

Appendix A – Flood and coastal erosion risk management governance evaluation framework

Criteria	Main evaluation questions
Process - refers to process-based elements of governance and the way in which decisions are made.	
National versus local consistency (Line of sight)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are RMAs acting in line with national policies/strategies and guidance? ▪ Is clear guidance available for implementing national FCERM policy/laws as intended? ▪ Are national policies implemented as intended at the local scale? ▪ Do authorities with 'strategic overview' make full use of this? ▪ Is there consistency in reporting on condition of flood and coastal change infrastructure?
Place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are the needs of 'place' embedded in the decision-making process? ▪ Are decisions based/implemented at appropriate scales?
Resource efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are resources used efficiently? ▪ Are there high and/or avoidable transaction costs present? ▪ Is there duplication of effort and overlap in actions/responsibilities? ▪ What proportion of resources are targeted towards different actions? ▪ Have diversified funding streams and/or financing options been considered? ▪ Does the governance arrangement cause avoidable delays in tackling flood risk? ▪ Are current resources sufficient and adequate? Are the right skills and capacities in place? ▪ Have other benefits/ecosystem services been considered in the design of FCERM schemes and initiatives? Do funding criteria enable optimal benefits to be achieved?
Collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is there evidence of effective collaboration and cooperation between relevant stakeholders across relevant scales and/or policy sectors?

Criteria	Main evaluation questions
(within FCERM and between allied policy sectors)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are good working relationships established between relevant stakeholders?
Integration (within FCERM and between allied policy sectors)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is there evidence of effective integration of activities between relevant bodies, where possible? ▪ To what extent are flood and coastal erosion risk management strategies co-ordinated and aligned, where relevant? ▪ To what extent are FCERM policies/activities integrated with other relevant environmental, economic and social needs? ▪ To what extent are FCERM policies/activities integrated with the wellbeing agenda and national wellbeing goals (Wales)?
Long-term sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are short-term needs balanced against long-term needs? ▪ Are a range of climate change futures considered?
Participation and involvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ (How) have all stakeholders (including the public) been involved in the decision-making process? ▪ Are all perspectives equally considered? ▪ To what extent is there inclusive engagement?
Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the best available 'evidence' embedded in the decision-making process? ▪ Does evidence draw from a range of disciplinary perspectives? ▪ Does the decision-making process draw from 'lessons learned'? ▪ Are uncertainties full acknowledged and considered? ▪ Have innovative ideas been considered?
Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the FCERM approach/activities periodically assessed/monitored? ▪ Are clear objectives/targets set in order to monitor progress and ensure accountability? ▪ Are all relevant documents made publicly available? ▪ Is FCERM governance transparent?
<p>Outcome - refers to the implementation of the decision-making process and whether the intended goal was achieved.</p>	

Criteria	Main evaluation questions
Societal resilience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are local communities empowered and encouraged to adopt individual property level resilience measures? ▪ Are local residents aware of the risks they face? Are risk messages understandable and accessible to everyone? ▪ Does the approach encourage/enable communities to prepare for flooding? ▪ Are local flood action plans in place? ▪ Were schemes successfully implemented (for example, equity release)? ▪ Are planning conditions enforced?
Hazard reduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What types of flood risk(s) were addressed? ▪ Were (defence) schemes successfully implemented (for example, defences erected)? ▪ Are assets effectively managed and maintained? ▪ Are SUDs in place and working effectively? ▪ Has the governance approach resulted in additional (defence) schemes being developed? ▪ Is there sufficient flexibility within outcomes to be adjusted to suit changing conditions and/or the emergence of new evidence?
Multi-benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have other benefits/ecosystem services been achieved? ▪ Are 'integrated solutions' to environmental and social challenges provided? ▪ Has the optimal amount of multi-benefits been achieved?
Partnership working	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do all stakeholders (including the public) understand the distribution of roles and responsibilities in FCERM? ▪ Have effective working relationships been established between relevant stakeholders? Does this result in better achievement of outcomes?
<p>Impact - refers to the resulting effect of governance processes and outcomes. To be considered effective, flood and coastal erosion risk governance should achieve what was intended.</p>	
Resilient places	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have outcomes ensured that communities are able to cope with flood events? ▪ Are flood-affected communities able to recover within an acceptable timeframe? ▪ Has flood and coastal erosion risk been reduced, to what level? For what types of flooding? ▪ Have the number of properties at risk of flooding or coastal erosion been reduced? ▪ Has inappropriate development been prevented?

Criteria	Main evaluation questions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent do new developments contribute to place-based resilience? ▪ Has there been sufficient uptake of property-level resilience? ▪ Has access to affordable insurance been ensured? ▪ Are efforts being taken to move and/or relocate people, property and infrastructure away from risk where necessary? ▪ Is the (combination of) approach(es) taken appropriately tailored to the economic, social and environmental needs of the place and people?
Resilient growth and infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has disruption to businesses been minimised? ▪ Has disruption to critical infrastructure been minimised? ▪ Do LPAs and advisory RMAs engage and advise developers to inform resilient development? ▪ Do FCERM approaches support economic growth?
Adaptive capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are sufficient planning epochs used to ensure a long-term approach is taken? ▪ Are a range of futures embedded in the planning process? ▪ Are all actors empowered to adapt to future climate and coastal change? ▪ To what extent is the approach taken 'durable' and able to withstand projected climate/coastal changes in the future? (adaptive approaches) ▪ Is there sufficient flexibility within outcomes to be adjusted to suit changing conditions and/or the emergence of new evidence? ▪ To what extent are adaptive approaches embedded in (spatial) planning? ▪ To what extent is there evidence of active learning and implementation of 'lessons learned'? ▪ To what extent are opportunities created for innovation and experimentation? ▪ Are legal instruments/plans and programmes subject to periodic review in order to incorporate new information about climate and coastal change? ▪ To what extent does the legal framework successfully balance the need for legal certainty versus the need for adequate flexibility to allow adjustments? ▪ To what extent do recovery mechanisms foster adaptation and building back better?
Social equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the governance approach create disproportionate burdens or benefits for different stakeholders?

Criteria	Main evaluation questions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is FCERM perceived to be fair by all actors involved?
Acceptability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are local communities satisfied with RMAs and the approach taken? Is there trust and confidence in the approach taken? ▪ Is there acceptance (and uptake) of roles/responsibilities between all actors involved? ▪ Is there a sense of shared ownership in FCERM? ▪ Is there assurance that the best appropriate approach has been taken?