

Notes from the 31st meeting of the Broads Climate Partnership (formerly Adaptation Panel)

Date: 30th June 2017

Present

Kerry Turner (UEA – chair){KT}, Mark Johnson, Kellie Fisher (EA), Andy Millar (NE), Rob Wise (NFU), Giles Bloomfield, Matthew Philpott (Water Management Alliance) , Bill Parker, Sharon Bleese (Coastal Partnership East), Graham Brown (Norfolk County Council), Phil Pearson (RSPB), John Packman, Jacquie Burgess, John Ash, Sarah Mukherjee, Simon Hooton {SKH} (notes), Maria Conti (BA)

Apologies:

Sarah Dawkins / Dougal McNeil (NE), Karen Thomas (WMA), Matthew Cross (BDC), Charlie Beardall (EA)

Summary points:

ACTION

1. Broadland Futures Initiative Flyer

- a. SKH recapped on the work by MJ to produce a simple framework for what this initiative covered that had then been developed further by EA and BA to produce something that summarised what this was all about. The draft flyer that had been circulated was therefore primarily an aide memoire for those in the Partnership and could be used as a firm foundation for future communication / messages to others.

Members were invited to send in any detailed comments in the next fortnight and a further revision would be made as necessary although there was broad support for what was presented. It was agreed some reference to the fact that current Government policy would not release sufficient central funding and so significant local funding would also be needed should be added. Some indication around time-lines may also be helpful.

- b. BA had held meetings with all the local authorities to inform them of the Review along with meetings with Brandon Lewis, Norman Lamb and Peter Aldous MPs. The MPs were happy to pull together a briefing meeting for all local MPs though with the election this is likely to be deferred to the autumn. The Local Authorities were happy with the current position and would be interested in further details as they emerged.

ACTION: Any comments on draft flyer to be sent in before the end of July. SKH, MC, SB & KF work on any revisions and re-circulate revised copy.

ALL
KF, SB,
MC, SKH

2. Broadland Futures Initiatives – high level framework

- a. SB provided a context for the discussion with the importance of all being clear about what was within scope and without. This may not please all but it made it clear what were the outcomes that were being sought. We needed to remember that the context of the national park brought in 7 million visitors who would feel they had a stake in the area as well. There would also be a need to review, reflect and refresh the initiative over time to help manage

people's expectations.

b. Scope

Discussion highlighted some important points to cover:

- i. Existing flood management projects are unlikely to be altered but there would be a need to be aware of them to provide context and in time future projects would need to be aware of this initiative and ideas it was generating.
- ii. The WMA/IDB was currently working up proposals to consider needs as large amounts of their existing pumping infrastructure was close to its end of life and their future investment choices over the next few years would normally be given a 50 year life. So setting the direction of travel was important now.
- iii. The process needs to retain a sense of realism around existing funding constraints and likely future ones and how the development process included checks and balances to ensure society was happy with the outcomes.
- iv. The natural environment, whilst needing to be appropriately protected itself, could provide some natural protection methods for other assets that would be a great positive. Fully understanding sediment movements and stability might be very helpful.
- v. Central to the work would be to develop the message this area was a national priority and that was best achieved by moving towards a consensus and so having a coherent and consistent local message to lobby with. A case of working bottom up and top down.
- vi. Although having an open discussion can help, most people prefer some clear boundaries and content to help them relate to the issues. Use can be made of other people and existing channels and frameworks to make the engagement most effective.
- vii. Timescales of short, medium and longer will help although these might be defined by triggers (events / thresholds being reached) rather than specific dates when different things needed to be addressed.
- viii. As the approach progresses it should be flexible enough to enable evidence from elsewhere to come into scope if required.
- ix. Generally agreed to try and keep this complex initiative as simple as possible and to avoid getting distracted into tackling allied issues which although important may not be central to the choices.
- x. Mapping out all the current and short term activities will be helpful to build the big picture and share knowledge. Some may not be directly relevant or need change but being aware was vital and would help develop consistent messages.
- xi. The relatively imminent end of the Broads Flood Alleviation Project needed to be recognised so that transition arrangements can be considered. Making use of their previous work and knowledge would also be important as overall it had been successful it meeting its expected outcomes. However a similar approach is extremely unlikely to be repeated.
- xii. Having an eye to what success would look like would help frame the steps needed. Assessing the changing risks, creating a clear vision of the needs of the varying interests and sharing information will help

move towards a consensus on solutions – recognising that there may be ‘losers’ that would be looking for something from the process.

- xiii. Normal cost benefit analysis may not be clever enough for this longer term approach. Using the balanced scorecard type of approach pioneered in the national ecosystem assessment would help clarify winners and losers and help bring clarity on the returns from investment. A wider economic picture could help identify where other finance can be brought in.
- xiv. Reference was made to the Thames 2100 project which looked at the wider picture for flood risk management for London. Although the scale of assets involved created a different model, the approach to engagement and triggers for decision making could be a useful model to explore.
- xv. An important part of the approach will be to help people affected by flood risk to understand what will be done by others and what they can do themselves based on shared evidence. To help people make informed choices and decisions.

In summary some key points are:

- I. The output from the Initiative would ideally be an ambitious but realistic plan with general broad consensus across the area and be supported by politicians. It was likely to have a mix of defence of key locations/ settlements and some areas where natural processes were allowed to dominate. It is likely to be looked at in terms of short, medium and longer time scale but there would be triggers identified for when pragmatic changes might need to happen creating stepping stones from where we are to where we are likely to want to be. Flexibility would allow revision of ideas as more information about future conditions were confirmed.
- II. The engagement process would seek to draw out important information from stakeholders and establish ways of sharing knowledge and understanding between interests. People would know who is responsible for what and who is doing what as well as what they can do themselves. This would be supported by robust evidence that shows what is possible and what isn't and why. Decisions would rest within democratic processes and the intention would be to minimise surprises for those impacted by the choices made.
- III. Short term: Fuller understanding of what is happening now and its interactions. Considering how immediate actions might influence future choices.

Medium term: likely to be exploring how adaptive options can be brought into the protection plans. Checking the challenges of financial, technical, social and environmental

Longer Term: Developing wider list of options to cope with changing climate, sea level patterns and more challenges. Clarity on decision thresholds, trigger points and the framework for success

ACTION:

- a. List and map geographic FCRM areas and current/planned flood risk management schemes. Incorporate what is in the scope of the BCP study – but also note wider scale projects that are influential or that can be used as evidence/case studies, both coastal and catchment. Led by EA (and consider if the Cranfield big data project and/or the Norfolk and Suffolk

KF & MJ
lead

<p>Coastal Network can help with this).</p> <p>b. Consider whether having someone from Thames 2100 to share their approach would be helpful. SB to discuss with T2100 Head of Engagement</p>	<p>SB (SKH)</p>
<p>3. Stakeholder mapping</p> <p>SB led an exercise to suggest the main stakeholders and where they 'sat' in a spectrum of power and one of influence to help identify the most appropriate level of engagement. As time was limited, it was agreed these would be written up and emailed to everyone and they would be invited to return their thoughts on what would be the elements of concern for each stakeholder. This would be a starting point that would be more fully informed through engagement with those stakeholders.</p> <p>ACTION:</p> <p>Write up post its and email to all of group inviting emails returned in set period with initial thoughts about stakeholder concerns. These responses would be collated and shared. SKH write up. ALL respond</p>	<p>SKH ALL</p>
<p>4. Governance</p> <p>The group considered some simple models of how democratically elected representatives could be at the heart of the decision making. The view was that some form of elected members' forum - which reported back to the constituent authorities as required – would make the relevant decisions. The Broads Climate Partnership would take on the role of 'client steering group' seeking information and providing that, alongside appropriate recommendations where needed, to the elected members forum. The Broads Climate Partnership would in turn be informed by a key stakeholder group and/or task and finish groups. This initial model would be shared with relevant others such as existing decision making bodies (such as the Regional Flood and Coastal Committee) and stakeholder groups (such as Broads Forum, Coastal area stakeholder groups etc.) as well as through future briefings with local authorities and MPs. They would be invited to comment, consider any overlaps and suggest any refinements.</p> <p>As initially any actions and financial resourcing to gather relevant information would come through existing decision processes and at this stage would not be substantial, the governance structure can evolve according to the feedback received.</p> <p>The notes from the Broads Climate Partnership are already placed on the Broads Authority web site. Additional information would initial be placed there as well as an open public source.</p> <p>ACTION:</p> <p>a. Broads Climate Partnership notes to be regularly put on BA website</p> <p>b. Outline model for governance to be shared with other bodies for comment as opportunities arise ALL</p>	<p>SKH ALL</p>
<p>5. Next steps summary</p> <p>1. Map existing projects and schemes and share – EA lead</p> <p>2. Stakeholder mapping – SKH to write up today's work and share. ALL to respond with thoughts about likely stakeholder concerns to help inform</p>	<p>ALL and specifics as identified</p>

<p>engagement planning.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Outline for initiative – from scoping exercise SKH will map out a framework for moving forward. This will be shared with key partners and refined and then sent to all for improvements and agreement at next meeting. 4. Communication and engagement strategy – from initial work at this meeting develop a draft strategy on communicating with and bringing in stakeholders to initiate the needed work on confirming scoping and next steps needed. Covering what and why / objectives, targets and outcomes. Task and finish group to be establish led by Karen Thomas and supported by SB, KF, MC, SKH. Others would be invited to be a part if wished. 	
<p>6. Date of next meeting</p> <p>To be determined through a doodle poll scoping later October, early November.</p>	<p>SKH</p>

DRAFT