

CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

EXPENDITURE JUSTIFICATION

1. Title

Funding for the Speyside Way 2009/10

2. Expenditure Category

Operational Plan	1e	Code	74105000	Project	
1 (goal description)	Speyside/Deeside & Glenmore		Grant		✓
Core or Project spend	Code		Consultancy		

Is this spend to be funded from an existing budget line, existing line with additional funds or is it a totally new spend?	£ 70,780	Existing budget	✓
	£	Additional	
	£	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)

The Speyside Way is managed on behalf of the Cairngorms National Park Authority and Highland Council by Moray Council through a Minute of Agreement. Moray Council employ a Route Manager and supporting staff to manage the route. The standards for the route and priorities for work are agreed by the funders through a 3 year Development and Management Programme. The current DMP terminates on 31 March 2009 and Moray and Highland Council have sought a one year roll forward of the existing funding arrangements with a small inflationary uplift. The CNPA contribution is likely to be in the order of £7,780.

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

The Speyside Way offers a strategic link from Buckie to Aviemore and attracts walkers from outwith the area to undertake one of Scotland's four official long distance routes. Such routes have been developed to provide a managed facility with accommodation available within a days walk of each other and

with reasonable public transport links at either end. Short sections of the route can also attract local users and can, where the surface and infrastructure permit, allow for sustainable commuting such as between Boat of Garten and Aviemore.

Visitor surveys have shown in the past that the route is popular with visitors but has not been possible to gauge accurately the total number of long distance walkers in any given year.

A long distance route, catering for a wide range of users provides a good fit with the National Park Plan and priorities contained within the Outdoor Access Strategy. The Speyside Way within the National Park has been identified as a possible core path as it offers good links between communities and to the wider path network.

5. Option Analysis

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

There may be other options for delivering a long distance route and these have yet to be explored by the Speyside Way Management Group. These could include the contracting out of elements of the management and maintenance, delivery of some aspects of maintenance through other funding mechanisms and user groups and/or utilising existing ranger services to assist with the management of visitors along the route. These options need to be explored as part of the preparation for the future Development and Management Programme (DMP).

It is proposed however that a review be undertaken in the next 3 months on how effectively the current DMP has been delivered to help shape the future DMP.

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.

This offer of grant is for one year only and is dependant on a review being undertaken which will inform CNPA and other members of the Speyside Way Management Group on how effectively the current management programme has been delivered .

There are risks of the programme not being delivered but regular reports from the Route Manager to the Speyside Way Management Group measuring progress can mitigate this risk. Such measures will ensure that the Management Group can act timeously to ensure the programme can be delivered.

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)

The costs and funding for the route is expected to be as follows:

Moray Council	£91,465
Highland Council	£11,824
CNPA	£70,780
Total	£174,069

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 condition of funding will be that a review is completed on how effectively the existing Development and Management Programme has been delivered.

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 fully managed long distance route, with considerable progression towards a barrier-free route, for the section of route within the National Park. Success will be measured through an emerging Development and Management Programme that shares the key principles agreed by the CNPA Board. These are:

- The route should be managed for multi-use with a priority to upgrade the route to meeting this target within the 3 year period of the DMP;
- The future staffing and their location should be based on achieving best value; and
- An appropriate mechanism explored to ensure that communities have a voice in the management of the route.

Monitoring will be provided by the Speyside Way Route Manager in his reports to the Speyside Way Management Group.

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).

Value for money will be tested through the review process.

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?

The grant is for one year only and future funding from CNPA will be dependent on a close fit with the objectives of inclusiveness, accessibility and engagement being met. The Minute of Agreement between the 3 access authorities commits CNPA to the current funding regime and it is hoped that discussions regarding future management will result in a better facility. Any of the partners have the option to come out of the agreement giving one year's notice.

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?

The long distance route will continue to exist unless there is a Ministerial direction to close it. The reduction in funding would have an impact on how the route is managed and CNPA would require to consider how best to ensure the route remained open and meeting the needs of users.

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.

There is currently no direct means of engagement with communities in the management of the route, but feedback from the core paths planning process clearly highlighted the current and potential benefits of the route. The support shown through core paths planning consultation has led to it being included as a core path in the Draft Core Paths Plan.

14. Recommendation

The Board is asked to approve one year's funding of £70,780 subject to a review being undertaken of the current delivery mechanism.

Name:

Signature: _____

Date:

15. Decision to Approve or Reject

Head of Group

Name:	Signature:	Date:
-------	------------	-------

Chief Executive

Name:	Signature:	Date:
-------	------------	-------

Management Team

Name:	Signature:	Date:
-------	------------	-------

Finance Committee

Name:	Signature:	Date:
-------	------------	-------

Board

Not applicable – below approval limits		
Name:	Signature:	Date:

SEERAD

Not applicable – below approval limits		
Name:	Signature:	Date: