

## Coastal Change Pathfinder: Questions to guide the evaluation

### Pathfinder schemes

1. What was delivered that was different to your original plan and why?
2. Where there risks that arose during the course of the Pathfinder that you had not anticipated?

*Our drop-in sessions coincided with the worst winter weather in about 40 years which didn't help with attendance and required additional efforts and a longer timescale to survey opinion. The rules on competitive tendering and procurement delayed the start of the project and pushed it into the Autumn/Winter period (not the best time for a holiday area project).*

3. What were the benefits (obvious/expected and otherwise)?

*The level of community involvement that we did achieve usefully built on the work of the existing stakeholder group in this part of the coast.*

4. What were the costs, including any not covered by your original bid (including for example local authority staff time)? Please provide a breakdown of costs.

*None.*

5. What has experience told us about what expectations are around Government support and funding and how has pathfinder affected that positively/negatively?

*Many of the participants still regard sea defences as a national issue which should be funded centrally (see page 45, section 8.5 of the final report - Stakeholder Criticisms).*

6. Has the scheme come up with outcomes or promising looking ideas that warrant continuation? Which case studies do you think have the greatest replicability?

*The outcomes/promising ideas are set out in full detail in Chapter 7 of the Report. These include:*

- *the role of the RFCC and Grant-in-Aid;*
- *Contributions from direct/indirect beneficiaries;*
- *the role of Community Interest Companies;*
- *the use of Parish Precepts;*
- *the role of BID/TID schemes;*
- *the use of Council Tax from a wider area;*

- *the role of Shoreline Drainage Boards;*
- *the use of Special Expenses, TIF and CIL.*

*A number of these measures would require further study and, possibly, legislative changes before they could proceed. The policy, practical and financial implications of each mechanism are set out in Table 7.2 (page 37) of the final report. This table highlights where change would be needed to enable the mechanisms to be used to secure contributions. The issue is urgent on this stretch of coast as funding for the current regime of beach recycling and reprofiling is due to end in 2012.*

7. For each of these parts - Could they be self funding? Could/should they be funded by beneficiaries, the local community, or central government?

*They could be self funding in part, but are also likely to need RFCC/central Government support.*

8. How might this process have been kick-started in the absence of pathfinder funding?
9. If this was replicated by other local authorities, how could they fund it? How much funding do you need for sort of approach?

***Further investigation into legislative, policy, practical and financial implications of the mechanisms is likely to be required.*** *This will be needed before a mechanism can be rolled out for the Wolferton Creek to South Hunstanton frontage. However, there would be real advantage in identifying how these implications could be addressed at the national level, so the mechanisms could form a template that could be rolled out to enable local contributions to be collected in more areas that are potentially facing a funding shortfall. Ultimately, whichever mechanism is chosen, it needs to have sufficient public support and backing to be enforceable (see section 10.3 Recommendations of the final report).*

10. How would you have run the pathfinder scheme? What would you have done differently?

*Regarding the Pathfinder process itself, concerns were raised by stakeholders relating to the timescale and timing of the project, as well as the numbers of people consulted (see section 8.5 of the final report).*

## **Lessons for policy making**

11. Looking back to original aims of the pathfinder, can adaptation work in this way or are there barriers?

*There was unwillingness amongst stakeholders to consider adaptation actions (see section 9.3.1 of the final report). In general many of the respondents would rather contribute towards coastal defences than lose what they have.*

12. How can the barriers be overcome and who needs to do this?

*The obstacles/barriers to implementing a mechanism to secure contributions are set out in Table 10.2 of the final report. Potential actions to reduce the obstacles/barriers associated with the mechanisms are set out on pages 78-80 (section 10.3 Recommendations) of the final report or combined in Table 3 of the Executive Summary. The implications of potential adaptation actions are set out in Table 9.6 of the final report. Ongoing engagement is needed to take these actions forward. There is an issue here around how to resource this engagement work and who should lead on it.*

13. Who should pay for adaptation? What are the external funding options?

*Other Pathfinders have considered who should pay for adaptation. The prevailing view seems to be that this should be financed by central Government.*