



Policy scenarios for enhancing uptake of climate services – alternative options for combining public and private

Adriaan Perrels (1) and Peter Stegmaier (2)

(1) Finnish Meteorological Institute, Climate Services, Helsinki, Finland (adriaan.perrels@fmi.fi), (2) University of Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands

Whereas the upstream part of the climate services market is for several reasons mainly served by public sector actors (NMHSs, universities, national climate centres, international organisations like ECWMF), the midstream and downstream markets show more diversity in public and private actors, including public-private collaborative organisations. These public-private cooperative structures face however obstacles, which seems to lead to slowing down and falling through of innovations (Stegmaier and Perrels 2019).

There exist fairly broad interest in the EU and at Member State level to promote the use of climate services as an effective means for enhancing adaptation, mitigation, resilience and sustainable development policies (Perrels 2018). This requires however the implementation of sets of policies and measures to promote the use as well as development of climate services. In the project EU-MACS (<http://eu-macs.eu/#>) three alternative climate services promotion policies were designed, named State-centred, Business-centred, and Network-centred. Based on earlier work and internal rating of obstacles and remedies, as well by employing transaction cost theory and public choice theory, the different policy packages were rated.

The three policy scenarios are typified as follows:

State-centred – Driven by equity & safety concerns, aims to ensure sufficient resilience across society & in all regions to the extent needed & deemed affordable

Business centred - Driven by free market philosophy, under assumption that this approach best enables creativity to become productive

Network-centred - Driven by the notion that citizens, civic groupings, regional collaboration, etc. know best how to balance welfare & wellbeing interests, affordability, etc.

Despite the quite different policy scenarios the uptake of climate services can be promoted in all of them to a significant extent. A state central policy scenario would lead to a very good general access and coverage of sectors and regions, but the weakening market incentives make it likely that less diversity and innovation is implemented and thereby the total benefit potential is supposedly smaller. The favourable results of what is called 'network-centred' relate to the notions that for a thriving climate services market all kinds of collaborative forms seem to be necessary, whereas such collaborations will often need to be regional or sectoral to keep them manageable and responsive to specific user (segment) needs.

The presentation will also briefly discuss the approximate quantifications of the growth prospects in the alternative scenarios.