.

Make risk information and plans public, readable, and actively disseminated.

Publish and regularly update online the key local documents that shape preparedness: PPRN (Plan de Prévention des Risques Naturels, Natural Risk Prevention Plan), STePRiM (Stratégie Territoriale de Prévention des Risques en Montagne, Territorial Risk Prevention Strategy in Mountain Areas), PCS (Plan Communal de Sauvegarde, Municipal Safeguard Plan) and ORSEC (Organisation de la Réponse de Sécurité Civile, departmental civil security response plan). The brief shows that non-public plans and limited access to prevention documents undermine awareness and trust.

Build a "risk culture" through participation and practice, not just paperwork.

Set up citizen committees and hold regular municipal meetings and practical workshops, then translate that into routine preparedness: evacuation drills, siren tests, and clear "what to do" guidance for households and businesses. The brief links low participation and weak training to poor preparedness, and explicitly recommends drills, public engagement, and participatory approaches to make residents active actors in their own safety.

Climate resilience by design

The principle of 'climate resilience by design' means a **proactive effort to consider and prevent plausible high-impact risks and losses from the very beginning when conceiving policies, investments and other measures**. The 2024 Commission Communication on managing climate risks put it simply: 'planning decisions of today need to build on a sound anticipatory assessment of risks' likely to occur in the future. Climate resilience by design differs from measures taken to remedy the damage caused by climate impacts after they have already occurred.

The Commission intends to ensure that the future climatic conditions are duly integrated into all relevant EU policies and frameworks governing sectors and stakeholders vulnerable to climate change. It also seeks to encourage Member States and all public-sector authorities and private-sector stakeholders to embed this principle in their decisions, ensuring coordinated action across society.

Which sectors are most important for integrating the principle of "climate resilience by design"?

Flood risk governance and early warning: forecasting coverage, real-time monitoring, alert protocols, crisis communication, and public guidance.

Hydraulic and river infrastructure: dams, dikes, sediment traps, river maintenance, riverbanks, and upstream mountain lakes, including anticipatory retention management.

Water resources under drought: leakage reduction, interconnections, storage, reuse of treated wastewater, rainwater and grey-water systems, and drought planning beyond restrictive decrees.

Agriculture and local livelihoods in water-stressed areas: irrigation systems, canal maintenance, crop choices, soil and ecosystem restoration, and targeted support for smallholders.

Built environment and local services: resilient housing and public facilities, drainage and sanitation, and nature-based solutions that reduce exposure and vulnerability.

Which policy areas or EU legislative frameworks should prioritise embedding this principle, and how should this be done?

European Climate Law and the EU Climate Adaptation Strategy mention the need to systematically mainstreaming of adaptation across policy areas, with explicit focus on vulnerable and highly exposed populations and structured consultation with civil society. However, this is not happening at Member States level. The upcoming EU Resilience and Preparedness Plan should operationalise this through a common EU framework for assessing and communicating climate risks, downscaled climate intelligence that every local authority can use, and measures to close insurance gaps in high-risk areas. National adaptation planning should require forward-looking scenarios in flood-risk assessments. The +4 degrees warming model using in France is a step in the right direction, however more focus should be placed on implementing measures and identified areas of risk. For floods in Luchon it should be used for reinforcing protection infrastructure like dams and dikes, and by expanding the flood forecasting coverage to all parts of the river basins. for areas struck by droughts and water scarcity, it should be used to implement smart water policies to rethink how we use water, the agriculture model, and implement smart and nature based water collection and saving infrastructure.

Are there any existing policies or legislation (at EU, Member State, regional, local level) that prevent you from taking effective action to be better prepared for the impacts of climate change? If so, which ones and please explain how they impair your efforts.

Yes, mainly through regulatory design gaps, opacity, and complexity that reduce practical preparedness:

Forecasting and alert coverage gap: the Pique valley remains outside 24-hour flood forecasting, and municipalities along the Pique are excluded from the departmental flood alert regulation, meaning residents did not receive warnings through the Vigicrues system during the 2013 event. This directly reduces lead time for evacuation and protective measures.

Limited transparency of risk and crisis-management plans: key documents are not publicly accessible (for example, the local risk prevention plan is not available online, and neither the PCS nor ORSEC is public), which weakens trust and leaves residents unsure what procedures will be activated.

Overlapping plans and unclear responsibilities: the accumulation of strategies and tools (and uncertainty about how they interact, including between municipal and intercommunal approaches) makes the system hard to navigate for citizens and small municipalities.

Drought risk communication gaps: in Caramany, key risk communication tools omit drought risks (DDRM and DICRIM), and the municipality mainly relays restriction decrees without practical guidance, limiting preparedness beyond compliance.

Legislative framework for climate resilience

The European Climate Law requires the EU and Member States to ensure continuous progress on climate adaptation. Yet, Member States have very different policy frameworks for the assessments, strategies, plans and instruments, which limits the development of a shared understanding of the challenges and coordinated climate resilience actions across the EU. Policies are often not specific enough to address major climate risks, and the roles and responsibilities of individual sectors in adaptation planning and implementation vary widely.

Overall, **progress in strengthening climate resilience in the EU is slow and uneven and is not keeping pace with accelerating climate change. EU and national resilience policies and measures are currently not fit for purpose.**

Therefore, the Commission intends to prepare a legislative proposal to ensure a more comprehensive, robust and ambitious approach, while fully respecting the principle of subsidiarity, proportionality, avoiding unnecessary administrative burdens and ensuring coherence with sectoral policies. This section invites your views on the scope and key elements of the planned proposal.

The Commission considers that including the below aspects and requirements in its legislative proposal is essential to better prepare our economies and societies for climate change, and to prevent major losses and damage. What is your view on each of them?

Common baseline climate trajectories/scenarios, and acceptable risk levels:

	Fully agree	Slightly agree	Neutral	Slightly disagree	Fully disagree
<p>Determination of the levels of global warming or a similar common baseline* for adaptation decisions that EU and national public policy and investments should consider, for example through common EU climate reference trajectories/scenario(s)</p> <p><i>* An example is the decision by France to establish a Reference Trajectory for Adaptation to Climate Change (TRACC), setting +1.5°C by 2030, +2°C by 2050, and +3°C by 2100 as reference for national and regional adaptation strategies. Respondents to the Call for Evidence supported the development of minimum precautionary levels for climate resilience / common reference scenarios / reference warming trajectories.</i></p>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Duty to consider a common baseline (e.g. reference trajectories/scenarios) of global warming, as described in the preceding bullet point, in climate risk assessments.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Duty to apply a precautionary approach by integrating a common baseline into planning decisions by the EU and Member States	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Common approach for deciding what level of residual risks society / public authorities choose not to eliminate: a way to determine what are we willing to live with and why	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

I fully support an EU common baseline and a precautionary duty, because without consistent reference trajectories, public investments and protection infrastructure risk being under-designed and maladaptive. France's PNACC-3 already operationalises this logic by integrating a +4 °C trajectory into flood-risk assessments and the design of protection infrastructure, and by aiming to shift drought management from reaction to anticipation.

However, frameworks and communication are not enough: in highly exposed territories like Luchon, flood forecasting and the warning chain remain non-functional and the valley is still outside Vigicrues forecasting, showing a persistent implementation gap.

Residual risk choices should be transparent and equity-based, and must be made with real participation as required by the European Climate Law (Article 5(3) and Article 9) and echoed in PNACC-3 participatory objectives, which are currently under-delivered in practice.

Climate risk assessments:

	Fully agree	Slightly agree	Neutral	Slightly disagree	Fully disagree
Development of climate risk assessments that would also cover the most affected policy sectors, at European level	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Development of climate risk assessments that would also cover the most affected policy sectors, at national level	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Common parameters for the scope and content of both EU and national climate risk assessments (e.g. climate scenarios, regularity, sector coverage)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

Agree, but the priority must be to make risk assessments operational for territories. Our policy briefs demonstrate that strong policy frameworks can coexist with local failures, including non-coverage of forecasting, unclear alert chains, and limited public access to prevention and crisis-management information.

Risk assessments should therefore be required to produce intelligence that local authorities and residents can use. But the Commission itself notes discrepancies between what is presented in plans and what is planned and implemented, and warns that progress is not keeping pace with accelerating risks. The new European climate resilience framework should therefore focus on bridging the gap between assessments and implementation at local level.

Assessments should also include evidence of stakeholder participation, in line with the European Climate Law's public participation obligations (Article 9) and the duty to identify shortcomings "in consultation with civil society" (Article 5(3)).

Adaptation planning and determination of risk owners:

	Fully agree	Slightly agree	Neutral	Slightly disagree	Fully disagree
Definition of climate resilience and adaptation targets (possibly including sectoral / thematic targets) for EU institutions and Member States	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Robust obligation on the EU/Commission to prepare and implement an EU adaptation strategy and plan	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Climate resilience and adaptation plans should also cover the most affected policy sectors at EU level	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Robust obligation on Member States to develop national adaptation strategies and plans	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Adaptation planning and determination of risk owners (cont.):

	Fully agree	Slightly agree	Neutral	Slightly disagree	Fully disagree
Climate resilience and adaptation plans should also cover the most affected policy sectors at national level	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Identification of risk owners responsible for and mandated to address the identified vulnerabilities	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

Agree, but plans and targets must be tied to accountable “risk owners” and verified delivery. The Luchon case shows that unclear responsibilities, weak coordination (notably between the Prefect, the SDIS, the municipality and the dam operators) across the river basin, and gaps in real-time information on dams and defences can directly undermine safety during crises.

Participation must be treated as a legal requirement, not a communication exercise. The brief documents a “complete absence of participatory approaches” in local flood prevention planning, despite participatory objectives and legal expectations, and it notes that public engagement in PNACC-3 is often reduced to awareness campaigns or symbolic events rather than structured consultation.

The EU Climate Adaptation Strategy’s intent to close the gap between planning and action should be reflected in hard delivery requirements and monitoring, especially for early-warning functionality and transparent public access to key preparedness information.

Complementing action at EU level by Member State action, in compliance with the subsidiarity principle

	Fully agree	Slightly agree	Neutral	Slightly disagree	Fully disagree
Member States adopting national legal frameworks on climate resilience and adaptation (covering issues such as administrative set-up and coordination mechanisms, regular climate risk and vulnerability assessments, adaptation planning, early-warning mechanisms, governance at regional and local levels, alignment with subnational strategies and plans, inclusion of stakeholders and vulnerable groups, monitoring and evaluation framework)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Member States carrying out evaluations at appropriate levels to identify regions and groups of people that are particularly vulnerable to climate change, and developing plans for targeted adaptation measures to help these regions and groups	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Member States involving all relevant stakeholders, including particularly vulnerable groups, in adaptation policy planning	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

Fully agree. Subsidiarity means local and regional authorities must lead implementation, but they need resources, oversight, and be held accountable, to avoid persistent gaps. Our policy brief shows chronic underperformance on participation: young people and local communities in exposed territories have had little or no opportunity to interact with EU institutions or shape adaptation measures, and locally there is a documented absence of consultation in flood prevention planning.

This is not a minor issue: the European Climate Law explicitly requires prioritising vulnerable groups and identifying shortcomings “in consultation with civil society” (Article 5(3)), and requires inclusive public participation (Article 9).

National frameworks should also ensure transparency and public access to prevention and emergency procedures, since the brief highlights major information gaps that weaken preparedness.

Monitoring, reporting, evaluation and learning

	Fully agree	Slightly agree	Neutral	Slightly disagree	Fully disagree

Development of a limited number of performance indicators for both the EU and Member States, for measuring the effectiveness of climate adaptation and resilience measures	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In line with the simplification agenda, improvement and streamlining of monitoring, reporting, evaluation and learning practices at EU and national levels, through more targeted reporting on climate impacts	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Incorporation of corresponding resilience progress indicators into existing sector legislation to avoid duplication and new reporting requirements	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

Agree, with one condition: monitoring must test real-world implementation in territories, not remain at a high and superficial level. The policy brief explicitly shows that national and EU adaptation frameworks fail to translate into local action, and highlights discrepancies between plans and implemented measures.

Indicators should therefore track delivery on the ground, including whether early-warning systems function in exposed catchments, whether prevention and crisis-management information is publicly accessible, and whether consultation is real and continuous (as required by the European Climate Law Article 5(3) and Article 9).

Streamlining is welcome, but not at the expense of transparency and accountability for outcomes in the most exposed and least resourced territories.

Please specify other impactful measures with transformational impact that the Commission should include in its legislative proposal on climate resilience:

Make participation enforceable: require regular local consultation mechanisms (for example citizen committees and municipal co-design meetings), and require evidence that vulnerable groups and youth shaped measures, in line with European Climate Law Article 5(3) and Article 9.

Close the “last-mile” preparedness gap: require that exposed territories are covered by operational forecasting and rapid public alerts (SMS and e-mail), and that preparedness information is actively disseminated, not only available on request.

Verify implementation where risks hit: move beyond high-level assessment reports by auditing delivery in territories, including early-warning functionality, clarity of alert chains, transparency of key documents, and progress on concrete flood and drought measures (for example preventive lake management, riverbank restoration, and community-led water solutions).

Decision-support tools for climate resilience

Access to clear, reliable and practical information about how climate change affects us and what we can do about it, is essential to better manage the risks and develop effective solutions. Open-access web-based tools can help meet this need by **reaching large audiences with tailored, visually engaging and interactive information**. However, most existing tools are designed for experts focusing on scientific rather than practical needs. Furthermore, tools targeting different geographies, climate hazards or sectors often use different methods and reference points to quantify future changes, making comparison difficult. Cross-border information is often missing. The Commission would like to get feedback on how it can best use Europe's wealth of climate data and digital capabilities to **improve access to clear, reliable, practical and coherent information on climate risk and adaptation solutions across regions and sectors**.

Where do you look for information about how climate change could affect you or your activities?

	Fully agree	Slightly agree	Neutral	Slightly disagree	Fully disagree
Sectoral organisations resources, including advisory and support networks	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Regional and/or local authorities' resources	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
National government resources, including national meteorological services	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
European climate adaptation platforms and/or climate services	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
European scientific programmes and networks	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Where do you look for information about how climate change could affect you or your activities? (cont.)

	Fully agree	Slightly agree	Neutral	Slightly disagree	Fully disagree
Reach out to a consultancy to find and analyse this information for me	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In the media, social media and online	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Using artificial intelligence	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have never looked for such information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

What information would help you determine if and how to take action to better prepare for the effects of climate change?

--	--	--	--	--	--

	Fully agree	Slightly agree	Neutral	Slightly disagree	Fully disagree
Recent economic losses or damage caused by climate events in my area or in activities related to my job	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Current severity of extreme or unseasonal weather in the area where I live or work (e.g. expected number of days with temperatures exceeding 35 °C)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Estimates of future severity of extreme or unseasonal weather in the area where I live or work	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Current impacts of extreme or unseasonal weather on my community and me in terms of health (e.g. excess mortality due to dangerous heat waves), and economic activities (e.g. crop production losses from heat, damage to energy infrastructure due to floods, etc).	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

What information would help you determine if and how to take action to better prepare for the effects of climate change? (cont.)

	Fully agree	Slightly agree	Neutral	Slightly disagree	Fully disagree
Estimates of future impacts of extreme or unseasonal weather on my community and me in terms of health and well-being, and economic activities	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Information on insurability of exposed assets	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Benefits of specific adaptation solutions in reducing impacts on health and wellbeing and specific economic activities.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If other information, please specify:

Actionable, local-level information is missing where it matters most: (1) operational flood forecasts and clear public alert thresholds for exposed valleys (not only observation), (2) a transparent “who does what” alert chain and what residents should do before and during an event, and (3) public access to local prevention and crisis-management documents and procedures. For drought, risk communication should go beyond restrictions and include practical guidance and support measures for households, farmers, and small municipalities, including locally relevant water-saving and storage options.

The Commission considers developing a user-friendly web-based tool for non-experts that provides authoritative and harmonised quantitative information on climate change across Europe. This tool could translate the common climate scenarios into national, regional and local climate and weather conditions, which can be expected under these scenarios, and help to find possible solutions for addressing the identified risks. The Commission considers this tool essential for informing EU policies, addressing cross-border risks, and supporting people and businesses lacking alternatives. Would you benefit from such a tool?

	Fully agree	Slightly agree	Neutral	Slightly disagree	Fully disagree
Answer	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

What features would help you use that tool?

	Fully agree	Slightly agree	Neutral	Slightly disagree	Fully disagree
Simple language that does not require specialist knowledge	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tutorials and onboarding information	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Visual presentation of information, e.g. on a map	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to download data or summary reports	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Clear link between climate risks and adaptation solutions	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

What features would help you use that tool (cont.)?

	Fully agree	Slightly agree	Neutral	Slightly disagree	Fully disagree
Navigation support through an AI-powered chat	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Links to other trusted sources for more specialised information	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Access to a help desk	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

What other features would you find helpful?

A local “preparedness layer” that turns risk information into practical steps: clear alert thresholds and what-to-do guidance; a public map of who is responsible for forecasting, alerts, and protection infrastructure in each

catchment; and one place where key local documents and procedures are accessible (prevention plans, emergency procedures, public instructions).

Protecting people and supporting regional and local action

Climate change has a detrimental impact on human health, lives and livelihoods, disproportionately affecting the most vulnerable. The new framework should drive EU and Member States measures that help individuals and local communities to be better equipped to face climate risks. Because climate risks vary across Europe, action under the framework should be **place-based and co-designed with local and regional authorities** and communities. Launched in 2021 as a pilot initiative to support pioneer regional and local authorities, [the EU Mission on climate adaptation](#) is providing direct support and empowering European regions and local authorities to develop and implement place-based measures towards climate resilience. The new framework provides an opportunity to scale up this support to all regions and communities across Europe.

What policy measures should the EU and Member States take to ensure that the most vulnerable groups and geographical areas receive adequate support and are protected from the disproportionate impacts of climate change?

EU:

Prioritise minimum standards and funding that reach the most exposed and least resourced places, including small mountain valleys and small rural communes. In the Pyrenees, the policy brief documents that young people in rural and marginalised areas are both highly affected and excluded from decision-making, and that preparedness and public information remain inadequate. EU instruments should therefore require meaningful participation (including youth) and fund “last mile” delivery such as early-warning, public communication, and community-led water solutions.

Member States:

Make targeted, place-based support operational: publish and explain local prevention and crisis procedures, clarify “risk owners” and responsibilities, and finance delivery capacity in small municipalities. The brief shows that in Luchon, key crisis procedures are not publicly available, and in Caramany drought communication and support measures are largely missing despite severe water scarcity.

What measures should the EU and Member States take to protect people’s health against the impacts of climate change?

EU:

Support prevention measures that reduce direct harm and stress during floods and droughts by turning risk knowledge into practical preparedness: early-warning with clear public instructions, evacuation drills, and measures that reduce hazard intensity (riverbank restoration; preventive management of mountain lakes and sediments). These are explicit recommendations from the Pyrenees brief and directly reduce injury risk, displacement, and longer-term anxiety.

Member States:

Deliver locally: regular public meetings and accessible training tools (not the minimum legal frequency), plus community workshops that combine information and practice. The brief notes that current approaches underperform on informing and training the population, and that infrequent public meetings are not enough to build risk culture.

What measures should the EU and Member States take to provide greater support to regional and local stakeholders?

EU:

Scale practical implementation support, not only strategies: fund local technical assistance to design and deliver early-warning, risk communication, and community-led water solutions (rainwater collection, canal restoration, natural filtration). This responds to documented capacity constraints in small communes like Caramany and to the persistent lack of functional warning systems in Luchon.

Member States:

Clarify governance and unblock delivery: define coordination mechanisms so programmes do not blur responsibilities, ensure local strategies can access funding, and publish crisis documents (PCS/ORSEC) and local risk plans so residents and local actors can prepare. The brief highlights unclear responsibilities and lack of public transparency as direct barriers to preparedness.

What targeted initiatives should the EU and Member States implement to specifically support the EU's outermost regions in adapting to climate change, considering their particular exposure to extreme weather events and their unique geographical and socio-economic contexts?

EU:

Member States:

What are the most pressing barriers that should be removed to enable action at regional and local level?

- Lack of sufficiently specific data and information about current and future risks to design science-based policies
-

Limited access to specialised support (specialist language, too technical, etc.) to help develop impactful measures, provided at national or EU level

- Insufficient funding or financing for regional and local measures, including access to dedicated national and EU funds
- Insufficient institutional capacity to absorb funding and develop a project pipeline.
- Limited engagement of local communities in designing and implementing measures
- Existing legislation that complicates efforts to deal with climate impacts
- Lack of consistent monitoring and reporting schemes that would provide incentives to act
- Other

How could the EU Mission pilot be leveraged or replicated to support action by all European regional and local stakeholders?

- Encourage Member States to develop Mission-type national initiatives with dedicated financial resources for their implementation
- Define the roles and responsibilities of National Missions within the Framework
- Mandate Member States to set up national platforms or coordination tables where local and regional stakeholders have a legally recognised role and responsibility
- Encourage Member States to dedicate financial resources to support regional and local action
- Connect EU funding opportunities with the relevant stakeholders to scale up the regional and local climate adaptation solutions developed within the Mission.
- Other

Competitiveness – harnessing innovation opportunities

Climate resilience and preparedness go beyond minimising and managing risks. They open **a new world of commercial opportunities and potential to innovate and create new project pipelines and markets.** There is a rapidly growing demand for resilience products and services, such as water technologies, regenerative agriculture solutions, heat and drought resistant crops, climate risk insurance, climate services and the use of space data, risk modelling tools, developing smart systems to predict and prevent supply chain disruptions, climate resilient construction materials and designs, technologies for resilient energy and transport

infrastructures, or health system adaptation solutions and innovation. Deploying such technologies **can enhance the competitiveness of EU companies and key economic sectors** by improving adaptive capacity and opening new export markets. The new Framework aims to support EU companies, SMEs and start-ups in **seizing these opportunities, helping position Europe as a global leader in climate resilience innovation.**

In your sector/industry/area, what are the climate resilience technologies /innovations that you need to develop or scale up to make your sector /industry more competitive?

In VUPK climate advocacy and local resilience delivery, the priorities to scale are:

Operational early warning and alerting that reaches people fast (better prediction plus alarm raising through channels people actually use).

Downscaled climate intelligence and tools that every local authority can use for decisions and investment planning.

Flood resilience solutions that can be procured and deployed locally, including flood defence systems and nature-based measures like restoring riverbanks and preventive management of mountain lakes and sediments.

Water security solutions for drought that move beyond restrictive decrees, including community-led options like rainwater collection, natural filtration, and canal restoration.

Urban drainage and waste-management resilience as a core flood prevention innovation, with community-level early warning via SMS and social media.

What measures could improve the competitiveness and innovation of climate resilience products/services in your sector/industry the most?

	Very relevant	Relevant	Neutral	Not very relevant	Not relevant at all
Increased public funding and investment	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased private funding and venture capital	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improved access to specialised expertise/workforce	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improved market certainty and regulatory support	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

What measures could improve the competitiveness and innovation of climate resilience products/services in your sector/industry the most (Cont.)?

	Very relevant	Relevant	Neutral	Not very relevant	Not relevant at all
Access to technologies/ modernisation of equipment	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased consumer awareness and demand	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Innovative climate risk management and insurance tools (e.g. parametric coverage)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If other, please specify:

Use public procurement and EU funding rules to create first markets for the solutions identified in the policy brief: flood defence systems, heat and flood resistant building materials, and water infrastructure, while favouring nature-based solutions where appropriate.

Finance and insurance

Climate change is already imposing significant measurable costs on consumers, businesses and economies. Extreme weather events and chronic risks such as sea level rise or soil subsidence - damage assets, disrupt supply chains, and reduce productivity, turning them into a mainstream financial concern. Therefore, it is **crucial to factor in climate resilience in investment and financial decisions**, to reduce climate-related economic losses and minimise disruptions to the business continuity and maintain revenues. To fully address the risks, the building of climate resilience would need to be complemented by insurance. Currently, only 25% of the losses are insured and the insurance premiums continue to rise. The scale and systemic nature of climate-related economic impacts make it impossible for governments to bear their cost and will require engagement, including financial contributions, from all levels of governance, economic sectors and the public. The new Framework will put forward policy measures **to scale up resilience finance** needed to fund the expanding project pipeline. It will also include measures aiming to improve **access to affordable insurance and reduce the widening insurance-protection gap**.

Public sector role in funding climate resilience

	Yes	No
Is it necessary to integrate climate resilience considerations in fiscal planning and financial decisions at all levels of the public sector as well as in the private sector?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Would incorporating climate resilience considerations in investments, including public spending and procurement limit economic losses from climate events?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Private-sector investments and climate resilience

	Fully agree	Slightly agree	Neutral	Slightly disagree	Fully disagree
National adaptation plans should be designed to serve as resilience and adaptation investment plans, unlocking the full potential of private-sector funding.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The private sector needs more guidance on how to incorporate climate resilience into investment and business decisions.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Effective public-private risk sharing mechanisms for climate adaptation investments (such as public-private partnerships, blended finance, disaster bonds, etc.) would increase resources invested in climate resilience and adaptation.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

What are the key obstacles for scaling up investments strengthening climate resilience and adaptation?

What policy measures would help overcome these obstacles and boost climate resilience finance?

Does the existing EU accounting framework duly reflect the climate physical risks in the valuation of assets? If not, what policy measures do you propose?

Do the other existing policy / regulatory frameworks duly account for the climate physical risks? If not, what policy measures do you propose?

Climate risk insurance

	Fully agree	Slightly agree	Neutral	Slightly disagree	Fully disagree
Location-specific comprehensive information on climate hazards could improve insurance uptake.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Climate risks insurance products need to be clearer on the hazards they cover	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

What policy / regulatory measures -based on market-based mechanisms- do you propose to address the increasing insurance gap and improve access to affordable insurance?

- What kind of risk pooling and transfer mechanisms would be most suitable to increase insurance cover for secondary perils in the European Union?

- How can insurers in the Union access new capital to back climate-related policies?

- How to mobilise private investor interest in insurance-linked investment vehicles?

- Is there a need for a European marketplace where climate-related risk can be pooled among insurance companies and non-insurance investors?

Additional comments:

What policy measures would be needed to avoid climate insurance protection gaps from having negative repercussions on financial or macroeconomic stability?

- Promote innovative climate risk diversification and/or transfer approaches to mitigate the concentration of risk within specific sectors or regions.
- Encourage market-based solutions that connect those who can afford to finance risk with those seeking climate risk coverage – this helps ensure business continuity and avoid disruptions caused by natural catastrophes.
- Other

Contact

Annika-Gilstrom.FORGAARD@ec.europa.eu

