

**Appendix 1b: Panel's Assessment and Scoring Sheet Template: LEGACIES – Due Diligence Panel Meeting held on 28/01/21**

<b>Proposer: Justine Wells</b>	<b>Panel's assessment, score and recommendations for mitigating action</b>
Name of deceased	■■■■■
<b>Assessment of proposal against 1-6 in process criteria</b>	
1. Identity check section	■■■■■ was not known to the Authority.  No issues identified – Score 10
2. Terms of legacy - Fit with PDNPA brand values section	One fifth share for general benefit of the National Park Authority, no special conditions.  No issues identified -Score 10
3. Conflict of interest/impact on Authority's reputation section <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reputation</li> <li>• Planning/enforcement history</li> <li>• Promotional/campaign/political association</li> <li>• Links to Members/staff/volunteers</li> </ul>	Not know to Authority, lived outside of the National Park, no planning or enforcement history.  No issues identified – Score 10
Conclusions on whether appropriate to develop a relationship with interested party	Generous legacy, no concerns by Panel in accepting. No publicity until amount received less taxes. Awaiting details from the solicitors to see if there was anything ■■■■■ or ■■■■ family specifically wanted the money to be used for. If there are any specific requests need to consider how fit with NPA values. Panel feels strong need for the legacy to be used for something tangible.

Scoring: Score out of 10

10 = no issues

1= prohibitive issues meaning cannot proceed whatever the value of other scores

5= satisfactory – some issues but not insurmountable

0= difficult to make judgement from information provided- more information needed