

APPENDIX 2: BIOSPHERE REVIEW: SERVICE GOVERNANCE OPTIONS (for June 2014 Partnership)

	WITHDRAWAL FROM BIOSPHERE SERVICE (exc ASSETS)		PUBLIC SECTOR HOSTED					MIXED APPROACH	EXTERNALISED			
OPTION	1. COMPLETE WITHDRAWAL AND DE-DESIGNATE	2. WITHDRAW SERVICE BUT MAINTAIN FUNCTION	3. DCC HOSTED ie STATUS QUO	4. DISTRICT COUNCIL HOSTED	5. INCREASED INTEGRATION OF BIOSPERE AND AONB	6. OTHER PUBLIC SECTOR - NATIONAL	7. OTHER PUBLIC SECTOR - LOCAL	8. COMBINATION: PUBLIC SECTOR HOSTING WITH INCREASED ROLE FOR EXTERNAL PARTNER	9. STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP ARRANGEMENT	10. SOCIAL ENTERPRISE MODEL	11. ESTABLISH NEW CHARITABLE BODY	12. CONTRACTUAL COMMERCIAL ARRANGEMENT
SUMMARY DESCRIPTION	<p>No longer have a Biosphere function in place.</p> <p>Asset management (SWCP and Tarka Trail) continues through DCC as part of highways authority.</p> <p>Implications for designation with Defra / MAB. Possibly revert to "old-style" Biosphere or complete de-designation</p>	<p>Withdraw any funding for a Service.</p> <p>Independently hosted Partnership to retain responsibility</p> <p>Maintain functions through stakeholders in voluntary Biosphere Partnership and highways authority</p>	<p>Service continues to be hosted by DCC; no change in governance structure or method of operation.</p> <p>Will need to adapt to reduced funding from local auth partners or find new sources of funding to plug gap.</p> <p>Likely that will need to operate with reduced staffing level</p>	<p>TDC or NDC take on hosting and staff TUPEd.</p> <p>Will still need to adapt to reduced funding from local auth partners.</p> <p>Will need an Agreement to share liabilities between local auths</p>	<p>Phased integration of staff (eg joint manager / other posts) and governance arrangements (eg combined Exec initially through to single Partnership).</p> <p>Would require single funding agreement between local auths for both Services</p> <p>Needs support of both Partnerships and political mandate</p>	<p>Hosted by another statutory agency eg NE, EA or FC</p> <p>Partnership funding from LAs through MoA</p>	<p>Hosted by another authority eg Dartmoor or Exmoor National Park</p> <p>Partnership funding from LAs through MoA</p>	<p>Original intention.</p> <p>Reduced service for core essential activities at a minimum level within public sector team ie Partnership support, strategy, etc.</p> <p>External Partner may need development to increase role and deliver desirable activities</p> <p>External partner leading on external funding, project activity and providing added value.</p> <p>Opportunity to progress to Option 10</p>	<p>An external body takes on the management role and develops it through own resources in non-commercial capacity.</p> <p>Partnership funding from local auths through an MoA.</p> <p>Asset management stays with DCC as highway authority</p> <p>BR Partnership committed to closer governance with NIA</p> <p>Potential perception of Exeter bias</p>	<p>Longer term vision as Biosphere matures</p> <p>Options could be existing Biosphere Foundation model or the Service becomes an independent social enterprise</p> <p>Potential in longer term for charitable arm</p> <p>Tapering transitional funding from local auths.</p> <p>Could be development from Option 8 if proved successful</p> <p>Likely to require transfer of assets</p>	<p>Create a new charitable body with change led by the Service.</p> <p>Similar model would be origins of Torbay Coast and Countryside Trust.</p> <p>Would require transfer of some assets from local auths to support it eg management of SWCP, ownership of TT; parks and open spaces; LNRs; Christie Estates charitable holdings</p>	<p>Has been investigated previously without result</p> <p>An external body is paid to either host the team or deliver the service as contractual arrangement.</p> <p>Likely to require TUPE staff transfer</p> <p>Require ongoing funding from local authorities</p> <p>Asset management stays with DCC as highway authority</p>
BENEFITS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost Savings for local authorities Clear unequivocal position 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost savings for local authority. Retains designation Clear local ownership which might be strength Community focus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum change Retain accountability Retains confidence of Partnership ie "Comfortable" option 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater synergy with DC services eg planning,, parks, Retain accountability Stronger local ownership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff savings for both Services Improved joint working and efficiency More viable if pursue Option 3 for Biosphere Brings opportunity for communication and understanding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Synergy and close working with other partners in delivery Link with other Defra bodies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Synergy and close working with other partners Political accountability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Builds on existing structures which already in place Increasingly active role for key constituent bodies within Partnership Partnership takes leadership role Help in kind from local auths 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Builds on strength of new host body Greater integration with related projects New and increased funding opportunities Potential for support from volunteer network Increased opportunities to promote BR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independence from core funding bodies as services and projects diversify Easier access to external funds Local ownership Potential to grow in future Opportunity to bring in other groups eg community energy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involvement with Christies would bring new focus on core Complete independence New and wider funding opportunities Decreased on-costs / management costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only suitable if just maintaining obligations
RISKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obligations of designation will not be fulfilled Asset management within Highways will focus on maintenance, not promotion Reputational issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Separating out assets threatens funding for some posts Asset management within Highways will focus on maintenance, not promotion Not clear cut Biosphere would remain but be ineffective (ie pre-2003 position) Reputational issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weaker, smaller team will need to prioritise delivery Not sustainable as on downward trajectory External funding options restricted Operates within constraints of local auths 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues as with DCC as host DC focus on transformation agenda Complication of redundancy issue External funding options restricted Operates within constraints of local auths 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Politically difficult for DCs; felt too soon to be revisited Would need commitment to both services from local auths Perceived loss of identity / independence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agencies unlikely to want to pursue Very restricted by agency process and change – not sustainable Strange communication message for a non-statutory designation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPs unlikely to want to pursue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too messy and need clear-cut solution Complication of restructuring of team to deliver core activities. Would require redundancies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff TUPE issues and liabilities VAT implications More vulnerable to future budget cuts by partner organisation LAs would not commit funding for more than 3 years; likely longer term commitment needed. Identity for Biosphere may be lost Functioning Partnership at risk and may lose confidence Likely political reluctance Skill sets of some organisations may not be right 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Viability question unless well-resourced through local auths. Vulnerable to future budget cuts by external organisations Will need capacity building for new organisation to support change. Cash flow issues for first major projects. Needs endowment or assets for it to grow from. Staff TUPE issues VAT implications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need ongoing grant support from local auths, especially initially Need assets to enable finance to be achieved Risky – most Trusts struggle to maintain viability (but also applicable to other options) Charities have onerous requirements Competition with other charitable bodies for funds Staff TUPE issues VAT implications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No added value Perception that more expensive due to management costs Complication of redundancies; liabilities for staff retained Asset management within Highways will focus on maintenance, not promotion Will require ongoing funding VAT implications Staff TUPE issues