



FCERM Strategy 2050 Communities & Businesses Working Group

Summary notes

Meeting – 17 July 2018

Millennium Point, Birmingham

10:30 – 15:30

Ideas for change

The main focus on the meeting was identifying ideas for change. The full list is set out in Appendix 1 of this note. Break out groups agreed key ideas and discussed these in more detail – the outcome of these discussions is in the supporting Ideas for Change document.

Ideas were generated around the following themes:

- **Communities and businesses better participate in/own FCERM**
- **Communities and businesses living with water**
- **Communication and language**
- **Accepting where communities are unsustainable in the long term and relocation**
- **Connected communities living in resilient/adaptable places and buildings**
- **Community and business involvement in incident preparation and response**
- **FCERM industry and other stakeholder support required**

Key issues highlighted through the discussion

The issue that recurred most throughout discussion related to language and definitions. Who do we mean by 'we'? What is a community? What do we mean by protect? Who sets that standard and what is the standard?

The EA agreed to work with the strategy creative writer to ensure that all working groups have a common understanding of these terms.

Guiding principles

The suggested guiding principles for the delivery of the strategy were presented to the group

- We put **people** at the heart of what we do
- We create **great places** for people and for wildlife
- We **continually improve** our understanding of risk and solutions
- We **trust** one another to deliver
- We manage **all sources** of flooding and coastal change
- We value **flexible** solutions that **adapt** to changing risk
- We are **carbon-neutral** and **climate resilient**
- We actively grow and support the range of **skills** we need
- We seek **innovative finance solutions** to fund resilience

Working together to manage flooding and coastal change

Comments received on these were as follows:

- Confusing to combine people and wildlife, instead 'create great places for multiple benefit'
- Concerns about using 'we' – communities will not feel part of this
- Who are these aimed at? Problem with 'deliver', 'delivery' (we are not talking about pizzas..) and solutions – overly complex corporate language.
- Solutions are an end result so not the right wording in this context.
- Not necessarily innovative finance, just finance but should be using more up to date technology to reach people.
- 'Trust' is earned over time. 'Supporting each other' and 'building relationships' are something we can do, trust is something we earn.
- Manage all sources – oh no you don't!
- Where is the technology?
- 'Share' and 'communicate' are missing.

Summary of evidence gaps/requirements

Case studies for using history of places (from catchment to town) to communicate flood risk and engage people (Historic England is looking to collaborate with others on this type of research).

The following questions were also raised in relation to evidence base development:

- Reference to national strategy – is it England only, is evidence from elsewhere relevant? Confirmed that the strategy is focusing on England but good practice and lessons learned from the rest of and outside of the UK will be considered and are welcomed. Particularly importance for communities and rivers that cross boundaries e.g. Usk, Wye, Severn, Dee.
- What is the timetable for the publication of the evaluation of Partnership Funding being undertaken by RPA and RHV Haskoning? Imminent – will seek confirmation from Defra/EA and confirm to all.

- The evidence base summary states: ‘Flooding is seen as a Government problem’ and ‘Communities do a lot that is not recognised’. Important to expand upon and explore these potentially contradictory statements.
- Small communities are affected by coastal erosion, affordability and long-term sustainability issues; does Government give false hope?
- Property Resilience Round Table should drive forward take up – how do we get everyone to buy into some common solutions? The Round Table should also be more involved in the process. NB: several individuals that sit on the Round Table are involved in the working groups
- Communities are not homogeneous, can’t talk about them as one entity or approach them all in the same way.
- Tools are needed to work at all scales, including small, rural.
- High risk areas – what about high risk people? People’s individual vulnerability to flood risk varies and needs to be recognised. This will be brought into the evidence base via the Joseph Rowntree Foundation Climate Change and Social Justice research portfolio.
- Interesting that communities and businesses were separated (in the evidence slides)
- Flood Re launched transition plan last week – this needs to be taken into account.
- Business in the Community are very involved with Defra Round Table discussions and very active (BiTC group should be involved).

Agreed actions:

ACTION	OWNER
Draft and circulate detailed meeting note within 2 weeks of the meeting	JBA/EA
Continue to refine ideas for change and submit any additional thoughts by end July	Attendees
Talk to networks about ideas for change and send back by email by end July	Attendees
Provide information on evidence gaps to JBA/EA	Attendees
Next meeting (WebEx) to consider new ideas and refine existing – 9 August	All

Implications for other working groups

Overlaps with the following groups of ideas:

- FCERM industry and other stakeholders – ambitions and advisory groups
- Communities and businesses participating in FCERM and living with water – water at the heart of decision making and roles and responsibilities working groups
- Unsustainable communities and adaptable building and places – protection and funding working group

Items to raise with Ambition Group

- Use of language throughout the strategy development process
- Ideas highlighted for FCERM industry and other stakeholders
- Lack of attendance at working group meetings by business and infrastructure representatives

Suggested Action points (i.e. those that may feed into the Strategy)

Nothing specific outside of the identified ideas

Questions asked (to feed into FAQs)

- Who is being consulted and how?
- What is being done to engage with 'Hard to reach'?
- How are children and young people, businesses and trade unions being engaged?

Legislative/policy points raised to share with Defra

Partnership funding policy reform was highlighted as was roles and responsibilities that may need a different approach.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING: Thursday 9 August – WebEx

Appendix 1: Ideas for Change

The following table lists all the ideas at the meeting and those that had others had identified through the engagement process before the meeting. Those in bold and italicised were selected by break out groups for more development – the resulting more detailed proformas are appended to this note. The categories used to group the ideas were identified by the note taker for ease of presentation – these were not discussed at the meeting.

Communities and businesses better participate in/own FCERM
Ideas identified before the meeting
Community at the forefront and ownership of flood risk with the communities. Empowerment of communities, businesses and individuals to participate in FCERM 'own' the problem and solve it through locally appropriate solutions
Informed communities – social contract: devolving what we do as far as we can to communities – once the information/education is there. People take responsibility and control of what they can or where risks are better managed in that place. People – communities – businesses. Who is best placed to manage the risk. Communities take responsibility and action during incident response (e.g. community ConOps model).
Communities are driving change in their localities and managing flood risk, alongside other issues, seen as a way of enabling change. People are comfortable and knowledgeable about living with water, flood risk communities are vibrant, forward looking and are adapting to the future.
Agencies enable and start with community views when developing infrastructure.
Ideas identified at the meeting
<i>By 2050, communities that are part of the solution recognise that and act on it. Even when they're not at risk themselves but their actions (e.g. tarmac driveways) could affect others.</i>
<i>Long term approaches incorporating flood memory from local communities</i>
<i>By 2050 flood risk will be normalised in the work place and trade unions</i>
Longitudinal work with flood affected communities which is multi-disciplinary. This links with a proposal from the Water Focussed Group – flood memory.
Communities have the information they need to understand the risk. They accept the risk, and they have plans in place to manage/mitigate/deal with the risk in a way that suits them.
Businesses “champion” flood risk and their local community.
Individuals think about flood risk in the same way they may consider fire risk etc.
Full collaborative working between agencies/authorities/communities/businesses in flood risk -> plans are shared
Establish formal connection between communities and FCERM 'establishment' i.e. parish, town, district council representation linked directly with LLFAs, EA

Bring business more formally into the FCERM world by giving it the same local connectivity as 'communities' with LLFAs, EA, etc., but also local structures for investment (e.g. LEP). Encourage investment (with sponsorship, advertising etc.).
Self-help: it's up to you to sort out your own flood risk mitigation
Better collaboration
Expectations and offers at local, sub regional and national level are unpacked so that all understand responsibilities and options
We moved from an expectation of communities having plans to having conversations to inform expectations
We consider preparedness and recovery as equal partners in the discussion
If we want it to be more socially orientated/responsible...the statutory offer needs to be clearer
By 2050 communities at risk will have the opportunity to be part of the solution – i.e. involved in the planning process
In the future all business will have FRM plans to ensure they are resilient
In the future businesses will protect themselves from flood risk and coastal erosion
Communities should take the lead. What comprises a community group? (parish/flood/catchment?). How do different community groups (in same catchment) work together? Who facilitates?
That residents flood affected or not became involved in the science, technology and engineering interventions that take place.
That a more nuanced version of 'public' is worked with; e.g. instead of being managed and instead of being educated. What can be learned from the public?
Better understanding of what 'committees' and sub cultures actually do in a flood or risk situation. i.e. 'self-help' understood better.
Attitude and authorities to empower
Support of flood group
By 2050, communities that are part of the solution recognise that and act on it, even when they're not a community at risk. "if you're not part of the solution, you're part of the problem"
Communities and businesses living with water
Ideas identified before the meeting
Reconnect water and culture
People are happy to live with water, it is a visible and positive part of urban design. When new strategic programmes are planned (housing/infrastructure), water is seen as something that enables success, rather than a potential problem to be avoided/managed out of the process.

Flood risk management, landscape design and protection of wildlife go hand in hand and form the centre of our towns and villages.
Water is seen as an asset, not a problem. It is valued and the importance of working with the water cycle is understood so that water shortages, as well as flooding, are avoided
Ideas identified at the meeting
Flooding and water scarcity will both be more common. It should be the norm to be resilient to both e.g. rainwater harvesting, water butts, flood control, SuDS – this accounts for all, even those on a hill! Link flood and water as one.
Integrated water management - UU hosepipe ban after serious flooding
Reconnection with river/sea and land so lower downstream communities not flooded. Wetlands. Hydrologists
NFM make sure can be done with proper research so doesn't flood anyone else.
Environmental/wildlife damage and long-term effects on communities
Integrate flow risk and water management/resources for a combined while -> public perception -> living with water -> reservoir – role and purpose etc. More reservoirs – plan for the long term and gain local NFM and FCERM benefits too. Artificial recharge. Drought <-> flood
By 2050 (ideally earlier) we'll have an integrated water management. Integrate – environment, biodiversity, social/amenity, farming, community, drought/flood UU.
Communication and language
Ideas identified before the meeting
Benefits of technology – using technology to nudge people to do the right thing – give them information in the way that they want. Examples: technology telling you the risk of flooding at 'favourite' locations e.g. Alexa, accessing/sharing data e.g. BMW windscreen gauges, Satnavs find you the safest way and alert you to flooding, technology at fords – flashing lights/automatic sensors to cut car engines out.
Improvement in environmental education for communities and students
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Understand user needs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What information is needed • How information is presented, shared. Accessible and language used • What decisions are they making? 2) How do we package the information into products – working together examples 3) Tailoring our information/advice to better enable those decisions
Deliver through trusted messenger via multiple routes
The drivers for local communities and business communities are the same in the context of flooding
How do we get communities and businesses to understand their risk and what can they do about it?

Ideas identified during the meeting
<i>By 2050-we have ended the fear of flooding, made the younger generation more aware and informed, improved education on flood risk.</i>
<i>No one-size-fits-all to define a community or how to engage, especially transient communities</i>
<i>By 2050, we will have a more balanced view of knowledge exchange, and what constituted "expert" and "lay" knowledge</i>
<i>By 2050 local communities are being actively supported in developing their knowledge, skills and ability to be more flood resilient</i>
<i>Constructive dialogue with big businesses (claiming their contribution)</i>
<i>By 2050 we will be more accessible and consistent with flood risk messages so people can act</i>
<i>In the future communities and businesses will understand what they can expect and who to engage with</i>
Sharing ideas and policy from international examples. More away from reluctance to look outside the UK for our climate scenario adaptations.
Schools provide education on flood risk management, mitigation etc. -> to improve education within communities
Establish a strong message that inspires a propensity to act in the public. Harsh realities identified, including responses generating fear and need for local involvement.
Develop a 'language' for public consumption that refers to level of risk i.e. depth of flood, rather than probability. Useable information, concepts that people relate to, not mathematical unknowns (% , 1 in 10 etc.).
International approaches and lessons: especially from low countries around flood resilience infrastructure and communicating not only risk but responsibility w/ communities/public.
Toolkits/comms strategies campaigns: essential to democratise the approach but to stay on message.
Education campaigns for young people/public. To help change the culture for 2050 (e.g. recycling in the 1980s or RNLI drowning campaign. Raising social awareness).
Gov. needs to set aside money for improved communications somehow? (incorporated in taxes?)
That the role of heritage in living with loss is realised.
That we learn from the past – we don't always need to rush to rely on the new.
Flood to be taken seriously, like fire is now etc.

The term community/communities is defined and used effectively across the flood family discussions.
Do we really need to understand language better?? Or is it the pathways to behaviour change that need to be understood and supported etc.
The need to use a common language and explain that we can only reduce risk and a guarantee of protection is not possible.
Who encourages/priorities/facilitates businesses to contribute (especially big businesses)? Requires specialist skills/knowledge...not always consistent with risk adverse local authorities/agencies
Aspiration. That all children and young people know what to do before, during and after a flood because they've had appropriate education in school
More bottom up understanding/knowledge gathering: listening and learning from the community. For example: what does resilience communicate to flood communities -> ask them. Find a language this is meaningful to authorities and communities.
The FCERM strategy must understand the heterogeneous nature of community -> this will underpin communication engagement and partnership working
Long term goal: to end the fear of flooding. This needs to be the mantra of the FCERM strategy.
Using community knowledge to augment and ground truth our understanding of flooding. If communities can see their knowledge and aspirations reflected in policy and approach they are more likely to be involved and connected.
The definition of flooding needs to be extended beyond 'water in your lounge'. The social, psychological and physical impact stretch way beyond the water.
Develop central hub to enable communities to engage
Education – connecting with communities. Research/smaller groups organisations rather than big organisations
Helping to cope (resilience) and language - recoverability. Fire (prevent, protect, recovery, adapt). FCERM family
Improve education – make flood awareness part of geography curriculum. All students know flood risk and what to do depending on risk. Educated next generation who can influence parents/previous generation.
Improve message relayed in media. Often when flooding reported no one mentions that areas flooded are consistent with those areas shown at risk on flood map. Stronger message to public to know their risk. Shifts from it being 'a shock' to we knew this could happen
Different approaches for different types of community. A village community is very different to urban communities in cities where population is more transient.

FCERM to not be a political pawn. Just a fact of life. Mixed messages will be detrimental – such as those from local MPs in event of flood
Everyone aware of flood risk and own their risk. Flood warnings opt out not opt in.
Maintain awareness even in areas not at risk. Lack of events in ‘drought’ years can equal complacency. Continuous campaign to ensure this doesn’t happen.
Understand the heterogeneous nature of community- more bottom up understanding, knowledge gathering from a wide range of flood communities, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resilience: What does it mean to various flood communities? How can resilience, adaption, flood risk be more meaningfully communicated? • What constitutes ‘good practice’ in recovery from the communities who go through it? • How do you communicate flood risk in a meaningful and situated way-talk to communities
People understand the consequences of their choices
By 2050 society won’t use the word prevent from flooding or erosion. The language used to convey the point that we can only ever reduce risk – will be understood by the vast majority of at risk communities.
By 2050 we will use more accessible language
Delivering hard messages in plain English about personal flood risk so that people take ownership and responsibility to act.
The language used to explain flood risk is clear and easy to interpret and understand by property owners.
Businesses and communities know who to talk to.
Clarify who to engage with.
Structure and scalability to enable communities to engage.
Accepting where communities are unsustainable in the long term and relocation
Ideas identified before the meeting
We have moved communities at risk by 2050. People accept the risk where they are and cope with health and wellbeing aspects. Moving communities will be one of the options for Government, risk management authorities and communities. People know and accept their risk and have the knowledge of choices to manage it to keep themselves healthy and well.
Ideas identified at the meeting
<i>By 2050 we will be upfront about talking about where measures are not affordable or sustainable.</i>
Moving communities. ‘We have moved communities at risk by 2050’. How does ‘we’ sit with the notion of risk ownership?

Where adaptive solutions are needed for greater good (widening river corridors in towns) need a system that is just for those that need to relocate (say property value +10%) to ensure prompt delivery of sustainable solutions
Compulsory Purchase Order to remove those that can't be protected
Connected communities living in resilient/adaptable places and buildings
Ideas identified before the meeting
Need to recognise homes will be built in areas at risk. Build new homes to be adaptable/resilient
Create places where resilience is intrinsic to the design of that place (new or existing)
Ideas identified at the meeting
<i>By 2050 people are aware and properties are adapted to their flood risk</i>
<i>Concrete creep is being reversed by 2050 and sustainable drainage is norm</i>
<i>By 2050 flood resilience spending is properly valued, sustainable and socially equitable (Rural poor?)</i>
Insurers provide "build back better" post-flood and encourage/expect flood resilience measures to be installed pre-flood. Individuals and businesses get benefits from this -> reductions in premiums.
That business, communities, home owners, insurance, construction surveys understand traditional buildings and how to look after them and support their inherent resilience (30% of our housing stock is traditional).
That post flood recovery doesn't unnecessarily harm traditional buildings e.g. removing features, removing line motors etc
That there is no 'post code lottery' on how flood protection/resilience/recovery support is achieved – clarity and consistency.
By 2050, new home builders have responsibility for future flooding and flood risk for X period of time.
Residual risk is managed at a property level. In both existing and new build.
Code of practice becomes 'the norm'/legislate
SuDS to reduce risk is adapted
We stop using urban creep concrete/tarmac and hard impervious surfaces in favour of something natural and impervious
'industry-wide' agreed list/position of what property resilience is, so that stakeholders can choose from a 'basket' of measures.
A consistent technical process for delivering property resilience that is supported by legislation, standards, guidance, resources etc.

Wider resilience issues considered such as by new emergency flood plans
Nat research facility for property resilience in widest sense – current UKRIC call
Who sets the standards? Should we allow local (diverse) standards or require compliance.
What incentives do individual landowners have to contribute/participate/allow natural flood mitigation solutions?
There's good practice for resilience going on in other countries beyond Australia and USA. Don't let language get in the way!!
Build back better
Repairs to buildings that have been flooded need to make them more resilient to future events.
Community and business involvement in incident preparation and response
Ideas identified before the meeting
In 2050, communities are part of the emergency response (rather than emergency response done to them). People instinctively take action themselves rather than looking for others to save them or let life stop.
Ideas identified at the meeting
<i>Local institutions are responsible for enabling local prep, planning and response</i>
<i>We consider preparedness and recovery as equal partners. In the future risk management authorities will spend more time preparing for emergencies and RMAs and property owners being aware of the risks, such as flooding</i>
<i>Planning for flooding is business as usual</i>
Support for resilience is available to all (regardless of risk – ref: mains bursts are unpredictable) before flooding happens not just afterwards
By 2050 emergency planning becomes part of FRM as the public plan to manage multiple risks at the same time
By 2050 re 'self-help'. Better understanding of what groups and sub-groups/cultures actually do in a flood-risk situation. Build on that to enhance 'self-help' – valuing what people already do.
The response for and with flooded areas needs to be smarter, better co-ordinated and based on realistic expectations - social contract
That emergency planning becomes part of FRM as the public has to manage multiple risks at the same time
By 2050 local communities are professional, formal, empowered and integral first responders, supported by "authorities" and "policies". Let's flip the dynamic!
By 2050, businesses are all planning for managing current and future risks including flood. Continuity planning. Flooding is business as usual

FCERM industry and other stakeholder support required
Ideas identified at the meeting
<i>The Environment Agency needs to involve more diverse audiences (socio-economic, ethnicities and abilities)</i>
Government investment increases to match risk
Adequate funding either for resilience, or to promote the uptake of resilience. People will not become 'flood' resilient unless they are educated about it. The current approach does not work.
Reduce the stress and fear of flooding and have support available afterwards – mental health
Professional agencies should support. What support can communities expect?
Longitudinal work with flood affected communities which is multi-disciplinary
That social effects of flooding are counted more when considering interventions – not just mental health!
Projects for young people/disadvantages delivered by groups like LVFF.
'not being able to protect everyone' - means testing.
Funding from larger business-like lottery etc particularly for flooding and coastal erosion
Commitment to funding Property Flood Resilience just as capital programme funded – do not delegate/dump on individuals where cost/benefit rules out a capital scheme. Very divisive and inequitable to only support/fund major capital schemes. Helps facilitate property/business owners to then follow up and use measures, prepare and act. NCPMS and area delivery – embrace and facilitate.
Flood Re – must incentivise property owners who have taken EFFECTIVE STEPS to protect their properties and/or make them more resilient (reducing damage etc). Annual audit/MOT to retain incentives.
EA/LA framework for PFR to deliver above to PFR roundtable standards. Align future government flood recovery grants to EA framework. Poor standards, comms and outcomes.
Critical infrastructure – include and align. Network Rail, Power/Utility, Highways
Water companies -> inclusion – reduce surface water flooding, align investment
Lobby insurers to reduce premiums linked to flood resilient repairs (domestic/commercial)
The Environment Agency needs to engage with the hard to reach e.g. businesses aren't here today. For consultation need to direct to the hard to reach.