

YORKSHIRE DALES NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
AUDIT AND REVIEW COMMITTEE

16 June 2006

REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE IN 2005/06

Purpose of report

To provide Members with an overall assessment of the Authority's performance in relation to the targets set out in the Best Value Performance Plan 2005/06.

Strategic Planning Framework

The information and recommendation(s) contained in this report are consistent with the Authority's statutory purposes and its approved strategic planning framework:

- ***Best Value Performance Plan***

Plan and manage all aspects of the Authority's business so as to make the most effective use of our resources..., including achieving at least 80% of the actions identified in the Best Value Performance Plan each year.

- *Carry out an annual review of progress on BVPP objectives and comparison with performance of other National Park Authorities*
- strengthen the role of the Audit and Review Committee

Background

Each year the Authority produces a Best Value Performance Plan, setting out what it is hoping to achieve over the coming 12 months. These fall into three main categories, all of which are (or should be) interlinked:

- **objectives** – the big things we want to achieve over the next few years
- **performance indicators (PIs)** – measure progress each year towards our objectives
- **actions** – specific things that we are going to do to in order to achieve our objectives

Progress on the actions is reported quarterly (to Audit and Review Committee and the full Authority). This shows whether things have been done or not. However, it does not show whether the actions had their desired effect (i.e. whether they are helping to achieve the objectives). Nor does it show how this Authority's performance compares to that of other National Park Authorities.

One of the recommendations coming out of the National Park Authorities' Performance Assessment (NPAPA) process was to strengthen the role of the Audit and Review Committee, particularly in relation to performance management. This report represents one of the steps in providing the Committee with the information it will need in order to take on such a role. How that information is used, and the way in which information is presented to the Committee in the future, is now for Members to decide.

Review of performance 2005/06

At the start of 2005/06, the Authority had:

- 45 objectives;
- 51 meaningful¹ PIs for which targets had been set; and,
- 192 actions .

NB where an objective, PI or action was broken down into a number of sub-objectives, sub-indicators or sub-actions, each has been counted separately.

Progress on all the actions was reported to the full Authority in May. This report, therefore, focuses on:

- a) whether we are achieving our objectives;
- b) whether we achieved our PI targets;
- c) (where possible) how we compare to other NPAs;

The summary information is presented with the objectives and PIs grouped in order of their priority (A-E).

Objectives

The table at **Annex A** gives a brief assessment of progress on the Authority's objectives. For each one the table summarises how we performed in 2005/06, as follows:

☑ = achieved

✓ = on course

✗ = not achieved/on course

Overall, the Authority achieved 11 of the 16 objectives that were due to be completed in 2005/06. Of the remaining 29 objectives, 23 remained on course. High priority objectives that were achieved include:

- improvements to enforcement (A);
- support through the Sustainable Development Fund (A);
- implementing the open access provisions of the CROW Act (B).

The only high priority objectives that were not achieved were:

- a management strategy for recreational motor vehicles on 'green lanes' (A);
- determining planning applications and issuing standard decision notices (A).

For the future, there are a number of areas where the achievement of current objectives is doubtful or where objectives have already had to be revised. These are:

- efficiency of dealing with planning applications (A);
- managing scheduled ancient monuments (B);
- digitising the Definitive Map of rights of way (C);
- raising the national profile of the Park (C);

¹ Some PIs (e.g. 'No of planning applications') are contextual, and have been discounted from this analysis. Others are simply different versions of the same data (e.g. No. and % of buildings at risk) and duplications have been removed.

- completing the Pennine Bridleway (E);
- providing services electronically (core).

Members may like to consider whether they wish to look more closely at performance in some or all of these areas, as part of any future programme of reviews.

Performance Indicators (PIs)

The spreadsheet at **Annex B** provides an assessment of performance in relation to each of the 51 'meaningful' PIs. For each one, it shows:

- a) our target for 2005/06;
- b) the actual figure for 2005/06;
- c) how we rank (out of 8) compared to other NPAs;
- d) the 'top quartile' figure for all NPAs (i.e. the figure achieved by the 2nd best NPA);
- e) a summary of our performance against both our own targets and compared to other NPAs, as follows:
 - ✓ = achieved/exceeded target and/or in the top quartile of NPAs
 - = close to target and/or in the middle of the NPAs
 - × = missed target by some way and/or in the bottom half of NPAs

Overall, we achieved or exceeded our targets for 35 (69%) of our PIs (compared to 50% in 2004/05) and for six others we were close to (within 10% of) the target. There were big improvements in:

- rights of way that are 'easy to use' (A);
- number of website users (A);
- % of new homes on previously developed land (A);
- dealing with breaches of planning control (A);
- % of land available for public access (B);
- volunteer days (B);
- cultural heritage consultations (B/C);
- definitive map orders (C);
- buildings accessible to disabled people (core).

Encouragingly, several of these are high priorities. However, it is worth noting that overall the Authority continues to achieve (or get close) to roughly the same percentage of targets (80%) irrespective of their relative priority.

The key areas where the Authority missed its targets by some way were:

- speed of dealing with natural environment consultations (A);
- % BAP habitats surveyed (A);
- speed of dealing with planning applications (A);
- valid planning applications (A);
- woodland planting (B);

- listed buildings 'at risk' (C);
- definitive map cases opened (C);
- Equality Standard (core);
- sickness absence (core);
- completing staff appraisals (core)

Again, Members may like to consider whether they wish to look more closely at performance in some or all of these areas.

Performance compared to other National Park Authorities (NPAs)

There are 28 'meaningful' PIs collected by all NPAs. These fall into two categories:

- 'national' PIs – these are collected by all local authorities, not just NPAs
- 'NPA' PIs – just collected by NPAs

Members should note that only the 'national' PIs are subject to external verification (by the Audit Commission). There is, therefore, the possibility (and in some cases a certainty) that there are inconsistencies in the way NPAs calculate their figures.

Of the 28 PIs, the Authority was in the top quartile (i.e. first or second) for 11. This compares to only one in 2004/05. The main areas where our performance is very good compared to other NPAs are:

- rights of way signposted (A);
- homes on previously developed land (A);
- planning appeals (A);
- individual contacts for promoting understanding (C);
- NPC effectiveness rating (C)
- buildings with disabled access (core)

The Authority was in the bottom half on 11 indicators, the most significant of which were:

- natural environment consultations (A);
- speed of dealing with planning applications (A);
- quality of planning services checklist (A)
- cultural heritage consultations (B/C)
- Conservation Area appraisals (C)
- electronic service delivery (core).

Members may like to consider whether they wish to look more closely at performance in some or all of these areas.

Conclusion

In assessing the Authority's performance, it is important to try to look at the whole picture. That means current and past performance on the objectives, PIs and actions, as well as other external assessments such as the NPAPA peer review, annual audit letter, and audit report. It should also be understood that most of the analysis in this paper has taken the figures at face value. The need

for action to tackle apparent areas of weakness can only be assessed by digging behind the headlines.

With those caveats, the overall picture is one of fairly good progress in 2005/06, particularly given the resources devoted to the NPAPA process. The Authority:

- achieved several major objectives (notably, implementation of open access, and adoption of the Local Development Plan) and kept most others 'on course';
- achieved (or got close) to 81% of its PI targets, including big improvements on high priorities like rights of way; website users; new homes on previously developed land; enforcement; and, volunteer days.
- we are in the top quartile of NPAs on 11 out of 28 PIs (including high priorities like rights of way signposted; homes on previously developed land; planning appeals)

Of course, there were also a number of areas that did not go so well:

- 5 objectives were missed, including 3 that were high priorities (planning applications, planning decision notices, and a management strategy for Green Lanes);
- targets were missed on 10 PIs, notably natural environment consultations; % BAP habitats surveyed; and, valid planning applications (A).
- the Authority was in the bottom quartile on 4 PIs (major planning applications, natural environment consultations, conservation area appraisals, and electronic service delivery).

RECOMMENDATION

That Members:

- a) note the Authority's performance in 2005/06;
- b) consider whether, in the light of performance in 2005/06, there are any areas of the Authority's work that should be looked at more closely, as part of a future programme of reviews.

GARY SMITH
HEAD OF CONSERVATION AND POLICY

5th June 2006

BVPP 2006/07 – ‘REVIEW OF OBJECTIVES’

	Objective	Progress	Comment
A	Work with our partners to ensure that we have up-to-date (i.e. less than 10 years old) information on the condition and extent of all the important habitats and species in the National Park.	✓	68% of park surveyed in last 3 years. 98% will be completed by end of 2006, with completion of survey of Richmondshire.
A	Influence farming and land management practices so as to increase the area of the Park in ‘good conservation management’ to 120,000 ha (79%) by 2007	✓	Target reached in 2005/06 with further small increase expected this year.
A	Increase the involvement of local communities in conservation and management activities by establishing and/or supporting a network of at least five sites managed by community or volunteer groups by March 2006	☑	5 sites established. Groups set up, and management plans being drawn up this year.
A	Improve the network of public rights of way so that 75% are ‘easy to use’ and 95% are signposted by March 2007	✓	86% and 97% respectively in 2005/06 (up from 60% 3 years ago). Figures based on small sample so can fluctuate but should meet the objective.
	Contribute to the production and implementation of a Rights of Way Improvement Plan for the Dales by 2007	✓	YDNPA has had input into the detail of draft plans for both the Cumbria and North Yorkshire. The county councils will be consulting on the drafts this year.
	Manage and restrict the use of recreational motor vehicles on green lanes by completing the ETRO project and agreeing a management strategy with partners by the end of 2005 .	✗	ETRO project completed but management strategy delayed until June 2006
A	Determine 100% of planning applications in line with adopted Development Plan Policies	✗	????????????? What was the actual figure for 2005/06?
	Provide a planning enforcement service that minimises environmental harm by regularising 50% of cases within 16 weeks	☑	55% in 2005/06. Objective now revised to 60% in future years.
A	Determine 68% of ‘minor’ and 80% of ‘other’ planning applications within eight weeks by Mar 2007	✗	Figures were 59% and 72% respectively. Authority now ‘Standards Authority. Objective for ‘minor’ applications now revised to 65%
	Provide planning information on the website	☑	Website now includes comprehensive ‘planning’ section.
	Issue all standard planning decision notices within two days of decisions by Mar 2006	✗	94% in 2006/07. Up 1% of on previous year.
A	Meet 83% of ODPM’s planning ‘Quality of Service’ Checklist criteria by Mar 07	✓	78% in 2005/06 (up from 71%). [What are we doing this year to add 5%?]
	At least 90% of applicants to be satisfied with the planning service provided by Mar	✓	88% in 03/04 (up from 81% in 00/01) but fall in speed of handling applications may

	Objective	Progress	Comment
	07		have an impact.
A	Promote 'sustainable development' within the National Park as the basis for the long-term social and economic well-being of local communities including funding at least 15 innovative local initiatives each year that bring economic, social <i>and</i> environmental benefits	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	21 projects in 05/06
B	Double the area of woodland from 3.6% of the Park in 1995 to 7.2% of the Park by 2020	✓	YDMT has secured funding to stay on course for next two years. However, will need more funding from FC etc in future years.
B	Advise and assist in the restoration of 80 traditional field barns by March 2007 Prepare management prescriptions for 40 Scheduled Ancient Monuments and bring at least 10 into appropriate management by March 2007	✓ ✗	57 done and 25 planned for 06/07 Objective rescheduled to March 2008 (reflecting delay in launch and slow uptake of Environmental Stewardship Scheme).
B	Implement the Countryside and Rights of Way Act, and preparing for 62% of the Park to be brought into open access by 2005	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Launched May 2005.
B	Provide individuals and groups of people from all backgrounds with the opportunity to make a difference to the long-term conservation, enhancement and enjoyment of the national park by providing 4,500 volunteer days per year by 2007/08	✓	4,800 days in 2005/06 (up over 1,000 in 3 years) and expect a similar level this year.
B	Increase the percentage of residents in Keighley and Bradford who are aware of the Yorkshire Dales National Park from 25% in 2005 to 30% by 2010 Increase the percentage of residents in Keighley and Bradford's Asian communities who are aware of the Yorkshire Dales National Park from 8% in 2005 to 13% by 2010 Increase the percentage of residents of Yorkshire and Teesside who are aware of the Yorkshire Dales National Park from 34% to 39% by 2009 .	✓ ✓ ✓	YDNPA outreach programme is ongoing. Now into year 3 of Countryside Agency-funded Beyond the Boundary cricket project, year 2 of CNP Mosaic Partnership and year 2 of YDMT Learning in Limestone Project. Emphasis of YDNPA events programme also shifting to attract 'new' audiences. Campaign to increase awareness due to take place during 2006/7.
B	Define, measure baselines and set targets for 'sustainable tourism product' and 'sustainable tourist behaviour' by Dec 05 for achievement by Dec 2010 Increase numbers of people who are accessing our visitor services to 670,000 by Mar 08 .	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ✓	Targets set this year and new objective in place.
B/C	Work with our partners to ensure that we have up-to-date (i.e. less than 10 years old) information on the condition and extent of all the designated historic features within	✓	Listed buildings done 2002-2004. All publicly accessible SAMs were surveyed in 2005/06.

	Objective	Progress	Comment
	the Park, and make that information widely available		
C	Take action to save 10 'at risk' listed buildings by March 2007 Complete the 'Public Spaces, Private Places' project, producing character statements, conservation action plans and interpretation for 20 villages by December 2006	✓ ✓	Behind schedule - 2 listed buildings saved so far. At least 7 planned this year (5 through 'Milestones' project) so should still meet objective. Village appraisals completed. Action plans being produced this year.
C	Define and gain broad agreement on the particular qualities of the Yorkshire Dales' landscape that make it special, as part of a revised National Park Management Plan by the end of 2005	✗	Special qualities have been drafted but public consultation on NPMP postponed until June/July 2006.
C	Continue to review and update the Definitive Map, producing a fully digitised version by 2007 .	✗	Digitised map for Richmondshire will be produced this year. Overall objective rescheduled to 2010
C	Progress actions within Area Action plans (that achieve NP purposes) so that 75% are progressed by 2009	✓	10 projects completed in 05/06. However, budget constraints will hamper progress in 2006/07
C	85% of users are satisfied with the Authorities 'promoting understanding' services by Mar 07 At least 700,000 users per year of the Authorities 'promoting understanding' services and website by Mar 07 Raise the YDNP profile throughout the UK, as measured by the national opinion poll, from 7% to 10% by Mar 07 90% of visitors are aware that they are in a National Park and at least 50% have an understanding of NP purposes and/or special qualities by Dec 07 All residents are aware of the National Park, 80% are aware of the NPA and at least 70% have an understanding of NP purposes/special qualities by Dec 09	✓ ✓ ✗ ✓ ✓	85% satisfied in 2005/06 and should maintain this level. Target comfortably exceeded in 2005/6 (over 900,000 users) because of significant increase in use of YDNPA websites, and change to the way figures are calculated. A new long-term objective will be needed. Branding work was postponed in 2005/6 owing to other priorities (website). Work now underway but behind schedule. Also awaiting clarification of whether NOP survey will definitely take place in 2007. Work on Visitor Newspaper, websites and new forms of interpretation ongoing and incorporating work on purposes and special qualities. 95% of residents were aware of YDNPA (2004) but no figures yet for awareness of NP purposes etc. To be included in next residents' survey.
C	Ensure that there are up-to-date (i.e. less than five years old) local development plans covering the National Park, which properly reflect National Park purposes and provide a clear and consistent framework for planning decisions.	☑	Local Plan adopted April 2006
D	Increase the number of education service users by 8% by December 2008 using 2006 as a baseline	✓	2006 baseline was 4,400 users, so target is 4750 by 2008. Plan to increase participants in formal and informal education events,

	Objective	Progress	Comment
			contacts with schools, and Dales Countryside Museum education events.
D	Review and update the State of the Park report by May 2006	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Published March 2006
	Review and update the National Park Management Plan by May 2006	<input type="checkbox"/>	Timetable has slipped – now due for completion by September 2006

E	Work with Countryside Agency to prepare for the opening of the Pennine Bridleway through the Dales by 2007	<input type="checkbox"/>	60% of route should be open this year but completing whole route now re-scheduled to end of 2009.
E	Work with partners to promote the use of sustainable and integrated forms of transport to and within the National Park.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Provided secretariat and officer input into the Yorkshire Dales Sustainable Transport Partnership.
E	Progress the Dales Apprenticeship Scheme in partnership with YDMT and Craven College	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Scheme in place and continuing.

Core	Plan and manage all aspects of the Authority's business so as to make the most effective use of our resources and consistently reduce the environmental impact of the Authority's own projects and operations, including achieving at least 80% of the actions per annum as identified in the Best Value Performance Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	82.5% of actions achieved in 2005/06
Core	Make all appropriate Authority services available to the public electronically by Dec 05	<input type="checkbox"/>	All now available through website
	Expand and improve the facilities for stakeholders provided on site by the Authority through the relocation of the Bainbridge office and the re-organisation of the Grassington office by Sep 06	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Move to new Bainbridge office completed in January 2006. Re-organisation at Grassington will be completed by June.

ANALYSIS OF PERFORMANCE AGAINST BVPIs IN 2005/06

Indicator	YDNPA		Comparison with other NPAs		Analysis of performance		Priority	Comments
	Target	Actual	Rank (of 8)	Top Quartile	Against target	Against 'top quartile'		
Net annual change in area managed in line with NPA conservation objectives (ha)	2,471	4,731	-	-	✓	-	A	Target exceeded due to residual take-up of 'classic' agri-environment schemes
Percentage of the Park with up-to-date surveys of BAP habitats (ha)	80%	68%	-	-	✗	-	A	Partly the result of miscalculating the target (which inadvertently excluded woodland habitats)!
Area of Local Nature Reserve per 1,000 population (ha)	4.4	4.4	-	-	✓	-	A	Target achieved - now focusing on management of existing LNRs
No. of nature conservation sites managed by community and volunteer groups	5	5	-		✓	-	A	Achieved
% of public rights of way that are easy to use	73%	86%	4	94%	✓	✗	A	Big improvement on previous year but still some way behind best NPAs
% of public rights of way that are signposted where they leave a road	93%	97%	2	97%	✓	✓	A	Target exceeded and now in top quartile of NPAs
Use of the website for promoting understanding:								
a) number of 'unique users'	95,000	302,230	-	-	✓	-	A	Targets significantly exceeded. Long-term objectives for use of the website will need to be revised accordingly
b) number of 'page impressions'	1,400,000	2,034,547	-	-	✓	-		
% of new homes built on previously developed land	60%	100%	1	84%	✓	✓	A	Met our target and the Government's. Top-performing NPA.

Indicator	YDNPA		Comparison with other NPAs		Analysis of performance		Priority	Comments
	Target	Actual	Rank (of 8)	Top Quartile	Against target	Against 'top quartile'		
% of planning applications determined within Govt target times:								
a) major applications	60%	20%	8	70%	✗	✗	A	One target achieved but still close to bottom of the NPA league table. Even if we meet our current targets for 2008/09 we would still not be in the top quartile.
b) minor applications	60%	59%	6	77%	○	✗		
c) other applications	70%	72%	6	81%	✓	✗		
% of appeals allowed following refusal from the Authority	35%	20%	2	20%	✓	✓	A	Target achieved and in the top quartile. Total no. of cases is small, which means figures can vary wildly (last year we were worst NPA!).
Quality of Planning service checklist	76%	78%	6	94%	✓	✗	A	Achieved our target and improved from last year. But still a long way behind the best performers. On current plans, we will still be well outside the top quartile by 2008/09.
% of applications that are valid on receipt	70%	61%	-	-	✗	-	A	Performance has dropped back after good progress in previous years.
% of decision notices issued within two days	100%	94%	-	-	○	-	A	Missed the target but still reasonable. Slight increase (1%) in previous years performance.
% of reported breaches of planning control which are resolved within target time	50%	55%	-	-	✓	-	A	Target achieved with additional resources. Target increased to 60% for future years
% of reported breaches of planning control which are resolved without the need for formal enforcement action	90%	96%	-	-	✓	-	A	Target exceeded
Number of projects supported through the Sustainable Development Fund	15	21	-	-	✓	-	A	Achieved

Indicator	YDNPA		Comparison with other NPAs		Analysis of performance		Priority	Comments
	Target	Actual	Rank (of 8)	Top Quartile	Against target	Against 'top quartile'		
% of statutory and non statutory nature conservation consultations completed within the agreed period	85%	77%	7	98%	✗	✗	A, B	Drop in performance and still one of the worst-performing NPAs. Largely due to problems in handling large number of agri-environment consultations early in the year.

Area of new tree planting assisted by YDNPA (ha)	50ha	24ha	-	-	✗	-	B	
No. of traditional field barns restored with advice or assistance from YNPA	25	25	-	-	✓	-	B	Achieved
Total number of volunteer days on projects led and/or supported by the Authority	3,700	4,813	-	-	✓	-	B	Again exceeded target, and further improvement on 2004/05.
% of land within the National Park open for public access	62%	62%	-	-	✓	-		Achieved with launch of open access in May 2005.
% of statutory and non-statutory cultural heritage consultations completed within the required period	75%	89%	5	95%	✓	✗	B, C	Big improvement on last year but still one the poorer performing NPAs.
No. of individual contacts (for promoting understanding and enjoyment) during the year	600,000	626,695	1	264,124	✓	✓	B, C, D	Target exceeded.
Overall level of satisfaction with the promoting understanding and enjoyment services	83%	85%	-	-	✓	-	B, C, D	Achieved

No. of 'at risk' Listed Buildings rescued by NPA action during the year	3	1	2=	1	✗	✓	C	Target missed but performance no worse than most NPAs.
---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	--

Indicator	YDNPA		Comparison with other NPAs		Analysis of performance		Priority	Comments
	Target	Actual	Rank (of 8)	Top Quartile	Against target	Against 'top quartile'		
Conservation areas:								
a) Percentage of conservation areas in the local authority area with an up-to-date character appraisal	11%	14%	7	95%	✓	✗	C	Achieved target but overall position is poor compared to other NPAs
b) Percentage of conservation areas with published management proposals	0%	0%	4	7%	✓	○	C	A lot of work to do in this area - as have all NPAs
Definitive map:								
a) number of order cases	25	19	-	-	✗	-	C	Both targets missed (one only just) but big improvement on performance in previous year.
b) number of order making decisions	15	14	-	-	○	-	C	
NPC effectiveness rating (average score out of 100)	87%	88%	2	88%	✓	✓	C	Achieved NPA top quartile
Local Development Scheme:								
Did the Authority submit the Local Development Scheme by 28 March 2005 and thereafter maintain a 3 year rolling programme?	Yes	Yes	1=	Yes	✓	✓	C	All achieved (as did all NPAs)
Has the Authority met the milestones which the current Local Development Scheme sets out?	Yes	Yes	1=	Yes	✓	✓	C	
Did the Authority publish an annual report by 31 December	Yes	Yes	1=	Yes	✓	✓	C	

Indicator	YDNPA		Comparison with other NPAs		Analysis of performance		Priority	Comments
	Target	Actual	Rank (of 8)	Top Quartile	Against target	Against 'top quartile'		
% of NPA public meetings, events, walks and talks that are accessible by means of public transport	77%	84%	3	86%	✓	○	E	Achieved
% of main visitor destinations with a Sunday and public Bank holiday service from their main catchment for June, July and August	64%	64%	-	-	✓	-	E	Achieved

Level (if any) of the Equality Standard for Local Government to which the Authority conforms	1	0	4	1	✗	○	Core	Missed target again (as did many other NPAs). Plans in place (again) to achieve Level 2 this year.
% of invoices for commercial goods and services which were paid within 30 days	97%	94%	5	98%	○	○	Core	Missed target but improvement on last year.
No. of working days per employee lost due to sickness	4.0	5.4	3	4.4	✗	○	Core	Missed target - largely due to 3 long-term absences in External Affairs Dept.
Ill health retirements as % of total workforce	0%	0%	1	0%	✓	✓	Core	Achieved
% of employees declaring that they meet the Disability Discrimination Act disability definition	2.2%	2.1%	3	3.4%	○	○	Core	Just missed target (due to increase in total no of staff).
% of workforce from minority ethnic communities	0%	0%	5	1%	✓	○	Core	Achieved (unchallenging) target.
% of Authority buildings open to the public in which all public areas are suitable for/accessible to disabled people	100%	100%	1	90%	✓	✓	Core	Achieved - and best performing NPA.

Indicator	YDNPA		Comparison with other NPAs		Analysis of performance		Priority	Comments
	Target	Actual	Rank (of 8)	Top Quartile	Against target	Against 'top quartile'		
% of interactions with the public, by type, which are capable of electronic service delivery and which are being delivered using internet protocols or other paperless methods	100%	92%	8	100%	○	×	Core	Improved from 75% in 2004/05 but missed Government target. Poorest performing NPA.
No. of complaints against the NPA	18	15	-	-	✓	-	Core	Achieved
% of staff undergoing performance management review within target time	95%	88%	-	-	×	-	Core	Again missed target (although slight improvement on previous year)
Average no of training/development days per member of staff (fte)	5	7	-	-	✓	-	Core	Exceeded target (again).
Average no. of training/development days per member of the Authority	3.5	4.0	-	-	✓	-	Core	Achieved
% of BVPP actions achieved	80%	83%	-	-	✓	-	Core	Exceeded target.