

Notes from the 30th meeting of the Broads Climate Partnership (formerly Adaptation Panel)	
Date: 4 th April 2017	
Present Kerry Turner (UEA – chair){KT}, Mark Johnson, Kellie Fisher (EA), Andy Millar (NE), Rob Wise (NFU), Karen Thomas (Water Management Alliance) {KTh}, John Packman, Simon Hooton {skh} (notes), Maria Conti (BA)	
Apologies: Bill Parker (Coastal Partnership East), Charlie Beardall (EA), Jacquie Burgess, John Ash, Sarah Mukherjee (BA),	
Summary points:	ACTION
<p>1. Broads Futures Flyer</p> <p>MJ introduced the draft flyer which had been created to define the scope of the project. Important points he felt needed to be there were that it looked into the long term, it covered the flow of water out from GY (rather than directly impact on the current protection work along the Quays), that EA recognised that this would be part of their future planning and so a normal resource route can be followed and particularly that the project needed to have a local democratic process at the core.</p> <p>RW was keen to see reference to why it was needed – tackling climate issues, dealing with competing needs and interests. Identifying the important stakeholders would help and being clear about who the audience for it was. There may also be a need to draw out early on that local partnership funding was likely to be needed for actions proposed.</p> <p>Discussion highlighted that this was about creating a new way of working that considered the fresh and coastal waters together. That the emphasis would be to explore new ways of working to tackle the medium to longer term strategic approach with the existing process dealing with the short term, typically the 6 year project planning, continuing as normal. It would be useful to consider why people needed to know about the change and what we hope they could do to be involved.</p> <p>The Group concluded that tightening the phraseology to consistently name this as the Broadland Futures Initiative, exploring new ways of collaborative working to produce a strategic framework to guide flood risk management in the medium to longer term would help. It would need to consider this in the context of the catchment and coast and be supportive of the current policy approach. The involvement of a wide range of stakeholders to develop this approach and inform the work of the Risk Management Authorities is important with local democratic representatives at the heart of the decision making.</p> <p>ACTION: using KF & SKH's notes, re-draft the flyer capturing those ideas and share as a new draft</p>	KF & SKH
<p>2. Project phases</p> <p>SKH introduced the draft as a first attempt at detailing the various steps of the (now called) Initiative.</p> <p>The basic framework was supported though there were suggestions of how it could be improved:</p> <p>First bullet points: consider re-draft so that it was clear 'local and environmental acceptability' was referring to the aspiration of having local people accept</p>	

<p>proposed actions;</p> <p>Need to explore the role the environment can play in achieving the desired outcomes i.e. Natural Capital securing societal benefits. Perhaps drawing out that we are looking for the best combined benefits from Flood Risk Management (FRM) for people and nature;</p> <p>Bullet points at 6: re-order to have early on that (local) people would be at the heart of a new way of working – early emphasis on stakeholder involvement and suitable governance procedures;</p> <p>Bullet points at 6: ‘develop integrated policy requirement’ may be more understood if we use plainer English and say “ tackle the challenge of finding a way to look at coastal and fresh-water flood risk in combination”.</p> <p>Discussion highlighted that we need to recognise that the levels of understanding in local and national politicians and stakeholders varies tremendously. We need to help people appreciate it is not about environment versus people, or inland versus coast, but finding a way to get the best multiple benefits for people and nature at the coast and inland through all interventions. It was also vital to help people look at a longer time frame and more than the normal political cycle of 4/5 years.</p> <p>The new approach would need to be more than a consultation opportunity and ideally pick up on a deliberative development of solutions.</p> <p>ACTION: Using KF and SKH’s notes re-draft the outline for the way ahead</p>	<p>KF & SKH</p>
<p>3. Executive summary of the High Level Review</p> <p>A short executive summary of the High Level Review incorporating simpler English and including illustrations was circulated. With the modification of including ‘landowners’ after residents in point 6 in the concluding summary, the Group were happy with the summary.</p> <p>ACTION: Add in ‘landowners’ at point 6</p>	<p>SKH</p>
<p>4. Next steps</p> <p>MJ & KF would be meeting with the EA National Capital Programme Management Service to draw attention to this developmental work so they are aware if and when funding requests for work to support this approach are made.</p> <p>Communication with stakeholders will need a range of approaches to be successful. Existing mechanisms – such as IDB Boards – may provide some effective channels. Seeking from stakeholders what channels they would favour would also help determine suitable mechanisms.</p> <p>To attract people in over such a large area may require sub areas / smaller spatial interests. Sharing information could well be an attraction as well as using opportunities to reflect back what is being heard, actions being taken and progress being made. Providing opportunities to discuss the big drivers such as land and water management processes and trends, economics and climate change in realistic groups (i.e. not too big) should help. Being aware of those</p> <p>Getting the start right would be important and as this was working towards the medium term, taking time to plan it well should not be a problem. It was unlikely that stakeholder workshops would start until autumn/post harvest.</p> <p>Discussion highlighted that the Broads Climate Partnership should continue to provide the overall steering of the Initiative. Encouraging representatives from key areas to attend would be good and the Group were happy to see if someone from the RSPB could replace John Sharpe who was retiring. Approaches to try</p>	

<p>and secure local authority/lead local flood authority attendance and water company attendance would be helpful.</p> <p>Although the flood work was the main emphasis at present, remaining aware of holistic water management (i.e. drought preparedness) was important and at least annually there should be a chance to consider the fuller changing climate adaptation picture.</p> <p>Some early work to map out other flood /water related initiatives may be helpful including existing decision making processes. The main next steps would be to tap into the various expertise to develop and define a draft stakeholder engagement approach for consideration.</p> <p>The Broads Climate Partnership would remain alert to the need for establishing a suitable democratic decision making process to determine outcomes if they were away from suitable existing mechanisms.</p> <p>ACTION: SKH to create doodle poll options for an 'officer group' to work on stakeholder engagement ideas and to establish the next Broads Climate Partnership meeting.</p>	<p>SKH</p>
<p>5. Date of next meeting</p> <p>To be determined but probably before the end of July.</p>	<p>SKH</p>