

ROUND TABLE 3:
TOWARDS A CO-ORDINATED USE OF MODELS FOR POLICY SUPPORT:
CASE FOR A NETWORK ON POLICY ANALYSIS FOR ENVIRONMENT-ECONOMY- ENERGY
AND/OR CLIMATE ISSUES IN EUROPE?

MODERATOR:

MATTI VAINIO, EUROPEAN COMMISSION, ENVIRONMENT DG, ECONOMIC ANALYSIS UNIT

In Round Table 3, it was evident that the environment-economy-energy modellers on climate issues as well as the users of the modelling results (the policy makers) would find it very helpful to have a European-wide network or platform for policy analysis in this field.

1. PRINCIPLES

It was thought that the network/platform should have the following principles:

1.1. Focus on issues that are of interest in Europe

It was thought that one *raison d'être* for such a network is to focus on issues that are of keen interest in Europe. In addition to the issues of interest in the EU, the network should also include the EEA and accession country issues. Obviously many global or developing country issues are in the interest of Europe, so these issues should not be forgotten.

1.2. Complementing other similar exercises

It emphasised that the network should complement other similar exercises, in particular the excellent work that is carried out under the Energy Modelling Forum as well as under the IPCC. It was recognised that many modellers are already part of these forums and thus, efforts should not be duplicated.

1.3. Openness

The network/platform needs to be open to all modellers, regardless if they come from the EU, other European countries, North America, Japan or elsewhere. Also the network should be open for participation of (private, governmental and non-governmental) users of modelling results. Of course the participation of environmental policy makers was felt to be essential.

1.4. Research driven, supported by policy makers

It was emphasised that such a network/platform should be formed by the researchers, while it would be supported by policy makers. The network should thus be managed by a research institution (or institutions) and have a very light bureaucratic structure.

1.5. Participation of developing country modellers/experts

Many thought that such a platform/network should be made accessible to modellers/researchers from developing countries. Thus, the network could have financial

resources available for e.g. funding the travel to the meetings and for transferring environment-economic-energy modelling know-how.

2. CHARACTERISTICS

The network/platform could have the following characteristics: It could be a forum for policy makers to pose policy relevant questions. Likewise, it could be a forum for researchers/modellers to point out (omitted) policy issues that should be addressed.

The management of the network would require some funding. Such funding could be available from the Commission (DG Research in particular) as well as from Member States. It was also noted that the network should get some funding from stakeholders – this would not only diversify the funding portfolio but also ensure that the network would look into issues that are relevant from the stakeholders point-of-view.

The network/platform should have a large focus. All greenhouse gases as well as on sinks should be included under its umbrella.

3. FURTHER THOUGHTS

It was emphasised that such a network/platform would in no way replace need for funding model development. The network/platform could be initiated in an ad hoc way as part of an existing Commission funded project, like AKROPOLIS. It was noted that a network/platform could induce some Member States to use a more analytical and quantitative approach in policy analysis to complement the environmental policy making. Many thought that the network/platform idea would fit very well with the European Research Space initiative that has been launched by DG Research.

Finally it was noted that the forum could have two distinctive issues to deal with : model comparison and analysis for policy work. As part of a model comparison exercise, the assumptions could be harmonised. However, in reality, there is seldom much time to carry out such exercises when the demand for policy analysis is high. Thus, the expectations for model comparison should not be high.