



MedSeaRise

Interreg  
Euro-MED



Co-funded by  
the European Union



December 2025

## PRESENTATION OF THE METHODOLOGY TO STAKEHOLDERS

Deliverable D.3.3.1

<https://medsearise.interreg-euro-med.eu/>





## Deliverable ID

<b>Project acronym</b>	MedSeaRise
<b>Project title</b>	Supporting Adaptation to Mediterranean Sea Level Rise
<b>Project mission</b>	Protecting, restoring and valorising the natural environment and heritage
<b>Project priority</b>	Greener MED
<b>Specific objective</b>	RSO2.4 Promoting climate change adaptation and disaster risk prevention, resilience, taking into account eco-system based approaches
<b>Type of project</b>	Study project (Thematic Project)
<b>Project duration</b>	01/01/2024 – 31/03/2026 (27 months)

<b>Deliverable title</b>	Presentation of the methodology to stakeholders
<b>Deliverable number</b>	D.3.3.1
<b>Deliverable type</b>	Report
<b>Work package number</b>	3
<b>Work package title</b>	Methodology validation, capacity building and amplification
<b>Activity name</b>	Fostering the methodology and increasing the capacity building of stakeholders
<b>Activity number</b>	3.3
<b>Partner in charge (author)</b>	CCINCA
<b>Partners involved</b>	ANATOLIKI S.A., ARPA FVG , CCINCA, UoM-IBMK, BCC, UM

## Document history

Versions	Date	Document status	Delivered by
Version 0.1	23/10/25	Draft	PP2
Version 1.0	29/12/2025	Final	PP2



## Table of contents

Introduction and Objectives	5
Shared features of each communication event	6
Methodology presentation by each Project Partner	7
Deliverable indicators	8
Concluding remarks	9
Annex 1 – LP1 - ANATOLIKI – Methodology presentation events	10
Annex 2 – PP2 - ARPA FVG - Methodology presentation events	10
Annex 3 – PP3 - CCINCA – Methodology presentation events	10
Annex 4 – PP4 - UoM-IMBK - Methodology presentation events	10
Annex 5 – PP5 - BCC - Methodology presentation events	11
Annex 6 – PP6 - UM - Methodology presentation events	11
Annex 7 – Slides summarizing the MedSeaRise methodology	11
Annex 8 – Questionnaire guidelines and addressed questions	12
Bibliography and Sitography	15



## Abbreviations

<b>ANATOLIKI</b>	Organisation for Local Development, Anatoliki S.A. – Project Partner - LP1
<b>ARPA FVG</b>	Regional Environmental Agency of Friuli Venezia Giulia Region- Project Partner - PP2
<b>CCINCA</b>	Chamber of Commerce and Industry Nice Côte d’Azur - Project Partner - PP3
<b>UoM-IMBK</b>	Public institution University of Montenegro - Institute of Marine Biology - Project Partner - PP4
<b>BCC</b>	Barcelona Chamber of Commerce - Project Partner - PP5
<b>UM</b>	University of Malta - Department of Geosciences- Project Partner - PP6
<b>PP</b>	A Project Partner, in general. Nobody specifically indicated
<b>PPs</b>	All Project Partners
<b>D.2.3.1</b>	Project deliverable 2.3.1: Benchmarks on evaluation of sea level rise anthropic impacts risk assessment
<b>D.2.3.2</b>	Project deliverable 2.3.2: Benchmarks on evaluation of sea level rise ecosystem impacts risk assessment
<b>D.2.4.1</b>	Project deliverable 2.4.1: Methodology and the best practices
<b>GWL</b>	Global Warming Level
<b>WP1</b>	Work Package 1 of the MedSeaRise project - Information retrieval, data input and stakeholder awareness
<b>WP2</b>	Work Package 2 of the MedSeaRise project - Information analyses, methodology development and tools generation
<b>WP3</b>	Work Package 3 of the MedSeaRise project - Methodology validation, capacity building and amplification



This is a deliverable of the MedSeaRise project. The project contributes to the Natural Heritage mission of the Euro-MED Programme and it belongs to the Study Project class.

The document summarizes the work done in the frame of project activity 3.3, describing how the project partners have shared the results of the MedSeaRise methodology application with the stakeholders and experts external to the project partnership.

The methodology was presented and explained in detail to the stakeholders and experts, with the support of examples of its application on both classes of sea level rise impacts, namely those affecting anthropic activities and those ecosystems.

Feedbacks from users and potential users were collected to understand how much training, human and material resources are required for a full exploitation of the methodology and what actions are required to capitalize on the project results and let the methodology be included in the risk assessment approach, as a common practice.

The potential of the capacity building of the involved actors was measured by way of questionnaires, which have also been meant to collect information useful to prepare the amplification of the project results with further application and tests across the cooperation area.

The document is completed with a summary of the stakeholders feedbacks and annexes that give finer details of the work done. Deliverable indicators are reported too.



# The methodology presentation aim

## Introduction and Objectives

This document presents a specific contribution in the achievement of the general MedSeaRise WP3 objective, namely the validation of the methodology on the sea level climate scenarios data usage and the related risk assessment processes.

Thanks to the work carried out by all PPs in the frame of project activity 3.3 the MedSeaRise methodology was presented and explained in detail to the stakeholders and experts, with the support of examples of its application on both classes of sea level rise impacts, namely those affecting anthropic activities and those ecosystems. The examples have been identified through the stakeholders participation in the WP2 activities and the experts analyses.

One of the aims of this project activity is to understand how much training is required to apply the methodology and to exploit the supporting tools that have been developed as project deliverable, such as datasets and benchmarks. Furthermore, the potential of the capacity building of the involved actors is measured by collecting information useful to prepare the amplification of the project results too, that in turn means further application and tests across the cooperation area.

So, feedbacks from users and experts are harvested and they are analysed to understand which capitalization actions are required to let the methodology be included in the risk assessment approach, as a common practice.

Practically, the activity 3.3 was implemented through a series of dedicated meetings, in which benchmarks, see D.2.3.1 and D.2.3.2, have been presented to the stakeholders together with a schematic summary description of the MedSeaRise methodology (D.2.4.1). During such meetings, the participants followed the practical application of the conceptual steps that, starting from the finding of the suitable sets of data on sea level rise scenarios and proceeding with the datasets retrieval and usage, according to the guidelines defined in the WP2, lead to the risk assessment.

After the presentation, each stakeholder was asked to fill in a questionnaire. The addressed questions focus on the easiness and difficulties in understanding and applying the methodology, besides to the opportunities the methodology can exploit in the working environment in which the stakeholder would apply it or the threats against which its application could fall.

To understand what are the positive and negative aspects that can boost or limit the amplification of the project results, the questions have been defined and organized to be suitable for a SWOT analysis [7.1].



# Organization of communication events

## Shared features of each communication event

MedSeaRise activity 3.3 has produced several meetings with stakeholders and consequently there is one set of information for each of the PPs. There is an annex collecting the results achieved during the meetings organized by the Project Partner.

All the meetings had the same structure. In the first phase the MedSeaRise methodology (D.2.4.1) was presented in a summary, recalling the key aspects of the general logic supporting the best practices, see image here below.

### MedSeaRise methodology application by points



- Identify the impact** you are going to focus on
- Select **data on future sea level** that are suitable to describe the hazard causing the impact
- Retrieve the **data suitable to describe the exposure and the vulnerability** of your focus
- Identify the **tools and the expertise** required **to simulate the impact** on your focus
- Use the tools and expertise to **simulate the impact as many times as many inputs are** available
- Summarize the **results of the impact ensemble**, taking care to keep its range too
- Assess the **impact sensitivity** to the inputs' variation and spread
- Present the **results of the impact and its range**, according to the Global Warming Levels

MedSeaRise - Supporting Adaptation to Mediterranean Sea Level Rise



To make the work of the PPs easier and to use a common set of information, a presentation guideline was prepared and shared among the PPs [3.1].

Next, a set of case studies were described in detail, explaining how the methodology was applied and what the main issues have been in generating the case study. The presented case studies are the benchmarks (see D.2.3.1 and D.2.3.2) developed in the frame of the projects.

Finally, the attendees were requested to fill in a questionnaire composed of four sets of questions. Each set refers to an element of the SWOT analysis [7.1]. That allowed PPs to analyze the positive and the negative aspects of the methodology, as they are perceived by the stakeholders, dividing them into factors strictly pertaining to the methodology (internal SWOT elements) and factors related to the working environment in which the methodology will be applied (external SWOT elements)

The set of questions is reported in annex 8.



# The communication events

## Methodology presentation by each Project Partner

MedSeaRise activity 3.3 has produced meetings with stakeholders, organized by each Project Partner, and consequently there is a set of information, namely files, for each of the PPs. They are listed here below together with the annex number in which there is the reference to the compressed archive file storing all the meetings information.

Project Partner	Annex
LP1 - ANATOLIKI	Annex 1
PP2 - ARPA FVG	Annex 2
PP3 - CCINCA	Annex 3
PP4 - UoM-IMBK	Annex 4
PP5 - BCC	Annex 5
PP6 - UM	Annex 6

Each of the meetings carried on by the PPs has collected information through a questionnaire. The set of questions proposed to the stakeholders are common to all PPs, see annex 8, and they have been translated into the mother language used by the stakeholders, to facilitate the understanding of the contents and the objective of the question.

Details on each given answer by stakeholders, together with the documentation on the meetings, are stored in compressed archive files (zip files) and they are part and parcel of this deliverable; they are attached to this document as annexes.

In the annexes there is the SWOT analysis too, which was performed by each PP using the answers collected from all filled questionnaires.





## Deliverable indicators

This deliverable is summarized by means of the indicators reported here below. For each of them the expected indicator value and the actual one are presented. In addition, comments are reported too, if any.

Indicator	Expected value	Actual value	Comments
Meetings and related documentation	6	6	Documentation available as annexes, compressed archive files

The total number of filled in questionnaires is 65.

Information available in Google Drive Data area [\[4.1\]](#) and in Basecamp WP3 key production files [\[4.2\]](#)



# Conclusions

## Concluding remarks

The MedSeaRise methodology is a compound of a coordinated set of good practices, datasets and examples of its applications, namely the benchmarks, that are meant to support the assessment of risks and the adaptation actions related to sea level rise due to climate change scenarios, specifically suited for the Mediterranean coastal areas.

The methodology was presented to stakeholders and experts external to the project partnership with the aim to understand if training, and how much, is required to apply the methodology and to exploit the supporting tools that have been developed as project deliverables, such as datasets and benchmarks.

Results clearly show that the technical aspects of the methodology application have to be managed with proper knowledge, while the general approach to the risk assessment proposed by MedSeaRise methodology is easy to understand.

Also, the new approach in describing the consequences of the progressive sea level increase, using the Global Warming Levels (GWL) instead of the future time windows is appreciated by experts and stakeholders.

The relevance of including the uncertainty of the scientific information, which is implicitly present in the hazard and is expressed by means of the ensemble of future scenarios of sea level increase, was understood and appreciated. Stakeholders and experts have expressed positive judgments in the propagation of that uncertainty downstream to the simulated impacts too, producing an ensemble of impacts that shall be explored to get awareness of the impact response to the hazard uncertainty.

Furthermore, the potential of the capacity building of the involved actors was measured. The environment for an amplification of the project results is considered favorable.

Here below are reported the average results for each SWOT class of answered questions. The average is computed using the scores collected by each PPs. Scores can range from 1 to 10, with 1 the worst result and 10 the best. See annex 8 for more details.

Total number of contributions =				65
PP	S	W	O	T
Average	8.12	6.18	7.84	6.27

The strengths of the methodology (S) are on average larger than the Weaknesses (W). Also the external factors show the Opportunities (O) be greater than the Threats (T).



## Annexes

### **Annex 1 – LP1 - ANATOLIKI – Methodology presentation events**

Detailed information on the events conducted by LP1 ANATOLIKI S.A.

Archive file storing all the information collected by LP1 in the frame of methodology presentation events.

File: **Act\_3.3\_MedSeaRise\_methodology\_presentation\_LP1.zip**

### **Annex 2 – PP2 - ARPA FVG - Methodology presentation events**

The SWOT analysis conducted by PP2 ARPA FVG.

Archive file storing all the information collected by PP2 in the frame of methodology presentation events.

File: **Act\_3.3\_MedSeaRise\_methodology\_presentation\_PP2.zip**

### **Annex 3 – PP3 - CCINCA – Methodology presentation events**

Detailed information on the events conducted by PP3 CCINCA.

Archive file storing all the information collected by PP3 in the frame of methodology presentation events.

File: **Act\_3.3\_MedSeaRise\_methodology\_presentation\_PP3.zip**

### **Annex 4 – PP4 - UoM-IMBK - Methodology presentation events**



Detailed information on the events conducted by PP4 UoM-IMBK

Archive file storing all the information collected by PP4 in the frame of methodology presentation events.

File: **Act\_3.3\_MedSeaRise\_methodology\_presentation\_PP4.zip**

## **Annex 5 – PP5 - BCC - Methodology presentation events**

Detailed information on the events conducted by PP5 BCC.

Archive file storing all the information collected by PP5 in the frame of methodology presentation events.

File: **Act\_3.3\_MedSeaRise\_methodology\_presentation\_PP5.zip**

## **Annex 6 – PP6 - UM - Methodology presentation events**

Detailed information on the events conducted by PP6 UM.

Archive file storing all the information collected by PP6 in the frame of methodology presentation events.

File: **Act\_3.3\_MedSeaRise\_methodology\_presentation\_PP6.zip**

## **Annex 7 – Slides summarizing the MedSeaRise methodology**

The MedSeaRise methodology was presented on each of the meetings the PPs have organized with the stakeholders, to share with them the results achieved thank to the project activities.

To make the work of the PPs easier and homogeneous in transferring the key points supporting the methodology and the best practices it carries with, a series of slides have been prepared and shared among the partners.

The slides are available in the Google Drive shared area of the project [3.1] and they are attached to this document as annex, whose file name is:

**Act\_3.3\_MedSeaRise\_methodology\_presentation\_slides.pptx**



## Annex 8 – Questionnaire guidelines and addressed questions

### Questionnaire organization and goals

The methodology developed in the frame of the MedSeaRise project is meant for an effective use of sea level rise scenarios in climate change impact risk assessment. This means the methodology has to be promoted and feedbacks for users and the potential users collected and analysed.

So, each PS organizes meetings with stakeholders and experts with the aim to collect the feedback from the involved actors.

During those meetings, the methodology is presented in a summary, by points, or in detail; that is up to the meeting organizers. Furthermore, one or more benchmarks are shown and commented to describe the application of the methodology, step by step.

Naturally, the benchmarks are chosen among those the PP has generated for the area on which it has focused the case studies. Anyway, it is possible a PP uses benchmarks generated by other PPs.

Benchmarks presentation is important because it allows to explain, with the aid of methodology applications, what sets of data on sea level rise scenarios are suitable, from where data are accessible, what are the other data required to define the impact indicators related to the specific exposed and vulnerable target in the benchmark, what is the sensitivity of the impact from the variations in input data, what are the hardest steps found in methodology implementation and so on and so forth.

After the methodology and benchmark presentation, the stakeholders, associated partners and experts are requested to answer a set of questions. Through those questions, the PP collects the information useful to conduct the methodology validation.

In case the actors have already received information on methodology and benchmarks, it is possible to bypass the meetings and to ask them to fill in the questionnaire only.

Easiness and difficulties in applying the methodology are collected from all the PPs questionnaires and a SWOT analysis [7.1] is conducted with the aim to pick up which of the external and internal factors of the methodology have to be considered good enough and those requiring further improvements.

Thanks to the answers given to questions related to the internal factors, both positive (Strengths) and negative (Weaknesses) it is possible to understand whether stakeholders require specific training of methodology application and on the use of developed supporting tools, such as datasets and benchmarks.

On the other hand, analysing the external factors, it is possible to measure the potential of capacity building of the involved actors. That is also useful to prepare the amplification actions aimed to further application and tests across the cooperation area.



To make the harvesting of the information comparison and the preparation of the questionnaire easier, in the next section there is the set of questions the PPs have agreed to address to the stakeholders, together with their corresponding area of SWOT analysis.

### Questions related to methodology Strengths

Questions on Strengths are meant to collect information on aspects and features **internal** to the methodology that are considered valuable and improve the process of impact assessment, besides to make the job easier to assess. Here are some questions that may be used for the purpose.

1. How clear and understandable do you find the methodology to be?
2. Would you have the methodology be applied in the assessment of risk you consider relevant?
3. Could you apply the methodology with the involvement of human resources available inside your staff?
4. Do you consider it useful to have the results of the impacts expressed as a function of the Global Warming Levels?
5. Do you consider it useful to have the impacts presented with the range of uncertainties?
6. Do you consider the methodology to have a wide range of applications?

### Questions related to methodology Weaknesses

Questions on Weaknesses are meant to collect information on aspects and features **internal** to the methodology that are considered limiting or worsening the process of impact assessment and the job to assess heavier. Here are some questions that may be used for the purpose.

1. Does the methodology require specific know-how to be understood?
2. Does the methodology application require too many resources (time, economical or human) in comparison to your availability?
3. Does the methodology application require hiring experts outside your staff?
4. Do you think it is difficult to interpret the uncertainty of an impact due to sea level rise?
5. How difficult is it for you to see the link between the increase of the sea level and the impacts on your asset?

### Questions related to methodology Opportunities

Questions on Opportunities are meant to collect information on actual or potential elements **external** to the methodology, for example the environment or the context in which the methodology is used, that may leverage the efficacy and efficiency of methodology in assessing the impact, besides to let the job to assess easier. Here are



some questions that may be used for the purpose.

1. Does your sector or asset consider the risk assessment in decision making valuable?
2. Is the methodology a new or innovative tool in the sectors you are working on?
3. Do you think that many other operators of the sector you are working in could be interested in learning about and using the methodology?
4. Is there an adaptation strategy in which the methodology can be helpful?
5. Would you base your strategic plans on the methodology?
6. Would you propose the methodology for the application to other sectors than yours?

### **Questions related to methodology Threats**

Questions on Threats are meant to collect information on actual or potential elements **external** to the methodology, for example the environment or the context in which the methodology is used, that may hinder the efficacy and efficiency of methodology in assessing the impact, besides to let the job to assess heavier. Here are some questions that may be used for the purpose.

1. Are external experts hard to find in order to apply the methodology?
2. Is the cost of the methodology a burden for its application, even for a case of your interest?
3. Do you think the methodology is too complicated for the environment where you are operating and working?
4. Do you think there is a lack of data to assess the impacts of sea level rise in your asset?
5. Is it possible that the results of the methodology are not taken into consideration in defining adaptation planning related to progressive sea level rise?



## References

### Bibliography and Sitography

- [3.1] The [slides shared among the PPs](#) to recall the MedSeaRise methodology
- [4.1] Google Drive MedSeaRise shared area ([MedSeaRise\\_Interreg Euro-MED](#))
- [4.2] Basecamp [Key Production WP3](#) area.
- [7.1] Structured decision making: A practical guide to environmental management choices. Gregory, R., Failing, L., Harstone, M., Long, G., McDaniels, T., Ohlson, D. (2012), Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.



**MedSeaRise**

**Interreg  
Euro-MED**



Co-funded by  
the European Union

