

Organizing for climate change adaption in Norway

Mari Severinsen



uni Research
Rokkan Centre

Stein Rokkan Centre for Social Studies

Working paper
7-2016

Uni Research Rokkan Centre, The Stein Rokkan Centre for Social Studies, runs a publication series consisting of two parts, Reports and Working Papers. The Director of the Uni Research Rokkan Centre together with the Research Directors form the editorial board of the publication series.

The Report series includes scientific papers, such as final reports on research projects. The manuscripts are accepted by the editorial board, normally after a peer review.

The Working Paper series includes working papers, lecture transcripts and seminar papers. The manuscripts published as Working Papers are approved by project managers.

ISSN 1503-0946

Uni Research Rokkan Centre
Nygårdsgaten 5
5015 Bergen
Phone +47 55 58 97 10
Fax +47 55 58 97 11
E-mail: rokkansenteret@uni.no
<http://rokkan.uni.no/>

ORGANIZING FOR CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTION IN NORWAY

MARI SEVERINSEN

STEIN ROKKAN CENTRE FOR SOCIAL STUDIES

UNI RESEARCH AS, BERGEN

JULY 2016

Working Paper 7 – 2016

Contents

Summary	3
Introduction.....	4
The policy process.....	6
The initiative	6
NOU 2010:10 Adapting to a changing climate	8
Consultation round.....	9
Meld. St. 33 (2012–2013) Climate change adaption in Norway (White paper)	10
Stortinget’s treatment (Parliamentary treatment).....	12
Implementation	13
Discussion.....	15
Concluding remarks.....	17
References.....	18
Official documents.....	20
Internal documents	20

Summary

How does organizational structures effect the development of a policy field, and how is the structure decided? What challenges does wicked problems cause for traditionally base governing systems with a clear hierarchical structure? This paper takes a closer look at how climate change adaption as a policy field has developed in Norway and how it has been organized. Climate change adaption can be referred to as a wicked problem, which means that it does not follow the traditional structures of organization and is characterized as being complex, ambiguous and uncertain. The transboundary nature of climate change adaption has effected the development of the policy field, especially regarding how it has been organized. A main conclusion is that how climate change adaption has been defined and which political actors that has participated through out the process has effected the development of the policy field. Furthermore, the paper discusses different aspects of the development of the policy field and their impact on how climate change adaption as a policy field has developed.

Introduction

Climate change adaption was raised as a political issue for the first time at the establishment of the UNs Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Changes in 1988, but struggled to get political support because it was seen as a difficult and controversial subject (Næss et al., 2004). If you started to talk about climate change adaption, some might think that the hope to reduce the effect of climate change was forfeit (Parry et al., 1998). But as the scientific knowledge base around the reasons for climate change grew, so did the agreement that there was a need to plan how to meet these changes. This attitude was strengthened by the fact that the UNs Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Changes in its report for 2001 devoted considerable space for the adaption issue (MacCarthy et al., 2001). As a result of this countries began developing their own climate change adaption policy.

The paper looks at the development of the climate change adaption policy area in Norway¹. It focuses on how the policy area has been organized and how it has evolved, and tries to explain why it has evolved the way it has and what implications that the organization has had for the development of the policy area. The paper is based on a process study of the climate change adaption policy area in Norway (Severinsen, 2016). Policy formation or design can be seen as a process consisting of different phases that lead to a certain outcome (Howlett et al. 2009). In this paper, I divide the process in six stages, which are; the establishment stage, the assessment stage, the consultation stage, the policy formulation stage, the decision stage and the implementation stage. These stages will constitute the framework in which the empirical data is presented in this paper. The study is based in qualitative interviews with centrally placed informants as well as in depth document studies of official reports, white paper etc., collected and analyzed in relation to my master thesis in 2015–2016.

The paper builds on an organization theory based framework emphasizing that organization matters for policy formation (Christensen et al., 2009). The analysis of the process builds on two different perspectives linked to organization theory. The first is the instrumental perspective that perceives organizations as tools to achieve certain goals (Christensen et al., 2009). The other is the institutional perspective. The main assumption of the institutional perspective is that organizations have some sort of intrinsic value (Selznick, 1957). By using these perspectives

¹ The working paper presents data and research from the project «Organizing for Societal Security and Crisis Management: Building Governance Capacity and Legitimacy (GOVCAP)» financed by the Norwegian Research Council (2014–2018), Project no. 238016.

simultaneously to analyze the process I manage to conduct a thoroughly analysis of a complex process (Rones, 1997).

The study is inspired by the so-called «garbage can» approach. This theoretical approach is based on the assumption that all decision-making processes consist of four independent flows; decision opportunities, problems, solutions and actors. These flows will interact in different ways throughout the process (Cohen et al, 1972; Olsen, 1978). Any decision-making opportunity can be seen as a chance for problems, solutions and actors to meet. To gather knowledge about the movement of these flows you got to study the actors involvement in the process, as well as what meaning that is attributed to the problems and solution at all times. This can be done by studying two closely linked processes, the activation process and the decision process (Olsen, 1978). The activation process says something about the time and resources the actors put in to the process. The decision process, on the other hand, tells us something what problems and solutions that exists and what meaning the actors put in their decisions.

Climate change adaption is a cross-sectoral governance area and can be described as a «wicked issue». A wicked issue typically does not follow the existing organizational structures of government and is characterized as being complex, ambiguous and uncertain (Rittel & Webber, 1973). To handle such problems coordination, across sectors as well as administrative levels, is extremely important (Fimreite et al. 2014; Lægreid & Rykkja 2015). Regarding climate change adaption the most important form of coordination is horizontal coordination. Horizontal coordination is coordination between actors at the same level (Christensen & Lægreid, 2008). In this paper this means coordination between the different policy sectors. The issue of climate change adaption is seen as relevant for a broad selection of government authorities, from authorities working with the environment to those responsible for societal security and crisis management.

A lot of different ministries have an important role in the climate change adaption work through their responsibilities regarding climate change adaption within their own activities. In this paper I will focus on the Ministry of Climate and Environment and the Ministry of Justice and Public Security since these two ministries have played a crucial role in the organization of the policy area. The Ministry of Climate and Environment was established as the first of its kind in 1972, with the task of balancing the use and protection of natural resources (Jansen, 1989). The ministry was given the national coordination responsibility for climate change adaption in 2004 and has played a crucial role in the development of the policy area. The Norwegian Environmental Agency is the department that today supports the

ministry in questions regarding climate change adaption and leads the coordination of other agencies in climate change adaption work.

The societal security sector has played an important role in the development of the policy area, especially in the early stages of the process. It was the Ministry of Justice and Societal Security that placed climate change adaption on the political agenda through a white paper in 2004. The initiative came from the Norwegian Directorate of Civil Protection, one of the ministry's departments. The directorate noticed the effect climate change had on the societal security situation and pushed for action. The societal security aspect of climate change adaption has been considered one of the most pressing elements of the climate change threat, and because of this the Norwegian Directorate of Civil Protection was given an important role in the national coordination of climate change adaption in the early stages of the process.

The paper proceed as follows: First, we look into the process of establishing climate change adaption as a policy field in Norway, before we follow the field's development through the political system. The main focus throughout the process is the development of the way climate change adaption is defined and what problem and solution deceptions that exist, as well as to what degree the different actors participates in the different stages of the process. At the end the paper will be summed up by taking a closer look at some of the central elements of the process.

The policy process

The initiative

According to the participants in my study, the initiative to put climate change adaption on the political agenda came from The Directorate for Civil Protection (DSB). The directorate had witnessed the growing impact climate change had on the societal security situation and pushed for it to be taken into account at the political level. The initiative was followed up The Ministry of Justice trough the inclusion of the subject in a white paper on societal security in 2004 (St. Meld. 39 (2003–2004)). The white paper included a notion of the broad specter of challenges that climate change causes for the society and the need for good adaption strategies, but focused on what these changes would mean for the societal security situation in Norway.

Stortinget followed up the white paper by asking the Government to conduct a study regarding the consequences of climate change for the society and to present adaption measures in the various sectors. As a response to this request the Ministry of Environment was quick to point out that climate change adaption was a part of their area of responsibility, and they there for should be made responsible for the policy field. Based on the ministry's responsibility for climate and environmental politic the Ministry of Environment was pointed out as the lead agency for climate change adaption.

In 2007 the Government launched a national initiative called *The Norwegian Climate Change Adaption Program*. As a part of the initiative a cross-sectoral coordination group consisting of representatives from 12 ministries² was established as a five year project. The establishment of the coordination group was intended to enhance the cross-sectoral nature of climate change adaption, something that at an early stage had been pointed out as an essential factor in the development of the policy area (Internal: MD, 2007a). A secretary function was placed within The Directorate of Civil Protection. The secretariat was intended to assist the coordination group and work to enhance the knowledge of climate change adaption with relevant actors. Even though the secretariat was placed under The Ministry of Justice it received most of its founding and guidelines from The Ministry of Environment (Internal: MD, 2007b).

The decision to place the secretary function at The Directorate for Civil Protection was a result of multiple parallel processes. First of all The Directorate for Civil Protection had played an important role at an early stage of the process. Climate change adaption was considered to be foremost a societal security issue. It was therefore considered to be natural that the societal security sector would play an important role in the development of the policy area. Coordination had also been pointed out as a crucial factor in the climate change adaption work (MD, 2007). Since the Directorate for Civil Protection had developed coordination abilities through its coordination role in the national civil protection and emergency work, the Directorate was considered a suitable agency for the task. At the time, it was looked at as politically incorrect to talk about climate change adaption in the environment sector where the focus traditionally had been towards climate change mitigation. To start talking about climate change adaption was perceived as saying that the effort of climate change mitigation was unsuccessful and that the fight

² Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Fisheries and Coastal Affairs, Ministry of Health and Care Services, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Local Government and Regional development, Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Trade and Industry, Ministry of petroleum and Energy, Ministry of Transport and Communication and Ministry of Foreign Affairs

against climate change was lost. This might explain why The Ministry of Environment did not push to place the secretariat in one of its own subordinate agencies.

One of the tasks given to the coordination group was to develop a strategy for the national climate change adaption work (Internal: MD, 2007a). This strategy was presented by the Government in May 2008. The main goal of the strategy was to reduce society's vulnerability to climate change and enhance Norway's adaption capacity (Regjeringen, 2008). One of the ways this was to be done was through an Official Norwegian Report (NOU). The work concerning the mandate and the selection of the committee members was conducted by The Ministry of Environment in collaboration with the cross-sectoral coordination group. The mandate was enacted at a Governance conference in November 2008 and the committee was appointed by Stoltenberg's Second Government by Royal Decree of 5 December 2008 (Kgl.res., 2008).

NOU 2010:10 Adapting to a changing climate

The drafting of NOU 2010:10 took just under two and a half years. It was a comprehensive process. The committee consisted of 16 members, mostly from directorates and natural science institutions, led by the county governor of Sogn and Fjordane. This composition of participants affected the degree to which the committee could discuss certain topics. The mandate given to the committee was very open so the committee stood very freely in deciding what they wanted to focus on. (NOU 2010:10).

The Ministry of Environment decided to keep distance to the drafting process. They reasoned this with the notion that they feared that the report could appear as a commission from the ministry if they were too involved in the process (Internal: MD, 2008). The committee leader saw this as challenging. This meant, among other things, that the committee had to find offices outside the ministry and employ a secretary from the open market. The Secretariat for the Norwegian government's adaption effort was more involved in the drafting process. They acted as a provisional secretariat from December 2008 to February 2009. They also offered to assist the new secretariat after they took over, but due to disagreements between them and the new leader of the committee secretariat they withdrew from the process.

Even though the committee mostly cooperated well there were intense discussions about some topics. Responsibilities and organization of the government at the national level was one area of disagreement. The committee agreed that the

Ministry of Environment should keep its role as a lead agency, but the committee members from the directorates seemed unable and unwilling to agree where the practical coordination responsibilities should be located. In the fear of it causing disagreements about the recommendations in the report the committee leader decided to make a compromise. The compromise consisted of only giving some guidelines to what they saw as important features in the agency that would be given the coordination responsibilities and not a suggestion to which agency it should be. These disagreements were in stark contrast with the discussions about responsibilities and organization of the government at the regional and local level where the committee seemed to be quite harmonized both regarding the problem and the solution.

In March 2010 the leader of the secretariat stepped out on maternity leave and her position had to be replaced. The committee leader made it clear to the Ministry of Environment that the replacement should be someone that was familiar with the topic. The position was eventually filled by one of the members of The Secretariat for the Norwegian government's adaption effort. As a result both the Ministry of Environment and The Secretariat for the Norwegian government's adaption effort were more involved in the finishing stages of the drafting of the report.

NOU 2010:10 *Adaption to a changing climate* was submitted to the Ministry of Environment on the 15 of November 2010. The Minister of Environment at the time, Erik Solheim, had expressed to the committee leader before the white paper was released that he feared a falling interest in environmental issues in Norway, and was therefore very surprised when the white paper was released and got a lot of attention in the media. The committee leader on the other hand was not surprised. He meant that the white paper's focus on how individuals could be affected by climate change would make the topic more understandable for the people.

Consultation round

NOU 2010:10 was sent to consultation in December 2010 with a deadline three months later. The Ministry of Environment received 98 statements from public and private actors. Among the consultative bodies there was a high degree of agreement regarding the importance of the report and the recommendations that were given. Many of the consultative bodies also commented that they felt that the report should be followed up with a development of a comprehensive national policy. Several also pointed out that they felt this should be done through a report to Stortinget (a white paper).

There was a high degree of agreement that the national coordination of the climate change adaption, which at this point was taken care of by The Secretariat for the Norwegian government's adaption efforts, should be strengthened. The consultative bodies agreed with the report that this should involve replacing the project based structure of the secretariat and making it into a permanent part of the administration. However, among the consultative bodies that had further comments regarding the national coordination of climate change adaption there were different opinions on where such a responsibility should be placed. The Directorate for Civil Protection wanted to keep the coordination responsibility and make it a part of their permanent portfolio. The Climate and Pollution Agency on the other hand pointed out their key role in the national climate work and stated that they wanted to be included in the discussion of where the responsibility should be placed. *Vestlandsforskning* (an assignment-based research institute in Norway responsible for a number of research and development projects within the area of climate change) raised the possibility of moving the coordination responsibility from directorate level and to the planning department in the Ministry of Environment.

All the ministries gave statements in the hearing, but only the Ministry of Government Administration, Reform and Church Affairs commented on the national coordination of climate change adaption, remarking that it was important to determine in which agency the coordination function should be placed.

Meld. St. 33 (2012–2013) Climate change adaption in Norway (White paper)

The political leadership decided to write a report to Stortinget regarding climate change adaption. Stortinget had not been properly informed about the subject until this point and it seemed like a natural development of the policy area. The report would be based on NOU 2010:10 and the following comments, as well as experience from the preliminary climate change adaption work.

NIVI analysis AS (a Norwegian consultancy company performing commissioned research for the public sector) was in 2011 given the task to evaluate the Secretariat for the Norwegian government's adaption effort (NIVI, 2011). The report concluded that the secretariat for the most part had achieved the set goals within the limited resources they were given. It also concluded that the participation actors considered the relationship between the Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Justice and the Secretariat for the Norwegian government's adaption effort as mainly good. Even though the informant from the secretariat said that their connection to the Ministry of Environment had gradually deteriorated and that they

saw it as a struggle to get the Ministry of Justice to see how important climate change adaption is to societal security and emergency work.

In the evaluation report from NIVI it was also pointed out that there were different expectations to the cross-sectoral coordination group. The directorates and the Secretariat for the Norwegian government's adaption effort said that they had hoped that it could be an arena for discussing cross-sectoral issues, while the ministries only saw it as an arena for information shearing (NIVI, 2011). Representatives from the Secretariat for the Norwegian government's adaption effort have expressed that they felt that the Ministry of Environment could have exercised its role as a lead agency better and thereby enhanced the group's performance level. The group's activity also declined during its duration. Most meetings were held in association with the early stages of the process regarding the development of a strategy for the national climate change adaption work and the subsequent work affiliated with the mandate and selection of committee members to the official Norwegian report. A representative from the group described this decline as a result of that the participation was mandatory and the sectors did not necessary send the same representatives each time (NIVI, 2011).

The report also concluded that they agreed with NOU 2010:10's recommendation to keep the Ministry of Environment as the lead agency. Most of the informants in the report said that they thought that the Directorate for Civil Protection should keep the coordination responsibility, but that it should be made into a permanent part of the directorate's portfolio. Others argued that one of the Ministry of Environments own directorates should be given the responsibility or that the responsibility could be moved to the ministry itself.

The Directorate for Civil Protection clearly stated in their response to NOU 2010:10 as well as in meetings with the Ministry of Environment that they wanted to keep the coordination responsibility. Even though the ministry had given positive feedback on previous occasions, the ministry now seemed to look at the existing governance structure as a challenge. Informants from the Secretariat for the Norwegian government's adaption effort in DSB said that they experienced this as difficult. They also expressed that they were frustrated with their own ministry (the Ministry of Justice) because they felt that the ministry did not understand the importance of climate change adaption in societal security and emergency work, and that they therefore did not properly fight for them at the political level.

The work affiliated with the report to Stortinget was headed by the Ministry of Environment. The director general of the Department for Climate Change described the process as a very normal drafting process (interview). A group of three senior

advisors had the main responsibility regarding the report and sectors concerned with the subject were included in the different parts of the drafting. Some of the more comprehensive subjects were handled by the Government itself. One of these subjects was the discussion regarding where the coordination responsibility should be located. The Minister of Environment at the time, Bård Vegar Solhjell, recalls that this was something that they spent a lot of time discussing. There were different opinions regarding what kind of organization structure that would be the best suited, both in the administration level as well as in the government itself.

The report to Stortinget, Meld. St. 33 (2012–2013) *Climate change adaption in Norway*, was approved in the Council of State on the 7 of May 2013. Approximately two and a half years after NOU 2010:10 were submitted to the Ministry of Environment on the 15 of December 2010. The report gave a summary of how the Government wanted to proceed in the development of a national climate change adaption policy. The Government did not manage to produce a recommendation to where the coordination responsibility should be placed.

Stortinget's treatment (Parliamentary treatment)

After Meld. St. 33 (2012–2013) was approved by the government it was assigned to the Parliamentary Committee on Energy and the Environment. The committee presented its recommendation, Innst. 497S (2012–2013) in June. It mostly agreed with the statements in the white paper. The one thing the committee was most critical about was the lack of a clarification of where the coordination responsibility should be located.

The committee's recommendations were raised in Stortinget a few days later. The representative from Venstre (the Liberal Party), Borghild Tenden, presented five suggestions regarding different aspect of the report, among others to place the coordination responsibility at the Directorate of Civil Protection. The recommendations from the committee were unanimously approved, while Tenden's five suggestions were voted down 97 against one vote.

Finally, during the fall of 2013 the Government made a decision on where the coordination responsibility for climate change adaption should be placed. This was presented in the Ministry of Environment's proposal to the state budget for 2014 (Prop. 1S (2013–2014)). The responsibility was moved from the Directorate of Civil Protection to a permanent location at the newly founded Norwegian Environment Agency. The Norwegian Environment Agency was established July 2013 and

consisted of the former The Climate and Pollution Agency and Directorate for Nature management. This meant moving the coordination responsibilities from the societal security sector to the environmental sector. The decision was not commented on during the negotiation around the state budget for 2014 and was approved by Stortinget along with the rest of the state budget in December.

The reasoning behind the decision to move the coordination responsibility was that climate change adoption was much wider than just societal security and emergency work. The director general of the Department for Climate Change said that they in the beginning had focused on the effect climate change had on the societal security, but as the process evolved so did the policy area and they did not feel that the Directorate of Civil Protection could handle the width of the policy area anymore (interview). Minister of Environment at the time, Bård Vegar Solhjell (SV, the Socialist Left Party), agreed with this reasoning and pointed out that we today have a much more holistic view of the policy area that we had in 2007 (interview).

On the 18 of October 2013 there was a change of government. The newly appointed government introduced an additionally proposition to the state budget for 2014 on the 8 of November 2013 (Prop 1S Tillegg 1 (2013–2014)). The proposition introduced an additional organizational change that affected the work regarding climate change adaption. The former planning department in the Ministry of Environment was merged with the Ministry of Government Administration, Reform and Church Affair into a new ministry named Ministry of Local Government and Modernization. Since including environmental issues in planning processes is an important management tool for the environmental sector this reorganization could be expected to have a negative impact on the inclusion of environmental consideration in policy planning and thereby also the consideration of climate change adaption. In addition it was decided to change some of the ministries names including the Ministry of Environment that was renamed Ministry of Climate and Environment.

Implementation

The Ministry of Climate and Environment still possesses the role as lead agency in the climate change adaption work. Incorporating environmental consideration in planning processes has been a central management tool in the environmental sector. Environmental law professor at the University of Oslo, Ole Kristian Fauchald, fears that the moving of the planning department from the Ministry of Local Government and Modernization can cause that environmental consideration will be taken less in to account than previously (Bjercke, 2013). To handle this, the Ministry

of Climate and Environment has begun to draft a state planning guideline that intends to make sure that environmental consideration will be taken in to account in all the sectors. The decision to create such a guideline was decided in Meld. St. 33 (2012–2013).

The cross-sectoral coordination group that was created in 2007 is no longer active, even though NOU 2010:10 recommended this function to be continued. The director general of the Department for Climate Change says that there have been discussions about creating a new arena for information sharing. At the same time she notes that there are other cross-sectoral workgroups that among other things handle climate change adaption issues. For example there is one group that works with the drafting of the state planning guideline for climate change adaption, which was mentioned above. She also emphasize that policy area has developed a lot since the national initiative regarding climate change adaption was launched in 2007 and that this causes the need for new forms of collaboration.

The Norwegian Environment Agency took over the coordination responsibility for climate change adaption on the 1 of January 2014. The agency was tasked with the coordination responsibility as well as assisting the Ministry of Climate and Environment with their sectoral responsibilities. A key role in the work affiliated with the cross-sectoral coordination is the facilitation of a common knowledge base and the dissemination of this. The agency has also been granted a big increase in the funding compared to the Secretariat for the Norwegian government's adaption effort. The secretariat had a couple of million NOK in their possession, while the Norwegian Environmental Agency in 2016 were granted 6 million to a support scheme for municipalities and additional funding for operating costs.

The agency itself, as well as the Ministry of Climate and Environment, say that they are under the assumption that the new organizing structures are working fine. This stands in stark contrast to the perception of the Directorate of Civil Protection. The directorate says that they feel that the Norwegian Environmental Agency is trampling in what they consider to be their sectoral responsibilities. They also express that this is a frustration they share with other agency, especially The Norwegian Water Resource and Energy directorate. To get clarity in the division of responsibilities the three agencies drafted a note where the division of responsibilities was described. This was finished in February 2015, but the informants from the Directorate for Civil Protection did not feel that this had the wanted effect.

Even though the Directorate of Civil Protection lost the coordination responsibility regarding climate change adaption the directorate still has a very important sectoral

responsibility. Through its responsibility to coordinate societal security it's responsible to make sure that climate change adaption is sufficiently included in the directorates own management areas as well as in the cross-sectoral societal security work. After the reorganization of the coordination responsibilities the directorate has lost most of its funding towards climate change adaption. Informants from the directorate at the same time say that they feel that they have to assist the Norwegian Environmental Agency a great deal and that they therefore have little time to work on their own stuff. They also say that they do not feel that it is right that the Norwegian Environmental Agency should manage the support scheme for municipalities since most of the municipalities use the funds towards planning processes and societal security and the Directorate of Civil Protection has more expertise regarding deciding which municipalities should receive support.

Discussion

In this paper I have presented the development of climate change adaption as a policy field in Norway. In the following part of the paper will I take a closer look at some of the central elements of the policy process. The first thing I will take a closer look at is the development of how the concept of climate change adaption has been defined and what implications this has had for the organization of the policy field. When climate change adaption first was put on the political agenda in Norway the societal security sector played an important role. Firstly it was the societal security sector that through St. Meld. 39 (2012–2013) put climate change adaption on the political agenda, and even though the Ministry of Environment were given the role as lead agency societal security were considered to be at the center of climate change adaption. The societal security sector's important role was emphasized by the fact that the Secretariat for the Norwegian government's adaption efforts was placed in the Directorate for Civil Protection. The secretariat was at the center of the development of the policy field and it could be argued that it also was the most important actor at the national level regarding climate change adaption at the early stages of the process.

Some have argued that even though the environmental sector played an important role in the development of climate change adaption as a policy field in Norway the subject was still a bit taboo. This can be seen as an explanation to why the early stages of the development of the policy field was focusing on societal security. By framing the issue as mostly a societal security issue the environmental sector could keep focusing on climate gas reduction without admitting to the fact that it in many ways had gotten past that point were that was enough.

As the policy field developed the definition of climate change adaption grew broader. A lot of sectors had been involved in the early stages of the process, but their participation hadn't been very active. Some agencies such as the Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate had been working with climate change adaption, but this effort did not reflect on the political level. But as the policy field developed so did the realization that a more active approach towards climate change adaption in all the affected sectors was needed. Simultaneously the environmental sector seemed more willing to take ownership of the subject. This development could be seen as a factor in the ministry's changing attitudes towards the Secretariat for the Norwegian government's adaption efforts and the decision to move the coordination responsibility to the Norwegian Environmental Agency.

The second element is the conflict level throughout the process. In the beginning the policy field was characterized by a common problem and solution perception, but as the process evolved more and more conflicts emerged. The high level of agreement at the early stage of the process can be seen as a result of the fact that the policy field was fairly new and that only the outlines of how the policy field should be developed was discussed. Few of the involved sectors had any experience with the field and didn't therefor have a lot of strong opinions regarding it. As the policy area evolved more and more conflicts emerged. This can be seen as a result of the fact that the sectors raised their level of awareness regarding climate change adaption and that more concrete issues were being raised that affected the sectors to a greater degree.

With the exception of giving the Ministry of Environment the role as lead agency and the placing of the Secretariat for the Norwegian government's adaption efforts in the Directorate for Civil Protection, there were a lot of conflict related to the organization of the policy field at national level. In the process of drafting NOU 2010:10 it turned out to be impossible for the committee members to come to an agreement regarding the recommendation for where the coordination responsibility should be placed. In the subsequent consultation round it was also made clear that there existed a lot of different opinions regarding the issue. This conflict was also at the center of the process regarding the drafting of Meld. St. 33 (2012–2013). The issue had to be handled by the Government where it became clear that there were both administrative differences between the sectors as well as internal differences in the Government. The government did not manage to present a decision in the report to Stortinget. The final decision regarding the coordination responsibilities for not presented until the fall of 2013 in Prop. 1S (2013–2014) from the Ministry of Environment.

The high level of conflict surrounding the organizational decisions could be interpreted as a result of that this is decisions that will have direct effect on the actors involved in making the decisions. It can also be a result of power play between the different sectors or as a way of ensuring that the different sectors interests is taken into account.

Even though there have been some very different opinions between the different sectors, there is not much conflict surrounding the subject between the political parties. Both prior and current ministers from both the left and the right wing has said that their experience the different parties as being on the same page. This was also made clear in the parliamentary handling of Meld. St. 33 (2012–2013) where the decision process was characterized by a low degree of conflict.

The third and last element is the different opinions regarding how the involved actors perceive the new organization of the coordination function for climate change adaption. Both the Norwegian Environmental Agency and the Ministry of Climate and Environment say that they are under the impression that the new organizational structure is working fine. This stands in stark contrast with the informants from the Directorate of Civil Protection impression. They say that they feel that the reorganization has damaged the overall climate change adaption work.

The fact that there exist two perceptions of the same situation that differs so much could be seen as a problem. This could point to a bigger problem regarding communication between the two sectors. At the same time it is important to look at what motivates the different opinions. It is in both the Ministry of Climate and Environment and the Norwegian Environmental Agency best interest that the new organization structure is succeeding; For the Ministry because it's the one that wanted the new structure, and for the Norwegian Environmental Agency because they are now in charge of the coordination responsibility. The Directorate for Civil Protection on the other hand lost the coordination responsibility and could be interpreted as a bit bitter about this and also wanting to prove their point that they are the best agency to place such a responsibility.

Concluding remarks

This paper illustrates the development of climate change adaption as a policy field in Norway. The cross-sectoral nature of climate change adaption work has had a great impact of the development of the policy area. Relating to "wicked issues" such as climate change adaption, a need for a higher degree of coordination emerged (Boin et al., 2005; Christensen & Lægreid, 2007). The need for efficient cross-

sectoral coordination was pointed out at an early stage of the process as an important factor in the development of the policy field. To ensure cross-sectoral coordination throughout the process there were among other things created a cross-sectoral coordination group consisting of representatives from the different affected sector. The Ministry of Environment also included affected sectors and the Government in the process of drafting Meld. St. 33 (2012–2013). To which extent this involvement has been successful could be questioned, especially the participation in the cross-sectoral coordination group. The differences regarding the perception of the new organization structures could also make one question the efficiency of the cross-sectoral coordination.

The Ministry of Climate and Environment has been criticized for being too weak in its role as lead agency. This has been claimed to reduce the output of the cross-sectoral cooperation. Some argue that this has been a result of lack of commitment from the ministry. Others argue that this is a problem in all environmental politic and that the reason is the lack of access to governing tools. To some extent both arguments can be seen as true; Climate change adaption has been seen as a threat to the mitigation effort and has been argued to, mostly in the developing stages of the policy fields, taken the focus away from the need for climate change adaption. At the same time the Ministry of Climate and Environment has a limited access to governing tools that allows them to put pressure on other agencies.

Throughout this paper the development of the climate change adaption field has been presented and discussed. One thing has become very clear, and that is the fact that finding a good organization structure is difficult. This is especially true concerning wicked issues such as climate change adaption. But nevertheless in such cases the need to find a good organization structure is even more important. There will never be such a thing as the perfect organization, a fact that emphasizes the importance of good coordination among sectors and governing levels.

References

- Bjercke, B. (2013) Erna har flyttet metallkontrollen. NRK Sàmpi (not in English).
- Boin, A., Hart, P., Stern, E. & Sundelius, B. (2005) *The Politics of Crisis Management – Public Leadership Under Pressure*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Cohen, M.D., J.G. March & J.P. Olsen (1972) A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17 (1):1–25.
- Christensen, T. & P. Læg Reid (2007) The Whole-of- Government Approach to Public Sector Reform. *Public Administration Review*, 67 (6):1057–1064

- Christensen, T. & Læg Reid, P. (2008) The challenges of coordination in central government organizations: The Norwegian case. *Public Administration Review*, 8:97–119.
- Christensen, T., M. Egeberg, P. Læg Reid, P. Roness & K. A. Røvik (2009) *Organisasjonsteori for offentlig sektor: instrumentelt, kultur, myte*, Oslo, Universitetsforlaget (not in English).
- Fimreite A. L., P. Lango, P. Læg Reid & L. H. Rykkja (2014) *Organisering, samfunnssikkerhet og krisehåndtering*, Oslo, Universitetsforlaget (not in English).
- Howlett, M., Ramesh, M. & Perl, A. (2009) *Studying public policy. Policy cycles & public subsystems*. Canada, Oxford University Press
- Jansen, A.I. (1989) *Makt og miljø: en studie av utformingen av den statlige natur- og miljøvernpolitikken*. Oslo, Universitetsforlaget (not in English).
- Læg Reid, P. & L. H. Rykkja. 2015. Organizing for 'wicked problems'. Analyzing coordination arrangements in two policy areas: Internal security and the welfare administration. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 28 (6): 475–93.
- NIVI Analysis AS (2011) Evaluering av klimatilpasningssekretariatet. *NIVI rapport 2011:8*. Miljøverndepartementet (not in English).
- Næss, L. O., P. Prestrud, K. O'Brien & K. H. Alfsen (2004) Forstudie til klimatilpasningsstrategi for Norge. *CICERO Report 2004:11*. Oslo, Miljøverndepartementet (not in English).
- MacCarthy, J. J., Canziani, O. F. & Leary, N. A. (2001) Climate change 2001: Impacts, adaption and vulnerability. IPCC.
- Olsen, J. P. (1978) *Politisk organisering*, Bergen, Universitetsforlaget (not in English).
- Parry M., N. Arnell, M. Humle, R. Nicjolls & M. Livermore (1998) Adapting til the inevitable. *Nature*, 395, 741.
- Rittel, H. & Webber, M. (1973) Dilemmas in a general planing theory. *Policy Sciences*, 4, 155–169.
- Roness, P. (1997) *Organisasjonsendringeri*. Bergen, Fagbokforlaget (not in English).
- Selznick, P. (1957) *Leadership in administration. Asociological interpretation*. New York, Harper & Row.
- Severinsen, M. (2016) Tilpasning til klimaendringer. Organisering av det nasjonale koordineringsansvaret. Masteroppgave. *Institutt for administrasjons og organisasjonsvitenskap*. Bergen, UiB (not in English).

Official documents

Innst. 497S (2012-2013) *Innstilling til Stortinget fra Energi- og miljøkomiteen om Klimatilpasning i Norge, Meld. St. 33 (2012-2013)* (not in English).

Kgl.res (2008) *Oppnevning av offentlig utvalg som skal utrede samfunnets sårbarhet og behov for tilpasning til konsekvensene av klimaendringene, 12.12.2008* (not in English).

NOU 2010:10 *Adapting to a changing climate.*

MD (2007) *Rapport om sårbarhet for og tilpasning til klimaendringer i sektorer i Norge* (not in English).

Meld. St. 33 (2012–2013) *Climate change adaption in Norway.*

Prop. 1S (2014-2014) *For budsjettåret 2014 fra Miljøverndepartementet* (not in English).

Prop. 1S Tillegg 1 (2013-2014) *For budsjettåret 2014 – Endringer av Prop. 1S (2013-2014) Statsbudsjettet 2014 fra Finansdepartementet* (not in English).

Regjeringen (2008) *Klimatilpasning i Norge – Regjeringens arbeid med tilpasning til klimaendringene* (not in English).

St. Meld. 39 (2003–2004) *Samfunnssikkerhet og sivilt–militært samarbeid* (not in English).

Internal documents

Internal: MD (2007a) *Mandat for koordineringsgruppen* (not in English).

Internal: MD (2007b) *Statsbudsjett 2007 – belastningsfullmakt Klimatilpasningssekretariatet* (not in English).

Internal: MD (2008) *Referat fra møte mellom Flæte, MD og Klimatilpasningssekretariatet om klimatilpasningsutvalget, 18.11.2008* (not in English).