

YORKSHIRE DALES NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

28th March 2006**IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT (NPAPA) IMPROVEMENT PLAN****Purpose of the Report**

To seek:-

- (a) Members' support for the detailed implementation of the National Park Authority Performance Assessment (NPAPA) Improvement Plan, and their role in it;
- (b) Members' views on their future role in the overall leadership of the Authority;
- (c) Approval for reducing the size of the Authority's Planning Committee and the arrangements for doing so.

Background

At the National Park Authority meeting in January, Members considered an initial draft of the NPAPA Improvement Plan and after due consideration resolved that:-

- (a) *the package of recommendations and actions set out in the Improvement Plan appended to the report of the Chief Executive be approved;*
- (b) *Members confirm their belief that there are advantages to the suggestion made by the Peer Review Team to reduce the size of the Planning Committee;*
- (c) *the membership and remit of the Planning Performance Working Group be extended to take forward recommendations 11-13 of the Improvement Plan and report back to the Authority with recommendations on what the most appropriate arrangements would be for operating a smaller Planning Committee, the membership of the Group being extended by the addition of Messrs Blackie, Lis and Pearlman;*
- (d) *a report setting out proposals for the way in which Members will be involved in the implementation of the other recommendations and actions be brought to the March meeting of the Authority for consideration and adoption.*

In the light of resolutions a) and b) above, this report deals with Members' requests for further work to be done on items c) and d).

The Improvement Plan

In January, Members' approved the package of recommendations and actions set out in the Improvement Plan. That Plan shown at **Appendix 1** has now been expanded to:

- a) show lead responsibility for carrying out the work leading up to implementation of each action;
- b) the deadline for doing so, together with, where appropriate, the relevant body (full Authority or one of its Committees) that will formally approve any new arrangements

Lead responsibility for a number of the actions rests with officers (and a glossary has been included at the end of the paper). However, as part of the development of the strengthened role of members, lead responsibility for a number of actions has been assigned to existing Member working groups (e.g. the Planning Performance Working Group). In other cases, it has been tentatively allocated to the proposed new Member 'champions'.

The NPAPA Review

The report of the Peer Review Team, published in October 2005, included a series of recommendations for improvement, and concluded that: "The Authority has committed Members who could contribute significantly more with a wider governance role". Their report raised a number of specific issues (most of which were also identified through the Authority's self-assessment) that need to be considered here:

- Leadership
- Representing the Authority
- Ownership of policies and decisions
- Review and performance management
- Communication (internally and externally)
- Sharing learning for the benefit of future work and performance improvement

Piecing together the various elements of the Peer Review and the Authority's own self assessment, it quickly becomes apparent that improving our 'governance' is integral to achieving most (if not all) of the improvements. To do so, boils down to two fundamental issues, which are inextricably linked:

- a) Widening and strengthening the role of Members in the governance of the Authority; and,
- b) Creating the capacity for Members to take on this enhanced role.

Leadership

Members should expect (and be enabled) to:-

- set a clear direction for the Authority (policies, objectives, priorities etc)
- hold officers to account for implementing the above
- set the framework within which officers operate (Standing Orders, Delegation, Financial Regulations etc)
- have their abilities, experience and capabilities recognised
- represent the Authority (sell the Purposes and, if necessary, 'fight the NP corner')
- represent the views of all stakeholders so as to inform decisions.

The need for improved leadership was a theme of the NPAPA process. Leadership within this National Park Authority is significantly different from that of other local authorities where party politics plays a significant role in determining who leads and how. The National Park Authority does not have the advantages (or disadvantages!) of this approach. From discussions that have already taken place in a number of forums, there seem to be a number of principles that Members would like to see enshrined in any new arrangements:

- all Members should continue to have equal standing (i.e. there should be no 'executive' group or 'senior' members);
- all major decisions on policy should continue to be taken by the full Authority;
- places on all committees should be allocated equitably and fairly;
- the Authority should not be, nor be seen to be, officer-led';
- there should be more contact/joint-working between officers and members.

In addition, following discussion between the Authority's senior managers it is suggested that it would be useful to adopt a number of other principles, namely:-

- Members should lead the Authority and set the agenda;
- Governance arrangements should be appropriate to the relatively small size of the organisation;
- Members should have a role as 'ambassadors' for the Authority and there should be 'buy in' to the Authority's decisions;
- Responsibility for day-to-day operational decisions should continue to rest with the Chief Executive.

In light of these principles, a key question facing the Authority is: How to get leadership from a group of 26 people (sometimes with 26 different views!), whose views are all equally valid?

It does not appear that there is a 'big bang' approach that will resolve this question and deal with all the issues above. Moreover if there were, and the Authority 'got it wrong', we might find ourselves in severe difficulties in being unable to retrench our position. What follows are a number of proposals of how the role of Members might be developed and improved in order to implement some of the principles identified above.

Future Role of Members

Members continue to be formally involved in the work of the Authority through:-

- the National Park Authority itself;
- the committees;
- the sub-committees;
- working groups;
- Policy Development Forum
- representation on external bodies.

This involvement, though important, often tends to be at the end of the process rather than the start/during it. Much of this work is also very formal, sometimes creating barriers to member /officer dialogue and the development of policy and decision making.

Member 'champions'

It is proposed that in order to better deliver the Authority's objectives a number of member 'champions' or 'portfolio holders' be established to work much more closely with officers. This would be a significant change in the culture of the Authority's working. However, a more direct working relationship between members and officers has the potential to deliver the National Park's purposes and objectives in a much improved way.

It is proposed that the Authority's seven 'functional headings' (as contained in the BVPP) are used as the basis for defining the seven broad 'services' covered by the Authority.

They are:-

- Conservation of Natural Environment
- Conservation of Cultural Heritage
- Recreation Management
- Promoting Understanding
- Development Control
- Forward Planning
- Corporate and Democratic Core Functions

Terms of Reference would be required for the role of Members in acting as 'champions' for each of these areas of work. Clearly, this is a matter for Members themselves to determine but the principles identified earlier in this report would suggest that Members do not wish to see decisions on policy being taken out of the full Authority. It is, therefore, suggested that the role of the 'champions' could be to:

- assist with the implementation of agreed Authority policy;
- develop future policy proposals;
- champion the service within the Authority;
- represent the Authority externally on issues relating to that service.

Such a role would be quite time intensive. The relationship with senior officers would be much closer than has been the case at any time in the Authority's history. Members taking on this role would need to have the capacity to carry it out. This will only be possible if the 'champions' come from the 11 Members who would not be involved on the Planning Committee (should the size of the Committee be reduced from 26 to 15). If more than 7 of

the 11 members wished to take up this opportunity then there could be co-champions for some areas. Given the time commitment, it is suggested that Members should not act as champion for more than one of the areas. However, in line with the earlier principles, Members are the ones who are required to establish the role and parameters of these new groupings.

The Role of the Audit and Review Committee

In recent months there has been a change of focus within the Audit and Review Committee. The most tangible representation of this has been the establishment of the Corporate Governance Working Group (CGWG). This was created in December 2005 and comprises the following membership: - Mr Blackie, Mrs Marshall, Mrs Peacock, Dr Petyt and Mrs Rose.

The Working Group's terms of reference are set out in **Appendix 2**.

Members have already indicated that they would not favour the Audit and Review Committee taking on the sort of formal 'scrutiny' role adopted in other local authorities. Instead, initial discussions within the Working Group have highlighted a more positive 'looking to the future' or 'performance improvement' role for the Audit & Review Committee. This could be developed in a number of ways:-

- taking the lead on improvement planning and learning from major projects (e.g. Out of Oblivion, Yoredale) and ongoing programmes (e.g. Archaeology, Rights of Way etc);
- monitoring the Authority's performance against its objectives and targets;
- instigating reviews in areas where the Authority is under-performing;
- dealing with the new Audit Commission agenda on value for money;
- ensuring implementation of the actions in the NPAPA Improvement Plan for the Authority.

However, it would be important for any future arrangement to recognise that this Committee would be one whose primary function was to review and improve performance in relation to delivering the policies and targets *set by the full Authority*.

Representational and 'ambassadorial' role

The principles, identified above, deal with the representational and ambassadorial role of Members. Who Members represent, and how they do so, has not been adequately dealt with since the passing of the 1995 Environment Act. Alongside the development of specific Member 'champions', there is a piece of work necessary to more clearly define the roles and responsibilities of Members more generally. This will need to ensure Members are able both to represent the views of all stakeholders as part of the consideration of decisions, and to represent the Authority externally to explain and champion those decisions. It is suggested that this might sensibly form part of the work of the (CGWG).

Review of Partnerships

The Audit and Review Committee has recently carried out the Authority's annual review of partnerships. We remain an exemplar of good practice in our approach to the use of partnerships but it may be useful to carry out a further piece of work to assess whether Members' expertise and capabilities are being fully utilised across this important area of our work. It may be that a greater use of member representation on partnerships, rather than that of officers, should be encouraged.

Recognising Members' Capabilities

In a similar vein to the points around Members' potential role on partnerships, it is worth considering whether formal Member representation, on what have hitherto been internal working groups, would be beneficial. This proposed approach could usefully deliver the principle of closer member/officer working in delivering the Authority's objectives. Examples would range from; a role on the proposed joint working group with YDMT, looking at how we might generate external funding, to the rather more pragmatic need for Member issues to be raised as part of the Authority's Health & Safety Working Group.

The Future of the Planning Committee

As highlighted earlier in this report the Peer Review Team identified a need to release Members' capacity, which was primarily tied up within the Planning Committee function, in order to free Members to take on a more positive leadership/ambassadorial role for the Authority.

At the January Authority meeting, Members confirmed their belief that there are advantages to this suggestion. However, this was clearly subject to getting a clearer indication of the proposals for both the future role of Members (set out above) and the operation of a smaller planning committee.

In order to assist the process, the Planning Performance Working Group (PPWG) recently met to identify what might be the most appropriate arrangements for operating a smaller Planning Committee. The Working Group examined a number of different issues: The size of any future Committee, the method of selection for Members, the rotation of Members, substitutes, the reference back system and the separation of policy from the development control function. (These discussions took place on the basis that the final decision on the size of the planning committee, had still to be determined by the Authority).

Size of Committee

In order to retain the necessary balance it was considered whether a Committee of 11 or 15 might be appropriate. There was an initial suggestion that 15 would be an appropriate size moving to 11 once the membership of the whole Authority was reduced in April 2007. Members unanimously supported the figure of 15 for Committee membership but did not want to commit the Authority to a further reduction in 2007. This matter should be

examined at the same time that the membership of all the Authority's committees, sub-committees and working groups is considered.

Method of Selection

Members will be aware that, as a matter of law, the appointment to all committees is one that has to be undertaken by the Authority. There was strong support in the Working Group for the 'four groups' nominating Members to the Authority for appointment. It is envisaged that this approach will apply for appointment to all the Authority's committees. If this proposal is accepted by Members a paper will be brought to the May Authority meeting on how this can be implemented to allow any necessary changes to come into force at the Annual General Meeting in July.

Rotation

There was some support expressed for 'no rotation', but after discussion Members unanimously supported the idea of 'optional rotation' (i.e. those Members who wished to be on the Planning Committee but were unsuccessful would be guaranteed a place on it the following year).

Use of Substitutes

There was majority support for the principle of having named substitutes for Members on the Planning Committee. This would take the form of an agreement, at the start of the Authority year, to who was the first, second and third substitute. If a member of the Planning Committee wasn't able to attend a meeting, the first substitute would be their replacement. At a future meeting, if a member of that same group wasn't able to attend, the second substitute would take their place and so on.

Reference Back

In light of the Audit Commission's planning report, members of the Working Group considered four options: -

1. Reference back to the full Authority (the recommendation of the Auditors)
2. Reference back to the Planning Committee
3. Reference back to a new Committee comprised of those Members not on the Planning Committee
4. Abolish the reference back system

There was majority support for the reference back to the Planning Committee. This would ensure the knowledge and continuity of the initial decision would be retained within that group. There were considerable practical disadvantages to the establishment of a new committee. Creating a new committee would not help with member/officer capacity issues and would involve the re-running the planning application for the new committee.

Splitting Policy from Delivery

This concerned the question of whether it should be the Planning Committee or the full Authority that prepared the local development framework (LDF). There was strong support that this policy issue should remain with the full Authority and a majority view that the local development framework went beyond the planning function and should involve the whole membership. It was also felt that it was important for all Members to `buy in' to the process through their involvement. However, one member did make the point that he felt the LDF remained a planning issue that did not have wider connotations.

Conclusion

The most fundamental issue arising from the NPAPA process relates to strengthening the future role of Members in leading, directing and managing the Authority's future work. This opportunity, afforded by what is a major cultural shift in the way in which we do business, has a number of potential pitfalls and difficulties. Not least of these will be ensuring that any new initiatives add value to the work of the Authority and can be delivered within the capacity of members and officers. Anything contrived or artificial about these new arrangements would soon be exposed. As a result, if the Authority does commit to the changes outlined in this report, that commitment will need to be wholehearted and supported by a real determination to ensure that the necessary changes and improvements are made.

Possibly the greatest benefit that could accrue to the Authority is to deal with the somewhat artificial definition of an organisation that is either `member led' or `officer led'. The proposals contained within this paper, if adopted, will go some way to ensure that that distinction is irrelevant in relation to the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority.

Recommendation(s)

It is recommended that:-

- (a) Members approve the detailed Improvement Plan set out at **Appendix 1**.
- (b) Members reduce the size of the planning committee to fifteen and approve the arrangements for doing so.
- (c) That a paper on the new arrangements for the operation of the Planning Committee be brought to the May National Park Authority (after further consideration by the Planning Performance Working Group).
- (d) That consideration be given to how best to take forward the proposals and ideas contained within the paper on the future roles of Members.

DAVID BUTTERWORTH
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

14th March 2006

OUTCOME #1: A CLEAR AND UNIQUE VISION FOR THE FUTURE OF THE PARK

Recommendations	Actions	Lead	Date
<p>1. Ensure that the review of the NPMP is completed as soon as is practicable:</p> <p>a. Finalise the development and documentation of the special qualities of the Park;</p> <p>b. Ensure there are opportunities for all stakeholders and local strategic partnerships (LSPs) to engage in the development of a shared vision for the Park</p> <p>c. Update long-term objectives to ensure all have clear outcomes and timescales</p> <p>d. Put in place arrangements for reviewing and monitoring progress that keep stakeholders informed and engaged</p>	<p>Publish and consult on a list of the Park's special qualities (as part of the development of the NPMP and Local Plan)</p>	<p>GS</p>	<p>Done</p>
	<p>Set up an NPMP steering group of key stakeholders (including all 3 LSPs)</p>	<p>GS</p>	<p>Done</p>
	<p>Set up 'drafting groups', including key stakeholders, to draw up initial proposals for each NPMP 'theme'</p>	<p>GS</p>	<p>Done</p>
	<p>Carry out full public consultation on the draft updated NPMP</p>	<p>NPMP Steering Group</p>	<p>Apr 2006</p>
	<p>Set clear and measurable long-term objectives in the updated NPMP</p>	<p>NPMP Steering Group</p>	<p>NPA Sep 2006</p>
	<p>Use the updated NPMP as the basis for future engagement with all stakeholders</p>	<p>GS</p>	<p>Oct 2006</p>
	<p>Review and consider a follow up to the Area Actions engagement process.</p>	<p>DB</p>	<p>NPA Nov 2006</p>
	<p>Put in place appropriate arrangements to monitor, record and publicise progress on the NPMP objectives, including through future 'State of the Park' reports.</p>	<p>NPMP Steering Group</p>	<p>Sep 2006</p>
	<p>Secure YDNPA representation on South Lakeland LSP</p>	<p>DB</p>	<p>Done</p>
	<p>Identify opportunities for joint consultations with LSPs on key issues</p>	<p>AG</p>	<p>Aug 2006</p>

OUTCOME #2: A SIMPLER, CLEARER STRATEGIC PLANNING FRAMEWORK

Recommendations	Actions	Lead	Date
<p>2. Continue the work on improving the clarity of the strategic plan structure and monitoring arrangements.</p> <p>a. Rationalise the Authority's strategic planning framework</p> <p>b. Update long-term objectives in all plans and strategies to make clear links with the updated NPMP.</p> <p>c. Ensure there is a consistent approach to setting 'outcomes' and 'milestones' in all plans & strategies, and to monitoring progress on all plans and strategies</p>	Review the current framework and set up a programme to reduce the number of plans and strategies	FP Champions	NPA Jul 2007
	Establish a consistent approach to the use of terminology ('objectives', 'aims' etc) in Authority plans	FP Champions	Aug 2007
	Maintain a widely-accessible 'library' of the Authority's plans and strategies	GS	May 2007
	Publicise the new framework across and outside the Authority	GS	Dec 2007
	Update the objectives in the BVPP to link to revised long-term objectives in the updated NPMP	All Champions	NPA Nov 2006
	Establish a programme to update the objectives in other plans and strategies to link to revised long-term objectives in the updated NPMP	FP Champions	NPA Jul 2007
	Establish consistent arrangements and timetable for preparing, reviewing and updating all plans and strategies (within the framework set by the updated NPMP)	FP Champions	NPA Jul 2007
Refine the State of the Park reporting process to ensure arrangements are in place for monitoring all outcomes identified in the updated NPMP	GS	Dec 2006	

OUTCOME #3: STRONGER MANAGEMENT OF PERFORMANCE

Recommendations	Actions	Lead	Date
<p>3. Improve the priority-setting process:</p> <p>a. review the current process</p> <p>b. ensure that staff are involved in the process</p> <p>c. raise awareness of priorities inside and outside the Authority;</p>	<p>Carry out a review of the priority-setting process to consider how it could more clearly incorporate day-to-day activities/costs and 'added value'</p> <p>Review and update the priority-setting process every five years</p> <p>Seek staff views on current priority-setting process to inform review</p> <p>Consult all staff and Members on proposed new 'model'</p> <p>Use the revised process to reconsider the Authority's priorities in light of the updated NPMP</p> <p>Include information on priority-setting in staff and Member induction</p> <p>Consider whether all individual staff objectives should be prioritised as part of appraisals</p>	<p>CM Champions</p> <p>CM Champions</p> <p>DB</p> <p>GS</p> <p>NPA</p> <p>DB</p> <p>RB</p>	<p>NPA Jul 2006</p> <p>NPA Jul 2011</p> <p>Apr 2006</p> <p>Jun 2006</p> <p>NPA Sep 2006</p> <p>Aug 2006</p> <p>Jan 2007</p>
<p>4. Enhance the existing performance monitoring and management arrangements:</p> <p>a. improve the monitoring of BVPP objectives and BVPIs;</p> <p>b. develop measures to show the extent to which YDMT is contributing to Authority priorities.</p>	<p>Review BVPIs and objectives to ensure all are relevant and that appropriate measures of progress are in place for all priority areas of work.</p> <p>Monitor BVPIs every 6 months, where practicable</p> <p>Incorporate an annual review of progress on BVPP objectives into existing monitoring arrangements</p> <p>Assess YDMT's current contribution to achieving the Authority's aims and objectives.</p> <p>Agree appropriate arrangements with YDMT for measuring and reporting performance in relation to Authority-funded work.</p>	<p>GS</p> <p>GS</p> <p>GS</p> <p>JA</p> <p>JA</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>A&R Dec 2006</p> <p>A&R Jun 2006</p> <p>F&R May 2006</p> <p>F&R May 2006</p>

Recommendations	Actions	Lead	Date
c. develop cost-effective arrangements for monitoring the Authority's environmental performance	Identify and put in place appropriate measures	RB	Sep 2007
5. Put in place systems for extracting learning and sharing it across the organisation.	<p>Put in place arrangements to make it easier to find and share research and survey information across the Authority</p> <p>Reports on progress and lessons learnt from major projects to go to the appropriate Committee</p>	<p>GS</p> <p>DB</p>	<p>Mar 2007</p> <p>A&R Sep 2006</p>

OUTCOME #4: CLEARER LEADERSHIP

Recommendations	Actions	Lead	Date
<p>6. Re-emphasise the role of members, and increase ownership and common purpose:</p> <p>a. clarify the advocacy and representational role of Members</p> <p>b. strengthen Member involvement in the wider governance and leadership of the Authority</p>	<p>Audit and Review Committee to develop guidance as part of its corporate governance work.</p> <p>Strengthen the role of the Audit and Review Committee</p> <p>Identify most appropriate 'governance' arrangements/structure for future management and leadership of the Authority.</p> <p>Update the programme of Member training and development as necessary</p>	<p>Corporate Governance Working Group</p> <p>CGWG</p> <p>CGWG</p> <p>DB</p>	<p>A&R</p> <p>NPA Jul 2006</p> <p>NPA Sep 2006</p>
<p>7. Re-establish arrangements for appraisal of Chief Executive</p>	<p>Chairman to determine and introduce appropriate arrangements for appraisal process and agreeing future objectives.</p>	<p>Chairman</p>	<p>Apr 2006</p>
<p>8. Gain a better understanding of staff expectations of leadership</p>	<p>Consult staff e.g. through consultations, workshops etc., and include in future staff surveys</p>	<p>RB</p>	<p>Dec 2006</p>
<p>9. Develop and support all line-managers to take on more of a leadership role</p>	<p>Identify management competencies based on the Authority's core values</p> <p>Incorporate arrangements for developing management competencies as part of staff appraisal process.</p> <p>Identify generic management issues arising from staff survey and any corporate training requirements.</p> <p>Hold annual meeting of line managers to improve understanding of personnel issues and ensure fair implementation of policies.</p>	<p>JA</p> <p>DB</p> <p>DB</p> <p>DB</p>	<p>F&R May 2006</p> <p>Aug 2006</p> <p>Aug 2006</p> <p>Aug 2006</p>

OUTCOME #5: A BETTER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SERVICE

Recommendations	Actions	Lead	Date
<p>10. Improve Authority effectiveness:</p> <p>a. consider the recommendation of the Audit Commission and Peer Review Team to reduce the size of the Planning Committee</p> <p>b. improving the operation of Planning Committee meetings</p>	Identify what the most appropriate arrangements would be for operating a smaller planning committee, while retaining balance	Planning Performance Working Group	NPA Mar 2006
	Change standing orders to introduce any new arrangements	RTD	NPA May 2006
	Reduce length of Committee reports by summarising content and weight of consultation responses.	PW	May 2006
	Provide training to the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of Planning Committee	RD	Apr 2006
	Review operation of 'A' and 'B' list on Committee papers	PPWG	Jul 2006
	Consider guidelines for management of Committee meetings	PPWG	Jul 2006
<p>11. Implement and monitor the impact of the Audit Commission recommendations approved by the Planning Committee.</p>	Review programme of visits to completed developments that have been controversial.	PW	Aug 2006
	Report annually to the Planning Committee on progress in implementing Local Plan	PW	Dec 2006
	Continue the close involvement of constituent authorities in reviews of economic & housing policies	PW	Mar 2007
	Planning issues to be included in annual programme of PDF meetings	PW	Mar 2007
	Amend Members Code of Conduct for DC to cover dialogue between officers & members before Committee.	RD	Jul 2007
	Consider how reports could contain more explicit analysis of policy issues, material considerations, and the weight to be attached to them.	PW	Done
	Record evidence or reasoning for material considerations that justify a decision contrary to recommendation or policy in the minutes.	PW	Done

Recommendations	Actions	Lead	Date
<p>12. Maintain the focus on improving the work of development control and planning enforcement:</p> <p>a. Implement and monitor impact of recommendations from Audit and Review Committee's internal planning performance review.</p> <p>b. Identify and implement further improvements to the quality and efficiency of the service</p>	<p>Appoint a Planning Enquiries Officer and develop clear, more effective and efficient arrangements for handling enquiries.</p>	PW	Done
	<p>Extend planning surgeries to all areas of the Park</p>	PW	May 2006
	<p>Revise internal arrangements and set and monitor clear targets for all stages of application process and develop a proactive system of caseload management between officers</p>	PW	Sep 2006
	<p>Report performance against targets to Planning Committee every quarter.</p>	PW	May 2006
	<p>Review the structure of the planning department to ensure it is fit for purpose</p>	DB	Aug 2006
	<p>Require all applications to be accompanied by all necessary information before validation</p>	PW	Apr 2006
	<p>Improve procedures for completing s106 agreements, including exploring options for earlier agreement/drafting</p>	PPWG	Jul 2006
	<p>Clear backlog of s106 agreements</p>	PW	May 2006
	<p>Make 'Yoredale' the permanent base for Planning Committee meetings and consider options for holding other Committee meetings around the Park.</p>	DB	Aug 2006
	<p>Set and publicise a clear deadline for late representations (Friday before Committee) and identify appropriate arrangements for handling any later representations</p>	PPWG	Apr 2006
	<p>Require reasons to be given for all Member 'call-ins' and identify these in Committee agendas/reports.</p>	PPWG	May 2006
	<p>Review operation and current extent of call-ins, and consider whether appropriate to set 'call-in' criteria and associated processes (e.g. Chairman's approval).</p>	PPWG	May 2006
	<p>Develop arrangements for earlier identification and arrangement of Committee site visits</p>	PPWG	Jun 2006
	<p>Clarify Members role in advising applicants</p>	PW	Jul 2006
<p>Promote new elements of the service (as set out above) to local communities, and promote wider understanding of the planning process.</p>	PW	May 2006	

OUTCOME #6: A MORE EFFECTIVE ORGANISATION

Recommendations	Actions	Lead	Date
<p>13. Look closely at current targets and performance in a number of service areas</p>	<p>Draw up prioritised programme of future service reviews</p> <p>Review BVPI targets compared to other NPAs</p>	<p>Corporate Management 'Champions'</p> <p>GS</p>	<p>A&R Jun 2006</p> <p>A&R Sep 2006</p>
<p>14. Put in place arrangements to ensure follow through with commitments made to stakeholders and partners, and increase continuity when change over of staff occurs</p>	<p>Develop appropriate administrative arrangements, including consideration of 'live' project notes, process manuals, library of key documents etc.</p> <p>Examine recruitment/exit procedures e.g. to fill vacancies more quickly, improve induction briefings and exit interviews/debriefings.</p>	<p>DB</p> <p>RB</p>	<p>Mar 2008</p> <p>Aug 2007</p>
<p>15. Implement more consistently the Authority standards for responding to correspondence.</p>	<p>Update, re-publish and re-publicise the Service Standards leaflet, and carry out appropriate monitoring.</p>	<p>CM Champions</p>	<p>Sep 2007</p>
<p>16. Improve effectiveness of management and development of Authority resources:</p> <p>a. Make provision for the future development of a procurement strategy and asset management strategy</p> <p>b. Provide a more structured approach to project management.</p>	<p>Review current arrangements for asset management and procurement, and identify most appropriate approach to future management</p> <p>Assess project management systems used by other organisations, including project management software, and introduce appropriate arrangements.</p>	<p>CM Champions</p> <p>CM Champions</p>	<p>F&R Dec 2006</p> <p>Aug 2007</p>

Recommendations	Actions	Lead	Date
17. Carry out an evaluation of IT services, including an assessment of the pace and complexity of change for information and communications technology, and amend the programme in the light of this	Audit current progress and impact of existing IT 'projects'	JA/PU Champions	Aug 2006
18. Make provision for the future development of a communications strategy.	Consider internal and external communication needs, and best approach to delivering key messages to target audiences	PU Champions	Nov 2006
	Develop a model contingency plan for dealing with 'crises' (focused on communication).	PU Champions	Oct 2006
19. Provide a means of showing more publicly the Authority's involvement in socio-economic partnership schemes.	Develop a more pro-active approach, as part of recommendation 19, to promote YDNPA involvement in socio-economic projects, including through Dales newspaper.	PU Champions	Oct 2006

Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority

Audit & Review Committee

Working Group on Corporate Governance

Terms of Reference

The Audit & Review Committee agreed that the “Good Governance Standard for Public Services”, published by the Independent Commission on Good Governance in Public Services, would be an appropriate framework for the Authority’s corporate governance arrangements.

The proposed terms of reference of the Working Group are as follows:

1. To assist the Audit and Review Committee to discharge its responsibilities in relation to the corporate governance of the Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority by:
 - a) Identifying any gaps in current arrangements for corporate governance;
 - b) Examining the appropriateness of policies and procedures which do exist and are relevant to corporate governance, and proposing changes where necessary;
 - c) Considering the structure of, and roles within, the Authority’s corporate governance arrangements, including the roles of Authority members;
 - d) In the light of the above, developing a corporate governance policy for the Authority and making recommendations to the Committee on these matters.
2. If thought appropriate following the above work, to offer advice to the Standards Committee in relation to any issues which fall within its terms of reference and are relevant to the corporate governance of the Authority.

In considering these matters, the Working Group will have regard to national initiatives and developments in relation to public sector governance and standards, as well as to the Authority’s particular circumstances, including in particular the outcomes of the National Park Authorities Performance Assessment process. The Group will work collaboratively with officers, in a spirit of partnership, to develop excellent governance arrangements for the Authority.

The Working Group aims to have completed its task by 31st December 2006, though an extension beyond that time may be agreed by the Audit & Review Committee if necessary.