

## Flood Risk Management Working Group

19 July 2023

### Microsoft Teams

#### **Attendees**

[REDACTED] - SG (Chair)  
[REDACTED] – SG, Flood Risk Management Team  
[REDACTED] – SG, SG Flood Risk Management Team  
[REDACTED] - SG LG Finance,  
[REDACTED] - SG LG Finance  
[REDACTED] – COSLA  
[REDACTED] -COSLA  
[REDACTED] - SCOTS  
[REDACTED] – SEPA  
[REDACTED] – Inverclyde Council Director of Finance  
[REDACTED] – West Lothian Council Director of Finance  
[REDACTED] – SEPA  
[REDACTED] - City of Edinburgh Council, Director of Finance

#### **Apologies**

[REDACTED] – SG Flood Risk Management Team  
[REDACTED] - Chair of the Lead Local Authority Forum  
[REDACTED] - SCOTS  
[REDACTED] – COSLA  
[REDACTED] – North Ayrshire Council, Director of Finance

#### Note of Discussion

##### **Welcome & Introductions**

1. The Chair opened the meeting.

##### **Settlement and Distribution Group (SDG)**

2. The Group were of the view that it would be useful to have a meeting of the SDG which was solely focussed on flood risk management funding issues and affordability. This would allow proper consideration of future funding requirements and potential implications.

**Action** - COSLA to organise extra meeting of SDG in September to focus on flood risk management funding, subject to SDG agreement.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- | [REDACTED]
- | [REDACTED]
- | [REDACTED] e
- | [REDACTED]
- | [REDACTED]
- | [REDACTED]
- | [REDACTED]

**Communication with LAs on recommendations**

- 13. It was noted that the 6 recommendations which had already been agreed with Council Leaders may not have been conveyed to Flooding or Finance Officials within LAs. SG agreed to write to LAs confirming that recommendations 1-6 have been agreed, and implementing recommendation 4 by asking LAs with a cycle 1 scheme whether they wished to proceed or voluntarily withdraw from the scheme.
- 14. The letter would also note that these recommendations applied to all cycle 1 schemes that are currently not yet notified and/or not under construction.

**Action** - SG to write to LAs confirming that recommendations 1-6 have been agreed by Ministers and COSLA leaders and seeking information as to whether LAs with a cycle 1 scheme proposed to continue (recommendation 4).

**Strand Two (staged approach) and Strand Three (Future distribution criteria) update**

- 15. An update was provided to the Group by the Technical Working Group on work to develop a staged approach to funding. The Technical Group had begun

discussion of a skeleton process focussed around HM Treasury Green Book business cases. In brief, this included what the stages could be, where gateways may be required, what level of scrutiny and what happens if work does not progress to the next stage.

16. The Technical Group will meet again on 24 July and continue to develop the process.

**Summary of actions agreed at meeting:**

- COSLA to organise extra meeting of SDG in September to focus on flood risk management funding, subject to SDG agreement.
- SG to write to LAs confirming that Recommendations 1-6 have been agreed by Ministers and COSLA leaders
- SG to publish minutes on SG website once agreed.

█ [REDACTED]

## Flood Risk Management Working Group

7 June 2023

### Microsoft Teams

#### **Attendees**

[REDACTED] - SG (Chair)  
[REDACTED] - SG Flood Risk Management Team  
[REDACTED] - SG, Flood Risk Management Team  
[REDACTED] - SG LG Finance,  
[REDACTED] - COSLA  
[REDACTED] - COSLA  
[REDACTED] - Chair of the Lead Local Authority Forum  
[REDACTED] - SCOTS  
[REDACTED] - SCOTS  
[REDACTED] - SEPA  
[REDACTED] - Inverclyde Council Director of Finance  
[REDACTED] - West Lothian Council Director of Finance  
[REDACTED] - North Ayrshire Council, Director of Finance

#### **Apologies**

[REDACTED] - SG, SG Flood Risk Management Team  
[REDACTED] - SG LG Finance  
[REDACTED] - COSLA  
[REDACTED] - SEPA  
[REDACTED] - City of Edinburgh Council, Director of Finance

#### **Actions**

1	SG to action recommendation 4.
2	Scottish Government to revisit scenario analysis
3	Technical sub group to discuss options for cost capping.
4	SEPA to provide further information on the flood risk for remaining cycle 1, and cycle 2 schemes.
5	COSLA and SG to agree method for publishing meeting minutes

#### **Note of Discussion**

##### **Welcome & Introductions**

The Chair opened the meeting.

The group agreed the minutes of the previous meeting (26 April 2023)

##### **Strand One - Recommendations to progress Cycle One Schemes**

1. An update was provided to the group to confirm that the 6 recommendations (Annex A) put forward by FWG were agreed by SDG and Council Leaders with a caveat for FWG to explore exemptions for exceptional circumstances for recommendation 2 and 3. [REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

8. FWG agreed that further scenario modelling would be helpful to consider implications on affordability and cycle 2 onwards. To aid this, FWG would like Recommendation 4 to be actioned as soon as practical, with LAs also asked to voluntarily indicate if they think they are at risk of not meeting recommendations 2 or 3. This information can inform the scenario modelling.

9. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Strand Two (staged approach) and Strand Three (Future distribution criteria) update**

12. An update was provided to FWG on the first meeting of the 'Cycle Two Funding Reform Working Group.' The inaugural meeting confirmed the terms of reference. The group will reconvene on 20 June with a focus on a staged development model for flood protection actions.

**AOB**

13. The group agreed that the minutes of FWG should be proactively published. Further discussion required on whether COSLA or Scottish Government is best placed to do so.

Annex A – list of agreed recommendations

***Recommendation 1 – All non-completed cycle 1 schemes should be included in the viability review***

***Recommendation 2 - All schemes must be notified (as required by para 1, schedule 2 of the FRM Act) by the end of Quarter 4 2023/24 financial year (March 31st 2024). If a LA is not able to provide evidence the scheme has been notified, then it will not be considered viable and automatically removed from cycle 1 funding.***

***Recommendation 3 - All schemes must have the main construction works signed contract in place by the end of Quarter 4 2025/26 financial year (March 31st 2026). If a LA is not able to provide evidence the scheme has a tender in place then it will not be considered viable and automatically removed from cycle 1 funding.***

***Recommendation 4 - Every 6 months all schemes are asked the following question. If the answer is no, they are automatically deemed not viable and removed from cycle 1 funding:-***

***Q. Does the LA wish to continue to progress with the scheme, and is it in a position to do so?***

***Recommendation 5 - All unclassified schemes and level 4 (low) schemes are not to be taken to the stage/gateway process.***

***Recommendation 6 - All LAs are asked:***

***Q - If they wish to progress the proposed Scheme in Cycle 2, or if they wish to voluntarily withdraw or defer to a future cycle.***

***Q - Where they wish to progress in Cycle 2, confirm they are in a position to progress the Scheme should funding be made available and what stage of development they think they could reach by the end of Cycle 2.***