

Annex 2

**CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY  
EXPENDITURE JUSTIFICATION**

**1. Title**

Funding the Cairngorms Outdoor Access Trust's Business Plan 2009/11
---

**2. Expenditure Category**

Operational Plan		Code	74104000	Project	
(goal description)				Grant	✓
Core or Project spend		Code	1d	Consultancy	

Is this spend to be funded from an existing budget line, existing line with additional funds or is it a totally new spend?	£ 365,000	Existing budget	✓
	£	Additional budget	
	£	New budget	

delete as appropriate

**3. Description**

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

<p>Summary</p> <p>a) The Cairngorms Outdoor Access Trust is seeking £365,000 support from CNPA towards delivering the business plan covering 2009/11. The total value of the programme amounts to £1,270,00</p> <p>Background</p> <p>b) The Cairngorms Access Trust has used its first 6 months since inception to deliver some key projects but also to develop a programme of works over the following 2 years that is closely allied to the priorities within the National Park Plan.</p> <p>c) The Draft Business Plan is shown in Annex 1 and highlights the key aspects of work that will be tackled and the funding that has been, or is likely to be attracted from partners. This, the second and third year of operation, focuses heavily on delivering path improvements coming out of the core paths planning process and from the prioritised programme of upland path repairs.</p>
--

#### 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 low and high ground delivery, signage, interpretation and continued potential expanded investment in health walk schemes.
- b) The low ground work envisaged reflects the views expressed by communities through the Core Paths Planning consultations. Improving path provision will enable people of all ages and abilities to enjoy the special qualities of the Park. In relation to mountain path repairs, this will help enhance landscape, protect wild land qualities and 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 Trust is currently considering the potential expansion of health walk schemes into other areas and will provide a co-ordination across the National Park to provide more consistent integration with health professionals. This latter work provides a close link to Scottish Government targets on health and social inclusion.

#### 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 COAT. In addition, a small organisation provides flexibility in adapting to new projects and challenges and can be opportunistic in seeking support. For all these reasons, it is felt that the most appropriate means of delivery is through COAT.

#### 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 low but are dependant on the other funders coming on stream. Funding is currently being explored with all the organisations mentioned in Annex 1 and there is a strong likelihood that, with the exception of two of the Councils funding levels will be achieved. Even if the Councils are unable to support the programme, their level of funding is not high and other sources will be secured to bridge the gap.
- b) Staff turnover in a small organisation is a potential risk with a consequential impact on delivery. The employment of a second access project officer in early 2009, based in Strathspey, will help mitigate this risk by providing additional cover in the event of either the Manager or the other access project officer leaving.
- c) Financial risks have also been considered as COAT operates with limited reserves. In particular as the larger projects start there is the possibility of funds being required at an early stage. This risk can be managed by staging the CNPA contribution to ensure funds are available at the appropriate time.

## 7. Costs and Funding

- Detail the financial costs of the project/activity
- Detail the sources of funding
- Justification also needs to be given if the CNPA is the major funder
- Detail any non-monetary costs to the CNPA (such as Member or staff input)

a) Costed areas of work are shown in the table below.

<i>Project Costs</i>	<b>09/10</b>	<b>10/11</b>
<i>Area of Activity</i>		
Path Networks Project	195,000	185,000
Health Walks Programme	25,000	35,000
Pan-Cairngorms Upland Path Project	16,500	230,922
Associated visitor infrastructure	35,000	17,000
Promotion, marketing and development	35,000	24,000
Maintain Upland paths	17,000	17,000
Maintain Lowland Paths	15,000	15,500
<b><i>Programme Subtotal</i></b>	<b>338,500</b>	<b>524,422</b>

b) Funding for this work programme is likely to come from the following sources.

<b>COAT Business Plan 2009-11 (Outline Costs and Income)</b>		<b>2009/10</b>	<b>2010/11</b>
<b><i>Income</i></b>	<i>Source</i>		
	CNPA	180,000	185,000
	SNH	70,000	65,000

Aberdeenshire Council	20,000	20,000
COAT Income	35,000	35,000
Highland Council	10,000	10,000
RSPB		10,000
Highlands and Islands Enterprise		20,000
Moray Council	10,000	10,000
Angus Council		10,000
HLF		100,000
ERDF		100,000
CCF	100,000	100,000
LEADER	90,000	90,000
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>515,000</b>	<b>755,000</b>

### 8. Funding conditions

- Detail the project specific conditions that need to be included in any contract for services or grant offer letter in order that CNPA obtains the intended outcomes and Value for Money
- In the case of grant offers, our Financial Memorandum requires that SEERAD agree these conditions in advance of the grant offer being made

a) Further discussions are required about cash flow for the Trust. These will be dependant on start up costs for projects. It is likely therefore that in both years funding of up to 80% may be required in quarter 1 with the balance paid in quarter 4.

### 9. 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) The access infrastructure products will result in improved access opportunities for all. 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. The upland path project will help protect the wild land qualities and natural heritage of the mountain areas.

b) Use of the new facilities and continued uptake of the paths to health schemes will be the key measures of success.

c) The monitoring of all path and other projects is undertaken both by COAT Directors, two of which are CNPA representatives, and through the COAT Management Group. CNPA is represented on this latter 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 COAT Board of Directors.

### 10. 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) 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 CNPA contribution to the overall programme is 29% of total budget. This represents very good leverage for the CNPA contribution and reflects good progress from year one in which CNPA's contribution accounted for 69% of the total funding package.
- 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.

#### 11. 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 two year offer of funding. Future funding will be dependant on satisfactory delivery of the current Business Plan and any future plan being closely tied into the priorities identified in the National Park Plan and agreed for future years.

#### 12. 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 curtailed and it is unlikely that other funders would be willing to support if CNPA did not contribute to this key areas of work. At best the scale of works would be seriously diminished and some aspects would not be able to go ahead.

#### 13. Stakeholder Support

- Have the organisations and/or communities that would have an interest in this work/project been involved, and are they supportive?
- If supporter are also not funders an explanation may be required.

- a) Support has been demonstrated for the low ground work through the core paths planning consultation process and for the high ground work through engagement with land managers and parties interested in upland path repairs.

**14. Recommendation**

a) It is recommended that a grant be offered from CNPA amounting to £365,000.