



SWEET Call 2-2021

Questions and answers (Q&A)

Please carefully read the SWEET Call Guideline and this Q&A document.



1 General Questions

Q 1.1: In which form should the consortium contribute to the NCCS? We see two possible options and remain open to more suggestions:

- a. the consortium collaborates with NCCS to produce new climate services based on existing data (e.g., heating degrees for the past and the future)
- b. the consortium provides NCCS with advice on new data sets (e.g., related to wind) that are of direct use for energy sector-related risks

Answer:

Regarding the interaction with NCCS, the most important points are stated in the call guideline, namely:

- a. Page 8: "... by completing its work programme, the successful consortium will also contribute to NCCS-Impacts. This means participating in programme-wide activities of the NCCS, such as meetings and workshops, contributing to synergies, as well as aligning communication to allow for the creation of cross-cutting syntheses."
- b. Page 11: "Close collaboration with relevant federal [in footnote: FOCP, NCCS, ...], cantonal, and municipal authorities is strongly encouraged."
- c. Page 12: "... consortia are strongly encouraged to include in their work programme a re-evaluation of those Hazard Files that are affected by climate change. Furthermore, consortia are strongly encouraged to base the re-evaluation on the CH2018 Climate Change Scenarios, to collaborate with the NCCS on the re-evaluation,"

We anticipate that the main results of the interaction are re-evaluated FOCP Hazard Files taking into account climate change and new findings about how selected energy-system infrastructures are affected by climate change. Any new climate services or advice on new data sets would certainly be very desirable. However, the main focus of the interaction with the NCCS must be on the points given above .

Q 1.2: Are there concrete expectations in terms of Hazard file updating, if yes for which hazard files, in which form?

Answer:

The call guideline does not specify which Hazard Files should be updated because we wanted the consortium to have the freedom to select the hazards that best match the consortium's expertise. (Your selection of hazards must nevertheless take into account the directive on p. 10: "Particular attention must be paid to hazards that may arise from the changing energy system itself (i.e., the above-mentioned events and trends) and to hazards that arise from or are accentuated by climate change.") Footnote 23 on p. 12 describes questions that should be considered in the re-evaluation of the hazards. Your re-evaluation should be communicated in written form, either directly in the Hazard Files (which the FOCP can provide as Word documents) or in a separate document that details the proposed changes.

Q 1.3: Are there concrete expectations in terms of contribution to FOCP activities?

Answer:

We believe that this question is answered at least partially by our reply to Q1.2. We add that your findings in response to the questions posed in Section 2.1.1 and the outcomes given in Section 2.1.3 of the call guideline are also directly relevant to the FOCP.



Q 1.4: Could we organize a meeting with NCCS and FOCP for clarifying our interaction and ideally have representatives of both groups as consortium partners?

Answer:

Representatives from the NCCS and FOCP (any federal organizations, in fact) cannot be part of any SWEET consortia. We regret that meetings with representatives from the NCCS and FOCP cannot be organized, but you may submit further written questions.

Q 1.5: I have access to the NCCS impacts programme description that has been issued for the public call. I do however not know whether other activities are going on within this programme that are directly related to climate change impacts on natural hazards and if we should name actual collaborations with NCCS impacts partners. In fact, I do not understand if / how the critical energy infrastructure consortium should work on its own on climate change impacts on natural hazards. This seems like a task for which we need a clear hint on who else will work on this.

Answer:

In Section 1.2 of the Call Guideline, it is stated that "the successful consortium will also contribute to NCCS-Impacts. This means participating in programme-wide activities of the NCCS, such as meetings and workshops, contributing to synergies, as well as aligning communication to allow for the creation of cross-cutting syntheses." Originally, the work on the reevaluation of the Hazard Files of FOCP was setup as part of a sixth project of NCCS-Impacts, but was then integrated into the SWEET Call. NCCS wants to ensure that results and potential services/products of this work also provide a benefit for NCCS-Impacts and contribute to its program-wide synthesis. It is also the expectation of the NCCS that it will be informed and consulted if needed during the reevaluation. This collaboration with NCCS is also reflected in the SWEET Call being run as a Joint Activity between NCCS and SWEET.

The programme description is the central document regarding the content of NCCS-Impacts (especially Chapter 3 thereof). There are no other activities planned within NCCS-Impacts that are directly related to climate change impacts on natural hazards. In NCCS-Impacts, a seventh project (run by MeteoSwiss) ensures that climate (scenario) data and information is properly employed in the five NCCS-Impacts projects. The same support provided by the MeteoSwiss-run project also applies to the reevaluation of the Hazard Files. It is also one of the tasks to support the work in this direction, as consortia are strongly encouraged to base the reevaluation on the CH2018 climate change scenarios, as outlined in the SWEET Call Guideline.