

## CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

---

### FOR DECISION

**Title: DEVELOPING A PARK-WIDE TRUST FOR THE NATIONAL PARK**

**Prepared by: Bob Grant, Senior Outdoor Access Officer  
David Cameron, Head of Corporate Services  
Murray Ferguson, Head of Visitor Services and Recreation**

#### **Purpose**

This paper seeks approval in principle for the development of a Trust for the National Park which would, in its first few years, carry forward a programme of work focussed on providing opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoor environment and the special qualities of the National Park. As an interim measure the paper also seeks approval for funding a programme of work in the eastern Cairngorms which will be delivered by the Upper Deeside Access Trust.

#### **Recommendations**

That the Board:

- a) Notes progress with the collection and analysis of the technical information required to develop and set up a Trust;
- b) Approves in principle the establishment of a Park-wide Trust, subject to the expression of sufficient partnership support and submission of a detailed business case; and
- c) Approves the CNPA funding contribution of £90,000 towards a work programme for 2007/08 of access improvements in and around the Upper Deeside area.

#### **Executive Summary**

This paper reviews the options for delivering key priorities identified within the National Park Plan and Outdoor Access Strategy and seeks approval in principle to proceed with the more detailed work required to develop a Park-wide Trust as this is the most efficient and effective means by which these priorities can be delivered. In addition, the outcomes from the 2006/07 funding of the Upper Deeside Trust's work are detailed together with proposals for 2007/08.

---

## DEVELOPING A PARK-WIDE TRUST FOR THE NATIONAL PARK – FOR DECISION

### Background

1. A proposal to establish a Trust for the Cairngorms National Park was discussed at the Board meeting on 30 June 2006 as part of the considerations of the draft Outdoor Access Strategy. The Board asked officers to undertake further investigation and appraisal of the options and matters of technical detail and asked them to report back, presenting a single recommendation for the most effective delivery mechanism.
2. Since the Board meeting in June 2006, the development work has been taken forwards as part of three broad strands, each of which is described in further detail below under appropriate headings:
  - a) Finalising the Outdoor Access Strategy in the light of consultation responses and liaising further with partners to assist in evaluation options and to gauge partner support;
  - b) Investigating further the technical aspects of the formation of a Trust with financial advisers; and
  - c) Developing the work programme of access improvements in and around the Upper Deeside area and ensuring that the Upper Deeside Access Trust (UDAT) are well appraised of developments so as to keep open the possibility of transition options.
3. It is recognised that there is a need to develop partnership support for a Trust and to take this process further a meeting of potential partners, chaired by David Green, was scheduled to take place on 19 March. However, due to bad weather the meeting had to be postponed. The meeting is now scheduled for 30 April and will seek to establish the level of support from the partners for the Trust, the scope of activity that they would wish to see the Trust deliver and the level of partnership support available.

### Policy Context

4. The National Park Plan provides the strategic context for our work on outdoor access. Providing high quality opportunities for outdoor access is one of the seven Priorities for Action. Establishing a Park-wide Trust or similar mechanism is one of the actions identified within the Park Plan that will assist in delivering the outcomes listed in Table 1. This is further expanded in the Outdoor Access Strategy which provides greater detail on the necessary policies that require to be implemented across the National Park to ensure the Park Plan is delivered.
5. Greater integration between public bodies delivering public benefits is being actively encouraged by the Scottish Executive, for example through initiatives such as “On the Ground.” The establishment of a Trust, with public sector partner support and engagement, will facilitate this collaborative approach. A Trust should be viewed as

an effective mechanism to deliver a range of public benefits. Whilst it is proposed that these would initially relate primarily to outdoor access infrastructure, such works will deliver a range of wider benefits. Opportunities for informal recreation close to where people live will contribute to wider government agendas on, for example, adaptation to climate change, social inclusion, health and sustainable transport.

6. In due course the availability of a Trust dedicated to the National Park may be valuable to take forward a number of other areas of work that are highlighted in future Park Plans.

### **Finalising the Outdoor Access Strategy and further evaluation of options d for a delivery mechanism**

7. On 2 March 2007 the Board approved the Outdoor Access Strategy for the National Park, following a period of consultation with stakeholders. The outcomes to be delivered collectively by partners are shown in Table 1.

<b>Table 1: Outcomes for 2012</b>	
1.	A wider range of people will have the opportunity to enjoy the outdoors.
2.	Land managers and those enjoying the outdoors will have a better understanding of their respective rights and responsibilities which will positively influence behaviour and enable all to enjoy the special qualities of the National Park.
3.	There will be a more extensive, high quality, well maintained and clearly promoted path network so that everyone can enjoy the outdoors and move around the Park in a way that minimises reliance on motor vehicles.
4.	There will be greater involvement of communities, land managers and visitors in the management and maintenance of the paths.
5.	There will be more effective connections between public transport and places with outdoor access opportunities.
6.	There will be locally based healthy walking groups throughout the National Park and active promotion of outdoor activity by health professionals in order to contribute positively to the physical, mental and social health of residents and visitors.

8. It is important to note that, despite its title, the scope of the Outdoor Access Strategy is about much more than paths or access rights. The Strategy is the place to find the outcomes and actions on improving health, public transport and people's active

experience of the outdoors and of maximising enjoyment while minimising impacts on the natural or cultural heritage. The Strategy is also about more than visitors' experience of the Park – it encompasses proposals to improve travel to school and workplaces too. There are also very strong links to the strategic work going on in the Park on sustainable tourism, strengthening communities and on ensuring that the Park is increasingly demonstrating to other parts of Scotland how a low carbon economy can function. Fundamentally, the Strategy provides a key route-map in the development of the world class National Park that we collectively aspire to.

9. The Strategy highlights in Section 5 the need for an effective “delivery mechanism” for many aspects of work to do with outdoor access in support of all the Outcomes described above, specifically including:
  - a) work on enhancing paths, bridges, car parks and associated infrastructure on both low and higher ground;
  - b) providing infrastructure for a greater range of users in terms of abilities and recreational type;
  - c) supporting the creation of business opportunities in the outdoors through the provision of a high quality recreational resource that has something to offer for everyone;
  - d) promoting enhanced visitor information and marketing of recreational opportunities;
  - e) improving public transport links and information for recreational users;
  - f) improving the range of travel options for school, work and daily life; and
  - g) developing programmes of activity for health purposes.
10. It is important to recognise that whichever delivery mechanism is chosen it is envisaged that CNPA staff will continue to have an important role to play. In particular CNPA staff will focus on implementation of the core duties of the Park Authority, development of strategic work and integration of outdoor access work with other activities of the Park Authority. The work associated with the four legal duties of the Park Authority will take a high priority. Other work will include the allocation of funds for path repair and maintenance and development of policy and best practice advice. CNPA staff will also lead on coordination of those aspects of the Strategy relating to Transport and Health.
11. At the Board meeting on 30 June 2006 an initial analysis of the three possible options for a delivery mechanism were described (see **Annex 1**):
  - a) Option A – establishment of a Park-wide Trust;
  - b) Option B – direct delivery by CNPA; and
  - c) Option C – work through existing mechanism.
12. Experience in the Cairngorms and elsewhere in Scotland has shown that there can be considerable advantages in using a trust or similar mechanism to assemble funding programmes spanning several years and running the project management of the works. The particular advantages include development of commitment from a variety of funding partners around an agreed set of goals and encouragement of the planning of work programmes over a number of years. A Trust, being an

independent entity and frequently holding charitable status, is also often a good mechanism for delivery of visitor payback initiatives and it is relatively easier for it to access funds from charitable sources. The Trust can also be flexible and entrepreneurial in its approach, directing resources to certain parts of its geographic area as priorities demand – for example working with very light touch where there is existing capacity at local level and taking more of a delivery role in other parts.

13. For the reasons given above, Options A and C should not therefore be viewed as mutually exclusive. Where there currently exists an active and appropriate Trust, community or path group, funding of works could be channelled through that organisation. However, for a very substantial part of the Park no such organisation exists and a Trust would provide the essential management service of improving and maintaining access infrastructure and related visitor information.
14. Option B would have some advantage in the Park Authority having direct control of delivery but the disadvantages include :
  - a) difficulty in generating significant partnership buy-in to programmes of work;
  - b) managing large multi-year programmes with sufficient flexibility between years; and
  - c) accessing funds from visitor payback schemes or from sales of Park merchandise.
15. For all these reasons Option B is not considered an effective mechanism to deliver the works required. Further analysis of the benefits that a Trust can deliver would suggest that, in particular, a Trust provides the best opportunity to develop a strong partnership approach in this area of work across the geographic area covered by the Park, with the flexibility to direct resources to particular parts of the Park as priorities demand. Funding activities through a Trust would provide a transparent use of resources delivering prioritised and agreed work programmes. More detailed technical information on the creation of a Trust is described in the following section. A full business case will be developed by staff and Board approval will be sought once the degree of partnership support has been ascertained.

### **Further technical information on the formation of a Trust**

16. Technical information has been supplied by Scott Moncrieff, Chartered Accountants and by Scottish Natural Heritage who have in-house legal advisors and first hand experience of some 40 Trusts operating throughout Scotland. This advice has enabled us to consider how best a Trust might work. Key aspects of this advice is shown below.
  - a) *Governance*: It is anticipated that the Trust would be led by a Trust Board, comprising around 6 to 12 members. Responsibility for overall direction and management of the body would rest with Trust Board members rather than with funding partners. There would require to be strong links with the National Park Authority and other funding partners, land managers and users. It would be important to design governance arrangements that did not

duplicate existing structures. Trust secretariat services could be provided by CNPA. There are potential difficulties associated with a Trust comprising a small number of staff, limited resources and large cash flows. These require careful planning and management and the development of sound relationships with funding bodies.

- b) *Business planning*: The Trust Board would be responsible for agreeing a Business Plan, drawing from information set out in the National Park Plan, Outdoor Access Strategy and other documents, that comprised a three year, rolling programme of works. The Business Plan would form the basis for discussions with funding partners, including CNPA. The Trust Board would also be required to establish and monitor an annual operational plan and annual budget. The Trust Board would need to be supported by some staff resource and a small team of the relevant contact officers from each funding partner.
- c) *Partnership working*: In areas where there is a strong local and appropriate Trust or Community Company, the Park-wide Trust could play a minimal or merely coaching role, allowing it to pass on resources or other support while focussing on other parts of the Park. Elsewhere the Trust could assemble funding packages and manage projects directly, generally through supervising commissioned works.
- d) *Scale of funding*: It is difficult to be precise about figures with so many other variables. However, as the access authority for the National Park, the CNPA anticipates that significant level of funding would require to be transferred to the Trust in order that it can deliver its work programmes. Funding availability will depend on the next budget settlement and on competing priorities in the Corporate Plan. Currently, it is estimated that contributions of up to £250k would be made annually from CNPA. Funding partners may become involved with a Trust either through block funding an annual programme of works, or match funding specific projects to be delivered by the Trust. We anticipate total match funding requirement from partners of around the same amount again, to give the Trust a total annual budget of around £500k. It is hoped that, in time, the Trust would also benefit from other sources of funding – for example through bequests and other donations. The bid for a Landscape Partnership Project that is currently being led by CNPA may also be a potential route through which to bring in additional funds.
- e) *Staffing*: The Trust Project Manager is potentially the only new post to be created as a result of the development of the Trust. Actual levels of staffing would require to be balanced between the cost of direct staff employment and the requirements for delivery of work programmes. The role of the Project Manager will be to commission and contract individual works and recommend external grant funding to the Board in line with business and operational plans.
- f) *Administration and other support*: In order to minimise the “overhead” draw on the resources available to the Trust, CNPA would in the first instance consider providing administrative, finance and facilities support from within existing resources. This is likely to include the provision of office

accommodation and other facility support such as human resources but would require legal advice to be bought in.

- g) *Legal status:* It is anticipated that the Trust would be established as a separate legal entity. CNPA has sought specific advice on this matter and the most likely option at this stage seems to be a Company Limited by Guarantee with charitable status.
- h) *Transition arrangements with existing Trusts:* At this stage no firm proposals are being considered for any transition arrangements between existing Trusts, notably the Upper Deeside Access Trust. This is a matter that will have to be looked into in detail at a later stage.

17. The summary appraisal of the options and the technical advice received to date provides corroboration that the creation of a Park-wide Trust will be the most effective and efficient mechanism of delivering the outcomes listed in Table 1. It is, however, acknowledged that partner support and further consideration of matters of detail are required before a Trust can be established.

### **Recommendation**

18. **That the Board:**
- a) **Notes progress with the collection and analysis of the technical information required to develop and set up a Trust; and**
  - b) **Approves in principle the establishment of a Park-wide Trust, subject to the expression of sufficient partnership support and submission of a detailed business case.**

### **Developing the work programme of access improvements in and around the Upper Deeside area**

19. In the interim period leading up to the development of an effective mechanism at Park-wide scale, the Board approved in September 2006 expenditure of £100,000 as a contribution towards a programme of access work totalling £496,000 in the eastern side of the Park. This work was to be delivered by UDAT. Progress with the work programme has been extremely good with only one slight delay in the completion of the Clarack Loch all-abilities path near Dinnet.
20. Detailed discussions have taken place on delivering a programme of works in the 2007/08 financial year. The proposed programme of works again reflects many of the specific elements of work that are detailed in the Outdoor Access Strategy. The proposed funding from the Park Authority towards the programme is £90,000 out of a total funding package of £274,250. The expenditure justification for the Park Authority's contribution towards this programme of works is shown in **Annex 2**.
21. The Directors of UDAT are also currently considering future options for the Trust and there is an inevitable degree of uncertainty until the Park Authority determine the most effective and efficient delivery mechanism for the whole of the Park. To try

and minimise this uncertainty both bodies have been keeping each other informed about current thinking. The Chairman of the Trust has recently sent a very positive letter to the Park Authority making suggestions about the potential for integration if CNPA and partners decide to establish a Park-wide Trust. At this stage options are being kept as open as possible but further details will be considered as part of the full business case that is to be submitted to the Board.

### **Recommendation**

22. **That the Board approves the CNPA funding contribution of £90,000 towards a work programme for 2007/08 of access improvements in and around the Upper Deeside area.**

### **Implications**

#### *Financial Implications*

23. The Park Authority currently spends between £250,000 and £300,000 per annum on outdoor access related projects which result in new or improved infrastructure or visitor information. A sum of around £250,000, with leverage of at least similar sum from partners, would be required to ensure an effective programme of works can be delivered annually. Further external funding sources to deliver such things as elements of the Landscape Partnership Project could also be channelled through a Trust. Partner support is however still to be obtained and an initial view of this will be obtained at the meeting of 30 April.

#### *Presentational Implications*

24. It is recognised that there is a sensitivity in seeking Board approval for the principle of a Trust prior to initial discussions with potential partners. The meeting at the end of April will, however, emphasise the “in principle” nature of the decision and the need to ensure that partners’ views are incorporated into the business case.
25. Equally, there is a continued requirement to keep UDAT Board and staff informed of decisions and progress and this will be done to ensure that there is a common understanding of the way ahead.

#### *Implications for Stakeholders*

26. There are potentially funding and engagement implications for key partners. Early engagement and support of partners is required to ensure funds are in place for the potential start up in April 2008.

### **Next Steps**



27. Following the meeting with partners in late April, a further paper will be brought to the Board in June with a full business case seeking detailed approval for the creation of a Trust.

**Bob Grant**  
**David Cameron**  
**Murray Ferguson**  
**April 2007**

bobgrant@ Cairngorms.co.uk  
davidcameron@ Cairngorms.co.uk  
murrayferguson@ Cairngorms.co.uk

**Annex 1: Evaluation of options for a delivery mechanism relating to outdoor access****Key:**

+ Advantage over other options

- Disadvantage compared to other options

○ Neutral (could be advantage or disadvantage depending on how the mechanism is managed)

	<b>Option A: Establishment of a Park-wide Trust</b>	<b>Option B: Direct delivery by CNPA</b>	<b>Option C: Work through existing mechanisms</b>
Quality and Control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Influence at arms length - exercised through governance structures and allocation of finance</li> <li>+ Quality of work ensured by skilled, dedicated staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Direct control by CNPA</li> <li>+ Quality of work ensured by skilled, dedicated staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Control at arms length – exercised through allocation of funding</li> <li>- significant risk of lower quality delivery of projects and programmes</li> <li>- likely to require substantial support and guidance to ensure quality outcomes</li> </ul>
Impact on other stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ potential for strengthening of capacity of existing smaller Trusts and community companies where required</li> <li>+ relatively easier to develop agreed work programmes</li> <li>- perceived duplication of overlapping Trusts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- unlikely to strengthen community capacity to significant degree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ strengthening of existing smaller Trusts and community companies</li> </ul>
Charity and corporate legislation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ likely to obtain charitable status</li> <li>○ need approval from the Charities Regulator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Charitable status not applicable</li> <li>- More difficult to access potential funds which are available to charities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Depends on varying status of each body</li> </ul>
Procurement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ would have to comply with procurement rules that are appropriate for use of public</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ governed by the Financial Memorandum of CNPA and potentially</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ would have to comply with procurement rules that are appropriate for use of public</li> </ul>

	<b>Option A: Establishment of a Park-wide Trust</b>	<b>Option B: Direct delivery by CNPA</b>	<b>Option C: Work through existing mechanisms</b>
	<p>funds as agreed by funding partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ potential added consideration of VAT implications</li> </ul>	<p>of other funding bodies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- projects procured internally would be subject to full, unrecoverable VAT</li> </ul>	<p>funds as agreed by funding partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ potential added consideration of VAT implications</li> </ul>
Fund management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Greater opportunity for flexible management of funds between financial years (as agreed by funding partners )</li> <li>+ Access to additional sources of funding for complementary projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Limited opportunity for flexible fund management between financial years</li> <li>○ May have some access to additional sources of funding for complementary projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Some opportunity for flexible fund management between financial years - but only for smaller area of Park</li> <li>○ Access to additional sources of funding for complementary projects but only for small geographical areas</li> </ul>
Staff and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ focus moves from managing CNPA resources internally to managing strategic outcomes that are delivered in partnership with others</li> <li>○ Core administration arrangements and costs to be considered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Requirement for additional CNPA staff (including admin costs)</li> <li>- CNPA resources focussed on direct delivery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ focus moves from managing CNPA resources internally to managing projects through others</li> <li>- significant CNPA staff time required to bring Park-wide coordination</li> <li>- Core administration costs have to be found</li> </ul>

# CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

## EXPENDITURE JUSTIFICATION

Ref:

Approved:

### 1. Title

Developing a programme of access improvements in and around the upper Deeside area
--

### 2. Expenditure summary

Operational Plan (Goal No. – Task No.)	9-3	Project	
Outdoor access infrastructure		Grant	✓
Core	(detail)	Account	Consultancy
Is this spend to be funded from an existing budget line, existing line with additional funds or is it a totally new spend?	£90,000	Existing	✓
	£	Additional	
	£	New	

(delete as appropriate)

### 3. Description

- Brief overview of project/activity
- Specific elements for which support is sought (if not whole project/activity)

#### Summary

- a) The Upper Deeside Access Trust is seeking £90,000 support from CNPA towards an agreed programme of works for the 2007/08 financial year. The total value of the programme amounts to £274,250.

#### Background

- b) The Upper Deeside Access Trust has delivered a wide-range of path projects and associated infrastructure and information over the last 9 years. Funding to date has stemmed from Aberdeenshire Council, Scottish Natural Heritage, Scottish Enterprise Grampian and Balmoral Estate with further income deriving from car parking charges at Glen Muick, sale of leaflets covering promoted walks, donations to the Trust and other sources. In addition, a large scale path programme – the Eastern Cairngorms Access Project (ECAP) – attracted substantial funding from the Heritage Lottery Fund, European Union (ERDF) Angus Council and other partners in Angus.
- c) Changes in legislation have resulted in the statutory elements of access now being delivered by the Cairngorms National Park Authority rather than Aberdeenshire Council within Upper Deeside. This has required UDAT and its partners to review and

consider the most effective means of funding and delivering their access objectives both within and outwith the Upper Deeside area in the future.

- d) It had been envisaged that decisions on the most effective mechanism by which the Park Authority could deliver access infrastructure would be in place by April 2006, however the lead in time required has proved considerably longer. To maintain the momentum and ensure that a range of suitable projects which deliver the outcomes of the Park Plan and Outdoor Access Strategy, it is proposed to offer a single year grant to UDAT.

#### 4. Rationale and Strategic Fit

- Objectives/intended beneficiaries
- Evidence of need and demand
- Fit with National Park Plan/Corporate Plan/other relevant strategies
- Linkages to other activities/projects

- a) The range of work planned provides a mix of both high and low ground work, with supporting signage and leafleting. Improving path provision will enable people of all ages and abilities to enjoy the special qualities of the Park and, for the upland areas, help protect fragile plant communities from pressures arising from outdoor access. These are both strategic objectives within the draft Park Plan. In addition, the Outdoor Access Strategy has policies that seek to improve the path provision and quality and seeks greater provision for people of all abilities and multi-use. The addition of health related walks in the Strathdon and Deeside areas to the work being delivered by UDAT has a further close tie with the policy objectives within the Outdoor Access Strategy. The proposed programme has therefore a very close fit with the strategy for the Park.
- b) The identification of works within the UDAT programme has stemmed from consideration of the Outdoor Access Strategy and broad consultation with stakeholders and through area wide audit and assessment processes.

#### 5. Option Analysis

- Are there other ways in which the above objectives could be achieved?
- If so, why is this the preferred option?

- a) The management of this overall programme of works by a single body provides a coordinated and cost effective approach to delivering a diverse range of individual projects. It would be possible in some instances to have elements of the programme taken forward as single, stand alone projects developed through individual initiatives and led by communities where this capacity exists. Such an approach would involve a much greater degree of management and involvement from potential funders, as there would not be the level of project management experience, quality control and contract supervision that can be assured through UDAT. For all these reasons, it is felt that the most appropriate means of delivery is through UDAT.

## 6. Risk Assessment

- Are there risks to the CNPA in funding this project/activity?
- Are there risks in the project/activity not being delivered to required timescale/quality?
- Comment on the likelihood of such risks occurring, their potential impact, and (where appropriate) any action that would be taken to mitigate the risks.

- a) The risks to CNPA of funding this programme are very low. UDAT have considerable experience of handling a diverse annual programme of works of this magnitude and content. The main risk is in relation to partnership funding, however all other funding sources have been agreed which includes Aberdeenshire Council, SNH, Paths to Health, private estates and income generated from UDAT's own efforts. A further risk would exist if there was further staff turnover with the Trust (the Trust's manager left last year). This threat is slightly greater than in previous years due to existing uncertainty over the long term future of the Trust. The Trust does, however, continue to utilise self-employed contractors on a regular basis to augment the work of its core staff and therefore this risk is mitigated to some extent.
- b) Statutory and other permissions have already been obtained for the majority of works with others in advanced stages of planning. All landowners concerned have given consent for the works to take place. As such there would appear to be little external risk posed through permissions being refused.
- c) Financial risks have also been considered as UDAT operates without reserves nor can they borrow to bridge funding gaps. Cash flow projections have been considered and are based on funding streams being delivered at agreed times.
- d) There is the continued potential for funding of this work programme to be viewed as favouring one area within the Park. Whilst this is possible the proposed programme provides a very clear link to the outcomes detailed in the Park Plan and future decision on a delivery mechanism will ensure a more consistent, Park-wide approach to infrastructure development.

## 7. Costs and Funding

- Detail the financial costs of the project/activity
- Detail the sources of funding
- Detail any non-monetary costs to the CNPA (such as Member or staff input)

- a) The total value of the programme amount to £274,250 and the breakdown of the component parts is shown in the table below.
- b) If funding is approved, CNPA's overall contribution will be 33% of planned expenditure.

Total Expenditure	£274,250
Aberdeenshire Council	£30,000
SNH	£80,000
Balmoral	£3,000
Paths to Health	5,000
UDAT (income and	£66,250

reserves	
Potential CNPA Contribution	£90,000
CNPA proportion	33%

More detail of the works being delivered is shown in Annex 3.

## 8. Deliverables/ Impact Assessment

- What end products/outputs will be delivered?
- How will success be measured?
- How will the project be monitored and what will be the feedback to the CNPA?

- a) Each product will result in improved access opportunities in and around the Upper Deeside area. Combined, they will enhance the range of opportunities that already exist in the area and will make a positive contribution to both local and visitor experience within the Park.
- b) There are a range of measures that will be used to gauge success. These will include sales of leaflets, feedback from visitors and reduced damage to fragile ecosystems.
- c) The monitoring of all path and other projects is undertaken through the UDAT Management Group. CNPA is represented on this group by Bob Grant, Senior Outdoor Access Officer. Progress reports, including financial monitoring are presented to this group quarterly. The Management Group have responsibility for recommending changes to the work programme, noting that such changes require ratifying by the UDAT Board of Directors.

## 9. Value for Money

- In view of the costs, do the deliverables appear to offer value for money? (consider cost of comparable projects, where available).

- a) The Upper Deeside Access Trust has proved to be effective at delivering access related projects. Delivery through an established Trust provides an efficient mechanism to deliver a broad programme of works. Delivering such works on a project by project basis would require considerably more staff time and would prove harder to ensure a consistent, high quality output.
- b) The leverage gained by contributing to this programme is provides good value for money (CNPA contribution is 33% of total budget).
- c) The programme of works provides good value for money by delivery being undertaken through a single organisation with a recognised pedigree for delivering high quality work timeously.

## 10. Exit or Continuation Arrangements (where applicable)

- If this is not a discrete, time-limited , project or piece of work, what are the exit/continuation arrangements for when CNPA support ceases?

- a) This is a one year offer of funding. Future funding will be dependant on decisions CNPA take on how best to deliver the access remit within the Park.
- b) A single year funding ensures a broad programme of identified work which meets the Park's objectives is fully delivered, provides continuity and retention of existing UDAT staff, and allows CNPA to work up the options under consideration to ensure sufficient time is available to enact any changes from 2008/09.

## 11. Additionality

- Does this work/project substitute for or duplicate work being carried out or proposed by others?
- What would be the effects of the CNPA not supporting the project? Would it proceed without CNPA support?

- a) The proposed work programme does not duplicate or impinge on other projects.
- b) CNPA's contribution is essential to allow the full programme of works be delivered. Without it, the programme would have to be seriously curtailed and remaining partners contributions could not be guaranteed leading to a potential impact on UDAT staffing.
- e) Overall the Authority will be making contributions which allows UDAT's interim 2007/08 programme to be delivered.

## 12. Stakeholder Support

- Have the organisations and/or communities that would have an interest in this work/project been involved, and are they supportive?

- a) UDAT has broad support in the relevant communities and has representatives from this wider group on the Management Group. There are some 47 affiliated organisations who are kept up to date with the work of UDAT and who are invited to attend the Annual General Meeting to feed in their views on the work of UDAT.
- b) The other funding agencies: particularly SNH and Aberdeenshire Council hold UDAT in high regard.