

Proposed Scrutiny Project Brief

APPENDIX 1

<u>Topic for Scrutiny:</u> Aspect of Understanding of the National Park	
<u>Scrutiny Team Chair:</u> To be appointed by scrutiny team	<u>Scrutiny Team Members:</u> To be appointed by the Authority on 26 March 2010.
<u>Lead Officer for topic:</u> Richard Campen, Director of Operations	
<u>Rationale / Reasons for topic selection:</u> The following reasons were given at the Member workshop in July 2009: core purpose; poor performance indicator result; community tensions; greater accountability; long term future security of the National Park	
<u>Range of suggestions for focus from Member workshop:</u> The following suggestions for the focus of the scrutiny were made at the Member workshop in July 2009: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Stakeholder groups (Local authorities, Parish Councils, Regional Development Agencies, Young people, members)• Education• Image (need higher profile)• Relationships with: a) communities b) non east midlands regions c) Constituent authorities understanding National Parks• Need to sell attributes of National Park to constituent authorities. Make our plans part of theirs• How to engage communities effectively in National Park decisions and gain their support• How can we set about increasing the level of understanding amongst constituent councils and RDAs of National Park purposes so that they contribute to achievement of the National Park Management Plan and we engage with LAs and RDAs outside the East Midlands on a rational but practical basis	
<u>Proposed focus for scrutiny process:</u> The following proposal is in line with the broad suggestions made at the Member workshop, would add value to the Authority progressing action against its Performance Improvement Plan and is timely. Proposal for focus: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. How are constituent authorities engaging with communities and how best can we be involved in order to increase the understanding of NP purposes What will be achieved: Evidence and recommendations for action that can be taken to make improvements in the Authority's impact in this area	
<u>Potential risks:</u> Are there any risks, barriers or dangers associated with undertaking this review? To be identified by scrutiny team	
<u>Methodology / approach for scrutiny process:</u> To be agreed by the scrutiny team in line with the revised scrutiny process	
<u>Information and support requirements (e.g. Documents, Witnesses, Experts, Consultation, Research, Site visits)</u> To be identified by scrutiny team	
<u>Resource implications:</u> The scrutiny guidelines explain that Resource Management Team will consider a proposal from the relevant Director on officer support and project management arrangements in parallel with agreeing these with the Chair of the scrutiny team. It will be necessary to plan the commitment of such resources within current budgets and to fit with planned work programmes.	
<u>Approvals needed:</u> Chair and Vice Chair of Audit and Performance Committee (19 February 2010); Management Team (1 March 2010); Authority meeting (26 March 2010)	