

ANNEX I: Evaluation of Options for Delivery of Natural and Cultural Heritage Conservation and Enhancement

Key:

- + Advantage over other options
- Disadvantage compared to other options
- Neutral (could be advantage or disadvantage depending on how the mechanism is managed)

Criteria	Option A: No change	Option B: Direct delivery by CNPA	Option C: Park-wide Trust
Funding and Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduction in LBAP funding and capacity likely - Leader funding for Community Heritage Project ends in 2011 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reducing budget means reduction in scope of CNPA delivery - More difficult to access potential funds which are available to charities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Access to a greater range of funds + Transparent and direct mechanism to invest funds
Quality and Control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Quality of work ensured by skilled, dedicated staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Direct control by CNPA + Quality of work ensured by skilled, dedicated staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Influence at arms length - exercised through governance structures and allocation of finance + Quality of work ensured by skilled, dedicated staff
Impact on other stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - potential disengagement of stakeholders linked to reductions in funding commitments - significant untapped potential to engage others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - potential disengagement of stakeholders linked to funding reductions and inference it is now CNPA's sole responsibility - unlikely to strengthen community capacity to significant degree 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + potential to increase stakeholder participation and sense of ownership + potential for strengthening of capacity of existing smaller Trusts and community companies where appropriate - potential duplication of overlapping Trusts
Charity and corporate legislation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Charitable status not applicable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + likely to obtain charitable status ○ need approval from the Charities Regulator
Procurement		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ governed by the Financial Memorandum of CNPA and potentially 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ would have to comply with procurement rules that are appropriate

Criteria	Option A: No change	Option B: Direct delivery by CNPA	Option C: Park-wide Trust
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> of other funding bodies - projects procured internally would be subject to full, unrecoverable VAT 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> for use of public funds as agreed by funding partners ○ potential added consideration of VAT implications
Fund management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited opportunity for flexible fund management between financial years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited opportunity for flexible fund management between financial years ○ May have some access to additional sources of funding for complementary projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Greater opportunity for flexible management of funds between financial years (as agreed by funding partners) + Access to additional sources of funding for complementary projects
Staff and administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significant staff time in seeking project funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Opportunities for synergy with other CNPA work and staff skills - Requirement for CNPA to finance full staff costs (including admin costs) - CNPA resources tied to direct delivery for indefinite commitment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + focus moves from managing CNPA resources internally to managing strategic outcomes that are delivered in partnership with others - potential duplication of administration costs