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Abstract
This master thesis analyses two citizen initiatives; the flood action plan of LLanddowror, Wales and the mound plan of the Overdiepse Polder, the Netherlands. It uses the collaboration theory, the ladder of citizen participation, cross-scale interaction and community resilience to explain the role of citizens in flood risk management. The aim of this research is to see how governments facilitate citizens and if culture and context influence the roles of governments and citizens. The Welsh system is bottom-up with an increasing role for market and civil society to take responsibilities. Citizens generally insure themselves against flood damage. The Welsh system has enhanced community engagement and creating awareness is important. Dealing with big strategic issues seems to be difficult. The Dutch flood governance is more top-down which means less room for citizen initiatives. Citizens are not insured for flood damage since the government profiles itself responsible for floods therefore awareness amongst citizens is low. The Dutch system has benefits when dealing with large scaled projects but has issues with creating awareness as well as engaging citizens in water development. Assumingly there are opportunities for both countries to learn from each others’ way of dealing with flood risk management and citizen engagement.
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1. Introduction to the research

1.1 Context & Research problem statement

In many of its strategic documents the European Union has targeted citizens, local communities, town and city councils to play an important role in the regional development. In every major developing project there has to be a stage of community engagement through consultation. With the trend of multi-level governance every level of government needs and wants to engage citizens. Even though academics try to analyse the role of citizens’ in policy-making and decision-making, often only the perspective of the policy-maker is taken in consideration (Stoker, 1997). So the view as in “how should we involve citizens to improve governance”. Ever since the WWII the role of citizens became more important in governance (Maier, 2001). This is not only stimulated by governance but also by the success of citizens’ initiatives such as de Overdiepse Polder (OP) in the Netherlands. Looking at Arnsteins’ (1969) Ladder of Citizen Participation (LoCP), up to recent, the interaction between civil society and state has been merely in the degree of tokenism. From an Anglo-Saxon and American perspective citizens have always played an important role in flood risk management (FRM) reasoning that it also directly affects them. In the Netherlands the role of the government has always been very strict and the role of citizens quite limited (Roth & Winnubst 2015). Since the extreme flooding in New Orleans in 2006 FRM became globally even more important than it already was. The change that we notice in several planning projects is that the tokenistic citizen involvement has been replaced by degrees of citizen power as mentioned by Arnstein (1969). This means that citizens are taking the lead becoming co-producers of plans, projects and programmes. The assumption is that there is a shift in the relation between state and civil society not only from the perspective of the changing role of the citizen but also for the government who is becoming more facilitating towards citizens and their initiatives. In subjects that directly affect citizens such as FRM this changing role is clearly notable. Better understanding of the relation between authorities and local communities is of societal relevance. If the two understand each other better there is a chance for better collaboration and more targeted ideas throughout Europe.

The interpretation of vulnerability to flood is different throughout member states in Europe (Greiving et al, 2013). A discussion about vulnerability was brought up in an ESPON Climate research (2013) which focussed on the relation between risk, impact of climate change and vulnerability. According to this research the relation between risk and impact is important to measure vulnerability. In the Netherlands for example the impact of a flood is bigger than in other countries even though the probability, the chance of a breakthrough, is much smaller. The result of the ESPON research, which studied all member states of Europe, was that the interpretation and the political sphere also play an important role. For example in southern European countries flood vulnerability is way higher than in the northern member states because governments do not invest in resilience measures since they have other political priorities (Greiving et al, 2013). Even though the fact that in member states like the Netherlands the impact to flood is bigger the probability and therefore vulnerability of citizens is considerably less because the government takes more measures and resilient measures are higher on the political agenda (Greiving et al, 2013).
I want to study two cases where I focus on the changing roles between government and citizens in different context. A full description about the cases can be found in chapter 5. A societal question that has been asked by public authorities as well as academics frequently is how the government can facilitate citizens and how society is better off with the plans made. Result Based Accountability (Friedman, 2005) is one of the many theories that attempt to create more measurable outcomes by looking at the benefits and involvement of society. In the OP citizens took initiative by voluntarily turning their land into a flood plain. From a government perspective LULU (Locally Unwanted Land Use), turned from NIMBY (Not In My Backyard) to PIMBY (Please In My Backyard). The initiative was in line with the national programme Room for the River (RFTR) and the interaction from citizen in lead cooperating with the national government is what makes this case unique (Roth & Winnubst, 2015). The citizens’ initiative eventually led to a win-win situation with more water storage and new mound houses for the farmers. 

The second case, the flood risk plan of Llanddowror is located in Wales (See Figure 1.1) in a complete different cultural setting and context. The Anglo Saxon way of governing differs in certain ways from the Dutch perspective which also leads to differences in the two cases. In this case citizens took initiative by creating a flood risk plan for their small historic village, where floods occurred often (Cory, 2013). Having resilient and active communities that feel involved with their community is not only on the Welsh agenda but also a high priority of the UK. In this sense communities and citizens have a stronger role then in the Netherlands (Wiering et al, 2015). Welsh Government is implementing a new Well being of Future Generations Bill (FG Bill) which has as one of the aims to involve citizens more in the planning system. In Wales local communities tend to be quite sceptical about the process and
afraid that they will not be heard. An example was seen during my internship in Penarth. In this project citizens were consulted in a traditional form and were not in power of such a plan which led to much resistance. A big part of FG bill is about resilient communities. Flood and other means of resilience are politically important since more floods occur as the flooding of the Thames in February 2014 (UK floods: Homes evacuated as swollen Thames keeps rising, 2014) and the floods in January, 2013 in Llanddowror (Cory, 2013). Llanddowror is a small Welsh village that is seen by the government as an example community initiative according to respondent NRW2. According to Cory (2013) this small community often suffered severe floods so the community created their own flood plan supported by Natural Resources Wales (NRW). But the floods in January, (2013) were so severe that they could not protect themselves even though they had a plan in place. NRW, the public body that is responsible for all the natural resources, is currently running a flood awareness project across Wales. According to NRW this project targeted communities at risk through various engagement techniques and methods in the past four years. By promoting behavioural change people can prepare themselves, their homes and businesses so that the impacts of flooding financial, social and emotional are reduced. More recently the aim is to create more resilient communities that are self-sustaining which is done by empowering flood plan volunteers to manage, promote and test their local flood plans. In their eyes the biggest challenge is creating communities where none exist. They are convinced that this is where citizen participation and methods of co-production would be most successful (NRW3, Personal Communication, February 2015).

In Europe empirical research has been done on single member states and comparisons between member states related to governance of flood resilience and citizen engagement. The angle this research takes by comparing two quite similar cases in different contexts makes it unique and in its own way it tempts to contribute to the existing knowledge in society. The different ways countries are governed leads to different perceptions on resilience and government-citizen relationships. Having a clear focus is necessary in this research which can be challenging. This is a qualitative research which uses the cases with the hope to describe the different perspectives on “resilience” in the two European member states. In order to study the relations between governments and citizens this qualitative research consists of desktop research, content analysis, policy analysis, observations and semi-structured interviews with citizens and governmental bodies involved with the project cases.

1.2 Scientific and societal relevance of the proposed research
Better understanding of the influence of context and culture on the relation between state and citizens is of societal relevance. If the two understand each other better there is a chance for better collaboration and more targeted ideas throughout Europe. State and civil society relations regarding flood risk have always been an important societal as well as scientific topic. Who is responsible, who is affected by the measures and issues and how are the two parties collaborating. Do governments merely inform citizens or are they engaged in the process or even taking the lead (Arnstein, 1969). Involving society in a topic that directly threatens or saves citizens is what this research is about. The question is if citizens should be involved when policy is about saving lives but since FRM directly effects society the societal relevance is high. As mentioned before public bodies have widely set the policy goal of
enhancing community resilience and improving public awareness of floods (Burningham et al, 2008). Besides that, several researchers have been debating community resilience related to flood risk topics and it has increased in popularity amongst researchers and policy-makers. It is known that the social relationships regarding FRM and community resiliency are very complex (Fox, 2014). This paper tempts to contribute to the academic debate as well as to give a better understanding of how relationships between government and society related to flood risk and the perception of “resilience” vary in different countries. Public organizations, policy makers and academics struggle to figure out why citizen participation and support differs in countries within Europe. With this research I hope to give insight on the different ways of involving citizens and the recent shifts in some countries of the relationship between governments and citizens.

1.3 Research aim and research question(s)
The aim of this research is to see via two bottom-up cases how governments facilitate citizens referring to the Welsh and the Dutch flood risk governance systems and if culture and context influence the roles of governments and citizens. My main research question is: Regarding flood risk management, how does the national and local government facilitate citizens in different societal contexts?

The guiding questions are as follow:
- What does collaboration and resilience mean in the policy framework of The Netherlands and Wales?
- How do the national or local government authorities responsible for the flood risk strategies in De Overdiepse Polder and Llanddowror interact with citizens and intent to involve them?
- Why did citizens take initiative in these two cases?
- Why are the two cases seen as example projects and how important is collaboration?

1.4 Structure
This master thesis is structured as follows. In Chapter 2 you will find a discussion of academic literature and the theoretical framework which results in an analytical conceptual framework. The theories used for the research are about citizen participation, community resilience and collaboration. In Chapter 3 a general view is given on the governance of flood risk in the two cases this chapter can be seen as the policy context. In Chapter 4 the methodology is discussed. It starts with a description of the research strategy, followed by the mixed research methods and concluded with an analysis of how the validity and reliability of the research can be guaranteed. In Chapter 5 the two cases are analysed. Both cases start with a description of the story from top to bottom regarding culture & context related to FRM. After this the uniqueness of the case, flood resilience and awareness, challenges and keys to success and collaboration and dilemmas are analyzed. Finally chapter 6 contains the concluding remarks and recommendations and a critical reflection of limitations and advice for further research.
2. Literature review and theoretical framework

2.1 Critical review of academic literature

To start the review of academic literature I would like to clarify what citizen or civil participation is. Civil participation is according to Freidrich (2007) the engaging and partaking in some form of activity with other people including religious, cultural and social activities. What is important is that within the decision-making process all citizens taking part in the activity have equal weight. According to the rules of democracy in order to have any form of decision making or governance where the common interest is involved, it is necessary to engage citizens (Freidrich, 2007). In this sense citizen participation is also necessary at local level and FRM should engage citizens because it touches the common interest. Western European democracies have been experimenting for decades with various means of providing citizens with an equal voice in the planning process. Ever since World War II (WWII) the voice of citizens became more important (Maier, 2001). According to Maier (2001) several schools of planning developed a theory in the 1960s identifying different roles for citizens in planning decisions using different angles. One of most important academics studying citizen participation is Arnstein. The citizens’ ladder from Arnstein (1969) forms the roots for citizen participation. It illustrates which steps are possible in involving citizens. What can be seen in the Netherlands and in Wales is that citizens generally used to be informed or not involved at all in the past. In past 40 years there is more involvement of citizens throughout collaborative projects as well as consultation rounds in decision making. Recently a new trend appeared where citizens take initiative themselves and governments gain a more facilitating role. In this sense governments set the rules of the game while citizens generate ideas and realize projects with the expertise of public authorities. According to Cuthill & Fien (2005) it is questionable if local authorities can actually take the role of facilitating opportunities for local citizens to take action regarding local sustainability issues. Even though they do mention that community groups require support from local government to be able to participate effectively (Cuthill & Fien, 2005).

Involvement of citizens in the decision making process changed. According to Denters (2002) local authorities are more relevant to citizen’s willingness and trust in participation then national. He also mentions that citizens in smaller local municipalities in the UK as well as in the Netherlands tend to be more satisfied with their government compared to the larger once. In this sense smaller local levels mean more citizen’s trust but trends and theories such as Europeanization tend to lead to bigger local organizations in order to support the new tasks and stronger identities they are getting. Marshall (2005) mentions that there are pressures from other tiers of governance on local authorities and communities to take more responsibilities. According to Keatings’ (2001) regionalism thoughts there is a trend of stronger sub-national identities supported by the EU which in his words is a reterritorialization of European space. The study of Marshall (2005) involves urban areas and urbanization. It sets out a theoretical framework which proves the increase of Europeanization in urban areas which are involved in European funding programmes. There is a definite fact of up and downloading of information from Europe to and from urban cities in the UK according to Marshall (2005). Directly being funded by the EU as a city, town or community
leads to more involvement with European strategies and ideas and interacting with other international local areas. The multi level structure of Europeanization involves local parties and local groups which are often pressured by nation and regions to work in a certain way. Marshall (2005) pledges that academic attention for Europeanization on urban local levels should be of the same attention as other territorial levels in the governance structure. In other words there are numerous assets that influence the way citizens can be facilitated by the government. Not only national but even European government tends to influence the involvement of citizens in governance. Nevertheless according to Apostu (2013) there is still a gap in meeting the needs of civil society and therefore their involvement in policy consultation can still be improved. Others say that citizens do not have to be directly involved in strategic decisions but more on local level, on things that directly involve them. In some cases public participation should be analysed by itself. According to Innes & Booher (2004) five purposes for participation can be identified. First to figure out what public preferences are, second to improve decisions and use local knowledge, third advancing fairness and justice, fourth getting legitimacy for decisions and finally it is done because the law obliges them too. Often literature on participation is dominated by dilemmas and paradoxes and according to Innes & Booher (2004) new participation models are often created in response to anger of citizens. In my eyes citizen participation and trust in government changes with restructuring and reorganization of governance especially on local level. Yet citizens within rural areas can be active and more involved within the community. If we look at the two cases it can be said that both are happening in small local communities where citizens are relatively socially close.

According to several scholars decentralization is one of the aspects that led to a bigger role for citizens (Dühr et al, 2007; Zonneveld and Waterhout, 2005). In the UK Decentralization started in 1990 with the new labour run government. This new labour oriented government brought fundamental changes to the political administrative organization of the UK. This also meant increased devolution of government functions to Wales and new bodies on regional level (Dühr et al., 2007). Also in the Netherlands decentralization of tasks is a fact. Programmes and funds from the EU extra stimulate decentralization with the hope to create more regional competitiveness and identity (Zonneveld and Waterhout, 2005). Even though there is criticism against the process of decentralization and the risk of increased disparity it seems rather inevitable since it is stimulated by the European Union who promotes multi-level governance and regional funding which leads to a growth of responsibilities for the regional and local authorities (Marks et al, 2002). The trend of decentralization of governmental roles leads to a shift of powers to the local and throughout Europe. One of the results in Wales is Community Asset Transfer (CAT) (Development Trust Association Wales, 2012). Tasks being passed on down and eventually if Local Authorities cannot cope with these issues, because of lack of resources or priority, tasks are being lost. In my eyes there is a strong relation between, on local level disappearance of tasks and the willingness of citizens to take initiative. If local authorities lack the capacity, citizens or the community often take control to prevent loss of important assets.
According to several scholars (Winnubst, 2011; de Bruijn et al, 2007; Samuels et al., 2006) FRM in Europe has been undergoing change and with this also the role of citizens. Regarding FRM in the Netherlands as Winnubst (2011) mentions, water policy had been undergoing change since 1993 and 1995 when the extreme high water events in the rivers Rhine and Meuse caused near floods. These events led to a shift from dike reinforcement to new alternatives. In 2000 a policy called Room for the River (RFTR) was adopted by the Dutch national government. This policy tends to give as the name states more room to rivers so flooding happens on manageable locations improving overall FRM. Bruijn et al. (2007) defines FRM as all activities that are done to improve or maintain the ability of a region to deal with peak discharges or extreme weather events. But not only in the Netherlands had water policies undergone change. According to de ibid. building flood defences was gradually replaced by a focus on managing flood risks. According Winnubst (2011) what has to be mentioned is that FRM in different countries depends strongly on their legislation and administrative system, their cultural context and their experience with floods and river management. In Wales the making space for water policy covers an integrated approach covering all sources of flooding. The difference compared to the Netherlands can be found in the spatial planning aspect which is highly relevant in Dutch water management (Samuels et al, 2006). The Dutch include the area around the dikes by creating flood plans inside dikes according to Winnubst (2011).

In FRM and broader climate change in general, resilience is often referred to as an end state that policies aim towards or as a tool to evaluate adaptation policies (Adger et al, 2000; Walker et al. 2010). Looking at the flood strategies and other sustainable policies of Wales we can see that the importance of the future generations’ well-being as well as resilient communities increases (Welsh Government, 2014). But while resilience is often considered as a one-size-fits-all definition, it cannot be defined without taking the different social contexts in consideration. From a socio-ecological perspective it has different meanings depending on the social context (Wiering et al, 2015). According to Adger et al. (2013) a resilient system strongly relies on the depending social relationships or as he defines the “social contract”. Wiering et al. (2015) agree with this fact and adds that, governance arrangements in society and what is appropriate in governance context strongly influences the perception on a resilient society. According to Hamer et al (2013) it is important that we look at: the fact if there is public interest in adaptation, the distribution of responsibilities between public and private and the balance between individual rights and public interest. Regarding the interpretations of flood resilience in Wales and in the Netherlands there are differences in responsibilities and therefore also in the social relationships. Wales as part of the UK has a system where centrally problems are organized yet the tasks are mainly executed on local level. In the UK there is also a big responsibility for insurance companies since the National government does not have any recovery responsibilities in case of a flood (Wiering et al, 2015). Regarding this, resilience in the Netherlands is seen different since there are fewer roles for the market or society compared to Wales and resilience is seen as a strong national physical flood risk system as a whole instead of targeting communities (Ibid.).
2.2 Brief introduction to the applied theory.

Theoretical issues that have grown out of earlier discussions in the planning field mentioned in the literature review are related to community participation (Arnstein, 1969) and community resilience. In order to explain the current phenomenon of community engagement in planning activities in Wales and the Netherlands, the concepts of “collaborative planning” as well as “cross scale interaction” have to be discussed. If we look upon civil society from the triangular model of Cohen and Arato (1992), civil society is quite important. It sets the rules of the game for the state through the public interest. Cohen and Arato (1992) see civil society as “a sphere of social interaction between the economy and the state, composed above all of the intimate sphere (especially the family) the sphere of associations (…), social movements, and forms of public communication” (Serdynska, 2008, p. 109). The interaction between state and civil society is important for decision making but does the context and culture have influence on this interaction? Some scholars (Arnstein, 1969; Gramberger, 2001; Schrijver, 2015; Lee et al, 2014) have designed theories that are necessary to introduce in order to form a concept for this study. Theories by previously mentioned scholars are about citizen participation, Citizen Initiatives and Collaborative planning. In order to find indicators Cross Scale Interaction and Community Resilience are also overlooked.

The well known LoCP from Arnstein (1969) has been relevant not only as a theory of community participation but especially because it divides participation in different levels and recognizes levels of partnership and citizen control. The LoCP has been taken by several scholars and has been evolved into different forms of participation such as the policy-makers perspective (Prieto-Martin, 2009). Figure 2.1 below from Prieto-Martin (2009) shows how several institutions have used the LoCP to explain how citizens behave. The LoCP developed a categorization to explain the citizens’ role in practice situations. It divides participation in three main groups. At the bottom we start with the level of Therapy and Manipulation this is where classically citizens are seen as consumers and where they have no influence at all. Further up in the ladder at the level of Tokenism we see Informing, Consultation and Placation. This is where citizens are being heard and where they have some form of influence but where they also lack the chance to ensure that the powerful will hear their voice. Finally on top, the steps of Citizen Power in which citizens truly have some form of control. Partnership is where citizens create something together with the organization in charge, Delegated power is where citizens truly have a power of directing and organizing something themselves and lastly Citizen Control is where citizens organize something by themselves without influence of public bodies. This last level is a quite unique step on the ladder that in practice rarely happens. Ostroem (1990) recognized this step in the ladder in a different context and called it the self-organized system which basically means an institution that devises, applies and monitors its own rules. Arnstein herself already recognized some limitations to this theory. She mentioned that the theory is organized assumes that citizens are homogeneous groups (Arnstein, 1969) in practice these groups are often more diverse and it is hard to identify an exact step of participation. Burns et al. (1994) added ‘Civic Hype’ to the bottom of the ladder to mention the phenomena of involving citizens as a marketing exercise. This is a recognized threat to participation. The International Association for Public Participation (IAPP) evolved Arnsteins’ ladder into a different model focused towards
engaging communities in public programmes. This evolved ladder shows the perspective from a public body’s eye. It indicates the levels of participation by goals, time frames, resources and level of concern in the decision to be made. The ladder of the IAPP is used widely by public decision-makers. It divides into inform, consult, involve, collaborate and empower.

![Evolution of views on participation](image)

The third academic who looked at the LoCP from a governance perspective is Gramberger (2001). He wrote a handbook for the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) regarding informing, consulting and engaging citizens in the development of public policy. The handbook is aimed to give government officials practical assistance in improving the relation between government and citizens (Gramberger, 2001). The book not only explains the three levels of citizen engagement but also elaborates on how governments should build a framework that strengthens the relations with citizens so that there is a stronger democratic society. It explains how you should apply elements of informing, consulting as well as active participation, when you should apply them and what the strengths are of combining the tools. According to Gramberger (2001) informing is something many member-states do there is mainly lack of showing that information is accessible to citizens. Consulting is something that in 2001 was done by mainly the Scandinavian countries. Recently though more and more member-states have taken consultation as a serious measure by organizing referenda and consulting citizens in an early stage for their needs. This is also because public engagement through consultation is recently implemented by the European Union as mentioned in the introduction. The third stage active participation is where civil society, market and individual citizens organize activities and relations. This is where public-private relations become a partnership (Gramberger, 2001).
Recently citizens’ initiatives seem to be a governmental trend that evolved from citizen participation. Schrijver (2015) generated a theory on this highest form of Citizen Power. He looked from an academic perspective upon citizen initiatives that arise in the Netherlands as a form of governance that puts citizens in charge as organizers and developers of plans. The question Schrijver (2015) raises is if this trend should be seen as a change in citizens’ behavior or a change in governance or perhaps both. Schrijver (2015) categorizes Citizens initiatives in three steps related to the level of government involvement; Real Citizen Initiatives, Stained Citizen Initiatives and Usual Citizen Initiatives. In his eyes Real Citizen Initiatives are initiatives that are fully organized and managed by citizens without any interference of governments. This form rarely happens in practice. Stained Citizen Initiatives are initiatives that are managed and organized by citizens and where governments have some form of influence but they are not actively taking part in the organization. Usual Citizen Initiatives are initiatives mentioned by many in the Netherlands as initiatives but are often forms of collaboration where you can see a form of good partnership between government and citizens or citizen groups. In this form government and citizens work together as equal and often citizens are still strongly influenced by the government.

If we relate the LoCP to other theories we see that several theories have been written about separate steps of the ladder. In this research we focus on the top part of the ladder: Citizen Control, Delegated Power and Partnership. This is because a citizens’ initiative, which both cases are, are where citizens have a form of Citizens Power (Arnstein, 1969). Partnership is as mentioned before by others recognized as collaboration (see for example IAPP above). Partnership comes therefore back to the collaboration theory. This theory focuses on collaborative planning and forms of collaboration not only with citizens but also with Market and Civil Society. Collaborative planning is a method created to give stakeholders power by bringing them on equal level as decision-makers through direct engagement and dialogue between market, civil society and public bodies (Innes & Booher, 2000). According to Innes & Booher (2000) the advantages of Collaborative planning are that you can not only use the local knowledge but you can also create more awareness among the public. One famous British urban planner who could be seen as one of the European founders of Collaborative planning is Patsy Healey. Healey sees collaborative planning as a more desirable alternative to “neo-liberalism” after deregulations in the 1980s (Healey, 2003). To Healey (1996) it was important to look at four topics to take part in the collaborative process. It is necessary to see who is stakeholder and what political, culture, legislative and administrative arena discussions take place. It is important to recognize distance between stakeholders and what this division means. A policy discourse has to be created and consensus has to be maintained. Ansell & Gash (2008) define collaborative governance as “...A governing arrangement where one or more public agencies directly engage non-state stakeholders in a collective decision-making process that is formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative and that aims to make or implement public policy or manage public programs or assets....” (Ansell & Gash, 2008, p.544). Non-state stakeholders in this sense can also mean citizens and therefore citizen participation is also a form of collaborative governance. We often see that citizen initiatives can happen in a form of collaboration (Schrijver, 2015). After citizens come with the initiative they engage with public agencies that facilitate the initiative and collaborate together with
citizens to realize the idea. Collaboration contains aspects of comparable terms according to Lee & Schottenfeld (2014) such as cooperation and coordination. They define Collaboration as a process of creating something together for a common goal, based on different perspectives and knowledge in a group. They created figure 2.2 by combining thoughts on collaboration from several academics. From a perspective of collective activity, designed by Elliott (2007) it explains the three terms as cooperation solves a problem by thinking convergent, collaboration looks at it in a divergent way, having a creative component. Coordination is seen as an arrangement amongst parts of collective activities but also as a way of having one party organizing and steering the others by completing a task (Lee & Schottenfeld, 2014). In this sense, in theory, coordination can also be done by citizens in the form of a citizen initiative where the citizens also lead the project. Yet often citizen initiatives are a form of collaboration or cooperation where citizens work together with other parties to realize their idea with a common aim.

Some other important factors for successful collaborative planning come from experience in the US. These factors are that: Collaborative planning must include all related stakeholders, the community itself must have the final decision, government must be committed, and the group should have clear common objectives (Shandas & Messer, 2008; Sirianni, 2007).

In the following part I would like to discuss useful elements from the Cross-scale Social Interaction (CSI) theory used by Winnubst (2011) in her dissertation and I would like to address elements of Community Resilience. In this research these elements could serve as indicators for the conceptual model of this theoretical framework and therefore address the level of collaboration and the level of influence of citizens in the process. According to several academics (Berkes, 2002; Winnubst, 2011; Young, 2002) CSI refers to interaction between social organizations linking institutions horizontally and vertically. Vertical linking, interaction across levels of organizations is as Winnubst (2011) mentions the most challenging part in flood risk management. This research focuses on the interactions between government bodies and citizens via two citizens’ initiatives. In order to analyse the interaction between these organizations one aspect of CSI that will not be covered throughout other theories is the importance of functional interdependencies (Young, 2002). Winnubst (2011) mention that FRM could have interdependencies when land-use as well as water management aspects come together. Important aspects for analysis in CSI are culture, traditions and behavior of all involved parties. This helps achieving a common aim and better
understanding. Culture and context is one of the indicators that is important to understand the reason for collaboration and the way collaboration exceeds. Vertical CSI also relates to forms of collective activity mentioned before; Coordination, Cooperation and Collaboration.

The widely interpreted definition of Community Resilience holds for some an important relation with CSI and cross scale communication (Norris et al, 2008). Community Resilience is a vague theory with many different interpretations by academics but also different rationales throughout different countries (Wiering et al, 2015). According to Norris et al. (2008) Community Resilience is a post-event activity that means that the community has to adapt to the altered environment after single or multiple transient dysfunctions. Ronan & Johnston (2005) define a resilient community from an Anglo-Saxon perspective as a healthy community that functions by itself and is able to bounce back following negative events after a local hazardous event. Important facets of Community Resilience are; who should act, who is responsible and who decides but also the relations between market, state and civil society and interaction between these institutions (Wiering et al, 2015). One of the academic complexities is as Ronan & Johnston (2005) identify stress on transformations and adaptability to change instead of conserving and only recovering disasters. Some important aspects of community resilience for this research are; what is resilience focused on communities’ households and firms or more on the collective? what is the state of the community, are they active, innovative, adaptive? Furthermore the social identity and the level of responsibility derive from community resilience are important.
2.3 The conceptual or analytical framework

This study uses figure 2.3 as a tool to indicate where we can position the two cases in categorizations done by several theories. Therefore the relation between theories about citizen participation, citizen initiatives and forms of collaboration has been related to their indicators expanded by CSI and community resilience. With this addition this study explains why governments and citizens act in certain ways and if this way of interaction could perhaps be explained by the culture and context in which these two cases are situated.

Conceptual Model of the Theoretical Framework

If we look at Figure 2.3 the LoCP in brief can be seen as a tool to categorize the way citizens can be part of the decision-making process. Since both cases have in common that citizens have a higher than usual form of influence in the decision-making process. This study mainly focuses on the top of the ladder called Citizen Power (Arnstein, 1969). Other academics have evolved this part in different ladders or categorizations. One of them Schrijver (2015) relates to the recent trends mentioned in the academic literature as appearance of citizens’ initiatives, bottom-up approach and according the new policy hype of “kitchen table conversations” referring to authorities having informal conversations to improve collaboration between state and civil society. Schrijver (2015) mentions that public authorities often identify projects as citizen initiatives while most of the time it is rather a form of collaboration which represents the collaboration theory. If we put Schrijvers’ (2015) categorization next to the Ladder of Arnstein (1969) we can see that the top of the ladder is comparable with the 3 steps Schrijver (2015) mentions. Schrijver mentions that a real citizen initiative is where citizens are fully in control. A stained citizen initiative is where the government delegates power in a form that citizens have control but where they are still strongly influenced by the government. Finally
the usual citizen initiative is where projects are seen as a bottom-up initiative but where generally speaking a form of good collaboration/partnership takes place. According to the collaborative theory state actors have to include non-state actors and participants have to be engaged and not consulted. Collaboration includes elements of coordination, cooperation as Lee et al (2014) mentions. This form of a more market perspective categorizes in three levels of social interaction. We could compare those with the two previous ladders and see that they are quite comparable yet using different indicators. Citizens in control lead to a real citizen initiative which is a form where citizens occupy the role of coordinator. Delegating power leads to a stained citizen initiative which is a form where citizens cooperate with the public and vice versa. Partnership in the form of a usual citizen initiative is where we create something new together in the form of collaboration.

Within these three comparable concepts illustrated on Figure 2.3 indicators should explain the role of citizens and governments but also give an indication to what type of citizen initiative the two cases are and what influence “context and culture” have on these two initiatives. The indicators are derived from the theories and are mentioned to be important to decide the level of collaboration, the role parties take as well as the level of citizens power. In order for parties to act or to take a certain position, collaboration theory and horizontal CSI indicate that “the capacity to act and motivation” are important (Winnubst, 2011). “Motivation and capacity” in this study is expressed in resources and priorities they have. “Culture and context” includes governance structure from the government side and if this creates a space for citizens to act but also continuity of priorities and leadership on both sides. In public authorities there has to be “capacity and motivation” to act not only in resources but also in time and human capacity. For citizens, motivation in this case is already there because they take the initiative, but it appears to be very important for initiative takers that the community has a “common goal and aim” as well as the “capacity to act” (Roth & Winnubst, 2015). Motivation could be translated in the “feeling of success & achievement” to stay motivated during the process. The conceptual model is applied in this research by using the previously mentioned indicators. As shown in Table 1 the analysis of each case is divided in different paragraphs in which the indicators are represented. These indicators should help describe the role of citizens and governments as well as the position the cases take within the three theories.

Table 1: Indicators represented in the analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraphs in the Analysis</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture &amp; Context</td>
<td>Culture &amp; Context, Capacity &amp; Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness of the project</td>
<td>Active Citizens (Leaders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Resilience and awareness</td>
<td>Responsibility, Awareness and Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges and keys to success</td>
<td>Feeling of success &amp; achievement, Common goal and aim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration and important dilemmas</td>
<td>Importance of Collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. Brief policy context and recent trends in public participation

This chapter describes the current flood risk governance in both countries guided by related European Directives. Furthermore a general view on how citizens are involved and the tension between citizens and public bodies will be discussed. In order to describe the policy context it is necessary to start with the European legislation on this topic. The Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC) and the Floods Directive (2007/60/EC) are EU’s main legislative documents that contain the regulations for qualitative and quantitative water management. The aim of the Floods Directive (FD) is to reduce the risks of floods to humans, environment, cultural heritages and economic activity. The Water Framework Directive (WFD) contains, besides river basin management, water ecology and qualitative measures for surface and groundwater. According to the WFD (2000/60/EC) in order to get our waters clean and liveable the role of citizens and citizens’ groups will be crucial. According to Collins et al. (2007) the WFD focuses on a transparent integrated approach to water management. This new form of Integrated Water Management therefore asks for an approach with new economic, social and environmental interpretations and relations where the interests of multiple stakeholders are important. This new approach led to a formal role for the public with the purpose to improve decision-making by ensuring that decisions are based on shared knowledge, experiences and scientific evidence. This would also lead to public awareness, use of local knowledge, experience, citizens’ initiatives, more public support, more transparency and social learning (Ker Rault & Jeffrey, 2008). The WFD gets supported by the FD which includes that the Member States are required to carry out preliminary assessments to identify the river basins and coastal areas at risk of flooding. Once identified the appointed zones require a flood risk map and FRM plans for prevention protection and preparedness by 2015 (2007/60/EC). Both the UK as well as The Netherlands are active and have managed to develop flood risk maps as well as FRM plans. The Welsh and the Dutch have consulted with the stakeholders and citizens. Yet the approach to FRM is different. Table 2 explains the governance of The Netherlands and Wales in response to the Floods Directive. The Dutch national government has a separate department called Rijkswaterstaat (RWS) which is responsible for main rivers and water management on national level.

Table 2: Governance Floods Directive The Netherlands and Wales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International level</td>
<td>European Commission (EC)</td>
<td>Manages International legislation and is responsible for implementation and reviewing of that legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International River Commissions (Belgium, Germany, England, France,</td>
<td>Responsible for mandatory international coordination of water safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Netherlands)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National level</td>
<td>Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment (MIE)</td>
<td>Responsible implementation Directives and reporting to Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Department of Waterways and Public Works Ministry of Security and</td>
<td>Responsible for implementation and reporting to Brussels Liaison on behalf of the safety regions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justice (Rijkswaterstaat)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspectorate for Transport, Public Works and Water Management</td>
<td>Responsible for review of policies and regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delta Commissioner</td>
<td>Involved with Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local level</td>
<td>Water Boards</td>
<td>Responsible for providing information about primary and secondary barriers and regional flood simulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Provinces</td>
<td>Coordination at regional level, Management of flood risk maps, responsible for information about primary and secondary barriers and regional flood simulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association of Dutch River Municipalities</td>
<td>Provide information about secondary barriers, emergency management plans at safety region level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the table 2 above shows both member states have national and local authorities involved. The difference lies in the responsibilities. The Netherlands has a top-down organized structure which has been rooted in their long water planning traditions. This also explains why the local authorities have the role of providing information as shown above. Wales on the other hand is restricted by the UK and has less national power and resources. This is why the national government has a more facilitating role generating strategies and passing on full responsibility to local organizations and citizens. This bottom-up approach differs from the Dutch. For now this study will leave the way these countries are governed. We will come back to it later in Chapter 5 and 6 where we dive deeper into these two cases.

In the rest of this chapter this research focuses on a more general discussion of governance trends and the change of government-citizen interaction in FRM. As mentioned before the European directives oblige governments to engage citizens in decision-making. It is of course thinkable that implementation of FRM is possible without involvement but basically all climate adaptation strategies matter little if there is no public support (Crawford & Davoudi, 2009). It has also been shown by scholars (Toke, 2005; Crawford & Davoudi, 2009) that often the reason why climate change plans are rejected is that local people oppose it. Protesting citizens still appear to be very effective slowing down or stopping processes and therefore it is effective for governments to show the benefit of developments, creating a win-win situation.
Besides involving the public in decision making to increase success Yearley et al. (2003) identifies that the public holds the local knowledge which can contribute more than only the view of an expert. Therefore climate change related issues such as FRM should be seen as an interaction between market, state and civil society. Governments challenge is to respond to flooding issues but also to increase the well-being within society.

Because of different political roots and historical ways of governing member states in Europe differ in the way they face climate change challenges such as flood risk (Wiering et al, 2015). Perhaps differences in citizen engagement can also be found within different governance structures. In Europe there are two big policy traditions (Nilsson, 2015). The first is the Anglo Saxon traditions in which member states such as the UK, Sweden, Czech Republic and Ireland are structured (ibid.). This way of governing could be seen as an economist perspective focused on solving problems supported by liberals. In this sense member states aim for economic and social prosperity. This way of governing puts emphasis on meeting the future by balancing out disparities where local authorities have a significant role. The other big stream comes from the French territorial traditions. This tradition is related to planners and socialists. Member states such as France, Germany and The Netherlands are governed this way (ibid.). If we look at this way of governing it puts emphasis on planning the future developing central plans with big public investments. This system is more top-down organized and leaves less space for bottom-up initiatives.

Recent trends reveal that new layers of political practices have emerged between the institutional layers. Participation is slowly changing from citizens and government interacting formally to citizens actively approaching other actors in formal and informal ways to influence their action (Innes & Booher, 2004). In this sense citizens are starting to lobby more about their needs and they transform into equal partners in processes. One reason why this is happening could be found in the globalization of society where citizens can easily gain more knowledge through internet. Citizens therefore are becoming part of decision making networks giving them more power and influence. This is especially noticeable in countries with an Anglo-Saxon tradition such as UK and the US. But even the French territorial rooted member-states are opening up more for citizen participation. Not only discussion on equal level is necessary but it helps if both parties have tools to bargain with. Governments often have resources available to realize certain things but also citizens’ initiatives can use certain tools such as the media. According to Farmer media was a tool in the OP to speed up the often slow government decision making processes. According to Wiering et al. (2015) the interpretation on community resilience is also very important as this is often interpreted in the UK as a community that is self dependant while in the Netherlands it is more about a resilient system. Citizen initiatives derive in this sense from an angle of responsibility, awareness and trust between parties. But community resilience also includes aspects of leadership and therefore active citizens or community leaders are necessary. In order to test the indicators from figure 2.3 it is important that data is gathered from national and local public bodies, as well as citizens and experts for a comprehensive research.
4. Methodology

4.1 Research strategy
The five months master thesis was undertaken in several overlapping phases. The first phase could be seen as a pre-phase. This research builds upon some data and contacts in Wales from the three months internship research done before this research. The data and interviews gathered during this period give a brief insight in the policy context as well as local sustainable governance in Wales. The first real phase of this research from February till March consists of data collection and analysis. The second phase from March till May consist of interviews and continues with analysis of the gathered data which includes deepening conversations to better interpret the data. The third is the reporting phase which started in May till the beginning of June. Finally the research used the spare time in June for reviewing and rereading the report including implementing comments from supervision.

In this research we focus on the theories mentioned in Chapter 2 via qualitative methods. One of the main approaches is the case study approach which is widely used as a method for in depth research when links between phenomenon and the context are unclear (Yin, 1984). In this sense the phenomenon are the appearance of citizens’ initiatives in FRM and the context is the governance of both countries and the reason why these initiatives were taken. The reason why qualitative methods were chosen is that it helps focusing on the reason why countries involve citizens in a different way than others and why they interpret flood resilience in a different way (Verschuren & Doorewaard, 2007). A resilient empirical research is necessary in order to use the short time period of this research to its optimum. In this study is aimed to figure out how the different states collaborate with their citizens, how initiatives appeared and how countries are involving citizens in FRM. A combination of active collecting data via desktop research, document research and observations through interviewing is done. This data gathering supported the multiple case studies which enclose two cases in Wales and the Netherlands. The reason why this multiple case study consists of two cases is that generally via comparison stronger analyses can be done (Verschuren & Doorewaard, 2007). In the three months internship some connections were made which helped data gathering within Wales. In the Netherlands two PhD papers were written related to FRM, governance and public participation one has as one of the cases de OP. Besides that several public and private organizations in the Netherlands will be approached in order to gain insight in de OP. Several semi structured interviews in the Netherlands and Wales were conducted with the National and Local government as well as representatives from citizens and experts. The semi structured interviews consist of three phases; an Introduction phase where information about the initiative and the process is gathered, an analysis phase that focuses on the collaboration and the success and finally a concluding phase that asks for remarks and grading on a scale from 1 to 10 about the level of collaboration and the level of success. The main target groups for the interviews are public bodies on national and local level and representatives citizens in the Netherlands and in Wales as well as two experts. Via these methods this research tended to develop well underpinned conclusions that will hopefully lead to new insights. Involving experts tends to make sure that less colored answers and a more objective view on the project is given.
This report is as mentioned before, an empirical research presenting a multiple case study within organizations (Yin, 2009). This methodological approach is the preferred method when "How" and "Why" questions are being asked such as the research question of this report and also when the scholars have little control over events, as posed in public participation and governance of two member states (Yin, 2009). There are several benefits to a multiple-case study. Firstly by having more than one in depth case study there is the possibility to do cross-case analysis which helps to generate more objective answers to the questions and could show more significant differences if we look at for example the influence of context and culture from two different settings (Stake, 2013). Stake (2013) also mentions that the effect of a multiple-case study is limited if less than 4 cases are chosen. But cross-case analysis will be more beneficial than a single case study and since time is limited for this research the benefit of choosing two cases is that more in depth research can be done as well as cross-case analysis. Gerring (2004) identifies a case study “…as an intensive study of a single unit with an aim to generalize across a larger set of units...” (Gerring, 2004, p. 341). What is significant from his analysis is that a single case study is more descriptive and more suitable for in-depth research of a single unit which leads to the question of how it evolved over time. The benefit of a single case is that theories can be generated upon this one example. The benefit of a two case study is that the potential can be increased from causal mechanisms to the causal effect of certain activities and that we can look at boundedness and breadth of the proposition (Gerring, 2004). To study several cases suits more in this research also because it looks more at confirmation of assumptions and it could lead to a more representative result then a internal one (Gerring, 2004). What also should be kept in mind is that a case study is used when units are small. This research represents this because even though citizens’ initiatives and grass-root projects are arising more they are still quite scarce especially in flood related and other hazardous issues which often include serious consequences for citizens. Therefore quantitative methods such as surveys would have not been suitable for this research since this research focuses particularly on two example cases. One of the limitations of a multiple case study is that depth of analysis usually has to be sacrificed because it often needs more resources to gather information on several cases (Christensen & Johnson, 2004). According to Hodkinson et al (2001) some weaknesses of the research strategy chosen are that; in depth research is often complexly examined which makes it difficult to represent simply, it is hard to represent the data numerical or to generalize the data, it is easy to dismiss the findings by for example saying the sample was too small, it is not like that somewhere else, etc. Another limitation of multiple case studies is that the researcher has to make many choices, what to research, how to ask questions, construct a story. This requires expertise, knowledge and intuition of the researcher but this deep insight in the case can raise doubts about the objectivity of the research.

4.2 Research methods, data collection and data analysis

The research objects of this research are employers in local as well as national public bodies in Wales and the Netherlands, citizens or citizen groups and experts. In order to gain knowledge and information different methods will be used. The main methods are desktop study and interviews. Throughout the desktop study I used Academic literature, policy documents, historical literature and media analyses. After describing the governance within
the member states clearly focused interview questions were formulated. The interviews are semi-structured and with open-ended questions. In total the interview phase had 14 respondents of which each case targeted two citizens and one or two project managers and policy makers from national and from local bodies. For an overview of respondents see the respondents table in appendix C. The interview guide is designed to fit both cases in order to lead to comparable data. Via observation and deepening conversations data was gathered about the way citizens are involved by local and national government and their perception on resilience. Observations in the Netherlands were mainly done by visiting the location, in Wales observations were done during the internship where I visited the area which made me more aware of both situations. By continuously following BBC News, NOS news, governmental websites and attending conferences related to planning, localism, FRM, community resilience and regionalism I tried to gain more information on recent trends and activities. Since this study speaks about recent trends and two cases that are still being finalized recent papers can lead to new insights. On Figure 4.1 a model is shown that illustrates how the different methods are used. Besides methods for gathering data, deepening follow-up conversations with targeted politicians or policy-makers and experts helped interpret the data better. This way I hope to get more clear and focussed conclusions and recommendations in my research. I involved government authorities in an early stage with the aim to gain quick access to information and relevant contacts that gave more insight in the case and the perception upon resilience within the country.

For the two cases I started gathering data via desktop research. I researched current activities, trends via news sites and recent academic literature. Besides that I looked at recent visions/plans written by the public authorities in charge. After that I did a focussed interview phase in which I targeted involved politicians and policy makers, experts as well as citizens, I also looked at academics that wrote about the cases. The two cases are quite similar project wise...
but the context in which they took place are very different which makes it interesting but also difficult to compare. This comparison will not only tell something about the influence of different contexts but also about the actions and behaviour of state and civil society regarding FRM grass root projects. The comparison is structured and guided by the operationalization of the theories and the concept created. By looking at these two cases I gained new insights on citizen participation and flood resilience. Since I grew up very closely to where the case in the Netherlands is located I targeted the locally involved policy-makers directly via the water board “Brabantse-Delta”. Furthermore I targeted several academics under which Dr. M. Winnubst who wrote a big part of her dissertation on the case and Dr. A. Netherwood who did research related to FRM in Wales and community engagement. In chapter 3 I started with a policy and governance description of the two cases in which I discussed the different context in which FRM is done and more about the wider context of FRM, flood resilience and recent public private trends. The Dutch case is an interesting example between citizens and the national level. This unique way of citizens governing a project and the strong roots the Dutch have in flood resilience and water management sets the frame. In the UK and specifically in Wales FRM is governed differently. From experience through my three months internship in Wales I can say that Wales is nationally targeting communities directly and governance is more decentralized which means often a bigger role for citizens and communities compared to the Netherlands where water management is more organized and structured and where every public layer has its own specific tasks. These two cases in different context lead to different outcomes.

Before I continue with validity and reliability of this research I would like to give a brief biography of myself since this is of relevance to this research. I am originally Dutch and I have lived in the Netherlands almost my whole live. I have been studying planning in the Netherlands on a University of applied science and after that did my pre-masters in the Netherlands. Since my masters I have lived half a year in Sweden and 4 months in Wales in which I did an internship at Cynnal Cymru – Sustain Wales the body working for the commissioner of sustainable development to promote sustainability in Wales. Obviously I know more about governance and research traditions in the Netherlands compared to Wales. Even though I am highly influenced by this matter there will always be a higher bias. Yet I think this will have a positive influence on my research since the Netherlands has long traditions in FRM. Having lived in Wales and trying to be objective by targeting a triangulation of citizens, policy-makers and scholars I will use this to my advantage. Since I have been in touch with governance in Wales I am open for their way of governing and in Wales they gave me the complement that I understood there way of organizing quite well. This biography also explains why I targeted more people in the Local Authority and the National Authority in Wales compared to the Netherlands. Throughout the research there were quite some difficulties in data collection and analysis more about this can be found in the discussion chapter.
4.3 Validity and reliability of the research

By using a wide variety of sources I developed a grounded basis for a well developed conclusion over the theoretical framework mentioned above. I interviewed policy makers, citizens and experts in order to create more than one perspective on the cases. This way the results became more valid and reliable. With the desktop research I used only academic research or data from mass media and throughout the interviews questioned in a continuing way in order to get as close to the truth as possible. The sources are more reliable because I used multiple sources to build upon the same statement. The qualitative research is finalized using different software. Atlas.ti was used to transcribe the interviews which were all recorded according to the ethical guidelines. Data was stored via EndNote and image material has been optimized via Photoshop and Indesign.
5. Cases

5.1 Overdiepse Polder, The Netherlands

5.1.1 Culture & Context: The story, from top to bottom

As we saw in Chapter 3 in The Netherlands FRM is organized more top-down then bottom-up. The reason for this can be found in the long tradition of FRM as well as the big impact a flood might have if it would occur (Roth & Winnubst, 2015). The Dutch, around 200 years ago when the Water Boards were created, invested public money to organize water related issues into their legislative and governance system (Lintsen, 2002). The water management system related to flooding has been set up well this is why it has not changed much up till the Room for the river (RFTR) project. The main tasks for water boards and RWS, the national body for water management, have always been that of creating and reinforcing dikes and dealing with big floods such as the infamous flood “de Watersnooddamp” in 1953 in which many people died. The main focus according to the respondents from RWS and WBBD was after 1953 to protect against these kinds of disasters which led to the creation of the delta works. In 1993 and 1995 two near river floods occurred caused by heavy rain falls and melting snow in the Alps and in Germany (Wind et al, 1999). Unexpectedly this occurred in the East of the country above sea level, in the province Gelderland (Ibid). The Dutch expert mentioned in the interview that after the near flood of 1993 the Dutch created their first disaster plans. In 1995 around 250,000 people had to leave their houses and around a million cattle had to be moved according to the respondent of RWS. The first reaction of RWS was that they wanted to reinforce the dikes once again. But there was always a lot of protest to dike reinforcement since old historical houses on dikes had to be removed and old lanes of trees had to be cut (Ibid). So the near floods in 1993 and 1995 were a push to think can we not do it differently. Another push during this time came from environmental agencies and nature protective organizations that were planning to realize projects to create wider river beds to develop a natural habitat for water birds and plants (Ruimte voor de rivier, 2007). This was also stimulated by the new Habitat directive (1992/43/EEC) and Birds’ directive (2009/147/EC). These two ideas came together by several commissions such as Commission Boertien which was created to deal with the issues from the flooding (Van Beek, 2009). Commission Boertien decided to deal one last time in the old fashion way improving water security by cranking up water protection from 1:1250 year to 1:1500 years but they also decided that after that there should be change in strategy (Roth & Warner, 2007). According respondent RWS, the question asked that led to the paradigm shift was how can we use our knowledge for nature to take measures on water safety? The Dutch government developed a vision together with KNMI, the Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute which had direct links with International Panel for Climate Change (IPCC). The outcome was that the Netherlands needed to deal with more heavy and short term rainfall in rivers but at the same time a sea level rise of around 60cm in the next century. The Dutch parliament decided to create the programme RFTR which had as aim to create more room for the river with the purpose that water
drainage of 15000-16000 cubic meters per second via the river Rhine would not raise the water level (Ruimte voor de rivier, 2007). This meant that the river had to expand in width. This was the first step the far aim 2050 vision was that it had to increase to 18000 cubic meters per second (Vlies & Waals, 2010). RWS was responsible for the development of RFTR plan from 2000 to 2007. The plan led to 600 potential measures of which 34 measures had to be taken in order to achieve the aim. According to the Dutch expert, when national governments look at certain possible measures they often give preference to rural options since there are less interests to deal with then in urban areas. It generally is also less expensive since the density of housing in rural areas is less. Another issue that occurred was that because of reorganization RWS did not have enough resources to execute all 34 measures which they intended to do as usual. So there was a delegation of certain tasks to the province. This delegation of power led to the fact that responsibilities were passed on to the Province Noord-Brabant. According to from respondent Water Board Brabants-Delta (WBBD) they got involved in 2009. The Water board was asked to do the realization of the project since they were most skilled in procurement of major works but also because they are the administrating authority of the area. According to the respondent of WBBD they steer the contractors which is done in an innovative way. The contractors worked under demand specialized procurement meaning that they have more design freedom and the extra role of qualifying their own work. WBBD then has the task of controlling the qualification report of the contractor.

One of the 34 options for RFTR was the OP one of the last dry milled polders as a result of the Dutch land consolidation in 1973. There were 18 farmers living in this polder which became inhabitable after the creation of the delta works which decreased the tidal change and therefore the amount of flooding in the polder. Most of the farmers had a diary farm which was one of the few farming possibilities in this relatively wet polder. The farmers were quite active in several organizations. This led to the fact that they heard in an early stage that the polder had the potential of becoming a flood retention area. One of the farmers had been executive in the related WBBD and another farmer was member of the town council furthermore they were active members of ZLTO the Dutch farmers organization. This active attitude led to the point that the farmers were invited by the province to a meeting in which the provincial executive Jan Boelhouder presented the plan of the OP. According to Farmer 2 the plan came in the form of a map where the polder was shown as a dark blue water retention area. According to him this was quite shocking and there was a mumbling noise going through the room when this was presented. He said that one of the brave things was that after the presentation Jan Boelhouder came into the room to speak with the farmers to show them that he was open for ideas. According to both interviewed farmers this led to the fact that the weekend after a small group of the farmers came together to discuss what was going to happen to their polder. They came to the conclusion that they wanted to stay in the polder and that they had to come up with an alternative. They already decided with the help of some experts that they had to form an association with one voice. Their idea was to develop a mount plan where the farms would be on hills so that the area could be flooded and they could stay. This would in their eyes form a win-win situation.
As expected in the Netherlands, originally the government intended to involve citizens in a tokenistic way as Arnstein (1969) indicates it. But because of the window of opportunities of a willing government, a time where change was accepted and the project RFTR that could realize its aim with the idea of the farmers, the farmers had the chance to change this in a true form of citizen initiative and citizens power. This project is now globally seen as a successful citizen initiative in FRM. If we look at the theory Schrijver (2015) mentions we see that this initiative was developed by citizens as response to a national strategy. In this sense Schrijver (2015) would like to indicate this initiative as a usual citizen initiative or as a good form of collaboration. In this sense the citizens did forms of collaboration with government but also as co creator and in this sense coordinator of their own idea (Lee et al, 2014). The reason why the citizens took initiative is quite clear. Without them taking an active approach they would lose their property, business and they would have to start elsewhere.

5.1.2 What makes the project unique
Roth & Winnubst (2015) already described that the OP project is unique for three reasons. First because it is the first RFTR project that was delegated from the national government to the Province Noord-Brabant. According to the Dutch expert the cause of this delegation was that RWS had to deal with reorganization and could not take on the responsibility of all RFTR projects before the deadline of 5 years. The Dutch expert also mentioned that this is the first citizen initiative in the Netherlands related to water management. According to the Dutch expert the reason that the farmers initiated their idea is because one worked as a water board executive and the other was working in the local council and they were both active members at ZLTO. According to respondents RWS and Dutch expert this way they could act earlier then the regular citizen who would not hear from such a project until it was already a full developed plan on which they could only oppose. Third the citizens also kept playing a key role in the implementation and realization of the plan. According to the Dutch expert this was because the province Noord-Brabant had the delegating role. “...They were much more open minded and water was one of their core themes at that time....” (Dutch expert, personal communication, May 2015). The relation between citizens and government changed throughout the project but the initiative taking citizens got elevated to the level of co-creators and officially accepted as partners of the project. Key to this was that they managed to get involved in an early stage and stayed involved during the process which led to a citizen partnership with public bodies on equal level. This form of usual citizen initiative or collaboration led to shifts in relations from debate, conflict, to negotiation, to collaboration throughout the process. But overall can be said that the relation was well established. Also the interviewed agreed that what makes the project unique is that the initiative came from farmers which were supported by influential people with links to the politics as well as ZLTO and Habiforum. These influential people helped to get the farmers into policy and decision groups according to a respondent of RWS. The relations the farmers had were very important for this aspect since this gave them connections and influence but also the media was mentioned as a useful tool by Farmer 1 since they could really use this as “...an iron fist on the table..” (Farmer 1, personal communication, May 2015). This meant that it could be used as a tool to speed up the process because they had the media and publicity behind them. What is also unique is that this way of governing has not been used somewhere else in the Netherlands even though it is widely seen as a success. The reason for this could perhaps be found in the
fact that the farmers were no ordinary citizens as is reflected in the roles and influence they had besides having their own farm. The Dutch expert as well as RWS mention in the interview that because of the uniqueness of this case and the setting in which it took place, the project does not seem usable as a framework for other cases. A respondent of RWS adds that what is unique about this project is not that citizens got involved since that is often done in the Netherlands in a strict, decided by law, way. But what is unique is that “…normally citizens are consumers of policies and they have an opinion on it. What was different in this case is that they became co-designers and co-responsible of the project and that gives a complete different effect…” (RWS, personal communication, May 2015). For the respondent WBBD as well as the respondent from RWS the uniqueness of the project was not only that the citizens were involved differently in the development but also the fact that a complete polder was redesigned, that a river dike had to be excavated and a new river dike had to be build.

5.1.3 Flood resilient community and awareness

According to the Dutch expert, if we look at resilience and awareness in the Netherlands we see that this is not really attended. The farmers in the Overdiepse Polder (OP) were aware of their risk of farming in the OP and therefore moved into the polder when the delta works got build. This new project and the potential of moving led to a unique attitude of the citizens in a way that they did not protest, which is most common in the Netherlands, but decided to find an alternative that would work for both parties. Coming back to resilience we see that this plan helped to create a way for the farmers so that they are not at risk anymore. So basically the community with their active attitude could be seen as resilient since they adapted to a changing situation. In terms of national flood risk awareness we see that in the Netherlands in an early stage when water boards were created the Dutch gave full responsibility to their government (Lintsen, 2002). Citizens are aware of the quality of FRM in the Netherlands yet they are not aware of their risk, in this sense there is an awareness gap where citizens take water security for granted (OECD, 2014). An example was given by the interviewed Dutch expert. When a polder in the Netherlands used to flood often it was common to have a boat next to the house but since flooding occurred less all these boats are removed. She also mentioned that in other sense it is noticeable that the Dutch awareness is not very high since we still build electric equipment in the basement of apartment buildings according to the Dutch building code. This means that if flooding occurs electricity and water supply stops immediately. The unawareness of Dutch citizens can also be related to the fact that flooding did not occur that often in the Netherlands. Another matter that indicates this is that we started to develop disaster plans only from 1993 onwards. In this sense it seems that the Dutch are well evolved in mitigating flood risk instead of adapting to the effects of floods since they have not occurred as often as people might expect. According to Wiering et al (2015) this proves that the Dutch work towards a resilient national flood system more than towards having resilient communities and citizens. Therefore citizen initiatives related to this topic are quite unusual. In the eyes of the respondent of WBBD a resilient community is a community that sees chances and takes them. It is important to have a positive attitude and not to be only against. In his eyes this is not always possible and it is location dependant. According to the respondent of WBBD the strength of RFTR is that they purposely wanted to involve the local community since there was a risk of getting protests and long procedures. By actively involving the relevant actors they realized a lot of support for the projects. Most respondents
see resilience as active citizens being capable of thinking in a positive way. The Dutch expert sees social resilience more as the way that individuals can get themselves to safety which in her eyes in the wider context means that society must be capable of giving support for people who are not capable of doing so. Farmer 2 responded to the question if they are aware of their risks with the quote “... we as citizens in the polder are more afraid of the government then of floods. We went to live here knowing that it could flood. But when we started this project we were afraid of the government because you only have to nod and the cabinet fall and we were very afraid that our promises would disappear with political change...” I would like to point this out because in this sense from a citizen perspective politics leads to uncertainties and this shows that continuity from both sides is very important.

5.1.4 Challenges & Keys to success
In this research success is interpreted as high level of satisfaction of involved actors. For RWS the key to success of RFTR was that they involved citizens in an earlier stage and that they used the Design Table from Deltaris, a tool to see what costs and effects are of certain projects. They did this with the affected interest groups to effectively create support. Another success was that RWS went out to talk to citizens who at first were against. By informing them beforehand they prepared the citizens and gave them a chance to do something else then oppose. According to the respondent of RWS there are three things that are relevant to success and to get support from citizens. First the citizens have to understand the cause and aim of the project. Second the citizens should not have the feeling that they have to suffer the public burdens alone. Third people are willing to suffer and sit in a construction pit for 10 years if it is worth it afterwards. So they have to have a sense of the final result is beautiful so it was all worth it. Going deeper into the particular case there are other elements that played a key role. There were two community leaders who took full responsibility and formed the link between public bodies and the community. This way they basically linked the interests of both parties which was according to public respondents a responsible and tough task. Furthermore the window of opportunity was there in a sense that the government as shown in the storyline was open for change. They wanted a new form of flood risk strategy. Another aspect that was really important according to the Dutch respondent is continuity. This means that there were two representatives in the community which stayed with the same goal and idea. But also the government where involved parties also kept their promises and worked on the same aims for 15 years. Jan Boelhouder the executive of the province played a key role but also his follower. According to Farmer 2 there was always the risk that political shifts would change the priority and would basically stop the plan, but the fact that this did not happen enhanced collaboration.

Some cultural aspects were also important. The polder was only inhabited for 30-40 years which means that the people had no real bindings with the property and inhabitants of the polder were all dairy farmers which was important since this meant less spread interests. This led to the creation of the interest group that could represent the community in an early stage. The Dutch expert mentioned that during the process the farmers had difficulties since they noticed that individual interests were more spread than expected and this led to some conflicts within the community. According to all respondents the project can be seen as very successful. The interviewee of WBBD mentions that it was successful for RWS, WBBD and the Province. For the citizens it is very successful now that it is realized but it also brought a
lot of sacrifices, after all the process from initiative to realization took 15 years. According to Roth & Winnubst (2015) thanks to the citizens’ collective agency and the provincial agents the plan from the citizens turned into an official plan that fitted into the national flood risk policy RFTR which led to the commitment of residents and government. The public interest of water safety, the communities’ interest and the individual interests were met. This perhaps is most significant in explaining why satisfaction level amongst all respondents is so high. Both respondent farmers give the successfulness of the project a high grade reasoning that even though it took long, all the issues were solved because they had the time to deal with them. Farmer 2 during the interview also looked at the community from a government perspective and mentioned that there are always some individuals in the community that complain about everything and that as a decision-maker you have to see through that and stay positive. But the most important thing is that people should behave normally to each other and have open conversations that are the true successes to collaboration in his eyes.

5.1.5 Collaboration and important dilemmas

Regarding previous section it seems that good collaboration as described above is one of the most important aspects to success or satisfaction of actors in projects where citizens are involved. This is also why all interviewed persons scored the importance of collaboration above an 8 on a scale from 1 to 10. According to lee et al. (2014) collaboration can only take place if both parties either lose or benefit from the collaboration and this was definitely the case in de OP. According to RWS there has to be an equal form of winning or losing for every party involved in order profit from cooperation and collaboration. Therefore it is important that public bodies take time after the project aim to go out and gather local knowledge, historical use and the ambition of the locally involved.

Citizen participation in the form of collaboration is seen as citizens in power (Arnstein, 1969). In this sense citizens have a high form of control. This is reflected in the fact that the citizens were real partners of the project not consumers of policies as the respondent of RWS mentions. According to the respondent of WBBD there were uncertain moments for all parties during the process especially in the realization phase. This was because there were deadlines to be met which led to enormous time pressure. For example a fine had to be paid if the new farms were not realized in time and it was extra difficult since the citizens had their own responsibility to build the new houses in time. All respondents mentioned that collaboration was extremely important for the project and this reflects in the example before. According to the respondent farmers the time that it took was one of the biggest dilemmas. Farmer 1 mentioned that “…if you place yourself in the shoes of a farmer or any other entrepreneur being out of work for 10 to 15 years is fatal for someone who wants to realize a business...”. This has been mentioned as one of the barriers in the research as priority and motivation which has to be continuous from both sides. If political priorities change as a result of reelections or if the community representative changes it will negatively influence collaboration and citizen participation. Both respondent farmers mentioned that they sometimes had to speed up the process by pushing some points through and the support they had was a good tool for that.
They also mentioned that collaboration was very important for this project and the benefit was that both parties achieved things because the farmers had the local knowledge and the public bodies the strategic one. According to Farmer 2 it is important for the collaboration that we speak more in one language and on equal level. Governments having informal conversations really investing time into citizens will definitely help more than pushing things through. Roth & Winnubst (2015) identify three main decisions on community level or on household level that the residents had to deal with when they initiated the plan. They had to: accept or reject the flood plain plan, stay or move out of the polder, continue or stop farming. Farmer 2 mentioned that this was one of the moments where they identified that there were different individual interests. Even with a community with all the same profession the common interest and the individual interest seemed to be far apart. Eventually they accepted the plan, some farmers wanted to continue farming, some stopped farming and others moved out and continued farming elsewhere. In total 10 farmers moved out of the polder which led to a split in the community in an early stage. According to all respondents the fact that the project took the community apart was quite an emotional shock. Farmer 2 mentioned that before the project, the polder could be seen as a separate village where the kids went to school together and everyone knew each other. This project changed the social structure in the polder and one of the biggest dilemmas is that the inhabitants of the polder, the ones who left and the ones that stayed, had quite an emotional shock. Therefore the Dutch expert mentions in the interview that aftercare is one of the points that could have some extra attention in citizen participation.

5.2 Llanddowror, Wales

5.2.1 Culture & Context: The story, from top to bottom

In Wales Flood Risk Management (FRM) is managed different as in the Netherlands. According to Natural Resources Wales (NRW) “...In Wales the idea is that the government is not really responsible for flooding so everyone has the idea let’s look after ourselves...” (NRW1, personal communication, April 2015). What has to be taken in consideration is that FRM is a sensitive issue. If people are responsible for themselves this means that they have to be insured. As mentioned by Wiering et al (2015) this means that insurance companies are significantly more important compared to the Netherlands. Respondent NRW1 mentioned that the issue related to this is that if a property is often flooded an insurance company does not want to insure it. Nevertheless this different way of governance does not mean that Wales is not active in FRM. Regarding Table 3, on the next page, it is notable that flood risk is divided in three zones from high risk to low risk. In Wales high risk areas are interpret as areas with a risk of 1:1000 or greater. This is different compared to the rest of the UK where high risk starts at 1:100 or greater. Compared to the Netherlands a risk of 1:1000 or greater is quite high since the risk in the Netherlands is in some parts of the country covered up to 1:10000 meaning that a flood will happen once each 10000 years (Eijgenraam, 2006).

Wales has as part of NRW a national flood and coast risk management team which has around 100 employees located in one head office and two area offices. NRW2 respondent explained that this management team has the role of; flood incident management, flood warning, raising public flood risk awareness, flood maintenance, flood capital and schemes related to floods.
In Wales just as in the rest of the UK there are four public bodies responsible for flood policy and related funding: NRW previously Environment Agency, Local Authorities (LA), Water Companies and Internal drainage boards (Welsh government, 2014). Maintenance responsibilities of LA and NRW started in 1974 with a big public reorganization caused by the implementation of the Local Government Act (Jones, 2014). The government split river responsibilities into two bodies; NRW is responsible for larger rivers and LA are responsible for the smaller rivers and minor water courses. According to NRW2 in Wales it can be that halfway the river responsibility change from LA to NRW. This could for example be where a road crosses and the river gets bigger. The third party, water companies are responsible for surface water flooding and drainage from roads and sewage flooding. Respondent NRW2 explained that some of the recent tasks of NRW are that they have been trying to push for a one-stop-shop for flooding issues. Hopefully this will help with clearer responsibilities and better access for citizens to the responsible authorities.

Table 3: Definitions of flood risk zones and area by country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>'High risk' Flood risk definitions</th>
<th>'Medium risk' Flood Zone</th>
<th>'Low risk' Flood Zone</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Flood Zone 3a: River flooding: 1:100 or greater risk</td>
<td>Flood Zone 2: River flooding: 1:1000 to 1:100</td>
<td>Flood Zone 1: River and sea flooding: less than 1:1000</td>
<td>Flood Zones do not take account of flood risk management infrastructure. Zones 2 and 3 shown on EA Flood Map. Zone 3b to be determined through Strategic Flood Risk Assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>Zone C: River and sea flooding: 1:1000 or greater</td>
<td>Zone 8: River and sea flooding: Little or no risk</td>
<td></td>
<td>TAN 15 only uses the term 'high risk of flooding' in relation to Zone C. The terms 'medium' and 'low risk of flooding' are not used. Zones C1 and C2 incorporate consequences and 'residual' risk. Zone C derived from EA Flood Map. Zone B is taken from British Geological Survey drift data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Area 3: River and sea flooding: greater than 1:200</td>
<td>Area 2: River and sea flooding: 1:1000 to 1:200</td>
<td>Area 1: River and sea flooding: less than 1:1000</td>
<td>Note — terminology differs. 1. Medium to high risk area. 2. Low to medium risk area. 3. Little or no risk area. Based on SEPA maps of probability. Areas 3a) and 3b) include some recognition of existing development and resident's risks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Civil Contingency Act 2004 (CCA) led to a reform in Wales. This act designed a single framework for civil protections and the responsibilities of public bodies in the UK (Walker & Broderick, 2006). It also divided local responders into 2 categories. Category 1 contains LA, the emergency services and NRW which are at the core in responding to any emergency (Walker & Broderick, 2006). Category 2 is the water and electricity companies, health and
safety executives and infrastructure. For WLA2 this means that LA are responsible for local support in case of an emergency. According to respondent NRW1 the CCA basically says that authorities are responsible but be aware that if a major incident happens the public bodies are capable to help all citizens. In this sense it provokes resilience by harnessing community spirit as was done in WWII. This had as effect that insurance companies became even more important than they already were. In the summer in 2007 the UK suffered from severe floods. This was one of the biggest floods ever in the UK, half a million people were without water and electricity and 55000 properties were flooded, the insurance bill expected to be over 3 billion pounds (Pitt, 2008). Sir M. Pitt was asked by the government to write a policy review on the FRM in the UK. This led to the publication of the Pitt review: Learning lessons from the 2007 floods in which a total of 92 recommendations across the UK were addressed. These recommendations were accepted by the UK government and aim was set to implement them. Some of the most significant recommendations were that NRW has national responsibility for all flood risks, that building in flood risk areas has to be limited and that a committee for flooding and a national resilience forum had to be established (Pitt 2008). In Wales, the government together with the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA) commissioned a government response to the Pitt review looking at all the various flood events in Wales. The main recommendation from this report was that they need to make communities aware of their risk and try to get citizens prepared and warned in advance. They also created local resilience forums as obliged by the CCA in which the category 1 organizations are obliged to be in and the category 2 are voluntarily to join. According to respondent NRW1, the flood awareness campaign shortly followed after and led to several tasks done by NRW; one was a flood warning system that citizens can use to receive free flood warning by phone, text or email. Another measure is that they employed people to go out into the communities to tell them that they are at risk, living in flood prone areas. Going out to personally speak with citizens has increased the government citizen relationship according to NRW1. It was much more effective than the old fashion awareness campaigns via television and other forms of media.

Going out into the communities led to the fact that NRW came in contact with Jean Cory, a citizen living in Llandowror, a small village that suffered a lot from flooding. She asked what the man was doing in this little village and he told her about the flood awareness campaign. Jean Cory, living on a hill not at risk, felt that something had to be done in her community since she saw her village flood several times. Jean Cory was also community councilor at that time and she organized a public meeting in the community to talk about the responsibility. Jean Cory mentioned that she was the most advanced in IT skills and wanted to actively engage into the risk which meant she became the main responsible for the flood action plan. Jean Cory got a group of active citizens together who were assigned as flood wardens. WC1 mentioned that together with experts from Carmarthenshire County Council (CCC), NRW they involved their local Police, fire and rescue services. Together they developed a detailed flood action plan. According to WC1, CCC also provided the community with sand bags, household flood defenses and fluorescent jackets. NRW helped develop a flood warning system for the community by installing new advanced alarm systems higher up in the river. Respondent WC1 mentioned that in 2011 Jean Cory went into the community with her flood
plan to create awareness about the plan and to show what measures had to be taken so that people could protect themselves. In 2013 there was heavy rainfall again and the rapid increase of high river levels led to the fact that the village flooded again even though the systems were in place and had set off an alarm. Nevertheless the plan still stands and according to the interviewed organizations this is mainly because of good collaboration and the active attitude of Jean Cory who became community leader and formed the link between government and the community.

5.2.2 What makes the project unique
According to respondent the Welsh expert this way of citizen initiative and citizen involvement is typical for Wales. He refers here to the fact that there is a huge emphasis on Community Asset Transfer (CAT) meaning a transfer of services. According to the Development Trust Association Wales (2012), as also mentioned in the literature review, CAT indicates the strong trend of decentralization that takes place in Wales where a shift in management and ownership of buildings or land from public bodies to communities is taking place. This means that they have to take on services voluntarily as a community otherwise they will be lost. According to respondents NRW1 & NRW2 this case is not uncommon in Wales but unique in a way that it was the first case where professionals and the public worked hand in hand to develop a very detailed flood action plan. According to NRW1 it is also unique because of the community leader who is very community minded. She was able to identify people in the community who would help with the plan and was the link between the government and professionals and the community. Without her it would not have been so successful is what all respondents from the public bodies mention. WLA1 mentions that this community plan is fairly unique because of the way the council got approached in a late stadium because the community really developed the plan themselves. Often CCC gets approached only by communities that are known for their active attitude. Respondent WLA 2 adds that unfortunately it really depends on the community and she mentions that therefore this is not a one size fits all process. According to WLA 2 they often only come if floods happen often and many communities think they can deal with it themselves meaning they do not engage with the council. According to one of the interviewed citizens, what is unique is that the action plan has been taken on by CCC and is now used as a framework all over Wales for any kind of hazardous action not only for flooding on community level. She also mentioned that the community actively took on the plan and made it their own but that the people who kept flooding did not participate in development of the plan which in her eyes is kind of odd and unexpected. According to Wiering et al. (2015) and as NRW1 mentioned in the response this has to do with the rationales of resilience in the UK and the big role for insurance companies. Citizens in the UK are generally afraid to admit that they are at risk because the insurance companies might not want to cover their risks anymore. Without the government dealing with the risk as is done in the Netherlands people who are flooded have to deal with the damage.

5.2.3 Flood resilient community and awareness
According to respondent NRW 1 ideally she would see all residents of Wales, either at risk or not directly at risk, aware. Those individuals would also have taken measures to mitigate that risk. NRW1 lists the measures that citizens can take: register to receive flood warnings,
having property protection products, a flood plan on household level, a list of insurance documents and where to turn off the power. Citizens who use infrastructure that could flood should in her eyes also understand that they have to avoid using this infrastructure when floods occur. On community level there should be a flood plan in place so that there are means of communication between public authorities and the community. All the interviewed public bodies in Wales mention that they understand the risks but that they are aware that flooding cannot be prevented so they can only prepare for it. Respondent WLA1 mentions that they “…do not want the community to think that we are the cavalry coming over the hill and solve all cases therefore the more citizens can help themselves the better…” (WLA1, personal communication, April 2015). In this sense flood resilience is more about preparation and understanding risks and acting on that risk. Coming back to the respondent NRW1 she mentions that to get closer to this ideal image there is education required of citizens she is surprised how little the public knows of the potential of flood water. Citizen 2 identifies Llanddowor as a resilient community because they are capable of taking things on and key to that are the individuals in the village that are capable of instructing and leading the community towards the visions of public organizations. According to him those individuals are resourceful in implementing ideas that would work in the village which improves the social bond in the community. According Gaventa (2004) community leaders and representatives enhance life, improve democratic participation and contribute to more effective sustainable communities. The Welsh expert on the other hand thinks that an integrated approach makes a community resilient. He thinks that local service boards (LSB) in Wales are important because they will help understand the climate risks and link all public bodies together in the centre of governance. In that sense a community should involve LSBs and look at a wider range of issues involving all climate adaptation issues. Collaboration is important in this sense also in a way that the community, decision makers and other LSB partners work together to develop a governance framework. The Welsh expert calls this a form of integrated modeling where everyone knows their role and where citizens and the community are involved. In this sense I would summarize his view on a resilient community as a governance system where sharing strategic knowledge and gathering local knowledge to do something together is important. This would be in a form of “let’s improve this together” as cooperation by Lee et al (2014) refers too but also as “lets create something new” a new integrated model with cooperation of all parties to improve climate adaptation in Wales which refers back to the high level collaboration that is necessary. In Wales a resilient community is therefore integrated in the system, fully aware of risks and they can also contribute to issues reducing risk.

5.2.4 Challenges & Keys to success

In general all involved parties think that the case is successful since it realized its aim to develop a flood action plan within the community. According to NRW2 the challenge to FRM and any other type of climate risk management is to encourage the community to develop a structure that can adapt to risks. This means that they need plans in place to manage these risks. The difficulty in this is that you need to go into each community because according to NRW2 each community is unique. This requires a form of collaboration in which NRW2 together with the community have to understand the risks in order to reduce these risks together. The plan therefore has not to be a plan on itself but it has to be integrated in the
plans of the public bodies. Some other challenges NRW2 mentions is that it is hard to create a community when there is none. It is very difficult as a public body to create local ownership among citizens if there is no community. One of the biggest challenges for raising awareness of risk is socially related. As mentioned before citizens do not want to be related to flood because it will affect the value of the property. But also ignorance is an issue. Citizens mention it will never happen to me so why should I look at my property. As a national public body it is very hard to convince people that they are at risk and that they should prepare themselves. According to respondent WLA2 a challenge lies in the way local knowledge is used by public authorities. There should be a way to make citizens who are less capable of preparing themselves known by the authorities such as social care but also within the community so that there is also local help. This comes back to what the Welsh expert mentioned that community resilience is much broader then just flood risk, it also involves an element of social care and real community engagement. Involving citizens and the community, as the interviewed respondents and expert refer to, should build and strengthen the governance framework which leads to a stronger democratic society (Gramberger, 2001).

The interviewed expert is concerned that the plan is only dealing with evacuation and giving the communities’ expectations of getting people into safety and that it does not adress the fact that the amount of flooding increases. This is one of the important challenges Wales has to face turning from aftercare and risk management into climate adaptation. Netherwood & Flynn (2015) see a future in the new FG Bill which has been given royal ascent recently. They think that this will be the act that will change the climate change measures as the Welsh expert just mentioned into more sustainable and adapting once. Going down to citizen level there are different challenges to be recognized. According to Citizen 2 a challenge the community plan deals with is to keep the people on their guard and vigilant. These “false” alarms lead to the fact that citizens start to neglect the alarms. According to all interviewed public authorities a citizen leader in the community is extremely important. This person should be the link between the community and the public authorities. Without this certain person the project is often not as successful as it is. According to NRW1 the community champion can engage with the extended community and involve them. Respondent WLA2 adds that also individuals supporting the leader have been important giving her support and keeping her positive. On the other hand citizens and NRW see this key to success also as a risk. Citizens who are relevant to a plan also keep the process going so if they leave or stop it often leads to a stop of the plan as well. The Dutch expert indicates that continuity is an important factor for collaboration not only in the Netherlands but also in Wales.

5.2.5 Collaboration and important dilemmas

In general all respondents see good collaboration as an important factor for developing a community flood risk plan. Respondents in general feel that in order to develop a flood resilient governance system collaboration is a must. According to Citizen 1 all parties were extremely helpful. She sees collaboration as the way that both parties are equally willing to do something for each other. This was the case in LLanddowror since NRW and CCC immediately responded when a flood warning went off even when it was a holiday. But she does mention that even though the collaboration was great she wished that the public bodies could take further measures to mitigate flooding. On the other hand she also mentioned that
the council wanted to discuss further plans on an open day but only 12 people turned up. In her eyes this is disappointing and it seems as if citizens do not really care. The Welsh expert agrees with the citizen respondent that the public authorities managing flood risk are working short term. He mentions that the Welsh bottom-up approach is not appropriate to deal with climate related issues because of this short term thinking. They are good in generating case studies a few examples that are successful but since there are more than 300 communities in Wales it is difficult to deal with them all. That is why the Welsh expert thinks that a more top-down structure as is used in the Netherlands would be good in Wales. But the Welsh authorities should then on strategic level mention that some communities should move because he thinks that it is impossible to save all communities at risk. In his eyes those communities should be instructed to move and investments should be made in more safer and viable communities. He does admit that these kind of strategic problems are difficult to answer for public authorities. So according to him public engagement is good to a certain extent. There has to be a balance, at some point top-down decisions have to be made so that resources are spend in a sustainable way. Therefore collaboration is important but you also need to have a big picture so it is not recommended to start bottom-up as is done in Wales according to the Welsh expert. In this sense he describes a limitation of studying a flagship project since those projects are hard to replicate. In this sense the flood governance in Wales should be changed.

Citizen partnership, collaboration and cooperation as described in the analyses are important but what should be mentioned is that if there is no balance between governance top-down and bottom-up initiatives are likely to fail. Nevertheless collaboration seems to be the key word in a time with cut-backs on resources for public authorities. It seems that working together as Market, Civil Society and State as Cohen and Arato (1992) mentioned to create something new can be seen as the only way governance of flood risks and resilience can be successful in the future. According to interviewed Farmer 1 staying motivated during the process can be difficult since public projects can often take quite long from a market & civil society perspective. If governments are not open for a bottom-up initiative or if they have other priorities a form of interaction between public and private will often not occur or turn out negatively (Winnubst, 2011).
6. Conclusion & Recommendations

6.1 Concluding remarks

In this final chapter the differences in societal contexts in Wales and the Netherlands reflected through citizen engagement are systematically compared via indicators from the conceptual model in the same way as the analysing sections from the previous chapter are structured. Furthermore the strengths and weaknesses of the Welsh and Dutch approaches are discussed.

Regarding Culture & Context the two governance systems are organized different meaning that traditions in flood risk management and habits of involving citizens are different. In the Netherlands the culture has always been for the government to take responsibility and to protect citizens. Therefore there was less room for citizens to act outside of the obliged public consultation rounds. In Wales the government does not take responsibility as in the Netherlands but it lays responsibilities at citizens themselves. This is because the national government of Wales does not have the resources or the priority to take responsibility. Their culture and mind set is that citizens have to insure themselves meaning that insurance companies are more important as well as community spirit to solve flood related issues voluntarily. In this sense the Welsh government compared to the Dutch also sees their own role more as one that has to create awareness amongst citizens instead of dealing with the issues itself. The culture and context initially did not invite for collaboration or any form of citizen power. Both national governments intended to involve citizens in a tokenistic way but in both cases the citizens had a chance to make a change because of a window of opportunity. The Dutch and Welsh governments were either looking for a new strategy or implementing a new strategy which gave the opportunity for citizens to step up with new ideas taking the role of coordinators as Lee et al (2014) mentions. In the Overdiep case there was an opportunity because the government was more open for citizen engagement because of recent floods and because of frightening projections of climate change impacts. In Wales citizens were supposed to be informed about their risk and there was no real form of collaboration or participation intended.

What was most unique in both cases was that even though the culture & context were different there was a balance between public interest, common interest and individual interest. If these interests come close together the acceptance and the support seems to increase as well as willingness to participate. The difference with other partnerships is that the citizens became coordinators and co-creators of the project which meant that they could take part as equal partners in the decision-making process. OP is unique because it was the first project within RFTR that was delegated to a lower tier of government, it was the first ever Dutch citizen initiative related to water management and the citizens kept playing an important role throughout the process. In this last sense the citizens became co-designers and co-responsible of the project instead of consumers of policies. In Wales this case was also the first successful case where professionals and public worked hand in hand to develop a detailed flood plan. According to respondents the community had responsibility over the plan and the public authorities brought in expertise to guide the citizens in the development of the plan. This approach in itself is not unique since the Welsh governance system is set up in a way that
supports bottom-up plans but often these plans tend to have responsibility at local authority level and not voluntarily on community level.

Regarding Community Resilience and awareness we see in both cases that it is important to have one common aim and to have one or two active citizens who profile themselves as community leaders. These community leaders have a brave task and often sacrifice time and energy being the link between government and the community. If things are not going well they are looked upon from both sides and it takes a lot of courage to step up and to become part of a governance process that directly involves the people around you. Community resilience was interpreted different in Wales and the Netherlands which can be related to the different cultures and governance systems. In the Netherlands the government takes control which leads to a different interpretation of a resilient community, one that comes closer to a resilient system as a whole. In Wales community resilience relies more on the individual and the community. Welsh authorities as well as citizens see community resilience as a community that is aware of risks and actively interacts as a community to reduce that risk. In this sense flood risk awareness is also more important as in the Netherlands where awareness of citizens is relatively low. Nevertheless in both cases citizens were made aware top down of certain risks. In LLanddowror flood risk awareness was brought into the community and one citizen took the initiative to develop an action plan which benefited the whole community. In the Overdiepse Polder awareness was also raised top down, the province went out to community to tell them that they were potential flood plain. In both cases it seems that there had to be a push from public authorities in order for citizens to take initiative.

If we compare the challenges and keys to success we notice that in both cases there were several flooding events that led to change in governance. This aspect was important for public awareness. In both cases the citizens took initiative because they were personally affected by events, either by natural events or by public plans. In both cases citizens had an active attitude and felt responsible to take action. This together with the open minded government that accepted the citizens as equal partners and the continuity of certain leaders on both sides led to personal bonds and well established collaboration. With continuity on both sides eventually problems can be solved and both parties suffer or benefit equally which was very important for the success of the project. Another important factor in the Dutch case was transparency; this really strengthened the collaboration, having open conversations formal and informal. Both examples as mentioned before are fairly unique and therefore both cases are not easily replicated because they strongly depend on the cultural aspects within the community such as the leading individuals in the community and the social bond between inhabitants. Therefore a challenge is also not to tighten governance to much with templates and legislative frameworks but to use local identities. In Wales the issue is that the action plans rely on key persons within the community if these persons move on it is difficult to keep the plan going.

If we compare collaboration and important dilemmas we notice that most of the respondents mentioned that the success of a public project involving several parties is strongly related with the quality of the collaboration. This also contributes to Schrijvers’ (2015) theory in which both citizens’ initiatives could better be described as ways of good collaboration. Public
bodies have often issues involving citizens since they do not have one common interest but spread individual interests. On the other hand citizens have issues collaborating with public bodies because they are often slow in taking decisions as the Dutch case shows. Also political priorities can change and therefore agreements cancelled. The farmers in OP mentioned that they were more afraid of changing priorities then of flooding itself. The project could easily be held back or even stopped in their eyes. Looking back at the process they mentioned that for them politics worked in their favour. In Wales one of the important dilemmas for citizen engagement is that citizens can only collaborate actively till certain extend. Therefore respondents mentioned that the way Wales governs flood risk lacks mitigating measures since the action plans that communities develop mainly relate to after care and emergencies. According to the Welsh expert public engagement and collaboration therefore also has downsides. At some point governments have to make decisions and sometimes difficult once saying that some communities cannot be saved. In the Netherlands the farmers mention a similar dilemma. Public bodies should in their eyes stop trying to cover all the risks but to also take some risks to decide quicker so that they do not lose market and society which often work at a different pace.

If we look at the two different approaches to flood risk governance we see that they have different strengths and weaknesses. Starting with the Dutch flood governance it has the strength that the government takes responsibility. This way they can do large scaled projects which make it easier to adapt to climate impacts. Furthermore their strategy is well implemented and it has clear responsibilities for each public body. Another benefit is that the government can do larger public investments then in Wales so it has better ways of bargaining to realize their vision. A weakness is that this top down approach leads to less chance for citizens or other actors to participate. Another weakness is that this centralized approach where the government takes responsibility also means that they take risks with public investments meaning that they have to be take more careful and considerate decisions. This means that procedures can be slower than in a case where the government is not taking responsibility but leaves it up to the citizens. Another weakness that comes with responsibility is that there is an awareness gap in the Netherlands since water security is done by the government who aims to “keep Dutch feet dry”. Therefore the weakness is that citizens do not feel responsible and they feel less involved. The strength of the Welsh approach to flood risk management is that because of its bottom up approach the market and citizens are more engaged. This generally means that there is more understanding and support from citizens and communities. This leads not only to more awareness but also more integrated use of local knowledge. In this way, local qualities can be used better since the system deals with specific problems instead of visions or aims towards the future. The Welsh aim is therefore also more about creating a healthy environment where citizens have own responsibilities such as insuring against risks. The way of dealing with problems that occur instead of having big central plans with large public investments means that the Welsh government targets only communities that have flood risk issues. Targeting in this sense is more about bringing skills and expertise to the area helping to deal with issues instead of solving them with public funding. Small measures and flood protective supplies are therefore more in place. The weaknesses of this system are that it has issues dealing with projections of the future such as
climate change impacts increase of floods and bigger scaled issues. Larger problems cannot be covered by the government and therefore private funding will be necessary. Collaboration in this sense should be more important than in the Netherlands. This fact also makes it difficult to have clear government responsibilities about floods and maintenance of rivers. Another weakness of the Welsh system is that it has less money to bargain with communities therefore a issue is that if a village cannot be protected it is hard to tell them to move in advance. In the Netherlands these kinds of projects can be done because the government can cover moving expenses and therefore it is easier to allocate people to make changes such as RFTR tends to do. What is important to note is that one case is not wrong and the other is right. Even though people flood more in Wales, the way of dealing with flood related problems is completely different meaning that we can learn from both examples.

6.2 Recommendation
Involving citizens, as seen in these two cases, means that you involve the local culture and knowledge from a specific location which is unique in every community. In that sense using standard governance frameworks and protocols for cases that involve citizen partnerships can be rather restricting then supporting. All respondents recognize that these projects are fairly unique and that it relies on certain individuals. This means that they are not easily copied in other places therefore a governance system is necessary that recognizes this uniqueness and uses the local knowledge and qualities of the area.

Wales is involving communities and makes citizens part of the governance system but they lack real strategic decisions. The citizens initiatives stay small scaled because there is only so much a community can do. Therefore I would advice Welsh government to consider using an overarching strategic approach together with their bottom-up approach. I think a big opportunity lies in the new FG Bill that is being implemented. This could be the centre sustainable development strategic document that contributes to climate adaptation that Wales was missing. Even though the lack of national power and resources make it seem that the government cannot take full responsibility, the FG Bill could give the top down guidance necessary. This way, Welsh’ community based approach will be more directed towards one common vision, the one of becoming more climate resilient. To enhance this approach Wales would need to elevate, the most local tier of governance, town and community councils to an officially recognized body. In order to do so this tier should not work on voluntary basis as it currently is. Furthermore it would need understanding, engagement and an active attitude of the communities and citizens but also of the government. This way collaboration can take place where both parties are recognized and accepted on equal level.

For the Netherlands there is a threat that citizens’ initiatives are limited because of the tight legislative framework and the systematic top-down approach. This approach works great for flood risk reduction and large scale strategic projects such as RFTR. In order to give citizens a chance to participate beyond the obligatory consultation round there should be a space in the governance framework for unique aspects of communities that do not fit within certain templates. The current relatively tight systems and legislative framework in the Netherlands needs to be adjusted to generate space for citizen initiatives. Several respondents have agreed upon this argument and mentioned that it will also add to the relatively low awareness of
flood risk of citizens as well as government efficiency. The case of the OP is unique and not typical for the Netherlands. The reason for this can perhaps be found in the cultural setting where there is often no chance for citizens to actively participate but only to resist during consultation rounds when plans are already made. What is also important is that if citizens are involved more they will be more aware of FRM and their effects. Citizens currently seem to be less aware of flood risk in the Netherlands than in Wales. This is because of the different ways the governments tend to take on citizen engagement which is strongly influenced by the different cultures and contexts.

If we look at the recommendations mentioned above it seems as if both cases are opposites in the way they are governed. In this sense the Netherlands could learn from Wales how to actively engage citizens and how to create more awareness. Wales could learn from the Netherlands how to set up a flood system where public bodies have clear responsibilities and how to create strategies that contribute to flood risk management. Perhaps in this, a role for the EU and Interreg programmes could be identified. A role that stimulates international partnerships and cross-border comparisons not only related to cross-border river basin management but also exchange of knowledge throughout Europe.

6.3 Discussion
It was quite difficult to gather enough information to do thorough analysis of the two governance systems especially in such a limited time. Getting enough respondents was one issue which was achieved by chasing after respondents via phone calls, emails and targeting colleagues via websites. Another issue was that quite some scholars wrote about FRM and also about the Dutch case specifically which made it hard to find my way to the most relevant material. Another difficulty was that there are quite some theories about involvement of citizens and citizen partnership but none seemed truly sufficient for this study. Therefore I attempted to combine several theories into my own. The limitation of this is that perhaps some aspects are interpret differently then supposed to. Even though the theoretical framework did guide me throughout this study it was difficult to not go to broad taking too many things in consideration.

The first limitation of this research has to do with the methods chosen. Case studies are interesting since you can dive deeper into the specific example and really analyse how the collaboration went in this specific case. The Dutch as well as the Welsh case are not typical but seem to be flagship projects. This has as consequence that it is difficult to make general statements about the governance of the country. Qualitative methods are limited in this sense since in depth analyzing of one case makes it hard to look beyond this particular case. Nevertheless via the interview guide an attempt was made to ask about other cases, general strategies as well as if the case was typical. The issue, as earlier mentioned by the Welsh expert, is that some governance systems are set up to generate these kinds of projects. In Wales for example there are around a 100 communities at risk. Since this case was a success it does not mean that all the others are as successful. As mentioned throughout the thesis governance that really uses local knowledge and collaborates with citizens is unique, complex and hard to replicate. It seems rather difficult to use these examples as best practices. Perhaps an analysis of the whole governance system would be necessary to see the true effect of the
approach the two countries have taken. One other limitation would be that it was harder to get enough respondents then expected beforehand. Therefore the phases designed in the plan of approach did not go chronologic but desktop research went together with interviewing and even continued in the analyzing phase. Strict planning and chasing up respondents in further research could contribute to more time for revision.

What I would like to mention is that citizens’ initiatives are often put in a positive daylight. Recent trends throughout Europe give a positive idea to citizen engagement and what was mentioned before is that citizens’ initiatives need community leaders. Often these leaders have the issue that they do their job on voluntary basis while public bodies work professional and paid. This takes a lot of energy and toll from these individuals. They also frame themselves as the link between community and public body meaning that they are seen responsible from both sides. Often citizens from the community will knock on the leaders door mentioning that they did something wrong or that they are “consorting with the enemy”. For a community it takes a lot of energy to lead citizen initiatives and therefore aftercare is very important. What has been said throughout the interviews is that the project is a success because of these individuals but that these projects often take very long and that the community cannot function during this time. They say that even though the project is a success the community in the case of the Overdiepse Polder was torn apart and the aftercare for people affected was lacking or insufficient. The government often gives resources to move but psychological care is limited. It took a lot of energy from the initiative takers in the Overdiepse Polder and their health suffered by realizing this project. This should be taken in consideration especially looking at these flagship projects. This was an impression from respondents but further research would be necessary on the negative effects of a citizens’ initiative.

Another interesting topic for further research is that within the last decades a shift has been made in governance where single organizations cannot realize their goals and aims anymore. This means that the importance of partners and citizens becomes even more sufficient than before. Therefore my prediction is that collaboration and citizen participation will be increasingly relevant in decision making. Several academics have recognized this as well and have even identified a new form of governance called middle-up-down which is a form of hybrid project management in which is looked upon the system as a whole and the benefits of a particular area. Further research could perhaps analyse if this new form of governance is usable in FRM and how citizens would be involved in this new way of governance.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Interview guide searching for a case in Wales

Background:
Thank you for giving me the opportunity of interviewing you. I’m Pieter Louwers I am an Erasmus master student writing my master thesis. I am doing a research on the way citizens and governments interact regarding flood risk in Wales and the Netherlands. I want to test aspects of resilience, collaborative and cross scale interaction theories. My research question is: Regarding flood risk management, how does the national and local government facilitate citizens in very different context and with different perspectives on resilience in Wales and The Netherlands? For my own research I would like to record this interview in order to listen back to it and to understand the answers better. Am I allowed to do so?

Introduction:
Q.1 What is your current role in this subject and the role of (interviewed organization)?

Q.2 Will the community get the resources?

Q.3 It really has to come bottom-up. Who is we? Is that you and NRW or is that other organization?

Q.4 Do you know a local case?

Q.5 Any other challenges regarding what are the real challenges regarding citizen participation?

Q.6 I’m wondering I am not really familiar who is responsible for rivers and for coasts in the Netherlands it is completely different then in the other country.

Q.7 Does that make it any clearer yes it does. Who would that be? A national organization?

Thank you very much for your time and this interview. If you are interested I will send you my final report.
Appendix B: Interview guide English & Dutch and reasoning

Interview guide in English

**Background:**
Thank you for giving me the opportunity of interviewing you. I’m Pieter Louwers I am an Erasmus master student writing my master thesis. I am doing a research on the way citizens and governments interact regarding flood risk in Wales and the Netherlands. I want to test aspects of resilience, collaborative and cross scale interaction theories. My research question is: Regarding flood risk management, how does the national and local government facilitate citizens in very different context and with different perspectives on resilience in Wales and The Netherlands? For my own research I would like to record this interview in order to listen back to it and to understand the answers better. Am I allowed to do so?

**Introduction:**
1. What is your current role in this subject and the role of (interviewed organization)?

2. Who took the initiative (NGO, Platform, one citizen) and what was their reason for taking initiative? Which other groups became involved in the process? How was the initiative/process transformed to a project? What roles did the different actors take in the project?

3. Is this case typical for Wales/ The Netherlands, if not what is unique about it?

**Analysis:**

4. When and how were citizens involved during the process? Was this a positive or negative experience?

5. Is this project considered as a success? Why is it considered as a success? What made this success possible?

6. In case of flood emergency, who is responsible and why are they responsible?

7. Are the citizens aware of their flood Risks? Do you think that the approach is resilient what do you see as resilient and do you think there are other ways to interpret resilience?

8. **How do you see a flood resilient community?** (Is the community supposed to be more self-dependant to be resilient to floods, or do they talk more about awareness and active participation in flood governance?)

**Conclusion:**

9. What are the challenges/learning moments from this project?
10. What would you do different next time?

11. What are important dilemmas for collaborating with citizens?

12. Could you scale from 1 to 10 how important collaboration between government and citizens was in this project? Why this score? What were you missing in order to get that 10?

13. Could you scale from 1 to 10 how successful you find this project so far? Why this score? What were you missing in order to get that 10?

Thank you very much for your time and this interview. If you are interested I will send you my final report.

Interview guide in Dutch

Achtergrond:
Bedankt dat ik u mag interviewen. Ik zal mezelf even voorstellen. Ik ben Pieter Louwers een Erasmus Master student en ik ben mijn Master thesis aan het schrijven. Ik doe onderzoek naar de burgerparticipatie en publiek private samenwerking gerelateerd aan overstromingsrisico in Wales en in Nederland. Ik onderzoek twee specifieke casussen. De Overdiepse Polder en Llanddowror in Wales. Mijn onderzoeksvraag luidt: Vanuit het oogpunt van overstromingsrisico, hoe zorgen de nationale en locale overheid ervoor dat burgers gefaciliteerd worden in compleet verschillende context en met andere percepties op de veerkrachtigheid/resilience in Wales en Nederland?

Inleiding:
1. Wat is uw (organisatie) huidige rol/kennis in het onderwerp?

2. Wie nam het initiatief (NGO, Platform, een burger) en wat was daarvoor de reden? Welke andere groepen en organisaties werden tijdens het proces betrokken? Hoe werd het initiatief een project? Welke rollen namen de verschillende partners in tijdens het project?

3. Is deze case typisch voor Nederland?

Analyse:
4. Wanneer en hoe werden burgers betrokken tijdens het proces en hoe was de ervaring (positief, negatief)?

5. Word dit project gezien als succes? Zo ja, waarom? Wat maakte het succes mogelijk?
6. Als er overstroming plaatsvindt in het gebied wie is er dan verantwoordelijk en waarom juist deze mensen?

7. Zijn mensen goed op de hoogte van de overstromingskansen? Ziet u de gekozen benadering als een veerkrachtige benadering, wat verstaat u er onder, zijn er andere opvattingen mogelijk hierover?

8. Hoe zie jij een gemeenschap die veerkrachtig/resilient is? Zijn die meer zelf afhankelijk of gaat het meer over een bewuste gemeenschap en actieve samenwerking en een actieve houding in het overstromingsbeleid?

Conclusie:

9. Wat zijn/waren de uitdagingen en leermomenten van dit project?

10. Wat zou u de volgende keer anders doen?

11. Wat zijn belangrijke problemen met betrekking tot samenwerking met burgers?

12. Zou u op een schaal van 1 tot 10 kunnen aangeven hoe belangrijk samenwerking tussen overheid en burgers was in dit project? Waarom deze score en wat miste u om die 10 te krijgen?

13. Zou u op een schaal van 1 tot 10 kunnen aangeven hoe succesvol u het project vindt en waarom deze score en wat miste u om die 10 te krijgen?

Hartelijk dank voor uw tijd.
Reasoning behind the interview guide:

**Research questions:**
The aim of this research will be to see via two frontier cases if there is a change in the roles between government and citizens in different contexts regarding flood risk management in Wales and the Netherlands. Through this interview specifically I would like to know more about the collaboration process and specifically within the policy cycle in Wales and the Netherlands but also why these two cases are seen as successful cases by different actors. My main research question is: *Regarding flood risk management, how does the national and local government facilitate citizens in very different context and with different perspectives on resilience in Wales and The Netherlands?*

The guiding questions are as follow:
- What does collaboration and resilience mean in the policy framework of The Netherlands and Wales and on what level is flood risk management dealt with?
- How do the national or local government authorities responsible for the flood risk strategies in De Overdiepse Polder and Llanddowror interact with citizens and intent to involve them?
- Why did the public take initiative in these two cases and how does the public interpret citizens participation, -initiatives and is this visible in governance at local level?
- Why are these two cases seen as pioneer and successful cases and what was the role of collaboration in this?

**Targets:**
I aim to interview one person of the responsible department of the National Government, one in the Local government, one expert and two to three citizens who were active in the case. This way I hope to get a relatively objective view on the questions.

**Introduction:**
In this part I attempt to gain general knowledge on the interviewee’s position in the matter (question 1) and about the process (question 2 and 3). I would also like to figure out who exactly took the initiative and in what framework. Did this initiative come out of nowhere or was it stimulated by a certain policy/programme.

**Analysis:**
In this phase I attempt to gain insight on the level of collaboration, the level of involvement (Question 4) and responsibilities after the project (Question 6). With questions 6, 7 and 8 I elaborate on resilience in which aftercare of a project is very important. Social relationships, social contracts are important to discover the different rationales for resilience in Wales and the Netherlands. With question 5 I hope to create an answer to the final sub question of my research. I hope to gain an answer on what the success factors were and why this research is seen as a pioneer case within the country.

**Conclusion:**
In this final part I attempt to gain extra insight on how the process went (experience wise) through question 9, 10 and 11. I also attempt to see what important factors were during the process, perhaps collaboration will be mentioned and the role of citizens. With question 12 and 13 I hope to gain insight on the efficiency of the research and throughout these concluding questions I hope to be able to generate a general conclusion based on the interviewee’s answers which I will be able to combine with the general challengers of the research.
## Appendix C: List of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification in text</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
<th>Date interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dutch expert</td>
<td>Dr. Madelinde Winnubst</td>
<td>Utrecht University</td>
<td>Researcher public participation and cross scale interaction.</td>
<td>1-5-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales Expert</td>
<td>Dr. Alan Netherwood</td>
<td>Sustainable Development and Climate Change Consultancy</td>
<td>Researcher in sustainability and climate change governance and risk management</td>
<td>12-5-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRW 1</td>
<td>Simone Eade</td>
<td>Natural Resources Wales</td>
<td>Flood incident manager, Wales</td>
<td>24-4-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRW 2</td>
<td>Andrew Irving</td>
<td>Natural Resources Wales</td>
<td>Flood Incident Management Team Leader</td>
<td>19-3-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRW 3 (E-mail correspondence)</td>
<td>Amanda Paton</td>
<td>Natural Resources Wales</td>
<td>Project Manager Flood Awareness at Natural Resources Wales</td>
<td>24-2-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLA 1</td>
<td>Richard Elms</td>
<td>Camarthenshire County Council</td>
<td>Civil Contingencies Manager, Policy &amp; Performance Division</td>
<td>17-4-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLA 2</td>
<td>Hazel Veal</td>
<td>Camarthenshire County Council</td>
<td>Civil Contingencies Manager expertise on Humanitarian / Community Resilience.</td>
<td>7-4-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC 1</td>
<td>Jean Cory</td>
<td>Wales Initiative Taking Citizen and Clerk Llanmiloe &amp; Llanddowror Community Council</td>
<td>The citizen who took the initiative in Llanddowror to create a flood risk action plan</td>
<td>13-4-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC 2</td>
<td>Mark Tucker</td>
<td>Wales Initiative Taking Citizen</td>
<td>One of the key flood warden in Llanddowror</td>
<td>13-4-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBBD</td>
<td>Simon Hofstra</td>
<td>Dutch Water Board Brabantse Delta</td>
<td>Responsible for execution Overdiepse Polder</td>
<td>21-4-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWS</td>
<td>Hans Brouwer</td>
<td>Dutch National Water Department</td>
<td>River manager</td>
<td>7-5-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 1</td>
<td>Sjaak Broekmans</td>
<td>Chairman Interest group Overdiepse Polder 2000-2010</td>
<td>Dutch Initiative Taking Citizen</td>
<td>2-5-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer 2</td>
<td>Nol Hooijmaijers</td>
<td>Current Chairman Interest group Overdiepse Polder 2000-2010 and Councilor Waalwijk</td>
<td>Dutch Initiative Taking Citizen</td>
<td>21-4-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>