MOOR THAN MEETS THE EYE LANDSCAPE PARTNERSHIP BOARD

27 February 2015, Room 1, HMBC Princetown, 10am

Present:	Tom Stratton (Chair)	Duchy of Cornwall	TS
	Alison Kohler	DNPA	AK
	Ben Philipps	Forestry Commission	BP
	David Rickwood (in part)	Woodland Trust	DR
	Mark Allott	*MTMTE* Scheme Manager	MA
	Simon Lee	Natural England	SL
Attending:	Andy Bailey	Community & Events Officer, *MTMTE*	AB
	Emma Stockley	Community Heritage Officer, *MTMTE*	ES
	Chrissy Mason	Community Ecologist, *MTMTE*	CM
	Ellie Fabiani-Laymond	Finance & Admin Officer, *MTMTE*	EL

1 Welcome

The Chair welcomed everyone to the first Board meeting of the delivery phase of the *MTMTE* Scheme.

2 Introductions

There was a brief round of introductions.

3 Apologies

Apologies from Andy Bradford (Dartmoor Farmers Association), David Lloyd (DNPA Member), Ian James (Devon County Council), James Platts (SWLT), Kevin Bishop, (Chief Executive (NPO), DNPA), Layland Branfield (Dartmoor Commoners' Council), Phil Hutt (Dartmoor Preservation Association) and Ruth Garner (English Heritage) were noted.

4 Minutes of the last *MTMTE* Project Board meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 October 2014 were agreed as a true record.

There is one outstanding action from the previous meeting. The Communications Plan was due to be presented to Board in this quarter, however, there are several elements to be finalised before it is ready for scrutiny. Andrew Bailey is liaising with Kerenza Townsend (Communications Officer, DNPA) regarding the proposed logos and the consistency of branding the *MTMTE* Scheme across the partnership. It was also felt that the absent partners should be approached for their input into the draft plan before it is submitted for final approval.

Action: A draft Communications Plan to be brought to the next Board meeting in April.

5   Highlight Report Review

MA presented the content of the Scheme Highlight Report.

The Highlight report is produced quarterly by the Scheme Manager and is the key communications document for Board Members regarding progress of the Scheme and the individual projects.

The *MTMTE* Scheme was originally scheduled to begin in July 2014, however, 'Permission to Start' was not granted by the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) until 18 August 2014, resulting in a delay of 2 months at the outset. Therefore, Year 1 Quarter 1 report refers to the period 1 September to 30 November 2014 (instead of July to September 2014).

For the purposes of reporting on the Scheme, highlight reports refer to quarters in HLF terms and not the usual calendar year or the financial year. For example, Quarter 1 refers to Sept-Nov, Quarter 2 refers to Dec-Feb, Quarter 3 refers to Mar-May, and Quarter 4 refers to Jun-Aug.

The first HLF Claim was submitted online on 26 January 2015. We are now in Quarter 2 which ends on 28 February and the deadline for Project Leaders to report to the Scheme Manager is 7 March. The next HLF claims deadline is 21 March. The Highlight Report will be updated once all Quarter 2 progress reports have been received and this will be presented at the next Board meeting in April.

The overall Scheme budget is £3.8m, with HLF providing funding of £1.9m, an intervention rate of 49%. 10% of the grant is retained by the HLF until completion of the Scheme and MA will schedule a meeting with James Dennis, the HLF Mentor, to discuss cashflow queries and associated issues surrounding this process. The HLF quarterly claims deadline falls on the 21 of the month that follows the end of each quarter and Board meetings are planned to follow soon after each claim.

Action: A meeting is to be scheduled with James Dennis by MA to discuss grant retention and cash flow.

Page 2 of the Highlight Report includes a general summary: the *MTMTE* project team have been in place since 5 January 2015. There are 22 projects included in the *MTMTE* Scheme (not including Programme E, overheads, which brings the total to 28) and of these 22 projects, 15 have started since September 2014. The Parishscapes project (PB2) is counted as one project but actually involves 14 separate parish based projects, so in reality there are 47 individual projects in total. The first phase of Parishscapes is underway with 4 local projects from the communities at North Bovey, Moretonhampstead, Ashburton and Lustleigh. See Appendix A for a summary of individual Project Progress.

Appendix A is a summary showing the progress of each project as assessed against the PRINCE2 project management monitoring indicators of time, quality, cost, scope, risk and benefits. It is colour coded using a traffic lights scheme – red, amber green - to indicate the project status (green is within tolerance, amber indicates a plan is in place to restore tolerance and red means currently out of tolerance with no approved

plan). For this quarter, the summary is mostly green although there are exceptions. For example, the Pony Herd Identification project (PB8) has raised a concern regarding project leadership.

There was a meeting for Project Leaders on Thursday 5 February 2015 where MA covered reporting requirements and other relevant information. The Project Leaders were asked to look at their timelines and assess the impact of the initial delay on their original plans and update them accordingly. They were also asked to indicate where there may be some overlap with other projects. AK asked if the Project Leads were still confident of delivering their Year 1 plans on time. MA expects this to become clearer once they have submitted their progress reports for Quarter 2 (due by 7 March). Appendix G includes a list of Project Leaders.

The Highlight Report has a status summary on page 2 which can be summarised as follows:

The schedule is amber due to the 2 month delay having some impact on the start of some projects. Appendix B includes a Gantt chart summarising all 28 projects: their timelines and expected spends. The chart is based on the bid spend profile. This will be updated for the next Board meeting once the Project Leaders have made any revisions to their plans. MA will maintain a 'master' schedule to ensure there is always up to date information on project and Scheme status. The first HLF claim was fairly straightforward as many projects had nothing to claim or report but MA expects the workload to increase as the projects progress and we get deeper into the Scheme.

Page 3 of the report refers to the Gantt chart which also refers to the projects in financial spend profile terms.

For the Dartmoor Diploma (PD1) there is a hold on procurement to allow consultation with Duchy College to ensure we specify and procure the right qualification and service.

There were six projects scheduled to start in September which have reported no spend by the end of Quarter 1, resulting in a shortfall of £16.5k against their expected spend. However, the criteria against which we assess progress indicate their plans remain unchanged and we currently expect to deliver all of these projects to plan, with the possible exception of the Pony Herd Identification Project (PB8). The overall Scheme is scheduled to end on 17 August 2019 and this is a fixed endpoint, so all the projects will need to be completed successfully by that date.

Overall the Scheme was forecast to spend £169k in Quarter 1, however, the claim submitted was for £147k, a shortfall of approximately £20k. The intention is to make up this shortfall over subsequent claims.

Appendix C is a cost summary of the Scheme showing each individual project. The analysis of key indicators is based on the forecasts made in the original bid. By the end of next quarter the report will be able to show any changes that have occurred since September 2014.

TS asked if it was possible to change the process for the drawdown of funds from HLF. MA advised that any changes would have to be taken to the HLF (via James Dennis, the HLF Mentor) for their consideration and approval. Ideally, the Project Leaders should aim to follow their spend profile as closely as possible. AK felt that due to the length of the Scheme (5 years in total) the HLF might be willing to consider some flexibility.

MA felt that although the spend profile may fluctuate quarterly, over time it will balance out as the Scheme progresses.

Page 4&5 replicate some of the financial information.

Three projects totalling £75k are ahead of their spend profile. Approximately seven projects are at a risk of falling behind. To monitor this effectively, the Project Leaders have been asked to report to the Scheme Manager on a monthly basis rather than saving it all for their quarterly report. This will enable more pro-active response and opportunity to address any arising issues.

A particular concern for the Board to consider is the Pony Herd Identification Project (PB8).There is no firm project leader in place and this project may need to be pulled from the Scheme or replaced. We need to evaluate the effect of this on the other projects and on the funding.

Most projects are ticking over and the project leaders are engaged in the delivery phase now. The scope of the Scheme remains unchanged for now as do the benefits.

A consultant has been appointed for monitoring and evaluation purposes (Resources for Change, R4C) and the contract will be signed imminently.

Appendix E - Risk
MA has produced a Quantified Risk Register (QRR), putting all the risks from each Project Proforma into one place. It identifies areas of risk and apportions a notional monetary value to each one to deal with the risk if it materialises. This is an objective way to assess the possible financial and time impact on the Scheme as a whole if the risk(s) occur(s). There is no contingency in the budget. MA has identified 135 risks across the 28 projects and if they are all realised the cost could total somewhere in the region of £225k (~6% of the overall budget).

TS proposed ring fencing some funds to create a contingency. AK advised that the HLF did not expect large contingencies to be built into the projects at the development stage of the bid.

The total Scheme budget is £3.843m with £1.9m of that coming from the HLF grant. The HLF contribution is based on the Scheme delivering the approved purposes of the projects. If we fail to deliver them, the funding is at risk. AK proposed that risk planning is discussed at Board on a quarterly basis.

One of the main risks relates to cashflow problems and unsecured funding. Some of the identified risks will be low and consequently have a low cost exposure but others

may be high and carry a much higher cost impact. The QRR is ranked in order of risks with the highest likely monetary impact so that energies can be focussed on addressing those which have the most significant impact. Some Project Proformas identify very few or no risks at all (for example Welcome to Widecombe, PB5), which is unrealistic given the breadth and complexity of the Scheme.

MA suggested that depending on the type of risk, costs can be mitigated or addressed by careful management. For example, the Moorland Birds project (PA1) is dependent on the Red Backed Shrike returning to their nesting area. If they do not return to nest, it may have a cost implication for the Scheme as the HLF funding will not be unlocked. This could be mitigated if the plan was revised and a new one adopted in agreement with HLF. The same applies to volunteer hours and ensuring we meet those requirements of the Scheme. MA stressed that we need to be mindful of delivering the approved purposes of the Scheme across all the designated areas identified by HLF (conserving, engaging, learning and training). If we revise project scope, we need to ensure we protect and cover these approved purposes to avoid funding clawback.

MA proposed that the Board agree on a tolerance level for arising risks to be brought to Board (for example, anything above a £10k risk). The onus is on the Project Leaders to deliver a quality result with minimal disruption, which is a significant task and responsibility. MA will work with them to critically review their project risks. As the projects move towards the end of the Scheme the risks will gradually reduce. Project Leaders have been asked to report on risk on a monthly basis as part of their Highlight Reports.

Page 6 MA has been considering the merits of using risk assessment software in managing financial risk, specifically @Risk software. Appendix F is an example of @Risk being used in a previous project. Devon County Council uses this software for risk management and MA may be able to access this at intervals through DCC (as one of the Scheme partners) to run analysis for the *MTMTE* Risk Register.

The goal for the next quarter is to tighten up the risk management aspect overall.

Page 7 lists the key deliveries achieved in Quarter 1, which are: *MTMTE* Team in place, Project Leader meeting on 5/2/15, the first HLF Claim submission 26/1/15, the next 4 Board meetings scheduled, first phase of Parishscapes underway, other projects are also making progress. Details can be found in the report.

The Dartmoor Diploma (PD1) will need to be brought back on track once the scope and contract has been agreed upon for a provider. The Diploma needs to generate £80k in fees (paid for by student intake) to achieve the planned budget. A balance needs to be struck in designing the Diploma to ensure it is attractive to the fee paying public. Ideally the training programme will be fully functional and awarding Diplomas by the close of the *MTMTE* Scheme in 5 years.

<u>Key activities planned for the next period</u>

- The intention is to re-baseline all projects based on the updates in the Quarter 2 progress reports. The Scheme schedule, spend profile and cashflow information will be updated accordingly.

- The issue with PB8 (Pony Herd identification Project) will need to be addressed.

- The Moor Medieval project (PB3) is about to be launched with a symposium of speakers at an all-day event on Saturday 28 February at Parke.

- The contract to appoint R4C to monitor and evaluate the scheme will be finalised.

- There has been a delay in the launch of the *MTMTE* website due to the delay in the project team arriving in post. The content is to be migrated and up and running by May 2015.

- The Dartmoor Diploma (PD1) will be given further consideration before a final decision is taken on training provider and accreditation.

- The *MTMTE* team will continue to develop the local Parishscapes projects.

- The *MTMTE* team will publish an events programme including a *MTMTE* launch event.

<u>Page 8</u> lists the key issues arising in Quarter 1. They are summarised as follows:

- There will be a change in CDM Regulations (Construction Design Management) in April 2015 which may have an impact on construction projects (inc. Higher Uppacott, Wray Valley Trail and Postbridge Visitor Centre). MA will be working with Peter Wilson (DNPA H&S Advisor) to identify any likely consequences arising from this.

- The Board have been asked to consider the provision of a risk allowance and how this may be raised, the importance of the QRR and pro-active risk management by all parties.

- The role of the Local Stakeholders Group (LSG) requires some clarity given the Scheme has entered the Delivery Stage. Clarification is required on the function and role of the group as originally presented to the LP Board toward the end of the Development Stage in July 2014.

- The Project Leader for the Pony Herd Identification project (PB8) would like to step down and may run the project privately outside of *MTMTE*. The project was planned to contribute £5k in volunteering hours with an HLF input of £1,700. It covers two of the HLF approved purposes (summarised in Appendix D) and if the project does not happen this may affect the overall Scheme. The

general consensus is that if the project is replaced it should be with another 'pony' themed idea. TS suggested linking it to the Moorland Guides and giving them a role in educating people about Dartmoor ponies and the management of herds. TS suggested the Duchy of Cornwall may be able to suggest some potential replacement projects.

Action: MA will discuss this in a meeting with the HLF Mentor, James Dennis and take advice on providing an alternative project of similar size.

There are some cashflow issues relating to a few of the smaller projects due to the length of delay between submitting the quarterly claim and the HLF payment being received. The HLF also retain 10% of each claim until completion of the project; no account was taken of this in the bid financial profiling.

MA explained that typical turnaround from Project Lead Organisation claims to payment back into their accounts will typically be up to ~140 days. AK confirmed that DNPA is willing to help bridge the gap in the most pressing of cases for the first year as long as the risk is acceptable. Financial help will be decided on a case by case basis and covered by a Letter of Agreement.

Project PB10 (Whitehorse Community Play) is being delivered by MED Theatre who have considered taking out a bridging loan whilst waiting for payment of invoices submitted to HLF. AK said efforts would be made to alleviate problems such as this. The DNPA contribution to *MTMTE* of £200k has been made available for the drawdown of funds where necessary.

Project PB7 (In the Footsteps of the Victorians) plan to produce a book as part of their project outcomes, generating £5k in sales from retail sales. The Project Leader has asked the Scheme to underwrite the risk of low book sales in case it fails to generate £5k. There was some reluctance expressed over covering this cost. MA suggested a compromise be made based on a legal agreement being drawn up, giving *MTMTE* some assurance that quality control and appropriate marketing would be undertaken in the process.

A question was raised regarding the unsecured funds which formed part of the HLF bid. Clarification is required on when and how these funds will be secured.

Action: MA will ask other Landscape Partnership Boards how they deal with this problem.

6 **Governance**

a) Project management methodology: PRINCE2

   MA explained the principles of PRINCE2 of which he is a registered Practitioner. It is the default project management methodology promoted as best practice by the Office of Government Commerce and widely used by Government and Local Authorities. The Highlight Report reflects the application of PRINCE2 in that it assesses the progress of the Scheme against time, quality, cost, scope, risk and

benefits. The Highlight Report will also be taken to the DNPA's Audit and Governance Committee due to the elements of risk management it incorporates.

Action: MA to update *MTMTE* Governance to reflect PRINCE2.

b) Roles and responsibilities (see slide 5 of Board Meeting PowerPoint)

The project management structure is divided into 3 categories: directing, managing and delivering.

MA proposes that AK or KB is designated as 'Project Executive' (under PRINCE2 Roles and Responsibilities) as DNPA is the Lead Partner for *MTMTE* and this is a directing role ultimately responsible for the overall success of the Scheme.

The Project Partners are proposed as 'Senior Users' as they represent the key stakeholders ultimately using the Scheme outputs and benefits. The LSG would also fall into this category for quality control reasons.

The Project Leads provide the 'Senior Supplier' role in that they are delivering the project.

c) Reporting

Project Leaders have been asked to report progress to the Scheme Manager on a monthly basis, with their main report and claims information due at the end of each quarter. The intention is not to drown them in paperwork but to strike a balance between delivering the projects and effectively monitoring the Scheme as a whole. Regular reporting should help to ensure any problems or issues are identified and resolved in a timely manner.

The HLF claims deadline is always 21 of the month following quarter end. This gives the *MTMTE* team a two week window to compile all the claims information from Project Leaders and complete an online submission. The HLF Mentor then reviews the claim before it is signed off for payment by central HLF Finance and is expected to take 15 days from the claim submission. This process can cause a delay in paying the Project Lead Organisations who have submitted invoices on behalf of their project.

[DR joins the meeting]

d) Local Stakeholders Group (LSG)

Now that the Scheme has left the consultation phase as part of the Development Stage, MA suggested the LSG take on a Quality Assurance for the Delivery Stage. There was a discussion about the most appropriate composition of the LSG and the best way to recruit new members. Now that the Scheme is in the Delivery Stage, their ability to influence matters is not as strong as it was during the development/consultation stage of the bid, as the projects are largely defined with a series of outputs, outcomes and benefits HLF is expecting the Scheme to deliver.

However, it was felt that members should be drawn from the local communities and interest groups to ensure their perspectives are taken into account during delivery of the Scheme.

There is a draft Terms of Reference for the LSG which has not been formally sent out yet, although presented to the July 2014 Board. The role, size, composition and processes of the group requires more clarification. It is important to ensure that their participation stays within the scope of existing projects.

AB suggested an alternative would be to go out into the community on a 6 monthly basis and hold feedback meetings. However, AK felt it was important to include LSG input into the Scheme and this had already been mooted at the previous Board meeting.

Action: *MTMTE* team to review the LSG Terms of Reference and look at the mix of local interest groups in the Scheme area. AB to encourage each project to engage in the LSG in some way. Project Leaders are to be encouraged to engage in the community regarding their individual projects. The original members of the LSG should be approached for suggestions as to succession. This is to be actioned before the next Board meeting.

7   Decisions

a) PRINCE2

This was generally felt to be practical and useful in managing the Projects and Scheme overall. MA is aware it has to be relevant for the end users and not too onerous for the Project Leaders to administer. This is one of the central seven principles of PRINCE2, in that it is a scalable methodology.

b) LSG

There are actions for the next Board meeting. (Please see item 6d)

c) Tolerances

It was agreed that only the projects going off programme would need to be brought to the attention of the Project Board. Tolerance level would usually be decided by the level or size of the contingency plan, but as there is no contingency each project will have to be assessed individually as they all have different HLF intervention rates.

AK proposed a zero tolerance for budget problems as this is critical to the Scheme delivery and HLF funding. Also the Board should be mindful that budget issues early on in the project could have a negative impact on projects later in the Scheme.

8   AOB

MA briefly summarised points a), b) and d) of the AOB.

c) PR/Events

Since September, there have been some events run by *MTMTE* and also by some of the partners. AB summarised the following:

- Project PB3 (Moor Medieval) is being launched at a symposium on Saturday 28 February. It is a free ticketed event (fully booked) and has proved very popular with the general public and interest groups. Keith McKay (Historic Buildings Officer, DNPA) is the Project Leader and he is hoping to recruit some volunteers from which to start a study group.

- There is also a bat tracking volunteer workshop on the same day to raise interest in PA4 Discovering the Nature of the Bovey Valley.

- A big event is being planned for Bellever/Postbridge day in July with the focus on Whitehorse Hill archaeology.

- There will be an open day in Widecombe for the North Hall Manor archaeological dig which will be aimed at engaging families, visitors and the local community.

- An idea has been put forward to hold a *MTMTE* launch event for schools out on the moor. This would be good for public relations and raise interest in the wider community.

- Some work is underway with the Tim Powles (Forestry Commission) to base an event around the Fernworthy LIDAR to encourage volunteer take up for the project.

- It is planned to promote events as far and wide as possible with posters in appropriate areas, press releases, including them on the *MTMTE* website, social media and newsletters. There is potential to tap into the DNPA mailing list and ask Mike Nendick (DNPA, Communications Officer) to add *MTMTE* newsletters into his mail out, widening Scheme exposure.

DR suggested capturing the names of people attending events (required for some HLF reporting) and AB also suggested producing a generic *MTMTE* feedback form for all project leaders to use at their events to ensure HLF information is gathered and data capture is consistent.

Action: DR will share his organisation's feedback form with the *MTMTE* team. A feedback form template will be included in the Communications Plan to be brought to the next Board meeting to ensure all partners are happy with it.

The new *MTMTE* website is due to come online by the end of April.

Chairmanship of the Project Board will be brought to the next Board meeting.

d) **Date of next meeting**

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

There being no other business, the meeting closed at 12.35pm.