

Public Document Pack

Peak District National Park Authority

Tel: 01629 816200

E-mail: customer.service@peakdistrict.gov.uk

Web: www.peakdistrict.gov.uk

Minicom: 01629 816319

Aldern House, Baslow Road, Bakewell, Derbyshire. DE45 1AE



Our Ref: A.1142/1764

Date: 10 May 2018



NOTICE OF MEETING

Meeting: **Audit Resources & Performance Committee**

Date: **Friday 18 May 2018**

Time: **10.00 am**

Venue: **The Board Room, Aldern House, Baslow Road, Bakewell**

SARAH FOWLER
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

AGENDA

1. **Apologies for Absence**
2. **Minutes of previous meeting of 16 March 2018 (Pages 5 - 10)** 5 mins
3. **Urgent Business**
4. **Public Participation**
To note any questions or to receive any statements, representations, deputations and petitions which relate to the published reports on Part A of the Agenda.
5. **Members Declarations of Interest**
Members are asked to declare any disclosable pecuniary, personal or prejudicial interests they may have in relation to items on the agenda for this meeting.
6. **2017/18 Quarter 4 and Year End Corporate Performance Report (A91941/HW) (Pages 11 - 56)** 30 mins
Appendix 1
Appendix 2
Appendix 3

- | | | |
|-----|---|---------|
| 7. | Corporate Risk Registers: 2017/18 Year End and 2018/19 Proposed (A91941/HW) (Pages 57 - 66)
Appendix 1

Appendix 2 | 10 mins |
| 8. | 2017-2018 Outturn (A.137/22/PN) (Pages 67 - 82)
Appendix A

Appendix B

Appendix C

Appendix D | 15 mins |
| 9. | Internal Audit Report Block 2, 2017/18 (A1362/7/PN) (Pages 83 - 118)
Appendix 1

Appendix 2

Appendix 3

Appendix 4

Appendix 5 | 20 mins |
| 10. | Internal Audit 2017/18 Annual Report (DH) (Pages 119 - 130)
Appendix 1 | 10 mins |

Duration of Meeting

In the event of not completing its business within 3 hours of the start of the meeting, in accordance with the Authority's Standing Orders, the Authority will decide whether or not to continue the meeting. If the Authority decides not to continue the meeting it will be adjourned and the remaining business considered at the next scheduled meeting.

If the Authority has not completed its business by 1.00pm and decides to continue the meeting the Chair will exercise discretion to adjourn the meeting at a suitable point for a 30 minute lunch break after which the committee will re-convene.

ACCESS TO INFORMATION - LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 (as amended)

Agendas and reports

Copies of the Agenda and Part A reports are available for members of the public before and during the meeting. These are also available on the website <http://democracy.peakdistrict.gov.uk>

Background Papers

The Local Government Act 1972 requires that the Authority shall list any unpublished Background Papers necessarily used in the preparation of the Reports. The Background Papers referred to in each report, PART A, excluding those papers that contain Exempt or Confidential Information, PART B, can be inspected by appointment at the National Park Office, Bakewell. Contact the Democratic and Legal Support Team on 01629 816200, ext 362/352. E-mail address: democraticandlegalsupport@peakdistrict.gov.uk

Public Participation and Other Representations from third parties

Anyone wishing to participate at the meeting under the Authority's Public Participation Scheme is required to give notice to the Director of Corporate Strategy and Development to be received not later than 12.00 noon on the Wednesday preceding the Friday meeting. The Scheme is available on the website <http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/looking-after/about-us/have-your-say> or on request from the Democratic and Legal Support Team 01629 816362, email address: democraticandlegalsupport@peakdistrict.gov.uk.

Written Representations

Other written representations on items on the agenda, except those from formal consultees, will not be reported to the meeting if received after 12noon on the Wednesday preceding the Friday meeting.

Recording of Meetings

In accordance with the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 members of the public may record and report on our open meetings using sound, video, film, photograph or any other means this includes blogging or tweeting, posts on social media sites or publishing on video sharing sites. If you intend to record or report on one of our meetings you are asked to contact the Democratic and Legal Support Team in advance of the meeting so we can make sure it will not disrupt the meeting and is carried out in accordance with any published protocols and guidance.

The Authority uses an audio sound system to make it easier to hear public speakers and discussions during the meeting and to make a digital sound recording available after the meeting. From 3 February 2017 the recordings will be retained for three years after the date of the meeting.

General Information for Members of the Public Attending Meetings

Aldern House is situated on the A619 Bakewell to Baslow Road, the entrance to the drive is opposite the Ambulance Station. Car parking is available. Local Bus Services from Bakewell centre and from Chesterfield and Sheffield pick up and set down near Aldern House. Further information on Public transport from surrounding areas can be obtained from Traveline on 0871 200 2233 or on the Traveline website at www.travelineeastmidlands.co.uk.

Please note that there is no catering provision for members of the public during meal breaks. However, there are cafes, pubs and shops in Bakewell town centre, approximately 15 minutes walk away.

To: Members of Audit Resources & Performance Committee:

Chair: Cllr A McCloy
Vice Chair: Cllr F J Walton

Mrs P Anderson	Cllr J Atkin
Mr J W Berresford	Cllr A R Favell
Cllr C Furness	Mr Z Hamid
Cllr Mrs G Heath	Cllr C McLaren
Cllr J Perkins	Cllr Mrs N Turner
Cllr B Woods	

Other invited Members: (May speak but not vote)

Cllr Mrs L C Roberts	Mr P Ancell
Cllr D Chapman	Cllr D Birkinshaw

Constituent Authorities
Secretary of State for the Environment
Natural England

This page is intentionally left blank

Peak District National Park Authority

Tel: 01629 816200

E-mail: customer.service@peakdistrict.gov.uk

Web: www.peakdistrict.gov.uk

Minicom: 01629 816319

Aldern House, Baslow Road, Bakewell, Derbyshire. DE45 1AE



MINUTES

- Meeting: **Audit Resources & Performance Committee**
- Date: Friday 16 March 2018 at 12.30 pm
- Venue: The Board Room, Aldern House, Baslow Road, Bakewell
- Chair: Cllr A McCloy
- Present: Cllr F J Walton, Mrs P Anderson, Cllr J Atkin, Mrs F Beatty, Mr J W Berresford, Cllr C Furness, Mr Z Hamid, Cllr C McLaren, Cllr J Perkins, Cllr Mrs N Turner and Cllr B Woods
- Cllr Mrs L C Roberts, Mr P Ancell and Cllr D Chapman attended to observe and speak but not vote.
- Apologies for absence: Cllr A R Favell, Cllr Mrs G Heath and Cllr D Birkinshaw.

14/18 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING OF 19 JANUARY 2018

The minutes of the last meeting of the Audit, Resources and Performance Committee held on 19 January 2018 were approved as a correct record.

15/18 URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business for the Committee to consider.

16/18 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Five members of the public were present to make representations to the Committee.

17/18 MEMBERS DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Item 6

Cllr A McCloy declared a personal interest as he is a member of the Ramblers Association and has also received two emails relating to the item.

Item 8

The majority of members had received emails relating to this item.

Item 9

Cllr A McCloy had received three emails relating to this item.
Mrs Penny Anderson declared a personal interest as she is a member of Derbyshire Wildlife Trust.

18/18 ACTION PLANS FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF RECREATIONAL MOTORISED VEHICLES IN THEIR USE OF UNSEALED HIGHWAYS AND OFF-ROAD (A7622/SAS)

The Rights of Way Officer introduced the report and highlighted the importance of working with partnership organisations including the Highways Authorities, the Police and user groups.

The following spoke under the Public Participation at Meetings Scheme:

- Mrs Stoney, local resident
- Mr Chris Woods, Peak District Green Lanes Association, Friends of the Peak District and the Peak & Northern Footpath Society
- Ms Patricia Stubbs, Peak Horsepower

Members congratulated the team on the 'well put together' report, particularly the graphs which were easy to understand.

Members were concerned regarding the outstanding repairs to Hurstclough Lane as mentioned by the speakers and asked that Derbyshire County Council be encouraged to carry out the necessary work. Cllr Jason Atkin agreed to raise this with the officers at Derbyshire County Council and ask them to contact the Rights of Way Team regarding carrying out the work.

Derbyshire County Council had had notice served on them to carry out the repairs on Minninglow Lane but details were available regarding when these repairs would take place.

Members requested some changes to the Objectives for Green Lanes so that people were 'connected with nature for its enjoyment'.

Members agreed the objectives in appendix 3 of the report were good but that there was a need to ensure users are aware of the reasons why they should respect the lanes by increasing their understanding of why these lanes are important and providing a back story to highlight the history of the routes. Officers confirmed that this report is an opportunity to start to develop this.

Members raised the question asked by speakers regarding introducing more TROs as the Action Plan did not include any other than the current consultation on Wetton Hills. Officers clarified that there were no targets or plans for TROs but that there were a range of actions that could be taken on routes where problems occurred. Consideration also needed to be given as to which authority is appropriate to take action as Derbyshire County Council were also able to implement TROs and in some cases the more appropriate authority.

Officers reported that the National Trail Riders organisation had not supported voluntary restraint measures proposed by the local groups.

The Chair of the committee asked that a meeting between officers of Derbyshire County Council and the Authority's Rights of Way Team take place to discuss outstanding repairs.

The Officer recommendation as set out in the report was moved, seconded, put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED:

That the progress was noted and the action plans at Appendices 4, 6 and 7 of the report were approved, and that a follow-up report be brought to this Committee in March 2019

Cllr Becki Woods left the meeting at 1.23 pm

19/18 MOORS FOR THE FUTURE PARTNERSHIP OPERATIONAL PLAN 2018 - 2019 (SLD/CD)

The Head of Programme Delivery – Moors for the Future and Moors for the Future Programme Office Manager were present to introduce the report and answer any questions from Members.

Members had attended a ‘Bogfest’ event which had enabled some good discussions and highlighted the need to look at commercial opportunities and the possibility of a Charitable Trust.

The report highlighted the three main areas of focus for the project which are:

Communication – including

- Moorlife 2020 project
- Bogtastic Van – now up and running and starting to visit sites
- Citizen Science
- Land Managers Events

Science & Monitoring – including:

- Evidence Gathering
- Successful grant bids which are enabled by the evidence
- Moorland Bird Breeding Survey

Conservation & Land Management – biggest year of work for the programme including the Defra Restoration Fund work.

Members congratulated the Moors for the Future Team for a great report and on achieving 15 years of project work which continues with a stable team. The Community Science project funding was due to end in December 2018 and ideas on how to extend the project were welcomed from Members.

The Head of Programme Delivery confirmed that the work at Moss Rake East is being carried out by specialist contractors and project managed by the Moors for the Future team.

The Head of Programme Delivery clarified that if the money for the core funding deficit was not found the operational plan would still be delivered but business development costs reduced to maintain work within budget.

The Officer recommendation as set out in the report was moved, seconded, put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED:

That the Operational Plan is supported and is recommended to the Moors for the Future Partnership's Strategic Management Group.

Cllr Colin McLaren left at 1.40pm during the discussion of this item.

**20/18 PRIORITY ACTIONS FOR 2018/19 (YEAR 3 OF THE CORPORATE STRATEGY)
(A91941/HW)**

The Head of Strategy & Performance was present to introduce the item and answer questions from Members.

The Priority Actions had previously been discussed with Members at a workshop and comments had been incorporated into the document.

The Officer recommendation as set out in the report was moved, seconded, put to the vote and carried.

RESOVLED:

Members approved the priority actions for 2018/19 at Appendix 1 of the report.

21/18 DEVELOPMENT OF MILLERS DALE STATION (ES)

The Director of Commercial Development & Outreach and the Head of Visitor Experience Development were present to introduce the item and answer questions from Members.

Head of Visitor Experience Development explained that it was proposed to develop the site in two phases as detailed in the report with the second phase dependant on external funding. The Authority will invest a maximum of £370k in Phase 1.

Members raised the issue of stakeholder consultation which did not appear to have taken place. The Director of Commercial Development & Outreach clarified that full consultation was not anticipated in relation to the Phase 1 element; the opportunity to provide feedback would available via the planning process. Full consultation would take place in relation to Phase 2 and would be an integral element of this element of the initiative. Members noted that there is currently an issue with roadside parking. An agreement has been reached with Derbyshire County Council to paint white lines under the viaduct to try and reduce this problem and it was hoped that the proposed increase in parking spaces would help. There is the potential to increase interaction of Rangers with visitors to increase understanding of parking issues.

Members asked for clarification regarding the number of car parking spaces that would be created. The Head of Visitor Experience Development explained that there would be an overall increase of 20% with 18-20 new spaces and some re organising of the current spaces which may also increase the number of spaces.

Members noted the need to preserve the building and its history. It was confirmed that the plans did not increase the footprint of the current building and the refurbishment would be in keeping with the history as a railway station.

The Officer recommendation as set out in the report was moved, seconded, put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED:

1. **Approved borrowing of up to £370,000 to contribute to a capital project with a total value of up to £657,000 (Phase 1)**
2. **In respect of urgent works identified through the site condition survey, approved substitution of up to £130,000 of the borrowing referred to in Resolution 1, from either revenue resources or the capital fund, should funds become available as set out in paragraph 32 of the report.**
3. **That the Authority may, subject to compliance with procurement standing orders, enter into contracts for the delivery of Phase 1**
4. **Approved development of long term plans for Millers Dale Station (Phase 2)**

22/18 EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 19 JANUARY 2018

The exempt minutes of the last meeting of the Audit, Resources and Performance Committee held on 19 January 2018 were approved as a correct record.

Mr James Beresford left the meeting at 2:35pm

23/18 APPROVAL TO AWARD A CONTRACT FOR CLEANING ALDERN HOUSE (EF)

The Officer recommendation as set out in the report was moved, seconded, put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED:

In accordance with the Authority's procurement standing orders Members approved awarding a contract for the cleaning of Aldern House.

The meeting ended at 3.30 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

7. **CORPORATE RISK REGISTERS: 2017/18 YEAR END AND 2018/19 PROPOSED (A91941/HW)**

Purpose of the report

1. The purpose of this report is for Members to review the year end position for the 2017/18 Corporate Risk Register and approve the proposed Corporate Risk Register for 2018/19.

Key issues

- The 2018/19 Corporate Risk Register, once agreed, will be included in the 2018/19 Performance and Business Plan and will be monitored by this Committee on a quarterly basis as part of corporate performance monitoring.
- The proposed Corporate Risk Register for 2018/19 has been developed by the Leadership Team by:
 - Reviewing the 2017/18 corporate risk register year end position.
 - Considering risks that might prevent the achievement of year three of the 2016-2019 corporate strategy.
 - Considering risks in service plans that need to be escalated and monitored at a corporate level.
 - Considering the external environment that we operate in.

Recommendations

2. **1. That the Corporate Risk Register 2018/19, as given in Appendix 1, be reviewed and approved, taking account of the year end position on the 2017/18 Corporate Risk Register given in Appendix 2.**

How does this contribute to our policies and legal obligations?

3. Risk management contributes to the cornerstone *Our organisation – develop our organisation* so we have a planned and sustained approach to performance at all levels. Additionally, risk management is part of our internal and external audit monitoring. Establishing and monitoring a Corporate Risk Register ensures mitigating action can be taken to ensure risks are controlled and managed down.

Background

4. In line with the arrangements set out in the Authority's risk policy, Appendix 1 shows the proposed Corporate Risk Register for 2018/19 as developed by the Leadership Team considering:
 - a) Risks that remain at the 2017/18 year end carry forward into 2018/19 but have been reassessed and redefined.
 - b) Risks identified during the service planning process that are considered appropriate to escalate for monitoring at a corporate level.
 - c) Other risks identified by the Leadership Team, particularly through consideration of the focus of activity being undertaken in our 2018/19 year.
 - d) The external environment that we operate in.

5. Appendix 2 shows how 2017/18 risks have moved over the year with seven risks remaining in Amber, two remaining in Red and all other risks managed down over the year. Those remaining in Amber and Red are:
- Failure to create a common understanding for the White Peak, including engaging with the farming community and land managers
 - Adverse exchange rate movements for Moorlife 2020 European funding
 - Failure to maintain core Moors for the Future Partnership income, leading to failure to deliver contractual commitments (Red)
 - Area of NP land safeguarded in agri-environment schemes reduces because of Brexit uncertainty and continuing issues with Countryside Stewardship (Red)
 - Failure to inspire people to give to the Peak District National Park Authority
 - Failure to deliver an integrated conservation service for land managers and communities which increases awareness, understanding and support for the National Park's special qualities and the public goods delivered by the place
 - Failure to influence the transposing of EU laws and legislation for landscape and the environment into UK law after Article 50
 - Failure to gain sufficient buy in from partners for the updated National Park Management Plan (NPMP), particularly the delivery plan element
 - Being a "poorly performing" Authority based on DCLG measures – specifically major applications appeal performance.
6. These remaining risks have been reassessed, refocussed and redefined in the proposed 2018/19 Corporate Risk Register as follows:
- Adverse exchange rate movements for Moorlife 2020 European funding
 - Area of NP land safeguarded in agri-environment schemes reduces because of Brexit uncertainty and continuing issues with Countryside Stewardship
 - Failure to inspire people to give to the Peak District National Park Authority
 - Failure to deliver an integrated conservation service for land managers and communities which increases awareness, understanding and support for the National Park's special qualities and the public goods delivered by the place
 - Failure to influence the transposing of EU laws and legislation for landscape and the environment into UK law after Article 50
 - Being a 'poorly performing' Authority based on DCLG measures – specifically major applications appeal performance.
7. Three new risks have been added to the proposed 2018/19 Corporate Risk Register as follows:
- Lack of capacity in the Property Support team to develop and maintain our asset base
 - Failure of the Birds of Prey initiative to deliver
 - Failure to realise opportunities in the 25-Year Environment Plan.
8. For 2018/19 we have categorised the risks into the following categories:
- Outcome/delivery risk
 - Reputation risk
 - Financial risk.

Proposals

9. Members are asked to:
- a) Consider the year end position of the 2017/18 Corporate Risk Register as given at Appendix 2.

- b) Agree the proposed 2018/19 Corporate Risk Register as given at Appendix 1 - this includes an initial assessment of where the risk sits on our risk matrix at the start of the year. Risks will be managed down over the year with quarterly monitoring reported to this committee.
- c) Note that the agreed 2018/19 Corporate Risk Register will be included in the 2018/19 Performance and Business Plan.

Are there any corporate implications members should be concerned about?

- 10. **Financial:** Some of the risks on the proposed register have financial implications as indicated.
- 11. **Risk Management:** The corporate risk register is a key part of the Authority's risk management process.
- 12. **Sustainability:** None identified.
- 13. **Background papers:** none

Appendices

- 1. Appendix 1: Proposed 2018/19 Corporate Risk Register
- 2. Appendix 2: 2017/18 Corporate Risk Register year end position showing movement from the start of the year

Report Author, Job Title and Publication Date

Holly Waterman, Senior Strategy Officer Research, 10 May 2018

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 1: Proposed 2018/19 Corporate Risk Register

The following 2018/19 Corporate Risk Register has been developed through an assessment of the risks to achieving year three of our 2016-2019 corporate strategy. This assessment has also included an assessment of:

- 2017/18 corporate risks remaining at amber or red at the 2017/18 year end
- Considering risks that might prevent the achievement of year three of the 2016-2019 corporate strategy.
- Any risks to be escalated from service risk registers
- The external environment that we operate in.

In developing our risk register we have used a 9 grid tool based on likelihood and impact of the risk which not only gives a Green, Amber, Red classification but helps us prioritise action to mitigate that risk depending on where the risk sits on the grid. This is shown at Table 2. The risk register is a 'live' tool that is changed if new risks arise or risks are managed down over the year.

Table 1: Proposed 2018/19 corporate risks and position at start of year

Corporate strategy ref	Risk Description	Existing controls/mitigating action	Risk rating at start of year	Green, Amber or Red	Lead officer
Shift 1 The place and the park on a landscape scale	1. Adverse exchange rate movements for Moorlife 2020 European funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capping Sterling budget • Consider hedging transaction 	Medium Impact Medium Likelihood	AMBER	PN
Shift 1 The place and the park on a landscape scale	2. Area of NP land safeguarded in agri-environment schemes reduces because of Brexit uncertainty and continuing issues with Countryside Stewardship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National influencing for post Brexit agri/ environmental policies and support systems • Local communications across the farming & land management industry • NPMP work • Increase promotion of the service provided, working closely with other agencies such as NFU, CLA, NE, EA, FC. • Public payment for public goods/ benefits • Influencing role through PDNPA links and NPE's Future of Farming 	High Impact High Likelihood	RED	JRS
Shift 2 Connecting people to the place	3. Failure to inspire people to give to the Peak District National Park Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial Development & Outreach strategic plan • Commercial Development & Outreach Operational plan • Authority-approved budget • Implementation of Marketing & Fundraising Service plan to include: - National Parks UK charity and potential PDNP charity 	Medium Impact Medium Likelihood	AMBER	SM

APPENDIX 1: Proposed 2018/19 Corporate Risk Register

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reputation protection activity - Brand activation to engage supporters e.g. supporter videos - CRM solution 			
Cornerstone 2 Our services	4. Failure to deliver an integrated conservation service for land managers and communities which increases awareness, understanding and support for the National Park's special qualities and the public goods delivered by the place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing advice service delivered by teams • Neighbourhood and village planning offer by policy and communities service • Updating of NPMP, including comms for special qualities • Refreshing the community development offer • Development of data to provide information • Partnership working, including through NPMP 	Medium Impact Medium Likelihood	AMBER	JRS
Cornerstone 3 Our organisation	5. Failure to influence the transposing of EU laws and legislation for landscape and the environment into UK law after Article 50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPE Board have agreed 4 priority areas for Government engagement as we leave the EU, including, delivering a better environment for all and grasping the opportunities for farming and land management 	High Impact Low Likelihood	AMBER	SF
Cornerstone 3 Our Organisation	6. Being a 'poorly performing' Authority based on DCLG measures – specifically major applications appeal performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member training • Standing Order 1.48 • Director to liaise with CLG • Further training of Members • Training of officers 	Medium Impact High Likelihood	AMBER	JRS
Cornerstone 1 Our assets	7. Lack of capacity in the Property Support team to develop and maintain our asset base	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seeking to recruit • Identified priorities • Finding alternative ways of resourcing 	High Impact Medium Likelihood	AMBER	DH
Shift 1 The place and the park on a landscape scale	8. Failure of the Birds of Prey initiative to deliver	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of the Birds of Prey initiative • Breeding birds surveys • Engagement with moorland owners • Engagement with Policy and Crime Commissioner 	High Impact Medium Likelihood	AMBER	JRS
Shift 1 The place and the park on a landscape scale	9. Failure to realise opportunities in the 25-Year Environment Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working with National Parks England • NPE Business Plan focusing on 25-Year Environment Plan delivery 	Medium Impact Medium Likelihood	AMBER	SF

APPENDIX 1: Proposed 2018/19 Corporate Risk Register

Table 2: 2018/19 Corporate Risk Register – risk starting point following existing mitigating action

IMPACT	High	<u><i>closely monitor</i></u> 5. Failure to influence the transposing of EU laws and legislation for landscape and the environment into UK law after Article 50 (Outcome/delivery risk)	<u><i>manage and monitor</i></u> 7. Lack of capacity in the Property Support team to develop and maintain our asset base (Outcome/delivery risk) 8. Failure of the Birds of Prey initiative to deliver (Reputation risk, Outcome/delivery risk)	<u><i>significant focus and attention</i></u> 2. Area of NP land safeguarded in agri-environment schemes reduces because of Brexit uncertainty and continuing issues with Countryside Stewardship (Outcome/delivery risk)
	Medium	<u><i>accept but monitor</i></u>	<u><i>management effort worthwhile</i></u> 1. Adverse exchange rate movements for Moorlife 2020 European funding (Financial risk, Delivery risk) 3. Failure to inspire people to give to the Peak District National Park Authority (Financial risk, Outcome/delivery risk) 4. Failure to deliver an integrated conservation service for land managers and communities which increases awareness, understanding and support for the National Park's special qualities and the public goods delivered by the place (Outcome/delivery risk) 9. Failure to realise opportunities in the 25-Year Environment Plan (Outcome/delivery risk)	<u><i>manage and monitor</i></u> 6. Being a 'poorly performing' Authority based on DCLG measures – specifically major applications appeal performance (Reputation risk, Financial risk)
	Low	<u><i>accept risks</i></u>	<u><i>accept but review periodically</i></u>	<u><i>accept but monitor</i></u>
		Low	Medium	
LIKELIHOOD				

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 2: Corporate Risk Register 2017/18 - year end position showing movement from start of year

IMPACT	High	<p>1. Failure to create a common understanding for the White Peak, including engaging with the farming community and land managers</p> <p>10. Failure to influence the transposing of EU laws and legislation for landscape and the environment into UK law after Article 50</p>	<p>13. Failure to gain sufficient buy in from partners for the updated National Park Management Plan (NPMP), particularly the delivery plan element.</p>	<p>3. Failure to maintain core Moors for the Future Partnership income, leading to failure to deliver contractual commitments (<i>re-worded</i>).</p> <p>4. Area of NP land safeguarded in agri-environment schemes reduces because of Brexit uncertainty and continuing issues with Countryside Stewardship</p>
	Medium	<p>6. Failure to implement the integrated strategic commercial plan</p>	<p>2. Adverse exchange rate movements for Moorlife 2020 European funding</p> <p>9. Failure to deliver an integrated conservation service for land managers and communities which increases awareness, understanding and support for the National Park’s special qualities and the public goods delivered by the place</p>	<p>5. Failure to inspire people to give to the Peak District National Park Authority</p> <p>14. Being a “poorly performing” Authority based on DCLG measures – specifically major applications appeal performance</p>
	Low	<p>7. Failure to design the organisation at all levels so it has the skills and capability to deliver</p> <p>8. Failure to support staff going through a time of change</p> <p>11. Failure to deliver against our Performance and Business Plan in a time of change</p>		
		Low	Medium	High
		LIKELIHOOD		

APPENDIX 2: Corporate Risk Register 2017/18 - year end position showing movement from start of year

Risk 12. **Lack of engagement from the farming and land management community in landscape scale delivery models, the national agri-environment schemes and post Brexit policies & new support systems**, having started the year at high likelihood and high impact, was removed from the Risk Register after Q3.

Risk 13. **Failure to gain sufficient buy in from partners for the updated National Park Management Plan (NPMP), particularly the delivery plan element**, was introduced during Q3, starting at medium likelihood and high impact.

Risk 14. **Being a “poorly performing” Authority based on DCLG measures – specifically major applications appeal performance**, was introduced during Q3, starting at high likelihood and medium impact.

List of risks remaining

1. Failure to create a common understanding for the White Peak, including engaging with the farming community and land managers
2. Adverse exchange rate movements for Moorlife 2020 European funding
3. Failure to maintain core Moors for the Future Partnership income, leading to failure to deliver contractual commitments (*re-worded*).
4. Area of NP land safeguarded in agri-environment schemes reduces because of Brexit uncertainty and continuing issues with Countryside Stewardship
5. Failure to inspire people to give to the Peak District National Park Authority
6. Failure to implement the integrated strategic commercial plan
7. Failure to design the organisation at all levels so it has the skills and capability to deliver
8. Failure to support staff going through a time of change
9. Failure to deliver an integrated conservation service for land managers and communities which increases awareness, understanding and support for the National Park’s special qualities and the public goods delivered by the place
10. Failure to influence the transposing of EU laws and legislation for landscape and the environment into UK law after Article 50
11. Failure to deliver against our Performance and Business Plan in a time of change
13. Failure to gain sufficient buy in from partners for the updated National Park Management Plan (NPMP), particularly the delivery plan element
14. Being a “poorly performing” Authority based on DCLG measures – specifically major applications appeal performance

8. **2017-2018 OUTTURN (A.137/22/PN)**

Purpose of the Report

1. This report explains the outturn for 2017/2018 and seeks approval of the necessary appropriations to or from reserves, together with approval of unspent funds and overspends to be carried forward into the 2018/19 financial year.

Key Issues

- The 2017/18 financial year accounts need to be signed by the Chief Finance Officer by the 31st May 2018 with audited accounts published by 31st July 2018.
- In order to meet the deadline for the accounts it is suggested that if Members feel unable to approve all the recommendations it is proposed that the sums affected should be allocated temporarily to the slippage reserve (or other reserve where appropriate), subject to Members' further decision.
- Subject to a number of possible minor adjustments and final confirmation of the figure, the general reserve is protected and shows a minor increase.
- The National Park Grant for 2017/18 benefitted from the second year of the "protected" Spending Review period, with an increase of 1.72% from the previous year. The approved budget for 2017/18 included £498,500 of one-off investment allocations.
- At midyear review stage there were no major concerns reported, but it was noted that the closure of Castleton Visitor Centre in the first quarter would not be likely to be fully recovered by the end of the year and an overspend (from not trading in that period) of approximately £50,000 was forecast. A number of small virements using vacancy savings were also agreed to support the new staff structure. The visitor centre deficit can be found from the overall outturn position.
- The recommended slippage requests and specific reserve requests, in support of budget-holders achieving their business plans, are contained within Appendix C.
- The Authority's reserve position is maintained at the levels shown in Appendix D for four main purposes:-
 - 1) allowing a degree of one-off resilience to cope with existing challenges and liabilities, to safeguard National Park policies without immediately requiring resources to be found from diminished revenue budgets.
 - 2) helping to underwrite the consequences of adverse variances against budget in times of greater uncertainties in income trading or as we move into the next Spending Review period.
 - 3) acting as a mechanism for budget managers of key authority properties to meet their financial objectives over a period longer than 1 year, allowing for surpluses to be retained and deficits to be supported on an annual basis, within the context of meeting the financial objective on an averaged basis.
 - 4) The Reserves are an essential cushion to meet the challenges of balancing budgets during adverse Spending Review periods; in the current circumstances confirmation of the 2016/17 cuts facilitated the reallocation of

resources to priorities in the current Corporate Strategy, meaning that slightly higher reserve levels will be carried in the medium term until the new allocation decisions are fully spent.

Recommendation

2. **1. That the outturn be noted, and the slippage requests and specific reserve appropriations shown in Appendix C be approved.**

How does this contribute to our policies and legal obligations?

3. The Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 require the Chief Finance Officer to sign the annual accounts by the 31st May. This report has been written therefore to allow the Audit, Resources & Performance Committee to agree recommendations on the movement of funds to and from reserves, which will need to be incorporated into the annual accounts. The accounts are required to be audited and signed off by 31st July. The consequence of this is that the Chief Finance Officer will need to prepare and certify the accounts by 31st May. The outturn information in this report is based on the budget report agreed in March 2017.
4. There were periodic budget monitoring meetings of the Senior Leadership Team with the Head of Finance together with the four appointed Budget Monitoring Members at key stages of the year. Variances from the agreed budget and forecasts are discussed during this meeting, together with updates on the anticipated level of reserves and movements in the budget arising from in-year committee resolutions.

Background

5. The approved budget for 2017/18 was based on the level of National Park Grant confirmed by Defra on January 21st 2016, which confirmed a £109,474 (1.72%) increase to the agreed level of National Park Grant, as part of a protected settlement up to 31st March 2020 in line with the current Spending Review period. As part of coping with the resource reductions in the previous Comprehensive Spending Review Members had previously approved a total of £2,378,000 of savings/income in the 2010/11-2015/16 years, and the 2016/17 budget approved a further £602,000 of savings which were already in hand.
6. The March 2017 meeting also approved the Chief Finance Officer's report under the Prudential Code for Capital Finance, setting prudent borrowing limits for the 2017/18 year of £2.0m. In August 2006, in accordance with Services Committee Minute 41/05, the Authority borrowed £697,000 to finance the Aldern House Project, and in December 2009 £500,000 for the replacement of vehicles (Minute 22/08 in March 2008): total debt of £1,197,000. No further external borrowing has taken place to date, and the total outstanding external debt at 31st March 2018, after repayments to date, is now £472,706. Repayments are made half yearly and are a fixed amount, with a proportion covering the interest payable, and the remainder, in increasing proportion over the repayment period, repaying the original capital sum. A number of further borrowing approvals have been agreed since then totalling £997,045; these have been financed internally from internal cash balances. They are:-

Committee / RMT Minute	Date	Approval	Reason	Annual charge to budget	Ending
ARP 41/12	20/07/2012	£108,812	Aldern House Biomass boiler	£8,000	2032/33 (20 years)
N/A Head of Service	16/05/2012	£9,247	Replacement vehicle Learning Team (now adopted as a general pool car following staff	£1,311	2019/20 (7 years)

			move to Aldern House)		
RMT 70/12	31/07/2012	£19,480	Litter Service vehicle replacement (from lease to owned)	£2,770	2019/20 (7 years)
RMT 63/12	31/07/2012	£98,506	Borrowing for landlord elements of Big Fernyford Farm refurbishment	£5,758	2037/38 (25 years)
ARP 11/15	23/01/2015	£60,000	Showers and camping facility improvements at North Lees campsite	£4,583	2030/31 (15 years)
ARP 18/16	04/03/2016	£330,000	Castleton Visitor Centre re-modelling	£19,791	2037/38 (20 years)
RMT 17/16	09/05/2016	£40,000	2 additional Camping Pods	£2,057	2031/32 (15 years)
RMT 42/16	01/11/2016	£21,000	Replacement vehicle for volunteer service	£2,715	2023/24 (7 years)
RMT 01/17	10/01/2017	£90,000	Tenancy Refurb. - 2 properties	c. £5,000	2031/32 (15 years)
RMM 32/17	01/08/2017	145,000	Tenancy Refurb – 1 property	c. £7,125	2041/42 (25 years)
RMM 38/17	04/10/2017	75,000	Pool car replacements	C £6,100	2023/24 (7 years)

The annual charge to the budget is based on the same principle as external debt, in that the service is charged annually a fixed amount, with a proportion covering interest (based on the prevailing fixed rate from the Public Works Loan Board at the time the sum is advanced) and the remainder repaying the original capital sum, over a term reflecting the nature of the underlying asset and its life. At some point external debt might need to be raised to cover any outstanding amounts but currently it is more cost effective to use internal funds.

7. The Budget Monitoring Group met during the year and as usual paid close attention to trading income, that being the least controllable element within baseline budgets; there were no significant areas of concern which would merit reporting to Committee during the year, although it was noted that Visitor Centre income was below previous years and the outturn would be adverse because of the temporary closure of the Castleton Visitor Centre during refurbishment.

Base Rates were increased from 0.25% to 0.5% in November 2017, and investment receipts have improved slightly from the previous year as a result; the actual interest rate earned from the Treasury Management of the cash balances reduced from 0.52% at the beginning of the year to 0.42% midyear, improving towards the end of the year to 0.6%. Interest earned was £41,227. The budget for 2018/19 was approved with an increased interest receipt expectation, of £50,000.

8. At the outturn stage it is sometimes possible to make temporary resource allocations, based on actual results. The current year's outturn shows that there are not likely to be any extra funds available for allocation, after taking account of slippage requests and specific reserve requests, subject to confirming final accounting provisions. The table illustrates how these "outturn" resources have varied in the past few years:-

	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Midyear Review allocation	95,000	0	45,690	0
Surplus for reallocation	0	34,000	0	185,000
Slippage approved	1,147,550	799,189	764,467	518,984

9. Resource Management Meeting (RMM) discussed the outturn figures and slippage recommendations on the 8th May.

10. The main points in the appendices are summarised as follows:

Reserve Levels (Appendix D)

- (a) General Reserve: The General Reserve exists to accommodate unforeseen circumstances and was £647,851 in March 2017. The proposal is that a level of £650,000 is sufficient and any increase above this figure if confirmed in July will be available for allocation alongside other investment discussions (although this year that may be a very small amount).

The level of the General Reserve needs to take account of about 8 principal variable factors – contingent liabilities; the quality of budgetary control; loss of key staff, policy or delivery changes; the extent of demand-led services; unidentified future budget savings; significant capital projects; and the availability of other reserves. Generally the Authority only has one or two of the above factors to consider in any one year; however up to four are currently pertinent.

The external auditors consider the adequacy of the Authority's reserve levels as part of their overall audit opinion and it is an important component of their financial viability assessment.

- (b) Specific Reserves: The level of specific reserves overall has increased by £297,000. The reserves are being operated in accordance with agreed policies, allowing services to draw from and add to their reserves in line with their longer term programmes, especially in relation to tackling backlog maintenance of properties occupied.
- (c) Capital Reserve: The Capital Receipts reserve started the year at £1,188,163, and there were sale receipts during the year of 8 further woodlands and the disposal of 3 vehicles. The net receipts from these sales are added to the Reserve, increasing the reserve by £136,474, in line with the approved Capital Programme and needed to sustain that expenditure programme. The reserve was also used to support previously authorised Environmental works and the Board Room floor (Minute 58/11), plus the partially completed alterations at Aldern House (ARP Minute 52/14), expenditure totalling £31,695
- (d) Slippage Reserve: This Reserve operates differently from the other reserves in the sense that the funds do not remain within the reserve if they are required in the following year: basically the amount of slippage approved in Appendix C is temporarily held on the balance sheet on 31st March and is then immediately allocated into the budgets upon committee approving the slippage amount. The National Park Grant Memorandum which the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) uses to govern National Park finances states that "The Department will consider the level of end-year cash balances in assessing grant for subsequent years. In doing so it will take account of a NPA's need to maintain appropriate working balances and contingency provision and of factors which may necessitate the deferral of expenditure around the year end in order to safeguard value for money." It is this final purpose for which slippage is recognised as an essential tool for managing National Park finances over financial years. The level of slippage fluctuates year on year and the 2017/18 level is £1,147,550 which is approximately 160% of its long term average of £693,669.

(e) Matched Funding Reserve:

This reserve was created to protect funds committed to partnership projects. The Authority's annual contributions to these projects tend to be allocated on a straight line basis across the years of the project to facilitate budget planning, and the actual expenditure pattern is often very different between years: this, together with the accounting requirement to allocate partner income to expenditure proportionately to the contributions originally determined in the application means that unspent Authority funds committed to the projects in contracts with funding bodies need to be ring-fenced and carried forward to match expenditure, when required in future years, in order to fulfil the commitment. This reserve has also been used to ring fence funds approved for re-allocation. The reserve level is likely to be sustained at quite high levels in the next four years as new commitments are made up to 2019/20.

Revenue Account & Services

11. Appendix A, Column F, shows the final budget surplus or deficit arising from each service, after appropriations to and from reserves and slippage requests have been taken into account, and is useful to refer to along with the comments below, which only pick out the larger variances.

- (a) The Countryside & Economy Service budget variances are explained by vacancy savings and the desire to understand how the new national scheme grant awards would be distributed before committing to Authority funds.
- (b) The £318,000 core costs of the Moors for the Future team were recovered, based on partnership contributions to core costs and recovery of costs from projects towards supporting the core team. The Authority's contribution was £96,000. The budget is consistent with the operational plan presented to ARP Committee members in January 2018.
- (c) The Planning Service fee-based planning applications in £ terms were £45,000 above the previous year, £23,000 above budget estimate, whereas pre application advice fees nearly met the estimate, achieving £46,000, compared to the estimate of £50,000. Overall numbers of chargeable applications were up to 690 from 670 the previous year; larger applications also making up the higher fee level. Overall the service budget was helped by much higher vacancy savings than usual, with a net surplus of £90,000. A S.106 payment of £55,000 was also received, which is not included in the above figures.
- (d) The Warslow estate balanced its budget and achieved full cost recovery.
- (e) The North Lees estate exceeded its 93% full cost recovery target and managed full cost recovery (actually 111%). This was due to a number of positive factors, including net income from the campsite above budget of £19,000, reduced input costs for rented properties, and higher income from Surprise View car park.
- (f) The non-Estate car park budget suffered from a combination of lower car park receipts, a change in card payment machine operator, the cost of machine replacements and the advertising of statutory notices for the public consultation on car park proposals. There was less expenditure on maintenance of non-Estate toilets in 2017/18 helping to offset the car parks' deficit.
- (g) The Trails' budget underspend of £144,000 arises from extra income above budget (£15,000) and deferred ground maintenance expenditure relating to phasing of essential infrastructure work and is appropriated to the Specific Reserve. The level of the Trails reserve is much better than in previous years

when Members have expressed concerns about its low level. These funds will be supplemented by the Capital Programme approval for infrastructure work, approved by this committee in September 2016 (Minute 51/16)

- (h) Visitor centre sales were £13,000 above the previous year with overall sales in the region of £441,000. Lower visitor numbers and the temporary closure of the Castleton Visitor Centre pending refurbishment were the main causes of the budget overspend. The interpretation improvements require draw down of the remaining reserve.
- (i) The Cycle Hire Service continued its implementation of the improvement plan, and the year end result shows another very strong performance, with a year end surplus of £22,000 which more than covers the service's full cost. The surplus is requested to be appropriated to the specific reserve to carry out further service improvements.
- (j) The ICT service implemented its programme to change the basis of its provision to an infrastructure as a service model within budget and is achieving the objectives of the project.
- (k) There were vacancy savings in the Customer & Business Support Team
- (l) The new Corporate Strategy team slippage requests are for ring-fenced funds towards the climate change vulnerability assessment.
- (m) The Legal Services funds ring-fenced for legal actions which were not required in 2017/18 are carried forward into the Minerals and Legal Reserve. The level of the Reserve allows the Authority to make strong responses in defence of its policies.
- (n) The corporate training programmes for 2017/18 were delayed and are requested to be carried forward into 2018/19.
- (o) The corporate overhead recovery fund is managed by the Director of Corporate Strategy and Development and collects the agreed recharges levied against all externally funded projects who have staff in post, which support the extra demands placed on Corporate Support Services (finance, legal, IT, HR, property) as a result of these activities. The demands are assessed by the director and commitments have been agreed for 2018/19 onwards – hence the remaining sum is requested as slippage to help meet the agreed demands in 2018/19 and 2019/20. It is in the nature of this fund that the charges to projects occur in advance of the supporting allocations so there is usually a timing difference between the income being received in the fund, and the subsequent expenditure.
- (p) The Projects in Appendix A are separately shown away from the “core” budgets as they all rely on either Partnership or external grant funding and are ring-fenced for those purposes. The expenditure on these projects can be substantial and the Authority's cash contribution – often small in relation to the grant funding - is shown in the budget, or may be represented by in-kind contributions. If a project is entirely externally funded / has in-kind contributions, then the budget will show as zero – and also the outturn position (i.e. net expenditure) will be zero, illustrating that the gross expenditure has been fully balanced by the external income. Although this is the most appropriate presentation in respect of the overall impact on the budget, it does not of course show the actual expenditure of each project. Projects with expenditure over £150,000 have all been approved by ARP (or its predecessor) Committee; the smaller projects over £50,000 are approved by Resource Management Team in line with Standing Orders. If Members wish to see more analysis the Head of Finance will provide detailed breakdowns on

request. The comments section of Appendix A highlights the principal funder and the total expenditure of the larger projects.

12. The current policy on under and overspends at year end is longstanding and was confirmed by the original Resources Committee on 19 July 2002 and is as follows:
- overspends are carried forward and found from service budgets the following year unless there are extenuating circumstances
 - For underspends or surpluses remaining at year end, budget holders may bid for slippage (where commitments have already been made) or where specific reserves exist, for the balance to be appropriated to these reserves.
 - All other underspends or surpluses are allocated to general reserve.
13. The RMM has reviewed the circumstances surrounding any overspends, and is content that where these have occurred, they are capable of being contained within overall service or divisional responsibilities, or dealt with corporately without impact on reserves, and no recommendations are put forward for these overspends to be carried forward and retrieved from next year's service budgets.
14. The following appendices are provided to give a full analysis of the outturn:

Appendix A

A variance analysis which highlights the individual service under or overspends, together with the impact of the proposed slippage and reserve requests on the overall figures – based on over and underspends from Appendix B. Column F shows the final balance of surpluses and deficits, with the total surplus or deficit at the bottom being the impact on the general fund. It should be noted that an “underspend” may arise from additional income earned above budget.

Appendix B

The outturn in the form in which budget responsibility is allocated and monitored during the year. This Annex is used as the basis for RMM decisions on over and underspends, as it reflects directorate and service head budget responsibilities. A full analysis of income and expenditure by service/function and by type of income and expenditure is available on request to the Head of Finance.

Appendix C

C (i) lists the recommended slippage requests put forward by service heads and Directors for carry forward of unspent funds into the 2018/19 budget. C (ii) lists the recommended appropriations to or from specific reserves. C (iii) contains the overspends proposed to be carried forward against the 2018/19 service or project budget, if any.

Appendix D

Shows the level of the Authority's cash reserves, after all the above adjustments.

15. There may be some late adjustments arising from final provisions and system reconciliations, any final changes in the figures between this report and the final position will be reported to Members in the accounts report.

Proposals

16. In terms of the Authority's overall financial position, the outturn for the 2017/18 is as presented, and the actions recommended in Appendix C are regarded as an appropriate way of managing the Authority's resources across financial years.

17. Reserve levels have been maintained at the levels required to meet statutory requirements, to provide a prudent level of provision for substantial asset liabilities, and to give strong support to our planning policies in the legal process; they represent limited and temporary one-off sources of funds which allow the Authority to maintain stability of National Park outcomes into the medium term.

Are there any corporate considerations Member should be concerned about?

18. **Financial:** The issues have been covered in the report.

19. **Risk Management:**

The Chief Finance Officer has a statutory responsibility under Sections 25 – 28 of the Local Government Act 2003 to report to Members, the Monitoring Officer and external auditors on the robustness of the budget setting and monitoring process, and has an express duty to monitor the budget and underlying assumptions throughout the year, and to take action when significant overspends or shortfalls in income occur. The Annual Governance Statement prepared by the Monitoring Officer is reported to and approved by Members. Management Team consider financial risks in the Risk Register during the year.

The External Auditor assesses the financial position of the Authority as part of its annual Value for Money conclusion.

This outturn report and the recommendations arising from it are considered to be evidence of the effectiveness of these processes as they relate to the 2017/18 financial year.

20. **Sustainability:** There are no issues relevant to this report.

Consultees

21. The outturn was discussed and agreed by the Resource Management Meeting (RMM) on the 8th May.

22. **Background Papers** (not previously published)

Full income and expenditure analysis

Appendices

Appendix A - 2017/18 Variance Analysis

Appendix B - 2017/18 Outturn by services within divisional headings

Appendix C - Slippage and reserve requests

Appendix D - Reserve Levels

Report Author, Job Title and Publication Date

Philip Naylor, Head of Finance / Chief Finance Officer, May 2018

		Col A	Col B	Col C	Col D	Col E	Col F	Col G
		(Overspend)	Underspend	Capital - (overspend) underspend	Slippage requests App C i	Appropriations (to) from reserves App C ii	Final Surplus (Deficit)	Main Cause of Variance / Comments
Conservation and Planning								
Rural Economy	Gp.	0	82		(86)		(4)	Vacancy saving& awaiting national scheme grant decisions
Natural Environment	CNE	0	0		(5)		(4)	-
Cultural Heritage	CAR	0	6		(20)		(14)	-
Moors for the Future core costs	RMF	(1)	0				(1)	-
Planning Service	PDC	0	145		(102)	(55)	(12)	S.106 payment; vacancy savings; fee income above estimate
Transport Policy	PTT	0	28		(28)		0	vacancy saving & programme saving
Policy Planning	PPP	0	13		(13)		0	-
		(1)	274	0	(253)	(55)	(35)	
Commercial Development & Outreach								
Rangers	Gp.	0	41		(56)	(7)	(22)	vacancy savings
Rangers, Projects	RAM	0	64		(63)		1	Ring fenced project funds: Derwent Valley
Learning and Discovery Team	LD1	0	10		(3)		8	-
Visitor Experience (V.E.)	HWA	(1)	0	(4)			(6)	-
V.E: Access & Rights of Way	RRU	0	7				7	-
V.E: Footpaths & Pennine Way	GP.	0	27		(33)		(6)	earmarked funds for funding 1 yr contract post in 18/19
V.E: Edale Centre premises costs	HWE	(3)	0				(3)	-
V.E: Warslow Estate	CEW	0	36	(12)		(25)	0	-
V.E: Eastern Moors Estate	CEE	0	3				3	-
V.E: North Lees Estate	CEN	0	39			(39)	0	higher income receipts in particular campsite pods
V.E: Minor Properties	CEM	0	6			(6)	0	-
V.E: Non-Estate Recreation facilities	Gp.	(2)	0				(2)	-
V.E: Non-Estate Car Parks	CEP	(51)	0				(51)	lower receipts; machine replacement & publication of notices
V.E: Non-Estate Toilets	CET	0	18				18	reduced maintenance expenditure
V.E: Woodlands	JAA	0	16	129		(129)	16	woodland disposals & reduced operating costs
V.E: Estate Workers	CED	(6)	0				(6)	-
V.E: Rural Surveyors	HWB	0	9				9	-
V.E: Trails	CEQ-Z	0	145			(145)	0	deferred maintenance expenditure
V.E: Visitor Centres	RVC	(57)	0	(36)		29	(63)	Castleton first quarter closure; lower Bakewell trading
V.E: Cycle Hire	CEB	0	21			(20)	1	good trading year
Fundraising	RFU	0	163		(155)		8	deferred giving strategy expenditure
Communications	RII	0	50				50	vacancy savings
Design	RDE	0	2				2	-
		(119)	657	77	(310)	(341)	(35)	
Corporate Resources								
Information Management	AIT	0	50	(0)		(50)	0	-
Aldern House HQ	AHQ	0	22	(25)		12	8	-
Customer & Business Support	AIC	0	46		(8)		38	Vacancy savings
Corporate Strategy	PPM	0	138		(137)		1	ring fenced funds for climate change
Property Support Unit	Gp.	0	12		(12)		0	-
Finance	AFS	0	11		(10)		1	-
Legal Services	ALE	0	28			(28)	0	lower costs for external legal advice
-Committee & Member Services	Gp.	0	10				10	-
Human Resources	APE	0	31		(46)		(15)	mainly deferred corporate and vocational training
Corporate Management	ACS	0	3	(6)		5	2	-
-Corporate Overhead Recovery	ABQ	0	176		(176)		0	Charges received from projects committed in 18/19 onwards
		0	527	(32)	(389)	(61)	46	
Projects - externally funded								
<i>Conservation & Planning Projects</i>								
Ecton Mine Project	VBE	0	0				0	English Heritage funded £10,000 expenditure
Sustainable Development Fund	VBH	0	0				0	PDNPA funded £4,000 expenditure
Farmsteads	VBZ	0	0				0	
South West Peak	VSW	0	0				0	South West Peak HLF funded £267,000 expenditure
Village & Communities Officer	VMC	0	50		(50)		0	Partnership funding £30,000 expenditure
Rural Enabling	VME	0	10		(10)		0	Partnership funding £9,000 expenditure
Brownfields	VMG	0	52		(52)		0	DHCLG funding £13,000 expenditure
Moors for the Future (MFF)	VC6	(0)	0				(0)	Partners/govt/water co/NT contracts £233,000
MFF - Private Lands	VM2	(0)	0				(0)	Natural England funded £854,000 expenditure
Moorlife	VC8	(4)	0				(4)	European Life funded £4,000 expenditure
Moorlife 2020	VM3	(0)	0				(0)	European funded £1,336,000 expenditure
Moorlife Partners	VM4	0	0				0	Moorlife Partners funded £292,000 expenditure
Peatland Project	VM5	0	0				0	Defra funded £0 expenditure
Edale Station	VGL	0	0				0	car park machine collection for partner authority
Edale Explorer	VGO	0	20		(20)		0	remaining funds Peak connections for Edale explorer
<i>Commercial Dpvt. & Outreach Projects</i>								
Fire Operations Group	VFA	0	32		(32)		0	Partnership funding £6,000 expenditure
Access Fund	VFH	0	16		(16)		0	external donations
Peak Park Pedals	VFP	0	1		(1)		0	-
Mend Our Mountains	Gp.	0	0		(0)		0	-
Pedal Peak 3	VZJ	0	6		(6)		0	car park machine collection for partner authority
Moorland Discovery	VEF	0	1				1	remaining funds Peak connections for Edale explorer
Better Outside	VEH	0	9		(9)		0	-
<i>Corporate Projects</i>								
Visit England	VDE	(2)	0				(2)	Visit England funded £305,000 expenditure
Asset Mgt Revenue Account	VDY	0	0				0	Capital minimum revenue provision holding a/c
Matched Funding Appropriations	VDX	0	27				27	Provisions & accruals holding a/cs; also bequests received
		(6)	224	0	(195)	0	23	
		(127)	1,683	45	(1,147)	(457)	(2)	
		(34)	39		(1)		38	contingencies in 17/18 not allocated
			11				(34)	approved use 17/18
		(161)	1,733	45	(1,148)	(457)	13	surplus in investment interest receipts

This page is intentionally left blank

Rounding Errors may occur		Col A	Col B	Col C	Col D	Col E
		Total Budget 2017/18	Outturn	Overspend	Underspend	Variance %
Conservation and Planning						
Rural Economy	Gp.	369	287	0	82	22%
Natural Environment	CNE	205	205	0	0	0%
Cultural Heritage	CAR	202	196	0	6	3%
Moors for the Future core costs	RMF	108	109	(1)	0	(1%)
Planning Service	PDC	551	406	0	145	26%
Transport Policy	PTT	106	78	0	28	26%
Policy Planning	PPP	142	129	0	13	9%
		1,683	1,411	(1)	274	16%
Commercial Development & Outreach						
Rangers	Gp.	722	681	0	41	6%
Rangers, Projects	RAM	38	(26)	0	64	168%
Learning and Discovery Team	LD1	129	119	0	10	8%
Visitor Experience (V.E.)	HWA	46	48	(1)	0	(3%)
V.E: Access & Rights of Way	RRU	113	106	0	7	6%
V.E: Footpaths & Pennine Way	GP.	32	5	0	27	85%
V.E: Edale Centre premises costs	HWE	48	50	(3)	0	(5%)
V.E: Warslow Estate	CEW	(58)	(94)	0	36	(63%)
V.E: Eastern Moors Estate	CEE	25	22	0	3	10%
V.E: North Lees Estate	CEN	(66)	(104)	0	39	(59%)
V.E: Minor Properties	CEM	0	(6)	0	6	100%
V.E: Non-Estate Recreation facilities	Gp.	(5)	(3)	(2)	0	33%
V.E: Non-Estate Car Parks	CEP	(70)	(19)	(51)	0	73%
V.E: Non-Estate Toilets	CET	97	80	0	18	18%
V.E: Woodlands	JAA	48	31	0	16	34%
V.E: Estate Workers	CED	44	50	(6)	0	(14%)
V.E: Rural Surveyors	HWB	95	85	0	9	10%
V.E: Trails	CEQ-Z	132	(14)	0	145	111%
V.E: Visitor Centres	RVC	153	210	(57)	0	(37%)
V.E: Cycle Hire	CEB	(39)	(60)	0	21	(53%)
Fundraising	RFU	242	79	0	163	67%
Communications	RII	275	224	0	50	18%
Design	RDE	17	16	0	2	10%
		2,017	1,479	(119)	657	27%
Corporate Strategy & Development						
Information Management	AIT	558	508	0	50	9%
Aldern House HQ	AHQ	203	181	0	22	11%
Customer & Business Support	AIC	409	363	0	46	11%
Corporate Strategy	PPM	352	214	0	138	39%
Property Support Unit	Gp.	188	176	0	12	6%
Finance	AFS	270	259	0	11	4%
Legal Services	ALE	264	236	0	28	11%
-Committee & Member Services	Gp.	229	219	0	10	4%
Human Resources	APE	254	222	0	31	12%
Corporate Management	ACS	476	472	0	3	1%
-Corporate Overhead Recovery	ABQ	(89)	(265)	0	176	(198%)
		3,113	2,585	0	527	17%
Capital						
Warslow Moors Capital	Gp.	172	184	(12)	0	(7%)
Forestry Capital	ZAD	0	(129)	0	129	100%
Edale Centre (Moors Project)	ZFA	7	7	0	0	0%
Visitor Centre Capital	Gp.	63	99	(36)	0	(57%)
Other Visitor Experience Capital	Gp.	0	4	(4)	0	100%
Fleet Management	ZGA	33	33	(0)	0	(0%)
Aldern House	Gp.	38	63	(25)	0	(67%)
Carbon Mgt Plan	Gp.	0	6	(6)	0	100%
IT Capital	Gp.	95	95	(0)	0	(0%)
		409	364	(84)	129	11%
Projects - externally funded						
<i>Conservation & Planning Projects</i>						
Ecton Mine Project	VBE	0	0	0	0	0%
Sustainable Development Fund	VBH	4	4	0	0	0%
Farmsteads	VBZ	0	(0)	0	0	0%
South West Peak	VSW	7	7	0	0	2%
Village & Communities Officer	VMC	81	31	0	50	62%
Rural Enabling	VME	19	9	0	10	53%
Brownfields	VMG	30	(22)	0	52	171%
Moors for the Future (MFF)	VC6	0	0	(0)	0	0%
MFF - Private Lands	VM2	0	0	(0)	0	0%
Moorlife	VC8	0	4	(4)	0	100%
Moorlife 2020	VM3	8	8	(0)	0	(4%)
Moorlife Partners	VM4	0	0	0	0	0%
Peatland Project	VM5	0	0	0	0	0%
Edale Station	VGL	0	(0)	0	0	0%
Edale Explorer	VGO	20	0	0	20	0%
<i>Commercial Dpvt. & Outreach Projects</i>						
Fire Operations Group	VFA	27	(5)	0	32	117%
Access Fund	VFH	16	0	0	16	99%
Peak Park Pedals	VFP	1	0	0	1	100%
Mend Our Mountains	Gp.	0	(0)	0	0	0%
Pedal Peak 3	VZJ	13	7	0	6	45%
Moorland Discovery	VEF	16	15	0	1	8%
Better Outside	VEH	12	3	0	9	72%
<i>Corporate Projects</i>						
Visit England	VDE	0	2	(2)	0	100%
Asset Mgt Revenue Account	VDY	54	54	0	0	0%
Matched Funding Appropriations	VDX	0	(27)	0	27	100%
		308	90	(6)	224	71%
Total		7,531	5,929	(211)	1,812	21%

This page is intentionally left blank

(i) Slippage Requests recommended for carrying forward into next year's service budgets

£0 - pounds

Conservation and Planning

vacancy savings and additional planning income earmarked for extra enforcement capacity	101,798
Vacancy saving from Tree conservation officer post c/f to catch up on backlog of priority work	4,800
Vacancy savings and income c/f to cover part contract Countryside & Economy advisor posts	29,496
Unspent land management grant funds c/f to add to the grant budget for 2018/19	56,547
Contribution to Edale Explorer (£14.1k) and Transport Design Guide publication (£13.4k)	27,579
Additional capacity to support village survey work in support of plan review	13,000
contributions to archaeology projects, quinquennial/ building at risk surveys	20,168
	253,388

Commercial Development & Outreach

Giving baseline budget not spent in 2017/18 c/f to support charity development, DMP contribution and audience insight work	120,000
General non-specific donations received ring fenced for specific projects to be determined	7,321
Joint partner funds ring-fenced for Derwent Valley projects	62,794
Fundraising vacancy savings & allocation for fundraising support c/f for fundraising development work in 2018/19	28,000
Basic Health & Safety training (driving / trailers / chainsaws/ strimmers etc) for field teams	38,240
Learning Team classroom and uniform expenditure	2,500
Countryside Maintenance Project Team Ranger fixed term contract post	22,950
Deferred expenditure on volunteer ranger training and uniform costs	19,632
Arrears of electricity and external donation North Area	8,048
	309,485

Corporate Strategy & Development

Revised final year VAT agreement with DCC including VAT registration advice	10,000
Customer and Business Support Team vacancy savings c/f to support Outreach administration transfer into the team	8,000
Climate Change vulnerability assessment	95,000
Outsourced work for completion of the second Carbon Management Plan project and development of next NPMP	21,350
External asset valuations for the 2017/18 annual accounts	8,000
National Park Management Plan next stages	3,000
Vacancy savings to support National Parks UK joint working	10,000
Property Service Aldern House project management costs for committed works	11,937
HR - funding temporary fixed term contract extension	4,607
HR - other HR (Mediation / safeguarding)	4,357
HR - system development e-recruit and Carval HR system	12,625
HR- vocational and corporate training commitments c/f into 2017/18	24,506
corporate overhead allocated to support service pressures arising from projects 18/19 onwards	176,165
	389,547

Capital

0

0**Projects**

Peak connections partner funding c/f to support implementation of Edale explorer in 2018	20,000
Brownfields site officer funding c/f financed by DHCLG	52,219
Partner funding for field projects including Fire Operations Group, Better Outside project	40,523
Income from donations to Access Fund & Mend our Mountains c/f and retained for purposes of donation	16,855
Pedal Peak matched funding contribution - programme behind schedule	5,648
Village project funds - Community planning and neighbourhood grants ringfenced	59,885
	195,130

TOTAL SLIPPAGE REQUESTS**1,147,550****(ii) Reserve Requests recommended for approval and appropriation to/(from) reserves**

Appropriation to Cycle Hire Reserve	20,973
Appropriation to Warslow Reserve	24,500
Appropriation to Minerals and Legal Reserve	27,000
Appropriation to Aldern House Reserve	13,820
Appropriation to North Lees Reserve	38,617
Appropriation from Visitor Centre Reserve	(29,146)
Appropriation to Trails Reserve	145,000
Appropriation to ICT Reserve	50,000
Appropriation to Minor Properties Reserve	6,164
Appropriation to S.106 Reserve: Endcliffe Bakewell	55,000
Appropriation from capital reserve - AH (ARP Minute 52/14); Carbon plan & Minor wks (ARP Minute 58/11) Warslow (07/06)	(31,695)
Appropriation to capital reserve - vehicle sales; woodland sales	136,474
	456,707

(iii) Overspends to be carried forward and set against next year's service budget**0**

This page is intentionally left blank

Movement on Reserves and Reserve Levels

	Opening Balance 01/04/17	Agreed use 2017/18	contingencies / not allocated / 16/17 overspends clawed back	extra interest receipts above/(below) budget	App B Col D Impact of underspends / income at year end	App B Col C Impact of overspends at year end	App C (ii) Further Reserve requests	App C (i) Slippage requests	Closing Balance 31/03/18
General Fund	647,851	(34,000)	39,154	11,397	1,812,036	(210,557)	(456,707)	(1,147,550)	661,624
Capital Reserve	1,188,163						104,779		1,292,942
	1,836,014	(34,000)	39,154	11,397	1,812,036	(210,557)	(351,928)	(1,147,550)	1,954,566
Specific Reserves									
Car Parks & Facilities	36,901								36,901
Trails Reserve	226,910						145,000		371,910
Aldern House	33,800						13,820		47,620
ICT	196,816						50,000		246,816
Warslow	15,966						24,500		40,466
Design	42,106								42,106
Visitor Services	29,146						(29,146)		0
Woodland	18,140								18,140
Cycle Hire	69,798						20,973		90,771
Vehicle Maintenance	18,009								18,009
Planned Maintenance	21,545								21,545
Minerals & Legal	480,959						27,000		507,959
Restructuring	146,693								146,693
North Lees	40,329						38,617		78,946
Minor Properties	10,000						6,164		16,164
Conservation Acquisitions	19,000								19,000
	1,406,118	0	0	0	0	0	296,928	0	1,703,046
Matched Funding	1,018,686	26,400							1,045,086
Slippage Reserve	902,062	(799,189)						1,147,550	1,250,423
Restricted Funds	208,159						55,000		263,159
	5,371,039	(806,789)	39,154	11,397	1,812,036	(210,557)	0	0	6,216,280

This page is intentionally left blank

9. INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT BLOCK 2, 2017/18 (A1362/7/PN)

Purpose of the report and key issues

1. This report presents to Members the internal auditors' recommendations for the second block of the 2017/18 audit and the agreed actions for consideration. The Internal Auditors will be available at the meeting to answer any questions relating to the audit report or process as usual.

Key issues include:

- The auditors give an opinion based on five grades of assurance (High / Substantial / Reasonable / Limited / No). The five areas audited – Creditors, Debtors & Income, Information Governance Systems, ICT Controls, and Information and Asset Security compliance, have been given a High, High, Substantial, Substantial and Reasonable level of assurance respectively.
- The priority of agreed actions is determined based on a scale of 1 – 3, with 1 representing a fundamental system weakness which needs urgent attention, 2 a significant weakness which needs attention, and 3 no significant weakness but merits attention. Managers have responded to 3 Priority 2 actions and 2 Priority 3 actions.

2. Recommendations

1. **That the internal audit reports for the five areas covered under Block 2 for 2017/18 be received (in Appendices 1 - 5) and the agreed actions considered.**

How does this contribute to our policies and legal obligations?

3. As identified in the Annual Governance Statement, the Internal Audit process is regarded as an important part of the overall internal controls operated by the Authority and recommendations are addressed by the Authority's managers in the management response to the audit report.

Background

4. The Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 require that the Authority maintains an adequate and effective system of internal audit of its accounting records and its system of internal control in accordance with proper practices in relation to internal control. The contract for the internal audit service is let to Veritau Ltd. Officers in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of this committee approved a two year extension of the current contract up to 31st March 2019 (the original contract was a three year contract starting April 2014, with an option to extend for two years). The Internal Audit Plan for 2017/18 was approved by this committee in May 2017.

Proposals

5. Managers have carefully considered the internal auditors' recommendations and the agreed actions are set out in the audit reports in Appendices 1 - 5 for members' consideration.

Are there any corporate implications members should be concerned about?

Financial:

6. There are resource implications of implementing recommendations and this is why prioritisation of action is important as this has to be managed within existing budgets and staffing levels, taking account of the level of risk agreed by management. The cost of the Internal Audit Service Level Agreement is found from within the overall Finance budget.

Risk Management:

7. The Internal Audit process is regarded as an important part of the overall internal controls operated by the Authority.

Sustainability:

8. There are no implications to identify.
9. **Background papers** (not previously published) – None

Appendices -

Appendix 1: Creditors
Appendix 2: Debtors & Income
Appendix 3: Information Governance
Appendix 4: ICT Controls
Appendix 5: Information & Asset Security Compliance

Report Author, Job Title and Publication Date

Philip Naylor, Head of Finance, 10 May 2018



Income and Debtors

Peak District National Park Authority

Internal Audit Report 2017/18

Business Unit: Finance
 Responsible Officer: Director of Corporate Services
 Service Manager: Head of Finance
 Date Issued: 12 April 2018
 Status: Final
 Reference: 69120/002

	P1	P2	P3
Actions	0	0	0
Overall Audit Opinion	High Assurance		

Introduction

The majority of income for the Peak District National Park Authority is received from grants. However income is also received from a variety of services, including car parks and concessions, visitor centres, and cycle hire. Total income from services as of the 2017/18 budget is £9,865,000, made up of sales fees and charges and grant/partnership income.

One of the corporate objectives for the Authority is to increase both commercial and non-trading income. This objective was due to be addressed, at least in part, by increasing car parking fees and a move towards enforcement planned to begin in 2018/19. The Authority receives rental income which totalled £272,623 for 2016/17.

The majority of debts are raised on the Exchequer Financial System and as such are able to be monitored centrally in respect to the collection, debt monitoring and write off. The short term debtors figure in the annual accounts was £2,562,183 as of 31 March 2017.

Objectives and Scope of the Audit

The purpose of this audit was to provide assurance to management that procedures and controls within the system ensured that:

- there was a formal strategy in place regarding increases in income, and there were appropriate performance management arrangements and corporate monitoring arrangements including budget reporting and reporting to Members to ensure that income targets were being achieved;
- the system was operated in accordance with Authority Financial Regulations, VAT rules and other relevant legislation and guidance;
- debtors transactions were correctly accounted for by the debtors system and related accounting systems;
- invoices were accurately and promptly raised for goods or services provided and income was accurately credited to accounts;
- appropriate recovery action was taken where invoices were not paid within specified timescales;
- all income was banked promptly; and
- income collection arrangements were secure.

Key Findings

The PDNPA has a strong set of corporate objectives which are agreed by Members annually. Directional shift 4 relates to growing income and supporters. One of the main focus areas is to achieve commercial programme income targets.

One of the commercial targets related to increased car parking charges. Parking charges across other Park Authorities and other local charges have been reviewed. A decision was made to increase car parking charges. The new charges have yet to be implemented as a change in byelaws is required. A change in byelaws is required and the Authority are currently awaiting a decision from the Secretary of State, following an

objection, as to whether the new byelaws are to be confirmed so that the charges can be increased.. After a small survey on non-payment of parking charges, enforcement is also due to go ahead with the Authority joining the Derbyshire Parking Partnership, however this is also a complex area which has required, amongst other things, a new traffic order being granted.

Another focus has been on cycle hire. In recent years improvements have been made moving the service from deficit into a significant surplus. .

There are specific policies and procedures for debt recovery and write offs, which detail timescales and responsibilities, ensuring that regulations, legislation and VAT rules are being complied with. A debtors report is run weekly and those outstanding over 30 days follow the agreed procedure of two reminder letters to the debtor at specified intervals, the second letter outlining that the debt will be referred to Legal if not paid in 7 days. Debts over 4 months are recorded on a separate spreadsheet which enables monitoring and recording of any actions between Legal and Finance.

The authority did not have any write-offs, only cancellations and re-issues for incorrect invoice amounts. A sample of aged debts was reviewed to ensure that appropriate recovery action was being taken where invoices were not paid within specified timescales. A sufficient explanation was provided for each. One VAT invoice is still outstanding from December 2016 for a fairly substantial amount of £73,426.19. A chasing letter had been sent out on 25 January 2018 asking for confirmation of payment date. It was also explained that this has taken longer due to the company changing accountants. In another case, a residential tenancy on the Warslow Moors Estate, there have been periods of debt owed to the Authority since 2009. Although have remained relatively low for a period, with contributions being made periodically, the debt has escalated since May 2017 and now stands at £6,065. This figure will only keep increasing with monthly rent contributions of £695 per month. The Authority is well aware of the case and has been proactive in chasing this debt with frequent correspondence to the tenants.

Income collection arrangements both centrally and at the Bakewell Visitor Centre were reviewed. Procedures surrounding the security of cash appeared appropriate. Regular reconciliations were taking place on the cash held at the visitor centre. Staff in Customer and Business Support and at the visitor centres have signed up to the Authority's PCIDSS policy and have undertaken training.

Bank reconciliations are carried out monthly, with preparatory work carried out throughout the month in order to allocate any unallocated income. All reconciliations we reviewed had been signed off by the Head of Finance.

Sales invoices were generally raised within the required two days. All those in the sample had appropriate backing documentation to initiate the sales invoice.

Overall Conclusions

It was found that the arrangements for managing risk were very good. An effective control environment appears to be in operation. Our overall opinion of the controls within the system at the time of the audit was that they provided High Assurance.

Audit Opinions and Priorities for Actions

Audit Opinions

Audit work is based on sampling transactions to test the operation of systems. It cannot guarantee the elimination of fraud or error. Our opinion is based on the risks we identify at the time of the audit.

Our overall audit opinion is based on 5 grades of opinion, as set out below.

Opinion	Assessment of internal control
High Assurance	Overall, very good management of risk. An effective control environment appears to be in operation.
Substantial Assurance	Overall, good management of risk with few weaknesses identified. An effective control environment is in operation but there is scope for further improvement in the areas identified.
Reasonable Assurance	Overall, satisfactory management of risk with a number of weaknesses identified. An acceptable control environment is in operation but there are a number of improvements that could be made.
Limited Assurance	Overall, poor management of risk with significant control weaknesses in key areas and major improvements required before an effective control environment will be in operation.
No Assurance	Overall, there is a fundamental failure in control and risks are not being effectively managed. A number of key areas require substantial improvement to protect the system from error and abuse.

Priorities for Actions

Priority 1	A fundamental system weakness, which presents unacceptable risk to the system objectives and requires urgent attention by management.
Priority 2	A significant system weakness, whose impact or frequency presents risks to the system objectives, which needs to be addressed by management.
Priority 3	The system objectives are not exposed to significant risk, but the issue merits attention by management.

Where information resulting from audit work is made public or is provided to a third party by the client or by Veritau then this must be done on the understanding that any third party will rely on the information at its own risk. Veritau will not owe a duty of care or assume any responsibility towards anyone other than the client in relation to the information supplied. Equally, no third party may assert any rights or bring any claims against Veritau in connection with the information. Where information is provided to a named third party, the third party will keep the information confidential.

This page is intentionally left blank



Creditors 2017-18

Peak District National Park Authority

Internal Audit Report 2017/18

Business Unit: Finance
 Responsible Officer: Head of Finance
 Service Manager: Head of Finance
 Date Issued: 04 April 2018
 Status: Final
 Reference: 69130/003

	P1	P2	P3
Actions	0	0	0
Overall Audit Opinion	High Assurance		



Introduction

It is essential for the Authority that legitimate, valid and prompt payments are made to suppliers. Duplicate, invalid and late payments pose significant risks in the form of fines, unnecessary expenditure and reputational damage. It is therefore imperative that the Authority has a robust control framework and system in place, in order to protect itself from exposure to such risks.

A creditors audit was carried out in 2016/17 and the audit only identified one minor finding relating to the creditors system. This is an additional piece of work using Interactive Data Extraction and Analysis (IDEA) software, which can undertake a 100% review of payments to identify unexpected data, through using data matching and interrogation techniques.

Objectives and Scope of the Audit

The audit used the Interactive Data Extraction and Analysis tool IDEA to carry out a 100 percent check on the creditors database. The checks reviewed the database to identify:

- Potential duplicate payments
- Duplicated creditor records
- Missing or unaccounted for purchase order numbers
- Potential splitting of invoices to remain within authorisation or procurement limits
- Indications that bank details have been fraudulently changed

Key Findings

Our analysis on the authority's payments and supplier details did not have any indication to suggest that there is any major issues with the creditor payments system or that fraudulent activity had taken place. The data analysis identified some potential issues but suitable explanations were provided by officers in all cases.

There was no gap within the purchase order numbers detected. This indicates that there have not been any cancelled or concealed purchase orders. There was no indication that payments had been split so that the payments were beneath the authorisation limits or under limit for a procurement exercise. We found that there were no payments that had no paid date entered without a logical reason e.g. the payments had been cancelled. There was no indication that any payments made to suppliers were duplicated. We also reviewed the supplier details to identify if there any key details that were missing. We did not identify any indication that the bank details had been changed incorrectly or fraudulently.

Overall Conclusions

It was found that the arrangements for managing risk were very good. An effective control environment appears to be in operation. Our overall opinion of the controls within the system at the time of the audit was that they provided High Assurance.

Audit Opinions and Priorities for Actions

Audit Opinions

Audit work is based on sampling transactions to test the operation of systems. It cannot guarantee the elimination of fraud or error. Our opinion is based on the risks we identify at the time of the audit.

Our overall audit opinion is based on 5 grades of opinion, as set out below.

Opinion	Assessment of internal control
High Assurance	Overall, very good management of risk. An effective control environment appears to be in operation.
Substantial Assurance	Overall, good management of risk with few weaknesses identified. An effective control environment is in operation but there is scope for further improvement in the areas identified.
Reasonable Assurance	Overall, satisfactory management of risk with a number of weaknesses identified. An acceptable control environment is in operation but there are a number of improvements that could be made.
Limited Assurance	Overall, poor management of risk with significant control weaknesses in key areas and major improvements required before an effective control environment will be in operation.
No Assurance	Overall, there is a fundamental failure in control and risks are not being effectively managed. A number of key areas require substantial improvement to protect the system from error and abuse.

Priorities for Actions

Priority 1	A fundamental system weakness, which presents unacceptable risk to the system objectives and requires urgent attention by management.
Priority 2	A significant system weakness, whose impact or frequency presents risks to the system objectives, which needs to be addressed by management.
Priority 3	The system objectives are not exposed to significant risk, but the issue merits attention by management.

Where information resulting from audit work is made public or is provided to a third party by the client or by Veritau then this must be done on the understanding that any third party will rely on the information

This page is intentionally left blank



Information Governance

Peak District National Park Authority

Internal Audit Report 2017/18

Business Unit: Corporate Services
 Responsible Officer: Director of Corporate Strategy and Development
 Service Manager: Head of Information Management.
 Date Issued: 06 March 2018
 Status: Final
 Reference: 69140/003

	P1	P2	P3
Actions	0	1	0
Overall Audit Opinion	Substantial Assurance		

Introduction

Information is one of the most valuable assets held by any organisation. The authority should have adequate processes and controls implemented to manage information at an enterprise level, supporting an organisation's immediate and future regulatory, legal, risk, environmental and operational requirements.

The introduction of GDPR in May 2018 has increased the importance of effective controls surrounding information governance. GDPR will introduce additional mandated requirements to the Data Protection Act that it is superseding. Failure to meet these standards could result in a large fine up to the value of 4% of annual global turnover or €20 Million (whichever is greater).

An Information Governance audit carried out in 2014/15 identified seven findings and provided Moderate Assurance. Appropriate actions were agreed to address the issues identified. This was followed up in the 2015/16 Information Governance audit, which identified that suitable progress had taken place and provided a high assurance rating.

Objectives and Scope of the Audit

The purpose of this audit was to provide assurance to management that procedures and controls within the system ensure that:

- The agreed actions within the 2014/15 information governance audit have been maintained
- The authority has made sufficient preparations for the introduction of GDPR.

Key Findings

The agreed actions in the 2014/15 information governance audit report have been maintained or superseded with the introduction of GDPR. The authority has introduced secure bins for disposing of confidential data. The authorities head office, Aldern House uses lock mechanisms that restricts access within the building to authorised personal.

We have found that the authority have acknowledged the importance of sufficient information governance processes in preparation for the implementation of GDPR in May 2018. The authority have carried out a gap analysis of current procedures and processes relating to information governance and compared them to GDPR requirements. This exercise identified where they need to implement actions and an action plan was created based on this. The authority has presented this action plan to senior management. We have reviewed the action plan and found that it contains all main requirements of GDPR. The authority have assigned a Data protection officer (DPO) which is a mandated requirement of GDPR. The DPO has been overseeing the action plan to ensure it is completed.

To educate staff about data protection and GDPR the authority have implemented a training programme. The authority has processes in place to monitor the individuals who have completed the course. There is currently no escalation process in place if an individual does not carry out the training course. In June 2017 the authority assessed what data they hold and created a retention policy based on what data they have stored. However the policy did not explicitly mention the retention of CCTV recordings. The authority is in the process of setting up a data management system that will be used to notify data holders of when data has reached its retention date. When data (hard copy and electronic) is ready for disposal the authority have procedure in place to dispose of it securely.

The authority has defined a data breach within the current version of the Information Management policy. The policy also defines the actions that should be taken when a data breach has been identified and the actions that should be taken in the event that a FOI is received. However the current version of the policy does not define what counts as a FOI. This may be appropriate to include as FOI can be requested in multiple ways.

Before GDPR has come in to effect the authority needs to update their Information Management policy and Privacy notices as well as update their asset register and review new contracts to ensure they comply with GDPR. Once these policies and procedures have been implemented the authority should put in place a monitoring programme to ensure that the policies are being complied with.

Overall Conclusions

The arrangements for managing risk were good with few weaknesses identified. An effective control environment is in operation, but there is scope for further improvement in the areas identified. Our overall opinion of the controls within the system at the time of the audit was that they provided Substantial Assurance.

1 GDPR Readiness

Issue/Control Weakness

The authorities have not taken out all necessary actions to prepare for GDPR.

Risk

The authority does not make necessary changes to information governance processes before GDPR legislation comes in to effect. This would have the potential impact of reputational damage and large fine.

Findings

When GDPR comes in to effect in May 2017 there are a number of actions that the authority would need to carry out in order to become compliant with the regulations. The authority has recognised these actions in an action plan. The action plan covers all the main requirements of GDPR. The authority has fourteen actions on the action plan. At the time of testing (January 2018) the authority was overdue in completing two of the actions that was due to be implemented in December (2017).

There are additional actions that are not scheduled for completion until later in the year, where the authority needs to be able to ensure these are completed as required. It is important that progress is monitored to identify potential delays, and that action is taken to ensure completion. In particular actions that require action by staff or 3rd parties need to include an escalation procedure in case of delays.

Agreed Action 1

The action plan is being actively monitored by the Head of Information Management as a part of the SIRO role with regular update and progress checks taking place. Any delays in completion of actions to be reported to RMM in April as part of the GDPR preparation follow up that was scheduled when the Authority (through RMM) accepted and agreed to these actions as the mechanism for preparing for the GDPR.

Priority

2

Responsible Officer

Head of Information Management

Timescale

30 April 2018

Audit Opinions and Priorities for Actions

Audit Opinions

Audit work is based on sampling transactions to test the operation of systems. It cannot guarantee the elimination of fraud or error. Our opinion is based on the risks we identify at the time of the audit.

Our overall audit opinion is based on 5 grades of opinion, as set out below.

Opinion	Assessment of internal control
High Assurance	Overall, very good management of risk. An effective control environment appears to be in operation.
Substantial Assurance	Overall, good management of risk with few weaknesses identified. An effective control environment is in operation but there is scope for further improvement in the areas identified.
Reasonable Assurance	Overall, satisfactory management of risk with a number of weaknesses identified. An acceptable control environment is in operation but there are a number of improvements that could be made.
Limited Assurance	Overall, poor management of risk with significant control weaknesses in key areas and major improvements required before an effective control environment will be in operation.
No Assurance	Overall, there is a fundamental failure in control and risks are not being effectively managed. A number of key areas require substantial improvement to protect the system from error and abuse.

Priorities for Actions

Priority 1	A fundamental system weakness, which presents unacceptable risk to the system objectives and requires urgent attention by management.
Priority 2	A significant system weakness, whose impact or frequency presents risks to the system objectives, which needs to be addressed by management.
Priority 3	The system objectives are not exposed to significant risk, but the issue merits attention by management.

Where information resulting from audit work is made public or is provided to a third party by the client or by Veritau then this must be done on the understanding that any third party will rely on the information at its own risk. Veritau will not owe a duty of care or assume any responsibility towards anyone other than the client in relation to the information supplied. Equally, no third party may assert any rights or bring any claims against Veritau in connection with the information. Where information is provided to a named third party, the third party will keep the information confidential.

IT Systems Controls

Peak District National Park Authority

Internal Audit Report 2017/18

Business Unit: ICT
 Responsible Officer: Director of Corporate Services
 Service Manager: Head of Information Management
 Date Issued: 23 March 2018
 Status: Final
 Reference: 69180/002

	P1	P2	P3
Actions	0	0	2
Overall Audit Opinion	Substantial Assurance		

Introduction

Local Authorities are becoming ever more reliant on ICT. Councils are using data electronically because it is the most practical and effective way of working. There will likely be increased amounts of data stored within an Authorities network and a greater 'business need' to have network availability. All these factors mean there is a higher level of inherent risk around network security.

A lack of effective security controls within the Authority's network will increase the likelihood of data breaches and people having access to information they should not have. Also the risk that malicious software is used to corrupt the Authority's data has been increasing. Recent research from Barracuda Networks has revealed that 27% of UK local authorities have been affected by ransomware.

ICT services are currently provided by a third party (Server Choice) to Peak District National Park Authority (PDNPA). These services are agreed in a number of Service Level Agreements (SLAs).

Objectives and Scope of the Audit

The purpose of this audit was to provide assurance to management that IT systems, procedures and controls will ensure that:

- The performance of the ICT provider (Server Choice) is monitored to ensure standards set out in the contract are met.
- PDNPA comply with mandated requirements set out in the contract with Sever Choice.
- Access controls are in place to ensure only authorised individuals have access to the authority's data

Key Findings

We have found the authority have effective controls in place to protect the authority's data. Server Choice are meeting the requirements set out in the contract between the two organisations. The PDNPA ICT team have a procedure in place to monitor the performance of Server Choice in line with the contract.

The PDNPA ICT team have obtained assurance that data is secure within the 3rd party's data centre. The ICT team have also been proactive in ensuring data was not at risk when flaws to ICT hardware came to light. Server Choice is responsible for patching the authority's operating system. There is a procedure in place to ensure patches were updated and PDNPA has a record of all updates carried out. There is a suitable roll back procedure in place encase there is an issue with any of the patches.

Server Choice is responsible for completing regular backups of PDNPA data. Officers have confirmation of when backups have been taken. A full organisation wide system back up test has not been carried out. However individual components of the network have been successfully restored from back up.

The Information Management policy informs users of the acceptable use of ICT equipment. All staff are required to sign up to confirm they understand and will follow the policy. The policy is currently under review, following the implementation of a new Business Continuity plan and the introduction of GDPR in May 2018.

There is a procedure in place to ensure that the software licences are up-to-date. There is strong logical access controls in place to ensure that only authorised staff are provided with access.

ICT assets have antivirus software installed on the machines to safeguard against malware. The antivirus software on a small number of assets has not been updated with the latest version software, within one year. This is because the computers have not been connected to the network within this period.

All the assets are managed by the I.T team. Following the 2014/15 audit report it was agreed that IT will perform 6 monthly checks for assets that have reported as not connected to the network for a period of 3 months or more. It was also agreed that an inventory check would be carried out by a member of the finance team. These procedures have not occurred.

Overall Conclusions

The arrangements for managing risk were good with few weaknesses identified. An effective control environment is in operation, but there is scope for further improvement in the areas identified. Our overall opinion of the controls within the system at the time of the audit was that they provided Substantial Assurance.

1 Testing of Disaster Recovery Arrangements.

Issue/Control Weakness

The authority has not carried out a full disaster recovery test, since there has been a change in I.T infrastructure.

Risk

Issues may not be identified within the current disaster recovery arrangements. This may increase the time taken to restore the network following a network outage.

Findings

Since January 2017 Server Choice has been responsible for the restoration of systems following a network outage. In the contract between PDNPA and Server Choice it states 'DR testing is to take place on a 6 monthly basis initially, and upon agreement by the Customer, more infrequently (e.g. Annually or every two years).'

At the time of audit review (January 2018) PDNPA had not carried out any organisation wide tests of disaster recovery arrangements.

The I.T team have made an agreement with Server Choice to carry out a full system disaster recovery test in November 2018. The Authority have not carried out a full network disaster recovery test due to a high volume of work load. This is also partly due to the complication that if PDNPA was to carry out a test of the disaster recovery arrangements they would be charged extra from Oracle for duplicating licenses. Therefore the authority had to find a way of testing the disaster recovery provisions without including Oracle components.

The authority had requested Server Choice carry out tests of individual components of the network which had all been carried out successfully.

Agreed Action 1.1

As noted in this finding, several partial tests have been completed, and work has been progressed in order to disaster test as much of the overall infrastructure as is reasonable without incurring significant licencing costs (note: the licencing issue is accounted for in plans for a disaster and so the issue only applies to simulated scenarios).

As such, a more comprehensive test for the disaster recovery provisions can now be scheduled, and will therefore take place by the end of July 2018.

Priority

3

Responsible Officer

IT Support Officers
(*2)

Timescale

31 July 2018

2 ICT Asset Management.

Issue/Control Weakness

There is no compensating control in place to verify that the authorities' asset management software is accurate.

A small percentage of computers are not used on a regular basis and therefore do not have the latest antivirus updates applied.

Risk

Items, including those containing Authority data, may be lost.

Findings

I.T assets are purchased, monitored and disposed of by the I.T team. The assets location and current user information is logged on an asset management system. There is a small risk that members of the I.T team could dispose of the assets for their personal gain. Following the 2014/15 audit report the authority agreed for a member of the finance team to carry out a periodic independent sample check of ICT hardware invoices which is verified back to the IT inventory. There was no record of this check being carried out and the finance team did not have access to the ICT asset management system, at the time of testing. This is an important compensating control if the authority has machines that are not used for large periods of the year.

The authority has antivirus software loaded on to computers to prevent malicious software from corrupting data. We found out of 314 of the authority's computers, 10 of the computers antivirus software has not been updated in six months. There was a further 4 that had not been updated for more than one year. The laptop antivirus software automatically updates when the computer is connected to the network. Therefore the software is not updated frequently. There is a small risk the computers do not have adequate protection if they are switched on for the first time after being unused for large period of time. In the 2014/15 audit report it was agreed that IT will perform 6 monthly checks for assets that have reported as not connected to the network for a period of 3 months or more. There is no indication to show that this has occurred. This emphasise the importance of carrying out a stock check independent from the I.T team.

Agreed Action 2.1

- A) The Finance team will ensure that an independent sample check of the IT inventory is undertaken annually
- B) Not all computers operate on the PDNPA network. Many of the devices that are reporting as missing virus definitions or as having not connected in 6 months or a year are based at offices that are not on the PDNPA network, and so it is expected behaviour for these devices to show as not connecting for a long period of time. That said however, the virus definitions should still be updating, as the current antivirus

Priority

3

Responsible Officer

Part A – Finance Officers
Part B – Head of Information Management

Timescale

Part A – Completed

software will update through any internet connection and is therefore independent of the PDNPA network.

To mitigate this, improved reporting will be created that will take into account:

- Data from Active Directory showing when a device last connected to the network
- Data from ESET showing when the virus definitions last updated
- Data from the Asset management system showing devices expected to be included in one of the two elements above as well as data showing when an IT support office last inspected that device.

This report will be reviewed on a 6 monthly basis and any unplanned cases of devices not connecting to the network, not having been inspected by an IT support officer and/or not having an up to date anti-virus definition will be investigated further by a member of the IT team.

To supplement this, as a part of the ongoing work to increase network access security, we will also investigate whether it is possible to deny network access to devices that have not received a virus definition update within a reasonable amount of time.

Audit Opinions and Priorities for Actions

Audit Opinions

Audit work is based on sampling transactions to test the operation of systems. It cannot guarantee the elimination of fraud or error. Our opinion is based on the risks we identify at the time of the audit.

Our overall audit opinion is based on 5 grades of opinion, as set out below.

Opinion	Assessment of internal control
High Assurance	Overall, very good management of risk. An effective control environment appears to be in operation.
Substantial Assurance	Overall, good management of risk with few weaknesses identified. An effective control environment is in operation but there is scope for further improvement in the areas identified.
Reasonable Assurance	Overall, satisfactory management of risk with a number of weaknesses identified. An acceptable control environment is in operation but there are a number of improvements that could be made.
Limited Assurance	Overall, poor management of risk with significant control weaknesses in key areas and major improvements required before an effective control environment will be in operation.
No Assurance	Overall, there is a fundamental failure in control and risks are not being effectively managed. A number of key areas require substantial improvement to protect the system from error and abuse.

Priorities for Actions

Priority 1	A fundamental system weakness, which presents unacceptable risk to the system objectives and requires urgent attention by management.
Priority 2	A significant system weakness, whose impact or frequency presents risks to the system objectives, which needs to be addressed by management.
Priority 3	The system objectives are not exposed to significant risk, but the issue merits attention by management.

Where information resulting from audit work is made public or is provided to a third party by the client or by Veritau then this must be done on the understanding that any third party will rely on the information at its own risk. Veritau will not owe a duty of care or assume any responsibility towards anyone other than the client in relation to the information supplied. Equally, no third party may assert any rights or bring any claims against Veritau in connection with the information. Where information is provided to a named third party, the third party will keep the information confidential.

10. INTERNAL AUDIT 2017/18 ANNUAL REPORT (DH)

1. Purpose of the report

This report asks Members to consider the internal audit 2017/18 annual report.

Key Issues

- **The overall opinion of the Head of Internal Audit on the framework of governance, risk management and control operating in the Authority is that it provides Substantial Assurance. There are no qualifications to this opinion and no reliance was placed on the work of other assurance bodies in reaching that opinion. There are also no significant control weaknesses which, in the opinion of the Head of Internal Audit need to be considered for inclusion in the Annual Governance Statement.**
- **Out of 8 areas reviewed in 2017/18 3 areas received an opinion of ‘High’ assurance; 4 “Substantial” and 1 “Reasonable”.**

2. Recommendation(s)

- 1. To note and accept the 2017/18 annual report from the internal auditors as set out in appendix 1.**

3. How does this contribute to our policies and legal obligations?

As identified in the Annual Governance Statement, the Internal Audit process is regarded as an important part of the overall internal controls operated by the Authority.

The Internal Audit reports therefore make a significant contribution to the “Our Organisation” cornerstone by assisting us in developing our organisation so we have a planned and sustained approach to performance at all levels by developing and maintaining appropriate standards of corporate governance and developing key business processes underpinning the Corporate Strategy.

4. Background

The Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 require that the Authority undertakes an adequate and effective system of internal audit of its accounting records and its system of internal control in accordance with proper practices.

5. Proposals

Members are asked to consider the internal audit 2017/18 annual report. The report contains the Head of Internal Audit’s overall assurance opinion, and a summary of the key findings in each area audited during the year.

Are there any corporate implications members should be concerned about?

6. Financial:

The cost of the Internal Audit Service contract is found from within the overall Finance budget.

7. Risk Management:

The Internal Audit process is regarded as an important part of the overall internal controls operated by the Authority.

8. **Sustainability:**
There are no implications to identify.
9. **Equality:**
There are no implications to identify.
10. **Background papers (not previously published)**
None

Appendices

Appendix 1: Internal Audit annual report for year ended March 2018

Report Author, Job Title and Publication Date

David Hickman, Director of Corporate Strategy and Development, 10 May 2017



Peak District National Park Authority

Internal Audit Annual Report

2017-18

Audit Manager: Ian Morton
Head of Internal Audit: Max Thomas

Circulation List: Members of the Audit Resources and Performance Committee
Director of Corporate Strategy & Development
Chief Finance Officer (S151 Officer)

Date: 18 May 2018



Background

- 1 The work of internal audit is governed by the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 and the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards (PSIAS). In accordance with the PSIAS, the Chief Audit Executive (Head of Internal Audit) should provide an annual internal audit opinion and report that can be used by the organisation to inform its governance statement. The annual internal audit opinion must conclude on the overall adequacy and effectiveness of the organisation's framework of governance, risk management and control.
- 2 During the year to 31 March 2018, the Authority's internal audit service was provided by Veritau Limited.

Internal Audit Work Carried Out 2017/18

- 3 During 2017/18, internal audit work was carried out across the full range of activities of the Authority. The main areas of internal audit activity included:

Financial Systems – providing assurance on key areas of financial risk. This helps support the work of the external auditors and provides assurance to the Authority that financial processes are operating correctly and risks of loss are minimised.

Information Systems – providing assurance on information management and data quality.

Operational Systems - providing assurance on operational systems and processes which support service delivery.

Governance / Risk Management - providing assurance on governance arrangements and systems to manage risks to the achievement of corporate objectives.

- 4 No investigations into suspected fraud or other irregularities were carried out during the year
- 5 Appendix A summarises the internal audit work carried out during the year and the opinion given for each report. Appendix B provides details of the key findings arising from our internal audit work for those audits not reported in detail elsewhere on today's agenda. Appendix C provides an explanation of our assurance levels and priorities for management action.

Professional Standards

- 6 In order to comply with the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards (PSIAS) the Head of Internal Audit is required to develop and maintain an ongoing quality assurance and improvement programme (QAIP). The objective of the QAIP is to ensure that working practices continue to conform to the required professional standards. The results of the QAIP should be reported to senior management and the Audit, Resources and Performance Committee along with any areas of non-conformance with the standards. The QAIP consists of various elements, including:
- (a) maintenance of a detailed audit procedures manual and standard operating practices;
 - (b) ongoing performance monitoring of internal audit activity;
 - (c) regular customer feedback;
 - (d) training plans and associated training and development activities;
 - (e) periodic self-assessments of internal audit working practices (to evaluate conformance to the Standards).
- 7 External assessments must be conducted at least once every five years by a qualified, independent assessor or assessment team from outside the organisation. An external assessment was last carried out in April 2014.
- 8 The outcome of the previous QAIP demonstrates that the service conforms to the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards. The QAIP for 2018 is yet to be completed, but further details of the 2018 Quality Assurance and Improvement Action Plan will be provided to this committee when available.

Audit Opinion and Assurance Statement

- 9 In connection with reporting, the relevant professional standard (2450) states that the Chief Audit Executive (CAE)¹ should provide an annual report to the board². The report should include:
- (a) details of the scope of the work undertaken and the time period to which the opinion refers (together with disclosure of any restrictions in the scope of that work)
 - (b) a summary of the audit work from which the opinion is derived (including details of the reliance placed on the work of other assurance bodies)
 - (c) an opinion on the overall adequacy and effectiveness of the organisation's governance, risk and control framework (ie the control environment)
 - (d) disclosure of any qualifications to that opinion, together with the reasons for that qualification
 - (e) details of any issues which the CAE judges are of particular relevance to the preparation of the Annual Governance Statement

¹ The PSIAS refers to the Chief Audit Executive. This is taken to be the Head of Internal Audit.

² The PSIAS refers to the board. This is taken to be the Audit Resources and Performance Committee.

(f) a statement on conformance with the PSIAS and the results of the internal audit Quality Assurance and Improvement Programme

10 The overall opinion of the Head of Internal Audit on the framework of governance, risk management and control operating in the Authority is that it provides **Substantial Assurance**. There are no qualifications to this opinion and no reliance was placed on the work of other assurance bodies in reaching that opinion. There are also no significant control weaknesses which, in the opinion of the Head of Internal Audit need to be considered for inclusion in the Annual Governance Statement.

Table of 207/18 audit assignments completed to 31 March 2018

Audit	Reported to ARP	Assurance Level
Income and Debtors	May 2018	High Assurance
Procurement	January 2018	Substantial Assurance
Creditors	May 2018	High Assurance
Information Governance	May 2018	Substantial Assurance
Performance Management	January 2018	Substantial Assurance
IT Systems control	May 2018	Substantial Assurance
Information Security Compliance check	May 2018	Reasonable Assurance
Risk Management	January 2018	High Assurance

Summary of Key Issues from completed audits not reported elsewhere on this agenda

System/Area	Opinion	Area Reviewed	Reported to ARP	Comments	Management Actions Agreed & Follow-Up
Procurement	Substantial Assurance	<p>The purpose of this audit was to provide assurance to management that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The tender process complies with the authority's procurement policies and directive on spend. • All spend is tendered/quoted where necessary and tenders are recorded appropriately. • The authority's procurement activities ensure best value. 	January 2018	<p>Strengths</p> <p>Testing identified that tenders of varied values followed the relevant procurement rules. The correct documentation was present for all tenders. There is a high level of awareness of the need to comply with procurement policies and the importance of securing best value during procurement activities.</p> <p>Weaknesses</p> <p>Insufficient monitoring and management of aggregated spend of suppliers is undertaken. This is currently the responsibility of budget managers, but does not always take place. There is no formal procedure to score tenders</p>	<p>The responsibility will remain with budget managers to use the FRED reports to identify aggregated spend and alter their procurement approach accordingly. However, the Finance Team will monitor these aggregated expenditures to ensure the rules are being followed.</p> <p>The legal team are currently trialling a more sophisticated scoring system to ensure that tender and quotation criteria are transparent and objectively evaluated and quantifiably evidenced with a view to rolling out the scoring system</p>

System/Area	Opinion	Area Reviewed	Reported to ARP	Comments	Management Actions Agreed & Follow-Up
				or quotations for best value under £25,000.	
Performance Management	Substantial Assurance	The purpose of this audit was to provide assurance to management that the appraisal process was being correctly followed within required timescales and that managers feel adequately supported to carry out their role effectively	January 2018	<p>Strengths</p> <p>A briefing note has been produced that provides comprehensive instructions on how to carry out an effective appraisal. Directors also have responsibility for sample checking compliance with policy and the completion of appraisals.</p> <p>Weaknesses</p> <p>Due to re-structuring and staffing changes not all appraisals had been completed within the required timescale.</p>	
Risk Management	High Assurance	<p>The purpose of the audit was to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> significant risks are identified and addressed actions are carried out in a timely 	January 2018	<p>Strengths</p> <p>The procedures in place for the identification, monitoring and reporting of risk appear robust. Risks are reviewed quarterly and scores and action plans</p>	Responsible officers have been allocated for those risk identified. All risk management policy documents to be reviewed and signed off by ARP

System/Area	Opinion	Area Reviewed	Reported to ARP	Comments	Management Actions Agreed & Follow-Up
		<p>manner, ensuring risks are mitigated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the requirements of the risk management policy are followed		<p>updated. The annual report to Audit, Resources and Performance Committee clearly shows the movement of key risks throughout the year.</p> <p>Weaknesses</p> <p>One service risk register did not identify the responsible officer for some risks</p> <p>The risk management policy and procedures have not been reviewed for a number of years</p>	

Audit Opinions and Priorities for Actions

Audit Opinions	
<p>Audit work is based on sampling transactions to test the operation of systems. It cannot guarantee the elimination of fraud or error. Our opinion is based on the risks we identify at the time of the audit.</p> <p>Our overall audit opinion is based on 5 grades of opinion, as set out below.</p>	
Opinion	Assessment of internal control
High Assurance	Overall, very good management of risk. An effective control environment appears to be in operation.
Substantial Assurance	Overall, good management of risk with few weaknesses identified. An effective control environment is in operation but there is scope for further improvement in the areas identified.
Reasonable assurance	Overall, satisfactory management of risk with a number of weaknesses identified. An acceptable control environment is in operation but there are a number of improvements that could be made.
Limited Assurance	Overall, poor management of risk with significant control weaknesses in key areas and major improvements required before an effective control environment will be in operation.
No Assurance	Overall, there is a fundamental failure in control and risks are not being effectively managed. A number of key areas require substantial improvement to protect the system from error and abuse.

Priorities for Actions	
Priority 1	A fundamental system weakness, which presents unacceptable risk to the system objectives and requires urgent attention by management
Priority 2	A significant system weakness, whose impact or frequency presents risks to the system objectives, which needs to be addressed by management.
Priority 3	The system objectives are not exposed to significant risk, but the issue merits attention by management.

This page is intentionally left blank

6. **2017/18 QUARTER 4 AND YEAR END CORPORATE PERFORMANCE REPORT (A91941/HW)**

Purpose of the report

1. This report provides Members with monitoring information for the end of Quarter 4 2017/18 (Jan to Mar 2018). Members are asked to consider:
 - Quarter 4 and year end performance against 2017/18 indicator targets
 - Quarter 4 and year end performance against each of our cornerstones and directional shifts, including achievement of priority actions
 - Quarter 4 and year end analysis for complaints and Freedom of Information/Environmental Information Requests.

Key Issues

2. Key issues include:

At the end of Quarter 4 and the end of our 2017/18 year plan:

- Out of 24 priority actions: 15 are assessed as green in status, 9 are assessed as amber and 0 as red.
- We have met or exceeded our target on 55% (or 21 out of 38) of the indicators used to monitor progress. We fell short of target on 32% (or 12 out of 38) of the indicators. For the other 5 targets, we are still setting (or have just set) a baseline or have no data.

Recommendations

3.
 1. **That the 2017/18 Quarter 4 Corporate Performance Report, given in Appendix 1, which includes performance against indicator targets and priority actions, is reviewed and agreed.**
 2. **That the 2017/18 Quarter 4 and year end status and analysis of complaints and Freedom of Information/Environmental Information Requests, given in Appendix 3, is considered and received.**

How does this contribute to our policies and legal obligations?

4. Performance and risk management contributes to *Cornerstone 3, Our Organisation: developing our organisation so we have a planned and sustained approach to performance at all levels*. Monitoring the corporate indicators and corporate priority actions for 2017/18 is part of our approach to ensuring we are progressing against our Performance and Business Plan and, if needed, mitigating action can be taken to maintain and improve performance or to reprioritise work in consultation with staff and Members.

Background

5. Information is given so that Members of Audit, Resources and Performance Committee, in accordance with the scrutiny and performance management brief of the Committee, can review the performance of the Authority.

6. Performance information is reported each quarter by cornerstone and directional shift (of which there are 8). An overview of each priority activity and indicator contributing to each cornerstone or shift is provided, covering:
 - where we are doing well;
 - an understanding of associated risks;
 - specific issues;
 - and remedial action.

7. The traffic light system for the assessment of performance uses the following guidance at year end:
 - **green** – the priority action or indicator was achieved
 - **amber** – the priority action or indicator was almost achieved
 - **red** – the priority action or indicator was not achieved.

N.B. As this is year-end, indicators are scored as only red or green.

Information relating to 2017/18

8. The following Q4 performance information for 2017/18 is provided:
 - a) Appendix 1 gives the Q4 assessment of priority actions achieved, including an analysis of performance against indicator targets.
 - b) The relevant indicators for each cornerstone and shift are also given in Appendix 1. A full list of indicators is given at Appendix 2. We have met or exceeded our target on 55% of the 38 indicators used to monitor progress. We fell short of target on 32% of indicators. We are still setting baselines for the remaining targets.
 - c) Appendix 3 provides Quarter 4 and year end analysis for complaints and Freedom of Information/Environmental Information Requests.

Proposals

9. Members are asked to:
 - a) Review and agree the 2017/18 Quarter 4 Corporate Performance Return, given in Appendix 1, which includes performance against indicator targets and priority actions.
 - b) Consider and receive the 2017/18 Quarter 4 and year end status and analysis of complaints and Freedom of Information/Environmental Information requests, given in Appendix 3.

Are there any corporate implications members should be concerned about?

10. This report gives Members an overview of the achievement of targets in the last year and includes ICT, financial, risk management and sustainability considerations where appropriate. There are no additional implications in, for example, Health and Safety.

11. **Background papers** (not previously published)

None

Appendices

1. 2017/18 Quarter 4 Corporate Performance Return
2. Corporate Indicator Table 2017/18 (Year-end indicator outturns)
3. Quarter 4 and year end status and analysis of Complaints, Freedom of Information (FOI), and Environmental Information Regulations (EIR) Enquiries

Report Author, Job Title

Holly Waterman, Senior Strategy Officer Research, 10 May 2018

This page is intentionally left blank

Cornerstone 1: Our assets

Our Focus:	2017-18 priority actions	Progress (RAG)
1. Reduce the size of our property portfolio and retain what we need	a) We will have reviewed, and be on target with, disposals of our woodlands and minor properties.	GREEN
2. Ensure that the Trails, Stanage, North Lees and Warslow Estate are well-managed assets able to support the delivery of our directional shifts	b) We will have an updated Asset Management Plan which aligns with the Corporate Strategy and sets out the need and scope for improvement in a targeted way.	AMBER
3. Get the basics right on the visitor infrastructure we own and operate, from both a local and visitor perspective		
4. Increase the value of our brand and its reach		

Corporate Indicator	Target 2017-18	Status at Q4
6. Percentage of assets that meet the standards set for: a) Maintenance	Baseline	All high priority condition surveys completed and 17 medium priority completed. Work has begun on implementing works to address the defects recognised in the surveys. Progress is slightly slower than anticipated due to staff shortages and difficulty in re-recruiting to the post.
b) Environmental performance	Baseline	Data collection will begin in 18/19

Overview:

- Brand activity is now moving forward after stalling earlier in 2017-18 while the team underwent staff changes. Brand signage at visitor locations is in need of review, which is now underway; the results will be seen in 2018/19.
- Traditional communications and social media have continued to generate proactive (rather than reactive) and positive content which has been more evident in the later stages of the last operational year.
- Reputational issues are a constant threat with the passion and emotions of anti-grouse shooting groups targeting the PDNPA and PDNP on an almost daily basis.
- Returns from the asset disposals have been good, providing a strong cash flow for the capital fund and enabling investment. The management of estates has also been strong, delivering good conservation, recreational, engagement and income outcomes.

- The long-standing maintenance issues with some of the assets and infrastructure have remained – in particular the Trails. A proposal to generate much needed income (and engagement) through the development of a café/information centre at Millers Dale station for existing users of the Monsal Trail has been approved. This will, however, be a relatively small amount of new funds in relation to the investment required to deal with backlog of work required on such a super-structure to ensure enjoyment, accessibility and ultimately mitigate any health and safety risks.

Progress against priority actions, indicator(s) and focus:

Priority action a):

- The woodlands disposal programme is on target with 5 more freeholds going on the market shortly. Bakewell Town Council leased woods were relinquished during Q4 and several other leasehold woods also relinquished, reducing management costs. This programme is now nearing its end. Minor properties disposals have been approved by ARP and high priority sites for disposal have been valued by the District Valuer and will go to market early in 2018/19.

Priority action b):

- Work continues on the development of a Strategic Asset Management Plan which will align with the 2019-24 Corporate Strategy as per the proposal set out to Members during Q3/Q4. The action is being led in-house by the Corporate Property Officer. This part-time, fixed-term role (sponsored by SLT) was confirmed to remain in place for 2018-19 and will be the key direct contact with the Member Representative for Asset Management.

Service plan actions linked to ‘Our Focus’:

- 1) The direction of travel regarding disposal is in line with aspirations – see priority action (a) above. The reconfigured approach to the development of a Strategic Asset Management Plan led by the Corporate Property Officer (and fully integrated into the 2019-24 Corporate Plan approach and timetable) will ensure clarity and alignment on retention plans.
- 2) & 3) After a period of considerable change we have recruited to all vacancies at North Lees Estate in order to maintain consistent management of the site in support of our purposes. Warslow Moors Estate continues to perform well from an income and conservation perspective while opportunities remain to boost its impact on our engagement aspirations. The Trails remain critical to delivering engagement numbers, and we have in Q4 moved the maintenance and development of the important Millers Dale station asset on. However, due to a lack of capacity we have been unable to make a start to identified high priority repairs to the Trails structures. Progress should be possible early in 2018/19. This brings with it continued concerns from a health and safety perspective.
- 4) Brand development work is gaining momentum with the three new branded pool cars – creating a professional, highly visible brand presence throughout the PDNP – being delivered in Q4. The PPCV 4x4 vehicle has also been branded, although it is not a new vehicle. As the remaining pool cars arrive on site they will also be liveried in the new brand. Feedback has been positive.
- Work continues to develop the story behind the Peak District National Park brand, ensuring a narrative that makes sense and can reflect across all our touchpoints; signage, merchandise, social media, content and traditional communications. This work will continue into Q1 2018/19.
- ParkLife, the National Park’s magazine has been refreshed and the most recent edition was issued in March. It has a wider distribution base, covering the residences within the National Park, but also significant populations on our borders (including Buxton, Glossop, Matlock, Ashbourne). The magazine is printed on new paper stock, which is FSC approved, giving it a more environmentally friendly and quality feel. The frequency has also been increased from twice a year to three times a year. The next (extra) edition will be published in July.

- Work is underway to develop brand touchpoints at North Lees campsite and Edale Visitor Centre, creating a more welcoming and professional appearance while maintaining the character of, and being sensitive to the audiences at, each site.
- There has been a need to continually address a negative social media campaign directed towards the grouse estates, but targeting the PDNPA. This has run since last summer, and has covered specific instances in the last quarter including the RSPB pulling out of the Birds of Prey Initiative, continued posting of images taken last year by the Hunt Investigation Team, blogs by numerous individuals, calls for rewilding of the Peak District and other national parks, and a petition to ban driven-grouse shooting. Social media is constantly monitored, and reacted to accordingly. The online petition to ban driven grouse shooting closed with too few signatures for it to be debated in Parliament (it achieved c48k and needs 100k for a debate).
- Improvements were carried out to the website to build a frequently asked questions area providing detail on sensitive areas such as recreational vehicle use, Chinese lanterns and drone usage. Ongoing work with the Derbyshire Rural Crime Team and the Police and Crime Commissioner in 2018/19 will allow us to prioritise the issues and the information we can provide in this way.
- There was continued healthy growth in our social media accounts over Q4:

○ Total Fans	71,702	6.2%
○ New Twitter Followers	2,139	4.2%
○ New Facebook Fans	1,583	10.2%
○ New Instagram Followers	458	29.6%
Total Fans Gained	4,180	6.2%
- The biggest stories in these channels over the quarter were:
 - Twitter**
 - 23/01/2018 – Whinstone Lee Tor to Cutthroat Bridge, bridleway repair – 252k reach.
 - 15/01/2018 – Feeling Blue? Watch the PDNP videos – 205k reach.
 - 14/03/2018 – Peak Rangers guided walks – 188k reach.
 - 09/02/2018 – Cut Gate Mend our Mountains campaign – 182k reach.
 - 05/03/2018 – Mend our Mountains Sheffield Adventure Film Festival launch – 170k reach.
 - Facebook**
 - 15/01/2018 – Where will your next adventure in the Peak District National Park take you? Video – 48K reach.
 - 09/03/2108 – Visitor centre manager recruitment – 43k reach.
 - 22/02/2018 – BBC Countryfile with Mosaic – 22k reach.
 - 31/01/2018 – Mam Tor has been named as one of the country’s favourite places to explore. Britain's Favourite 100 Walks – 21k reach.
 - 29/01/2018 – Britain's Favourite 100 Walks is on ITV tomorrow night – 20k reach.

Issues arising and action to address:

Our Focus: 2)

- a) **RAG Rating:** Amber.
- b) **Issue:** Inability to make headway with maintenance work on significant Trails’ structures.

- c) **Action:** Income generation plans proposed and approved but scale and timing will mean limited impact. Consultant appointed to specify work programme – progress on appointment of contractors and work schedule unclear.

Risk implications:

The above risk poses a potential health and safety risk to members of the public and PDNPA staff, which could result in significant financial and reputational damage to the PDNPA.

Priority Action: b)

- d) **RAG Rating:** Amber.
- e) **Issue:** Updated Asset Management Plan aligned with 2019-24 corporate strategy.
- f) **Action:** CPO role confirmed for another twelve months; postholder continuing in the role providing continuity and longstanding knowledge of PDNPA asset base; process/timeline in place. Regular review meetings established with SLT sponsor.

Risk implications:

Resource match to task – slippage in terms of time.

Cornerstone 2: Our services

Our Focus:	2017-18 priority actions	Progress (RAG)
1. Deliver our services in a customer focused way	c) We will have an extended paid-for advice service for conservation.	GREEN
2. Ensure clear policies are in place through facilitated and effective engagement and communication	d) We will have partners indicating their commitment to Special Qualities.	GREEN
3. Ensure appropriate regulatory action	e) We will be communicating the clear value of our performance on enforcement.	GREEN

Corporate Indicator	Target 2017-18	Status at Q4
7. Proportion of planning appeals allowed	<30%	0% (9 of 9 dismissed)
8. Proportion of planning applications determined in a timely way		
a) 13 weeks – major	a) >70%	a) 100%
b) 8 weeks – minor	b) >70%	b) 75%
c) 8 weeks – other	c) >80%	c) 85%
d) 13 weeks – county matters	d) >70%	d) 100%
9. a) Number of enforcement cases resolved	30 per quarter	26
9. b) % of enforcement enquiries (excluding minerals and waste) investigated (and reach a conclusion on whether there is a breach of planning control) within 30 working days	>80%	80%
10. Customer satisfaction with Planning Service:		
a) Applicants/ agents	>75%	No data
b) Parish councils	>70%	No data
c) Residents	>38%	47%*
d) Pre-application advice	>75%	65% **

11. a) Number of complaints received	<20	5
11. b) % complaints dealt with in accordance with agreed deadlines	>90%	67%
11. c) Satisfaction with first and second lines of enquiry (planning)	75% target	75%

* Residents' Survey every 3 years (Baseline 2012, data 2016) ** Based on 2016/17 survey

Overview:

The examination into the Development Management policies has been set for May 2018. This follows Public consultation on these changes in November, and which finished in January 2018. The Authority has been advised that it may be designated for special measures based on its appeal performance on major developments. The Director of Conservation and Planning has responded. The NPMP update work is on track, with the final consultation having closed in April 2018.

Progress against priority actions, indicator(s) and focus:

Priority action c): Charging for advice was extended to Cultural Heritage in April 2017 and work on an integrated conservation advice service progressed during Q4 (see Shift 1).

Priority action d): Consultation on the National Park Management Plan commenced in January and finishes in May, following the Authority's approval of a consultation draft. There was widespread support for the special qualities (SQs) and the areas of impact, and we have added some further intentions to some of the areas of impact, with some changes to the wording.

Priority action e): 26 enforcement cases were resolved in the quarter, under the target of 30 for the quarter, but 122 were dealt with in the year, exceeding the target of 120. 80% of enforcement enquiries were investigated (with a conclusion on whether there is a breach of planning control) within 30 working days, on the target of 80%.

Indicators:

- Performance on planning application determination was within target in the last quarter, above the figures set by the Government for "under-performing" LPAs. However, the Authority received a letter from the Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) advising that the Authority may be at risk of designation because of its performance on major appeals in the qualifying period (2015-2017). The "quality" performance measure is that the Authority must not lose more than 10% of major applications on appeal. During this period the Authority lost 2 major appeals in a total of 4 applications. The Director has responded, as requested, to highlight two factors that should be taken into account. Firstly, the figures only show the "District" function, but omitted the higher number of applications dealt with under the "County" function, as a unitary Authority. Secondly, the overall number of cases is very low so the statistics are not representative of the Authority's overall performance. The figures for the last 2 year period show the Authority falling within the measure.

- Planning appeals: it was a very successful quarter, with 9 appeals determined in Quarter 4, with all 9 dismissed, well within target. An annual report for 2017-18 is being considered at the Planning Committee in May, with the figure for the year as a whole.
- 165 Planning, listed building applications and other applications were dealt with, plus applications for prior notifications, non-material amendments and discharging of conditions determined, with 152 applications dealt with under delegated powers approved. In addition to this, the Service also dealt with 138 planning enquiries, of which 48% were completed within 15 working days; many enquiries are an on-going dialogue and are completed in more than 15 days because of their scale or nature.
- The number of formal complaints has risen in the last quarter to five, four in Development Management, one in Moors for the Future. There have been no cases where the Ombudsman has found maladministration.
- Data on satisfaction with first and second lines of enquiry was collected in Quarter 1: 57% rate overall advice service as Excellent, 17% rate overall advice service as Good, 8% rate overall advice service as Fair, and 17% rate overall advice service as Poor. This is a slight improvement on the previous quarter but still requires improvement.

Service plan actions linked to 'Our Focus':

- The examination into the Development Management policies has been set for May 2018. This follows Public consultation on these changes in November 2017, and which finished in January 2018. The hearing is scheduled for 4-5 days.
- The Planning Liaison Officer (Fi Todd) organised a successful agents' meeting in February and Parish Council training in March. Planning training was provided to Parish Councils, with training on Cultural Heritage planned for April. A monthly Parish Bulletin is being produced by the Planning Liaison Officer.
- The Policy and Communities team continued to work with communities, particularly Saddleworth, on proposals for a site near Greenfield and the Neighbourhood Plan and with further work on the Bakewell Neighbourhood Plan, which is proceeding to a referendum. The community Facebook page and Community Grant scheme has been launched and is proving to be successful.

Issues arising and action to address:

- a) The Authority received a letter from the MHCLG advising that the Authority may be at risk of designation because of its performance on major appeals in the qualifying period (2015-2017). The Director has responded to highlight the exceptional factors that should be taken into account.
- b) **Our services, Indicator 7:** The percentage of appeals dismissed was 100% in the last quarter (9 of 9), but for the year as a whole, the performance was around 60 dismissed, 40% allowed, below target.
- c) **Our services, Indicators 8 and 10d:** Performance on dealing with planning and other applications has improved in the quarter and is above government targets. However, staff vacancies and absences in the previous quarters has resulted in a poorer performance on dealing with enquiries. However, the filling of vacant posts and the reduction in absence through long-term illness has resulted in a better performance than the previous quarter.
- d) **Our services, Indicator 9a:** The target for resolving enforcement enquiries cases was exceeded in 2017-18. The Action Plan adopted in 2015/16, placing a greater focus on prioritising cases and then dealing with higher priority cases more quickly, is helping to address the backlog.

-
- e) **Our services, Indicator 10b:** Officers continue to work with Parishes, either through the PPP Forum or through individual parishes to understand their concerns. The new Planning Liaison Officer has led to progress is being made on liaison with parishes, with regular Bulletins being published and planning training organised for Parish Councils.

Risks associated with this objective: None

Cornerstone 3: Our organisation

Our Focus:	2017-18 priority actions	Progress (RAG)
8. Develop and maintain appropriate standards of corporate governance	f) We will have implemented the new governance framework requirements as a public body.	GREEN
9. Implement our medium term financial plan	g) We will have clearly communicated the way in which our aspirations for the Peak District National Park, as set out in our Corporate Strategy, will be funded now and in the future.	GREEN
10. Develop key business processes underpinning the Corporate Strategy	h) We will have a single corporate register of the data we hold across the organisation.	GREEN

Corporate Indicator	Target 2017-18	Status at Q4
12. Audit conclusions showing satisfactory governance arrangements in place	Achieve	The External Auditor has confirmed that the Authority's Annual Governance Statement for 2016/17 complies with the guidance issued.

Overview:

During the fourth quarter of 2017-18 the essential governance and financial business-as-usual operational activities to ensure the Authority continues to run smoothly were maintained and a great deal of work was undertaken to develop the organisation. This development work included the Peak District National Park Management Plan 2018-23 and initial work on the Authority's Corporate Strategy 2019-24. All the priority actions for 2017-18 were successfully completed and the corporate indicator was achieved.

Progress against priority actions, indicator(s) and focus:

Priority action f): We will have implemented the new governance framework requirements as a public body.

- During the first quarter of 2017-18, an Annual Governance Statement (AGS) was prepared and provided to KPMG (the Authority's External Auditors) for review. During Quarter 2 it was reported to the Audit Resources and Performance Committee (ARP) on 21st July 2017 that KPMG had confirmed that the Authority's AGS for 2016/17 complies with the guidance issued by CIPFA/SOLACE (Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy/Society of Local Authority Chief Executives).
- A report recommending amendments to the ARP Committee's Terms of Reference to adopt the latest best practice governance guidance was considered by the Authority and approved at a meeting on 7th July 2017.

- Our Members' representative roles have been aligned with the National Parks' 8-point plan published by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) and were appointed to at the Annual General Meeting (AGM) on 7th July. We also welcomed a new Secretary of State Member to the Authority who has been through our induction programme.
- A Members Appointments Panel process was put in place to assist decision making at the AGM and a review of representation of Members on Outside Bodies was undertaken and approved and these roles were appointed to at the AGM.
- The members' Strategic Advisory Group (SAG) was replaced by a Members Forum open to all Members which it is hoped will address a number of issues identified in the 2016 Member Survey.
- A report providing details of the Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) Annual Review of complaints for the period 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2017 was presented to the ARP Committee on 15th September 2017. The report did not raise any concerns about the Authority's performance.
- In November, the ARP committee considered the annual report of the Due Diligence Panel and the items that had been dealt with during the last twelve months were noted.
- The Members' Learning and Development Annual report and programme of events for 2018 was approved by the Authority with a target of 20 hours learning and development activity per Member.

Priority action g): We will have clearly communicated the way in which our aspirations for the Peak District National Park, as set out in our Corporate Strategy, will be funded now and in the future

- The Authority's 2016/17 financial accounts were presented to the ARP committee on 19th May 2017. KPMG reviewed the accounts and it was reported at the ARP Committee on 21st July 2017 that the Authority's external auditors had issued an unqualified audit opinion.
- KPMG also completed their work to consider whether the Authority has suitable arrangements in place to ensure it takes properly informed decisions and deploys resources to achieve planned and sustainable outcomes. For 2016/17, KPMG concluded that the Authority had arrangements in place to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness and have issued an unqualified value for money opinion. This was reported to the ARP committee on 21st July 2017.
- Members approved the Authority's 2017-18 Performance and Business Plan on 26th May 2017. The plan was published on the Authority's website prior to the statutory deadline of 30th June 2017 and performance was monitored quarterly.
- On 20th October, a workshop was held with Members to identify and agree the Authority's Corporate Priorities for 2018/19. The updated Corporate Priorities were shared with Members at a subsequent workshop and Members formally approved the 2018/19 Corporate Strategy Priorities on 16th March 2018.
- A member workshop focusing on the financial health of the Authority took place on 24th November and covered annual revenue budgeting and large scale capital projects. The associated funding, accounting frameworks, approval processes and reporting timetables were also covered. Members subsequently approved the Authority's 2018/19 Budget on 2nd February 2018 and Treasury Management Policy and Investment Strategy on 16th March 2018.

Priority action h): We will have a single corporate register of the data we hold across the organisation.

- To support the creation of a single register of corporate data, specific officers were identified in all service areas. These officers are being designated as Information Asset Owners (IAO). Training sessions were

provided and a framework was developed to capture the data required to construct the corporate data register. The focus of attention in 2018/19 will be to ensure that the data identified and registered is used effectively to improve service delivery.

- New online courses were created to raise awareness and provide training to employees who capture and process personal or confidential information.
- RMM approved a report and associated action plan which seeks to prepare the Authority to meet the challenges of the forthcoming General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR). The plan includes the assignment of key roles and the provision of training using a new online system called ELMS which is a joint initiative with other national park authorities.

Indicators:

- Successfully achieved

Service plan actions linked to 'Our Focus':

- A report relating to the Authority's Environmental Management Performance was approved by the ARP Committee on 15th September 2017. The Authority's performance continues to improve and a 24.9% reduction in carbon emissions has been achieved since the 2009/10 baseline year. The ARP Committee agreed that new targets will be established for the period from 2019 to 2024.
- The 2017-18 Internal Audit plan was approved by Members on 19th May 2017. The plan was based upon an assessment of strategic, financial, regularity and operational risks. On 19th January 2018, the ARP Committee considered a report from the Authority's Internal Auditors on Risk Management. The report considered the arrangements in place for risk identification, monitoring and reporting and the overall conclusion was that the current procedures provided "High Assurance". High Assurance is the highest level of assurance that can be awarded.
- A Resource Management Meeting (RMM) held on 19th July 2017 approved a business case to progress a large scale property maintenance programme to address the backlog of works across the Authority's property portfolio. The works will address all of the urgent items arising from condition surveys completed on high priority sites. It is anticipated that the programme will be completed in 2018/19.
- On 3rd October a workshop to engage partners in the development of the delivery plan for the 2018-2013 National Park Management Plan (NPMP) was held at Thornbridge Hall. An update on the development of the new NPMP, including feedback on the recent consultation exercise was formally provided to the Authority on 6th October 2017. On 2nd February 2018, the Authority approved the publication of the Peak District NPMP, including the partnership delivery plan, for final consultation.
- RMM approved an updated Business Continuity Plan for the Authority on 17th October 2017, which takes into account changes in the organisation's structure and the use of new technology. The new Plan also provides for a PDNPA Emergency Response Team to be temporarily hosted at a neighbouring Authority's offices should access not be possible to Aldern House.
- The heavy snow that fell during February and March 2018 provided an opportunity to test the Authority's updated business continuity arrangements. Following the event, a lessons learnt report was prepared to identify what worked well and what actions could be taken in similar circumstances to improve the Authority's response in order to reduce the impact upon service delivery.

-
- Following an analysis of the Property Support Team's draft work programme, RMM agreed in December to allocate temporary additional resources to the team in order to support planned development work across the Authority in 2018/19.

Issues arising and action to address:

- The Authority approved the appointment of an Independent Person in December 2017 to review the Members' Allowance Scheme. Work on the review commenced in March 2018 and a report will be considered by the Authority prior to the Annual General Meeting in July 2018. The impact of recent HMRC notifications relating to the taxation treatment of mileage and subsistence payments is currently being considered.

Cornerstone 4: Our people

Our Focus:	2017-18 priority actions	Progress (RAG)
11. Ensure the Authority shape is fit for the future	i) We will have a structure in place at all levels that fits our organisational design principles and supports our ability to deliver the Corporate Strategy.	GREEN
12. Retain, develop and recruit the right people in the right place at the right time, with the right resources	j) We will know the workforce profile in each service against the following areas:- - Skills resilience and gaps - Knowledge resilience and gaps - Hard to fill roles.	GREEN
13. Embed, in the way we work, our organisational values of people matter, performance matters, communities matter and every day matters	k) We will have used the staff survey feedback to gauge how well we are doing in living our organisational values and to identify improvements needed.	GREEN

Corporate Indicator	Target 2017 – 18	Status at Q4
13. Employee engagement – based on new Staff Survey	Baseline from Staff Survey in March 2017	64% (survey response)
14. Implement recommendations of the 2016-17 Investors in People assessment	Delivery of Action Plan	Delivered through the “People Matter – Action Plan” September 2017
15. Sickness levels*: a) % of total time lost due to sickness	a) 2.3% quarterly 2.15% annually	Q4 2.55% Annual 1.34%
b) Hours per FTE	b) 11.1h quarterly 44.4h annually	Q4 12.59h Annual 38.19h
c i) Absence: sickness frequency rate **	c i) 25% quarterly 100% annually	Q4 24.86% Annual 96.66%
ii) Absence: individual sickness frequency rate (reported at Year-end) ***	ii) No target	Q4 21.85% Annual 49.50%
d) Value of total time lost (expressed as pay cost)	d) £26,750 quarterly £107,000 annually	Q4 £30,306 Annual £68,165
16) Staff turnover	ACAS standard to be used (Range 9-15%)	Q4 3% Annual 14%

* All sickness indicators should be considered together for a full understanding of the overall picture.

** The absence frequency rate calculates the average number of periods of absence per employee as a percentage. It gives no indication of the length of each sickness absence period and no indication of employees who have taken more than one period of absence. For example, an outturn of 100% means that, on average, there has been one absence for every one employee. For context, an outturn of 50% would mean that, on average, there has been one absence for every two employees.

*** This shows the proportion of staff that have had one or more spells of absence in the last year. A lower score indicates a smaller proportion of staff having time off. A higher score indicates a larger percentage of staff having time off. This score should be looked at in conjunction with 15 a), 15 b), 15 c) i) and 15 d).

Overview:

During the fourth quarter of 2017-18 progress in implementing the “People Matter – Action Plan” continues to be monitored regularly by the Senior Leadership Team, Staff Committee and Unison representatives. Development work continued during the quarter to produce new and update existing workforce related policies and procedures to bring them up to date with current best practice. All the 2017-18 Corporate Strategy Priority Actions were successfully completed.

Progress against priority actions, indicator(s) and focus:

Priority action i): We will have a structure in place at all levels that fits our organisational design principles and supports our ability to deliver the Corporate Strategy

- Consultation commenced in May 2017 with employees, Staff Committee and Unison representatives relating to a proposed restructuring within the Commercial Development and Outreach Directorate (CD&O).
- On 1st August 2017 RMM approved the proposed restructure and staff in the CD&O Directorate, UNISON and Staff Committee representatives were informed. The work to populate the new structure has been completed.
- The Authority’s new organisational structure, comprising three directorates and twelve Heads of Service, is now complete.

Priority action j): We will know the workforce profile in each service against the following areas: Skills resilience and gaps; Knowledge resilience and gaps; Hard to fill roles.

- In June 2017, the Senior Leadership Team approved a framework and related processes for the development of a comprehensive workforce plan. The plan is being developed in conjunction with Heads of Service and now forms an integral part of the Authority’s service planning and performance management processes
- On 5th February 2018, a Resource Management Meeting (RMM) approved the adoption of a framework and guidance document relating to the employment of apprentices within the Authority. The opportunity to create an apprenticeship is now considered whenever a vacancy arises and RMM subsequently approved a team restructure that incorporated the creation of a new apprenticeship post.
- In line with the Authority’s updated business planning framework and associated timetable the Joint Performance & Achievement Review (JPAR) process commenced in December 2017. The JPAR

documentation and guidance notes were also revised to collect additional information to support the development of the Authority's workforce plan.

- The Authority's Internal Auditors undertook a review of the JPAR framework and related documentation and their report was presented to the Audit, Resources and Performance (ARP) Committee on 19th January 2018. It was noted that the arrangements for managing risk were good, with few weaknesses identified and a "Substantial Assurance" rating was awarded.
- Officers are supporting a multi-national park authority benchmarking exercise which is focusing on workforce issues and employment policies and practices. The results will inform the continuing development of the Authority's workforce plan.
- The Local Government Association has been engaged to develop an "Employee Benefits Package" which it is envisaged will support staff retention and future recruitment exercises. As part of this work, a Market Supplement Policy for the Authority has been developed and during Q2 consultation took place with the Senior Leadership Team, Operational Leadership Team and the staff who are currently in receipt of a market supplement in addition to Staff Committee and Unison representatives. The new policy was approved by the Authority at a meeting held on 6th October 2017.

Priority action k): We will have used the staff survey feedback to gauge how well we are doing in living our organisational values and to identify improvements needed.

- Following the 2017 Staff Survey, which was completed in March 2017, a Working Group with representatives from each Directorate, Staff Committee and Unison was formed to develop an action plan to address the issues identified in the survey. The "People Matter - Action Plan" was agreed with PDNPA Staff Committee and Unison representatives on 6th September and circulated to all staff on 11th September 2017.
- Joint performance reviews of the People Matter - Action Plan have been undertaken by the Senior Leadership Team and representatives of Unison and Staff Committee. It was noted that overall implementation progress has been good and many new initiatives introduced have proven useful.

Indicators:

- Successfully achieved.
- Although performance in the fourth quarter of 2017-18 dipped slightly, it followed a similar pattern to previous years, overall the corporate indicators assigned were achieved.

Service plan actions linked to 'Our Focus':

- A review of the Authority's current disciplinary processes and related management guidance has commenced. Any proposed changes will be the subject of appropriate consultation with staff, Staff Committee and Unison representatives in due course.
- Resilience coaching sessions aimed at supporting individuals through change were offered to all staff. The take up has been good and the development sessions were delivered in Quarter 3.
- A review of the Authority's compliance against the Investors in People (IIP) standard was undertaken in Quarter 3. The inspection report subsequently received is very complimentary about the organisation's

general approach and confirmed the Authority's IIP successful reaccreditation against the standard for a further eighteen months.

- The Health and Safety Committee considered changes to the Authority's Health and Safety policy relating to intent, delivery and governance on the 9th October. The new policy seeks to identify all existing health and safety procedures and includes the date of the last review and a nominated individual lead officer. At a meeting of the Local Joint Committee, held on 2nd February 2018, it was agreed to adopt the updated Health and Safety Policy. The Senior Leadership Team agreed the scope of a comprehensive review of the Authority's occupational health and safety arrangements on 19th March
- In order to respond to changes in tax and operational arrangements all staff were informed in December 2017 of proposed changes relating to the use of vehicles and revisions to the Authority's Travel and Subsistence scheme. Following an extensive consultation exercise with staff, Unison and Staff Committee representatives the proposed changes were approved by RMM on 6th March 2018 and implemented at the beginning of April 2018.
- The Local Joint Committee (LJC) provides an important role in the consultation arrangements involving the Authority's Members and employees. The LJC agreed on 2nd February 2018 to review their constitution and functions to encourage greater participation and engagement. A report setting out proposed changes will be considered in 2018/19.

Issues arising and action to address:

- No issues arising.

Directional Shift 1: The Place and the Park, on a Landscape Scale

Our Focus:	2017-18 priority actions	Progress (RAG)
1. The Dark Peak	l) We will define, and have support for, our strategic direction for Stanage North Lees within the wider landscape.	GREEN
2. The SW Peak	m) We will have secured HLF funding and match funding to start the SW Peak Landscape Partnership Scheme delivery phase plus HLF agreement to a phased approach to future match funding requirements.	GREEN
3. The White Peak	n) We will know what the opportunities are for the NPA to develop an integrated management project in the public sector across the White Peak.	AMBER
4. The Whole Park	o) We will be offering an integrated conservation service to land managers.	AMBER

Corporate Indicator	Target 2017-18	Status at Q4
1. Stage of development of Landscape scale partnership programmes a) Moors for the Future b) South West Peak Partnership c) White Peak Delivery Partnership d) Sheffield Moors Partnership	Stage of development a) Mature Partnership b) Strategic Plan c) Vision d) Vision	a) achieved b) achieved c) on target d) on target

Overview:

The White Peak Partnership has set out a clear governance structure and has established task and finish groups for key tasks. The Moors for the Future Partnership has been successful in a bid to the DEFRA Peatland Fund, being awarded over £3million, and continues to deliver restoration on the ground, working with partners and landowners. The South West Peak Landscape Partnership is now actively in the delivery stage. As in the previous quarters, the questions about agri-environment schemes and the wider Rural Development Programme, the EU Environment Programme, EU environmental protection and EU designated sites remain unresolved. The Government launched its 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment, which outlines the proposed steps to achieve its ambition to leave the environment in a better state than we found it. The Authority is considering a DEFRA consultation on “The future for food, farming and the environment” , with a May deadline for response and we continue to actively seek to influence future policy and support systems for the delivery of public benefits by the uplands and protected landscapes. Work has continued on the

development of an integrated conservation service for land managers and communities, with a working group established to progress this.

Progress against priority actions, indicator(s) and focus:

Priority action l): We continue to work with partners on the Sheffield Moors Partnership

Priority action m): The South West Peak (SWP) HLF-funded Landscape Partnership is now in its second year of delivery and has been promoting its work and objectives via events, news releases and social media posts. An annual celebration is planned in April. All 18 of the programme's projects have now started and all posts have been filled; this quarter the Cultural Heritage Officer and Youth Engagement Officer have started (the latter is a shared position with MoorLIFE 2020). Two further funding bids totalling £31,400 were submitted, one of which for £4,000 was unsuccessful; the outcome of the other is awaited. The difficulties of partnership working and securing match funding have been highlighted by Cheshire Wildlife Trust (CWT), who are delivering our Slowing the Flow project. Although an additional £100,000 from the Environment Agency's Natural Flood Management Communities Fund has been secured it will not be considered as partnership match funding as it will be delivered separately. Officers of the 3 bodies (NPA, EA and CWT) are meeting in May to discuss this.

Priority action n): The White Peak Partnership Steering Group has agreed the terms of reference and work plan. A vision task and finish group developed draft vision options which were shared with the wider partnership at a workshop in November. A final White Peak Vision and supporting summary is due to be launched in the next quarter. Stakeholder project ideas were also shared and prioritised at the White Peak Partnership workshop and were considered further by the Steering Group in Quarter 4. A further task and finish group has been established to develop a strategy and then prioritise proposed projects and funding bids. The Brexit task and finish group has looked at the White Peak as an example of how a future support system could address local circumstances whilst operating under a national framework.

Indicators:

See commentary below

Service plan actions linked to 'Our Focus':

- The Authority continues to work with partners, including the Moorland Association, to encourage land management and visitor management practices that will help moorland birds, particularly birds of prey. Early reports are that peregrines are nesting in increased numbers in 2018, following the 2016 and 2017 seasons when they failed to breed in the Dark Peak for the first time since they recolonised in 1984.
- Fundraising for the Breeding Bird Survey project has been successful with funding from Natural England and matched funding from project partners to a total value of £140,000. Surveying is due to begin in April.
- Discussions have continued with the Moorland Association, Authority officers and Natural England officers on four key areas: visitor engagement, moorland fires, sustainable and resilient moorland management, and moorland birds. A second event to look at progress on these is planned at Chatsworth for May 2018.
- The MFFP bid to Defra's capital grant scheme for the restoration of peatland was successful and was awarded over £3m for the Moor Carbon project. This will run until 2021 and deliver carbon benefits across the South Pennine and West Pennine Moors.

- The MFFP plan for water in the upper catchments of the South Pennines until 2030 has been sent out to Water Company CEOs, local and Defra MPs in order to secure support for future funding under the water companies price review mechanism (PR19).
- The Moor Business application to Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) to update business processes was submitted and will go to the HLF committee for consideration in May.
- Capital works to the end of March through MoorLIFE 2020, working with ML2020 partners and through the Private Lands Projects.
- Officers met with the Sheffield Wildlife Trust on the “Sheffield Lakeland” Landscape Partnership to seek clarification over areas of responsibility where the two partnerships overlap. The Authority was invited to become more involved in the Board of the Partnership.
- South West Peak: The Institute for Apprenticeships has re-examined the Countryside Worker standard which has now gained approval. More work is required to agree the funding band for training. The services of an apprentice training provider for the SWPLP Countryside Worker and Farm Worker have been procured and a contract has been entered into with a training provider
- SWP Farm Link Workers have successfully liaised with around 70 landowners to gain access permission for our PhD student to conduct her first season of field survey for our Working for Waders project. Whilst this has been time-consuming, requiring telephone calls and face to face visits, this legwork has had further benefits in engaging with hard to reach farmers, promoting the work of the partnership and discussing conservation issues relating to wading birds.
- SWP are now attracting a significant number of new volunteers and are almost ready to begin using the new Authority Volunteer Impact system. Volunteer figures for the financial year shows that 148 volunteer days have been given (this does not include all figures for the current quarter).
- Natural England has funded initial scoping and mapping of opportunities to focus on key areas of existing species rich habitat and where these could be made ‘bigger, better, joined up and more’.
- Officers have been involved in discussions with other national parks and partners to consider a response to the Defra consultation on “The future for food, farming and the environment”, with a May deadline for response and we continue to actively seek to influence future policy and support systems for the delivery of public benefits by the uplands and protected landscapes. The Peak District Land Managers Forum has set up a Brexit sub-group to develop a Peak District Ask consisting of a set of principles and greater detail of how a future Environmental Land Management Scheme might look for the White Peak. This group has worked closely with the White Peak Brexit group.
- Countryside Stewardship Scheme support has continued. The Authority’s Farm Advisers continue to act as sub-contractors for the delivery of nationally procured Countryside Stewardship advice in the Peak District.
- A pilot Traditional Building Restoration grant scheme has been launched by Natural England, Historic England and five upland national parks including the Peak District. The scheme has a limited budget and is only available in the five national parks who have been involved in its development. There has already been significant interest in the Peak District.
- The current Woodland Trust and Peak District National Park Authority Partnership arrangement for small scale woodland creation is in its third and final year; opportunities to extend this arrangement for a further period were considered in Quarter 4, together with a possible HLF-funded scheme for trees outside of woodlands to address the impact of ash dieback in the White Peak.
- The Pedal Peak for Business strand of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) funded “Growing and Developing the Visitor Economy Sector within Derbyshire Programme” continues to work with local businesses. After a slow start interest in the business support and Pedal Peak grant is now growing. This

quarter the number of grant enquiries rose to 118 and 7 businesses have now been offered grants. There was more promotion of the scheme and two business workshops on how to attract the cycling market and benefit their business were held.

- Work progressed on the development of an integrated conservation service, with a small project team meeting to set out and progress actions.
- The Authority considered two trans-Pennine proposals. Firstly, the Authority objected to proposals for upgrades to the A628 as they were likely to increase significantly traffic on the A628 and A57, and secondly, we raised concerns over the TfN Strategic Transport Plan as it did not give sufficient assurance that schemes would ensure proper consideration of National Park interests. In December TfN announced that the full Trans-Pennine tunnel was not being progressed due to high costs, and that a shorter tunnel with major upgrades within the National Park is the preferred option; this is likely to result in major development in the National Park, which can only be allowed in exceptional circumstances and if it is to the highest standard of environmental quality and design. Officers continue to work with TfN and Highways England on Trans-Pennine road proposals.

Issues arising and action to address:

- g) The debate about the sustainability of some aspects of grouse moor management including burning on deep peat, birds of prey, wildlife management and new and upgraded moorland tracks has continued. The Authority continues to work with partners on this and is supporting the bird survey which is being carried out in Spring 2018. A meeting with partners at Chatsworth in May 2018 will focus on these issues.
- h) Future funding of landscape partnerships is a constant focus for MFF and SWP partnerships. A bid was submitted to the DEFRA Peatland Fund, and a manifesto has been produced for PR19 funding from Water Companies. Further funding bids continue to be made by the SWP team.
- i) The Authority is actively involved in influencing future policy and support payments to deliver public goods in the uplands and protected landscapes through the Defra consultation on "The future for food, farming and the environment" and the NPE 'Future of Farming' group, Stakeholder Groups and events. The Authority is actively working with the Land Manager's Forum and other national parks to influence future policy.
- j) Countryside Stewardship is still not delivering effectively for the Peak District and work will continue to achieve further improvements as this is the only scheme we are likely to have for at least a further 3 years until a new domestic scheme is designed, trailed, tested, piloted and launched.
- k) The Authority has responded to Highways England proposals for upgrades to the A628 and to the TfN Strategic Transport Plan. The possibility of a shorter tunnel with major upgrades to the A628 in the National Park is likely to present a major challenge to Authority's position on road building in the National Park. The Authority has committed to working with TFN and Highways England to ensure that the special qualities of the National Park are protected and that any scheme provides net environmental benefit.

Risk implications:

Covered in the above commentary.

Directional Shift 2: Connect people to the place, the park

Our Focus:	2017-18 priority actions	Progress (RAG)
18. Build support for the Park through a range of approaches to enable people to give time, money or valued intellectual support	p) We will have examined the feasibility of a Charity Vehicle and, if deemed appropriate, established one.	AMBER
19. Improve access to the National Park for less represented audiences, in particular young people under 25	q) We will have identified the best channels through which to engage young people.	GREEN
20. Improve access to the National Park for less represented audiences, in particular people with health inequality	r) We will have identified the best channels through which to engage people living with health inequality and identified funding sources.	AMBER
21. Improve our volunteering opportunities and processes to nurture and build National Park volunteer supporters	s) We will have identified the range of volunteering opportunities we need for the Peak District National Park and have systems and resources in place to effectively deliver these volunteer experiences.	AMBER

Corporate Indicator	Target 2017-18	Status at Q4
2. Number of people experiencing the benefits of the Peak District National Park from our target audiences of:		
a) young people under 25	19,846 (+5% vs. 2015-16)	21,798
b) people living with health inequality (particularly mental wellbeing)	Baseline	1,703
c) volunteers (expressed as volunteer days)	10,003 (+5% vs. 2015-16)	6,765

Overview:

The new Outreach Team posts below tier 4 commenced in January this year. The team are now settled in the new structure and working on plans to deliver new and refreshed Outreach activities in 2018/19 with greater reach and impact. Our work with schools continues to be strong – in the face of declines nationally and trends away from fieldwork – and is evidence of our long-standing high reputation in this area. We will ensure we maximise this advantage and protect this hard-worn positive perception.

Volunteer numbers are cumulatively strong and good progress has been made on reviewing the approach to this valuable resource including investment in a new management system and a revised policy.

Engaging fully with the 'well-being' agenda has been hard; the benefits of the PDNP are not embedded as an efficient and effective 'treatment' in the minds of policymakers, practitioners and clients. It is not a challenge that the PDNPA can meet on its own – it requires a pan-national park approach with support at central government level to enable us to have impact at scale. We will continue to provide activities at the local level and our engagement this year has seen a doubling of the number of people benefiting from experiences in the PDNP.

Highlight of year was the Play Wild project, an HLF-funded partnership led by Derbyshire Wildlife Trust, providing families with young children from socio-economically deprived areas with the opportunity to take part in activities outdoors. Overall the project indicates that even short, one-shot sessions in nature can support families in gaining skills, information and knowledge about playing outdoors successfully with their families. This has implications for improving people's health and wellbeing and suggests the value of nature-based interventions for families from lower socio-economic backgrounds. The group are meeting in Q1 2018/19 to consider next steps. Further details and the final report can be found here: <https://www.derbyshirewildlifetrust.org.uk/PlayWild>

Progress against priority actions, indicator(s) and focus:

Priority action p):

- The Charity Working Group has continued to meet and make progress. The final meeting is scheduled for April 2018 and a proposal will be presented to Authority in May 2018.
- Third party audience research has been presented to the Charity Working Group providing insight into visitor, resident and volunteer understanding and engagement with the Peak District National Park, and propensity to support in the future.

Priority action q):

- Delivery has started on the Endeavour project, a partnership being led by Endeavour with delivery in the PDNP by the Outreach team. The project will give disadvantaged young people the opportunity to connect with the heritage of local natural and cultural spaces, and to develop an understanding of the importance of these areas and how they are managed.
- Staff from Castleton Visitor Centre, Blueberry Cafe and the Outreach team worked together to support pupils from Chapel-in-le-Frith High School 'take over' the visitor centre for the day. The 'Takeover Challenge' has been developed by DEBP for Special Educational Needs and Disability Learners. The approach supports a group of up to 10 learners to progress through a four-month bespoke programme where the group are matched with a local employer to enhance the students' understanding of the world of work, while increasing their confidence and showcasing their employability skills.

Priority action r):

- This audience group and outcome remained the most difficult to reach in Q4. The work done continues to be innovative and well received, but not at a scale in line with original aspirations. Conversations have continued to take place with health policymakers and practitioners – on a local and National Parks England

(NPE) level – on the best activities and routes to funding to meeting this objective. This will continue in 2018/19.

Priority action s):

- The 'Better Impact' volunteer management system is now being rolled out and is being used by Moors for the Future Partnership (MFFP), South West Peak (SWP) and the Outreach team. The volunteer policy has been updated and new paperwork to support it developed. This includes handbooks for both volunteers and their managers.
- The development of volunteer use on a corporate level is now underway – including the completion of an initial review into potential demand, tasks, value and recruitment. This work will continue in 2018/19 to support the current volunteer priority actions as well as the new 2019-24 corporate plan development.

Indicators:

- Young people target is 11% up on last year. This is due to a general increase all round, but we are seeing a very strong secondary demand as a result of changes in curriculum. Nationally, there appears to be a decline in GCSE groups going on field visits, where we are seeing an increase. This decrease has been especially so where visits are part of a residential visit, due to cost. We are one of the few providers offering fieldwork at this level as day visits, which makes them more affordable and accessible.
- Volunteer figures are showing a 19% decrease in the number of volunteer days. This is partly due to changes (improvements) in how we collect data and the poor weather in Q4, which saw a number of events being cancelled.

Service plan actions linked to 'Our Focus':

- See the narrative supplied for the individual priority actions.

Issues arising and action to address:

Priority Action: p)

l) **RAG Rating:** Amber.

m) **Issue:** Lack of charity vehicle to support donations growth.

n) **Action:** The Charity Working Group has now completed its initial work and will be providing its report to the Authority meeting in May.

Risk implications:

If the decision is made to not move ahead with the charity, a revised view of the medium to long-term growth in voluntary donations will be required. Steps have been taken to ensure the PDNPA can continue to stimulate and collect donations – and build a supporter database.

Priority Action: r)

o) **RAG Rating:** Amber.

p) **Issue:** Relatively low engagement with audiences experiencing health challenges.

q) **Action:** At a local level, partnerships and opportunities are actively sought to engage with this target audience (see year end performance figures +105% vs. last year). Nationally, the PDNPA is working in partnership with other 'northern' national parks to engage with Public Health England.

Risk implications:

The volume of interventions will remain relatively low if a national, pan-park, pan-departmental approach to this topic does not materialise. This could also mean PDNPA attempting to solve a problem – and secure an outcome – beyond its scope, expertise and resource, leading to misalignment of effort.

Priority Action: s)

r) **RAG Rating:** Amber.

s) **Issue:** Systems and processes to support growth of volunteer input into PDNPA work at a corporate scale.

t) **Action:** A system to support existing volunteers has been procured; training in its use has begun. A wider piece of work to understand the corporate tasks/value of widening the volunteer pool (matched to audience demand) will kick off in Q1.

Risk implications:

The inability to recruit (and retain) the volume and quality of volunteer will impact negatively on the PDNPA's ability to deliver its objectives.

Directional Shift 3: Visitor experiences that inspire and move

Our Focus:	2017-18 priority actions	Progress (RAG)
22. Look after the whole Park as a public asset in a way that encourages access and responsible behaviour	t) We will have identified key audiences and behaviours that sustain the special qualities of the Peak District National Park and be developing an understanding of what those audiences feel/know about us.	GREEN
23. Provide a quality experience for anybody who visits our property or uses our visitor services that people are willing to pay for	u) We will have an access service delivering a responsive service and have a programme of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site based maintenance and improvements for key visitor locations. - Prioritised action on regulation. - Engagement with people, recognising and valuing access in the Peak District National Park. 	GREEN
24. Provide quality new experiences that will generate new income to fund the place	v) We will be maximising the impact of the refresh to all our Visitor Centres to support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enhanced customer service engagement. - Income generation. - Fundraising. - Promoting understanding. 	AMBER

Corporate Indicator	Target 2017-18	Status at Q4
3. Brand awareness and understanding among existing audiences and potential supporters:		
a) % who know about the PDNP (compared with other comparator organisations/ causes)	a) Research Commissioned	Completed and findings fed into Charity Working Group and 2019-24 corporate planning process.
b) % who understand PDNP potential benefits/ services	b) >90%	63%
c) % who feel positive towards the PDNP	c) >90%	100%
d) % who are willing to support the PDNP	d) >90%	85%

4. Customer satisfaction with the PDNP experience	>90%	100%
---	------	------

Overview:

The new in-house maintenance team is now fully staffed and we look forward to bring its full suite of skills and effort to bear on our maintenance and development plans for our assets during the final year of this corporate plan period. Audiences continue to provide positive feedback on their encounters with the PDNPA at our assets – reflected in great trading results in the Cycle Hire Service, the food and beverage concession at Castleton and the North Lees campsite. The continued challenge is getting embedded a full understanding of the benefits of the PDNP and the resources required to keep it operating to this standard or increase services and education. We have made improvements in a number of communication channels, we have a fully-staffed outreach team and are increasing our reach through third parties. On the regulatory side, a prioritised improvement programme is in place and Traffic Regulation Orders continue to be deployed appropriately and in line with statutory duties.

Progress against priority actions, indicator(s) and focus:**Priority action t):**

- The recent audience research exercise – initiated as part of the work to review the potential value of creating a charity to stimulate donations – revealed a range of wider audience insights which will be extremely valuable in developing PDNPA products, services, income streams and communications channels. This insight will be shared with Members as part of the development of the 2019-24 Corporate Strategy.

Priority action u):

- The CMPT is now fully staffed with 2 new starters joining our existing team in Q4. This will enable a responsive access service and planned maintenance/improvements to key visitor locations.

Priority action v):

- Improvements to our Bakewell Visitor Centre have been completed creating a more welcoming exterior and clearer branding. Anecdotal feedback indicates that this has already resulted in increased footfall. Interpretation will be installed to further improve the visitor experience and promote understanding in Q1 2018/19.
- Bakewell visitor interpretation is signed off and ready for production. Implementation is planned in Qtr1 2018/19. Edale Visitor Centre interpretation refresh is underway and tweaks at Castleton are being finalised, also with a planned implementation of Q1 2018/19.

Indicators:

- The audience research – which focused on propensity to support the PDNP through voluntary donations – has been completed and findings have been fed into the Charity Working Group. The insight will also form part of the inputs into the development of the 2019-24 Corporate Strategy.
- The user survey findings indicate continued very high levels of satisfaction. The lower score for understanding suggests improvements are required in our outreach and communications which are now well underway and captured in more detail elsewhere in the performance report. Similarly, translating that satisfaction into active support remains a challenge – reflected in the level of donations. Volunteer retention remains high, but acquisition, particularly from under-represented groups, remains much lower.

Service plan actions linked to ‘Our Focus’:

- 22) Significant effort has been made in improving the behavioural messages at assets owned and run by the PDNPA and through its communications channels – digital and traditional. There is still inconsistency in content and standard. This will be addressed through the brand roll out programme which will continue in 2018/19. Elsewhere in the performance report is comprehensive information on some of the activity and its reach and impact.
- 23) and 24) Improvements at our visitor centres have been met with positive responses. Due to resource challenges, we have not progressed all the planned improvements at the ideal pace. The above user survey scores indicate a good level satisfaction.

Issues arising and action to address:**Priority actions t) and v)**

- **RAG rating:** Amber.
- **Issue:** The pace of improvements to the physical infrastructure is not supporting the aspirations for engagement. While satisfaction rates are high, understanding and willingness to support are not aligned with this positive score.
- **Action:** Improved working practices around the RASCI model have been introduced corporately.

Risk implications:

- Lower engagement with audiences and reduced donations.

Directional Shift 4: Grow income and supporters

Our Focus:	2017-18 priority actions	Progress (RAG)
25. Increase our income from giving	w) We will have defined our brand positioning to support our Corporate Strategy on fundraising development, income generation and outreach.	AMBER
26. Achieve our commercial programme income targets		
27. Develop / establish sponsorship relationships	x) We will have implemented changes to our car park management and effectively communicated them.	AMBER
28. Secure external funding for major programme and partnership delivery	y) We will have approved short and long term plans for Millers Dale.	GREEN

Corporate Indicator	Baseline 2015-16	Target 2017-18	Status at Q4		
5. Amount and proportion of income by source:		5. a) Commercial increase: 5% by 2018-19 5. b i) Donations increase: 50% by 2018-19 2. d iii) Donations increase: 50% by 2018-19	Actual & (Proportion)	vs. last year	vs. plan
a) Commercial	£2,162,394 (17.8%)	No target	£1,636,646		
i) Conservation & Planning	£362,909	No target	£263,989		
ii) Commercial Dev & Outreach	£1,610,618	£1,664,306	£1,640,780	+5%	-1%
iii) Corporate Strategy & Devpt	£188,867	No target	£64,294		
b) Donations	£40,255 (0.3%)	No target	£24,168		
i) Donations (exc. legacy)	£34,230	£45,640	£24,168	-58%	-47%
c) External funding*	£3,584,952 (29.5%)	No target	£4,232,212		
d) Defra grant*	£6,364,744 (53.4%)	No target	£6,075,000		
e) Total income	£12,152,345	No target	£11,965,416		
2. d) Non-trading income supporters (donors)					
i) Number of donations	Baseline	No target	34		
ii) Average value of donations	Baseline	No target	£68.75		
iii) Number of donations (exc. legacy)	151 (16/17)	227 annually by (17-18)	34		

iv) Average value of donations (exc. legacy)	Baseline	No target	£68.75
--	----------	-----------	--------

*Some quarterly distortions will appear for proportions of Defra Grant and External Funding due to accounting process.

Overview:

- The donations and trading income picture is a mixed one. As set out below and in the section on priority actions and indicators, the Authority has experienced growth alongside shortfalls. Some of the contributing factors (good and bad) were in the Authority's control; others were external (exceptional and in line with trends).
- In terms of giving/voluntary donations the most significant amount of resource has been invested in the Charity Working Group. This provided a group comprising four members plus officers from the finance, legal and democratic services teams the space to bring their expertise and scrutiny to bear on a charity vehicle concept proposed, in line with the Giving Strategy approved by the Authority in early 2016, by the Commercial Development & Outreach Directorate. Officers from that directorate have provided a range of inputs including evidence from other national parks, charities and audience research alongside potential investment and governance scenarios for the Working Group to review over the last 12 months. The work was completed in Q4 and the Working Group will meet in Q1 of 2018-19 to finalise the report requested by the Authority for its full meeting in May. The backdrop to this decision is the year-end performance of -47% vs Plan; -49% vs. LY. Cumulatively, however, the picture is better: -16% vs. plan and 2018-19 will include donations from Eroica, Mend our Mountains and, potentially, the property legacy.
- Commercial income is just below (-1%) target for the year (+5% vs. LY), driven largely by the closure of Castleton Visitor Centre to facilitate refurbishment, unavoidable delays with the refurbishment of Bakewell Visitor Centre and the impact of this year's exceptional weather closures. Cycle hire has performed well and exceeded income targets which go some way toward off-setting the Visitor Centre shortfall. Warslow Moors Estate has achieved its budget target for the year but a higher level of income (from rents) could have been achieved if sufficient resource had been available in the Property Support Team. The addition of camping pods has contributed to North Lees Campsite exceeding its income expectations. Income from Surprise View car park and refreshment concession has also exceeded expectations. Income from our other P&D car parks has been below target in general. This is assumed to be due to poor weather over the winter but also as a result of damaged/stolen machines at some sites. Unforeseen delays in implementing our revised parking charges have been disappointing but it is hoped that the planned changes will come onto effect early in 2018/19.

Progress against priority actions, indicator(s) and focus:

Priority action w):

- The joint fundraising initiative with the fundraising arm of the BMC, Mend our Mountains has the public launch at the Sheffield Adventure film festival in March. The PDNPA and MFF has presence at the event, raising money, increasing engagement, capturing potential supporter data and educating visitors about the National Park and the campaign.

Priority action x):

- A Traffic Regulation Order consultation covering our pay and display car park was issued by Derbyshire County Council.

Priority action y):

- ARP Committee agreed short and long-term plans to develop Millers Dale Station in 2 phases. Phase 1 is currently underway and will be considered by planning committee in July.

Indicators:

- Trading income in the quarter remained below plan for the reasons set out in the overview. We have not been able to clawback all the shortfalls created by closures of key visitor services assets in the quarter. That said, in relation to wider business reporting, this is a robust performance and shows the resilience of the sector. With a full trading year in 2018-19 for all our business, plus planned product and merchandising development we should be able to bring actual back on track. Cumulatively, trading income levels stand at -3% vs. Plan.
- The donations (excluding legacies) are down significantly for the full year versus plan (-47%) and -29% vs. 2014-15 baseline levels. The reason behind this drop is not clear nor whether it represents a trend or one-off. We have not reduced any outbound stimulus (although it must be noted the Authority has never undertaken any significant marketing in this area). The lack of any donor data means we cannot identify trends, however the purchase of a CRM system will allow an effective database and supporter communication plan to begin to be developed in 2018/19. On the plus side we have secured a significant donation (£10,000) stimulated by via the Access and RoW Team from the Ramblers' Association to the Mend our Mountains campaign. Similarly, the significant legacy reported in Q3 is making steady progress through the system and should be realisable as a financial donation (to the capital fund) in the second half of 2018-19.

Service plan actions linked to 'Our Focus':

- 25) Fundraising development has been progressing through the Charity Working Group. The report from the Group is scheduled to be presented at the May 2018 Authority meeting. The purchase of a CRM system will allow an effective database and supporter communication plan to be developed in 2018/19.
- 26) Merchandising development opportunities have been delayed due to resource limitations. We will look to move forward with this more actively with new products planned for 2018/19.
- 27) The most significant sponsorship/partnership arrangement for this year and across the corporate plan period to date is the relationship with Columbia Sportswear. This has provided a significant saving in terms of uniforms for staff alongside a cash contribution and marketing opportunities. We continue to have support from Tarmac for our conservation volunteering programme (dialogue has begun with company exploring national partnership opportunities) and enjoy contributions in terms of staff and accommodation costs from utility companies across visitor experience and outreach development. Eroica Britannia this year made the PDNP is official donation partner which means ticket purchasers can make a voluntary contribution at point of sale. To the end of Q4 this has generated c£3k. The final contribution value will be captured in reports for 2018-19. We continue to explore opportunities – large and small – with a range of other third parties including RHS Chatsworth Show, Why Not? Music Festival, Peak Resort and local retailers.

Issues arising and action to address:

Focus; 25) and 26); Priority actions: w) and x)

u) RAG rating: Amber.

v) Issue: The trend in donations to the PDNPA is not increasing. The potential to attract voluntary donations through a charity vehicle, realising the benefits of such an approach. The increased reliance on trading income through channels that have limited growth organic growth prospects or the corporate appetite for development.

w) Action: Improved communications and investment on campaign/audience management systems. Charity Working Group completing work and providing Authority with proposal to move ahead. Merchandise review, new locations and very early e-commerce thinking. Car park charge increase and enforcement plan being processed through appropriate third parties.

Risk implications:

- Failure to meet income diversification objectives undermining wider engagement and asset development aspirations leading to further decline in income development.

This page is intentionally left blank

Objective	PI Ref	Indicators
Shift 1 : The Place and the Park , on a landscape scale	1a	Stage of development of Landscape scale partnership programmes: Moors for the Future
	1b	Stage of development of Landscape scale partnership programmes: South West Peak Partnership
	1c	Stage of development of Landscape scale partnership programmes: White Peak Delivery Partnership
	1d	Stage of development of Landscape scale partnership programmes: Sheffield Moors Partnership
Shift 2: Connect People to the Place, the Park	2a	Number of people experiencing the benefits of the Peak District National Park from our target audiences of: Young people (under 25)
	2b	Number of people experiencing the benefits of the Peak District National Park from our target audiences of: People living with health inequality (particularly mental wellbeing)
	2c	Number of people experiencing the benefits of the Peak District National Park from our target audiences of: Volunteers (expressed as volunteer days)
	2d i)	Number of people experiencing the benefits of the Peak District National Park from our target audiences of: Supporters (donors)
	2d ii)	Number of people experiencing the benefits of the Peak District National Park from our target audiences of: Average value of donations
	2d iii)	Number of people experiencing the benefits of the Peak District National Park from our target audiences of: Number of donations (exc. legacy)
	2d iv)	Number of people experiencing the benefits of the Peak District National Park from our target audiences of: Average value of donations (exc. legacy)
Shift 3: Visitor experiences that inspire and move	3a	% who know about the PDNP (and compared with other comparator organisations/ causes)
	3b	% who understand PDNP potential benefits/ services
	3c	% who feel positive towards the PDNP
	3d	% who are willing to support the PDNP
	4	Customer satisfaction with the PDNP experience
Shift 4: Grow income and supporters	5a	Amount and Proportion of income by source: Commercial
	5a i)	Conservation & Planning
	5a ii)	Commercial Devpt & Outreach
	5a iii)	Corporate Strategy & Devpt
	5b	Amount and Proportion of income by source: Donations
	5b i)	Donations (exc. legacy)
	5c	Amount and Proportion of income by source: External Funding
	5d	Amount and Proportion of income by source: Defra Grant
	5e	Amount and Proportion of income by source: Total Income
Cornerstone 1: Our Assets	6a	Percentage of our assets that meet the standards set for: Maintenance
	6b	Percentage of our assets that meet the standards set for: Environmental performance (i) Existing - reduce the Authority's overall carbon footprint (ii) New - Carbon Management Plan (tbd)
	7	Proportion of planning appeals allowed
	8a	Proportion of planning applications determined in a timely way: 13 weeks for Major applications
	8b	Proportion of planning applications determined in a timely way: 8 weeks for Minor applications
	8c	Proportion of planning applications determined in a timely way: 8 weeks for Other applications

Cornerstone 2: Our Services	8d	Proportion of planning applications determined in a timely way: 13 weeks for County matters	
	9a	Number of enforcement cases resolved	
	9b	% of enforcement enquiries (excluding Minerals and Waste Enquiries) investigated (and reach a conclusion on whether there is a breach of planning control) within 30 working days	
	10a	Customer satisfaction with the Planning Service: Percentage of applicants / agents who are satisfied with the Planning and Enforcement service	
	10b	Customer satisfaction with the Planning Service: Percentage of Parish Councils who are satisfied / believe we provide a quality service	
	10c	Customer satisfaction with the Planning Service: Residents (from residents survey)	
	10d	Customer satisfaction with the Planning Service: Satisfaction with quality of the pre application advice provided	
	11a	Customer satisfaction with the Planning Service: Number of complaints received	
	11b	Customer satisfaction with the Planning Service: % complaints dealt with in accordance with agreed deadlines	
	11c	Customer satisfaction with the Planning Service: Satisfaction with first and second lines of enquiry (initially for planning service)	
Cornerstone 3: Our Organisation		12	Audit conclusions showing satisfactory governance arrangements in place
Cornerstone 4: Our People	13a	Employee engagement: % reponse rate to staff survey	
	13b	Employee engagement: Ave % of respondents that agree or strongly agree with the questions in the work engagement section of the survey	
	14	Implement the recommendations of the 2016 – 17 Investors in People assessment	
	15a	Sickness Levels: % of total time lost due to sickness (expressed as hours)	
	15b	Sickness Levels: Hours per FTE	
	15c i)	Absence: Sickness frequency rate	
	15c ii)	ii) Absence: Individual sickness frequency rate	
	15d	Sickness Levels: Value of total time lost (expressed as pay cost)	
	16	Sickness Levels: Staff turnover	

Baseline	2015 -16	2017/18	2018/19
		Outturn	Target
Mature Partnership		Mature Partnership	Mature Partnership
Strategic Plan		Strategic Plan	Operational Plan in place
Vision		On target	Operational Plan in place
Vision		On target	tbc
18,901		21,798	(+5%)
New		1,703	1,000
9,527		6,795	(+5%)
New		107	n/a
New		£204	n/a
New		107	(+50%)
New		£204	n/a
New		Year 1 data complete	Research Commissioned
New		63%	>90%
New		100%	>90%
New		85%	>90%
94%		100%	>90%
2,162,294	(17.8%)	£2,129,405 (15.2%)	n/a
£362,909		£343,233	n/a
£1,610,618		£1,640,780	(+5%)
£188,867		£145,402	n/a
£40,255	(0.3%)	£24,168 (0.17%)	n/a
£34,230		£24,168	(+50%)
3,584,952 (29.5%)		£5,361,511 (38.33%)	n/a
6,364,744 (53.4%)		£6,474,218 (46.28%)	n/a
12,152,345 (100%)		£13,959,302 (100%)	n/a
New		Insufficient data	Define methodology
(i) 24.30% (ii) New		Insufficient data	(i) 30% (ii) Define methodology
24%		0%	<30%
70%		100%	>70%
71%		75%	>70%
89%		85%	>80%

33%	100%	>70%
124	26	120 (30 per quarter)
New	80%	80%
New	82%	>75%
65%	Survey Parish Councils	tbc
38% (2012)	47%	>38%
New	65%	>75%
14	5	<20
86%	85%	90%
New	75%	>75%
Achieved	Achieved	Achieve
New	64%	No staff survey planned
New	66%	No staff survey planned
New	Delivered through the "People Matter – Action Plan" September 2017	Complete 3-Year Action Plan
New	Q4 2.55% Annual 1.34%	2.3% quarterly 2.15% annually
New	Q4 12.59h Annual 38.19h	11.1h quarterly 44.4h annually
New	Q4 24.86% Annual 96.66%	25% per quarterly 100% annually
New	Q4 21.85% Annual 49.50%	No target
New	Q4 £30,306 Annual £68,165	£26,750 quarterly £107,000 annually
15%	Q4 3% Annual 14%	ACAS standard to be used (Range 9-15%)

Quarter 4 2017/18: Report on Complaints and Freedom of Information and Environmental Information Regulations Enquiries

Complaints

Summary of Complaints in YTD	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	YTD	2017/18 Target
Number of Complaints Received in Quarter:	3	3	3	5	14	<20
Percentage of complaints dealt with in accordance with agreed deadline of 15 working days	100%	100%	100%	67%	92%	
Number of Complaints in Quarter regarding an Authority Member:	0	0	0	0	0	-

Complain t Ref, Date Made and Stage	Service and Reason for Complaint	Date Response Sent	Outcome	Any Change in Processes/Practices as a Result of Complaint Investigation
C.439 08/02/18 Stage One	Programme Delivery – MFFP Complaint regarding the actions of an officer with regard to the operation of a contract.	Original deadline of 01/03/18 extended due to need for more information from Complainant. Response to two allegations sent 16/03/18. Third allegation to be investigated further.	Complaint raised three allegations to be considered: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An officer used their position as a National Park employee to benefit a rival company; 2. An officer threatened a principle contractor; 3. A history of differential behaviour by an officer to different contract operators. The first allegation is not upheld and the Authority is confident that the officer acted reasonably and not conspiratorially with another party when made aware of an issue relating to registration of helicopters. The second allegation refers to an email and is not upheld. The email sets out the Authority’s position with regard to a contract and the legal options open to the Authority, it was checked with another officer and a legal officer before being sent. The principle contractor did not have any concerns regarding the email. The third allegation is to be investigated further as part of a wider review of our relationships with our contractors and our helicopter working arrangements.	None required.

C.440 09/02/18 Stage One	Development Management Service Complaint regarding actions of officers in planning issues	Original deadline of 02/03/18 extended to 09/03/18. Response sent 09/03/18.	Some of the issues raised related to historical planning applications and some to a current application. Confirmed that the current application was being handled in accordance with normal process and timings of process. Refuted allegations that an officer was using undue influence due to a former working relationship with the applicant and stated that the officer always worked within professional standards. With regard to a planning application made in 2013 advised that the decision was made on policy grounds and was robust, also as the permission was not implemented the conditions could not be enforced. With regard to the current application explained the process for reporting representations and responded to comments made concerning the Committee report. Stated that the Authority had already served enforcement notices in relation to the site and could enforce any new breaches. With regard to mislabelling of a barn on the Committee site plan stated that a number of Members visited the site prior to committee and were aware of its exact location and do not think that the mislabelling had any impact on the decision. Satisfied that officers reached a reasonable conclusion regarding impact on amenity and the overall impact.	None required.
C.441 09/02/18 Stage One	Development Management Service Complaint alleging inconsistencies in pre-application advice and how a planning application was subsequently considered.	05/03/18 3 working days over original deadline.	Response explained that pre-application advice was given within normal practice, without the benefit of a site visit, and was not legally binding as it did not take into account the views of statutory consultees. In the course of dealing with the then submitted application representations had raised concerns primarily about two issues, access across a neighbour's property and parking, which the case officer considered when making site visits. The officer who gave the pre-application advice had advised the Complainant to contact the Highway Authority for advice regarding parking which they did. Unfortunately the highway advice has not been considered acceptable. However as other residents have raised parking concerns the case officer and his Team Manager are endeavouring to visit the road at various times	None required

			<p>of day in order to make a proper assessment of the likely impact of the development in this respect.</p> <p>Accepted that amenity concerns raised by the case officer are contrary to the pre-application advice given and apologised for this. The Team Manager and case officer have been advised that the application should be assessed on this point in line with the pre-application advice.</p>	
<p>C.442 13/03/18 Stage One</p>	<p>Development Management Service</p> <p>Complaint concerning the following issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Email trail published on the Authority's website relating to a planning application under 'General Correspondence' shows an officer's conduct as unsafe, unsound and unprofessional. Complainant alleges the officer was biased in favour of the application. 2. Alleges the Authority was remiss in requiring the application to be considered by the Planning Committee before investigating the officer's conduct. 3. Expresses concern about the behaviour of Members at the Planning Committee with regard to the planning application and that several Members prejudiced the consideration of this complaint by expressing their personal views about the officer. 	<p>Response due by 05/04/18</p>	<p>Will be reported in next Quarter.</p>	

C.443 21/03/18 Stage One	Development Management Service / Information Management Service Complaint regarding handling of a planning application and a freedom of information request.	Response due by 12/04/18	Will be reported in next Quarter.	
--------------------------------	--	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	--

Update on Complaints Reported in Previous Quarters

Complaint Ref, Date Made and Stage	Service and Reason for Complaint	Date Response Sent	Outcome	Any Change in Processes/Practices as a Result of Complaint Investigation
C.434 Ombudsman (Stage One reported in Quarter 2)	Development Management Service Complaint that the Authority is failing to carry out its statutory duty as the planning authority for the National Park area.	None required	The Ombudsman will not investigate the complaint that the Authority is failing to carry out its statutory duty as the planning authority. The Complainants have not suffered significant enough injustice over and above that of others who may pass by the site daily to justify the Ombudsman's involvement.	None required.
C.438 21/12/18 Stage Two (Stage One reported in Quarter 3)	Development Management Service Complaint relating to planning issues and Complainant unhappy with Stage One response. Alleges did not answer issues raised and a complete failing of public accountability, record keeping and serious questions regarding conduct of officers with regard to the 7 principles of public life.	Meeting held with Complainant on 01/02/18 Written response sent on 16/02/18	Director and Head of Service met Complainant on site to discuss issues and concluded it was very likely that, depending on the details of how the building was finished, would be able to agree a satisfactory scheme which included most of the work the Complainant had carried out. Agreed to look at plans and advise whether changes would need to be subject to an application to amend the planning permission.	None required.

Complaints Review

Since 2015, at Members' request, we have included a review and update on trends in complaints over the past 3 years in the Quarter 4 report.

Numbers of Complaints Received Over Last 3 Years												
Year	No of Total Complaints					No of Stage 1 Complaints		No of Stage 2 Complaints		No of Ombudsman Complaints		
Period	Received	Withdrawn	Against Development Management (Previously Planning Service)	Against Other Services	Against Members	Development Management (Previously Planning Service)	Other Services	Development Management (Previously Planning Service)	Other Services	Development Management (Previously Planning Service)	Other Services	Members
1 April to 31 March												
2015/16	14	0	8	5	1	6	5	1	1	2	1	0
2016/17	13	0	8	4	1	6	4	1	1	3	0	0
2017/18	14	0	9	5	0	9	5	4	0	2	0	0

The following trends in complaints have been identified:

2015/16 – Planning Service: handling of planning applications, lack of enforcement action and actions of officers.
Other Services: Actions of officers.

2016/17 – Planning Service: actions of officers, enforcement issues and handling of planning applications.
Other Services: No particular trends identified.

2017/18 – Development Management Service: handling of planning applications and actions of officers.
Other Services: Actions of officers.

With regard to the number of complaints received, the reduction over the previous 4 years has been sustained this year and is shown in the table above. Of those complaints which were pursued to the Local Government Ombudsman, there have been no upheld complaints. As with previous

year's reports within the Planning Service it is considered that part of the reason for the reduction in complaints is the greater focus on dealing with issues as soon as they arise, rather than allowing them to escalate into a formal complaint.

Quarter 4 2017/18: Report on Freedom of Information (FOI) and Environment Information Regulation Enquiries (EIR)

Quarter	No. of FOI Enquiries dealt with	No. of EIR Enquiries dealt with	No. of Enquiries dealt within time (20 days)	No. of late Enquiry responses	No. of Enquiries still being processed	No. of referrals to the Information Commissioner
Q1	8	10	18	0	2	0
Q2	3	4	7	0	2	0
Q3	5	10	15	0	2	0
Q4	5	17	21	1	3	0
Cumulative	21	41	61	1	9	0