Rationale
Since AR4 we have moved in to a new state of need for policy makers, from being convinced that global change matters to needing to know how to act on it. Hence the community has to move from demonstrating that impacts could be alarming and that systems/people will be vulnerable, to supporting mitigation and adaptation decisions. This is a significant change in mindset… but also opens up opportunities for new collaborations among different interests in the community. We still need to understand impact and potential autonomous adaptation, since this helps emphasize the case for strong mitigation; but we need to place a much greater emphasis on frameworks for planned adaptation, and also to robust approaches to decision-making under uncertainty. These raise distinctive needs in adaptation research, aimed at multiple nested scales, where we still need to develop better conceptual frameworks to even express the nested (heterarchical!) nature of adaptation to decision-makers at all scales.

The Impacts Adaptation and Vulnerability (IAV) community has been a loose collection of individual researchers or small research centers, lacking coherence and structure. This has at least two implications: (1) it is difficult to harmonize or compare assumptions, tools and research practices within and across different groups, constraining effective communication and evaluation of results; (2) it is difficult to deliver clear, consensus messages to the climate and integrated assessment modeling communities, and similarly, for these groups to communicate effectively with IAV communities.

This workshop will make a contribution to improving the working relationship across the breadth of IAV communities towards being able to express a coherent voice when working with other research groups, yet maintaining the distributed, bottom-up character of these communities.

Goals of the workshop
(a) To discuss appropriate strategies and avenues for communicating and coordinating research efforts within the IAV community and between IAV and climate modeling (CM) and integrated assessment modeling (IAM) groups; and
(b) To develop a small set of agreed potential questions and issues which will distinguish a global strategic contribution of the IAV community from those of the other communities, during and beyond the development of IPCC AR5.
(c) To provide feedback to the CM and IAM scenarios groups on how to better develop, provide and interpret socioeconomic scenarios and narrative story lines to better support the deployment of both impact and adaptation assessments as well as regionally grounded assessments of the feasibility and effectiveness of mitigation options.
**Agenda items**

Summary of ca, 40 responses to survey circulated months ago by Wilbanks et al contributing to agenda and discussion topics:

a) Foci for community discussion and activity
- identify major constituent groups that make up the rich IAV communities
- discuss possible structure to channel information and perspectives
- outline funding opportunities for meetings and other activities
- identify representatives for particular purposes of importance to IAV
- identify key areas of research which distinguish the IAV community’s contribution from that of others; and,
- develop a preliminary set of critical applied questions that these key areas of research should be aiming to answer in a synthetic way across the IAV constituent groups and their different conceptual approaches.

b) Identify possible international coordination linkages with other ongoing activities other than IPCC ((e.g., Earth System Science Partnership (ESSP), Integrated Research on Disaster Risk (IRDR), IHDP, IGBP, WCRP, START, CIESIN, DIVERSITAS, etc.)

c) Identify and develop strategies and avenues for communicating and coordinating among IAV and IAM and scenarios communities

d) Questions requiring prompt response
- Who would like to be involved in interactions with the proposed New Scenarios parallel process?
- Who plans to use the new scenarios as a basis for future impact/adaptation/vulnerability analysis? What would you like to get from the new scenarios? Caveat: New Scenarios intended for post AR5
- Who would like to be involved in interactions with IPCC and other groups or assessment processes (e.g., proposed ICSU Ecosystem Change and Human Well-being’) with regard to climate change adaptation?

**Outcomes**

Workshop report for Amsterdam meeting and other events
Summary paper and recommendations
Suggestions on Role for the IAV, including discussions on coordination structure
Education and outreach within IAV and other groups

**Steering committee (SC): members and responsibilities**
The SC is responsible for setting agenda, and refining purpose, outcomes, and implementation of workshop decisions
The SC for this meeting are:
Paty Romero Lankao, Kathy Hibbard, Tom Wilbanks, Tim Carter, Brian O’Neil, Roger Jones, Chris Field, Lawrence Buja