

Tables

	Mitigation Policy	Adaptation Policy
Sectoral focus	All sectors that can reduce GHG emissions	Selected ones related to particular climate impacts
Geographical scale of effect	Global	Local, regional
Temporal scale of effect	Long term	Short to medium term
Level of Governance	International, National	Regional, Local
Effectiveness	Certain (with regard to the reduction of GHG emissions)	Less certain
Ancillary benefits (or co-benefits)	Multiple ancillary benefits that can be accrued	Often ancillary benefits accrue even in the absence of climate impacts
Actor benefits	Through ancillary benefits	Almost fully through reduction of climate impact and ancillary benefits
Polluter pays	Yes	Not necessarily
Monitoring	Relatively easy (measuring the reduction of GHG emissions)	More complex (measuring the reduction of climate risk)

Table1: Differences between adaptation and mitigation policies (adapted from Dang et al., 2003)

Type of interrelationship	Action/ Measure	Primary Objective	Interrelationship explained
Co-benefit	District heating system	Mitigation	District cooling can be used also in warm months to adapt to high temperatures
Synergy	Construction of green walls and rooftops	Adaptation and Mitigation	Green walls and rooftops increase energy efficiency of buildings and decrease water run off
Conflict	Densification of urban structure	Mitigation	Dense urban structure reduces green areas suitable for natural flood protection measures
Trade - off	Urban zoning	Adaptation or Mitigation	Challenges to set priorities in urban planning due to space limitations in cities

Table 2: Illustrative examples of adaptation and mitigation interrelationships

City	Name of Plan	Type of Plan	Year of publication	Justification of Selection
Bangkok, Thailand	Bangkok Master Plan on Climate Change 2013-2023	Combined	2013	The first major SE Asian city that addressed both Adaptation and Mitigation in one CCAP (2007).
Chicago, USA	Chicago Climate Action Plan	Combined	2008	The first major city in North America and one of the first globally that considered both mitigation and adaptation in one CCAP (2008).
Durban, South Africa	Durban Climate Change Strategy	Adaptation driven	2014	The first the city in Africa that developed a CCAP that addressed both adaptation and mitigation.
Mexico City, Mexico	Programa de Acción Climática de la Ciudad de México 2014-2020	Combined	2014	The first city that developed a CCAP before its national government. One of the first cities globally that developed a CCAP (in 2008) that addressed both mitigation and adaptation.
Montevideo , Uruguay	Plan Climático de la Región Metropolitana de Uruguay	Combined	2012	The city from Latin America that has been supported by a multilateral organization in drafting, framing and developing its CCAP and acts as a "role model" in the region.
Paris, France	Paris Climate and Energy Action Plan	Mitigation driven	2012	One of the first capital cities in Europe that developed a CCAP (2007) and also one of the first major European cities that considered both mitigation and adaptation objectives in one CCAP.
Seoul, South Korea	Action Plans for Promise of Seoul: Taking Actions Against Climate Change	Combined	2015	The first major East Asian city that addressed both Adaptation and Mitigation in one CCAP (2007).
Vancouver, Canada	Climate Change Adaptation Strategy	Adaptation driven	2012	The first Canadian city that developed a CCAP (2004). One of first major Canadian cities that considered both adaptation and mitigation in one CCAP (2012).
Wellington, New	Wellington City's 2013 Climate	Combined	2013	The first major city in Oceania that integrated adaptation and mitigation

Zealand	Change Action Plan			in one CCAP.
---------	--------------------	--	--	--------------

Table 3: Selected urban Climate Change Action Plans reviewed in the study (in alphabetical order)

Stage of Planning	Sector	Variable	Scoring
Identifying and Understanding	Scientific knowledge and information	GHG emissions profile	0-1
		GHG emissions forecast	0-2, See Appendix
		Vulnerability profile	0-2, See Appendix
		Future climate projections	0-2, See Appendix
		Uncertainty/probabilities of climate risks	0-1
		Cost estimates of damages of climate impacts	0-1
		Climate hazards detailed	0-1
Envisioning and Planning	Targets setting	GHG emissions reductions targets	0-2, See Appendix
		Sectoral targets	0-1
		Adaptation objectives	0-1
	Prioritization	Cost estimates of actions	0-1
		Benefit estimates of actions	0-1
		Consideration of both adaptation and mitigation actions	0-1
		Consideration of Ad/Mit interrelationships	0-2, See Appendix
Communication	Common (Ad/Mit) public education and outreach	0-1	
Implementation and Monitoring	Financing	Common funding body or budget (public)	0-1
		Financing commitment (public)	0-1
	Implementation	Mainstreaming of both Ad/Mit actions	0-2, See appendix
		Common policy or regulatory framework	0-1
		Common coordination or implementation body/department	0-1
		Partnerships (e.g. public – private, local – other government, local government – civil society, etc.)	0-1

	Monitoring	Common monitoring procedure/framework	0-2, See appendix
--	------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------

Table 4: Variables used to assess the level of integration of climate adaptation and mitigation in CCAPs

City	Date of CCAP used in report	Date of first CCAP released	Total Score
Mexico	2014	2008	23
Wellington	2013	2007	19
Chicago	2008	2008	19
Durban	2014	2014	18
Paris	2012	2007	17
Bangkok	2013	2007	17
Montevideo	2012	2012	16
Vancouver	2012	2004	16
Seoul	2015	2009	12

Table 5: CCAP release dates and their associated evaluation scores