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SUBJECT MATTER

Background to this report

1. The EC Implementation Report is required by Article 18 of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and Article 16 of the Flood Directive (FD). This Report presents the Commission’s views on the implementation of the WFD and FD based on its assessment of the second River Basin Management Plans (RBMPs) and the first Flood Risk Management Plans (FRMPs) which cover the period 2015-21. The report is accompanied by an Annex with recommendations for individual Member States on both RBMPs and FRMPs. It is also accompanied by Commission Staff Working Documents containing:

- European overviews of all Member States FRMPs and RBMPs;
- Detailed individual assessments of each Member State’s RBMPs and FRMPs including assessments for the UK.


2. The WFD, introduced in 2000, established ambitious objectives to protect and restore aquatic ecosystems as a basis for ensuring long term, sustainable use of water for people, business and nature. It incorporated into a legally binding instrument the principles of integrated river basin management that takes account of social and economic considerations and provides for public involvement in its implementation. WFD is transposed in England and Wales by the Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017. The WFD has two key objectives of preventing deterioration and aiming to achieve good ecological status for all water bodies, subject to limited exemptions based on technical feasibility and disproportionate cost.
3. The RBMPs are the main instrument for implementation of the WFD. The planning process entails an analysis of the environmental and economic characteristics of the river basin; environmental monitoring to establish the current status of water bodies; objective setting in consultation with affected parties; establishment of a programme of measures to achieve the objectives set; and implementation of the measures. The second cycle RBMPs cover the period from 2015 – 2021. The planning process is repeated every six years.

4. Flood risk management covers all sources of flooding including from rivers (fluvial flooding), the sea and heavy rainfall (pluvial flooding, commonly referred to as surface water flooding). The Floods Directive came into force in November 2007. It establishes a framework for assessing and managing flood risk aimed at reducing the adverse consequences for human health, the environment, cultural heritage and economic activity. It was transposed in England and Wales by the Flood Risk Regulations 2009, in Scotland by the Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009, and in Northern Ireland through The Water Environment (Floods Directive) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2009.

5. FRMPs establish appropriate objectives for the management of flood risk for Areas of Potential Significant Flood Risk (APFRs) focusing on the reduction of potential adverse consequences of flooding for human health, the environment, cultural heritage and economic activity, and if considered appropriate, on non-structural initiatives and/or on the reduction of the likelihood of flooding. They should include measures for achieving the objectives and take into account relevant aspects such as costs and benefits, flood extent and flood conveyance routes and areas which have the potential to retain flood water, such as natural flood plains, water management, spatial planning and land use etc. There are a number of requirements that should be described in the FRMPs such as the prioritisation of the measures aiming to achieve the objectives. There is a requirement in the Floods Directive for the development of FRMPs to be coordinated with the development of River Basin Management Plans under the Water Framework Directive.

Document 1: Implementation Report

6. The Implementation Report draws some encouraging general conclusions that compliance with the WFD is increasing gradually (though much remains to be done) and that important progress under the Floods Directive has been made as Member States have embraced the concept of flood risk management (although reducing the adverse consequences of flooding will require sustained effort by Member States). Key recommendations are made for the individual Member States, including the UK, in the Annex.

Document 2: Annex with Recommendations on RBMPs and FRMPs

7. The Annex summarises the key recommendations for individual Member States. In respect of the recommendations for the UK, we note that these are the EC's recommendations for the next cycle of plans which the UK is particularly
encouraged to implement. We will take these recommendations into consideration in the next cycle of plans. Further discussion is in the Policy Implications section.

Documents 3 and 4: European overviews:

RBMPs

8. Members States reported their Second Cycle RBMPs for the period 2015-2021 by March 2016. The general overview report concluded that whilst implementation of WFD had improved since the last cycle, progress on WFD objectives was slow. Around 90% of surface water across Member States had not changed since the last RBMPs. The report highlighted specific areas.

9. The report stated that Member States need to be clearer how their programmes of measures respond to the key pressures on the water environment, for example, pollution from agriculture and physical changes to water bodies from industrial, transportation and urban development.

10. There has been over use and a lack of transparency about how Member States have exempted certain water bodies from reaching good status if is technically infeasible, disproportionately costly or the natural conditions of the water will take longer to recover.

11. Little progress has been made generally in relation to water dependent protected sites, such as areas of conservation importance (e.g. Natura 2000 sites) and areas used for abstraction for drinking water. The report suggested greater alignment with other environmental Directives covering these area as a goal to improvement.

12. The report also suggested more work needs to be done by Member States in the areas of cost recovery for water services, such as, water pricing that incentivises consumers to use water efficiently.

FRMPs

13. The Commission's assessment was based on all the FRMPs or a representative sample in each Member State (the latter in the UK). Its overall conclusion was that Member States had made a good effort with solid results in their first FRMPs. It also identified areas for further development, and challenges to be addressed in the second FRMPs. Its recommendations are aimed at strengthening existing good practice.

14. The Report gives the figures for legal compliance by Member States in respect of completion and adoption and reporting to the Commission of their FRMPs. It covers what it regards as good practice on key themes highlighted in the Implementation Report e.g. assessment of objectives, implementation of measures, involvement of interested parties and public consultation, financing of measures, use of cost/benefit
analysis, links with RBMPs, consideration of the likely impact of climate change, international co-ordination.

15. It also summarises other relevant reports and strategies such as the Commission’s earlier 2015 Implementation Report, and the Common Implementation Strategy which acts for a platform for the exchange of best experience and best practice amongst Member States.

Documents 5 and 6: UK reports

RBMPs

16. The country specific report for the UK covers England and all of the devolved nations. It scrutinises RBMPs across 12 river basin districts (RBDs), 3 international RBDs in Northern Ireland and the one RBD of Gibraltar. The report provides a number of detailed national findings and recommendations. Those areas treated in the European overview report (see above) are repeated in case of the UK. In addition the report makes a number of UK specific points and recommendations:

- Public consultation on RBMPs should be stronger and more transparent
- Monitoring of water quality both, ecological and chemical status, should be more robust and a reduction in monitoring sites needs explanation.
- Improvements have been made in the delineation of groundwater bodies but more work is needed on uncertainties reported in relation to the assessment of the status, the pressures and the effect of potential measures on groundwater bodies, especially their chemical status.
- The UK is identified as using the exemptions under WFD (see above) and the report recommends that the application of these exemptions is more transparent.
- Greater clarity is required for all RBDs as to what extent basic measures or supplementary measures will contribute to achieving the WFD objectives. Also, to identify sources of funding to facilitate successful implementation of measures in all RBDs.
- The report mentions gaps in RBMP reporting data that should have been provided via the WISE databases and inconsistencies in reporting across England and the devolved nations. It also mentions the lack of an RBMP for Gibraltar. These findings were rebutted by the UK (see Policy Implications section below).

FRMPs

17. The Commission based its report on 5 out of 36 FRMPs. They looked at

- Severn (England and Wales),
- Neagh Bann (N Ireland),
- Clyde and Loch Lomond (Scotland),
- Solway (Scottish part)
- Solway Tweed (English part).
18. It concluded that there was good practice within the UK in relation to the planning and implementation of measures and their prioritisation for the achievement of objectives; climate change; public consultation; co-ordination of FRMPs with RBMPs.

19. Areas for further development included integration of previously reported information; setting of objectives with quantitative targets; measuring how the measure will contribute to the objectives. Work is already underway to address these concerns in the second FRMPs where we agree that the recommendation is relevant and it improve existing good practice in the UK. See Policy Implications section.

20. The detailed conclusions included the following:

(i) **On Objectives**
- strong evidence that objectives have been established and these included objectives reducing the adverse consequences of flooding
- some evidence that these included objectives aimed at the reduction of the likelihood of flooding, green non-structural measures
- strong evidence that these objectives considered the potential adverse consequences of flooding for human health, economic activity, environment (but only some in relation to cultural heritage).

(ii) **On Measures**
- strong evidence that measures have been identified and some evidence that these had been prioritised

(iii) **On taking into account relevant aspects of Article 7 of the Directive (see Policy Implications section on extent of the legal requirements here)**
- strong evidence that the FRMPs covered the extent of flooding, spatial planning, nature conservation, the likely impact of climate change, co-ordination with WFD, active involvement of interested parties
- some evidence that the FRMPs covered costs and benefits, environmental objectives of the WFD, co-ordination with other countries in the RBD, conveyance routes and natural water retention measures.

See Policy Implications section

**SCRUTINY HISTORY**

21. The Parliamentary scrutiny history relevant to this report is contained in the attached Annex A.

**MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY**

22. The Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs has responsibility for coordinating and leading on the response to Europe on implementation of the Floods Directive and the Water Framework Directive by the UK.
INTEREST OF THE DEVOLVED ADMINISTRATIONS

23. Flooding is a devolved matter and the devolved administrations are responsible for the implementation of the Floods Directive within their own areas of devolved competence. A UK Co-ordination Group meets to discuss and co-ordinate the management of flood risk across the UK in compliance with the Floods Directive.

24. Implementation of the WFD in the UK is also devolved and a coordinated approach is taken in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. Technical advice on implementation and environmental standards is provided by a UK Technical Advisory Group.

25. Scottish Government Ministers, Welsh Government Ministers and Northern Ireland therefore have an interest in recommendations on the Water Framework Directive and the Floods Directive. Officials in the devolved administrations have been consulted in the preparation of this explanatory memorandum.

LEGAL AND PROCEDURAL ISSUES

26. There are no legal or procedural issues.

i. Legal Basis
   Not applicable.

ii. European Parliament Procedure
    Not applicable.

iii. Voting Procedure
     Not applicable.

iv. Impact on United Kingdom Law
    Not applicable.

v. Application to Gibraltar
    The WFD and the FD apply to Gibraltar and HMG is responsible for reporting on Gibraltar's behalf. We have consulted officials in Gibraltar. There are no implications for them from this report in relation to floods as they have no APFRs and therefore do not report a Flood Risk Management Plan. Gibraltar, which has groundwater and coastal water does submit its own, single River Basin Management Plan which covers its whole territory.

vi. Fundamental Rights Analysis
    Not applicable.

APPLICATION TO THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AREA
27. The report's recommendations are not applicable to the European Economic Area.

SUBSIDIARITY

28. This is not a legislative proposal, and the Government does not have subsidiarity concerns in relation to it.

29. It should be clear in the Commission's reports on implementation of Directives where the Commission is checking in relation to Directive requirements and where it is recommending good practice.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS (including exit implications where appropriate)

30. On 23 June 2016 the EU referendum took place and the people of the UK voted to leave the EU. Until 29 March 2019, the UK remains a full member of the EU and all the rights and obligations of EU membership remain in force. During this period the Government will continue to negotiate, implement and apply EU legislation. The outcome of the negotiations will determine what arrangements apply in relation to EU legislation once the UK has left the EU. The timescales for some of the recommendations extend to 2022.

31. This is not a legislative proposal. It relates to the current implementation of the WFD and the FD.

32. Whilst the UK remains part of Europe we are required to comply with the Directives. We are seeking to maintain good relations with Europe and co-operate with the Commission. However, we wish to ensure that the Directives remain flexible and do not introduce unnecessary requirements or guidance seeking to standardise approaches within the EU without improving flood risk.

WFD and RBMPS Policy Implications

33. The report has no policy implications for the UK. This is not a legislative proposal and the report recommends continued work by MS on the implementation of WFD which is transposed in national law. No policy changes to the river basin management processes are entailed by the report.

34. The country specific report covering the UK's River Basin Management Plans highlights a number of recommendations from the Commission, as explained above. It is, however, the view of the UK that the Commission's assessment of UK RBMPs was not robust and failed to take account of information provided at the Commission's request via its WISE database. The draft report drew many conclusions based on incomplete and inaccurate data and many of its conclusions were subjective and not underpinned by any clear explanations. Defra Officials wrote to the Commission correcting these factual errors and expressing this view in May and October 2018. These criticisms were echoed by a large number of Member States and the Commission reissued an amended report in October 2018.
It is the view of the UK that, whilst improved, the final report still contains some factual inaccuracies and subjective conclusions.

35. References in the report to international river basin districts only apply to the Northern Ireland – Republic of Ireland cross border RBDs. There are no policy implications as North-South collaboration is established to ensure common policies and approaches in water quality management and co-ordination of the programme of measures for the whole of each internationally shared river basin district. Joint working is in line with requirement under the Water Framework Directive to protect and improve the condition of cross border water bodies falling within their shared international river basin districts.

36. There is continued collaboration and exchange of freshwater monitoring data and assessments in cross border water bodies (rivers and lakes) through North-South Lakes and Rivers Technical Group. There is also collaboration on Water Framework Directive monitoring issues through the WFD UK Technical Advisory Group (UKTAG), on which the Environmental Protection Agency of the Republic of Ireland is represented.

Floods Directive and FRMPs Policy Implications

37. It is possible that in the light of these Reports, the Council response to the recent European Court of Auditors Report and the current Commission “Fitness Check”, the EC may seek to amend the Floods Directive. The UK would be keen to ensure that changes improve flood risk management and are not done in a way that impacts on subsidiarity, national competence and flexibility. Whilst the UK remains part of the EU, we would need to implement any new requirements.

38. The findings of the Assessment on which the Implementation Report is based was discussed in general terms at the EU officials Floods and Water Working Groups and at meetings of European Water Directors. Commission Reports and Staff Working Documents are not the subject of discussion at these meetings though the UK (and other Member States) did have the opportunity to comment on its draft individual reports and secured a number of corrections.

39. Current Floods Directive Regulations requires Northern Ireland to harmonise plans for the three cross-border RBDs with competent authorities in the Republic of Ireland. This is essential to ensure that any flood mitigation measures proposed by Northern Ireland do not significantly increase the flood risk in the Republic of Ireland and vice versa. Strong co-operation exists within the context of the UK co-operation Group which NI and ROI attend. The level of joint working between NI and ROI continues to be very positive, and there are well established fora in place to maintain the necessary cooperation and coordination and the resolution of any cross-border issues. With respect to the management of flood risk in cross border catchments, this is undertaken in the spirit of mutual cooperation and any funding shared equitably between the jurisdictions.
40. There is also close cross border coordination between England and Wales and between Scotland and England in respect of shared FRMPs and cross border projects and their funding.

41. A UK co-ordination group of officials meets every two months to discuss these arrangements.

**UK position on the recommendations made to the UK in the Implementation Report Annex and UK specific report**

42. In the case of RBMPs the specific recommendations in the Annex of the overarching report were taken from the recommendations in the larger UK report we received in Autumn 2018 to which we responded last year.

43. In respect of FRMPs, the EC has made 5 specific recommendations to the UK in relation to objectives, measures and climate change. We have not had the opportunity to discuss or respond these recommendations yet but offer some initial comments below.

**Objectives**
- To develop measurable objectives of the FRMPs to the extent possible

44. Initial comment: We will consider this recommendation for the second cycle of FRMPs. As the Commission recognises, some types of objective lend themselves more easy to quantification than others.

**Measures**
- To present the methodology for assessing measures in terms of costs and benefits as well as its application and results of this analysis.
- Better document the prioritisation of the measures, including the process.
- To include an estimation of the cost of measures in all FRMPs and provide an explanation of how a lack of funding may impact the implementation of the measures.

45. Initial Comment: the UK report says that there is strong evidence that measures have been identified and some evidence that these had been prioritised. The EC wish to ensure that MS are identifying clear sources of funding for flood projects and decision are based on good cost-benefit analysis to ensure value for money in their FRMPs. The UK agrees that there needs to be accountability and good links between strategic planning of flood risk management activities and the funding of those activities. The UK also agrees that it is important to consider value for money when prioritising flood risk management activities, and that Member States and others should monitor progress towards the achievement of objectives set in FRMPs.
However, there is a trade-off here. Whilst FRMPs should not contain an impossibly ambitious set of activities, the inclusion of specific rules within FRMPs requiring the identification of funding for every action could reduce the ambition of FRMPs, with them only containing already funded projects.

46. We have well established funding mechanisms which prioritise allocation of resources in accordance with rigorous value for money principles. We will consider the recommendation to provide more detail on the assessment and prioritisation processes for measures in the second round of FRMPs, whilst still remaining within the legal requirements. Our second cycle development is looking to improve the transparency and clarity of the way measures are identified and prioritised, and balancing the level of detail considered at the strategic planning versus local delivery level.

Climate Change
- To ensure systematic coordination with the National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy

47. Initial comment: We support the principle of better integrating the effects of climate change in flood risk management. The latest climate projections (UKCP18) are an important contribution to our national policy on climate change. Adaptation is integrated in all our flood and coastal erosion risk management policies and programmes. We plan for early adaptation so we will be better equipped and the potential impact of climate change on those most affected will be less. We note that the Commission's report for the UK finds strong evidence that we have taken account of the likely impact of climate change in the first FRMPs and will seek to explore this with the Commission.

CONSULTATION

48. Not applicable.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT

49. Not applicable.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

50. Not applicable.

TIMETABLE

51. The reports are an obligation for the Commission. When the new Commission is in place later this year it will produce an evaluation which will be discussed at Council. We will know exact timings later in the year.
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(2007/60/EC) SECOND RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT PLANS FIRST FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PLANS

UNNUMBERED EM: EUROPEAN COURT OF AUDITORS: SPECIAL REPORT NO 25/2018.FLOODS DIRECTIVE: PROGRESS IN ASSESSING RISKS, WHILE PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION NEED TO IMPROVE (PURSUANT TO ARTICLE 287(4), SECOND SUBPARAGRAPH, TFEU)

DATE EM SIGNED: 11/12/2018

SCRUTINY COMMITTEES' RECOMMENDATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMONS</th>
<th>LORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT IMPORTANT CLEARED (AGENDA FOR REPORT NO 49; 19/12/2018)</td>
<td>CLEARED (ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT) AT CHAIRMAN'S SIFT 1719 - 18/12/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


DATE EM SIGNED: 25/03/2015

SCRUTINY COMMITTEES' RECOMMENDATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMONS</th>
<th>LORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLEARED AS NOT IMPORTANT (REPORT 01; 20/07/2015)</td>
<td>SIFTED TO SUB-COMMITTEE D AT CHAIRMAN'S SIFT 1583 - 03/06/2015 LETTER 21/10/2015 FROM HOL-RELEASED FROM SCRUTINY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


DATE EM SIGNED: 4/12/2012

SCRUTINY COMMITTEES' RECOMMENDATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMONS</th>
<th>LORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLEARED AS POLITICALLY IMPORTANT REPORT 23 - 12/12/2012</td>
<td>CLEARED AT CHAIRMAN'S SIFT - 1489 11/12/2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMISSION STAFF WORKING PAPER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT TO THE THIRD FOLLOW-UP REPORT TO THE COMMUNICATION ON WATER SCARCITY AND DROUGHTS IN THE EUROPEAN UNION [COM (2007) 414 FINAL]

DATE OF EM: 12/04/2011

SCRUTINY COMMITTEES' RECOMMENDATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMONS</th>
<th>LORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

EM 8368/09: REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ARTICLE 18.3 OF THE WATER FRAMEWORK DIRECTIVE 2000-60 (EC) ON PROGRAMMES FOR MONITORING WATER STATUS

SCRUTINY COMMITTEES' RECOMMENDATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMONS</th>
<th>LORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


SCRUTINY COMMITTEES' RECOMMENDATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMONS</th>
<th>LORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPIC, CLEARED 21/03/2007</td>
<td>CLEARED AT SIFT ON IN REPORT 13/3/2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EM 11816/06: PROPOSAL FOR A DIRECTIVE OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY STANDARDS IN THE FIELD OF WATER POLICY AND AMENDING DIRECTIVE 2000/60/EC
SCUTINY COMMITTEES’ RECOMMENDATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMONS</th>
<th>LORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REPORTED TWICE IN REPORTS 40, 05-06 AND 25,06-07 AND DEBATED IN EUROPEAN STANDING COMMITTEE ON 25/06/2007</td>
<td>SIFTED TO SUB-COMMITTEE D AND CLEARED FOLLOWING CORRESPONDENCE WITH MINISTERS ON 14/06/2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EM 5614/01: AMENDED PROPOSAL FOR A DECISION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL ESTABLISHING THE LIST OF PRIORITY SUBSTANCE IN THE FIELD OF WATER POLICY

SCUTINY COMMITTEES’ RECOMMENDATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMONS</th>
<th>LORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLEARED AS PIC ON 28/02/2001 IN REPORT 07, 00-01</td>
<td>CLEARED AT SIFT 20/02/2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EM 9488/09, 12927/97 & 7531/97

PROPOSAL FOR A DIRECTIVE OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL ESTABLISHING A FRAMEWORK FOR COMMUNITY ACTION IN THE FIELD OF WATER POLICY

SCUTINY COMMITTEES’ RECOMMENDATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMONS</th>
<th>LORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REPORTED ON 5 OCCASIONS IN REPORTS, 02, 97-98, 14, 97-98, 27, 98-99 AND 26, 99-00. PROPOSALS WERE DEBATED IN EUROPEAN STANDING COMMITTEE ON 29/04/1998</td>
<td>SIFTED TO SUB-COMMITTEE C AND CLEARED FOLLOWING MINISTERIAL CORRESPONDENCE ON 18/11/1997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>