



# Climate City Dash 2.0

## MUNICH, DORTMUND & HEIDELBERG, GERMANY

### Emissions domains addressed by the Pilot Activity



Consumption of non-electricity energy for thermal uses in buildings & facilities



Multi-sector waste management & disposal



Land use (agriculture, forestry & other land uses)



Consumption of electricity generated for buildings, facilities & infrastructure



Industrial process emissions



All vehicles & transport (mobile energy)

### Key Terms

Climate dashboards | ClimateView platform | Stakeholder engagement | Co-creation | Data governance | Emissions inventory | Scenario modelling | Quadruple helix | Multi-city collaboration

### Levers of Change

Data and Digitalisation | Democracy and participation | Financing and funding | Governance and policy | Learning and capabilities

### Description of the Pilot Activity

Climate City Dash 2.0 enhances climate action through digitalisation of climate data using ClimateView's dashboard platform, combined with comprehensive stakeholder engagement and co-creation processes. The three German cities work together to improve emissions inventories, scenario modelling, and action catalogues while engaging urban stakeholders (companies, civil society, science) in co-designing climate action portfolios.

### Year One Highlights

Climate City Dash 2.0 brought together three German cities at very different starting points — a design choice that created complexity but also comparative insight that a single-city pilot could not generate. Dashboard V1.0 was completed across all three cities. Munich built a multi-year emissions inventory covering 2018–2022 and began scenario and action development. Dortmund and Heidelberg, working from existing dashboards, focused on refining data, scenarios, and actions. Stakeholder mapping was completed using influence/interest matrices tailored to each city, and data governance was defined: all three cities concluded that direct platform access should be restricted to responsible municipal departments, with external stakeholders engaging through interpreted outputs rather than the platform itself. Stakeholder onboarding events varied in scale — Munich's kick-off drew 70+ participants across nine thematic tables, Heidelberg engaged 57 participants from 43 organisations, and Dortmund conducted smaller workshops and company visits. Training sessions covered outcome logic, intervention mapping, data structuring, and platform navigation.

Two honest challenges shaped the year. First, the cities' different starting points, priorities, and capacities made joint definitions unworkable — the consortium moved to city-specific definitions for dashboard versions, accepting that flexibility matters more than standardisation across contexts. Second, limited data availability in sectors like retrofitting, transport, and vehicle fleets affected all three cities, reinforcing that data gaps are a structural challenge for climate dashboard projects, not an implementation failure.

### Innovation Highlights

The multi-city structure enables comparative learning that single-city implementation cannot: three cities tackling the same tool in different contexts generates insights about what is context-specific and what is transferable. The dashboard is being used across four defined functions — emissions analysis, system conversion planning, measure design, and monitoring — rather than as a general-purpose platform, which sharpens its utility. The project's honest reckoning with data governance provides insights on what climate data platforms can realistically deliver in practice.

### Twinning with Reggio Emilia (Italy)

The exchange provided insights into urban climate measures such as public space redesign and park preservation. The pilot shared knowledge on ClimateView use, data aggregation, and stakeholder engagement. While interesting, there were limited direct connections to dashboard improvement work — the main value was practice examples for stakeholder engagement in nature-based urban projects.

