

CoCliServ

Co-development of place-based Climate Services for action

Anne De Rudder (IASB-BIRA) – Didier Peeters (ULB)

Axis 2: Geosystems, universe and climate

belspo .be

NETWORK PROJECT

CoCliServ

Co-development of place-based Climate Services for action

Contracts - BR/175/A2/CO-CLI-SERV and **BR/175/A2/CO-CLI-SERV-Topup**

FINAL REPORT

PROMOTORS: Anne DE RUDDER (IASB-BIRA)
Jean-Michel DECROLY (ULB)

AUTHORS: Anne DE RUDDER (IASB-BIRA)
Didier PEETERS (ULB)

BIRA-IASB aeronomie.be

ULB UNIVERSITÉ LIBRE DE BRUXELLES

belspo .be

Published in 2021 by the Belgian Science Policy Office
WTC III
Simon Bolivarlaan 30 bus 7
Boulevard Simon Bolivar 30 bte 7
B-1000 Brussels
Belgium
Tel: +32 (0)2 238 34 11
http://www.belspo.be
http://www.belspo.be/brain-be

Contact person: Aline Van der Werf
Tel : +32 (0)2 238 36 71

Anne De Rudder and Didier Peeters. ***Co-development of place-based Climate Services for action***. Final Report. Brussels: Belgian Science Policy Office 2021 – 39 p. (BRAIN-be - (Belgian Research Action through Interdisciplinary Networks)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS 4
ABSTRACT 5
CONTEXT 5
OBJECTIVES 5
CONCLUSIONS 5
KEYWORDS 5
1 INTRODUCTION 6
2 STATE OF THE ART 7
3 OBJECTIVES 8
4 METHODOLOGY 9
5 SCIENTIFIC RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 10
5.1 A METADATA CONCEPTUAL SCHEME FOR NARRATIVES 10
5.1.1 Granularity 10
5.1.2 Confidentiality 10
5.1.3 Functionality 11
5.1.4 Compromises, challenges, limitations 12
5.1.5 Conclusion on metadata 13
5.2 METADATA BASE, GEO-REFERENCING AND MAPPING 13
5.2.1 The challenge of storing social science information as data 13
5.2.2 The quality or ease of use dilemma 14
5.2.3 The development of the database 14
5.2.4 QGis 15
5.2.5 QGis/PostGis interconnection 16
5.2.6 The users 16
5.2.7 The data 17
5.2.8 The locations in the *informions* 18
5.2.9 Using the tool 19
5.2.10 Conclusion on mapping narratives 22
6 DISSEMINATION AND VALORISATION 23
7 PUBLICATIONS 24
8 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 25
9 REFERENCES 26
ANNEX - COCLISERV METADATA FOR NARRATIVES 28

ABSTRACT

CONTEXT

Under the umbrella of ERA4CS[1], CoCliServ explored novel ways to transform climate science into action-oriented place-based climate services to engage, enable and empower local communities, knowledge brokers and scientists to act locally.

OBJECTIVES

CoCliServ sought to identify future information needs and the nature of the climate science needed to address the local communities' concerns, aspirations and goals in view of climate variability and climate change. The Belgian partners were in charge of Tasks 4.2 and 4.3, dedicated to metadata and geographic mapping to support documentation, analysis and representation of local narratives.

CONCLUSIONS

A metadata scheme for narratives was developed and served as the basis to build up a QGis-based metadatabase and multi-layer geographic mapping device. These two exercises were experimental. The work performed is hoped to serve as a basis for similar activities in future projects focusing on multidisciplinary co-development of place-based facilities.

KEYWORDS

Local climate services, narratives, incremental scenarios, community-centred science, knowledge quality assessment, representations of climate change, metadata, geographic representation, cartography of narratives.

[1] The ERA-NET Consortium "European Research Area for Climate Services" (ERA4CS) has been designed to boost the development of efficient Climate Services in Europe, by supporting research for developing better tools, methods and standards on how to produce, transfer, communicate and use reliable climate information to cope with current and future climate variability.

1 INTRODUCTION

CoCliServ developed and explored novel ways to transform state-of-the-art climate science into action-oriented place-based climate services. The corner stones of the project were the set of narratives collected by the project partners at the elected five sites (WP1) and the resulting set of incremental scenarios derived from the narratives (WP2). Scenarios and their identified hinge-points led to a critical inventory of data needs (WP3) enlightened by a common reflection on knowledge quality (WP5), and to the definition of dedicated local climate services to meet those needs. This work actively involved local communities and integrated creative modes of representation in relation to the above activities (WP4).

Within WP4, tasks of the Belgian partners ULB/IGEAT and IASB-BIRA were to develop a metadata framework (Task 4.2) and a suite of geographic representation media (Task 4.3) suited to the project method and output. This report gives account of their work in this context.

2 STATE OF THE ART

Many scholars writing on climate services (Bolson & Broad, 2013; Buizer et al., 2016; Cash et al., 2006; Kirchhoff et al., 2013; Lemos & Morehouse, 2005; Lemos et al., 2012; Lorenz et al., 2017; Lowrey et al., 2009; McNie, 2012; Mauser et al., 2013; Moss et al., 2013) argue, explicitly or implicitly, that for products to be customised and useable for adaptation in a given context, they should be coproduced through ongoing interaction and collaboration between science producers and users (variously labelled as decision-makers, adaptation practitioners, citizens or stakeholders – we will call them users). As such, coproduction has emerged as an important theoretical lens for making sense of the complex and messy scientific, social and political processes of turning climate information into climate products. With the exception of a few alternative framings (see Hegger et al., 2012; Lövbrand, 2011), to date, the climate services literature has been dominated by one (albeit important) perspective on coproduction as an iterative producer–user interaction for producing useable products (see Cash et al., 2006; Dilling and Lemos, 2011; Kirchhoff et al., 2013; Lemos and Morehouse, 2005). Arguably, this limited lens of coproduction also limits the phenomena we can observe, and thus the ways we can learn from climate service practice.

In terms of metadata models, existing precedents include, for example, metadata standards for physical sciences, such as the Climate Forecast (CF) Convention (Eaton et al., 2020), and library catalogues. Beside studies aiming at exploiting users' expertise to enrich descriptive metadata in the realm of libraries and museology (Smith-Yoshimura, 2011), we are not aware of any comparable attempt in the context of social sciences or anthropology, so that the work performed in this regard during CoCliServ is essentially novel.

Mapping narratives, however, has some recent history (Caquard, 2011 ; Vivant et. al, 2014) and QGis tools are widely used by all sorts of professionals and administrations. GIS brings together various more or less sophisticated techniques of which cartography is probably the best known. Cartography produces rich and relatively easy-to-understand graphics to enlighten a discourse, but also opens the way to certain analyses by allowing the spatial dimension of studied problems to be taken into account. Geographers start by mapping a phenomenon and then use this spatialization to look for correlations with other aspects or other phenomena also mapped. As soon as the mapping is done, the locations are digitized and the associated data can benefit from computer processing of the digitized data. Although the process is common in human geography, it is only exceptionally used in the other human sciences. By attempting a hybridization between humanities and natural sciences, the CoCliServ project wanted to explore different unusual paths, including GIS.

3 OBJECTIVES

CoCliServ was pioneering, as it had been designed to: (1) engage in theoretical innovation on the coproduction of climate services and (2) contribute to systematic study of practices of climate services as coproduced, that is, structured according to a knowledge quality assessment framework that reflects processes and frameworks of coproduction. It did so by rising to the challenge of proactively connecting climate science with local communities, using local narratives as an entry point, and vision planning and adaptive pathways as a co-construction locus. These were the overarching goals of the project. They were transversely integrated in all work packages, with proactive facilitation by the coordinating partner.

More specifically, objectives of Tasks 4.2 and 4.3 were to provide the project partners with a metadata framework and a geographic representation tool adapted to the description and visualisation of climate-related local information or perception conveyed by the collected narratives.

4 METHODOLOGY

One of the first questions that arose was the type of objects that had to be described and categorised to serve the project objectives while exploring innovative ways forward. As the project elementary building blocks, narratives or sets of narratives were the most obvious candidates. The starting point of the metadata scheme, relatively reduced, was inspired from existing climate metadata.

The scheme and the mapping tool were developed in parallel, based on iterated discussions with the project site leading teams and the work package leaders, and were progressively expanded to meet their expectations. Documenting narratives was a pioneering task. The metadata scheme and the mapping tool were developed as to support the analysis of the collected narratives. They integrate sections recording key information required by each work package.

5 SCIENTIFIC RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 A METADATA CONCEPTUAL SCHEME FOR NARRATIVES

5.1.1 Granularity

In the context of Task 4.2, narratives were conceived as the original tales collected by the site leading teams: one narrative would be a story told, written, painted, illustrated, discovered by one individual or collectivity, who could be anonymous but would generally have a definite identity. Metadata were developed with this relatively non-constraining definition of a narrative in mind.

Toward the end of the project, one of the partners underlined the fact that what she called narratives were synthetic stories derived from a set of similar individual testimonials, retaining their common prominent features. In other words, narratives were not the individual pieces of raw material collected, but already resulted from some processing of this material, highlighting recurrent typical concerns through some disembodied or fictive story. It made more sense, for her work, to characterise such narratives than to describe in detail every singular story.

The point she raised was actually a matter of granularity, since the synthetic narratives she had in mind aggregated, somehow, sets of similar individual narratives. A large number of metadata fields required to characterise singular narratives, especially among the pieces of *contextual information* listed in the annex (such as the identity of the narrative's author or the place and circumstances where and when the narrative was collected), would not be relevant for synthetic narratives any longer.

There was no time left to change course, so that Task 4.2 stuck to the approach pursued up to that point. But it would be worth, for future projects similar to CoCliServ integrating a metadata application, to devote some time, at the beginning, to questioning which levels of granularity are desirable or useful for the work undertaken. In contexts where traceability (and hence posterity) is key, documenting individual pieces of raw material sounds like an appropriate decision. Where the focus is to highlight prominent features arising from some stage of the analysis, characterising datasets or abstractions derived from particular observations may be preferred.

5.1.2 Confidentiality

Provided the personal aspect of most narratives to be collected, it was decided at the start that their contents would not be divulgated, not even to the project co-partners, apart from quotes representative of climate-related local concerns.

At the beginning, the intention to represent the narratives using metadata was met with reluctance by some partners, who feared that this approach would violate the confidentiality of information entrusted to them. They were however reassured by the possibility to tag selected metadata fields with a "confidential" stamp that would prevent them from being seen by internal or external users of the metadatabase: personal details about the authors, stored in the metadata, would be kept unveiled, as well as any information likely to reveal their identity. As will be seen in the second part of

this document, the mapping tool developed at ULB offered easy technical solutions to achieve confidentiality, such as fuzzy geo-referencing.

5.1.3 Functionality

Beside the interest that may – or may not – lye in enunciating and naming for their own sake, metadata may serve a number of purposes.

In climate science, for example, where data are the numeric results of physical measurements, it has become traditional to distinguish between *discovery*, format and intrinsic metadata. Discovery metadata encompass elements informing on the existence, location and availability of the data, making the search for – and, but not mandatorily, the access to – the data possible, usually through a catalogue. Format metadata, especially relevant when data are stored in electronic files, inform on the data formal display, providing guidance on how to read the data once downloaded. Intrinsic metadata pertain to the data nature, allowing their understanding and informed use. One of the key pieces of information stored as intrinsic metadata is the data uncertainty, i.e. an assessment of their *closeness to truth*.

Although inspired from natural science practice and from libraries, CoCliServ metadata do not have a similar vocation, since the data collected by its partners are not, as such, intended for public dissemination. Yet, to the extent that they provide a common wording framework and support the data analysis, they can be far more than a gimmick for attractive representations.

TRACEABILITY

Metadata are a convenient instrument to keep, in a concise homogeneous form, the memory of the work accomplished, of the methods applied and of the original elements (here, the narratives) that led to the project conclusions. When used in a systematic way throughout a project, they can provide accurate information to later researchers interested in the subject, while avoiding diving into the bits and bobs of the actual stories, which are confidential anyway.

VISUALISATION AND DISSEMINATION

By standardising the description of narratives with words and by providing the underlying information to the geographic mapping tool developed by Task 4.3, narrative metadata contributed to WP4 (Representations) and had a potential to support, through visual representations, the dissemination of the project outcome ensured by WP6 (Coordination and dissemination).

COMPARING, SORTING, AGGREGATING

Metadata are an instrument to standardise the way an object is described. In retaining some features and excluding other ones, they somehow disarticulate the objects under study. When these objects are stories enunciated by humans, anthropologists may rightfully dislike the method, since it reduces vivid accounts to formal lists of factual elements and discards any unforeseen consideration – that would possibly throw some original light on the question tackled. The critic is justified. Yet, when it comes to forge a general image of the various views or wishes of people belonging to a certain community, or to establish statistics, metadata offer an appropriate medium to compare narratives

to each other based on common criteria, sort them out in categories and aggregate them into archetypical narratives, as already mentioned

DATA ANALYSIS

When the work on metadata started, it was debated whether they should be used for other purposes than recording basic facts about the narratives. However, their potential to support the analysis performed in the various work packages became clear as the project proceeded. The scheme was progressively extended to include metadata fields informing the researchers on features relating to their part of the study. At the work package leaders' demand, the *analytical information*, which at first only included an abstract, keywords, names of places mentioned by the narrator and quotes, was successively completed by the following metadata fields to support WP1 (Narratives of change), WP2 (Scenario design and development), WP3 (Local climate information in context) and WP5 (Knowledge quality assessment) – see Annex for more detail. In the end, this enlarged functionality of the metadata was not exploited, but it was recognized by the partners as a potentially useful analysis tool.

- Narratives of changes: mention of the future; mention of climate.
- Scenario design and development: potential for a hinge point.
- Local climate information in context: mention of meteorological physical parameter; mention of climate-related phenomenon, event or landscape feature; mention of life aspect in relation to climate.
- Knowledge quality assessment: knowledge types on which analysis and/or prediction of the site future is based; knowledge quality aspects.

5.1.4 Compromises, challenges, limitations

Constructing and using a metadata model and a metadata tool such as the ones developed by Tasks 4.2 and 4.3 is not necessarily straightforward. The time-consuming aspects of preliminary tasks may mask the interest of the hypothetical future benefits. Some of the issues and challenges we met are addressed below.

FEEDING THE METADATA SCHEME

Encoding metadata for the whole lot of narratives revealed too tedious a task for most partners, whether via the Excel spreadsheets provided or directly into the QGis-based tool developed by Task 4.3, even with the recourse to templates that could considerably simplify the task. Later advantages remained too unclear – and were indeed not demonstrated – to convince the project partners to really dive into this effort. The timing was also not ideal to do so, since the narrative collection and the metadata scheme proceeded and matured in parallel. The site leaders had already started to use their traditional methods of analysis when the possibilities that the metadata offered in this respect appeared more clearly. However, the prospective of visual representations of results was an incentive.

OPEN EVOLUTIVE MODEL VERSUS FROZEN FORM

In many respects, we opted in this project for a resolutely open metadata model:

- no field was mandatory;

- new options could be added to drop-down menus;
- new metadata fields could be proposed;
- numerous fields accepted free text.

The obvious advantages of such a model are its flexibility, the freedom left to the metadata provider and the high degree of nuances that can be expressed. But this approach has also strong drawbacks. The fact that the scheme expands as time goes by hinders the comparison of narratives for which metadata have been recorded at different stages of its life. Empty fields may result in discarding a narrative from statistical studies. Free text cannot be automatically read and makes comparison between various narratives arduous. To guarantee a sensible information content, an easy analysis and a minimal comparability, a balance between flexibility and rigor must be achieved. Flexibility may be preferred as long as the scheme is under development (which was actually the case during CoCliServ) but at some point, the model must be frozen in order to be useable.

SUBJECTIVITY OF NARRATIVES

Narratives are of a subjective nature. This makes them essentially different from the data treated by the physical sciences for which metadata schemes have been established for a long time. But even more crucially, the subjectivity of the researcher who will document a narrative will influence the metadata content, which will usually not be the case for metadata pertaining to physical measurements. Whether a number lies under a given threshold, for example, will not depend on the metadata provider, whereas an element of a narrative may be interpreted by one researcher as an allusion to a potential climate-related hinge point, and not by one of her/his colleagues. This provides metadata for narratives a relative nature of which users must be aware.

5.1.5 Conclusion on metadata

Due in part to the novelty of the approach, in part to the very different styles of practice, concepts and vocabulary of the researchers in their respective fields, developing a metadata scheme for narratives involved substantial communication and lasted for the duration of the project. The scheme that was progressively completed to meet the partners' expectations was only tested on some examples, not numerous enough to conclude if the concept was adequate, even less to document all the collected narratives and serve as an analysis or dissemination tool. Yet, it is hoped that the outcome of this pioneering exercise can be the starting point of future other projects.

5.2 METADATA BASE, GEO-REFERENCING AND MAPPING

The outcome of Task 4.3 is a tool made to be used by regular users in a research context, allowing, thanks to the metadata standardisation achieved in Task 4.2, to share (anonymous) data between study sites, between work packages or with other analogous projects.

5.2.1 The challenge of storing social science information as data

The ambition of CoCliServ in relation of mapping was more than just produce beautiful illustrative maps for brightening up reports or to support meeting discussions with local communities. These

were made as well of course, maps are a common tool in scientific discussions about environmental issues, and are presented in other deliverables. The plan was to explore the feasibility of producing a tool to dynamically share field observations from many types of sources (in fact, not only narratives) and ensure a maximum preservation of the collected information. In social science not every information can be saved and standardized, there is always a limit, even literature fails at capturing the ultimate personal feelings.

The ambition here was to develop a database model to push further the limits of the data capture from informal social sciences outputs. Therefore our first logical step was to elaborate a metadata scheme with the field investigators (see Task 4.2), the second was to produce a database model and the third one was to make a user-friendly interface that could be used by different types of users, dealing with different types of information. Of course this three theoretical steps were explored simultaneously with lots of back and forth during the project. "Whether such a dream may really be a nightmare is another topic" (Peuquet & Marble, 1990).

5.2.2 The quality or ease of use dilemma

As explained above, we needed to marry an IT tool with users who are not familiar with such technology in their usual activities. It has been tried before of course by other researchers (see Caquard, 2011, or Vivant et. al, 2014), and it is a never ending task, since on one side the needs are always too specific and on the other side a versatile solution would most probably require a high level of computer literacy as it would remain something very abstract. The challenge is therefore to find the right balance between solutions that are very simple to grasp but quickly overwhelmed by the difficulty of taking into account the specificities of human reality, and very sophisticated solutions with a very good potential for abstraction but which are too complicated to learn and use.

We have come to a (temporary ?) conclusion that mixing those opposite constraints might be feasible if:

- users are ready for a little learning ;
- there are a few users responsible for some of the more difficult tasks ;
- someone is there to manage the system on a technical level.

And our proposition is described below.

5.2.3 The development of the database

So the central element of our system is a database. The concept of "database" ranges from any set of data, like an address book or an MS Excel file for example, to a computer highly mathematical structure like the well known Oracle, MS SQL or MySQL, which are (Relational) Data Base Management Systems (RDBMS). Because they are very efficient tools these systems are now everywhere on all computers or smartphones, in all softwares and most web pages rely on them. They ensure a great safety for the data, they are very resistant to data corruption, they control very efficiently the accesses and allow to define specific privileges to the different users.

As said earlier this is the kind of tool we are using and we have chosen PostgreSQL which is also the choice of many important businesses and administrations around the world (like Google Earth, the

French and Swiss statistical national institutes). PostgreSQL itself can manage regular data (numbers, text, dates, ...) and it has an extension named PostGis that gives it the ability to manage geographical or geometric data (points, lines, polygons). PostgreSQL complies with open standards, is open source itself (meaning it does not depend on private technologies), uses the SQL language. A database developed inside PostgreSQL can therefore be managed by anyone having access to it and having the skills for it. The schema itself (the database structure and all the functions added) can be exported as a pure text file and installed on any other PostgreSQL host, or transformed in another RDBMS format. The data can be exported as well together with the schema or in a single compressed file (a "dump") or in individual tabular files (like "csv").

So we created a database containing tables and functions[2]. The general structure of the tables are based on the work made in the metadata part of CoCliServ; they are of course a little adapted to comply with the SQL logic and with the interface tool we made with QGis (see below). The database structure remains simple. The functions were added to ease the work of the user, either by adding some information like the name of the user, the date of the recording, the study site based on the location, re-organise the stage numbers inside a recorded journey (see below), etc, or to do some post-processing, like inserting new values to drop-down lists. Without these code elements, data recording would be more complicated and more error-prone.

5.2.4 QGis

As presented above, QGis is a free and open source software, quite easy to use and very rich in functionalities. It can be used to create regular maps but offers also lots of analytical functionalities, automation of processes, a programming environment in Python. It can use many different types of data and of course it can connect to database servers like PostgreSQL/PostGis.

So the data are either stored in files or in connected servers and are all organized in layers put one above the others, like in an image editor. The data in the main window are overlapping the ones from the layers below.

Among its user-friendly tools there is the ability to create forms connected to a data layer, so that by clicking on a feature belonging to a layer a window will open and display the specific attributes of that feature in a way pre-defined in the layer properties. This is the functionality we use in our tools, knowing that the form can contain many tabs, containing themselves several blocks, that can be hidden or displayed according to the value of other attributes. So the form will evolve along with the filling of the attributes by the user, hiding blocks of attributes that would not be relevant anymore and showing the ones that could for instance be useful to add some more relevant information. For example imagine that the user is recording information about a book, then the block of data containing everything needed to describe a book would appear (title, author, publication date, content description, etc) while the blocks containing the attributes useful for describing a migration journey would be hidden. The form is versatile.

In QGis all the data are organized in a 'project' which is where all the information regarding the list of layers, the formatting (the symbols, the colors, the forms, etc) are stored. The layers (the 'real' data)

[2] The functions are written in Pl/Pgsql and the tables are in SQL.

are stored elsewhere, in files or in web servers. Since we are working with a dedicated server the data and the project itself are also stored on the server (except the base maps which are provided by public servers like OSM or Google), so that the user can change of computer without having to carry everything with him/her, all he/she needs is to remember his/her credentials.

5.2.5 QGis/PostGis interconnection

As is often the case in IT, the tasks are shared between front-end and back-end. Qgis offers the front-end, i.e. the system with which the user interacts and which contains a minimum of the logic, while PostGis ensures the real data management. In this way, we could, if necessary and with minimal workload, replace or supplement QGis with another system, such as a smartphone or tablet application, and continue to work with the same database. We could also connect analytical tools, such as statistical software, to PostGis and perform analysis or mix data with other sources. Access is concurrent, which means that different users can work at the same time doing similar or different things. Still for now we use QGis because it fits the project requirements which were above all cartographic.

So the work would go like this:

- The user opens QGis and the CoCliserv project, which opens the connection to the server, which then identifies the user,
- The user chooses a task by selecting it in a list within a little window, like recording a new case (whatever it is) or updating one or adding information.
- If the task is recording a new case the user starts by clicking somewhere on the map, supposedly on a place in relation with the case, otherwise the user clicks on the case to modify, then a form predefined for the kind of task opens.
- At the end the user saves its work by clicking on 'save' then the database processes the data which are then organized according to the database structure. Possibly some symbol appears or changes on the map, on the user' screen and on any other user's.

A QGis project is personal to each user. The users are free to modify it, like replace symbols with others, change the colors, even the dialog in the forms, as long as he/she knows what he/she is doing. Having the projects stored on the server allows the system manager to create a new project whenever a new user joins, or alter existing projects whenever new functionalities are added or issues are fixed.

5.2.6 The users

We have mentioned above the 'users' but we need to clarify who they are and what they are allowed or invited to do. There are fundamentally three kinds of users:

- The regular users who are simply using QGis and the CoCliServ tools, and who only need to understand the basic use of QGis and who can only use the system 'as is'.
- 'Power users' with the rights to modify the system parameters,

- The system manager, who fixes the tools and who is above all in charge of the server, and therefore must have a good technical background with spatial databases and GIS.

Of course daily work can be done by regular users without any assistance, possibly there may be a need for power users and the system manager is only required for developing the tools or adding new functionalities.

The 'Power users' can change the system parameters because they are allowed to add/modify content inside specific tables. For instance there is a table containing the different languages the data can refer to, or a table with allowed keywords, another one with media that can be used for recording purpose, etc, and the need might appear to add one item in one of those tables, in order to make it available for use.

One of the features that was requested and that we included in the tool was the ability to extend easily a predefined list of categories: the interface of the tool offers fields to be filled, and some offer the possibility to make a selection between different values, but it can happen that the correct answer is not included in the list and therefore we have added the ability for the regular user to add new values that will immediately be added to the default list for the other users as well. The advantage is that these predefined lists are progressively elaborated by the users themselves but the drawback is that it could lead to duplicates or the to the inclusion of not relevant answers. This feature should therefore be evaluated carefully before enabling it or not.

5.2.7 The data

As said above, a list of attributes was elaborated in the metadata part of this work package, and the database reflects accurately this list but the general organization of the information is adapted to comply with the relational model and the QGis interface requirements.

First of all, the reader might be confused by the use of the words 'data' and 'metadata'. The metadata are nothing else but data about data, meaning usually that they define a set of data by specifying the source of the data, the time they were elaborated, the context of the collection, etc. In CoCliServ we elaborated an important set of metadata in order to describe - initially - each narrative that would be collected in the work package 1 because we didn't want to store and publish those narratives as is. In short, the metadata would describe who was interviewed, where it happened, when, by whom, in what context, what were the topics, what was the feeling about the climate topic, etc. So instead of having metadata describing a set of data, we have metadata describing each item in our collection, and we don't store the data itself which would be in the case of a narrative a conversation. And these metadata are our data. In our tool none of the attributes are mandatory, especially the identity can be a pseudo. The location recorded in the tool can also be altered afterward in order to scramble the information and strengthen anonymity.

It is important to note that the information collected is not necessarily the information published afterwards.

The metadata model elaborated contains an important number of attributes which makes the work with a graphical interface difficult because of the need to display all the fields to fill in a single form, and tricks had to be found to bypass the cluttering of the display.

A second challenge came from taking into account sources other than narratives, like books, tv broadcast, news in newspapers, and so on. Some attributes can fit several types of sources but not all, like for instance a ISBN number. We had therefore to elaborate a form that can adapt itself according to an initial choice of source.

This is when we invented the generic word "*informion*" to designate the different sources of information. A narrative is an informion, a book is an informion, a paper is an informion, well at least they are in our database and our QGis interface.

Figure 1. List of glossaries.

So we have informions, and we have other types of data in our tables, i.e. what we call the parameters and the glossaries. As mentioned above in the users description the glossaries contain the possible answers to questions when there is a limited list of possible answers, they typically are what we see in dropdown lists. These are important because they somehow limit the freedom of the user, in order to avoid apparently different answers which are in fact synonyms, or out of topic answers. Let's remind here that no question in our tool is mandatory and the tool is made to record *meta*data only.

5.2.8 The locations in the *informions*

So we are here talking about the possibility to document field studies taking into account the spatial dimension. The informions therefore (usually) have a location and it took us time to decide what would be the 'place' of this geographical dimension, i.e. what location to record, and above all what would be its meaning for the informion. Is it the place were the surveyor would have met the respondent ? The place where lives the respondent ? A place the respondent is talking about ? And in this case, what if the respondent talks about a country or the planet ?

We have answered these unsolvable questions by creating a '&-to-n' relation between the informions and the locations, and we allow thus to associate one single informion to several places. We have also added the possibility to specify the spatial dimension of the place; is it a point or an area ? And if it's an area it is possible to specify it's size. Finally we have added the possibility to link the places together in a sequence, in order to represent a journey, like for instance the migration of a refugee.

Places also have their own characteristics, such as a description of the environment, the place (birth place, residence, work place, ...) in the interviewee's life, a name, sensitivity to climate change, etc.

As said above the metadata model developed in WP 4.2 lists an important number of attributes, but these are now shared between informions and locations.

5.2.9 Using the tool

On opening the project (the QGIS project) the user sees the map showing his/her work area and the already recorded information and places. There is also a background map which can be chosen and modified by the user, the places have labels. There is also a panel listing the layers composing the map set and the actions that the user can do.

The main actions are :

- Create/Record a new informion ;
- Edit/Check/Add an informion (but not its location) ;
- Edit/Check/Add a location.



Figure 2. The main canvas of QGIS showing the Morbihan study site and the panel.

So the user can record, modify or delete the collected information in different ways, and also of course check the stored information by clicking on a symbol on the map. Doing so a form will open and display the data. The same form can be used to edit or create new items.



Figure 3. The informion form has many tabs grouping the different types of data to record.



Figure 4. Describing the collection circumstances.

Places can have different roles in an informion (Figure 5), and additionally to their specificities they can be part of a sequence like for instance they can be stopovers in a journey, like for refugees but not necessarily, the sequence can be anything. This can be recorded by giving a sequential number to them. The system will sort them and draw a line connecting all the stopovers for a same informion (Figure 6 and Figure 7).



Figure 5. Recording a new location for an existing informion.



Figure 6. Specifying the journey's stopover for a place in an informion.



Figure 7. A journey made by connecting several stopover places.

5.2.10 Conclusion on mapping narratives

Over the course of the project, we completely recreated the tool several times before reaching this final state, and we feel that we now have something that reflects the data collection work of the anthropologists in the project quite well, and thus could be used in the future for similar work. Above all, it is a very flexible and versatile architecture, which allows for a certain diversity of uses.

When the data are recorded and when they are found in a large enough quantity, it could be envisaged to carry out statistical analyses taking into account the spatial dimension.

6 DISSEMINATION AND VALORISATION

The CoCliServ project website sits at http://cocliserv.cearc.fr/

A poster presenting the project and its output is available from the CoCliServ website: http://cocliserv.cearc.fr/sites/cocliserv.cearc.fr/files/resultats/CoCliServ%20Poster.pdf

Toward the project mid-term, each workpackage of the project has been briefly outlined in an information booklet which can be found on the project website. WP4, which covered Tasks 4.2 and 4.3, has been described in Booklet n° 9 : http://cocliserv.cearc.fr/sites/cocliserv.cearc.fr/files/resultats/CoCliServ_IB9-WP4.pdf

The outcome of CoCliServ Tasks 4.2 and 4.3 is presented in a joint document combining Deliverables D4.2 – *Lessons learned from documenting, with metadata, local information* – and D4.3 – *Lessons learned from using mapping and geo referencing for the representation of local climate information* (Peeters et al., 2021).

As part of Deliverable D6.4 (*Online curriculum and training material*), this work has been the object of two pedagogic videos shot in June 2021, which will be made available on the project website.

From March to September 2020, this work has been used and developed at UVSQ, in a thesis work by Caroline Amrom, *Implementation of a value based approach for the analysis of semi-structured interviews and Reflexion on the registration of social data on Qgis tool*.

7 PUBLICATIONS

In 2020, CoCliServ partners have published four papers relating to specific activities within the project in a special issue of Climate Risk Management (Climate Risk Management, Volume 28, 2020): Marschütz et al., 2020; Krauß, 2020; Wildschut & Zijp, 2020; Krauß & Bremer, 2020.

8 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to all our CoCliServ partners for the stimulating conversations that have shaped our work together.

We thank Belspo and the ERA4CS programme coordination team for supporting this work.

9 REFERENCES

Bolson, J., & Broad, K. (2013). Early adoption of climate information: lessons learned from South Florida water resource management. Weather, Climate, and society, 5, 266-281.

Buizer, J., Jacobs, K., & Cash, D. (2016). Making short-term climate forecasts useful: Linking science and action. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 113, 4597-4602.

Cash, D. W., Borck, J. C., & Patt, A. G. (2006). Countering the loading-dock approach to linking science and decision making comparative analysis of El Niño/Southern Oscillation (ENSO) forecasting systems. Science, Technology & Human Values, 31, 465-494.

Caquard, S. (2011). Cartography I: Mapping narrative cartography, Progress in Human Geography. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0309132511423796

Caquard, S., & Dimitrova, S. (2017). Story Maps & Co. Un état de l'art de la cartographie des récits sur Internet/Story Maps & Co. The state of the art of online narrative cartography. Mappemonde, 121. http://mappemonde.mgm.fr/121_as1/#englishversion

Dilling, L., & Lemos, M. C. (2011). Creating usable science: Opportunities and constraints for climate knowledge use and their implications for science policy. Global environmental change, 21(2), 680-689.

Eaton, B., Gregory, J., Drach, B., Taylor, K., Hankin, S., Blower, J., Caron, J., Signell, R., Bentley, P., Rappa, G., Höck, H., Pamment, A., Juckes, M., Raspaud, M., Horne, R., Whiteaker, T., Blodgett, D., Zender, C., & Lee, D. (2020). NetCDF Climate and Forecast (CF) Metadata Conventions, Version 1.8. https://cfconventions.org/Data/cf-conventions/cf-conventions-1.8/cf-conventions.pdf

Hegger, D., Lamers, M., Van Zeijl-Rozema, A., & Dieperink, C. (2012). Conceptualising joint knowledge production in regional climate change adaptation projects: success conditions and levers for action. Environmental Science & Policy, 18, 52-65.

Kirchhoff, C. J., Lemos, M. C., & Dessai, S. (2013). Actionable knowledge for environmental decision making: broadening the usability of climate science. Annual review of environment and resources, 38, 393.

Krauß, W. (2020). Narratives of change and the co-development of services for action. Climate Risk Management, 28, 100217. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crm.2020.100217

Krauß, W., & Bremer, S. (2020). The role of place-based narratives of change in climate risk governance. Climate Risk Management, 28, 100221. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crm.2020.100221

Lemos, M. C., & Morehouse, B. J. (2005). The co-production of science and policy in integrated climate assessments. Global environmental change, 15, 57-68.

Lemos, M. C., Kirchhoff, C. J., & Ramprasad, V. (2012). Narrowing the climate information usability gap. Nature Climate Change, 2, 789-794.

Lorenz, S., Dessai, S., Forster, P. M., & Paavola, J. (2017). Adaptation planning and the use of climate change projections in local government in England and Germany. *Regional environmental change*, *17*(2), 425–435. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-016-1030-3.

Lövbrand, E. (2011). Co-producing European climate science and policy: a cautionary note on the making of useful knowledge. Science and Public Policy, 38, 225-236.

Lowrey, J. L., Ray, A. J., & Webb, R. S. (2009). Factors influencing the use of climate information by Colorado municipal water managers. Climate Research, 40, 103-119.

McNie, E. C. (2012). Delivering climate services: organizational strategies and approaches for producing useful climate-science information. Weather, Climate, and Society, 5, 14-26.

Marschütz, B., Bremer, S., Runhaar, H., Hegger, D., Mees, H., Vervoort, J., & Wardekker, A. (2020). Local narratives of change as an entry point for building urban climate resilience. Climate Risk Management, 28, 100223. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crm.2020.100223

Mauser, W., Klepper, G., Rice, M., Schmalzbauer, B. S., Hackmann, H., Leemans, R., & Moore, H. (2013). Transdisciplinary global change research: the co-creation of knowledge for sustainability. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 5(3), 420-431.

Moss, R. H., Meehl, G. A., Lemos, M. C., Smith, J. B., Arnold, J. R., Arnott, J. C., ... & Wilbanks, T. J. (2013). Hell and high water: practice-relevant adaptation science. Science, 342, 696-698.

Peeters, D., De Rudder, A., Baztan, J., & Da Cunha, C. (2021). Lessons learned from documenting, with metadata, local information. Lessons learned from using mapping and geo referencing for the representation of local climate information. CoCliServ Deliverables D4.2 and D4.3.

Peuquet, D. J., & Marble, D. F. (1990), Introductory Readings In Geographic Information Systems, CRC Press.

Smith-Yoshimura, K. (2011). Social Metadata for Libraries, Archives, and Museums: Executive Summary. Dublin, Ohio: OCLC Research. http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/library/2012/2012-02.pdf

Vivant, E., Ozdirlik, B., & Arab, N. (2014). L'artiste, la carte et le territoire : détourner et retourner les représentations, Belgeo, 3. http://journals.openedition.org/belgeo/13286 ; https://doi.org/10.4000/belgeo.13286

Wildschut, D., & Zijp, H. (2020). The discoveries of citizens running around. Climate Risk Management, 28, 100225. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crm.2020.100225

ANNEX - COCLISERV METADATA FOR NARRATIVES

The table below displays the CoCliServ narrative metadata scheme, as agreed at the end of the project. The last two columns in the table provide two examples, which are entirely fictive. They were made up to provide the project partners with a flavour of what metadata fields are and how they can be used. The fields are divided in two categories: contextual information documents the conditions in which the considered narrative was collected (top lines in the table). Analytical information refers to elements of knowledge conveyed by the narrative itself (bottom lines in the table).

All free fields may be left empty (i.e. with no value).

Fictive examples

	Definition / explanation	Field name	Sub-field name		*Additional info & technical aspects*	Example 1	Example 2
Contextual information	*CoCliServ site to which the object (narrative) relates.*	CoCliServ site			*To be picked in list of five: Bryggen (Bergen), Isle of Dordrecht, Wadden Sea, Gulf of Morbihan, Saint-Pierre/Kerourien (Brest).*	Isle of Dordrecht	Gulf of Morbihan
	Identification of the entity or object described by the metadata.	Object	CoCliServ code name		*Automatically generated upon metadata submission.*	DO001	MO002
			nature		*To be picked in a list.* *Only "narrative" is possible for the moment. Other categories (e.g. "scenario", "milestone") may be added at a later stage.*	narrative	narrative
	CoCliServ dataset to which the described object directly belongs.	Parent dataset			*Automatically generated upon metadata submission.*	CoCliServ Dordrecht Narratives	CoCliServ Morbihan Narratives
		Collector(s)	Collector 1	name	*It could be several people…*	Arjan Wardekker	Charlotte Da Cunha

Definition / explanation	**Field name**	**Sub-field name**	*Additional info & technical aspects*	**Example 1**	**Example 2**
Info on who collected the narrative.		institution	*… and several institutions.*	Copernicus Institute of Sustainable Development	Université de Versailles Saint-Quentin-en-Yvelines
Info on the circumstances when the narrative was collected.	Collection circumstances	location name		City Library Dordrecht	Gulf of Morbihan
		extreme Western longitude	*In decimal degrees, modulo 360.* *May be provided as a pair of coordinates (longitude, latitude), i.e. as a dot on a map, or as the coordinates of the corners of a rectangular bounding box (min & max longitude, min & max latitude).* ***The coordinates of the dot or bounding box may be** directly provided or **derived automatically from drawing on an interactive map.***	4,69	-2,98
		extreme Eastern longitude		4,69	-2,70
		extreme Southern latitude		51,81	47,53
		extreme Northern latitude		51,81	47,65
		area name			Britany
		country	*ISO 3166/MA English short name or Alpha-2 code: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ISO_3166-1*	Netherlands	France
		date	*Gregorian calendar.* *dd.mm.yyyy*	17.06.2018	18.06.2018
		start time	*hh:mm* *Local time. Or do we prefer UT?*	14:00	14:00
		end time		16:00	17:00
		occasion		Bibliographic research.	Boat trip.

	Definition / explanation	Field name	Sub-field name	*Additional info & technical aspects*	Example 1	Example 2
	Reference(s) of any standard procedure or ad hoc professional protocol followed in collecting the narrative, whether internal or external to the CoCliServ project.	Applicable document(s)	Reference 1	*Several documents may be applicable.*	CoCliServ WP1 – M1.1. Dordrecht – Protocol for initial mapping of narratives, January 2018.	CoCliServ WP1 – M1.1. DRAFT protocol for the Initial mapping and In-depth analysis of narratives for the Gulf of Morbihan study site, January 2018.
	Information on who enunciated (uttered, wrote) the narrative.	Narrator / group of narrators	name or nickname		Cornelis de Witt	Chirp
			age	*[Years].*	49	37
			professional activity		attorney, soldier	accountant
			solicited (interviewed or invoked) as		Mayor of Dordrecht	bird watcher
			additional relevant information		Accompanied Lieutenant-Admiral Michiel de Ruyter in his raids against the British fleet on River Medway (June 1667) and at Sole Bay (June 1672).	

	Definition / explanation	Field name	Sub-field name	*Additional info & technical aspects*	Example 1	Example 2
	Info on the circumstances when the narrative was enunciated, i.e. uttered or written. These may be identical to the circumstances when the narrative was collected, e.g. for interviews. They may be different from the former in situations where the narrative existed before it was collected, e.g. for press articles.	Production circumstances	location name		Den Haag	Gulf of Morbihan
			extreme Western longitude	*See above.*	4,19	-2,98
			extreme Eastern longitude		4,42	-2,70
			extreme Southern latitude		52,01	47,53
			extreme Northern latitude		52,13	47,65
			area name			Britany
			country	*Where relevant, ISO 3166/MA English short name or Alpha-2 code: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ISO_3166-1*	Republiek der Zeven Verenigde Nederlanden	France
			date	*Gregorian calendar. dd.mm.yyyy - or Month yyyy - or yyyy*	July 1672	18.06.2018
			start time	*See above.*		14:00
			end time			17:00
			occasion		Author's imprisonment by the Orangist party after the battle of Solebay.	Boat trip.

	Definition / explanation	Field name	Sub-field name	*Additional info & technical aspects*	Example 1	Example 2
	Features that characterise the situation of the narrator, or of the collectivity, or place, or period of time where he/she is immersed (e.g. familial conditions, way of life, socio-economic characteristics of her/his city, historical background).	Thematic context		*This field does not target the theme(s) tackled by the narrative, which are supposed to be captured by the summary and keywords.*	Holland's commercial Golden Age. Naval war between the Dutch and allied English and French fleets. Orange party conspiracy.	Farming (breeders, fishermen, oyster farmers, etc.).
	Language in which the narrative is expressed.	Language		*Using the ISO norm 639-1 - see https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liste_des_codes_ISO_639-1*	nl	fr
	Medium on which the narrative is recorded (sound recording, written notes, print, …).	Medium	format		manuscript	sound recording
			bibliographic reference		de Witt, C., Overwegingen over het belang van zeestrijdkrachten voor de welvaart van onze goede Staten van Holland, monograph, Dordrecht, 28 July 1672.	

	Definition / explanation	Field name	Sub-field name		*Additional info & technical aspects*	Example 1	Example 2
Analytical information	*Summary of the narrative or principal themes tackled by the narrator.*	Synthetic abstract or principal themes				A powerful fleet warrants commercial prosperity. Peace with France benefits the Dutch people. Johan de Witt has been a clever Raadpensionaris.	Modifications in the usual life mode and journey of migratory birds may be related to local or remote possible climate changes.
	Keyword : word or expression conveying a concept or denoting a fact identified by the collector as a particularly significant component of the narrative. It may but must not be a recurrent term used by the narrator.	Keyword(s)	Keyword 1		*As many keywords as desired may be provided. A keyword may be picked in the list of previously proposed keywords or added to the list. Keywords to be provided in English unless they refer to some concept specifically meaningful in the native language.*	Dutch history	bird
			Keyword 2			*Gouden Eeuw*	aquatic birds
			Keyword 3			Anglo-Dutch war	migratory birds
			Keyword 4			French-Dutch war	ecology
			Keyword 5			naval battle	climate change impact
			Keyword 6			trade	
	Places to which the narrative relates (a building,a neighbourhood, a	Place(s)	Place 1	place name		Sole Bay	Gulf of Morbihan

	Definition / explanation	Field name	Sub-field name		*Additional info & technical aspects*	Example 1	Example 2
	city, region, country, a mountain, a continent,…).			extreme Western longitude	*See above.*	1,67	-2,98
				extreme Eastern longitude		1,67	-2,70
				extreme Southern latitude		52,31	47,53
				extreme Northern latitude		52,31	47,65
				area name		Suffolk	Britany
				country	*See above.*	GB	France
			Place 2	place name		Dordrecht	Marais de Séné
				extreme Western longitude	*See above.*	4,69	-2,78
				extreme Eastern longitude		4,69	-2,69
				extreme Southern latitude		51,81	47,59
				extreme Northern latitude		51,81	47,66
				area name			Gulf of Morbihan
				country	*See above.*	Netherlands	France

Definition / explanation	Field name	Sub-field name		*Additional info & technical aspects*	Example 1	Example 2
		Place 3	place name		Republiek der Zeven Verenigde Nederlanden	
			extreme Western longitude	*See above.*	3,34	
			extreme Eastern longitude		7,22	
			extreme Southern latitude		51,01	
			extreme Northern latitude		53,59	
			area name			
			country	*See above.*	Republiek der Zeven Verenigde Nederlanden	
Explicit or implicit (i.e. derived by collector from the narrator's words) mention of - or allusion to - the future and/or climate.	Mention of the future	desired future		*Answer: "Yes" or "No".* *If yes, explicit or implicit?* *NB Past, present and future refer to nowadays as the present (not necessarily the narrator's present).*	yes, explicit	yes, explicit
		feared future			yes, explicit	yes, explicit
		without hope or fear overtone			no	no
	Mention of climate	past climate			yes, implicit	yes, explicit
		present climate			no	yes, explicit
		possible future climate impacts			no	yes, explicit
Does the narrative suggest anything	Potential for a hinge point	unclear		*One of the 3 options "Unclear", "No" and "Yes" must be ticked.*		
		no				

	Definition / explanation	Field name	Sub-field name		*Additional info & technical aspects*	Example 1	Example 2
	that might be used as (or result in) a hinge point in the future development of the case study area? *If so, is the key agent related to climate? Can it be controlled?*		yes	climate-related	*If "Yes", one of the 3 options about climate must be picked.*		
				not climate-related			
				relationship to climate undecidable			
				can be controlled	*If "Yes", one of the 3 options about the possibility of control must be picked.*		
				cannot be controlled			
				control possibility unclear			
	Explicit mention, in the narrative, of a meteorological parameter (e.g. temperature, wind direction or speed, relative humidity), a meteorological phenomenon (e.g. rainfall) or a meteorological event (e.g. flood). The mention can arise as a general statement (e.g. on the frequency or intensity of extreme events), a	Mention of meteorological physical parameter	air temperature		*To be ticked if relevant.*		
			sea surface temperature				
			soil temperature				
			air humidity				
			cloudiness				
			precipitation (rainfall, snow, hail)			☐	
			wind (speed and/or direction)			☐	
		Mention of climate-related phenomenon, event or landscape feature	storm(s)			☐	
			drought(s)				
			natural fire(s)				
			flood(s)				
			freshwater, river system				

	Definition / explanation	Field name	Sub-field name		*Additional info & technical aspects*	Example 1	Example 2
	particular story (e.g. the winter of 1947), a hypothesis, a question, a wish of information, etc.		sea level				
			coast line				
			salinity				
			other	please state			
	Same as above but for aspects of plant life, animal life, human life which are explicitly connected, in the narrative, to climate or climate change.	Mention of life aspect in relation to climate	air quality		*To be ticked if relevant.*		
			water supply				
			agriculture				
			food supply				
			energy supply				
			ecology				
			vegetation, forestry				
			animal life				
			health				
			economy				
			education				
			culture				
			human population density				
			human migration				
			peace				
			politics				
			other	please state			
	When existing, mentioned types	Knowledge types on which	type 1	knowledge type	*Free text*		

	Definition / explanation	**Field name**	**Sub-field name**		*Additional info & technical aspects*	**Example 1**	**Example 2**
	of knowledge used in analysing and/or predicting the future of the site, with the reasons why the knowledge is trusted and whether it is recognised to be uncertain.	analysis and/or prediction of the site future is based		reasons for trust	*Free text*		
				identified uncertainties	*Free text*		
			type 2	knowledge type	*Free text*		
				reasons for trust	*Free text*		
				identified uncertainties	*Free text*		
			type 3	knowledge type	*Free text*		
				reasons for trust	*Free text*		
				identified uncertainties	*Free text*		
	Does the narrator refer to any knowledge quality issues or criteria?	Knowledge quality aspects	mentioned knowledge quality criteria		*Free text*		
			mentioned knowledge issues		*Free text*		
	Excerpts from the narrative, judged interesting by the collector according to his/her own criteria or analysis perspective (illustrative	Quotes	Quote 1		*As many quotes as desired.* *Should we keep the quotes in their original language?*	We won at Sole Bay.	Birds, marvellous birds.
			Quote 2			My brother is not a treator.	A redshank ringed in Séné has been located in Iceland two years later.

	Definition / explanation	**Field name**	**Sub-field name**		*Additional info & technical aspects*	**Example 1**	**Example 2**
	quality, pertinence, meaningfulness, poetical quality, sense of humour, …).		Quote 3			Long life to the States of Holland.	We fear that level rise will make marshes disappear and sweep swamp life away.
		ADDITIONAL FIELDS ?					