



Climate policy mainstreaming in the EU: Origins, opportunities and limits.

Tim Rayner

Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, University of East Anglia

Frans Berkhout

IVM, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam.

March 19th 2013, Hamburg



Tyndall°Centre
for Climate Change Research

Importance of language

- The Minister would prefer that we did not 'leverage' or 'mainstream' anything ...
- Damages our worldwide reputation when we 'use language that the rest of the world doesn't understand'.

Alan Duncan,
UK Minister for International
Development, June 2012.



Mainstreaming, integration, proofing

- **Climate policy mainstreaming**: ‘actors whose main tasks are not directly concerned with mitigation of, or adaptation to, climate change also work to attain these goals’ (DG Clima website).
- ‘**mainstreaming or climate policy integration** .. has yet to be developed sufficiently either in scholarly literature or in policy practice’.

Ahmad, I.H. (2009). *Climate Policy Integration: Towards Operationalization*. DESA Working Paper No. 73ST/ESA/2009/DWP/73.

- **Climate proofing**: tends to refer to spending/ investment, to ensure its resilience to impacts.

Origins: Environmental Policy Integration

- EU's 'Cardiff process' for EPI (1998 -).
- PEER group (Mickwitz et al. 2009) extends the EPI concept ...
 - the incorporation of the aims of climate change mitigation and adaptation into **all stages of policy-making** in 'other' policy sectors (non-environmental as well as environmental)
 - an attempt to aggregate expected consequences for climate change mitigation and adaptation into an overall evaluation of policy, and a **commitment to minimise contradictions** between climate policies and other policies.

Mickwitz, P. et al. (2009). *Climate Policy Integration, Coherence and Governance*. Partnership for European Environmental Research.

Opportunities: Mainstreaming strategies

- Normative/ communicative
 - E.g. commitments to particular goals in constitutions, requirements for sectoral strategies, reporting performance; external/ independent reviews.
- Organisational
 - E.g. alteration of formal departmental mandates; creation of new ministries; placing environmental ‘correspondents’ in sector ministries; staff training/ network initiatives; structural changes of **budget lines**.
- Procedural
 - E.g. strategic/ impact assessments; veto or obligatory consultation rights for environmental departments or external stakeholders; forms of cross-compliance/conditionality.

Limits/ dilemmas: Lessons from EPI

- Elements of all three strategies will be necessary.
- Sectoral policy makers able to resist change!
 - Least resistance when own perceived sectoral interests co-incide (climate proofing?)
- Sectoral policy makers develop own integration strategies, failing to co-ordinate with other sectors.
 - In addition to *intra*-sectoral climate mainstreaming, there may be a need for broader, *inter*-sectoral policy coordination to ensure coherence.

Limits/ dilemmas: *differences* from EPI

- What does it mean to have normative commitment and clarity regarding climate adaptation goals?
 - Resilience to what? 2C or 4C?
 - Which ‘valued attributes’ to protect from impacts, which to let go?
 - Prioritise mitigation or adaptation ...?
- Who should lead, decide the objectives and priorities?
 - which sectoral policy makers; which levels of governance?
 - At what point to become ‘transformational’?

Limits/ dilemmas

- Promoting policy integration instead of issue-specific policies risks diffusing attention while declaring support for change through proclaimed integration. Therefore, strong mechanisms for accountability will be needed.
- How the mainstreaming challenge is framed (what normative goals prioritised, what forms of intervention it is deemed to require) will be very important to the results on the ground, and something we must continue to research.

**Thank you for your
attention!**

tim.rayner@uea.ac.uk
www.responsesproject.eu

