



**FCERM Strategy 2050 Ambition Working Group
Face to face workshop 24 September 2018
10:30 – 15:30**

Meeting objectives

- Understand the latest position on the development of the FCERM Strategy and the timeline
- Have reviewed the strategic ideas and ambition statements
- Understand the next steps in the development of the strategy
- Have provided suggestions for ongoing engagement

Strategy Update

Clare Dinnis provided an update on development of the FCERM Strategy, followed by discussion:

- The group discussed how the comments from the working group will link with Environment Agency and Defra (i.e. senior input from Ministers, John Curtin etc.?)
- The group discussed the approvals process for the strategy and Defra Policy Statement
- There are different levels of information: ambition > ideas > actions (but not focusing on actions today)
- The Environment Agency will be focusing on Flood Risk Management Plans (FRMPs) and River Basin Management Plans (RBMPs), so tactical actions won't be lost because they will support these. The timing for this is good.
- The group discussed how far the strategy will go in terms of policy. There will be 5-10 year actions that must be deliverable in current policy framework. There can be actions to consider in future policy options.
- The group discussed the timeline not showing other partners/boards (e.g. ADEPT). This engagement has been completed because of Advisory Group input.
- The Group discussed how existing policy and legislative framework may constrain the strategy and how the strategy will also be a game changer (in line with 25 Year Environment Plan):
 - Next 5-10 years actions are constrained

- 2°C legislation is a ministerial decision
- Beyond the next 5-10 years is about game changes
- The strategy should not be contradictory to 25 Year Environment Plan
- Environment Agency role now is to check strategy is ambitious
- We should present things as overtly linked to 25 Year Environment Plan.
- The consultation should link to 25 Year Environment Plan.

Reviewing the strategic ideas

The key areas were discussed in table groups. Each group reviewed the strategic ideas (in the table below) in relation to their key area.

There four key areas as well as an additional discussion on challenges and gaps:

1. One stop shop for flooding
2. Societal values/behavioural change
3. Place-based decision making
4. Climate resilience and adaptation
5. Challenges and Gaps

All references to strategic ideas are provided in brackets within these notes and relate to the numbering set out in the table below.

<p>1. Climate (flood) resilience is built into the fabric of society as standard</p>	<p>a. We will work with government and industry to ensure all community infrastructure (transport, power, houses, hospitals, schools etc.) is built with climate (flood) resilience incorporated so social and economic impact is minimised.</p> <p>b. We will work together to develop and implement a framework for local flood strategies that provide clarity about the service people can expect – including openness about the areas that will not be protected (cross link to 4).</p> <p>c. Working with all those who make decisions about place (local authorities, developers, land-owners etc.), we will ensure planning for place-based community infrastructure includes consideration of water as standard and supports sustainable growth.</p>
<p>2. Communities, businesses and individuals are empowered and supported to be involved in decisions about their local area</p>	<p>a. All Risk Management Authorities will have a presumption of community involvement and appropriate time and resource to support this. They will also ensure communities unable to contribute are not disadvantaged.</p> <p>b. We will seek to influence societal acceptance of water management as a valued service affected by natural events. We will create a programme which supports behaviour change by providing education tools for schools through to continually developing skills and understanding across society and professionals (cross link to 5).</p> <p>c. All Risk Management Authorities value communities’ knowledge about their local area in their decision making and work with them to build skills and help people to help themselves.</p>
<p>3. Flood recovery works in a way that reduces the fear of the unavoidable consequences of flooding</p>	<p>a. The insurance industry incentivises properties with measures designed to aid swift and efficient recovery from flooding.</p> <p>b. We ensure that X% of those who are flooded can be back in their home or business within X days. [As per NCC report, but which metrics?]</p>
<p>4. Everyone has clear expectations of the service they</p>	<p>a. Risk Management Authorities use a basket of measures to deliver a holistic standard of service on flooding and coastal change for all sources of flooding and all communities.</p>

can expect on flooding and coastal change	b. Risk Management Authorities protect our core cities to a X% level of service. [As per NIA, but which metrics?]
5. We strengthen and grow the 'flood and coastal change family' to provide a cohesive service across all sources of flooding	<p>a. The Environment Agency makes best use of its Strategic Overview role to bring the flood and coastal change family together and work collaboratively to deliver this strategy.</p> <p>b. We put in place strong assurance on delivery of actions, holding one another to account and reporting with influence through the S18 process. [Penalties?]</p> <p>c. Risk Management Authorities will be seen as providing a cohesive flooding and coastal change service – a one stop shop – with seamless language and delivery across organisational boundaries.</p>
6. The environment is protected, valued, respected and used to reduce flood and coastal risk, support community wellbeing and support natural capital	<p>a. We will work with land owners and managers to ensure decisions about land-use are made to reduce risk and achieve multiple benefits that support the environment, economy and society.</p> <p>b. All Risk Management Authorities will ensure that we take a full catchment and coastal approach to reducing flood risk, working from source to sea, and using natural capital to demonstrate the value this brings to individuals, society and the economy (cross link to 1).</p> <p>c. We will ensure that protecting places from flooding leads to a net gain for the environment and biodiversity by using natural flood risk management measures and protecting and restoring natural habitat.</p>

Specific comments on strategic ideas

- Add 'social' to 6: "...support community wellbeing and support natural, social capital"
- Add 'rural areas' and '(everyone, including communities)' to 4b
- Add: "4c. Developing and using metrics that reflect people's wellbeing, rather than the property over the long term" to strategic idea 4
- Add: "2d. People are equal partners. Investing their social capital is an important precursor to place based action" to strategic idea 2
- Amend 1c to read: "...we will ensure planning for place-based community infrastructure includes water as a key ingredient as standard and supports"
- Amend 1a to read: "...is built with climate (flood) resilience incorporated so social, environmental and economic impact is minimised and opportunities are maximised opportunities are maximised transparency"
- Add: "1b...for local flood strategies that provide clarity and transparency about the service people can expect..."

Key Issues

One stop shop for flooding

- Importance of cohesion
- Accountability and assurance is key
- Lessons from water industry outcome model
- It's about behaviour, not governance/architecture
- More than just an IT session
- Should come from everyone

- Leadership required
- Coastal change too
- Should 6b comment be before 6a? (a is part of c) (6)
- Who is 'we'? Particularly on 1C (1c)
- Is it a one stop shop for everything? What are we selling? What do we mean by one stop shop? A façade to make things join up or joining things up?
- Should 4 and 5 be merged? Both about providing a service. (4, 5)

Do any of the ideas conflict with the steer provided?

- Other organisations know much more about certain types flooding (5a)
- Remove “by providing education tools for schools through to continually developing skills and understanding across society and professionals (cross link to 5)” – too technical (2b)
- “They will also ensure communities unable to contribute are not disadvantaged” – dubious (2a)
- Not very holistic (4b) so perhaps drop strategic idea 4?

Are there any ideas missing?

- We do not have a level playing field – we all do this differently (5b)
- How are local authorities judged on other things? E.g. Ofsted health regulation is there a role for a regulator? (5b)
- Advisory Group, what are their powers? (5a)
- Adaptation needs to be written throughout (1)
- Tangible targets should be included (1)
- Can one stop shop help with R&D/measures that help meet this target?
- Something missing about providing it (2c)
- Future after Floodre is missing (3)

Societal values/behavioural change

- What do we actually want to achieve?
- Need to understand what drives behaviour around water and flooding
- Big area to focus on is home owning/buying
- Can insurance help us by driving down premiums for the right choices?
- Needs to be talked about with care!
- How to get people involved in place/space decision
- Long term FCERM strategies need to be holistic. Partnership funding – think about wider picture in space and place
- Time and resource to build social capital – so communities can support
- Structures – process need to be in place where place based decision making is transparent and accountable
- Community economic resilience:
 - We should focus on disadvantaged communities
 - Level of FCERM strategy should be focused on the overall impact
- Focus on disadvantage and the consequential impacts across communities. Those less able to help themselves should be better supported.

- Need to add a separate point on transparency (5)
- Add metrics – based on recovery for people
- Governance also strongly linked to this steer
- Place based decision making can only be made by societal value and behavioural changes
- Add people are equal partners, investing in their social capital (2)
- Empowerment: to be empowered people need to be equal partners (2)

Do any of the ideas conflict with the steer provided?

- Wording needs to be addressed to make more inclusive, conflict with value/behavioural marriage (2b)
- Add environmental impact (2b)

Are there any ideas missing?

- Drivers steer – becomes part of our drivers for change for values and behaviours
 - Societal values need to be wider. Include everyone, including those who are at less risk.
 - Including individuals i.e. permeable paving, solicitors. Needs to be set in wider context.
 - Narrative needs to be set out early. Water has effect on all, we all need to make difference.
- Behaviours – all organisations who have role to play working together
- Strategic idea – invest in building social capital: different from going into communities and asking them to act (2b)
- Social capital – invest in this before we ask for anything else
- Opportunities are maximised (1a)
- Remove “consideration of” (1c)
- Add: “Develop metrics that reflect people’s wellbeing rather than impacts to property etc. focus on communities” (3c)
- Add: “Rural areas (everyone including communities) (4b)

Place-based decision making

- Vital to have
- Process and behaviour, not structure
- Is our house really in order? Do we really think about place?
- Don’t want a strategic framework that drives daft solutions at local level
- Not just about water – also other infrastructure that makes communities work
- There’s lots we could use better (LEPs, local plans etc.)
- The ideas seem quite obvious and are things we should be doing already so the strategy should address why we aren’t doing them
- For the coast, what we mean by ‘place’? Need to work this out.
- Question over ‘metrics’ and how helpful they are? Strategy can still drive priorities even if no metrics e.g. 300,000 homes target is driving actions which

aren't necessarily the best thing to do now – bad decisions. May need to be more outcome rather than output focused?

- Remove 'from source to sea' (6b)
- New models now e.g. combined authorities (Manchester, Cambridge, Oxford) are good practice for place-based decision making
- Why isn't it happening? Governance, inability to step back and look at it holistically

Do any of the ideas conflict with the steer provided?

- How can the Environment Agency do this in the context of 'place'? current processes don't sit well with place-based decision making – looking through an FCERM lens (5a)
- Focus is individual property level rather than 'place' (3b)
- This would drive expenditure and management into a very small subset of the community (3b)
- It is useful to have metrics in the strategy, but be careful they don't drive the wrong actions. Often based on FCERM, rather than place (3b)
- Can't restrict the 'places' to a relatively small % of places (4b)
- Why should core cities take precedent? It's an economic argument but is contradictory to strategic idea 3 (reduces the fear) (4b)
- Could say 'protect all of our places' (4b)
- Holistic management (4b)
- How do we tie actions together in a place and hold each other to account? (5b)

Are there any ideas missing?

- Coastal change is missing from the ideas
- Strategic idea 4 is about standards but doesn't capture the issues around communities we can't protect (e.g. community empowerment) (4)
- Make sure the community isn't just seen as local residents – it's also businesses, infrastructure and environment (not just homes) (2c)
- Include funding sources in this idea, i.e. a basket of measures and funding sources (4a)
- 'Innovative funding' needs to be included
 - Concept of a major funding from a city to give opportunities to build a business – place-based
 - New ways of thinking
 - A proportion of future wealth could fund schemes

Climate resilience and adaptation

- Going to be challenging to deliver on ambition
- Practical and fundable scheme required
- Has to be ambitious/aspirational
- Not just about carbon, need to focus on whole climate mitigation story
- What are local flood strategies? (1b)

- Need to add 'coast' (1b)
- FRMPs/5MPs are the 'plans'? (1b)
- Why use 'water' and not flood and climate change – scope creep? (1c)
- Community involvement – need to be clear on what is 'community' and what this means and what community can influence. What is government or local provision? (2a)
- 'Water management' how much of the strategy will be as wide as water management. Needs a clear flood and coast focus (2b)
- As an example, are 'strategic ideas' the same as 'principles' – a way of working rather than a big idea/action (2c)
- See above – principle should be a given or change wording (5a/5c)
- Need to ensure climate resilience in place through existing assurance e.g. funding (5b)

Do any of the ideas conflict with the steer provided?

- Resilience should not lead to efficient recovery – agree with idea but add: "...aid. Swift and efficient recovery from recover" and add in resilience in wording. Incentivises bad decisions. (3a)
- Great idea and tangible but is it deliverable without other ideas being in place. Should it be place-based rather than 'one size fits all' (3b)
- What is a 'holistic' standard of service we don't want to keep everything dry all of the time. Not clear what this idea would result in (4a)
- This is not resilience and adaptation! 'Protect' is unrealistic and not something that should be promoted. Also risk levels are evolving, due to climate change, too quickly to make this a sensible ambition (4b)
- If this refers to adverse risk – be clear. Resilience can lead to increased risk where appropriate, some locations getting wetter or more often (6a)
- Missing coastal change (again!) (6c)
- About reducing risk, not protection (some places will get wetter or be allowed to erode or change) (6c)

Are there any ideas missing?

- Need to deal with legacy of community infrastructure that is not climate change proof (retrofit, relocation, adapt) (1a)
- Needs to include coastal change (6b)

Challenges and gaps

- Have to recognise diversity of people and places
- Funding is always critical
- Look forward – but what about decisions we've made in the past that will cause problems
- Are we thinking about health and mental impacts sufficiently?
- Are the ideas about change or BAU over a longer time period?
- Standards are referred to in a couple of ideas. Funding needs to follow this.

- All of the relevant players need to be able to agree on standards due to the financial commitment required
- Need to ensure that all owners of assets in the floodplain show leadership – third party costs
- Resilience and commitments
 - Need to ensure that communities who feel they are resilient now, take action to manage future risk
- Standard of performance (RMAs) needs to continually improve to manage increasing risk. Recognising performance of assets.
- Put a value against future resilience
 - Incentivise the partnership rather than government
- Is the partnership funding approach working?
 - Are there any incentives we could use?
- Maintenance funding goes to the Environment Agency only. Other RMAs receive maintenance funding via tax
- Highways – are they the missing asset link?
- Clear expectations of service for non main river?
- Surface water missing/gap?
- Current problem – aging infrastructure that was built as a non FCERM asset is now viewed as one – resources have not followed
- Better definition of flood family needed? Define who ‘we’ is
- Future materials management – material that is being landfilled could be used as building material. All FCERM family needs to take this into account and non-flood industry
- The actions as they stand don’t take account of mental health funding – failing to pick them up because we don’t fund it

Reviewing the four key ideas – plenary comments

- Big issues and ambitions, such as resources, that we need to convey in the strategy so the minister signs it off
- Not just about the ‘document’ – it is about ways of working
- Make sure the ‘pillars’ work isn’t lost (from previous workshops)

Climate resilience – plenary comments

- Like the way we are using the word ‘risk’. Start with where we are now, and say we don’t understand the risk now
- Biggest challenge is existing build (not new build)
- Be honest about risk and that it will change, there are uncertainties

One stop shop – plenary comments

- Role of Advisory Group – good for national level but what about place-based – local? RFCCs? Okay for FCERM but often that are other non-FCERM issues so need to have discussions at strategic level
- Local authorities – very difficult to have a consistent governance structure as they are so disparate

- RFCCs don't necessarily have all RMAs represented so is an issue

Societal values/behavioural change – plenary comments

- Actions are about empowering people to be involved – but we haven't included actions about disadvantaged communities
- Need to understand balance between what the government provides and what communities provide themselves. Who is involved and what role do they plan? Need to know broader picture.

Place based decision making – plenary comments

- Metrics sit underneath an outcome. Outcome is the driver. But people can forget about the outcome – terminology is key.
- Metrics is the enemy of a holistic approach! But do need to measure progress and hold to account.
- Metrics about how people feel – wellbeing. Useful to capture.

Challenges and gaps – plenary comments

- What shapes/steers decisions making ('how to') will stifle ambition?
- Will the team check back to the postcard ideas to enable us to paint the picture for 2050?
- Who is not in the flood family? Is it anybody?
- Is safety above everything else as a priority for the strategy? How we made a conscious decision that strategy to life is the bottom line?
 - We cannot guarantee safety – not saying this. It is the primary goal, ahead of everything else.
 - We cannot protect everywhere so need to build resilience
 - Need a narrative from wider society on this, not just from the Environment Agency. Has to be trust and openness for this to work
- Funding
 - People just think Environment Agency in relation to partnership funding
 - Drives decision-making
 - It's about 'choice'
 - Community chooses to protect itself
 - How to balance place based decision making and national strategy

Ambition Pack

Ambition Statements

The group discussed the ambition statements:

A: Society acts to manage & adapt to flooding & coastal change

- Some of the ideas read like ambitions and are better worded
- Statements don't sit very well together – doing/learning/understanding/planning/odd one about place!

- Missing ambition and missing ideas – strategic, operational and tactical decisions are co-ordinated across sectors (trust, accountability, regrets, scrutiny)

Individuals & communities accept their risk & act to minimise the impact on them & others

- ‘doing’
- Don’t like the word ‘accept’ – could say ‘understand’
- It’s about organisations too – need to add

Reducing risk & consequence to people & place are factors in all decisions

- ‘understanding’
- Reducing risk and consequence is only in 4b so we need it to feature more in the ideas. Perhaps 3 or 4 goals, like the FloodRe ambition, to set the bar
- Really like the word ‘consequence’
- Who are the decision makers?

Clear information is available about risk, plans to manage it & support for worst affected communities

- ‘learning’
- Missing ideas about gathering the evidence base around surface water and ground water

Society plans for & adapts to changing risk from flooding & coastal change, climate change, population growth & more

- ‘planning’

Decision makers focus on place so all land users are considered and multiple benefits are the norm

- ‘Odd statement’
- Who are the decision makers? Not just FCERM decision makers like RFCCs, also planners etc.
- How are we going to make sure it is focused on place?
- First line is an enabler. Second line is the outcome.

B: Our economy prospers even with flooding & coastal change Incident response is swift & effective, disruption is minimised, people & businesses are back sooner

- The ambition is around response and recovery, whereas 3b is more recovery only focused
- In this version of the ambition statement the word ‘housing’ has gone missing. Need to reflect community – housing, economy etc.
- The best use of government FCERM monies to benefit communities
- The economy is not a driver for FCERM and there is no idea which closes the gap
- The ideas – could they just be replaced with the ambition statements?
- Role is managed – does not pull through into ideas

- There needs to be a balance between housing and other parts of the economy

Comments in relation to strategic ideas

- Incident response only slightly comes through (3b)
- Need to include the interdependencies between the different authorities involved in incident response (3b)

C: Our environment is valued and helps to manage flooding and coastal change

General comments

- The language feels too rigid, only real difference: net gain and natural capital.
- There needs to be changing perceptions – needed to enable changes/ambitions
- Ambitions 3/4 natural capital and net gain are ambitious – but more ambitions in 25 Year Environment Plan which isn't captured here. Net gain needs to be explicit.
- 25 Year Environment Plan and FCERM should need to align better
- Land management – what exactly needs to happen (strategic ideas)? Without specifically this we will find it difficult to meet these statements.
- Environment leads to this statement. What can environment do for FCERM, coastal risk and economy?

Comments in relation to strategic ideas

- Strategic idea 6b – RMAs are on different starting points compared to Environment Agency. Need to reflect these differences.
- Change 1c strategic ideas include land managers not landowners. Inclusive
- 1c of strategic ideas needs to be linked through-out strategic ideas 1-6

Gaps identified

- Gap: maintenance costs. The cost of having to replace/repair – NFM type interventions. NFM maintenance costs might be a blocker to these ambitions
- Gap: link between environment and economy? Coastal changes are result of climate change and are competing
- Gap: working with nature and how we're going to invest in the next decade and onwards.
- Gap: environmental change not reflected environments are changing – ambition 2 – needs rewording to reflect these changes

The environment is recognised as a tool to manage flood & coastal change & natural capital is accounted for in all decisions

- Good ambition, but needs more planned work to meet these goals. Raise the bar in the strategic ideas to meet the environmental ambition statement.

People view the environment as a resource & value it as a benefit

- Won't be as people don't see environment as a resource – ambition might not be met as result

Guiding Principles – comments from the ‘Talking Wall’

- What does ‘manage all sources of flooding and coastal change’ actually mean? IDL

Items ‘car parked’

- Resilience/Adaptation: Are FCERM Assets viewed high enough as UK infrastructure assets given the importance put on what these provide
 - Starting to feed into the ambition. And talking to the NIC about it for next NIA. Agree is important.
- Are policies and assurance guidelines being addressed to meet the ‘ambition’ set out in the strategy
 - We’re feeding in everything we’re hearing to Defra and working closely. Your feedback is definitely shaping thinking but the end product is up to ministers.
- Importance of funding the ‘right’ metrics for FCERM – 300k homes is too simple. Link to 25 Year Environment Plan metrics perhaps?
 - Agree, too simple. 25 Year Environment Plan consultation due soon and we are talking.

Actions and next steps:

ACTION	OWNER
Circulate meeting notes & upload to website	Environment Agency