

FCERM Partnership Funding Evaluation

Evaluation of FCERM Partnership Funding Survey

Background

In 2011, the Partnership Funding approach was introduced for Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management (FCERM) projects. Risk Management Authorities (RMAs) can apply for Grant-in-Aid (GiA) for FCERM schemes. The amount of GiA provided relates to the benefits expected under four categories including overall benefits (outcome measure (OM) 1), households moved from one flood risk category to a lower one (OM 2), households better protected from coastal erosion (OM 3) and environmental obligations (OM 4). Any remaining funding required to meet scheme costs is expected to be made up by local contributions from scheme beneficiaries.

An initial evaluation of the Partnership Funding approach was undertaken in 2014. This survey is part of a study commissioned by Defra to further evaluate the Partnership Funding approach. The information gathered will be used to answer a set of research questions and provide Defra with evidence on the performance of the FCERM programme under the Partnership Funding approach.

We are interested in data from 2011 onwards. However, if you only have data for more recent years, please just include information for years where data are available. We will use the data provided to identify case studies to illustrate and further analyse aspects of the Partnership Funding approach.

Please note that responses to this questionnaire will be used in preparing our reports for Defra (which, subsequently, may be published). The data provided by all respondents will be aggregated and anonymised, and all information provided by any individual or organisation will be kept confidential.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

If you have any queries or any other comments, please contact Teresa Fenn at:

teresa.fenn@rpaltd.co.uk

Structure of this survey

The questionnaire is split into three parts:

- Part 1: About you
- Part 2: FCERM schemes in your area
- Part 3: Partnership Funding approach

Duration

The questionnaire should take around 30 minutes to complete depending on the number of schemes you wish to highlight. Please provide us with your response by the 14th July 2017.

FCERM Partnership Funding Evaluation

Part 1: About you

* 1. Please indicate whether you are responding on behalf of a Risk Management Authority (RMA) with responsibility for flood and coastal erosion risk management.

- ☐ My organisation **is** a Risk Management Authority
- ☐ My organisation **is not** a Risk Management Authority
- ☐ Don't know

* 2. Please indicate your organisation/type of organisation.

- ☐ Environment Agency
- ☐ Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)
- ☐ District/Borough council
- ☐ Internal Drainage Board (IDB)
- ☐ Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (RFCC)
- ☐ Highways England
- ☐ Water/sewerage company
- ☐ Department of Communities and Local Government
- ☐ Consultancy
- ☐ Professional organisation/association
- ☐ University
- ☐ Community group, flood action group or similar
- ☐ Other

Other (please specify)

* 3. Please provide us with your name and your organisation's name. This information will only be used for analysis purposes (e.g. to manage potential duplicate responses).

Name

Organisation

4. Please indicate which of the following you have undertaken in relation to Partnership Funding and FCERM schemes (please select all that apply).

- ☐ Prepared business case(s)
- ☐ Completed the Partnership Funding calculator
- ☐ Completed Medium Term Plan (MTP) submission(s)
- ☐ Submitted scheme(s) for approval
- ☐ Involved in discussions during scheme development
- ☐ Commented on scheme development
- ☐ Involved in discussions about Partnership Funding contributions
- ☐ Provided agreement to support Partnership Funding contributions
- ☐ Provided research support or data during scheme development
- ☐ Other

If you selected 'Other' please provide further details:

5. We may need to contact you to clarify some of your answers or to discuss these in greater detail. If you would be willing to have a telephone interview with us to discuss your response and Partnership Funding in greater detail, please provide us with your contact details.

Email address

Phone number

FCERM Partnership Funding Evaluation

Part 2: FCERM schemes in your area

Please note that we are interested in schemes submitted for approval since 2011 (i.e. new FCERM schemes that were implemented under the Partnership Funding approach and not those schemes that were part-way through the funding process once the Partnership Funding policy was introduced).

6. Please indicate the geographical area that your organisation covers in terms of its responsibility with regard to FCERM schemes (please select all that apply).

Maps of the regional flood and coastal committee areas can be found at the following link - <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/flood-and-coastal-erosion-risk-management-authorities> (under the 'Regional flood and coastal committees' heading).

- ☐ Anglian Central
- ☐ Anglian Eastern
- ☐ Anglian Northern
- ☐ English Severn and Wye
- ☐ Northumbria
- ☐ North West
- ☐ Southern
- ☐ South West
- ☐ Thames
- ☐ Trent
- ☐ Yorkshire
- ☐ Wessex

7. Have you developed, contributed to or been involved in FCERM schemes that have been submitted for approval since the Partnership Funding policy was put in place (in 2011)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know

FCERM Partnership Funding Evaluation

Part 2: FCERM schemes in your area (continued)

8. If you answered 'yes' to the previous question have these FCERM schemes required voluntary contributions to enable the adjusted Partnership Funding score to exceed 100%?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Don't know

9. We are interested in the types of FCERM schemes implemented. If you have data, please provide us with the number of FCERM schemes that have been implemented in your organisation's area by type of scheme (i.e. grey, natural or mixed schemes) for the years listed below. Where a scheme overlaps several years, please enter it in the year in which approval was given.

Grey schemes refer to traditional human engineered infrastructure and include:

- Concrete defences (walls, levees, dams, rock armour, etc.)
- Weirs
- Groynes
- River engineering (canalisation, etc.)

Natural schemes refer to blue-green infrastructure, which uses the natural environment to alleviate flood risk and include:

- Afforestation
- Natural storage (retention ponds)
- Wetland creation
- Restoration of a river's natural route (re-introducing meanders, river bank restoration, etc.)
- Land management practices (e.g. agricultural and upland drainage modifications to reduce run-off)
- Managed realignment of coastline

Mixed schemes refer to schemes using a combination of grey and natural solutions.

	Grey schemes	Natural schemes	Mixed schemes	Not known	Total number of schemes
2011	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
2012	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
2013	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
2014	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
2015	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
2016	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

10. In your experience have there been cases where Grant-in-Aid (GiA) funding is needed to enable other contributions (i.e. other grants, voluntary contributions, local levy, precept) to be obtained to fund FCERM schemes?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know
- ☐ I am not aware of any FCERM schemes in the area covered by my organisation

11. In your experience have there been cases where receipt of full Grant-in-Aid (GiA) funding (covering 100% of the costs for approval) for a scheme has been important in **ensuring that additional work is undertaken** in relation to flood and/or coastal erosion risk management within the local area in the future? (e.g. full GiA funding covering 100% of the costs for scheme approval provides funding security allowing a pipeline of future work to be agreed/undertaken).

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know
- ☐ I am not aware of any schemes that have received full GiA funding (to cover 100% of the costs for approval)

12. Have any of the FCERM schemes implemented in your organisation's area that were notionally approved for full Grant-in-Aid funding (covering 100% of the costs for approval for a scheme) **also been successful in attracting voluntary Partnership Funding contributions?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know
- ☐ I am not aware of any schemes that have received full GiA funding (to cover 100% of the costs for approval)

FCERM Partnership Funding Evaluation

Part 2: FCERM schemes in your area (continued)

13. If you answered 'yes' to the previous question please indicate the number of FCERM schemes that have been implemented in the geographical area covered by your organisation that were notionally granted full Grant-in-Aid funding (covering 100% of scheme costs for approval) **and have also successfully attracted voluntary Partnership Funding contributions.**

Please only include each scheme once (where a scheme is implemented over several years, please enter it in the year in which approval was given).

	Number of schemes
2011	<input type="text"/>
2012	<input type="text"/>
2013	<input type="text"/>
2014	<input type="text"/>
2015	<input type="text"/>
2016	<input type="text"/>

Please provide names of schemes here:

14. Have any of the FCERM schemes implemented in the geographical area covered by your organisation received a **transfer of Grant-in-Aid (GiA) through the Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (RFCC)** from schemes that attracted a greater amount of contributions than were needed to meet the costs for approval?

- ☐ Yes, I am aware of schemes that have received a transfer of funds from the RFCC
- ☐ I am aware of schemes that have attracted more contributions than required for the initial capital costs, but these have then been used to offset future maintenance costs
- ☐ No, I am not aware of any schemes that have received a transfer of funds from the RFCC
- ☐ Don't know
- ☐ I am not aware of any FCERM schemes in my geographical area

FCERM Partnership Funding Evaluation

Part 2: FCERM schemes in your area (continued)

15. If you answered 'yes' to the previous question please indicate the number of FCERM schemes that have been implemented in the geographical area covered by your organisation that have received a **transfer of funds from the RFCC**.

Please only include each scheme once (where a scheme is implemented over several years, please enter it in the year in which approval was given).

Number of schemes receiving a transfer of funds from the RFCC

2011	<input type="text"/>
2012	<input type="text"/>
2013	<input type="text"/>
2014	<input type="text"/>
2015	<input type="text"/>
2016	<input type="text"/>

16. We are interested in wider benefits provided by FCERM schemes in addition to flood/coastal erosion protection (e.g. regeneration, biodiversity benefits, wider community objectives). Have any of the schemes implemented in the geographical area covered by your organisation included **wider benefits** in their appraisal?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Don't know

☐ I am not aware of any FCERM schemes in the area covered by my organisation

FCERM Partnership Funding Evaluation

Part 2: FCERM schemes in your area (continued)

17. If you answered 'yes' to the previous question please enter the **names of schemes** and the **year in which they were approved**. Also, if possible, please provide a brief description of the **wider objectives that were delivered** in each case.

Scheme 1

Scheme 2

Scheme 3

Scheme 4

Scheme 5

18. Within the geographical area covered by your organisation, have any schemes been implemented where factors **other than benefit-cost ratio** have affected the choice of scheme? For example, the local community may prefer an option which is less cost beneficial but which brings benefits for recreation.

☐

Yes

☐

No

☐

Don't know

☐

I am not aware of any FCERM schemes in the area covered by my organisation

FCERM Partnership Funding Evaluation

Part 2: FCERM schemes in your area (continued)

19. If you answered 'yes' to the previous question please enter the **names of schemes** and the **year in which they were approved**. Also, if possible, please provide a brief description of **how the chosen option varied from the one with the highest-benefit cost ratio** in each case.

Scheme 1

Scheme 2

Scheme 3

Scheme 4

Scheme 5

	Very successful	Somewhat successful	Neither successful nor unsuccessful	Not very successful	Not at all successful	Don't know/no opinion
Encouraging local beneficiaries to help fund local schemes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Raising awareness about flooding and coastal erosion risk	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

21. In your view has the Partnership Funding approach resulted in FCERM schemes going ahead that would not have done so under the previous priority score system?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know/no opinion

FCERM Partnership Funding Evaluation

Part 3: Partnership Funding approach (continued)

22. If you answered 'yes' to the previous question please indicate why you think that the Partnership Funding approach has resulted in more schemes going ahead? (Please select all that apply).

- ☐ Having some government funding has given schemes a starting point from which to build
- ☐ The previous system gave no opportunity for schemes that weren't fully funded to go ahead
- ☐ Effort is now focused on how to take the scheme forward rather than how to explain to communities why a scheme cannot progress
- ☐ Other

If you selected 'Other' please provide further details:

FCERM Partnership Funding Evaluation

Part 3: Partnership Funding approach (continued)

23. If you answered 'no' to the previous question please indicate why you think that the Partnership Funding approach has not resulted in more schemes going ahead? (Please select all that apply).

- ☐ The gap between government funding and the scheme costs is too big to bridge
- ☐ Discussions on why the government won't pay for the full scheme (to cover 100% of the costs for approval) have caused delays in taking a scheme forwards
- ☐ There are insufficient beneficiaries with enough funds
- ☐ Expectations of communities of what can be achieved are unrealistic
- ☐ Issues with who is liable if cost increases are difficult to overcome
- ☐ Other

If you selected 'Other' please provide further details:

24. The following statements relate to Partnership Funding and obtaining contributions from the public sector. Please indicate whether you think they have made the process of obtaining voluntary contributions **from the public sector** more or less difficult.

	More difficult	No change	Less difficult	Don't know/ no opinion
Having a process in place to enable discussion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Awareness of public sector partners of the Partnership Funding policy and knowing they may be asked to contribute	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Availability of resources from public sector bodies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The need for public sector bodies to demonstrate accountability when contributing to schemes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Potential for public sector bodies to be asked to contribute to several schemes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Potential liabilities for public sector bodies where they are the lead organisation for collecting contributions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Contributions are voluntary – public sector bodies decide whether or not to participate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Public sector decision making processes have to be followed when approving contributions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you selected 'Other' please specify any other points that you think make the process of obtaining voluntary contributions from the public sector more or less difficult:

25. Overall, in your view has there been a change in how easy/difficult it is to obtain voluntary (non Grant-in-Aid) contributions **from the public sector** to fund FCERM schemes since the introduction of Partnership Funding in 2011?

- ☐ Overall, I think that obtaining voluntary contributions from the public sector to fund FCERM schemes is becoming **more difficult**
- ☐ Overall, I think that obtaining voluntary contributions from the public sector to fund FCERM schemes is becoming **less difficult**
- ☐ Overall, I do not think that there has been any change
- ☐ Don't know/no opinion

26. The following statements relate to Partnership Funding and obtaining contributions from the private sector (organisations and individuals). Please indicate whether you think they have made the process of obtaining voluntary contributions **from the private sector** more or less difficult.

	More difficult	No change	Less difficult	Don't know/ no opinion
Having a process in place to enable discussion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Level of awareness of the private sector of the Partnership Funding policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The priority placed on contributions to FCERM schemes by private sector organisations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Public relations and publicity over contribution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The potential for individuals and organisations to influence scheme design	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The expectations of individuals and organisations in terms of likelihood of getting a scheme to protect their property	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Potential for private sector organisations to be asked to contribute to several schemes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Potential liabilities for private sector organisations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

More difficult

No change

Less difficult

Don't know/ no opinion

Contributions are
voluntary – the private
sector decides whether
or not to participate

☐
☐
☐
☐

Other

☐
☐
☐
☐

If you selected 'Other' please specify any other points that you think make the process of obtaining voluntary contributions from the private sector more or less difficult:

27. Overall, in your view has there been a change in how easy/difficult it is to obtain voluntary (non Grant-in-Aid) contributions **from the private sector** to fund FCERM schemes since the introduction of Partnership Funding in 2011?

- ☐ Overall, I think that obtaining voluntary contributions from the private sector to fund FCERM schemes is becoming **more difficult**
- ☐ Overall, I think that obtaining voluntary contributions from the private sector to fund FCERM schemes is becoming **less difficult**
- ☐ Overall, I do not think that there has been any change
- ☐ Don't know/no opinion

28. In your experience does the design of an FCERM scheme encourage more voluntary (non Grant-in-Aid) contributions?

	Yes	No	Don't know/no experience
Use of natural or mixed-solutions encourages more voluntary contributions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Use of grey solutions encourages more voluntary contributions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Inclusion of wider objectives encourages more contributions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Focussing just on flood or erosion objectives encourages more contributions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Enabling local beneficiaries to influence design encourages more contributions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Having clear information on the costs and benefits encourages more contributions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you selected 'Other' please provide further details:

29. In your experience has the amount of time taken to obtain contribution agreements to fund FCERM schemes changed since the introduction of Partnership Funding in 2011?

- ☐ Increased over time, it takes longer now than it used to
- ☐ Decreased over time, it takes less time now than it used to
- ☐ Not really changed, the time taken to achieve an agreement hasn't changed
- ☐ Don't know/no opinion

30. In your experience how long in months does it take to obtain contribution agreements from the public sector and private sector (as a range, e.g. 3 to 6 months)? Please consider the time taken from initial discussions to obtaining a signed agreement.

	Length of time
Public sector	<input type="text"/>
Private sector	<input type="text"/>

31. Are you aware of any examples where the time taken to obtain contribution agreements **from the public sector** has been very short or very long?

If so, please provide the **name of the scheme**, the **year in which it was approved** and the **main reason(s) for the time being very short/long**.

Scheme 1	<input type="text"/>
Scheme 2	<input type="text"/>
Scheme 3	<input type="text"/>
Scheme 4	<input type="text"/>
Scheme 5	<input type="text"/>

32. Are you aware of any examples where the time taken to obtain contribution agreements **from the private sector** has been very short or very long?

If so, please provide the **name of the scheme**, the **year in which it was approved** and the **main reason(s) for the time being very short/long**.

Scheme 1	<input type="text"/>
Scheme 2	<input type="text"/>
Scheme 3	<input type="text"/>
Scheme 4	<input type="text"/>
Scheme 5	<input type="text"/>

33. In your experience, are local communities involved in FCERM schemes (e.g. do they provide input in terms of views/opinions on the preferred design of FCERM schemes and other aspects of the process)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know/no opinion

FCERM Partnership Funding Evaluation

Part 3: Partnership Funding approach (continued)

34. If you answered 'yes' to the previous question please indicate how local communities are involved in FCERM schemes (please select all that apply).

- ☐ Providing input in terms of preferred design/options
- ☐ Providing input in terms of possible location of schemes
- ☐ Providing data and/or information on causes or history of flooding or erosion
- ☐ Actively involved in providing funding
- ☐ Actively involved in promoting the scheme or organising fund raising
- ☐ Actively involved in providing cost and benefit estimates of options
- ☐ Actively involved in developing or writing the business case
- ☐ Other

If you selected 'Other' please provide further details:

--

FCERM Partnership Funding Evaluation

Part 3: Partnership Funding approach (continued)

35. If you answered 'no' to the previous question please indicate why local communities have not been involved in FCERM schemes (please select all that apply).

- ☐ Local communities have not shown an interest in being involved
- ☐ Local communities do not see the benefit of contributing
- ☐ Local communities have other priorities that they have considered to be more important
- ☐ Other

If you selected 'Other' please provide further details:

36. In your opinion, do you think that local communities are sufficiently involved in design choices of FCERM schemes?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know

FCERM Partnership Funding Evaluation

Part 3: Partnership Funding approach (continued)

37. If you answered 'no' to the previous question please indicate what you think could be done to increase community involvement in the FCERM process.

38. In your experience, do those providing funding for an FCERM scheme have more or less of a say in scheme design than those who are not contributing financially?

- ☐ Those providing funding for an FCERM scheme **are more able** to influence scheme design than those who are not contributing financially
- ☐ Those providing funding for an FCERM scheme have the **same opportunity** to influence scheme design as those who are not contributing financially
- ☐ Those providing funding for an FCERM scheme are **less able** to influence scheme design than those who are not contributing financially
- ☐ Don't know/no opinion

Please provide further explanation below:

39. In your view are there ways in which the Partnership Funding process could be improved?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know/no opinion

Please provide reasons and further details below:

40. If you have any additional comments you would like to make please insert them in the box below.