

Summary Paper re the SRA's 5 Year Enhanced Programme, covering the points raised verbally at the 27th July Board meeting

Background re why we need a Board approved 5 Year Enhanced Programme

- Firstly to have a prioritised list of projects/works outside the already approved Programme for this year so that as projects/works come in under budget (or the EA find they have extra money to deliver some of them) we can use our delegations to swiftly move to the next affordable prioritised work on the list without waiting for a Board meeting.
- Secondly the Technical Group need to be working up next year's programme now, ready for signoff by the Board later in the year, once we are clear about funding.
- Thirdly we need to be able to plan ahead, not least in order to gain procurement efficiencies.

Where are we in the process?

- This time last year, we identified the criteria for selection and prioritisation of works in this year's Enhanced Programme and these are outlined in Appendix 3 of our MoU. This is also attached as a separate document, called The Prioritisation Process and Criteria 2016/17.
- But in brief, our criteria for selection included that the proposal must address a need (defined as delivering one of the 6 key FAP priorities – which do include wider public benefits) and not be fundable through other sources (ie be additional). It is also the case that as part of that process we did look at the costs and a wide range of benefits, of each proposal.
- However, we recognised that there were a number of difficulties with the approach taken e.g.
 - What was the relative importance of each of the FAP priorities, including the environmental priority, one versus the other, and does this change over time
 - Having put a number of projects in place that have made and will make a significant difference to catchment scale flooding, should local flooding issues now assume a higher priority.
 - £ for £ is it better to deliver a very small reduction in flood risk to a large number of people or a large reduction to a much smaller number of people – a small amount of multiple public benefits, versus a large amount of a single benefit and so on
- For these reasons, the amended ToR for the Management Group in this year's MoU has given the job of reviewing the policy framework for the SRA's 5 Year Programme and prioritisation criteria to them.
- This work started at the Management Group meeting in July and has continued over the summer. It will identify a series of policy principles – a deeper understanding and definition of FAP priorities and their relative importance, and a prioritisation methodology which, once approved by the Board, can then be used

by the Technical Group to determine next year's prioritised list, as well as the overall 5 year Programme, which will go to the Board ready for next year.

Note:

- At the July SRA Board meeting, the Board recognised the need for this work to be done, but wanted to make it clear that this would not remove the need for the Board to review the list of proposals and understand the basis for each proposal's place on the prioritised list.