

**Research Project to Develop the
Internal Drainage Board Toolkit and
Performance Indicators
FD2673**

Final Report on Indicator Trial
prepared for

Defra/Environment Agency

12 August 2014



Research Project to Develop the Internal Drainage Board Toolkit and Performance Indicators

FD2673

August 2014

Report on Indicator Trial

Quality Assurance	
Project reference / title	J795/IDBs
Report status	Final Report on Indicator Trial
Author(s)	Teresa Fenn, Technical Director, RPA Elizabeth Daly, Senior Consultant, RPA
Approved for issue by	Meg Postle
Date of issue	12 August 2014

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Internal Drainage Boards (IDBs) are local public bodies that predominantly work to manage land drainage in areas of special drainage need (Entec, 2010¹). Although all IDBs have to submit an annual return to Defra to provide details on their finances, there is no consistent set of indicators which IDBs can use to show how they are performing. Several IDBs have developed their own systems to monitor the performance of IDBs within their consortium or group. However, these systems are likely to vary and be specific to the IDBs in question. The recent study 'IDB Beneficiaries and Performance Indicators' identified a long list of potential indicator areas which IDBs could use to demonstrate the value they provide to local communities and others, and to help achieve greater accountability. However, further work is required to develop this list of indicator areas into actual indicators which would be useful to IDBs and their stakeholders.

IDBs are diverse, in that their catchments may be pumped or gravity drained, they may be predominantly rural or with considerable urban areas, and they may operate individually or as part of a consortium. Any set of indicators needs to be fit for purpose and suitable for all IDBs, should they wish to use them. Developing the indicator areas into actual indicators therefore requires them to be tested with real data. This report relates to the development and testing of the indicator areas by two sample IDBs, as well as the selection of the final list of indicators (note that use of the indicators by IDBs is expected to be voluntary).

1.2 Aims and Objectives

The Research Project to develop the IDB toolkit and performance indicators has two distinct parts. This report refers to the part on performance indicators where the specific aim is:

- to ensure the performance indicators are fit for purpose and the benefits of using the indicators are recognised – reflected in positive uptake across the sector.

The associated objective is:

- to trial the performance indicators developed by RPA with a sample of IDBs and facilitate roll out across the sector.

1.3 Structure of the Report

This report provides a summary of the results of the indicator trial and subsequently sets out a final list of indicators. Section 2 outlines the approach, whilst Section 3 details the findings. The conclusions from the trial are summarised in Section 4. Section 5 presents the proposed final list of indicators (along with ways in which they could be reported) whilst an action plan for their uptake is presented in Section 6. Acknowledgements are given in Section 7.

¹ Entec (2010): FL0224: Update of the 2006 Review of the Internal Drainage Board Efficiency Evidence, Report produced for Defra, January 2010.

2 Approach

2.1 Approach to Trial

2.1.1 Indicator areas

The first step in the trial was to identify which indicator areas should be taken forwards for testing. The list of indicator areas for trialling was finalised following the workshop² in London on the 16th September 2013, the meeting of the IDB Technical Advisory Group (TAG) on 7th October 2013 and subsequent comments from the TAG. In general, where indicator areas received contradictory comments, they were given the benefit of the doubt and included within the trial. However, there were a few indicator areas which the TAG decided to exclude from the trial because these areas were deemed too onerous, or were not anticipated to provide any real benefits.

The indicator areas can be split into four categories as follows:

- Management of board and board activities
- Performance in relation to food production
- Performance in relation to reduction of waterlogging and flood risk to assets
- Performance in relation to environment

A full list of the indicator areas taken forwards for trialling is given in Table 2-1. This table additionally includes the rationale for including the indicator in the trial, as well as the potential aspects to measure. Note that the indicator area codes (M1, M3, etc.) may not be sequential due to the removal of unwanted indicator areas.

Table 2-1: Indicators for selection for trialling		
Indicator Area	Rationale	Potential aspects to measure
Management of board and board activities		
M1: Compliance with the requirements of the external audit	Shows overall trends in compliance	Yes/no response with additional space to record recommendations from the audit
M3: Number of incidents/accidents and time off due to injury, with causes and lessons learnt	Takes health and safety into account; enables individual IDBs to assess trends	Use data on reportable incidents, near misses, etc.
M5: Does the IDB actively seek to work with partner organisations to deliver its objectives?	Helps assess whether partnership working is increasing	Yes/no response with justification e.g. partners with whom the IDB is working, types of activity undertaken (meetings, etc.). Adding extra information is probably important because there may not be evidence/outputs available (e.g. if at early stage of project)

² The workshop was attended by IDBs, ADA, local authorities, Environment Agency representatives, etc.

Table 2-1: Indicators for selection for trialling		
Indicator Area	Rationale	Potential aspects to measure
M6: Percentage attendance at Board meetings	Shows good governance; councils may ask for this information	Attendance figures from board meetings
M7: Evaluation of performance – time taken to deal with information requests (Freedom of Information, FoI, only)	Shows time spent on FoI requests, allows IDB to assess trends	Record of FoI requests, including when received and time taken to provide response
M8: Percentage of income spent on maintenance/capital compared to office/administration	Provides measure of efficiency	Total income, amount spent on maintenance, capital, office and administration (definitions of categories need to be confirmed)
<i>Performance in relation to food production</i>		
F1: Proportion of drainage rates paid within three months of issue date	Allows individual IDBs to assess trends	Percentage of rates paid by a certain date
F2: Drought/water management plan/planning, percentage of outcomes/actions achieved	Aims to cover work undertaken on drought and water management planning; allows IDB to assess trends	Yes/no response for existence of plan, percentage of actions taken when appropriate
F3: Period of no restriction divided by total period of drought	Only relevant where IDB has a large number of abstractors within its district and IDB has capability to move water around to where it is needed; shows trends over time	Number of days/areas where abstraction is limited (with explanation if necessary because abstraction licences are issued by the Environment Agency)
F5: Number of incidents of waterlogging, area of land affected and duration (days), with causes and lessons learnt	Useful for drainage rate payers	Report incidents of unplanned/unintended waterlogging (do not include planned water logging where carried out to e.g. slow response down in the rest of the catchment)
<i>Performance in relation to reduction of waterlogging and flood risk to assets</i>		
A1: Compliance with the local flood risk management strategy	Shows overall trends in compliance	Simple yes/no is perhaps too subjective so may wish to elaborate on actions and outcomes
A2: Percentage of winter/summer penning level	Only relevant where agreed penning levels are in place; useful for landowners/managers and IDB to measure trends	Record when penning level is/is not achieved (e.g. number of days)
A4: Number of properties and area of land whose flood risk changes	Useful for local authority special levy payers and drainage rate payers (should only include changes due to IDB activities though to avoid double counting with the Environment Agency)	Dependent on data available. Individual IDBs may need to determine whether modelling and/or other data on change in risk to assets and land are available (but take care to ensure that deliberate flooding for the environment is explained so it is not seen as negative)

Table 2-1: Indicators for selection for trialling		
Indicator Area	Rationale	Potential aspects to measure
Performance in relation to environment		
E1: partnership working between the IDB and Environment Agency to help deliver Water Framework Directive measures	Shows contribution of IDBs towards good status/potential	Yes/no to partnership working along with measures required, actions taken, etc.
E2: Actions or processes undertaken by the IDB to address invasive or non-native species	Shows whether IDB district is affected by invasive species; records actions taken (where relevant)	Outcome focused: record % of watercourses affected by invasive/non-native species
E3: Completion of SSSI remedies	Only relevant where SSSIs are in the drainage district; shows contribution of IDB towards favourable status	Number of remedies completed, with explanations where awaiting actions by others (potential to link to WFD and habitats?)
E5: Description of any activities undertaken to enhance any particular BAP species or locally important species	Encourages sharing of best practice	Record of activities undertaken
E6: Whether the IDB has evaluated its drainage network to manage a balance of biodiversity and flood conveyance, in line with the Drainage Channel Biodiversity Manual	Enables trends to be assessed	Record of actions undertaken in line with the manual (bearing in mind that the manual is being updated)
E7: Use of an environmental audit report/scorecard to report on indicators and provide some detail behind them (cover E1 to E6)	Brings together the environmental indicators selected for trial (E1, E2, E3, E5 and E6) to provide overall summary of environmental performance	Dependent on data collected for other environmental indicators

2.1.2 Identifying interested IDBs

Requests for volunteer IDBs were made at the workshop in September 2013 and by email to particular IDBs. The IDBs who expressed interest in taking part in the trial were:

- Water Management Alliance (WMA): Norfolk Rivers IDB; and
- Shire Group of IDBs: Ancholme IDB, Black Drain DB, Danvm IDB, Doncaster East IDB, Goole Fields DDB, Reedness & Swinefleet DB, Selby Area IDB and Sow & Penk IDB.

2.1.3 Running the trial

Two teleconferences were set up (one with WMA and one with the Shire Group) to discuss the indicator areas and identify which ones were likely to be applicable to their drainage districts and thus which ones they would be interested in trialling. These discussions also covered the potential definitions of the indicator areas, i.e. what the IDBs would actually be measuring. Tables 2.2 and 2.3 provide details on the selected indicator areas and the aspects to measure for each of the trial IDBs as discussed during the teleconferences. Note that the aspects to measure may differ between the IDBs. Rather than being a problem, this should help show the best way of measuring a particular indicator area.

Table 2-2: Indicators selected for trial by WMA (Norfolk Rivers IDB)	
Indicator Area	Aspects to measure
Management of board and board activities	
M1: Compliance with the requirements of the external audit	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Receipt of qualified opinion from external audit (taken from annual return) 2) Number of enforcement notices issued by the Environment Agency/Natural England (<i>this covers actual IDB core-business practice</i>) 3) Number of environmental prosecutions (<i>this also covers IDB core-business practice</i>)
M3: Number of incidents/accidents and time off due to injury, with causes and lessons learnt	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Number of incidents in the accident book for each risk assessment type 2) Number of reportable incidents 3) Number of near misses for each risk assessment type (<i>splitting by type would help enable learning and improvement</i>) 4) Number of HSE Prosecutions
M5: Does the IDB actively seek to work with partner organisations to deliver its objectives?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Is there a stakeholder engagement plan? (potential to include hyperlink) 2) What is the value of work done in partnership with others? (to include a few sentences of narrative) 3) Ratio of number of meetings: value of work undertaken in partnership
M6: Percentage attendance at Board meetings	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Percentage of vacant positions on the board 2) Percentage attendance <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Percentage attendance/number of seats available (<i>helps cover engagement with local authority, measuring against seats available picks up cases where local authorities do not take up their full allocation</i>)
M7: Evaluation of performance – time taken to deal with information requests (Freedom of Information, FoI, only)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Does the board have an FoI publication scheme (covering information recorded, time required, cost of application, etc.) 2) Number of FoI requests in the financial year; 3) Percentage of FoI requests dealt with during the statutory timetable 4) Number of complaints as recorded in the register 5) Percentage of complaints dealt with in the timeframe of the complaints policy 6) Number of complaints outstanding at year end
M8: Percentage of income spent on maintenance/capital compared to office/administration	<p>Based on total income, amount spent on maintenance, capital, office and administration. Definitions of categories could be based on those used when completing the annual return (<i>there may be a need to include a statement to say that technical support should not be counted as administration; this will ensure consistency between boards</i>). <i>The rationale for this indicator needs to be extended because it measures efficiency and effectiveness</i></p>

Table 2-2: Indicators selected for trial by WMA (Norfolk Rivers IDB)	
Indicator Area	Aspects to measure
Performance in relation to food production	
F1: Proportion of drainage rates paid within three months of issue date	1) Percentage in value of rates outstanding/paid by 30 th June 2) Number of ratepayers who have amounts outstanding/paid by 30 th June <i>Coverage of number of ratepayers and value outstanding/paid provides a fuller picture</i>
F2: Drought/water management plan/planning, percentage of outcomes/actions achieved	1) Does the IDB have a water management plan to specify target water levels for each pumped catchment? 2) Does the IDB have water management plans approved by Natural England for protected areas (where relevant)? 3) Has the IDB undertaken the necessary assessments required by the WFD and Habitats Regulations when preparing plans for protected areas?
F3: Period of no restriction divided by total period of drought	<i>Dependent on water being available – considered to be captured through M7 and inclusion of complaints</i>
F5: Number of incidents of waterlogging, area of land affected and duration (days), with causes and lessons learnt	<i>Waterlogging could be due to agricultural practice as opposed to lack of/insufficient maintenance. Also, maintenance may not have occurred due to environmental restrictions e.g. water voles in a drain. Waterlogging issues could be picked up under M7 and inclusion of complaints</i>
Performance in relation to reduction of waterlogging and flood risk to assets	
A1: Compliance with the local flood risk management strategy	1) Number of issues raised by Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) in contravention with strategy/with regard to compliance with strategy
A2: Percentage of winter/summer penning level	<i>Probably already covered by F2 on presence of water management plan</i>
A4: Number of properties and area of land whose flood risk changes	1) Number of capital schemes delivered 2) Number of successful grant applications <i>(These measures will cover change in risk to properties and partnership working, since application success is affected by both. But note that risk levels are affected by ongoing maintenance in addition to capital schemes)</i>
Performance in relation to environment	
E1: partnership working between the IDB and Environment Agency to help deliver Water Framework Directive measures	1) Has the IDB designated waterbodies as natural, artificial or heavily modified, and had these classifications agreed with the Environment Agency? 2) Has the IDB incorporated measures into the maintenance programme and consenting procedures? 3) What is the value of any improvements delivered within the year? This can include an explanation along with the sources of any funding, i.e. grant, money from third sector organisations in receipt of funds from catchment restoration projects, etc.

Table 2-2: Indicators selected for trial by WMA (Norfolk Rivers IDB)	
Indicator Area	Aspects to measure
E2: Actions or processes undertaken by the IDB to address invasive or non-native species	1) Number of reported incidences of invasive/non-native species in watercourses 2) Number of incidences dealt with during the year (along with the sources of funding) 3) Number of outstanding instances at year end
E3: Completion of SSSI remedies	1) SSSI remedies completed
E5: Description of any activities undertaken to enhance any particular BAP species or locally important species	1) Percentage of targets delivered as set out in the IDB's BAP in the current year (IDBs are to report on the delivery of targets to Natural England currently)
E6: Whether the IDB has evaluated its drainage network to manage a balance of biodiversity and flood conveyance, in line with the Drainage Channel Biodiversity Manual	1) Has the IDB prioritised the drainage network in terms of flood risk so opportunities for increasing biodiversity can be identified in lower priority infrastructure? (<i>careful phrasing is required to ensure that the indicator does not detract from the core functions of the IDB</i>)
E7: Use of an environmental audit report/scorecard to report on indicators and provide some detail behind them (cover E1 to E6)	<i>Such a scorecard would ideally include all the indicators, not just the environmental ones. The reader could then determine which indicators were most relevant for each particular IDB</i>

Table 2-3: Indicators selected for trial by the Shire Group of IDBs	
Indicator Area	Aspects to measure
Management of board and board activities	
M1: Compliance with the requirements of the external audit	Yes/no to compliance Recommendations from audit
M3: Number of incidents/accidents and time off due to injury, with causes and lessons learnt	Data on reportable incidents, near misses, etc.
M5: Does the IDB actively seek to work with partner organisations to deliver its objectives?	Yes/no response with justifications/explanations <i>To include number of comments and consents in relation to development proposals</i>
M6: Percentage attendance at Board meetings	Attendance figures from board meetings
M7: Evaluation of performance – time taken to deal with information requests (Freedom of Information, FoI) <i>Also: Number of complaints; Non-compliance by board members</i>	Record of FoI requests, with when received and time taken to provide response <i>Number of complaints to the board (with nature of complaint, e.g. maintenance, rates, etc.) Instances of non-compliance by board members</i>
M8: Percentage of income spent on maintenance/capital compared to office/administration	Total income, amount spent on maintenance, capital, office and administration (with definitions of what has been included in each category)
Performance in relation to food production	
F2: Drought/water management plan/planning, percentage of outcomes/actions achieved	<i>Few sentences to describe actions/work undertaken on drought planning/making space for water</i>
F5: Number of incidents of waterlogging, area of land affected and duration (days), with causes and lessons learnt	Report incidents of unplanned/unintended waterlogging (area and duration, <i>with explanation if unavoidable e.g. due to gravity drainage</i>)
Performance in relation to environment	
E1: Partnership working between the IDB and Environment Agency to help deliver Water Framework Directive measures	Yes/no to partnership working along with measures required, actions taken, etc.

Table 2-3: Indicators selected for trial by the Shire Group of IDBs	
Indicator Area	Aspects to measure
E2: Actions or processes undertaken by the IDB to address invasive or non-native species	Outcome focused: record % of watercourses affected by invasive/non-native species
E3: Completion of SSSI remedies	Number of remedies completed, with explanations where awaiting actions by others (potential to link to WFD and habitats?)
E5: Description of any activities undertaken to enhance any particular BAP species or locally important species	<i>Existence and implementation of BAP</i> Record of activities undertaken
E6: Whether the IDB has evaluated its drainage network to manage a balance of biodiversity and flood conveyance, in line with the Drainage Channel Biodiversity Manual	Record of actions undertaken in line with the manual (bearing in mind that the manual is being updated)

Table 2-4 provides an overview of which indicator areas were selected for trial by which IDBs. It shows that all the indicator areas put forwards for trial have been tested by at least one IDB.

Table 2-4: Summary of indicator areas for selection for trialling		
Indicator Area	Trial by WMA (Norfolk Rivers IDB)	Trial by Shire Group of IDBs
Management of board and board activities		
M1: Compliance with the requirements of the external audit	Yes	Yes
M3: Number of incidents/accidents and time off due to injury, with causes and lessons learnt	Yes	Yes
M5: Does the IDB actively seek to work with partner organisations to deliver its objectives?	Yes	Yes
M6: Percentage attendance at Board meetings	Yes	Yes
M7: Evaluation of performance – time taken to deal with information requests (Freedom of Information, FoI, only)	Yes	Yes
M8: Percentage of income spent on maintenance/capital compared to office/administration	Yes	Yes
Performance in relation to food production		
F1: Proportion of drainage rates paid within three months of issue date	Yes	No
F2: Drought/water management plan/planning, percentage of outcomes/actions achieved	Yes	Yes
F3: Period of no restriction divided by total period of drought	Yes	No
F5: Number of incidents of waterlogging, area of land affected and duration (days), with causes and lessons learnt	Yes	Yes
Performance in relation to reduction of waterlogging and flood risk to assets		
A1: Compliance with the local flood risk management strategy	Yes	No
A2: Percentage of winter/summer penning level	Yes	No
A4: Number of properties and area of land whose flood risk changes	Yes	No

Table 2-4: Summary of indicator areas for selection for trialling		
Indicator Area	Trial by WMA (Norfolk Rivers IDB)	Trial by Shire Group of IDBs
<i>Performance in relation to environment</i>		
E1: partnership working between the IDB and Environment Agency to help deliver Water Framework Directive measures	Yes	Yes
E2: Actions or processes undertaken by the IDB to address invasive or non-native species	Yes	Yes
E3: Completion of SSSI remedies	Yes	Yes
E5: Description of any activities undertaken to enhance any particular BAP species or locally important species	Yes	Yes
E6: Whether the IDB has evaluated its drainage network to manage a balance of biodiversity and flood conveyance, in line with the Drainage Channel Biodiversity Manual	Yes	Yes
E7: Use of an environmental audit report/scorecard to report on indicators and provide some detail behind them (cover E1 to E6)	Yes	No

Following the discussions on what each IDB wished to measure, the volunteer IDBs were given time to collect and collate data against each of their chosen indicator areas. Adverse weather conditions at the end of 2013/start of 2014 lead to delays in this process, however, both volunteer IDBs provided RPA with the data they had collected in February 2014.

2.1.4 Analysis of the results

The data collected for the indicator areas were analysed to identify:

- Which indicator areas were actually reported against and therefore seen to be useful;
- The type of response required for each indicator area; and
- The differences and similarities between the trial IDBs in terms of the types of response used for the different indicator areas.

Conclusions were then drawn in relation to the reasons for the different types of response, and the implications this had for IDBs reporting against the indicator areas in the future. This analysis is presented in Section 3 using a series of tables.

3 Findings from the Trial

3.1 Overview

This section begins with a summary of the types of data gathered by the trial IDBs. The full results can be found in Annexes 1 and 2. This section also compares the approaches used by the IDBs where the same indicator areas have been selected, including an assessment of whether they used the same approach to reporting and the implications of the approaches used for rolling out of the indicators across IDBs. Consideration is then given to any additional issues highlighted by the IDBs during the trial.

3.2 Results for WMA (Norfolk Rivers IDB)

Table 3-1 provides a summary of the type of data gathered for each indicator area during the trial by the WMA - Norfolk Rivers IDB. The aim of the table is to provide a guide to the reporting effort likely to be needed when using the indicator. The key to the colour code is as follows:

- green: number, ratio, percentage or one word answer
- orange: short sentence
- red: several sentences, or number with sentences or justification
- grey: response given as N/A or indicator not measured

The full results with the actual data collected can be found in Annex 1.

Table 3-1: Summary of the results of the trial for WMA – Norfolk Rivers IDB		
Indicator area	Aspect measured	Form of response
Management of board and board activities		
M1	1) Receipt of qualified opinion from external audit	Short sentence
	2) Number of enforcement notices issued by the Environment Agency/Natural England	Short sentence
	3) Number of environmental prosecutions	Short sentence
M3	1) Number of incidents in the accident book for each risk assessment type	Short sentence
	2) Number of reportable incidents	Short sentence
	3) Number of near misses for each risk assessment type	Short sentence
	4) Number of HSE Prosecutions	Short sentence
M5	1) Is there a stakeholder engagement plan?	Several sentences with web link
	2) What is the value of work done in partnership with others?	
	3) Ratio of number of meetings: value of work undertaken in partnership	Ratio
M6	1) Percentage of vacant positions on the board	Percentage
	2) Percentage attendance	Percentage
	3) Percentage attendance/number of seats available	Short sentence

Table 3-1: Summary of the results of the trial for WMA – Norfolk Rivers IDB		
Indicator area	Aspect measured	Form of response
M7	1) Does the board have an FoI publication scheme (covering information recorded, time required, cost of application, etc.)?	One word answer
	2) Number of FoI requests in the financial year	Short sentence
	3) Percentage of FoI requests dealt with during the statutory timetable	N/A
	4) Number of complaints as recorded in the register	Short sentence
	5) Percentage of complaints dealt with in the timeframe of the complaints policy	N/A with justification
	6) Number of complaints outstanding at year end	Short sentence
M8	Based on total income, amount spent on maintenance, capital, office and administration. Definitions of categories could be based on those used when completing the annual return	Percentages with clarification sentences
<i>Performance in relation to food production</i>		
F1	1) Percentage in value of rates outstanding/paid by 30 th June	Percentage with additional information
	2) Number of ratepayers who have amounts outstanding/paid by 30 th June	Numbers with additional information
F2	1) Does the IDB have a water management plan to specify target water levels for each pumped catchment?	N/A with justification
	2) Does the IDB have water management plans approved by Natural England for protected areas (where relevant)?	Several sentences
	3) Has the IDB undertaken the necessary assessments required by the WFD and Habitats Regulations when preparing plans for protected areas?	One word answer
F3	Considered to be captured through M7 and inclusion of complaints	N/A with justification
F5	Waterlogging issues could be picked up under M7 and inclusion of complaints	Several sentences
<i>Performance in relation to reduction of waterlogging and flood risk to assets</i>		
A1	1) Number of issues raised by Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) in contravention with strategy/with regard to compliance with strategy	Short sentence
A2	Probably already covered by F2 on presence of water management plan	Not used (covered by F2)
A4	1) Number of capital schemes delivered	Short sentence
	2) Number of successful grant applications	Short sentence
<i>Performance in relation to environment</i>		
E1	1) Has the IDB designated waterbodies as natural, artificial or heavily modified, and had these classifications agreed with the Environment Agency?	Short sentence
	2) Has the IDB incorporated measures into the maintenance programme and consenting procedures?	Short sentence
	3) What is the value of any improvements delivered within the year? This can include an explanation along with the sources of any funding, i.e. grant, money from third sector organisations in receipt of funds from catchment restoration projects, etc.	Monetary value with explanation

Table 3-1: Summary of the results of the trial for WMA – Norfolk Rivers IDB		
Indicator area	Aspect measured	Form of response
E2	1) Number of reported incidences of invasive/non-native species in watercourses	Short sentence
	2) Number of incidences dealt with during the year (along with the sources of funding)	Several sentences
	3) Number of outstanding instances at year end	One word answer
E3	1) SSSI remedies completed	Short list
E5	1) Percentage of targets delivered as set out in the IDB's BAP in the current year (IDBs are to report on the delivery of targets to Natural England currently)	Percentage with explanatory text
E6	1) Has the IDB prioritised the drainage network in terms of flood risk so opportunities for increasing biodiversity can be identified in lower priority infrastructure?	Short sentence
E7	Scorecard to cover all indicators	Short sentence to provide information not given elsewhere (but note that actual scorecard would cover all indicators and require simple and more complex data)

As can be seen, the responses to 26 (or 65%) of the 40 aspects measured are rated as green or orange and are thus relatively simple. Twelve (or 30%) of the 40 aspects measured required a more complex response involving several sentences or numbers and a justification. However, the full results (provided in Annex 1) show that none of these responses are particularly long and so are not thought to represent an administrative burden. Only one indicator area, A2: Percentage of winter/summer penning level, was deemed to be surplus to requirements by the trialling IDB who thought the area was already adequately covered by F2 (Drought/water management plan/planning, percentage of outcomes/actions achieved).

3.3 Results for Shire Group of IDBs

Table 3-2 provides a summary of the type of data gathered for each indicator area during the trial by the Shire Group of IDBs. The same colour coding system is used as for Table 3-1, with green indicating the simplest type of response, orange a simple sentence (or partial sentence) and red a response where a justification or several sentences are required. Grey shading means that no response to the indicator area was received for that particular IDB.

The table signals that there are several indicator areas (M3, M5, M6, F2, F5, E1) where a few sentences or an explanation was required to respond to the indicator. However, the full results (Annex 2) show that the responses are not particularly long. Thus, these indicator areas are not expected to represent a significant administrative burden on IDBs.

Data were collected for all selected indicator areas during the trial. However, there were issues with obtaining data on the percentage of watercourse affected by invasive species. This was not thought to be a good indicator given that the boards either did not own the watercourse, or only owned a small proportion of it.

Table 3-2: Summary of the results of the trial for Shire Group of IDBs

Indicator area	Aspect measured	Form of response								
		Ancholme IDB	Black Drain DB	Danvm DC	Doncaster East IDB	Goole Fields DDB	Reedness & Swinefleet DB	Scunthorpe & Gainsborough WMB	Selby Area IDB	Sow & Penk IDB
M1	Yes/no to compliance	One word answer	One word answer	One word answer	One word answer	One word answer	One word answer	One word answer	-	One word answer
	Recommendations from audit	Short sentence	Short sentence	One word answer	Short list	One word answer	One word answer	Short sentence	-	Short sentence
M3	Data on reportable incidents, near misses, etc.	Short sentence	Short sentence	Numbers with explanation	Short sentence	Short sentence	Short sentence	-	Short sentence	Short sentence
M5	Yes/no response with justifications/explanations	Numbers with further explanation and examples	Numbers with further explanation and examples	Numbers with further explanation and examples	Numbers with further explanation and examples	Numbers with further explanation and examples	Numbers with further explanation and examples	-	Numbers with further explanation and examples	Numbers with further explanation and examples
M6	Attendance figures from board meetings	Numbers and percentages	Numbers and percentages	Numbers and percentages	Numbers and percentages	Numbers and percentages	Numbers and percentages	Numbers and percentages	-	Numbers and percentages
M7	Record of Fol requests, with when received and time taken to provide response	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	-	-	Number

Table 3-2: Summary of the results of the trial for Shire Group of IDBs

Indicator area	Aspect measured	Form of response								
		Ancholme IDB	Black Drain DB	Danvm DC	Doncaster East IDB	Goole Fields DDB	Reedness & Swinefleet DB	Scunthorpe & Gainsborough WMB	Selby Area IDB	Sow & Penk IDB
	Number of complaints to the board (with nature of complaint, e.g. maintenance, rates, etc.)	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	-	-	Number
	Instances of non-compliance by board members	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	-	-	Number
M8	Total income, amount spent on maintenance, capital, office and administration (with definitions of what has been included in each category)	Percentages	Percentages	Percentages	Percentages	Percentages	Percentages	Percentages	-	Percentages
F2	Few sentences to describe actions/work undertaken on drought planning/making space for water	Yes/no responses with percentages for outcomes achieved	Yes/no responses with percentages for outcomes achieved	Yes/in progress responses with percentages for outcomes	Yes/in progress responses with percentages for outcomes	Yes/no responses with percentages for outcomes achieved	Yes/no responses with percentages for outcomes achieved	-	Yes/no responses with percentages for outcomes achieved	Yes/no responses with percentages for outcomes achieved

Table 3-2: Summary of the results of the trial for Shire Group of IDBs

Indicator area	Aspect measured	Form of response								
		Ancholme IDB	Black Drain DB	Danvm DC	Doncaster East IDB	Goole Fields DDB	Reedness & Swinefleet DB	Scunthorpe & Gainsborough WMB	Selby Area IDB	Sow & Penk IDB
				achieved	achieved					
F5	Report incidents of unplanned/unintended waterlogging (area and duration)	Numbers with explanation	Numbers with explanation	Numbers with explanation	Numbers with explanation	Numbers with explanation	Numbers with explanation	-	Numbers with explanation	Numbers with explanation
E1*	Yes/no to partnership working along with measures required, actions taken, etc.	Several sentences of explanation	Several sentences of explanation	Several sentences of explanation	Several sentences of explanation	Several sentences of explanation	Several sentences of explanation	-	-	Several sentences of explanation
E2*	Outcome focused: record % of watercourses affected by invasive/non-native species	-	Partial sentence	Partial sentence	Partial sentence	No information available	No information available	-	-	Partial sentence
E3	Number of remedies completed, with explanations where awaiting actions by others (potential to link to WFD and	Partial sentence	Partial sentence	Partial sentence	Short list	Partial sentence	Partial sentence	-	-	Partial sentence

Table 3-2: Summary of the results of the trial for Shire Group of IDBs

Indicator area	Aspect measured	Form of response								
		Ancholme IDB	Black Drain DB	Danvm DC	Doncaster East IDB	Goole Fields DDB	Reedness & Swinefleet DB	Scunthorpe & Gainsborough WMB	Selby Area IDB	Sow & Penk IDB
	habitats?)									
E5	Existence and implementation of BAP	Partial sentence	Partial sentence	Partial sentence	Partial sentence	Partial sentence	Partial sentence	-	-	Partial sentence
	Record of activities undertaken	Partial sentence	Partial sentence	Partial sentence	Partial sentence	Partial sentence	-	-	-	Partial sentence
E6	Record of actions undertaken in line with the manual	Partial sentence	Partial sentence	Partial sentence	Partial sentence	Partial sentence	Partial sentence	-	-	Partial sentence
Notes: * the percentage of watercourses affected by invasive species was recorded under indicator area E1 rather than E2 as originally defined										

3.4 Analysis of the Results

3.4.1 Management of the board and board activities

The indicator areas under the category ‘Management of the board and board activities’ were selected for trial by both WMA and the Shire Group. However, the way in which they defined these areas differed slightly, thus there was variation in the types of data and the complexity of the response recorded. Table 3-2 provides a summary of the types of data collected against the indicator areas. As shown by the colour coding, there were sometimes several different ways of recording information against one indicator area. For example, for the indicator area M7 (Evaluation of performance – time taken to deal with information requests), Norfolk Rivers gave three different types of response whereas the Shire Group IDBs all provided a numerical response. This shows that the indicator areas are flexible and enable IDBs to provide more or less information as they wish.

Table 3-3: Summary of type of data recorded by IDBs for indicator areas covering management of board and board activities

Indicator area	Type of data recorded by IDB			
	Norfolk Rivers IDB		Shire Group of IDBs	
M1: Compliance with the requirements of the external audit	Short sentence		One word answer	Short sentence
M3: Number of incidents/accidents and time off due to injury, with causes and lessons learnt	Short sentence		Short sentence	Numbers with explanation
M5: Does the IDB actively seek to work with partner organisations to deliver its objectives?	Ratio	Several sentences		Numbers with explanation
M6: Percentage attendance at Board meetings	Percentage	Short sentence		Numbers and percentages
M7: Evaluation of performance – time taken to deal with information requests (Freedom of Information, Fol, only)	One word answer	Short sentence	Justification	Number
M8: Percentage of income spent on maintenance/capital compared to office/administration	Percentages with clarification sentences			Percentages

3.4.2 Performance in relation to food production

Table 3-4 provides a summary of the types of data recorded by the IDBs for indicator areas relating to food production. Note that grey shading shows that the IDBs did not report against an indicator area. Table 3-4 shows that, in general, the indicator areas related to food production required detailed responses rather than simple numbers or percentages. This is likely to be because there are many factors affecting the food production which are out of the control of an IDB. For example, indicator area F1 (Proportion of drainage rates paid within three months of issue date) does not just reflect ratepayers’ satisfaction with the work of an IDB, but also the economic conditions faced by

the ratepayers. It is important that IDBs are able to provide additional text since a low proportion of rates paid does not necessarily indicate poor IDB performance.

Table 3-4: Summary of type of data recorded by IDBs for indicator areas covering performance in relation to food production			
Indicator area	Type of data recorded by IDB		
	Norfolk Rivers IDB		Shire Group of IDBs
F1: Proportion of drainage rates paid within three months of issue date	Percentage and numbers with additional information		
F2: Drought/water management plan/planning, percentage of outcomes/actions achieved	One word answer	Several sentences/justifications	Yes/no with percentages
F3: Period of no restriction divided by total period of drought	N/A with justification		
F5: Number of incidents of waterlogging, area of land affected and duration (days), with causes and lessons learnt	Several sentences		Numbers and explanation
Notes: grey shading means that the indicator area was not measured			

3.4.3 Performance in relation to reduction of waterlogging and flood risk to assets

Table 3-5 provides a summary of the types of data recorded by the IDBs for the indicator areas on performance in relation to reduction of waterlogging and flood risk to assets. This category was only tested by Norfolk Rivers IDB. No data were collected for indicator area A2, since this was thought to duplicate information obtained for F2 on the presence of a water management plan. The remaining two indicator areas were given simple responses, suggesting that they are not particularly onerous for IDBs to use.

Table 3-5: Summary of type of data recorded by IDBs for indicator areas covering performance in relation to reduction of waterlogging and flood risk to assets			
Indicator area	Type of data recorded by IDB		
	Norfolk Rivers IDB		Shire Group of IDBs
A1: Compliance with the local flood risk management strategy	Short sentence		
A2: Percentage of winter/summer penning level	Not used		

Table 3-5: Summary of type of data recorded by IDBs for indicator areas covering performance in relation to reduction of waterlogging and flood risk to assets

Indicator area	Type of data recorded by IDB	
	Norfolk Rivers IDB	Shire Group of IDBs
A4: Number of properties and area of land whose flood risk changes	Short sentence	
Notes: grey shading means that the indicator area was not measured		

3.4.4 Performance in relation to environment

Table 3-6 summarises the type of data recorded by the IDBs for indicator areas covering performance in relation to the environment.

Table 3-6: Summary of type of data recorded by IDBs for indicator areas covering performance in relation to the environment

Indicator area	Type of data recorded by IDB		
	Norfolk Rivers IDB		Shire Group of IDBs
E1: partnership working between the IDB and Environment Agency to help deliver Water Framework Directive measures	Short sentence	Value with explanation	Several sentences of explanation
E2: Actions or processes undertaken by the IDB to address invasive or non-native species	One word answer	Short sentence	Several Sentences
E3: Completion of SSSI remedies	Short list		Short list/partial sentence
E5: Description of any activities undertaken to enhance any particular BAP species or locally important species	Percentage with explanatory text		Partial sentence
E6: Whether the IDB has evaluated its drainage network to manage a balance of biodiversity and flood conveyance, in line with the Drainage Channel Biodiversity Manual	Short sentence		Partial sentence
E7: Use of an environmental audit report/scorecard to report on indicators and provide some detail behind them (cover E1 to E6)	Short sentence to provide information not given elsewhere (actual scorecard would cover all indicators and require simple and complex data)		
Notes: grey shading means that the indicator area was not measured			

In general, it appears that these indicator areas required more than a simple numerical response to ensure that the indicator was meaningful. As noted previously, the ability to provide additional

information where desired is considered important to ensure that IDBs are not penalised for poor performance against indicator areas where there are many other external influences. For example, indicator area E1 (partnership working between the IDB and Environment Agency to help deliver Water Framework Directive measures) depends on the performance of the IDB and the organisations with which the IDB is interacting.

3.4.5 Overview of all four categories

The tables in Sections 3.4.1 to 3.4.4 show that the approach to reporting against the indicator areas varied across the IDBs. Table 3-7 summarises the similarities and differences across each indicator area and for each category as a whole. The table sums the number of ways of reporting against each indicator area and whether the same or a different approach was used across the two IDBs. Each method of reporting is recorded once, hence, for E2, it is identified that there are two different methods of reporting (one word answer and several sentences) and two the same (short/partial sentence), see Table 3-6.

Indicator area	Approach used		Number of each type		
	Same	Different	Number, ratio, percentage	Short sentence	Several sentences or combined
Management of board and board activities	8	10	6	6	6
M1: Compliance with the requirements of the external audit	2	1	1	2	0
M3: Number of incidents/accidents and time off due to injury, with causes and lessons learnt	2	1	0	2	1
M5: Does the IDB actively seek to work with partner organisations to deliver its objectives?	2	1	1	0	2
M6: Percentage attendance at Board meetings	0	3	1	1	1
M7: Evaluation of performance – time taken to deal with information requests (Freedom of Information, Fol, only)	2	2	2	1	1
M8: Percentage of income spent on maintenance/capital compared to office/administration	0	2	1	0	1
Performance in relation to food production	1	3	1	0	6
F1: Proportion of drainage rates paid within three months of issue date	Only reported by 1 IDB		0	0	1

Table 3-7: Comparison of recording methods between trial IDBs by category and indicator

Indicator area	Approach used		Number of each type		
	Same	Different	Number, ratio, percentage	Short sentence	Several sentences or combined
F2: Drought/water management plan/planning, percentage of outcomes/actions achieved	2	1	1	0	2
F3: Period of no restriction divided by total period of drought	Only reported by 1 IDB		0	0	1
F5: Number of incidents of waterlogging, area of land affected and duration (days), with causes and lessons learnt	2	0	0	0	2
Performance in relation to reduction of waterlogging and flood risk to assets	Only reported by 1 IDB		0	2	0
A1: Compliance with the local flood risk management strategy	Only reported by 1 IDB		0	1	0
A2: Percentage of winter/summer penning level	Not used				
A4: Number of properties and area of land whose flood risk changes	Only reported by 1 IDB		0	1	0
Performance in relation to the environment	6	7	1	10	3
E1: partnership working between the IDB and Environment Agency to help deliver Water Framework Directive measures	0	3	0	2	1
E2: Actions or processes undertaken by the IDB to address invasive or non-native species	2	2	1	2	1
E3: Completion of SSSI remedies	2	0	0	2	0
E5: Description of any activities undertaken to enhance any particular BAP species or locally important species	0	2	0	1	1
E6: Whether the IDB has evaluated its drainage network to manage a balance of biodiversity and flood conveyance, in line with the Drainage Channel Biodiversity Manual	2	0	0	2	0

Table 3-7: Comparison of recording methods between trial IDBs by category and indicator

Indicator area	Approach used		Number of each type		
	Same	Different	Number, ratio, percentage	Short sentence	Several sentences or combined
E7: Use of an environmental audit report/scorecard to report on indicators and provide some detail behind them (cover E1 to E6)	Only reported by 1 IDB		0	1	0

Table 3-7 shows that the predominant method of reporting against each indicator area varies across the categories:

- Management of board and board activities: same approach used 8 times, different approach 10 times, with an equal split between numbers (6), short sentences (6) and several sentences or a combination of number and sentences (6).
- Performance in relation to food production: same approach used one time, with different approaches used three times. Just one response was reported using a number, with six reported using a combination of numbers and explanations. This suggests that explanation is needed to support the information reported against these indicators.
- Performance in relation to reduction of waterlogging and flood risk to assets: only one IDB reported against these indicators in both cases using short sentences. This suggests that these indicators may not be widely applicable but, where they are, they can be reported using a short description and rather than by numbers.
- Performance in relation to the environment: same approach used 6 times, with a different approach used 7 times. The majority of the information was provided using short sentences (10), compared with 3 using several sentences/combinations and just one reported using a one word answer. As with waterlogging and flood risk, short answers are preferred to provide more information than could be conveyed by a number or one word response but longer explanations may not be needed in most cases.

The implications of the similarities and differences in reporting highlight that IDBs may record information in different ways or feel that some information needs explanation due to different priorities. Only management of board and board activities included a relatively large number of number or one word answers, with the majority of responses under the other categories being short sentences or several sentences combining numbers and explanations. This suggests that IDBs may require opportunities to explain their results. This is an important point since for particular indicator areas, IDBs are likely to want to provide clarification information to ensure that numbers and percentages are not misinterpreted, especially where there may be external factors affecting an IDB’s performance against an indicator area. Although the use of different types of response may mean that comparisons between groups of IDBs (for example, the IDBs within a consortium) are less easy to make, having the opportunity to provide a fuller response with an explanation or justification is considered important to ensure that the indicator areas are meaningful and help IDBs and their stakeholders to monitor performance. The ability to add extra detail and information to a response additionally helps ensure that the indicator areas do not provide perverse incentives for behavioural change in the wrong direction. This could be important in providing additional information to stakeholders to minimise the risk of misinterpretation and also misleading comparisons.

One of the key implications of this analysis is that there is likely to be a need for a flexible reporting mechanism and guidance explaining what type of data could be reported for each indicator. This should allow IDBs to tailor their response depending on the information they collect, with the potential to develop more consistent methods over time if required. In addition, the importance of allowing explanations to be included needs to be taken into account. Guidance could be provided to help IDBs identify how and where explanations might be needed, to minimise potential resource issues.

3.5 Issues and Comments

Other issues highlighted during discussions with IDBs and throughout the trial are summarised in Table 3-8. Both of these issues relate to the rollout of the indicators and the frequency with which they are to be reported. Therefore, they are seen as issues for discussions between Defra and ADA when taking the indicators forwards.

Table 3-8: Further issues and comments raised during the trial	
Area	Details
Time over which indicators should be assessed	It was suggested it would probably be most appropriate to assess the indicators over a financial year, since most of the reporting could be tied in with the submission of other data (i.e. the annual return)
Voluntary/compulsory nature of indicators	Reporting of indicators could be recognised within the transparency code for IDBs, thus encouraging best practice

4 Conclusions from the Trial

The trial of the indicators has shown that:

- IDBs were able to report against the indicator areas brought forwards for trial. However, there were a few overlaps between indicators. These overlaps affected indicators A2 (Percentage of winter/summer penning level; considered to be covered by F2), and F3 (Period of no restriction divided by total period of drought) and potentially F5 (Number of incidents of waterlogging, area of land affected and duration (days), with causes and lessons learnt) which may be captured by M7 (Evaluation of performance – time taken to deal with information requests).
- The approach used by IDBs to report against the indicators varied, suggesting that there may need to be guidance to encourage consistency or that flexibility in reporting could be used to minimise burdens on IDBs, allowing them to report against the indicators in ways which fit with the methods they currently use to collect and record data. Discussions on the way forward are likely to be required.
- It is important to allow IDBs space to record supporting information and explanation to avoid numbers and percentages being misinterpreted or misleading. This is also likely to be necessary where the indicators are to be used during discussions with stakeholders as the results will be more transparent than if just a number is given. The provision of additional information will also enable IDBs to record external factors that may have affected performance, thus ensuring that trends over time can be properly analysed.

These conclusions need to be taken into account in the development of the final set of indicators. Following the trial, steps have therefore been taken to:

- Revise the set of indicator areas to ensure that there are no overlaps. The final list (see Section 5) includes some suggestions on the way in which the indicators could be reported (depending on the level of flexibility which Defra wishes IDBs to have); and
- Provide an outline structure for an action plan to encourage the uptake of the indicators.

Consideration will be needed regarding the way in which local authority feedback on the indicators could be sought. Previous attempts to obtain local authority views on the indicators have been hindered by time constraints and lack of interest.

5 Proposed Final Set of Indicators

5.1 Final Set of Indicators

The final set of indicators is presented in Table 5-1 below. Since several indicators have been merged due to overlaps identified during the trial, there are now 16 indicators in total. However, one of these refers to the environmental scorecard (E7) which would bring together the results from environmental indicators E1, E2, E3, E5 and E6³.

Table 5-1 additionally provides suggestions on the ways in which IDBs could report against the indicators. As shown by the trial, different IDBs are likely to provide different types of response to the various indicators, depending on the information they have available and the justifications they wish to provide as appropriate. Thus, for each indicator, an attempt has been made to suggest the types of response⁴ which could be given, with text in italics showing how IDBs could provide further information if they wished (or their stakeholders requested it).

Table 5-1: Final set of indicators		
Indicator area	Rationale	Suggested response type
<i>Management of board and board activities</i>		
M1: Compliance with the requirements of the external audit	Shows overall trends in compliance	Yes/no (with recommendations from audit where appropriate) <i>Could include number of enforcement notices and number of environmental prosecutions</i>
M3: Number of incidents/accidents and time off due to injury, with causes and lessons learnt	Takes health and safety into account; enables individual IDBs to assess trends	Use data on accident book incidences, reportable incidents, near misses, etc.
M5: Does the IDB actively seek to work with partner organisations to deliver its objectives?	Helps assess whether partnership working is increasing	Yes/no response with justification e.g. presence of stakeholder engagement plan, partners with whom the IDB is working, types of activity undertaken (meetings, etc.)
M6: Percentage attendance at Board meetings	Shows good governance; councils may ask for this information	Attendance figures from board meetings (including %

³ Note E4 was screened out at an earlier stage as it was not considered to be a useful indicator; indicators M2, M4, F4 and A3 were also screened out and were not taken forwards to the trial. Following the trial A2, F3 and F5 were merged with other indicators to avoid overlap.

⁴ Given that the indicators are voluntary, Defra may wish to establish a minimum level of response to help ensure that there is some uptake.

Table 5-1: Final set of indicators		
Indicator area	Rationale	Suggested response type
		attendance; % attendance/number of seats available; % of vacant seats on board)
M7: Evaluation of performance – time taken to deal with Freedom of Information (FoI) requests; number of complaints received and dealt with in the timeframe of the IDB’s complaints policy	Shows time spent on FoI requests, (allows IDB to assess trends); Recording complaints takes account of problems caused by waterlogging and abstraction	FoI requests dealt with in the statutory period (yes/no); Record of complaints received with response provided and timeframe
M8: Percentage of income spent on maintenance/capital compared to office/administration	Provides measure of efficiency	Total income, amount spent on maintenance, capital, office and administration (definitions of categories could be based on those used when completing the annual return)
Performance in relation to food production		
F1: Proportion of drainage rates paid within three months of issue date	Allows individual IDBs to assess trends	Percentage (in value) of rates paid by a certain date. <i>Could also include number of ratepayers who have amounts outstanding/paid by a certain date</i>
F2: Drought/water management plan/planning, percentage of outcomes/actions achieved	Aims to cover work undertaken on drought and water management planning; allows IDB to assess trends	Yes/no response for existence of water management plans (where appropriate i.e. where catchments are pumped or cover protected areas); Has the IDB undertaken the necessary assessments required by the WFD and Habitats Regulations when preparing plans for protected areas?
Performance in relation to reduction of waterlogging and flood risk to assets		
A1: Compliance with the local flood risk management strategy	Shows overall trends in compliance	Number of issues raised by Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) in contravention of strategy/with regard to compliance with strategy

Table 5-1: Final set of indicators		
Indicator area	Rationale	Suggested response type
A4: Number of properties and area of land whose flood risk changes	Useful for IDBs to highlight areas of success in reducing flood risk or to identify opportunities for improvements; Useful for local authority special levy payers and drainage rate payers (should only include changes due to IDB activities though to avoid double counting with the Environment Agency)	Dependent on data available. Individual IDBs may need to determine whether modelling and/or other data on change in risk to assets and land are available (but take care to ensure that deliberate flooding for the environment is explained so it is not seen as negative) <i>Could report number of capital schemes delivered; number of successful grant applications</i>
Performance in relation to environment		
E1: partnership working between the IDB and Environment Agency to help deliver Water Framework Directive measures	Shows contribution of IDBs towards good status/potential	Yes/no to partnership working along with measures required, actions taken, etc. <i>Could record in a more structured way by answering the following:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) has the IDB designated waterbodies as natural, artificial or heavily modified, and had these classifications agreed with the Environment Agency? 2) Has the IDB incorporated measures into the maintenance programme and consenting procedures? 3) What is the value of any improvements delivered within the year? This could include an explanation along with the sources of any funding
E2: Actions or processes undertaken by the IDB to address invasive or non-native species	Shows whether IDB district is affected by invasive species; records actions taken (where relevant)	% of watercourses affected by invasive/non-native species OR number of reported incidences of invasive/non-native species in watercourses; Number of incidences dealt with in a year; Number of outstanding incidences at year end

Table 5-1: Final set of indicators		
Indicator area	Rationale	Suggested response type
E3: Completion of SSSI remedies	Only relevant where SSSIs are in the drainage district; shows contribution of IDB towards favourable status	Number of remedies completed, with explanations where awaiting actions by others
E5: Description of any activities undertaken to enhance any particular BAP species or locally important species	Encourages sharing of best practice	Record of activities undertaken (could record % of targets delivered as set out in the IDB's BAP for the current year)
E6: Whether the IDB has evaluated its drainage network to manage a balance of biodiversity and flood conveyance, in line with the Drainage Channel Biodiversity Manual	Enables trends to be assessed	Has the IDB prioritised the drainage network in terms of flood risk so opportunities for increasing biodiversity can be identified in lower priority infrastructure? Could state whether best practice guidelines have been adopted
E7: Use of an environmental audit report/scorecard to report on indicators E1 to E6 and provide some detail behind them [E7 is for IDBs wishing to report on all environmental indicators]	Brings together all the environmental indicators (E1, E2, E3, E5 and E6) to provide overall summary of environmental performance	Dependent on data collected for other environmental indicators <i>Could report whether IDB is accredited to any ISO standards</i>

6 Action Plan for Taking the Indicators Forward


6.1 Overview

The following section sets out a range of possible actions to encourage the uptake of the indicators that Defra and ADA may wish to consider. Whilst not all of the indicators will be relevant to all IDBs (and indeed, the indicators are expected to be voluntary), encouraging their uptake will help ensure consistent reporting between IDBs⁵.

6.2 Action Plan

Table 6-1 provides the draft action plan, which lists the range of possible actions which could be taken to encourage IDBs to report against the indicators which are relevant to them. The actions are organised by type to facilitate comparisons between resources needed and their expected benefits.

Figure 6-1 presents a flowchart which shows how the different types of action could be combined to make the indicators available, raise awareness of their presence and provide support to IDBs to select and report against relevant indicators.



⁵ Note that there is a need to establish responsibility for any follow up actions required.

Table 6-1: Draft Action Plan for rollout of the indicators					
Potential action	Potential lead	Resources needed	Intended audience	Expected benefits	Follow-up actions, including opportunity for feedback
Actions to make the indicators available to IDBs who may want to use them					
Publish the final set of indicators on a website (decision needs to be taken on whether to create a specific website or use an existing one)	Defra/ADA	Limited, requires time to set up webpage and upload list of indicators (likely to require up to 1 day)	IDBs, other interested stakeholders (e.g. ratepayers, local authorities) could also see that a list of indicators had been developed	Makes final set of indicators available to IDBs and their stakeholders	Would need to be combined with awareness raising as well as information on how to report against the indicators (e.g. definitions, selection of relevant indicators)
Develop set of webpages specifically for the indicators (providing information on the final indicator set, their definitions, and also examples of their use)	Defra and/or ADA	If a pre-existing website (e.g. Defra or ADA) was used to host the pages, around 2-5 days would be needed for their development. If a new dedicated website were used, the domain would need to be purchased, with time allocated to development (~ 10-20 days) and upkeep (~ 2-5 days). It would also be necessary to identify who would be responsible for maintaining the indicators and updating them based on feedback	IDBs and those to whom the indicators would be relevant (e.g. ratepayers, local communities, local authorities paying the special levy)	Dedicated webpages would ensure that the indicators were available to all. Having background information on the definitions and their usage would also help avoid any misinterpretation	Once several IDBs have used the indicators, permission could be sought to publicise their results on the webpages too, thus providing more examples for other IDBs to follow. The webpages could also include space for comments, so that IDBs could share their views on the advantages and disadvantages of the different indicators for particular situations (thus helping other IDBs to select appropriate indicators from those available)

Table 6-1: Draft Action Plan for rollout of the indicators					
Potential action	Potential lead	Resources needed	Intended audience	Expected benefits	Follow-up actions, including opportunity for feedback
Actions to make IDBs and beneficiaries aware that the final indicator set is available					
Announcement in ADA Newsletter (or Gazette) that the indicator set has been finalised and is ready for use by IDBs	ADA	Limited, needs time to write article and would need to link to location where IDBs can obtain the indicators (e.g. website link and/or QR code), estimated 1-2 days	IDBs	Raises awareness that the indicator set has been finalised and is ready to use	Use of the indicator set is voluntary, so further action may need to be taken to explain why IDBs may want to use the indicators and how they could be useful internally for monitoring performance and providing feedback to stakeholders (e.g. ratepayers and local authorities)
Announcement in Defra RandD newsletter, other widely read and circulated newsletters, etc.	Defra	As above, may take 2-3 days if article needs to be written from scratch for specific newsletter, reviewed, etc.	Dependent on the newsletter audience, but likely to include a wider range of organisations and people than just IDBs. Has the potential to stimulate interest in the indicators by local authorities (where staff members may subscribe to newsletters on particular topics)	More for raising awareness of the research and its outputs	Does not necessarily encourage uptake of indicators by IDBs. Article could include links to webpages where indicator set is provided along with examples where indicators have actually been used

Table 6-1: Draft Action Plan for rollout of the indicators

Potential action	Potential lead	Resources needed	Intended audience	Expected benefits	Follow-up actions, including opportunity for feedback
Email sent directly to IDBs and special levy local authorities, etc. to inform them that the indicator set has been finalised and to encourage use	Defra/ADA	Time to develop and circulate email (2-3 days, plus time and resources to respond to any email responses with queries/comments. Combining details on the indicator set with other information in an update email could decrease resource use, though a general email may be less effective at publicising the indicator set	IDBs, special levy local authorities, ratepayers (tailored emails may need to be produced for the different groups; this could add to the resource requirements)	Raises awareness, particularly amongst those who are likely to be interested in how their IDB is performing. Direct email ensures that the information reaches the desired recipients (thus may be more effective than an announcement in a newsletter)	Additional information is likely to be required to support the email (for example, a dedicated website or set of pages). Email responses could be collated and used to help develop an FAQ section or guide the provision of additional information
<i>Actions to assist IDBs with the process of selecting and reporting against indicators in the set</i>					
Presentation on selecting relevant indicators and reporting against them	Defra and/or ADA	Time to prepare for presentation; time to identify appropriate conferences (note that a regional approach may be more appropriate) and attend/present, estimated at 3-5 days	IDBs but could also target local authorities and representatives from local communities (e.g. parish councillors) depending on the conference	Raises awareness of indicator set and idea that IDBs select indicators which are applicable to them/useful to their stakeholders rather than using the whole set	Presentation provides the opportunity for attendees to ask questions. Presentation slides could be made available on the Internet after the event

Table 6-1: Draft Action Plan for rollout of the indicators					
Potential action	Potential lead	Resources needed	Intended audience	Expected benefits	Follow-up actions, including opportunity for feedback
Development of an indicator pack to provide information on the indicator set, how to report against each one, examples from the trial and an FAQ section. Could also include templates to use to report against the indicators (could be made available as paper or electronic copy)	Defra, ADA (potential for input from trial IDBs)	Time to develop indicator pack (several weeks if need to liaise between organisations). Additional time and resources to deal with comments and suggestions (there will be a need to identify who takes on the responsibility of managing this)	IDBs (potentially also their stakeholders)	Provides all the information on indicators and their use in one place	Pack could include contact details so users can submit comments, suggestions for change, etc.

7 Acknowledgements

Thank you to our trial IDBs, the WMA (Norfolk Rivers IDB) and the Shire Group of IDBs for their time spent discussing the ways in which the indicator areas could be measured, and also collecting and amalgamating the data.

Annex 1 Results: WMA (Norfolk Rivers IDB)

Table A1-1 provides the results of the indicator trial for the WMA (Norfolk Rivers IDB).

Table A1-1: Results of the trial for WMA – Norfolk Rivers IDB		
Indicator area	Aspects to measure	Performance
Management of board and board activities		
M1: Compliance with the requirements of the external audit	1) Receipt of qualified opinion from external audit	1) Clean audit opinion awarded by Mazars LLP auditors
	2) Number of enforcement notices issued by the Environment Agency/Natural England	2) No enforcement notices issued to the Board during this reporting period.
	3) Number of environmental prosecutions	3) None in this reporting period
M3: Number of incidents/accidents and time off due to injury, with causes and lessons learnt	1) Number of incidents in the accident book for each risk assessment type	1) None in this reporting period
	2) Number of reportable incidents	2) None in this reporting period
	3) Number of near misses for each risk assessment type	3) None in this reporting period
	4) Number of HSE Prosecutions	4) None in this reporting period
M5: Does the IDB actively seek to work with partner organisations to deliver its objectives?	1) Is there a stakeholder engagement plan? 2) What is the value of work done in partnership with others?	1) and 2) The Board is represented on a number of Joint Committees to protect its interests, gain access to alternative funding streams and provide solutions to drainage/water level management issues that could not otherwise be achieved by the Board alone: http://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/NRID_B_Joint_Committees.pdf
	3) Ratio of number of meetings: value of work undertaken in partnership	3) 2:1
M6: Percentage attendance at Board meetings	1) Percentage of vacant positions on the board	1) 10%
	2) Percentage attendance	2) 65%
	3) Percentage attendance/number of seats available	Local authorities' allocation is all taken up

Table A1-1: Results of the trial for WMA – Norfolk Rivers IDB		
Indicator area	Aspects to measure	Performance
M7: Evaluation of performance – time taken to deal with information requests (Freedom of Information, Fol, only)	1) Does the board have an Fol publication scheme (covering information recorded, time required, cost of application, etc.)?	1) Yes
	2) Number of Fol requests in the financial year.	2) None in this reporting period
	3) Percentage of Fol requests dealt with during the statutory timetable	3) N/A
	4) Number of complaints as recorded in the register	4) None in this reporting period
	5) Percentage of complaints dealt with in the timeframe of the complaints policy	5) N/A (because no complaints were received)
	6) Number of complaints outstanding at year end	6) None in this reporting period.
M8: Percentage of income spent on maintenance/capital compared to office/administration	Based on total income, amount spent on maintenance, capital, office and administration. Definitions of categories could be based on those used when completing the annual return	12% income spent on capital works in reporting period. 46% income spent on maintenance works in reporting period. 16.5% income spent on office/administration in reporting period. Technical support has not been counted as administration
Performance in relation to food production		
F1: Proportion of drainage rates paid within three months of issue date	1) Percentage in value of rates outstanding/paid by 30 th June	1) 9% of total drainage rates outstanding as at 30 June 2012 (£6284 of total £72,608 for 2012/13)
	2) Number of ratepayers who have amounts outstanding/paid by 30 th June	2) 166 ratepayers with payments outstanding at 30 June 2012
F2: Drought/water management plan/planning, percentage of outcomes/actions achieved	1) Does the IDB have a water management plan to specify target water levels for each pumped catchment?	1) N/A (Norfolk Rivers IDB is a gravity catchment)
	2) Does the IDB have water management plans approved by Natural England for protected areas (where relevant)?	2) Yes, the River Wensum WLMP and the River Nar WLMP. The Board's Standard Maintenance Operations Policy document also govern how maintenance work is done in these protected areas, which is distinctly different to the nature, extent and way in which maintenance operations are done in other areas
	3) Has the IDB undertaken the necessary assessments required by the WFD and Habitats Regulations when preparing plans for protected areas?	3) Yes
F3: Period of no restriction divided by total period of drought	Considered to be captured through M7 and inclusion of complaints	N/A (No abstractors dependent upon the Board's arterial system)

Table A1-1: Results of the trial for WMA – Norfolk Rivers IDB		
Indicator area	Aspects to measure	Performance
F5: Number of incidents of waterlogging, area of land affected and duration (days), with causes and lessons learnt	Waterlogging issues could be picked up under M7 and inclusion of complaints	No incidents reported. No complaints about quantity/quality of maintenance work undertaken.
<i>Performance in relation to reduction of waterlogging and flood risk to assets</i>		
A1: Compliance with the local flood risk management strategy	1) Number of issues raised by Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) in contravention with strategy/with regard to compliance with strategy	1) None in this reporting period
A2: Percentage of winter/summer penning level	Probably already covered by F2 on presence of water management plan	Assumed to be covered by F2
A4: Number of properties and area of land whose flood risk changes	1) Number of capital schemes delivered	1) Capital works undertaken in this reporting period were implementation of improvement works identified in the River Wensum Restoration WLMP and the River Nar Restoration WLMP
	2) Number of successful grant applications	2) Grant applications were successful for both of the above-mentioned schemes.
<i>Performance in relation to environment</i>		
E1: partnership working between the IDB and Environment Agency to help deliver Water Framework Directive measures	1) Has the IDB designated waterbodies as natural, artificial or heavily modified, and had these classifications agreed with the Environment Agency?	1) Yes, a sample assessment of watercourses for morphology has been completed, as requested by the EA
	2) Has the IDB incorporated measures into the maintenance programme and consenting procedures?	2) Safe system of works agreed with Natural England and in place for 2012/13 pending a full review of the IDB's Standard Maintenance Operations to ensure compliance with WFD best practice
	3) What is the value of any improvements delivered within the year? This can include an explanation along with the sources of any funding, i.e. grant, money from third sector organisations in receipt of funds from catchment restoration projects, etc.	3) £73k of capital work has been delivered during the reporting period, which was all funded from flood defence grant in aid.
E2: Actions or processes undertaken by the IDB to address invasive or non-native species	1) Number of reported incidences of invasive/non-native species in watercourses	1) None in this reporting period.
	2) Number of incidences dealt with during the year (along with the sources of funding).	2) Initiative to eradicate Giant Hogweed at Emanuel's Common. Three year herbicide licence granted by EA
	3) Number of outstanding instances at year end	3) None

Table A1-1: Results of the trial for WMA – Norfolk Rivers IDB		
Indicator area	Aspects to measure	Performance
E3: Completion of SSSI remedies	1) SSSI remedies completed	1) River restoration on River Nar; strategic approval of restoration of 24km of the Nar over a 4 year programme.
E5: Description of any activities undertaken to enhance any particular BAP species or locally important species	1) Percentage of targets delivered as set out in the IDB's BAP in the current year (IDBs are to report on the delivery of targets to Natural England currently)	1) 65%. Working in partnership with Norfolk Non-Native Species Initiative/Mid Norfolk Mink Control Project. IDB contributes £2,500 annually to this project to eradicate mink and maintain current levels of water vole distribution in the IDB district. Working with the SITA Trust to install new barn owl nest boxes and monitor these sites across Norfolk
E6: Whether the IDB has evaluated its drainage network to manage a balance of biodiversity and flood conveyance, in line with the Drainage Channel Biodiversity Manual	1) Has the IDB prioritised the drainage network in terms of flood risk so opportunities for increasing biodiversity can be identified in lower priority infrastructure?	Prioritisation of the drainage infrastructure is currently work in progress
E7: Use of an environmental audit report/scorecard to report on indicators and provide some detail behind them (cover E1 to E6)	Scorecard to cover all indicators	The IDB operates under ISO14001 & 9001

Annex 2 Results: Shire Group of IDBs

The results from the indicator trial for the Shire Group of IDBs are given in the following tables (note that full results are not available for all boards within the Group):

- Table A2-1: Indicator M1: Compliance with the requirements of the external audit;
- Table A2-2: Indicator M3: Number of incidents/accidents and time off due to injury, with causes and lessons learnt;
- Table A2-3: Indicator M5: Does the IDB actively seek to work with partner organisations to deliver its objectives?
- Table A2-4: Indicator M6: Percentage attendance at Board meetings;
- Table A2-5: Indicator M7: Evaluation of performance – time taken to deal with information requests (Freedom of Information, FoI), also complaints;
- Table A2-6: Indicator M8: Percentage of income spent on maintenance/capital compared to office/administration;
- Table A2-7: Indicator F2: Drought/water management plan/planning, percentage of outcomes/actions achieved;
- Table A2-8: Indicator F5: Number of incidents of waterlogging, area of land affected and duration (days), with causes and lessons learnt;
- Table A2-9: Indicator E1: Partnership working between the IDB and Environment Agency to help deliver Water Framework Directive measures;
- Table A2-10: Indicator E2: Actions or processes undertaken by the IDB to address invasive or non-native species;
- Table A2-11: Indicator E3: Completion of SSSI remedies;
- Table A2-12: Indicator E5: Description of any activities undertaken to enhance any particular BAP species or locally important species; and
- Table A2-13: Indicator E6: Whether the IDB has evaluated its drainage network to manage a balance of biodiversity and flood conveyance, in line with the Drainage Channel Biodiversity Manual.

Table A2-1: Results for Shire Group for M1: Compliance with the requirements of the external audit			
Board	External Auditor	Status	Issues Raised
Ancholme IDB	PKF Littlejohn LLP	Complete	Minor issues only (see report)
Black Drain DB	PKF Littlejohn LLP	Complete	Minor issues only (see report)
Danvm DC	BDO LLP	Complete	None
Doncaster East IDB	BDO LLP	Complete	Fidelity Guarantee Minutes (see report)
Goole Fields DDB	PKF Littlejohn LLP	Complete	None
Reedness & Swinefleet DB	PKF Littlejohn LLP	Complete	None
Scunthorpe & Gainsborough WMB	PKF Littlejohn LLP	Complete	Minor issues only (see report)
Sow & Penk IDB	PKF Littlejohn LLP	Complete	Minor issues only (see report)
Note: the Shire Group additionally provided the external auditor certificates for each of the boards as part of M1, but these are not repeated here			

Table A2-2: Results for Shire Group for M3: Number of incidents/accidents and time off due to injury with causes and lessons learnt									
Board	Reportable Accidents and Incidents (RAI) 2013			Non Reportable Accidents, Incidents and Near Misses (NRAINM) 2013			Time off due to injury	Time since last RAI	Time since last NRAINM
	Number	Causes	Lessons	Number	Causes	Lessons			
Ancholme IDB	Awaiting feedback from contractors			Awaiting feedback from contractors					
Black Drain DB	Awaiting feedback from contractors			Awaiting feedback from contractors					
Danvm DC	0	NA	NA	6	Unidentified electricity cables, loose large stone in compounds, poorly fitted access gates	Work with electricity providers to update their records and identify any other areas of concern, blinding of larger stone with smaller stone, greater attention required on how access gates are secured on private land	0	1 year, 3 months, 15 days	11 days

Table A2-2: Results for Shire Group for M3: Number of incidents/accidents and time off due to injury with causes and lessons learnt

Board	Reportable Accidents and Incidents (RAI) 2013			Non Reportable Accidents, Incidents and Near Misses (NRAINM) 2013			Time off due to injury	Time since last RAI	Time since last NRAINM
	Number	Causes	Lessons	Number	Causes	Lessons			
Doncaster East IDB	Awaiting feedback from contractors			Awaiting feedback from contractors					
Goole Fields DDB	Awaiting feedback from contractors			Awaiting feedback from contractors					
Reedness & Swinefleet DB	Awaiting feedback from contractors			Awaiting feedback from contractors					
Selby Area IDB	Awaiting feedback from contractors			Awaiting feedback from contractors					
Sow & Penk IDB	Awaiting feedback from contractors			Awaiting feedback from contractors					

Table A2-3: Results for Shire Group for M5: Does the IDB actively seek to work with partner organisations to deliver its objectives?					
Board	Yes / no	Examples / explanations	No. of partner meetings (per year)	No. of planning applications (per year)	No. of consents (per year)
Ancholme IDB	Yes	Part of Flood Working Group (Lincolnshire County Council, West Lindsey District Council, Waddingham Parish Council and Environment Agency) to deliver flood relief channel for Waddingham	3	50	15
Black Drain DB	Yes	Member of South Yorkshire Flood Risk Partnership, South Yorkshire Land Drainage Group	4	10	15
Danvm DC	Yes	Member of South Yorkshire Flood Risk Partnership, South Yorkshire Land Drainage Group	4	70	30
Doncaster East IDB	Yes	Part of the Isle of Axholme Strategy and Working Group, Member of South Yorkshire Flood Risk Partnership, South Yorkshire Land Drainage Group	4	120	30
Goole Fields DDB	Yes	Working with Associated British Ports and Reedness & Swinefleet DB	0	5	5
Reedness & Swinefleet DB	Yes	Working with East Riding of Yorkshire Council to address recommendations within the Swinefleet flooding 5th and 6th July 2012 report	2	5	3
Selby Area IDB	Yes	Councils/EA/Yorkshire Water attending Drainage District tours, forming Flood Working Groups in relation to flood risk/water level management	2	50	25
Sow & Penk IDB	Yes	Working with Environment Agency on Main River maintenance, LLFA/Councils/EA attending Drainage District tours	2	10	3

Table A2-4: Results for Shire Group for M6: Percentage attendance at Board meetings

Board	Meetings per year	Attendance Record over 2 years (number and percentage)																				
		Membership			Meeting 1			Meeting 2			Meeting 3			Meeting 4			Meeting 5			Meeting 6		
		Elected	Nominated	Total	Elected	Nominated	Total	Elected	Nominated	Total	Elected	Nominated	Total	Elected	Nominated	Total	Elected	Nominated	Total	Elected	Nominated	Total
Ancholme IDB	3	17	11	28	8	3	11	9	4	13	10	2	12	11	5	16	7	5	12	12	3	15
		61%	39%	100%	47%	27%	39%	53%	36%	46%	59%	18%	43%	65%	46%	57%	41%	46%	43%	71%	27%	54%
Black Drain DB	3	9	10	19	7	6	13	7	5	12	9	9	18	9	5	14	7	7	14	5	6	11
		47%	53%	100%	78%	60%	68%	78%	50%	63%	100%	90%	95%	100%	50%	74%	78%	70%	74%	56%	60%	58%
Danvm DC	3	12	13	25	12	10	22	9	6	15	11	10	21	12	9	21	12	11	23	12	10	22
		48%	52%	100%	100%	77%	88%	75%	46%	60%	92%	77%	84%	100%	69%	84%	100%	85%	92%	100%	77%	88%
Doncaster East IDB	3	12	13	25	9	9	18	9	7	16	8	9	17	9	6	15	8	9	17	9	10	19
		48%	52%	100%	75%	69%	72%	75%	54%	64%	67%	69%	68%	75%	46%	60%	67%	69%	68%	75%	77%	76%
Goole Fields District DB	2	5	1	6	3	0	3	4	0	4	5	0	5	3	0	3						
		83%	17%	100%	60%	0%	50%	80%	0%	67%	100%	0	83%	60%	0%	50%						
Reedness & Swinefleet DB	2	7	4	11	5	0	5	7	0	7	6	0	6	7	0	7						
		64%	36%	100%	71%	0%	46%	100%	0%	64%	86	0%	55%	100%	0%	64%						
Scunthorpe & Gainsborough WMB	3	10	11	21	8	6	14	6	7	13	8	4	12	9	5	14	8	4	12	10	6	16
		48%	52%	100%	80%	55%	67%	60%	64%	62%	80%	36%	57%	90%	46%	67%	80%	36%	57%	100%	55%	76%
Sow & Penk IDB	3	6	7	13	3	3	6	3	6	9	3	5	8	3	3	6	3	4	7	2	4	6
		46%	54%	100%	50%	43%	46%	50%	86%	69%	50%	71%	62%	50%	43%	46%	50%	57%	54%	33%	57%	46%

Table A2-5: Results for Shire Group for M7: Evaluation of performance – time taken to deal with information requests (Freedom of Information, FoI)			
Board	Number of complaints	Number of FOI requests	Member non-compliance with Code
Ancholme	1	0	0
Black Drain	2	0	0
Danvm	20	2	4
Doncaster East	0	0	0
Goole Fields	1	0	0
Reedness & Swinefleet	0	0	0
Sow & Penk	0	0	0

Table A2-6: Results for Shire Group for M8: Percentage of income spent on maintenance/capital compared to office/administration						
Board/Category	Accounts					
	2010/11		2011/12		2012/13	
	% of Expenditure	% of Income	% of Expenditure	% of Income	% of Expenditure	% of Income
Ancholme IDB						
Capital including loan repayment	32.7%	40.1%	20.1%	19.5%	14.4%	16.0%
Pumping Stations	20.1%	24.6%	17.9%	17.4%	16.6%	18.4%
Maintenance	30.3%	37.2%	38.5%	37.5%	45.6%	50.6%
Administration	5.3%	6.5%	7.5%	7.3%	8.4%	9.3%
Environment Agency Precept	11.6%	14.3%	16.1%	15.6%	15.0%	16.6%

Table A2-6: Results for Shire Group for M8: Percentage of income spent on maintenance/capital compared to office/administration						
Board/Category	Accounts					
	2010/11		2011/12		2012/13	
	% of Expenditure	% of Income	% of Expenditure	% of Income	% of Expenditure	% of Income
Black Drain DB						
Capital including loan repayment	27.1%	25.4%	32.3%	38.9%	24.3%	33.7%
Pumping Stations	9.1%	8.5%	10.4%	12.5%	27.3%	37.8%
Maintenance	42.4%	39.7%	29.8%	35.8%	26.6%	36.8%
Administration	14.7%	13.8%	19.5%	23.4%	15.4%	21.3%
Environment Agency Precept	6.7%	6.3%	8.0%	9.6%	6.3%	8.8%
Danvm DC						
Capital including loan repayment			5.9%	5.6%	1.3%	1.3%
Pumping Stations			12.9%	12.3%	26.8%	26.6%
Maintenance			50.6%	48.3%	36.8%	36.5%
Administration			8.9%	8.5%	12.2%	12.1%
Environment Agency Precept			21.7%	20.7%	23.0%	22.9%
Doncaster East IDB						
Capital including loan repayment			10.6%	11.0%	11.6%	12.5%

Table A2-6: Results for Shire Group for M8: Percentage of income spent on maintenance/capital compared to office/administration						
Board/Category	Accounts					
	2010/11		2011/12		2012/13	
	% of Expenditure	% of Income	% of Expenditure	% of Income	% of Expenditure	% of Income
Pumping Stations			9.1%	9.4%	13.7%	14.8%
Maintenance			44.0%	45.7%	33.0%	35.7%
Administration			12.9%	13.4%	16.0%	17.2%
Environment Agency Precept			23.4%	24.3%	25.7%	27.7%
Goole Fields District DB						
Capital including loan repayment	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pumping Stations	29.0%	32.3%	3.5%	2.3%	30.1%	28.8%
Maintenance	30.5%	33.9%	34.0%	21.9%	27.1%	25.9%
Administration	31.9%	35.5%	48.2%	31.0%	33.3%	31.8%
Environment Agency Precept	8.6%	9.6%	14.4%	9.2%	9.6%	9.2%
Reedness & Swinefleet DB						
Capital including loan repayment	14.7%	16.5%	10.6%	6.8%	2.9%	3.9%
Pumping Stations	1.6%	1.8%	12.0%	7.7%	7.1%	9.4%
Maintenance	48.3%	54.2%	128.2%	82.5%	54.4%	71.9%

Table A2-6: Results for Shire Group for M8: Percentage of income spent on maintenance/capital compared to office/administration						
Board/Category	Accounts					
	2010/11		2011/12		2012/13	
	% of Expenditure	% of Income	% of Expenditure	% of Income	% of Expenditure	% of Income
Administration	21.6%	24.3%	67.6%	43.5%	22.1%	29.2%
Environment Agency Precept	13.7%	15.4%	48.6%	31.2%	13.4%	17.7%
Scunthorpe & Gainsborough WMB						
Capital including loan repayment	33.4%	34.7%	32.3%	31.0%	35.5%	40.0%
Pumping Stations	19.3%	20.0%	11.1%	10.7%	25.9%	29.2%
Maintenance	24.2%	25.1%	35.9%	34.4%	27.2%	30.7%
Administration	12.2%	12.7%	9.9%	9.5%	11.3%	12.7%
Environment Agency Precept	10.9%	11.3%	10.8%	10.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Sow & Penk IDB						
Maintenance	64.6%	70.7%	64.1%	65.1%	73.0%	68.6%
Administration	17.3%	18.9%	17.5%	17.7%	19.3%	18.1%
Environment Agency Precept	18.0%	19.7%	18.4%	18.7%	7.7%	7.2%
Notes: Accounts were not available for all boards for all years considered						

Table A2-7: Results for Shire Group for F2: Drought/water management plan/planning, percentage of outcomes/actions achieved

Board	Flood Risk Management Policy	Water Level Management Policy	Water Level Management Strategy	Hydraulic Modelling	Seasonal variations in pumped Water Levels	% of outcomes achieved
	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	
Ancholme IDB	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	40%
Black Drain DB	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	40%
Danvm DC	Yes	Yes	In progress	In progress	Yes	65%
Doncaster East IDB	Yes	Yes	In progress	In progress	Yes	65%
Goole Fields DDB	Yes	No	No	No	No	20%
Reedness & Swinefleet DB	Yes	No	No	No	No	20%
Selby Area IDB	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	40%
Sow & Penk IDB	Yes	No	No	No	NA	25%

Table A2-8: Results for Shire Group for F5: Number of incidents of waterlogging, area of land affected and duration (days), with causes and lessons learnt

Board	Incidents of waterlogging					
	Number	Ha affected	Duration	Number of properties	Causes	Lessons
Ancholme IDB	1	100	7 days	75	Tidal surge overtopping flood defence	Work with flood risk partners
Black Drain DB	0					
Danvm DC	2	50	14 days	0	Overtopping of EA flood banks caused by fluvial and tidal peaks meeting	Work with flood risk partners
		10	21 days	1	Third party tidal doors in poor state of repair allowing water back into system	Work with flood risk partners and IDB have served an enforcement notice
Doncaster East IDB	1	15	1 month	0	Obstruction to flow downstream	Reviewing the system and pursuing potential enforcement action on third parties
Goole Fields DDB	1	2	1 month	0	Low spot in district	IDB looking at alternative ways to assist with drainage
Reedness & Swinefleet DB	1	15	7 days	25	Tidal surge overtopping flood defence	Work with flood risk partners
Selby Area IDB	0					
Sow & Penk IDB	0					

Table A2-9: Results for Shire Group for E1: Partnership working between the IDB and Environment Agency to help deliver Water Framework Directive measures			
Board	WFD	Invasive Species	% watercourses affected
Ancholme IDB	Pump station shapefiles to EA assist in CAMS	Being recorded	Not a good indicator, board doesn't own watercourse
Black Drain DB	Pump station shapefiles to EA assist in CAMS	Shapefiles to local Wildlife Trust	Not a good indicator, board doesn't own watercourse
Danvm DC	Pump station shapefiles to EA assist in CAMS	Shapefiles to local Wildlife Trust	Not a good indicator, board doesn't own watercourse
Doncaster East IDB	Pump station shapefiles to EA assist in CAMS	Shapefiles to local Wildlife Trust	Board owns small proportion of watercourses only, not good indicator
Goole Fields DDB	Pump station shapefiles to EA assist in CAMS	Being recorded	Not a good indicator, board doesn't own watercourse
Reedness & Swinefleet DB	Pump station shapefiles to EA assist in CAMS	No BAP	
Sow & Penk IDB	Pump station shapefiles to EA assist in CAMS	Being recorded	Not a good indicator, Board doesn't own watercourse

Table A2-10: Results for Shire Group for E2: Actions or processes undertaken by the IDB to address invasive or non-native species

Board	Invasive/non-native
Ancholme IDB	
Black Drain DB	Details of watercourses and species present
Danvm DC	Details of watercourses and species present
Doncaster East IDB	Details of watercourses and species present
Goole Fields DDB	No information available
Reedness & Swinefleet DB	No information available
Sow & Penk IDB	Details of watercourses and species present

Table A2-11: Results for Shire Group for E3: Completion of SSSI remedies

Board	SSSI
Ancholme IDB	None for which Board has responsibility
Black Drain DB	None for which Board has responsibility
Danvm DC	Shirley Pool - funding application for WLMP
Doncaster East IDB	Hatfield Chase Ditches WLMP in place, Potteric Carr WLMP in place, Haxey Grange Fen - funding application for WLMP
Goole Fields DDB	None for which Board has responsibility
Reedness & Swinefleet DB	None for which Board has responsibility
Sow & Penk IDB	Doxey & Tillington Marshes WLMP in place

Table A2-12: Results for Shire Group for E5: Description of any activities undertaken to enhance any particular BAP species or locally important species

Board	BAP Implementation actions
Ancholme IDB	5 year BAP implementation in place - annual reporting to members
Black Drain DB	6 year BAP implementation in place - annual reporting to members
Danvm DC	7 year BAP implementation in place - annual reporting to members
Doncaster East IDB	8 year BAP implementation in place - annual reporting to members
Goole Fields DDB	9 year BAP implementation in place - annual reporting to members
Reedness & Swinefleet DB	No BAP
Sow & Penk IDB	9 year BAP implementation in place - annual reporting to members

Table A2-13: Results for Shire Group for E6: Whether the IDB has evaluated its drainage network to manage a balance of biodiversity and flood conveyance, in line with the Drainage Channel Biodiversity Manual

Board	Maintenance/Biodiversity
Ancholme IDB	EU Procurement compliant tender process undertaken, will adopt best practice guidelines
Black Drain DB	2014 agreed to adopt best practice guidelines
Danvm DC	2013 Workforce trained on best practice guidelines
Doncaster East IDB	2014 Adopt best practice guidelines
Goole Fields DDB	Contractors and Board informed of best practice guidelines
Reedness & Swinefleet DB	Contractors and Board informed of best practice guidelines
Sow & Penk IDB	2014 Adopt best practice guidelines



Risk & Policy Analysts Limited
Farthing Green House, 1 Beccles Road
Loddon, Norfolk, NR14 6LT, United Kingdom

Tel: +44 1508 528465
Fax: +44 1508 520758
E-mail: post@rpald.co.uk
Website: www.rpald.co.uk

If printed by RPA, this report is published on 100% recycled paper