Design principles for flood risk governance to enhance the capacity to resist	**Conditions for success**	**Good practices**
Selected flood risk management measures (e.g. defence and mitigation) should be tailored to local circumstances (e.g. risk, vulnerability, institutional and economic context)	- Sufficient resources are provided (power, knowledge and financial), also for maintaining and improving existing defence structure - Legislation and decision-making allows/supports adaptability - Cooperation, in particular between defence and prevention and between defence and mitigation management, is supported - Long term forward planning is supported - Actors (citizens) are incentivized to undertake risk-reducing measures	- Partnership funding (England is a good example of where resources have been diversified to support the implementation of more defence and mitigation-based measures - Action Programme for Flood Prevention (France) - Water assessment (Belgium and the Netherlands) - Long-term investment strategy (England) is a good example of long-term forward planning of financial resources - Delta Programme (the Netherlands)

Design principles for flood risk governance to enhance the capacity to absorb and recover	**Conditions for success**	
Flood risk (prevention) should be incorporated within spatial planning decision-making to i. discourage development in known areas of flood risk, ii. ensure that development in at-risk areas is adaptive, and iii. ensure that development does	- Sufficient resources are provided (power, knowledge and financial) - Legislation and decision-making allows/supports adaptability - Legislation contains mechanisms to ensure implementation of spatial planning measures (enforcement) - Cooperation, in particular between defence and prevention and between	- Water assessment (Belgium) - Water test (the Netherlands) - Building regulations (Sweden) - Zoning system (France)

not heighten risk	defence and mitigation management, is supported	
Systems for forecasting and warning (preparation) should be effective and warnings should be transmitted with sufficient lead time.	- Sufficient resources are provided (power, knowledge and financial), also for investments in forecasting technology. - Formal responsibilities are established for the communication of flood warnings - Multiple pathways for disseminating flood warnings are available. - Community risk-awareness and preparedness are promoted.	- Use of new technologies (e.g. England and the Netherlands)
Effective and proactive arrangements are in place to enhance emergency preparation and response to flooding	- Requirements to assess and monitor local risks, to inform emergency planning are established. - Mechanisms for up-scaling and downscaling emergency response are established - Arrangements are in place to facilitate inter-organizational working. Roles and responsibilities are clear.	- Flood rehearsals (e.g. the Netherlands) - Flood leaders programme (Poland) - Dike armies (the Netherlands)
Strategies to recover from flood events should be available for all citizens, and should entice flood risk prevention	- Systems for compensation for flood damage (after severe floods) are in place	- Large variation; solidarity principle v. beneficiary pays - Belgium: risk differentiation approach - France: CAT-NAT and Barnier Fund

Design principles for flood risk governance to enhance the capacity to learn, innovate and improve practices	- **Conditions for success**	-
Opportunities for social and institutional learning should be created	- Mechanisms are in place to facilitate knowledge exchange, sharing experiences and best practices - There is a clear strategy and investment in Research and Development programmes.	- Adaptive planning and programme cycles (the Netherlands) - Independent public inquiries (e.g. England) - Learning from international experiences (Belgium, the Netherlands)