



**South Downs
National Park Authority**

**Agenda Item 16
Report PR19/20-38**

Report to	Policy & Resources Committee
Date	27 February 2020
By	Landscape and Biodiversity Lead (Water)
Title of Report (Note)	End of Project evaluation – Brighton Chalk Integrated Catchment Management Partnership (ChaMP) Project

Recommendation: The Committee is recommended to:

- I) Receive and consider the end of project review for the ChaMP project Phase I as included in Appendix I.**

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report presents the end of project retrospective review for Phase I of the Brighton Chalk Integrated Catchment Management Partnership (ChaMP). The ChaMP project is a collection of initiatives with partners all under the banner of improving groundwater quality. These include changes in rural land management practices, urban rain gardens and promoting best practice with various businesses such as golf courses. The committee is asked to consider the review, learning points and themes as highlighted.
- 1.2 The ChaMP 2 project was approved by the National Park Authority in December 2019, development and design of the second project has taken into account the learning from this review.
- 1.3 The ChaMP project started delivery in September 2015. It runs for 5 years until March 2020. The total project cost is £400,000 secured from a range of partners, in addition specific funding has been obtained for rain garden interventions from Highways England and a considerable amount of in kind time has been given to the project by partners. . The SDNPA contribution is a £105,000 cash contribution and wider support provided to the project manager from within the authority in areas such as communications and water strategy.

2. Issues for consideration

- 2.1 This project review was undertaken in 2019 with all partners to assist with developing a business case for continuing ChaMP as a second phase to 2025.
- 2.2 **Key successes** include the engagement of rural landowners and the development and rollout of land management interventions with a focus on new trials and innovation. These land management interventions have now been adopted as ‘business as usual’ by Southern Water. In the urban environment potential sites for rain garden interventions have been identified and taken through feasibility planning, awareness has been increased with key local authority staff through training sessions and funding for schemes has been brought in from the Highways England, section 106 and CIL funds.
- 2.3 **Challenges.** The project governance proved difficult with variable levels of engagement with the project board, duplication between the board and steering group and poor communication within some organisations.

- You have to have the right people in the room to get things done (with the right attitude). Working with a few, engaged and talented people doesn't mean the whole organisation is engaged.
- Streamline planning and reporting to reduce repetition
- Consistency in coms requires ongoing internal briefings and good 'boilerplate' documents, with all partners having access to a common source
- Sub-contractor relationships proved difficult in the rural delivery programme with failure to deliver on some key agreed targets, this was subsequently brought in house by the lead partner (Southern Water).
- Randscape projects are often more complex, take longer and are significantly more expensive than planned.
- Finally there was a need for clearer scoping of activities, deliverables and timing. At times the project tried to achieve too many things at once with limited resources.

2.4 Lessons learnt for Champ 2.

- Improved Governance with a simplified structure and wider organisational buy in.
- A simplified framework of expectations and outcomes that all partners can buy into and demonstrating added value.
- Partnership engagement at a strategic level with common direction and leadership from the top.
- A jointly developed 5 year strategic delivery plan based on agreed outcomes, costed and with allocated responsibilities.
- A jointly agreed communication strategy both externally and internally within partner organisations.

3. Next steps

- 3.1 A business case for ChaMP 2 has been developed to include lessons learnt from the review. Four major partners have committed resources to the Champ 2 project until 2025, with several additional supporting partners (inc University of Brighton). ChaMP 2 will commence on 1 April 2020.

4. Other Implications

Implication	Yes*/No
Will further decisions be required by another committee/full authority?	No
Does the proposal raise any Resource implications?	No
How does the proposal represent Value for Money?	The project evaluated represents good value for money.
Are there any Social Value implications arising from the proposal?	No
Have you taken regard of the South Downs National Park Authority's equality duty as contained within the Equality Act 2010?	There are no equalities implications arising from this report. The equalities implications of projects are considered as part of the project development process. Any issues raised as part of the evaluation will be monitored through the capture of learning points.
Are there any Human Rights implications arising from the proposal?	No

Are there any Crime & Disorder implications arising from the proposal?	No
Are there any Health & Safety implications arising from the proposal?	No
Are there any Data Protection implications?	No
Are there any Sustainability implications based on the 5 principles set out in the SDNPA Sustainability Strategy:	Learning from projects contributes to sustainability principle 2 ensuring a strong healthy and just society – considering social cohesion and wellbeing; principle 3 achieving a sustainable economy – considering impacts on or contribution to a sustainable economy; and principle 4 Promoting good governance – considering how to encourage active participation.

5. Risks Associated with the Proposed Decision

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation
That learning from projects is not fully captured	2	2	Well understood mechanisms are in place to capture information about the progress of projects and identifying learning through evaluation. Evaluation reports and case studies are routinely produced.
Learning from projects is not fed into future project development	3	3	A mechanism for improvement planning is in place. Project specific learning is followed up by themed programme boards which meet several times a year. Corporate learning is captured and disseminated via an organisational improvement plan and in any revisions to guidance that might be deemed appropriate.

JEREMY BURGESS
Landscape and Biodiversity Lead (Water)
South Downs National Park Authority

Contact Officer:	Jeremy Burgess
Tel:	01730 819292
email:	Jeremy.burgess@southdowns.gov.uk
Appendices	I. ChaMP end of project review
SDNPA Consultees	Chief Executive; Director of Countryside Policy and Management; Director of Planning; Chief Finance Officer; Monitoring Officer; Legal Services, Business Service Manager
External Consultees	None
Background Documents	1. Project PID 2015 2. Mid Project Review 2017 3. ChaMP 2 Business case April 2019

This page is intentionally left blank

End of Project Review

Project Overview

PROJECT TITLE:	Brighton Chalk Integrated Catchment Management Partnership (Brighton ChaMP)
PROJECT LEAD (AUTHOR):	Susie Howells, Aimee Felus
PROJECT START DATE:	September 2015
PROJECT END DATE:	March 2019, extended to March 2020
PROJECT TYPE:	Large

Executive summary

- Progress has been good, and ChaMP has the capability to raise its performance and impact with greater alignment between partners' individual strategic objectives, using their skills and experience to focus on delivery of targeted programmes, bringing in innovation and best practice from its research and communication strands.
- Outcomes agreed at the start of the project, including visits, walkovers, events, rural interventions, stakeholder engagement and publicity, have been achieved, with few exceptions
- Recognition is reasonably high regionally but could be better, with high-level interest at third-party events, and good quality support and testimonials received for the Wild Park Rainscape Project.
- Nitrate pollution of the aquifer is a long term trend so it is difficult to show direct impact of activities, but the value of interventions is recognised by all partners, and there is a core of land managers willing to act. Potential to evaluate impact data is being considered, with a view to publishing more data on the website – however nitrate trends can only be an indirect and long range indicator of ChaMP effort.
- The rural strand has progressed to a stage where stakeholders are engaged, relationships are evolving well, and interventions are effectively planned and developed to inform the next phase. Some interventions (Cover Crops) are now offered to farmers as 'business as usual' by Southern Water, rather than ChaMP interventions, enabling Southern Water to focus their collaborative engagement on testing new approaches and innovation.
- ChaMP partners identified five sites for urban rainscapes, from an initial list of 29 with agreed criteria for maximum impact in groundwater quality, flood attenuation, biodiversity, amenity value and awareness potential. While the project has successfully brought forward five concept designs, and established working groups to progress the work of three, the urban strand has met with delays and blocks, and at times it has been difficult to engage partners and other stakeholders productively to make progress. Resource constraints and conflicting senior level



direction were reported as the main reasons, and political timing has been an influence in planning and delivering actions, including consultation.

- The wider urban programme has been clearly defined, with actions prioritised and progressing
- Key successes in the research strand include cover crops, slug abundance and urban diffuse pollution.
- A project review was undertaken during 2019 to develop the business case for continuing ChaMP to 2025 with the following recommendations:
 - To continue and develop ChaMP
 - To lift aspiration and impact; to strengthen leadership and direction from each partner by aligning strategic objectives and using ChaMP as a vehicle for collaborative achievement of common goals
 - To continue to build appropriate wider organisational engagement, internal communication and advocacy
 - To seek funding from partners to support the continuation of project-based interventions
 - To agree a clearly defined in-kind contribution between partners, with allocated resource for each partner accounted for within day-job, with personal objectives aligned to partners' own strategic objectives
 - To confirm the hosting partner for the ChaMP project manager.
 - To retain and carry forward the current agreements, backed up with a simplified partnership summary, commitment to collaborative principles and agreement of expectations and outcomes
 - To agree a budget and develop a costed forward plan. The review exercise stimulated some excellent ideas and identified significant opportunities to uplift ChaMP's performance and impact. All has been documented and can be used as a basis to develop ChaMP's forward plan.
 - To convene a facilitated strategy workshop for board and steering group members, confirming high level objectives, and including a strategy alignment exercise (prepared), and an action prioritisation exercise to inform forward plans

References:

- Project Initiation Document (undated)
- Policy and Programme Committee paper (June 2015)
- Letter of Approval (July 2015)
- Collaboration Agreement (October 2015)
- Memorandum of Understanding
- Mid Project Review (Undated)
- ChaMP post 2020 Business Case (April 2019) (ChaMP Board Paper)

Analysis of



<p>PROJECT DURATION: <i>Did it overrun/finish early? What were the main reasons for this? (Large projects attach the project schedule for more detail)</i></p>	<p>This was initially a four year project. The project duration was extended by a year by agreement with all partners to 31 March 2020, recognising progress achieved in addressing a long-term issue.</p> <p>Following the project review in 2019, plans are in place to extend the project for a further five years (2020-25). Partners agreed that the need for the project remains, and that it should be ‘continued and developed’ because of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legal and policy drivers, - The global context – rising nitrate levels, - The local context – valuing the Brighton Chalk Block; and - The cost of alternative courses of action
<p>The foundation for collaboration on this long-term issue (nitrate trends) has been established, and there is the will and opportunity to build on this to lift the quality and impact to achieve a more ambitious joint programme.</p> <p>PROJECT CONTROL & GOVERNANCE: <i>Outline how the project was governed. Did this go as anticipated? Did the project receive the right level of support from the governing body (i.e. Theme Programme Board, Steering Group etc.) Were appropriate methods put in place for project management (e.g. regular team meetings, regular monitoring of data)? Was there good in-team communication?</i></p>	<p>The project was governed by a Collaboration Agreement and Memorandum of Understanding. A two-tier governance structure was agreed, with a twice yearly Project Board and quarterly Steering Group, and project-specific working groups established to progress rainscape projects.</p> <p>Lessons learned</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Levels of engagement were variable at board level, and attendance was poor. • Board and steering group meetings became repetitive and ineffective for decision-making, lacking focus and direction, repeating project updates in both sessions. • In moving away from this approach, a quarterly project update report was circulated with recommendations for board decisions provided by the project manager in advance, with the steering group focusing on a workshop-style session to capture learning and plan for the next quarter. • The importance of ensuring board and steering group members are able to represent their organisations effectively is critical. • A distinction between funding partner and non-funding partner has now been made – there is a need to articulate the benefits of collaboration as well as clearly identifying what each partner brings in financial and non-financial support. • Single-tier governance is proposed for ChaMP2, with task-specific working groups drawing on technical expertise of partners and associates to manage projects.



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board members will be briefed to make effective decisions and provide stronger leadership. A new collaboration agreement is being drafted which includes set collaboration principles, clear expectations from participants and an annual strategic planning session. <p>Appropriate methods were in place for project management, SDNPA hosts the project manager and provides employment, line management and organisational support, with good internal team communication and organisational support. While the project manager is hosted by the SDNPA, it's difficult to disassociate, and at times being an SDNPA employee is perceived more strongly than providing a fair representation of all partners equally. Opportunities to work in partner office space are being promoted to provide a broader opportunity for day-to-day collaboration.</p> <p>A Technical Delivery Programme spreadsheet was set up and used as a tool to plan and track activity, updated in regular work together days. (Up to June 2019). A quarterly project report was set up to enable consistency in regular for various audiences.</p>	<p><u>Financial</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ChaMP bank account was hosted by Southern Water, with agreement to work to their procurement procedures, terms and conditions As the project manager is hosted by the SDNPA, issues arose in contracts, invoicing and payment and the options of hosting the ChaMP account in the SDNPA is being explored Financial spreadsheets were set up to plan and track expenditure, balanced against the ChaMP bank account at the end of each month. <p><u>Good practice:</u> Regular 'work together' days went well, where selected members of the steering group worked together in the same location for a full or half-day on specific tasks. This enabled positive and effective collaboration, drawing from respective partner experience to develop plans and take the programme forward.</p>	<p>PARTNERS: Review how well the project worked with partners. Were partner roles clearly defined and</p>
---	---	--



<p><i>Understood by all? Did the project have an MOU in place, and was it robust enough? Did each partner carry out their commitments, or were interventions needed?</i></p>	<p>An MoU was in place, see above, which was appropriate in scope and coverage. Its impact could have been improved by summarising clear expectations, reinforced by involving partners at a more strategic level with a targeted internal coms plan</p> <p>As a small partnership, with only 5 board members it was difficult to convene a full board as other priorities often took precedence, leading to insufficient challenge and debate around critical issues. The level of commitment from board members was variable, and during the review it was found that we were not involving partner organisations at the right level, focusing on technical capability without engaging organisations at a more strategic level, which is being addressed for the second phase. The role of the chair will also be considered, with a view to strengthening leadership and direction; and linking personal and professional development more formally.</p>	<p>A quorum of ‘not less than 50%’ was required in the Collaboration Agreement to make a decision, but in practice this was not achieved on a regular basis and decisions were often made by email, by default and often passively (assumed agreement if not responded by set date).</p>	<p>For ChaMP 2 a single Collaboration Agreement is proposed, with set collaboration principles, clear expectations from participants, and a summary sheet to facilitate communication and effective partner engagement.</p>	<p>Each partner carried out their commitments for the most part. There were difficulties in the sub-contracted relationship to deliver part of the rural programme, mostly in planning and reporting activity, which has been resolved for ChaMP 2. On the urban side there were issues regarding resource constraints and conflicting senior level direction in a major rainscape project, which has been resolved by engaging the organisation at a more strategic leadership level.</p>	<p>Lessons learned include clear scoping of activities up front, including expectations around responsibility, deliverables and timing. Top level commitment will be sought up front for the second phase (involving CEOs and Leaders in the launch) to promote consistency in direction for partner organisations.</p>
				<p>LEGACY & SUSTAINABILITY: <i>What is the legacy of the project? Has this legacy remained as planned or did</i></p>	



<p><i>it change/evolve? What is the volunteering legacy (if applicable)? How will the successes for the project be sustained after project support has ended?</i></p> <p>Partners agreed to ‘continue and develop’ the partnership, and that there is scope to add organisational value for all partners by highlighting common objectives, using ChaMP as a delivery vehicle for greater consistency and impact. The review stimulated positive ideas and discussion, with acknowledgement that ChaMP’s approach could be developed further to meet wider strategic objectives common to all partners, to influence city and corporate plans, including adapting to climate change, the Whole Estate Plan, the Greater Brighton Water Plan, resilience and green-blue infrastructure planning; and incorporating high level Defra KPIs and water industry Asset Management Plans. This supports a move towards rationalising governance by mapping relevant workstreams across the ChaMP area and participating or linking appropriately to avoid gaps and duplication. There is opportunity to map the additional benefits of our work, including biodiversity, health & well-being, air quality, with a focus on natural capital and ecosystem services.</p> <p>By mapping interested parties within each organisation, the process provided an opportunity to build wider interest and engagement in the project, in particular with the Council.</p> <p>There has been significant learning and experience accumulated among partners from ChaMP to date, which will contribute to the development of ChaMP 2.</p>	<p>RISKS: Did the project effectively mitigate the risks identified? If not, give details. (Medium/large projects attach Risk Register)</p> <p>Risks were established and reviewed on a regular basis. Key risks included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of landowner buy-in/ engagement - Lack of awareness of groundwater protection - Staff changes - Restrictions to rural interventions - Weather - Barriers to implementing sustainable drainage (SuDS) - Partner engagement and leadership <p>Risks were managed through the project board via the project manager and steering group and reviewed on a quarterly basis. Actions were taken to address high-level risks (eg barriers to implementing SuDS) through planned actions (eg leadership engagement, stakeholder mapping and prioritisation).</p> <p>COMMUNICATION: Was the project's Coms Plan effective? If not, the level of engagement was appropriate for Phase 1 of the project (including 1:1 visits and advice, rural events, training and capacity building in urban interventions)</p>
---	---



<p><i>how could things have been done differently?</i></p>	<p>There was a reasonable degree of coverage in internal and external media, but there was lack of consistency in messaging (Partner X ‘working with the South Downs on Drainage projects’ and an article about Partner Y’s project without mentioning partners) despite core messages having been agreed in the coms plan. To address this, a meeting between partner coms professionals is being convened to promote better organisational engagement on coms for the second phase, with the website and the project manager remaining the prime sources of explanatory text for any publication.</p>	<p>SharePoint was used for document sharing, but access often difficult and users found it is very clunky to use. Version control of shared documents is critical, and GDPR regs have to be complied with when managing sensitive data.</p>	<p>ChaMP 2 will build on Phase 1’s foundation to raise the project’s visibility and profile. A high-profile launch is planned, with a new website, training, visits and workshops to raise skills levels, best practice case studies in the urban and rural landscape, stakeholder and community engagement, high-level academic and industry research collaborations; and a national groundwater conference.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A ‘Technical Delivery Programme’ spreadsheet was set up to plan and monitor project performance, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Project Programme, broken down by the project strands: project management, rural, urban, research and coms activities, listing activities and timescale o Action log (Summary of actions from all meetings), addressed in Work Together Days’ o Rural, Urban, Coms and Research outcomes tables - Quarterly reports were produced for the Board summarising progress. - The project was evaluated by partners in the project review, and key findings have been included in this report. - Reports were required for different audiences and different purposes in different formats, including SDNPA, the Biosphere, AOCP, as well as capital project reporting and milestones for funders, and a streamlined approach is recommended that demonstrates ChaMP 2’s progress and impact acceptable by all audiences to save time and repetition. - The benefits of rainscapes are difficult to prove in a traditional economic way, and natural capital/ecosystem services methodologies are being explored for ChaMP 2.
--	---	---	--



Agenda Item 16 Report PR19/20-38 Appendix I

OVERALL PROJECT AIM:
Copy from Project Brief (PID)

<p>The principal aim of the project is to protect and improve the quality of groundwater in the Brighton Chalk, to ensure it remains a sustainable resource for public water supply.</p> <p>To achieve this, actions identified and agreed collaboratively in the Environment Agency's Safeguard Zone action plans, the South East River Basin Management Plan, and the Adur and Ouse Catchment Plan (groundwater chapter) will be prioritised and delivered. This puts into practice the concept of integrated catchment management.</p> <p>These actions are based on a variety of evidence, primarily:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Framework Directive classifications and objectives 2009-2015 and 2015-2021; • South Downs Collaborative Nitrate Modelling project (part of the South Downs Way Ahead Nature Improvement Area (NIA)) – completed May 2014; and, • Southern Water's Safeguard Zone Nitrate Source Apportionment model, which is funded and being built during AMP5 (2010-2015). <p>Action delivery will employ collaborative techniques such as engagement and consensus building, to influence behaviour and agree specific mitigation/ intervention measures to be put in place.</p>	<p>There are three specific objectives of the project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Provide practical advice and improvements to land management <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1a) Rural <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of advice and support to improve land management, through grant funding and promotion of better business practice e.g. cover crops, precision farming. • This will take the approach of a Catchment Sensitive Farming-style partnership, to offer advice and grants to farmers and other rural land users such as equestrians. This will incorporate innovative elements where communities offer to work on a landscape scale, and large landowners form a 'hub' to share good practice advice and ideas. • This will build on a pilot project undertaken in 2012-2013 that provided advice and support to tenant farmers from BHCC's City Downland Estate, covering 4150 hectares. 1b) Urban <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of advice to key management bodies of urbanised areas. This will include information gathering, assessment, investigations and promotion of sustainable drainage (new and retrofitting) with regards to groundwater protection to those responsible for road drainage and transport (Highways Agency, BHCC, East and West Sussex County Councils), managers of green space, and industrial estates. • Fitting of sustainable urban drainage will be targeted through partnership working with BHCC to protect key sources for Southern Water's public supply (Source Protection Zones) that are currently experiencing urban influenced issues. Examples of these sources include Lewes Road, Goldstone and Surrenden. 2) Raise public and land-manager awareness <p>Raising awareness to influence behavioural change by (i) better and wider dissemination of information on where drinking water comes from, and (ii) promoting best practice for sustainable land management to farmers and other land managers.</p>
--	--



	<p>Awareness raising activities will also look for and exploit synergies with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the NIA's Valuing the Chalk objective • 'local and sustainable' water supply in the Biosphere area • the impact of local activities on flooding (e.g. Southern Water's Fats Oils and Greases campaign) • protecting and improving bathing water quality • developing green and blue infrastructure through spatial planning • water efficiency campaigns • engagement work of the Adur and Ouse Catchment Partnership • the South Downs Land Managers Group <p>3) Informing the evidence base & undertaking success monitoring A programme of work to measure the successes of this project, and to identify further actions to protect and improve groundwater. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of groundwater quality monitoring data. • Further nitrate pollution modelling, building on the NIA model, to geographically target future actions. • Drawing on best practice to measure dissemination effectiveness and behavioural change.
WAS THE AIM ACHIEVED? Did the project achieve what it set out to achieve overall? Include findings and evidence to support this.	<p>Groundwater pollution in the Brighton Chalk Block is known to be part of a long-term trend, where cumulative impacts can take many years to show up, while there are some areas (karstic features, soakaways) with rapid pathways to groundwater. The focus on changing behaviour and interventions to reduce the chemical load, in particular reducing the amount of fertiliser applied is leading to multiple environmental (significantly reducing leaching in to soil and groundwater), social (farmer and landowner engagement) and economic benefits (reduced costs).</p> <p>A solid foundation of information gathering (scoping of rural pressures and interventions, mapping vulnerabilities and opportunities, scoping of urban pressures and interventions, urban walkovers and mapping); together with learning and capacity building is informing ChaMP 2.</p>

Successes/Challenges

<p>KEY SUCCESSES: Describe what worked well. Could any of these successes be shared with others as best practice?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landowner/manager engagement - Rural incentives – Phase 1 success - Incorporation of interventions from Phase 1 into Southern Water's 'business as usual' enabling development of focus on new trials and innovation - Cover Crop Trials - Leveraged funding (2019 – 2021 - Wild Park £1.2-£1.4m). - Core funds (£500k) and additional leveraged funds (CIL, S106) in place for ChaMP 2 - Engagement of partners in the review, and developing the case to continue and develop ChaMP 2 - Facilitated strategy session to get partners working together at all levels - Improved governance, focusing on good collaboration practice - Financial management spreadsheets - In-kind contribution calculator to help in leveraging additional funds 	<p>KEY CHALLENGES: Describe what didn't work well. Explain why. How could these things be prevented from happening again in the future?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lessons learned <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Levels of engagement were variable at board level, and attendance was poor. Board and steering group meetings became repetitive and ineffective for decision-making, lacking focus and direction, repeating project updates in both sessions. In moving away from this approach, a quarterly project update report was circulated with recommendations for board decisions provided by the project manager in advance, with the steering group focusing on a workshop-style session to capture learning and plan for the next quarter. The importance of ensuring board and steering group members are able to represent their organisations effectively is critical. - A distinction between funding partner and non-funding partner has now been made – there is a need to articulate the benefits of collaboration as well as clearly identifying what each partner brings in financial and non-financial support. - Single-tier governance is proposed for ChaMP2, with task-specific working groups drawing on technical expertise of partners and associates to manage projects. - Board members will be briefed to make effective decisions and provide stronger leadership. A new collaboration agreement is being drafted which includes set collaboration principles, clear expectations from participants and an annual strategic planning session.
--	--



	<p>There were difficulties in the sub-contracted relationship to deliver part of the rural programme, mostly in planning and reporting activity, which has been resolved for ChaMP 2.</p> <p>On the urban side there were issues regarding resource constraints and conflicting senior level direction in a major rainscape project, which has been resolved by engaging the organisation at a more strategic leadership level.</p> <p>ChaMP partners identified five sites for urban rainscapes, from an initial list of 29 with agreed criteria for maximum impact in groundwater quality, flood attenuation, biodiversity, amenity value and awareness potential. While the project has successfully brought forward five concept designs, and established working groups to progress the work of three, the urban strand has met with delays and blocks, and at times it has been difficult to engage partners and other stakeholders productively to make progress. Resource constraints and conflicting senior level direction were reported as the main reasons, and political timing has been an influence in planning and delivering actions, including consultation.</p>	<p>Lessons learned include clear scoping of activities up front, including expectations around responsibility, deliverables and timing. Top level commitment will be sought up front for the second phase (involving CEOs and Leaders in the launch) to promote consistency in direction for partner organisations.</p>	<p>ChaMP 2 has been informed by ChaMP 1, with learning integrated, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improved governance - A simplified framework of expectations with outcomes agreed to enable planning and tracking performance, and streamlined reporting - Partner engagement at strategic level, with common direction and leadership from the top - A jointly developed strategic delivery plan based on agreed outcomes, costed and with responsibility allocated 	<p>WOULD YOU DO THINGS DIFFERENTLY: If you could repeat this project again, would you do anything differently? If so, what? Did you have to do things differently than originally planned?</p> <p>UNFORSEEN IMPACTS: Were there any unforeseen impacts from the project, either good or bad?</p> <p>Communication with partners at times was not straightforward, and varied through the project lifetime, when organisational priorities took precedence over proactive coms and joint working. This at times resulted in tensions and difficulty in ongoing positive engagement.</p>
--	--	---	--	--



	<p>This underpins the need to have up-front top level agreement to clear outcomes, transparent working methods and a costed plan that all partners have signed up to – as well as fostering open dialogue to enable difficult conversations to be managed well.</p>
LESSONS LEARNED: Summarise the key lessons learned. (An example of a lesson might be something like “We learned that more budget was needed for volunteer training than originally planned – never underestimate how much important training is”.	<p>We learned that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rainscape projects are always more complex, take longer and are significantly more expensive than planned 2. Collaboration is a skill 3. Good governance requires leadership 4. You have to have the right people in the room to get things done (with the right attitude) 5. Working with a few, engaged and talented people doesn't mean the whole organisation is engaged 6. Streamline planning and reporting to reduce repetition 7. There is a need to build greater understanding, engagement and skills in pollution prevention (land management and sustainable drainage) 8. Consistency in coms requires ongoing internal briefings and good ‘boilerplate’ documents, with all partners having access to a common source 9. SharePoint is very clunky to use, and version control of shared documents is critical

SDNPA & SDVRS Resources

ESTIMATED: What was the estimated SDNPA & SDVRS resource allocation set out in the Resource Agreement Form?	£105,000 cash, plus £16,000 in-kind for the four-year project
ACTUAL: What resource was actually needed to deliver the project? Was it over or under	£130,000 cash, plus £20,000 in-kind (agreement to extend the project by a year to March 2020)



estimated? Give reasons why this was the case.

Project Budget

SDNPA BUDGET (INCOME):	Total income (£) £105,000		
PARTNERS BUDGET (INCOME):	Total income from partners (£) £381,000 (including SDNPA)		
OTHER INCOME:	Total other income (£) £50,000 (Highways England for Wild Park Project Feasibility, managed through Lead Partner Brighton & Hove City Council)		

TOTAL PLANNED RESOURCE COST	TOTAL ACTUAL RESOURCE COST		ACTUAL TOTAL EXPENDITURE (£)
	IN KIND VALUE (£)	SALARY COST (£)	
£16,000	£105,000	£20,000	£130,000
EXPLANATION: Was the budget over or under estimated? Give reasons why this was the case	Project extended by agreement		
		Annual budget (not known)	£316,870



ChaMP Financial Overview

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	ChaMP 1
Cash Income						
Environment Agency	£16,500.00	£21,500.00	£38,000.00	£25,000.00	£50,000.00	£151,000.00
SDNPA	£30,000.00	£25,000.00	£25,000.00	£25,000.00	£25,000.00	£130,000.00
Southern Water	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£40,000.00	£60,000.00	£100,000.00
Brighton and Hove City Council						£0.00
Total	£46,500	£46,500	£63,000	£90,000	£135,000	£381,000
Expenditure						
Rural Spend	£0.00	£250.00	£16,890.84	£29,632.46	£43,250.46	£90,023.76
Urban Spend	£0.00	£0.00	£3,287.94	£19,591.60	£50,000.00	£72,879.54
Coms Spend	£0.00	£0.00	£1,534.80	£0.00	£18,431.49	£19,966.29
Research Spend	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£1,500.00	£5,000.00	£6,500.00
Project Manager				£60,000.00	£42,500.00	£127,500.00
Total	£0.00	£250.00	£81,713.58	£75,724.06	£159,181.95	£316,869.59

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	ChaMP 1
RECONCILIATION						
Balance brought forward		£46,500	£92,750	£74,036	£88,312	
<i>Income</i>	£46,500.00	£46,500.00	£63,000.00	£90,000.00	£135,000.00	£381,000.00
Expenditure	£0.00	£250.00	£81,713.58	£75,724.06	£159,181.95	£316,869.59
Balance carried forward	£46,500	£92,750	£74,036	£88,312	£64,130	£64,130



Value for Money	<p>WHAT IMPACT WAS ACHIEVED? Outline the impacts that the project has achieved. Was this the best method(s) to achieve this impact?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landowner/manager engagement - Rural incentives – Phase 1 success - Incorporation of interventions from Phase 1 into Southern Water's 'business as usual' enabling development of focus on new trials and innovation - Cover Crop Trials - Leveraged funding (2019 – 2021 - Wild Park £1.2-£1.4m). - Core funds (£500k) and additional leveraged funds (CL, S106) in place for ChaMP 2 - Engagement of partners in the review, and developing the case to continue and develop ChaMP 2 - Facilitated strategy session to get partners working together at all levels - Improved governance, focusing on good collaboration practice - Financial management spreadsheets, with in-kind contribution calculator to help in leveraging additional funds <p>ChaMP 1 has developed reasonable recognition through a range of channels, with relationships developed and evidence in place to provide substance to inform ChaMP 2's launch, and to raise the profile of groundwater protection among key audiences.</p>
<p>WAS THE PROJECT VALUE FOR MONEY? (After reviewing the project's actual resource/budget against achieved impacts, consider whether the project has been value for money). Please give your reasons</p> <p><u>Yes</u>/No</p> <p><u>Yes</u> – investment in addressing a complex, long-term, multi stakeholder issue. Effective collaboration adds value by reducing duplication of effort between different parties and maximising the impact of what's achieved jointly by selecting people with the right skills and strengths to work together. (<i>"The whole is greater than the sum of its parts"</i>)</p> <p>Groundwater pollution in the Brighton Chalk Block is known to be part of a long-term trend, where cumulative impacts can take many years to show up, while there are some areas (karstic features, soakaways) with rapid pathways to groundwater. The focus on changing behaviour and interventions to reduce the chemical load, in particular reducing the amount of fertiliser applied is leading to multiple environmental (significantly reducing leaching in to soil and groundwater), social (farmer and landowner engagement) and economic benefits (reduced costs).</p>	



	A solid foundation of information gathering (scoping of rural pressures and interventions, mapping vulnerabilities and opportunities, scoping of urban pressures and interventions, urban walkovers and mapping); together with learning and capacity building is informing ChaMP 2
--	---

Recommendations

Fill in the first three columns of the table below. Your Line Manager must complete the last two columns plus the ‘Management Response’ section below.

RECOMMENDATION	ACTION (INCLUDING TIMEFRAME)	WHO	WAS THE RECOMMENDATION ACCEPTED OR REJECTED BY LINE MANAGER?	LINE MANAGER COMMENTS
List the recommendations that have come out of this review <i>E.g. When developing a project budget, ensure that sufficient budget is put aside for training volunteers</i>	What action should be taken to move the recommendation forward?	Who will deliver the action?	LINE MANAGER - Accepted/rejected	LINE MANAGER - Record comments relating to each recommendation
A project review was undertaken during 2019 to develop the business case for continuing ChaMP to 2025 with the following recommendations:				
To continue and develop ChaMP	ChaMP 2	AF/SH		
To lift aspiration and impact; to strengthen leadership	ChaMP 2 outcomes agreed by partners and form the	AF/SH		



and direction from each partner by aligning strategic objectives and using ChaMP as a vehicle for collaborative achievement of common goals	basis of strategic delivery plan		
To continue to build appropriate wider organisational engagement, internal communication and advocacy	Partner coms meeting planned (Dec 19/Jan 20)	SH	
To seek funding from partners to support the continuation of project-based interventions	Core funding agreed (£100k pa for five years - £500k)	SH	
To agree a clearly defined in-kind contribution between partners, with allocated resource for each partner accounted for within day-job, with personal objectives aligned to partners' own strategic objectives	In-kind calculator with partners for confirmation of in-kind contribution (Dec 19)	SH	
To confirm the hosting partner for the ChaMP project manager.	Confirmed	AF/SH	
To retain and carry forward the current agreements, backed up with a simplified partnership summary,	New Collaboration Agreement drafted.	SH	



commitment to collaborative principles and agreement of expectations and outcomes	2020-25 Outcomes agreed by partners		
To agree a budget and develop a costed forward plan. The review exercise stimulated some excellent ideas and identified significant opportunities to uplift ChaMP's performance and impact. All has been documented and can be used as a basis to develop ChaMP's forward plan.	Strategic Plan under development (Dec 19-Jan 20)	AF/SH	
Convene a facilitated strategy workshop for board and steering group members, confirming high level objectives, and including a strategy alignment exercise (prepared), and an action prioritisation exercise to inform forward plans	Complete (May 2019)	SH	
Additional recommendations			
Adopt ecosystem services approach	Monitoring and evaluation of interventions	AF/SH	
High profile launch ChaMP 2	World Water Day	AF/SH	



	CEOs and leaders breakfast, 23/3/2020 together with website launch		
Management Response			

LINE MANAGER RESPONSE | **LINE MANAGER** - Record your comments about this review [here](#)

