



**FCERM Strategy 2050 Roles and Responsibilities Working Group**  
**Meeting notes**  
**Meeting – 24 July 2018**  
**IET Birmingham**  
**10:30 – 15:30**

**Evidence – points raised during discussion on evidence gaps/requirements**

- Some disagreement that “LLFAs work well with local planning authorities” - this not true in some cases.
- Recommendation to look at examples from The Infrastructure Operators Adaption Forum, Climate Change Adaptation Group. This comes together on how infrastructure planning can be collaborative, as well as in relation to FCERM.
- FCERM Strategy team advised to look at the new Water UK protocol on assets and add this to the evidence pack.
- The National Infrastructure Commission assessment was critical of failure to take climate change into planning decisions and policy. At a recent meeting there was a difference of opinion on likely impact of climate change, however there should be clear roles and clarity. The Strategy, and the work of the Flood Family should be clearly underpinned by climate change projections (and clear predictions from UKCP18).
- The FCERM Strategy needs to be underpinned by more certain knowledge.
- Should the Strategy have analysis of critical success folder? What initiatives/policies have been successful over last 10 years? It would be good to draw out particular initiatives from existing legislation.
- Water companies will have customer evaluation research on sewer flooding. This may be available post-September.

**Wider points raised:**

- Importance of really listening to and hearing the local communities and understanding what they want. Are we actively listening?
- The National Flood Forum did not attend this workshop – they are engaged in other Working Groups, and through specific sector engagement.
- How we are linking to homes and communities? And vulnerable communities?
- The group raised the need to be communicating with other Government departments.
- Important for the Strategy to consider the Calderdale and Cumbria Action Plans
- Alignment of timings – Strategy need to help address lining up programmes and actions across organisations.
- Need to make sure the strategy has outcomes and actions.

## Ideas for change

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

<b>Communities, society and the public</b>
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
<b>By 2050, communities understand their role and take ownership so they are more resilient and self sufficient</b>
<b>Society accepts/understands concepts/science of FCERM. Shared understanding – fact not opinion</b>
<b>By 2050, local communities will be empowered and funded to take ownership of their own resilience</b>
<b>The public get the right answer, first time, from which ever organisation they talk to. Shared language/understanding.</b>
Identify who is responsible for and takes ownership of the role of telling communities in areas of change they require re-adjustment/relocation/adaptation
Similar to coastal change management areas, it would be useful to have river corridor management areas to identify where communities are at risk and are in a changing landscape
Communities to have access to self-help type funding more readily and more support to enable it to be used themselves.
'Communities' understand and are clear on who does what before, during and after a flood event. Transparency.
The public are clear on who does what but as importantly they understand their role as well.
Communities understand the balance between protection and resilience and are able to take informed decisions. They understand the offer.
Individuals and communities understand the role that they have in managing flood risk and the support available for the FCERM community
Large incident response – appears to be huge gaps between what public expect and what authorities can offer. Need clearer roles in floods of all magnitude, and enhanced roles to meet expectations of impacted communities.
Bring local stakeholder engagement earlier into the development of FCERM strategies and schemes – often seen as “a bolt on” or a tick box exercise when solutions have been developed already. It is sometimes seen as coming too late in option process.
<b>Alignment/simplification of funding and organisations</b>
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
<b>In the future funding will be for the “problem” rather than where the water comes from</b>
<b>Money not constrained by organisation....but following outcomes. Get better at sharing.</b>
Better funding mechanisms engage non-EA with RMAs. Better valuation of benefits to economy beyond 'homes protected' especially transport and social infrastructure
Alignment of all organisations and programmes that have a role/impact on flood risk: planning, funding e.g. infrastructure, telecoms, rail, electricity.
Improved accountability to ensure those with roles in flood deliver them. Funding is fair to ensure ability to deliver against accountabilities.
Integrated working across all sectors/recognising the conversation is not just flood. Love for synergies.
Funding to deal with ageing infrastructure highways and water and sewerage infrastructure

Clear and agreed rules for what sources of funding can be used to address complex flooding. Current thinking and rules are too simplistic and are based on a simple view of flood risk responsibilities between EA, LLFAs, highway authority and WASCs.
Joint/partnership funding for schemes needs to be improved and success criteria re-evaluated. Required change e.g. funding targeted to the problem rather than directly related to the source
Appropriate funding for FRM in local authority sector: – appropriate number of skilled resources – adequate maintenance of asset – realistic funding to protect property
<b>(Sharing) Information/Evidence</b>
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
<b>By 2050, we have open source information that's easily accessible by everyone</b>
The country has the right list of RMAs who take ownership of their flooding issues and whose performance is evaluated and addressed (if needed) by relevant body e.g. port authorities, utility companies, Network Rail as well RMAs
Evidence base to be more collaborative, we talked a lot about collaborative solutions but not about collaborative analysis of the flooding issues i.e. collaborative modelling involve communities as well as their organisations to gain shared ownership of the problem
RMAs /professional partners have things in place to share knowledge and understanding and also resource (around the country) to manage flood risk. Capacity and capability.
Improved understanding of canal hydrology related to flooding – often action group will hold an opinion of the impact of a canal asset that is not correct. Better understanding required to work through required actions for asset management that are based on correct information: using reservoir for flood alleviation; holding down canal levels; dredging for flood alleviation. Covered this in C and RT strategy. Needs a change in culture.
Be better at sharing.
<b>Planning, joining together</b>
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
<b>Flooding and water is managed from source to sea in the future through source, pathway receptor including across catchments in an integrated way</b>
<b>A coherent framework for water planning (including water quality) so that plans are approved and assured to drive efficient resources and actions by all partners</b>
Better integration with water resources/multifunctional infrastructure. Better planning for drought and flood, climate change impacts.
We truly talk about FCERM and the relationship between the two. Are we investing in the right places for future risk?
Joint strategies, plans and instruction programs. E.g. how link FRMP, SWMPs, LFRMs, NFRMs, and things like new DWMPs, AMP cycles, WNSP, 6 year programme.
Need to make other key stakeholders i.e. water companies, to be statutory consultees in the planning process
<b>Catchment and land management</b>
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
<b>In the future our catchments and coasts have the space to change and by 2050 someone takes on this role and responsibility</b>
<b>In the future we will have better integration between FCERM and land management (e.g. incentives, rules, awareness)</b>
More legislation on diffuse water quality and ways of encouraging better multifunctional assets like water and flood storage reservoirs

The role of landowners is more recognised – duty of care not to cause flooding through poor management but also possibly an incentive scheme rewarding good practice somehow.
Building greater strategic resilience within catchments and on coast (avoiding viewing urban area in isolation) Think big ambition. Room for the river NL etc.
Role of land managers, linkage to post – CAP world. Future agricultural policy to include: right rules for farmers– E.g. soils; Right tools to deliver FCERM as soon as public good, beyond NFM
<b>Clear understanding of roles</b>
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
<b>Clear understanding for any organisation with water/flood responsibilities to ensure effective, seamless management.</b>
<b>By 2050 the structure of organisations and institutions is optimum for water management</b>
<b>By 2050 the FCERM family will include all the relevant RMAs, who are all performance assessed</b>
<b>In future, we have improved accountability for roles in flood risk management and funding is allocated fairly</b>
<b>Bringing private business into flood risk family and facilitating (incentivising) their involvement e.g. farmers, insurance, finance</b>
<b>In the future there will be a joined up hierarchy of RMAs – a one stop shop for flooding</b>
<b>Efficient use of resources in the future to avoid duplication of work and roles. No grey areas.</b>
“Grasping the nettle” with regard to coastal change has been spoken about 10- 20+ years however adaptation and who leads on this and roles within that are unclear
Defra (or another) to take the lead regarding CCMA forwarding their implementation as idea fed through the NPPF (national planning policy framework)
A huge national awareness campaign on riparian responsibilities. We have little information on riparian assets (culverts, ponds); they get very varying levels of maintenance; most people don't know or accept that they are the riparian owner; flood risk from these assets is notable and LLFA resources are drained by riparian work. Plus the new Living on the Edge guidance is a serious drop in quality.
Major infrastructure and organisations like HE and Network Rail need to have FCERM strategies so i) we know what their priorities are for joint projects and ii) to give them some FRM coordination between a) emergency teams and b) operation teams and c) major infrastructure scheme teams. RMA list needs updating please.
LLFAs on LRF – need to update the Civil Contingencies Act?
Strengthening/clarifying roles of Defra/RMAs (especially LLFAs, districts and around SUDs) with a view to facilitating greater collaboration. Role of infrastructure providers. Roll of ordinary.
Clarity and consistency and understanding of all those who have role/impact on flood issues, list of roles/remit/accountability
Accountability?
Roles and responsibilities across all key areas of flood risk management when flooding is complex. By all key areas I mean things like responding, recording, investigating, mitigating, funding interventions, maintaining, monitoring, planning. By complex flooding, I mean when there is more than one source of flooding and/or there is interaction between different assets or flows.
Clear definition of roles to avoid 'grey' areas and confusion
Enact Schedule three (SuDS Approval Bodies) or something similar
Improved integration of Water and Sewerage Company (WASC) role in flood risk management. WASCs have a huge role in the “flood family” of organisations but not fully integrated with current arrangements, plans and strategies.
<b>Resources – FCERM staff</b>
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
<b>Succession/capacity/skills. Ease of access to training. Common standards/resources. Capability building.</b>

<b>In the future there will be a new generation of floods staff trained on all sources and brought into the flood family.</b>
Communication between the national FCERM team and the local PSO teams is absolutely dismal – not a strategy issue but a serious internal issue that needs improving as comms is key and this affects LLFAs a lot regarding information supply.
<b>Surface water and sewerage</b>
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
<b>In the future there will be a simplification of what manages/is responsible for surface water e.g. single body</b>
<b>In the future we will enact schedule 3 of FWMA or something similar (i.e. clarity over who maintains them)</b>
<b>By 2050 we will have clearer ownership and maintenance and planning of surface water drainage and ordinary water courses</b>
<b>For 2050, advances in surface water flood forecasting between Met Office and EA to improve forecast lead time and impact on smaller areas. To better warn for events like Calderdale flooding in 2015/16.</b>
<b>In the future we need to better value the benefit of collaborative incident management (all sources and surface water) before and during the event.</b>
<b>In the future there will be a clear responsible organisation for the management of surface water incidents</b>
<b>In the future as a flood family we will require 0% discharge from new and re developments and infrastructure schemes (remove right to connect)</b>
Much better engagement with districts. District officers and members see surface water flood risk as LLFA problem now. They don't engage well on local plans RSFRAs, don't always take planning objections seriously and don't participate well in projects
Need more thought and guidance over long-term working with IDBs and in the Fens. Blindly promoting SUDs everywhere isn't always suitable and alienates the IDBs.
SUDs adoption – SUDs currently are an embarrassment to what they should be and the industry is getting a bad name with communities and developers.
Someone/ "A body" given responsibility to record and maintain records of SUDS implemented and given backing to enforce maintenance and replacement
Clarity on who is responsible for responding to surface water incidents: LFR? or LLFA? Water company? EA? And legislation changes to help facilitate this i.e. change Civil Contingencies Act to add LLFA and/or water company as a Cat 1 responder. Change FWMA 2010. Also LLFAs to be given seat on LRFs.
All water companies to have proactive partnership funding pots like Anglian Water to benefit our communities, this would be the norm. Good example Anglian case study.
Remove right to connect to sewers.
2050 Horizon. Advances in surface water flood forecasting to improve lead time of forecasts but also to focus impact to smaller areas. To better warn for events like the 2015/16 flooding that affected Calder Valley and Rochdale canal amongst others. Roles to be developed here between MO and KEA FF centre.
Clear division of responsibilities associated with surface water. Current mix of inter-related responsibilities between WOSCs, Highway Authorities, LLFAs, land owners/households, district councils.
Current responsibilities/powers fully utilised to reduce surface water run-off and any flow restrictions LPA– applying planning permission rules relating to domestic paving over impermeable areas LLFP- using Landng Act powers re watercourse maintenance H/way authorities - adequately maintain asset
Removal of right to connect to a sewer

Provide mechanisms (legal and funding) to remove (non-sewer) culverts flows from sewer
Mandatory requirement for zero surface water to sewer on new developments and infrastructure schemes
<b>Greater use of powers</b>
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
<b>In the future there will be greater facilitation of existing powers: powers become a 'duty'</b> <b>There is legislation around enforcement. For paving gardens, culvert maintenance, highway maintenance</b>
<b>In the future there will be consistency across all RMAs in the way they implement their existing powers (with accountabilities)</b>
Reservoirs?
RMA list widened to include Network Rail, gas, electric, and telecoms. Maybe Rivers Trust?
Give LLFA/ EA powers of enforcement on other RMAs such as district councils to ensure they understand their role
<b>One organisation</b>
<b>Ideas identified at the meeting</b>
Ordinary water course regulation and management moved to one organisation (not LLFAs/districts) for clarity.
One water authority for consistency. One Flood Family – shared skills, costs, efficiencies, modelling, comms, knowledge, experience, resilience, incident response. Easier for public to understand.
Shared vision across FCERM Community: Expectations/standards/etc
We use a common language to promote understanding legislation: FCERM community - powers and duties - roles and responsibilities Public - expectations
A joined-up hierarchy covering all, RMAs especially.
Consistency across the country with greater accountability
Greater collaboration/joined up approach is needed. Opportunities missed due to different flooding sources and responsible RMAs with conflicting agendas. Surface water management = one body for management?
One funded body responsible for all aspects of drainage

### Key issues highlighted through the discussion

- Need to be clear on who does what within FCERM, including communities and so communities know who to contact.
- Need clear, improved and appropriate funding for different sources of flooding, including complex flooding, shared across organisations.
- Lots of ideas around surface water, especially that Section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991 – “the right to connect” – to the public sewerage system should be removed.
- One ‘organisation’ should be developed for clarity, for example we use a common language, have joined-up hierarchy, consistent approaches across the country.

### 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:

- Why do we need to change the existing principles?
- Water companies work in a more performance driven culture – these principles are providing a bit more coherence and drive than the original six
- We should identify whether we are making progress towards previous legislation
- These are very aspirational – but it's important to have these
- Carbon neutral is a decision (that may be for individual organisations) – all others are things we should be doing anyway.
- Consider if we would be happy to be judged against these principles. Sign up to them and be accountable. Legally, RMAs to be accountable to the FCERM Strategy.
- Utilities, public authorities etc. don't currently manage flooding as well as they would like to – funding difficult
- Demand management – reducing amount entering system
- We're good at dealing with incidents. If people put the same effort into strategy then we'd be fine!
- A mixture of 'how we work' and 'what we do'
- How many of these are for RMAs to achieve? How many for collaboration? Some of these are specialisms.
- Are these aspirations or guiding principles?
- This is about aspirations, we should be judged on outcomes – they aren't particularly controversial.
- If we set it high but achievable, this is okay – but it must be achievable
- Need drivers to make people accountable to these, otherwise won't be delivered
- Won't we still have the legal requirements to deliver regardless?
- You need measured outcomes to decide how people can achieve these – a defined way. Need to be descriptive other meaningless.
- Don't need to be measured – this will put people off.
- We need to make sure we do deliver on these – need mechanism on these.

- Flood risk is only one element of environmental management. There's some recognition needed to be linking up with wider aims. In the future we won't have strict funding pots, we'll have wider funding for holistic projects.
- Business and economic growth need to be added.
- Delivering together needs including.
- Collaborating needs to be added – at the top as the key driver and linking all of the others.
- Nature should be used instead of wildlife (because it includes flora and fauna)
- Natural capital needs adding. Think more broadly than carbon neutral.
- Wellbeing needs adding. This is in two senses – wellbeing (places) and mental wellbeing (impact of flooding)
- Measure impacts of flooding – not just by numbers of properties but more widely to include e.g. children's lost education

### Enablers

No discussion

### Agreed actions:

<b>ACTION</b>	<b>OWNER</b>
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 – 13 August	All
Circulate A3 form Ideas for Change	EA
Resolve and confirm meeting on 5 September (clash with another meeting)	EA
We will consider adding UKCP18 to our timeline slide.	EA

### Implications for other working groups

Overlapping ideas:

- Communities need to take ownership so they are more resilient and self-sufficient – Communities and Businesses
- Local stakeholder engagement should be earlier in the development of FCERM strategies – Communities and Businesses
- Better integration with water resources/multifunctional infrastructure – better planning for drought and flood, climate change impacts – Water Based Decision Making
- One water 'authority' for consistency – Water Based Decision Making
- Alignment/simplification of funding and organisations – Protection and Funding
- Removal of right to connect to sewer – Water Focused Decision Making

### Items to raise with Ambition Group

- We need to recognise what currently works well. Does that mean we need to change? Or are there things that need to change?
- Infrastructure and other organisations need to be involved.

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

Nothing specific outside of the suggested ideas

### Questions asked (to feed into FAQs)

When will the DIY pack be available?

Where will the next meeting be?



**Legislative/policy points raised to share with Defra**

- Need to deal more effectively with surface water, especially that Section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991 – “the right to connect” – to the public sewerage system should be removed.
- One ‘organisation’ should be developed for clarity, for example we use a common language, have joined-up hierarchy, consistent approaches across the country.
- Need alignment/simplification of organisations i.e. plans, funding, programmes, accountability.

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING: Monday 13 August - WebEx**