

MOOR THAN MEETS THE EYE LANDSCAPE PARTNERSHIP BOARD

29 April 2015, Room 1, HMBC Princetown, 10am

Present:	Tom Stratton (Chair)	Duchy of Cornwall	TS
	Andy Bradford	Dartmoor Farmers Association	AB
	Ben Philipps	Forestry Commission	BP
	David Lloyd	DNPA	DL
	David Rickwood	Woodland Trust	DR
	James Platts	SWLT	JP
	Kevin Bishop	DNPA	KB
	Mark Allott	<i>MTMTE</i> Scheme Manager	MA
	Peter Exley	RSPB	PE
	Phil Hutt	Dartmoor Preservation Association	PH
Attending:	Andy Bailey	Community & Events Officer, <i>MTMTE</i>	ABY
	Emma Stockley	Community Heritage Officer, <i>MTMTE</i>	ES
	Ellie Fabiani-Laymond	Finance & Admin Officer, <i>MTMTE</i>	EL

1 Welcome

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2 Introductions

There was a brief round of introductions.

3 Apologies

Apologies from Ally Kohler (DNPA), Ian James (Devon County Council), Layland Branfield (Dartmoor Commoners' Council), Simon Lee (Natural England) and Chrissy Mason (*MTMTE* Community Ecologist) were noted.

4 Minutes of the last *MTMTE* LP Board meeting

Board Members were given time to read through the minutes of the previous meeting. At the conclusion of all Board business, the minutes of the meeting held on 27 February 2015 were agreed as a true record.

5 Highlight Report Review

MA presented the content of the Scheme Highlight Report for Year 1, Quarter 2 (Y1Q2) of the Scheme and explained the purpose of the report.

Page 1

Y1Q2 relates to the period from 1 December 2014 to 28 February 2015. The highlight report includes financial figures for this period but the opportunity has been taken to give a written update on issues and progress to 17 April 2015.

Overall the position has remained largely unchanged since the last report to Board, with some slippage in the Project schedules, mainly due to the late start of the MTMTE team and wider engagement with Project Leads. The Scheme is also ~50% behind in spend terms compared to the bid stage forecast.

Since the end of February, another four Projects have started, bringing the total number of active Projects to 19 out of the planned 28. One of these Projects is Parishscapes (PB2) which involves 14 separate community Projects within its scope. Programme E relates to overheads, accounting for another 6 Project/deliverables (including the website), so in total there are actually 47 Projects to deliver. Approximately half of these are now underway with a number of community Projects gathering momentum under the Parishscapes (PB2) Project. The Project schedules and overall Scheme delivery was presented in Highlight Report Appendix B.

The HLF quarterly claim for Y1Q2 was submitted on 1 and 2 April 2015. MA has also had a meeting with the HLF Mentor, James Dennis, to bring him up to date with the Scheme as it currently stands and this included a visit to some of the Projects. A meeting was also arranged with Kirsty Wallace from the HLF finance office in Exeter to discuss the mechanics of the Scheme finance and address some of the queries that have arisen from the claims process.

HLF has confirmed that the 10% retention will be applied to the cumulative amount claimed (ie. when 90%, £1.71m has been claimed) rather than 10% retention on each and every claim. Whilst this aids short-term cashflow, Projects toward the end of the Delivery stage will be impacted as £191k will be retained until:

- all Projects (and hence the Scheme) is complete
- Monitoring & Evaluation has been completed and approved by HLF (post August 2019)
- HLF has confirmed that the Scheme's Approved Purposes have been achieved.

Action: MA will revise the Scheme cashflow based on the outcome and advice from the meeting with Kirsty Wallace.

Page 2 – Overall Scheme progress

This gives an overall feel for the Scheme performance so far.

The public profile is increasing as more people become aware of *MTMTE*. The *MTMTE* team have been very active attending community events, Parish AGM's and Council meetings. There has been increased social media activity and the website is due to launch in the next couple of weeks.

In response to a query about the delay in launching the website, ABy explained that the original schedule was slightly unrealistic as it did not allow adequate time for all the steps in the process of bringing the website to life. The schedule allowed for the webpages to be designed, but following on from that, the DNPA are now working to import the design into their matrix platform, after which the pages will need to be

populated with the relevant information. The original schedule did not take into account the amount of additional work this would involve. The existing Development Stage WordPress website (<https://moorthanmeetstheeye.wordpress.com/>) remains the repository for Scheme information in the interim.

An overview of the individual Projects' performance is shown in Appendix A.

Page 3 - Schedule

Keeping to schedule is one of the aspects on which the Scheme will be monitored as it affects Scheme (and Project) cashflow. The traffic light system of red, amber and green, is useful for highlighting which Projects are going to plan (green), which Projects need attention (amber) and which Projects require some intervention or recasting (red).

Appendix B contained 3 and 6-month lookahead Project Schedules and the 5 year Scheme Overview Gantt Chart based on Project Leads' spend profiles.

Appendix A contains a Project Status Summary. The column on the right hand side of the table (next to the Lead Organisation column) shows when updates were last received for each Project (due monthly unless otherwise agreed). Dates highlighted in red indicate no report was received from the Project leader since the previous month.

The HLF quarterly reporting process is an important part of the monitoring process but there have been issues with some Project leaders not submitting their quarterly highlight report alongside their financial claim information.

MA clarified that all the Projects that have had invoices to submit for the quarterly claims have, so far, sent in the necessary information. However, there have been gaps in the highlight reports being submitted, which can cause problems with the effectiveness of the monitoring, reporting and management of the Scheme overall. This information is used to update the Scheme status overall, prepare Board papers and brief HLF (and any other interested party) on general progress.

This issue will be addressed at the next Project leaders meeting, which is being planned for late May/early June. The intention is to emphasise the collective responsibility of every Project to the Scheme as a whole.

MA understands the need to strike a balance between the reports required from the Project leaders and the needs of Board and HLF reporting. The intention is not to make the process too onerous for the Project leaders and to collect the necessary information at appropriate intervals in a consistent manner. MA uses the Project highlight reports to inform the Board on the performance of their Projects, any issues arising and Scheme performance overall. As such, this feedback is integral to the reporting procedure.

It is noted that several of the Project leaders that have not supplied reports have not done so as their Projects are not yet underway.

Action: Going forward, EL is to ensure any appendices involving large spread sheets are to be made available at the Board meetings printed in A3.

MA provided a concise summary of the Projects currently behind schedule;

- PA6 (Higher Uppacott) is being re-phased to allow for the additional building consent requirements and unexpected costs relating to this
- PB8 (Pony Herd Identification) will need a new Project leader, or the Project will have to be replaced with another 'pony centric' Project
- PC1 (Discovering the Dartmoor Story interpretation) has been slow to start. A meeting was scheduled with DNPA Communications Department to plan workload and deliverables to bring the Project back on track
- PD1 (Dartmoor Diploma) – a meeting with Duchy College as 'critical friend' was held to review the content and scope of the Project. New ideas and suggestions were made about the potential to access other funding and linking the training to other existing initiatives (such as MoorSkills). This may need to go back to HLF for approval.

TS requested more information on the discussions surrounding the diploma. KB explained that the Diploma could offer a 'pic 'n' mix' of modules for candidates to choose from depending on their specific interests. The meeting with Duchy College also involved a discussion on the potential availability of subsidies to help candidates fund some of their training, rather than it being entirely fee paying. This will make it more accessible to candidates and help de-risk uptake. MA added that there has been a skills audit which has identified gaps in the market for certain skills and the diploma could be re-scoped to bring these elements in. They are currently waiting for further advice from Richard Soffe (Duchy College) following their visit. Any changes to the Project would initially be submitted to Board and then on to HLF for approval.

The timescale associated with the diploma will be dictated by the candidates (within the overall HLF delivery stage window) and when they choose to undertake their training. ~£30k of the original costs of the Project had been allotted for the accreditation fees. A discussion ensued on whether there was a need for full accreditation if the diploma was to be focused specifically on Dartmoor. The general consensus was that the courses must be relevant and affordable, the real test being why somebody would invest in the training in the first place. Duchy College has successfully run training/schemes with appropriate and industry recognised endorsement.

A workshop has been arranged with R4C (Resources for Change) who have been commissioned to deliver the external monitoring and evaluation for the Scheme. Project leaders have been invited to attend.

Page 4

Project-specific issues that have arisen in this quarter are:

- PB2 (Parishscapes) has encountered a problem regarding the Moretonhampstead History Society's (MHS) business model for their proposed community book. Specifically, there were queries regarding publisher profit and income from book sales. Efforts have been made to

address and resolve these concerns and further information has been forthcoming from MHS.

However, in the meantime MHS has decided to withdraw from the Project and the Scheme generally following a re-prioritisation of their resources to pursue revenue generating activities for their Society.

MA and ES are trying to ensure the income generated from the MHS book sales is to be used appropriately and if this can be resolved to HLF satisfaction, the hope is that MHS may re-engage.

In the meantime, MHS withdrawal from the Scheme directly affects their involvement in another *MTMTE* Project, namely PB7 (In the Footsteps of the Victorians).

PB7 (In the Footsteps of the Victorians) will spend the first 2 years of their Project undertaking research. The MHS were intending to help with four of their research areas. It is understood MHS will still allow access to their archives even if they do not participate themselves.

Page 5 - Quality

MA has used PD1 (Dartmoor Diploma) as a quality impact example. MA also briefly touched on the role of the LSG during the delivery stage of the Scheme. This is an agenda item to be dealt with under governance.

Page 5/6 - Costs

The Scheme was forecasted to spend £700k to date but reported £327k, a variance of -53.2% against the bid stage budget. The majority of the shortfall in spend can be attributed to the Wray Valley Trail which is delayed due to land negotiations. MA has asked the Project Leader (Ian James, Devon County Council) to re-phase his spend profile so that the Scheme forecast is more robust and the impact on cashflow can be assessed (which may affect other Project delivery). Appendix C provided an update on individual Project spend 'v' forecast.

Page 6

In simplistic terms MA outlined that at the end of Y1Q2 we are one tenth of the way through the 5 year Scheme which is currently 84.9% complete against the forecast spend to date.

Projects with significant variance against their plans are:

- PA6 Higher Uppacott
- PC1 Discovering the Dartmoor Story
- PD1 Dartmoor Diploma
- PE5 Monitoring and Evaluation

The highlight report also notes Projects with no spend or significant underspend year to date.

MA reiterated the need for Project leaders to report at month-end intervals, with some Projects supplying quarterly updates where agreed with MA (coinciding with their HLF claim). The Scheme has to deliver outcomes and outputs on both financial aspects and on the HLF Approved Purposes agreed at the time of the bid acceptance. It is important to keep a balance between getting things done and maintaining an efficient and effective reporting mechanism.

Page 7

There is a list of the Projects currently behind plan.

Page 8/9

Some Projects are ahead of their spend profile:

- PA1 Moorland Birds
- PB9 Moor Boots
- PD2 Eco Skills
- PE3 Transport and Subsistence is ahead but this is due to budget coding rather than actual spend (i.e. office set-up and other miscellaneous overheads are posted under this heading due to a lack of a specific budget line for these items in the bid).

Appendix D is an updated Quantified Risk Register (QRR) for the Scheme. A notional financial cost has been allocated for each risk and the QRR as a whole stands at ~£220k cost if all risks are realised. The HLF budget does not include a contingency plan and the partners will be expected to absorb any monetary risk realised. Time risks can also affect the unlocking of funds (as is evident with PC5 – Wray Valley Trail delays).

Some risks have already been realised, including a few that were not identified before the delivery phase began. MA illustrated the real impact of these risks being realised:

For example, PC7 (Fernworthy Reservoir Access) has had to be re-scoped to address a VAT issue. Inflation in contractor fees and their availability to undertake work are also issues affecting construction Projects generally.

PA5 (Unveiling the Heritage of the High Moor and Forests) has received quotations for their planned survey work, the lowest being £895 above their budget of £8k. , The next lowest quotations were in the £20k's, much higher than expected and budgeted for. Fortunately the lowest tender satisfied quality criteria so this potential impact has been minimised and absorbed by de-scoping minor elements of the Project.

To date, the Scheme has realised approximately £90k in risk. MA will continue to identify risk issues and keep Board apprised of the impact and Lessons Learnt. At Project level, the subject of risk will be included in the next Project leaders meeting.

Following the meeting with Kirsty Wallace (HLF finance department), MA confirmed that the 10% HLF retention rate is not applied to each quarterly claim. On reaching

90% of the overall HLF grant payment (£1.71m of £1.9m), the remainder of the grant will be withheld until the Scheme is complete. Projects due to complete late in the 5 year plan are most likely to be affected by this and it is important that Project leaders do their best to give accurate spend forecasts to enable MA to predict when the Scheme will hit the 90% milestone, and be able to plan accordingly. MA estimates that this is likely to be near the end of 2018 and may have an impact on Projects:

- PA5 (Unveiling the Heritage of the High Moor and Forests)
- PA8 (Ancient Boundaries, Modern Farming) and
- PD1 (Dartmoor Diploma).

The HLF payment for the Y1Q2 claim was due by 27 April 2015 but has not yet been received.

Page 10

The report includes a list of activities undertaken in Y1Q2 and a list of key activities planned for Y1Q3.

R4C (Resources for Change) has been appointed to monitor and evaluate the Scheme (PE5). Following on from the initial meeting, a workshop for Project leaders has been arranged for this afternoon.

The *MTMTE* website is due to go 'live' in May.

ABY has published an events programme up to the end of May and will shortly be adding a core of events for the next 6 months, with additional events being added in as they occur within the Scheme delivery. It was noted there has been some inertia from partners in providing items for the newsletter.

There was some discussion surrounding ideas for an official launch of the *MTMTE* Scheme and suggestions of tying this in with a significant event relating to one of the Projects. For example, with the Northall Manor Community Dig event at Widecombe or with Bellever Day, which is scheduled for July.

ABY suggested working with some of the local schools in a central and iconic location on the moor, to bring the children together to swap stories about *MTMTE*. There has been positive feedback from the local schools in Ashburton, Moretonhampstead, Ilsington and Princetown.

The general consensus of opinion supported the idea of a focal event involving the Partners and including volunteering activities. Media coverage would be very important to help raise the profile of the Scheme. In broad terms this was agreed. The details will need to be worked on and invitations will be sent to HLF representatives.

Action: ABY to work on the details of a *MTMTE* launch event.

There has been a change in CDM (Construction Design Management) Regulations which will affect the Projects which have construction work planned. The *MTMTE*

team had a meeting with Peter Wilson, the DNPA's HSW Advisor, to ensure they understand the implications of the change in law. Technically, Project Leaders and the Partners fulfil the 'Client' role under the new Regulations. Some of the Project leaders work for small(er) organisations or are individual volunteers without the backup of being part of a large company and they will need to be made aware of the changes and duties placed on them by the new Regulations.

It was generally agreed that something needed to be put in writing to the affected Project Leads to comply with the duties placed on the Landscape Partnership Board and the individual Project Organisations and Leads. It was important to alert the affected Projects of the change in regulations but not to dispense advice.

Action: MA will write to all Project leaders of the affected Projects to advise them of the CDM changes and raise formally in the next Project Leads meeting.

6 Governance

a) Constitution

See below for the minutes on the MoU as the discussion relates to both documents.

b) MoU (Memorandum of Understanding)

The original documents were written in the Development Stage of the Scheme. The proposed changes in terminology now reflect the delivery stage. A definition has been added to section 2 of the MoU. Paragraph 4.1 refers to some supporting documents which need to be updated to ensure they cross reference correctly. The figures have been updated to reflect the approved Scheme budget. Paragraph 16.2 is to be checked by Chris Walledge, DNPA Head of Legal & Democratic Services, for legal compliance. Mention is made within the document of a Chairperson and a Vice-Chair. Currently there is no elected Vice Chair.

The composition of the Board has been updated to reflect recent changes. The Dartmoor Partnership no longer exists and the name and logo should be removed from the documents. It was generally agreed to keep the composition of the Board to 13 Partners and so a replacement is required. TS made a case for Visit Dartmoor (whom produce Active Dartmoor and are the official Visit England tourism organisation branch) to be invited onto the Board. This was supported by MA who felt this would be a positive addition and had already been in discussion with Jenny How on how MTMTE and Visit Dartmoor can work in partnership.

Any changes to the MoU require a signature.

Action: MA to explore inviting Visit Dartmoor to the *MTMTE* Landscape Partnership Board.

Action: EL to email amended MoU and Constitution to Board Members for further scrutiny. A summary of the revisions made is to be included, explaining why it has been changed. Members are to respond within 2

weeks of receiving the email with any queries or comments. The documents will be brought to the next Board meeting for approval and signatures.

c) Roles and Responsibilities

This subject was touched on for the benefit of members not at the previous Board meeting (see slide 6 of the PowerPoint presentation for the meeting of 27 February 2015).

d) Local Stakeholders Group (LSG)

TS asked the Board for their views on the role of the LSG. The ability to influence the scope of the Projects and participate in consultation ended at the end of the Development Stage on bid submission.

The general consensus of opinion was that more clarity was required on the role of the group given that we're in the Delivery Stage of the Scheme. Suggestions included fulfilling wider community feedback on individual Project and overall Scheme delivery and/or a quality assurance role over individual Project outputs to ensure the best possible result is achieved.

Overall, it was agreed that the LSG were valuable ambassadors for the Scheme, providing a link to their communities and an avenue for local engagement and feedback. The composition of the group may need revision in terms of numbers involved and some thought has to be given on how to make it sustainable for the future; to ensure it endures beyond the duration of the Scheme. The hope is that as each Project becomes more active, it will encourage members from that community to become more engaged with the Scheme.

The current Terms of Reference for the LSG was based on the model for La Roche. This template was useful for the Development Stage of the bid, however with the change in focus to the Delivery Stage; the document now requires some revision.

Board agreed that the existing LSG members should be approached to assess their continued level of engagement and gain feedback on the revised Terms of Reference.

Action: MA to contact existing LSG members. MA to draft a revised Terms of Reference to reflect the requirements of the Delivery Stage of the Scheme. The revised documents are to be circulated to the Board for review and comment before engaging LSG membership.

7 Projects

a) Schedule Review

It is hoped the issue regarding the Moretonhampstead Parishscapes Project can be resolved to the satisfaction of all concerned and be brought back into the Scheme.

The work involved with the PB2 (Parishscapes) Project requires a hefty time commitment from the Project Leader (Emma Stockley) who is also leading PB1 (Believer and Postbridge Trails) and giving support to PB3 (Moor Medieval), whilst also providing general heritage support to any other Projects that require her specialist knowledge. PB2 involves 14 separate community Projects under one title phased over 3 years. ES gave an update on the current Parishscapes Projects.

TS suggested that communities should be made aware of the limitations of the MTMTE resource, suggesting that where possible other Partners may be able to offer some extra support. ES suggested there may be opportunities to engage the EcoSkills trainees into some of the Project activities.

Action: MA and ES to monitor workload and plan accordingly by spreading the burden across the wider MTMTE team wherever possible.

b) Risk Management – Quantified Risk Register Review

This was included in MA's presentation of the Highlight Report earlier in the meeting. The top 10 risks in monetary impact terms remain unchanged.

c) Events Update

See Page 10 minutes in Section 5 above.

d) Project Spotlight

A slide show was presented by DR, ES and ABy to illustrate current Project activity after the conclusion of AOB - see summary below.

8 AOB

a) Chairmanship of Board and Vice Chair

There was unanimous support for TS to continue as Chair of the Board.

The issue of Vice Chair will need to be resolved or the MoU revised accordingly. It was agreed that Board Members who are interested in taking on Vice Chair duties should express an interest prior to the next Board meeting when the issue will be settled.

Action: EL to send out Expression of Interest to Board Members inviting anyone interested in the role of Vice Chair to respond before the next Board meeting.

KB thanked the *MTMTE* Team for their work to date.

9 Date of next meeting

8 July 2015, Room 1 HMBC Princetown, Room 1 at 10am.

[AB leaves the meeting]

Project Spotlight - slide show, summary as follows:

- PA4 (Discovering the Nature of Bovey Valley) - bat tracking volunteers captured a Barbastelle bat (called Bert) who was tagged and will be used to help them practice their tracking skills
- PA5 (Unveiling the Heritage of the High Moor and Forests) - ES, ABy and Tim Powles (Forestry Commission) held a volunteer taster event based on LiDAR data to find known archaeological features and discover new ones
- PB2 (Parishscapes) - North Bovey had an open day to launch their community Project which was well attended. Langaford Farm Trust expressed an interest in getting involved in a *MTMTE* Project
- PB3 (Moor Medieval) - launched their Project with a symposium on the 28 February. Their first study group met in Moretonhampstead at the beginning of May with 17 volunteers attending. There was a good mix of both professional and amateur historians
[TS leaves the meeting]
- PB4 (Engaging with the Nature of Bovey Valley) – DR hosted an event on traditional charcoal making. There was also a horse logging (horse powered timber extraction) demonstration and forest skills workshop supported by the PD2 EcoSkills volunteers
- PC4 (Brimpts Tin Trail) – the DTRG have produced 6 mobile display units using the Dartmoor Story branding. It introduces a character called ‘Tinner Tuckett’. They are currently waiting for HLF approval of the design
- PC6 (Heritage Trails) - a screenshot was shown to illustrate an example of the information provided by the Heritage Trails website

The Board Members found the slide show engaging and informative and KB suggested each Board meeting concludes with a profile on a particular Project.

Action: MA and relevant Project Lead to prepare a Project specific profile for the next Board meeting.

There being no other business, the meeting closed at 12.45pm.