



**FCERM Strategy 2050 Protection & Funding Working Group
Webex – Friday 15 June 2018**

Focus of meeting

- Providing stakeholders with an update on context of the FCERM Strategy
- Hearing stakeholder thoughts on what the FCERM Strategy should include on flood protection and funding
- Outlining the working group (WG) processes and tasks.

Suggested new approaches/ways of working

- Understanding how we and others communicate flood risk and manage expectations is critical to engaging with communities in a meaningful way. When considering flood protection and resilience, there can be knee jerk political responses in the wake of flooding to build flood defences and in the media to seek blame.
- What is the opportunity that resilience presents (for wider benefits) rather than incidental enhancement? How can efficiencies be gained by considering FRM as part of other projects e.g. in place-based decision making/ regeneration planning?
- Need to consider private sector partnerships and long term revenue needs – who should look after assets and be responsible for them?
- Communities want to understand what they can do themselves: people need to be enabled to help themselves. For example, Flood Action Groups can often implement Natural Flood Management with minimal or no public funding.
- We need to plan sustainably for the long-term e.g. will protecting a deprived community with poor quality housing stock and business premises be sustainable in high flood risk areas, or should the opportunity be taken to work with regeneration partners and communities to replan an area (so that we adapting to change). Short term political goals make this challenging. There is a need for place based solutions.
- Coastal communities in deprived areas can be challenging to protect. The funding criteria needs to evolve to consider other areas e.g. Grade 1 agricultural land, nationally significant infrastructure
- Should levels of resilience be considered instead of standards? All land uses need proper funding for resilience and this needs to be considered at a catchment scale and not just cities. It was recognised though that there is a need to prioritise.
- In order for there to be equitable levels of resilience, how can this be funded? There will not be enough government/ public funding. How do we find more innovative ways of getting private funding? Should insurers contribute to defences? In rural areas, what is everyone doing to look for other sources of funding? How should transition be managed if public

funding is removed? The government needs to be clear on priorities and what investment it expects from others.

- Whilst self-help actions should be encouraged, how can we regulate the impact that these actions might have on others downstream? Probably more appropriate for some sources of flooding e.g. river flooding than coastal and tidal flooding.
- Should standards vary between sources of flooding/ erosion? e.g. It can be harder for small communities to fund coastal works
- The type of schemes that will work need local interpretation and knowledge e.g. Lune Valley research into local applicability of SUDS
- Minor roads and communication infrastructure can be locally important to residents, business and the economy.
- Links to anchor points on developing better places for people & the environment, Partnership Funding policy, funding decisions by government, not being possible to protect everyone, supporting resilience, protecting those at highest risk and considering climate change.

Summary of evidence gaps/requirements

The key evidence gaps identified related to:

- Social science research on the use of language to communicate flood risk management terms in a meaningful way
- Common responses of others to flooding and residual risk issues e.g. media, politicians
- Examples of flood relief projects delivered as part of wider regeneration/ enhancement and where flood risk was not the main objective. What can we learn from these?
- Key outcomes from projects exploring how others can take responsibility for maintenance of assets
- Understanding the ability of communities to find funding towards schemes managing different sources of flooding/ erosion
- Understanding of long term funding needs (covered by Long Term Investment Scenarios Project, 2018 update)
- Exploring innovative ways to fund flood alleviation schemes
- Commercial models for flood insurance from other countries

Annex 1 provides more detail on evidence gaps and how these will be addressed.

Agreed actions

ACTION	OWNER	DATE
Confirm July meeting details	EA	ASAP
Circulate evidence base and 2 page summary for this Working Group before Face to Face meetings	EA	04/07/18
Confirm whether a meeting of all working groups will be held later in the year	EA	29/06/18
Circulate meeting notes, details of Strategy website and information for all Working Groups	EA	22/06/18
Review Evidence Packs (to be shared after WebEx) – what are the gaps? Discussions between attendees and within organisations/networks between now and face to face meeting.	Group	11/07/18
Review the information and questions provided – start to develop ideas for change and what solutions there might be. Discussions between attendees and within organisations/networks between now and face to face meeting.	Group	11/07/18

Send further information through where necessary on projects mentioned at the WebEx. These should be sent to FCERMStrategy@environment-agency.gov.uk	Group	ASAP
---	-------	------

Implications for other working groups

Key issues for other WGs highlighted in the meeting were:

- Water based decisions - place based planning and the need for SUDS that are suitable at a local level
- Communities and businesses – how the public interpret information from Risk Management Authorities and other sources e.g. the media quickly reverts from what has flooded to who is to blame
- Roles and responsibilities – the role of insurance in helping to manage residual risk, ways of working to deliver sustainable drainage, the role of planning and regeneration to consider long term resilience of communities

Items to raise with Ambition Group

- Need to carefully consider the use of language, including ‘protect’, ‘management’, ‘risk management’, ‘resilience’, ‘level of protection’ ‘flood management authority’ and how these can be interpreted and understood by the public.
- The implications of ‘protect’ are that in the long term, residual risk increases e.g. as sea levels rise and increase the risk to a defended community. ‘Protect’ also suggests an entitlement to protection rather than an emphasis on people being resilient to flooding.
- Need to consider roles of insurance in dealing with climate change and current risk
- By 2050 how do we want FCERM opportunities to enable communities to grow, develop and regenerate? Rather than just protecting the current world around us.
- In 50 years’ time, what flood damages do we expect and what are we prepared to accept as a nation? What funding do we need to provide this level of protection? How do we raise this?
- What is government funding and to what level of resilience? How should decisions by government be clearly communicated and areas at lower priority be given the tools to identify alternative sources of funding? How can a transition be managed before public funding is removed?

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

None identified

Questions asked (to feed into FAQs)

- What are the boundaries the strategy needs to be developed between?

Legislative / policy points raised to share with Defra

- Funding criteria for deprived communities on the coast
- Partnership Funding and other government policy and funding can drive short-term fixes rather than long term solutions. Who should drive long-term solutions? Is the regulatory framework appropriate e.g. should flood resilience be led by planning and regeneration teams?
- Policy regarding use of public money to protect urban and rural communities and relative standards of flood defence
- Definitive government policy and guidance on the use of private finance for asset management and third parties and communities maintaining assets
- Simple regulation to ensure people do not inadvertently make flooding worse for others that is applicable to all sources of flooding

ANNEX 1: Further information on evidence gaps and potential approaches to address

Evidence gap	Analysis required	Potential data source	Desk based or further engagement?	Can evidence be obtained to inform strategy development? Yes/No	If yes, when can this be provided by?	If no, provide more detail, e.g. would this need to be a new research project?
Public interpretation of language used to communicate flood risk	How the public interpret common language used to communicate flood risk	Social science research on the use of language to communicate flood risk management terms in a meaningful way Focus group work informing previous flood awareness campaign	Desk based, engaging with an academic in this field to understand if this has previously been explored	Yes	End July	TBC
How others communicate flood risk messages	Identification of common responses of others to flooding e.g. media, politicians to residual risk issues	EA collation of media responses to recent flood events	Desk based	Yes	End June	
Examples of multi-objective projects delivering flood risk benefits	Examples of flood relief projects delivered as part of wider	Request case studies from RMAs (via RFCC July meetings?)	Desk based, with engagement with RMAs to identify case studies	Partly	July	Depends on publication date for Partnership

Evidence gap	Analysis required	Potential data source	Desk based or further engagement?	Can evidence be obtained to inform strategy development? Yes/No	If yes, when can this be provided by?	If no, provide more detail, e.g. would this need to be a new research project?
	regeneration/ enhancement and where flood risk was not the main objective. What can we learn from these?	Defra Review of Partnership Funding				Funding Review
Considerations for third parties and communities undertaking small schemes and revenue work, without government funding	Key outcomes from projects exploring how others can take responsibility for maintenance of assets	Recent EA pilot studies, Defra Community Flood Resilience Pathfinders, current Defra/ EA Research Programme project and transferable work from local authorities exploring community maintenance	Desk based with some further engagement with local authorities e.g. via ADEPT	Partly	July	Defra/ EA Research Programme project is ongoing
The ability of communities to find funding towards schemes managing different sources of flooding/ erosion	Is there an inequality e.g. for coastal schemes protecting small communities?	Defra/ EA Research Programme	Review research programme to identify if this issue has been picked up already	Unknown	Unknown	Depends on whether this research already exists

Evidence gap	Analysis required	Potential data source	Desk based or further engagement?	Can evidence be obtained to inform strategy development? Yes/No	If yes, when can this be provided by?	If no, provide more detail, e.g. would this need to be a new research project?
Innovative approaches to funding flood alleviation schemes	Examples of schemes where such funding has been realised	Defra review of Partnership Funding EA and Defra Research Programme projects	Desk based	Unknown	Unknown	Depends on publication date for Partnership Funding Review
Commercial models for flood insurance from other countries	Understanding how other countries have approached this issue	Research undertaken whilst Flood Re was being developed?	Desk based but need to engage with Flood Re to identify if they hold this research	Unknown	Unknown	Depends on whether this research already exists