"AN APPLICATION OF THE OECD PRINCIPLES ON WATER GOVERNANCE TO FLOOD MANAGEMENT"

"Hydrologie pour une ville résiliente" "Hydrology for a resilient city" 7 Mai, Aubervilliers

Hakan Tropp Head OECD Water Governance Programme Centre for Entrepreneurship, SMEs, Regions and Cities







Are cities' governance structures well-equipped to handle the challenges?



- ✓ Roles and responsibilities in urban water management are still high fragmented → national-subnational coordination
- ✓ Urban water management concerns several scales → multi-level functional approach to water functions
- ✓ Multi-level governance gaps → "Mind the Gaps, Bridge the Gaps"



- Process
- Rationale
- Checklist
- Take away messages
- Case study profiles
- Questions for discussion



- "Checklist" to appraise the performance of flood risk governance arrangements against the OECD Principles.
- Oct.-Nov. 2016: Collection of 27 case studies analysed to highlight common features and key challenges
- Previous versions of this report were discussed at:

 ✓ STAR-FLOOD Conference, Brussels on 4-5 February 2016
✓ Dutch Water Governance Centre Sunset Symposium in Amersfoort, the Netherlands on 10 March 2016
✓ Adaptation Futures Conference in Rotterdam on 10-13 May 2016.
✓ 7th meeting of the WGI (23-24 June 2016, The Hague).



By 2050, **1.6 billion people** will be at risks from floods (compared to 1.2 billion in 2013), affecting nearly 20% of the world's population

Megatrends have an impact on floods



Traditional approaches to flood management are not sufficient

- 1. Tend to overlook the perceptions of risk which various stakeholders (individuals or businesses) may hold.
- 2. Fail to capture the complex interconnections between various policy instruments (including technology)
- 3. Can encourage greater development of flood prone areas
- 4. Most cost-benefit analysis methodologies discount the future and long term negative externalities of some measures that manifest decades later.
- Non-structural flood mitigation measures offer a window of opportunity to bridge the existing inconsistencies (water-land)

Flood governance through the lens of the OECD Principles on Water Governance

Assessing the state of play of flood governance against the OECD Principles on Water Governance.



Source: Adapted from the OECD (2015), OECD Principles on Water Governance, available at: http://www.oecd.org/cfe/regional-policy/OECD-Principles-on-Water-Governance-brochure.pdf



Key characteristics:



A voluntary self-assessment tool



Key questions on whether conditions are in place to manage risks rather than to manage crisis



Pilot-tested from a collection of case studies (10 Oct. -2 Nov. 2016)

A reading template to stimulate in depth discussion on each principle



The Flood Governance Checklist has +100 questions structured around three blocks: Diagnostic, Impact & Mechanisms

Box 2. <u>Principle 2.</u> Manage water at the *appropriate scale(s)* within integrated basin governance systems to reflect local conditions, and foster co-ordination between the different scales.

DIAGNOSTIC

At which scale are the flood risk management functions primarily managed:

	-	-		
	Basin (from sub-	National	City	Other, specify:
	basin to			
	transboundary)			
Flood anticipation/				
foresight				
Flood prevention/				
mitigation				
Flood preparation				
Flood response				
Flood recovery				

IMPACTS

What are the challenges towards vertical coordination?

□ Conflicting agendas, priorities and interests

□ Capacity gaps

□ Inconsistent budgeting, procurement and regulatory processes across levels

□ Different languages

□ Unbalanced power, capacities and resources

Legal allocation of powers and responsibilities

□ Other, specify:

MECHANISMS

Are flood risk management plans consistent with national policies and local conditions?

 $\hfill\square$ There are no flood risk management plans

□ Flood risk management plans are in place but some aspects are contradictory with national policies or not adapted to local conditions

□ Flood risk management plans are in place and they are aligned with national policies and adapted to local conditions

□ Other, specify:

Which **multi-level and riparian co-operation mechanisms** are in place among users, stakeholders and levels of government for the management of flood risks?

	(Sub-)Basin	National	City	Other, specify:
Basin committee				
Participatory processes				
Shared data and information				
systems				
Joint programmes of				
measures				
Joint projects or contracts				
Co-financing arrangements				
Inter-governmental dialogue				
Other, specify:				



27 case studies that represent a diversity of:



Key challenges for effective, efficient, and inclusive flood governance

- Fragmentation of institutions, responsibilities, policies, data
- Coordination misalignment between water and land management
- Place-based approaches to floods are insufficient
- No widespread systemic and comprehensive approach



Policy insights:

- Places: tailored to the place that policies and investments aim to serve
- Policies: reflect upon how each policy areas' strategy contributes to reducing flood risk
- People: results-oriented stakeholder engagement.



Source: OECD (2016) Water Governance in Cities, OECD Publishing, Paris

• Special attention to multi-level dimensions related to capacity, monitoring & evaluation and innovation.

27 case study profiles

OECD Flood governance practice: Eddleston Water Project, OVERVIEW Scotland Scale: River Basin . ► Thematic focus: National research project WHAT IS THIS CASE ABOUT? It is a long-term Scottish Government study of the effect of Natural Flood Management techniques on reducing flood risk and improving river habitats. The project takes a science and stakeholder-led approach to flood risk governance and delivery in order to explore how changes in land management and river channel structure might reduce flood risk for downstream communities. The key and novel feature is the local governance and participative to reducing flood risk. A series of practical works have been undertaken throughout the catchment as part of an overall plan to restore the river and valley. These practical works are being closely monitored through a detailed network of hydrological, ecological and socio- economic measures and models. WHO DOES WHAT IN FLOOD GOVERNANCE? Regulation & Policy Operational Policymaking Scale of management implementation management enforcement Flood authorities 5cottish anticipation & National government foresight Scottish Flood Local government Environment SEPA prevention & Basin Protection Agency Local ible mitigation Regional/Provincial (SEPA) government SEPA National Flood Respo preparation Flood Scottish Local/Metropolitan response government Local government Flood Regional/Provincial Local government recovery Local/Metropolitan Stakeholder NGO engagement in flood decision-making YES NO Source: Information provided by the University of Dundee - UNESCO-IHP Centre for Water Law, Science and Policy in the framework of the OECD project "Flood Governance: A Shared Responsibility" (November 2016) KEY CHALLENGES AGAINST THE OECD PRINCIPLES ON WATER GOVERNANCE The main challenges for managing floods are principles 3 and 5. Limited cross-sectoral co-ordination has led to policy incoherence. Furthermore, there is a lack of long-term empirical data on floods, as well as of social data that is key to assess and improve flood policy. Other obstacles include the absence of cost-benefit analysis that includes values and ecosystem services. Most challenging principle(s)





- What is missing in your city, basin, region, country to minimize flood risks?
 - -What type of governance measures can incentivize improved flood control?
 - -How can planning of water and land use be better coordinated?



Thank you

