

Comments from Board, Defra, OGD and External Stakeholders on 2010/11-2012/13 Corporate Plan

Target	Change requested	By	Date of coment	Response	Action	Source
1.1.1 Understanding of landscape and biodiversity	There needs to be an explicit reference that NE is the lead delivery body for the England Biodiversity Strategy, as per the current corporate plan. This is an absolute must. The current draft simply doesn't reflect the entirety of NE's role here.	Duncan Williams (UK biodiversity policy unit)	1st December 09	Amended text.	Yes	Defra
1.2.1 Biodiversity privity	The draft plan is much too light on how NE will work with and through regional and local biodiversity partnerships. Presumably they are intended to be covered by the reference to 'a range of delivery partners'. This should be made rather more specific as this mechanism will be absolutely crucial to meet the overall biodiversity aims and needs to be recognised here much more clearly. The current corporate plan commits to developing joint regional biodiversity delivery plans with our regional partners, so something similar is needed again.	Duncan Williams (UK biodiversity policy unit)	1st December 09	Amended text to pick up requested points under paras 1 and 3 'Who we will work with'	Yes	Defra
1.2.1 Biodiversity privity	The para on 'Securing biodiversity' mentions the landscape scale approach but gives the misleading impression that NE's role is simply to develop evidence to support this. There needs to be a much more explicit recognition of NE's lead role in taking this forward in partnership with others. Similarly there is no explanation of how NE will continue to support and work with Local biodiversity partnerships and Local Records Centres.	Duncan Williams (UK biodiversity policy unit)	1st December 09	Amended text	Yes	Defra
1.2.1 Biodiversity privity	There needs to be a reference to NE playing a role in each of the EBS SIGs (equivalent to the current corporate plan which makes a commitment to play a lead role in each of the EBS implementation groups). This is currently lacking.	Duncan Williams (UK biodiversity policy unit)	1st December 09	Have included reference to EBS and securing change through Govt policy. But have not specifically mentioned SIGs - far too process-driven for CP text	Yes	Defra
1.2.1 Biodiversity privity	There needs to be more emphasis on creation of habitat to reach the various 2015 priority habitat targets. The 2010/11 target for habitat creation doesn't make any reference to creating the right habitat to meet the targets. This link should be made	Duncan Williams (UK biodiversity policy unit)	1st December 09	text for KPI 1 amended to refer to EBS 2015 target	Yes	Defra
1.2.1 Biodiversity privity	I note that one target is still referring to NE-led BAP species plan objectives, rather than reflecting that these species plans are now somewhat overtaken by the landscape scale approach set out in Securing Biodiversity. I wondered if this needed to be updated accordingly.	Duncan Williams (UK biodiversity policy unit)	1st December 09	We still wish to manage delivery of species targets through an integrated programme - many will need actions which cannot be delivered at landscape scale	No	Defra
2.2.1 Engaging People to conserve and enhance	There is some good material in this section, but disappointed that the 2010/13 target has narrowed from the equivalent target in the current corporate plan and now solely relates to NE's own volunteers (which are a relatively small proportion of the overall numbers of people volunteering). This seems a big step backwards from the current corporate plan target which covers increasing the number of people volunteering on the natural environment across the board, i.e. working more with other organisations to help them increase their capacity too.	Duncan Williams (UK biodiversity policy unit)	1st December 09	Taken on board. 2.2 widened to cover explicitly: working directly with vols (2.2.1); and Natural England's role in wider enironmental volunteering (2.2.2)	yes	Defra
2.3.1 Strategic Understanding Access	Page 25: 1st bullet point – the phrase Weymouth Olympic Way has seemed to have appeared but it is not an official title so I think this should be dropped. In addition I would not use the term "delivery " as it implies that the coastal access rights on this stretch of the English coast will be in place in 2010/11 which is not the case as the new right will not come into force until June/July 2012. I therefore suggest a revision to "Commence implementing new coastal access rights along the stretch of the coast at Weymouth and in the five lead access authorities"	Richard Hepburn	1st December 09	Agreed. Text revised	Yes	Defra
	Page 18: 10th bullet point - glad to see a commitment to consult on the approach they intend to take on the open access maps in 2010/11 (the decadal review under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act). It is worth noting that although the review under the Act is a statutory duty on Natural England we will be expecting them to have shared their intended approach with us and hopefully agreed it. If the approach requires the introduction of any regulations (SIs) then the responsibility for them rests with Defra	Richard Hepburn	1st December 09	Agreed. We do emphasise that we will consult.	No	Defra
2.3.1 Strategic Understanding Access	Page 25: 1st paragraph that starts "In the..."– delete the word "preliminary" as it is unnecessary.	Richard Hepburn	1st December 09	Text revised	Yes	Defra

Comments from Board, Defra, OGD and External Stakeholders on 2010/11-2012/13 Corporate Plan

Target	Change requested	By	Date of coment	Response	Action	Source
	Despite commenting that "...it is less clear if the access network meets people's needs", there is a glaring absence of any reference to Rights of Way Improvement Plans, which are the Government's key mechanism of improving the rights of way network. The Corporate Plan <u>must</u> acknowledge the important part that Rights of Way Improvement Plans have played, and will continue to play, in the enhancement of the access network. There must also be a commitment to continuing to support local authorities in their development and implementation of Rights of Way Improvement Plans.	Dave Waterman (Head of Recreation & Access Policy)	1st December 09	Agreed. Reference is now made to ROWIPs	Yes	Defra
3.1.1 Spatial Framework	I would be interested to learn more about what NE plan for "an evaluation project to quantify and improve the effectiveness (including targeting) of our interventions" (page 29.. Can NE provide a contact for this work stream ? Whilst I would not expect to see this in the Plan itself as it is relatively detailed, I should like reassurance that NE will continue to provide ongoing support to Defra on revisions to planning policy guidance and input to assist with our policy development work on offsets.	Richard Chapman(Biodiversity Programme – Planning Policy Co-ordinator)	1st December 09	We will continue to provide ongoing support to Defra on planning policy guidance and policy development work. The NE contact for the evaluation project is Mike L Smith.	None	Defra
3.1.1 Spatial Framework	Outcome 3 could refer to <i>World Class Places</i> (HMG 2009) recognition of the need for a step change in the provision of green infrastructure to address climate change and say that NE will work with Govt to help to deliver this (primarily through influencing planning at the regional/local levels and working with developers)	Ian Barrett (People and Landscapes Programme Team Manager)	1st December 09	OK. Included in version 2	Yes	Defra
3.1.1 Spatial Framework	<i>Natural England's Green Infrastructure Guidance</i> should be recognised in the "Where we are now" section for outcome 3	Ian Barrett (People and Landscapes Programme Team Manager)	1st December 09	OK. Included in version 2	Yes	Defra
3.1.1 Spatial Framework	The "Who we will work with" section for 3.1.1 could make more of their <i>Natural Development</i> initiative to work with developers to demonstrate how both large and small scale development can incorporate green infrastructure in practice.	Ian Barrett (People and Landscapes Programme Team Manager)	1st December 09	OK. Included in version 2	Yes	Defra
	The one area where I suspect we might need substantially more (following this week's announcements) is on how Natural England would contribute to the target of increasing woodland cover by 4%, which would fit well under Outcome 3 (I don't think their role in the England Trees Woods and Forests Action Plan gets a mention anywhere here either).	Ian Barrett (People and Landscapes Programme Team Manager)	1st December 09	Agreed. The plan now include specific reference to working with the Forestry Commission on forestry and woodland management, and in relation to the England Trees Woods and Forests Delivery Plan. We have also cross referenced our draft plan with that of the Forestry Commission and each has advised on the others.	Yes	Defra
	Section needs to be clearer about how it links to, and is delivered by, work covered under other outcomes/objectives	Tanya Arkle	3rd December	text amended	Yes	Defra
	Section needs to be clear how it links to other outcomes/objectives	Tanya Arkle	3rd December	This is covered in text on P6 & on P8 under Objective 1.1/1st 3 paragraphs through sustainable, integrated etc.	No	Defra
	Section needs to be clear how it links to other outcomes/objectives	Tanya Arkle	3rd December	Links are within introductory text.	No	Defra
	Section needs to be clearer about how it links to and delivers other outcomes/objectives to help strengthen the justification for and value (including the economic) of doing it and to answer the scepticism around spending money getting people out and about. Need to be careful how we explain our work so we are not seen as acting as a "Nanny State".	Tanya Arkle	3rd December	Health and quality of life etc covered in introductory para.	No	Defra
	Section needs to be clearer about how it links to other outcomes/objectives particulalry Biodiversity and Climate Change	Tanya Arkle	3rd December	Links in text in 3.1.1 and 3.1.2	No	Defra
	Section needs to be clearer about how it links to other outcomes/objectives particulalry Biodiversity and Climate Change	Tanya Arkle	3rd December	Agreed. The intro text for Outcome 3 makes several refernces to why we are doing it and the link with biodiversity and climate change.	Yes	Defra
	Section needs to be clearer about how it links to other outcomes/objectives	Tanya Arkle	3rd December	Agreed, text revised	Yes	Defra
	Section needs to be clearer about the size of the challenge we face and how it links to other outcomes/objectives	Tanya Arkle	3rd December	Inserted line in first paragraph	Yes	Defra
	Do more to draw out the economic value of the environment and biodiversity and the work we do protect and encourage it.	Tanya Arkle	3rd December	The first para refers to the economic benefits of biodiversity.	No	Defra

Comments from Board, Defra, OGD and External Stakeholders on 2010/11-2012/13 Corporate Plan

Target	Change requested	By	Date of coment	Response	Action	Source
1.1.1 Understanding of landscape and biodiversity	Need to do more to draw out the links between landscape and biodiversity and its support for wildlife	Martin Brasher	3rd December	The links between landscape & biodiversity are mentioned on P6 (Why we are...?) & P8 (1st 2 paragraphs & objective 1.1 itself). T	NO	Defra
1.1.1 Understanding of landscape and biodiversity	Describe better the link and deliniation of our work with that of English Heritage	Dan Osgood	3rd December	The historic environment & cultural history aspects are an integral part of 'landscape' & inherently included in all of NEs work, text has been amended to make clearer,	Yes	Defra
1.1.1 Understanding of landscape and biodiversity	Work on soils seems to be missing from this work - Expected to see more in the Corporate Plan about relationship with NE's draft position on soils (currently out to consultation) and what NE plans to deliver/contribute through this and to the implementation of the Soil Strategy. Will need clarification/amendment before CP is finalised.	Dan Osgood	3rd December, updated 10 December	Soils work is in the target plan for this area of work but does <b>not</b> feature in the corporate plan as it is not a KPI. The soil biota evidence work will reflect NEs soil strategy & position. The position work is adequately covered in 1st bullet point at bottom of P8/top P9( where 'soil position' is specifically mentioned). NB the 'Soils' position should be endorsed by Board in Q4/Q1-2010 so this CP predominantly covers advocacy & technical guidance to implement the soil strategy.	None	Defra
	The introduction to the objective needs to demonstrate the economic value of the Marine environment and the work we do.	Tanya Arkle	3rd December	Intro to Objective 1.3 amended	Yes	Defra
	Where possible we need to demonstrate the economic value of the environment and the work we do.	Tanya Arkle	3rd December	Agreed, text revised	Yes	Defra
	The into to the objective needs to demonstrate the economic value of climate change adaptaion and the work we do to promote it.	Tanya Arkle	3rd December	Line added to first paragraph. Intro 4.1/4.2 also outlines link between our work and societal benefits.	Yes	Defra
1.2.1 Biodiversity prority	Need to be more explicit on the role organic farming has to play in supporting biodiversity and the link with the Organic H and ELS	James Whippeny	3rd December	This is not a big issue for biodiversity because organic farming is a minority contributor to BAP delivery	No	Defra
1.2.1 Biodiversity prority	Why double the farmland bird target? And why now? In any case we have set the target lower than the one that Defra/NE signed up to in the Campaign for the Farmed Environment. Need to be at least the same.	David Cooper	3rd December	We have doubled it in order to meet 3-yr rolling target to increase by 2011 40% above 2008 baseline - and because this year's lower target has been over-delivered. The CFE target is greater because it includes hectares from voluntary measures, as well as ES, whereas our target relates solely to ES	No	Defra
1.2.1 Biodiversity prority	Biodiversity and the significance of 2010 (IYB and Copenhagen) needs to feature strongly in the Foreword	Martin Brasher	3rd December	An important comment which needs to go in foreword	Yes	Defra
1.2.1 Biodiversity prority	Would like to see greater reference to non-native species and reference to our licensing work and its contribution to this target.	Francis Marlow	3rd December	Have amended text to include ref to statutory licencing contribution to BAP species	Yes	Defra
	Section comes across as fluffy because of the complexity of the area, more work needed on the text to sharpen it, shorten it to better demonstrate the integration of this target with other workstreams and to show the value of this work (links to tourism and other socio economic benefits).	Tanya Arkle	3rd December	Text has been smartened	No	Defra
	Would like to see wording changes in realtion to NE's role on marine in terms of climate change mitigation and renewable energy - specific wording change suggestions to follow.	Alison Reeves	3rd December	No specific wording suggestions followed. 3.3.1 makes our role on working with the renewables sector clear. Forward look section at end of 1.3.2 puts up marker about climate change (and ocean acidification).	No	Defra
	Plan needs to be clear about NE's actual role as opposed to others in this field (ie JNCC, CEFAs MMO). Need to do more to define and delineate what we do and what others do, where we lead and where we collaborate. Avoid the impression of a crowded, overlapping field of public servants. Is there scope for rationalisation across NE & partners over monitoring, perhaps moving to a more risk based approach.	David Cooper	3rd December	Marine text reviewed and minor adits made to address this and next two points	Yes	Defra
	Need to ensure consistent use of termonology and avoid phrases which might be taken as Natural England strying outside its jusrisdiction e.g. "high seas"	Alison Reeves	3rd December	See above	Yes	Defra
	Need to reference how we deliver some aspects of marine through others	Tanya Arkle	3rd December	See above	Yes	Defra
2.2.1 Engaging People to conserve and enhance	This target only refers to NE's volunteers and does not make links to the whole voluntary programme for the natural environment.	Martin Brasher	3rd December	Taken on board. 2.2 widened to cover explicitly: working directly with vols (2.2.1); and Natural England's role in wider enironmental volunteering (2.2.2)	Yes	Defra
	Need to show more clearly where we use other organisations to deliver our outcomes. This not just about "who we will work with" but needs to say how so we avoid the perception of overlap, duplication, waste, etc. Is there any evaluation we can draw on that proves the the value of access to the natural environment and to health and the economy?	David Cooper	3rd December	Working in partnership with others now explicit in 2.2.2	Yes	Defra
3.1.1 Spatial Framework	Need to make greater reference to the involvement we have in high profile planning casework and make reference to IPC	Martin Brasher	3rd December	This is covered in who we will work with	No	Defra

Comments from Board, Defra, OGD and External Stakeholders on 2010/11-2012/13 Corporate Plan

Target	Change requested	By	Date of coment	Response	Action	Source
3.1.1 Spatial Framework	We will need to consider drawing out and <u>defining</u> the link up with EA and FC especially on growth points and the potential for more joint working and less overlap.	David Cooper	3rd December	Suggested rewording of milestone to express this	Yes	Defra
3.1.1 Spatial Framework	Need to draw out the different ways in which we work from strategy to local level. It is good that we have descibed some clear output metrics but we must also state clearly the big startegic issues/outcomes we will achive through doing so.	David Cooper	3rd December	Revised targets make this clear	Yes	Defra
3.1.1 Spatial Framework	Need to demonstrate how we rise to the challenge of this work and need to be able to tell a better story about this work in the narrative around the milestones.	Tanya Arkle	3rd December	Section revised to take this into account	Yes	Defra
	Make sure that there is reference in 3.2 to "efficient delviery" and improvements and savings. Link to target c1.4 needs to be strong.	Dan Osgood	3rd December	Agreed. Introductory text for 3.2 now includes reference to a "continued focus on improving the efficiency of our delivery and so contribute to our target to maximise the resources available for the natural environment."	Yes	Defra
	Concern that the milestones show alot of activity and measurable numeric targets (which is good) but not enough done in either targets or text to demonstrate what outcomes this is all going to deliver and what environmental benefits (descibed in the intro to 3) can realistically be achieved through all this activity.	Dan Osgood	3rd December, updated 10 December	A fair point but one that is difficult to reflect in a plan that needs to capture both what we aim to achieve in the long term and the immediate, short term and measurable things we have to achieve in-year to make sure that the outcomes will follow.	No	Defra
	The ambition of what we want and need to achive (the early promise that appears in the outcome 3 introduction) is not drawn out in the detail of what we do (targets and milestones). It is not clear how these things can hope to deliver what is necessary.	Martin Brasher	3rd December	A fair point but one that is difficult to reflect in a plan that needs to capture both what we aim to achieve in the long term and the immediate, short term and measurable things we have to achieve in-year to make sure that the outcomes will follow.	No	Defra
	Farm visits/farm contacts, need to make better reference to who we work with and through particulalry with manitoring and advice.	David Cooper	3rd December	We have re-checked the text to make sure that section 3.2.3 fully reflects who we will work with and through to deliver land management advice. Most paragraphs include references to working via or with others and in partnership.	No	Defra
	4.1 objective introduction - it is not clear from supporting text how we work and what we do at an international level. Need to specify how, with which bodies, etc, be specific.	Martin Brasher	3rd December	Agreed. Text revised	Yes	Defra
4.1.1 Integrated Vision	Need to be clear about how autumn 2010 Vision links with key Biodiversity announcements planned for Oct 2010.	Martin Brasher	3rd December	yes, recognised. Launch of vision is timed late on in year and will capture and compliment IYOD messages.	None	Defra
4.1.1 Integrated Vision	Need to make sure that we draw out the link between outcome 4 and other work. Why do we do it? How does it benefit delivery?	David Cooper	3rd December	Agreed. We have drawn out the points seperately under the "why we are doing it" section	Yes	Defra
4.1.1 Integrated Vision	Going forward we need to get the balance right between what NE, Defra, EA and FC do in this area of work to avoid resource duplication and ensure better join up. Need to avoid the impression that Natural England is going out on a limb, is not joined up and is leaving others behind.	David Cooper	3rd December	Point taken. We have streghtened the references to talking with and acting collectively with partners and stakeholders.	Yes	Defra
4.3.2 Evidence Base	We will get back to you with more comments on the soil and peat milestones	Dan Osgood	3rd December	Comments received and detailed in line 146.	None	Defra
	Climate change mitigation needs to be better integrated with ES in the text. Reference to ES needs to be included in the climate change section, especially as references have been made previously at page 33, and reference at page 12 to ES being a vital tool for biodiversity.	Dan Osgood	3rd December	ES references added in a number of sections of text, as well as reference to the Rural Climate Change Forum.	Yes	Defra
3.1.2 Environmental Priorities	The milestones need to be sharper and more tangible. They currently do not say what we mean. More work needed on the presentation of this work area which shows what specific outputs and outcomes will be delivered. Also would like to see us give advice to Defra and DECC on where renewables should be located, the choices we face on species and protected areas.	David Cooper	3rd December	Milestones and targets have been sharpened	Yes	Defra
	Need to be clear about where we offer leadership in this area and where we act more collaboratively.	Tanya Arkle	3rd December	Text amended	Yes	Defra
	we will have a new government of whatever colour / we should welcome this but with care over the language used. We should acknowledge that the challenges for the environment will remain the same and we want to work together on the opportunities for better harmonising environmental, social and economic objectives.	Christopher Pennell	3rd December	Included in foreword	Yes	Board

Comments from Board, Defra, OGD and External Stakeholders on 2010/11-2012/13 Corporate Plan

Target	Change requested	By	Date of coment	Response	Action	Source
	refer to our statutory purpose and our 3 strengths - motivated by our statutory purpose to protect and promote the Natural Environment, that we are evidence based and a track record of effective and efficient delivery.	Christopher Pennell	3rd December	Included in foreword	Yes	Board
	Need to be very careful on the tone and language used - will need checking carefully with a political eye. Outcome 2 in the current environment looks even more relevant and feels a bit light at present. Warned against creating hostages to fortune in the CP text.	Pam Warhurst	3rd December	Included in foreword	Yes	Board
	no order at present to foreword - Copenhagen needs to be first. We need to create a separate point that we are in a very different economic climate. Consider that the reader might like to know how this is different from the last Corporate Plan.	Tony Hams	3rd December	Included in foreword	Yes	Board
	Supports the financial assumptions used. Tone needs to be about us receiving and listening more and transmitting/ telling / directing less.	Andy Wilson	3rd December	Included in foreword	Yes	Board
	Should new Infrastructure Planning Committee IPC be included in foreword	Tony Hams	3rd December	Included in foreword	Yes	Board
	Nothing about marine - we are not taking foot off the pedal - make a commitment to delivery.	Doug Hyler	3rd December	Included in foreword	Yes	Board
	Could improve the language on 4 positions on landscape	Lynn Crowe	3rd December	Included in foreword	Yes	Board
	Picture – Poul is now the Chair not Acting	unknown	3rd December	Update Foreword to reflect change of status of chair	Yes	Board
	page 4 at bottom and top of page 6 Need to say that ecosystem services contributes to everyone's quality of life and repeat quality of life message again.	Christopher Pennell	3rd December	It does	Yes	Board
	page 6 - wording of 4 positions looks wrong - Consider the wisdom of the wording on South Downs and tone around "successfully supporting Defra on the marine bill"	Pam Warhurst	3rd December	Text updated	Yes	Board
1.1.2 Protected landscapes	Page 10 first bullet – shouldn't we be doing more than support and advise – what is it we are actually doing. Consider rewording	Pam Warhurst	3rd December	<b>1st bullet comment:</b> Support & advice to Defra is Natural England's statutory role. In addition, NE also has a role within the region to engage, liaise & develop 'partnership' work with the transitional/new SDNPA to achieve joint outcomes of mutual benefit. This will probably be through a NP Action Plan & Shared Outcomes agreement (as NE has with other NPAs) covering a wide range of partnership work & delivery, such as on HLS agreements etc. <b>However, this part of NEs remit(NP/partnership working) is covered by the 3rd Bullet point</b> on same page so suggest that the wording is slightly changed to make it obvious that it includes SDNPA as well rather than change the 1st bullet point.	Yes	Board
1.1.2 Protected landscapes	left hand column – para starting “we will also deliver non-statutory” – we may be making promises we can't keep – careful that we aren't making ourselves a hostage to fortune. Consider rewording.	Pam Warhurst	3rd December	Agree with this comment & need to be careful what we commit to because of limited staff resources & budget ( NEs non-statutory role may be desirable but is obviously optional & may need to be more limited in its aspirations. Text amended.	Yes	Board
1.1.2 Protected landscapes	first para - NPs are there for recreation and enjoyment. Consider rewording	Tony Hams	3rd December	There has been a lot of discussion on the target description for T112 & I do not think that it needs to include 'recreation & enjoyment'. Suggest that the comment relates to the NPs duty & not NEs. NE would be involved in supporting & working with NPAs to deliver 'recreation & enjoyment' as part of 2nd Purpose. Thus, this would be covered by the 3rd bullet point/P10 on partnership working through action plans & shared outcomes for 'public benefit & enjoyment'. If it is a consensus to emphasise the point then 'recreation' could be inserted to say "public benefit, recreation and enjoyment", however suggest that this is unnecessary.	No	Board

Comments from Board, Defra, OGD and External Stakeholders on 2010/11-2012/13 Corporate Plan

Target	Change requested	By	Date of coment	Response	Action	Source
1.1.2 Protected landscapes	milestones should be clearer more aggressive on new designations e.g. lakes Dales specific and supporting new South Downs NPA.	Christopher Pennell	3rd December	Current CP text (1st para & 1st bullet point) describes NEs statutory role for Defra which needs to be clearly stated & sparate to NE's role as a champion, campaigner etc &/or where NE has 'positions' agreed. On the Lakes/Dales Gap boundary variations, NE would not at this stage want to clearly state its opinion(one way or another) regarding the options before the completion of the public consultation &/or before Defra's recommendation - in case NE wished to 'object' at some stage in the future & keep NEs options open. The changes to the CP text in 3rd bullet already suggested (from Pam Warhurst's comments) already emphasise partnership working with new SDNPA. The 4th bullet point describes the development of a 'robust approach for assessing new designations & boundary reviews' etc as this is what NE can deliver.	NO	Board
1.1.2 Protected landscapes	Page 11 request new wording after key milestones for what next - "we will work across government to ensure that protected landscapes are fully recognised for their natural beauty and for their social and economic benefits and in the particular case of national parks, for their recreation and enjoyment they provide."	Tony Hams	3rd December	Text could be revised to say " We will work across Government to ensure that all Protected Landscapes are fully recognised for their natural beauty, and for their social and economic benefits, and in the case of National Parks for the recreation & enjoyment they provide".	No	Board
	Page 12 second para - biodiversity to have a high public profile in IYB, but what and what we were going to do - are we doing more under 1.2 or in 2.1?	Doug Hyler	3rd December	Key focus of foreword	Yes	Board
1.2.1 Biodiversity prorty	these targets are not stretching enough - switch farmland bird option wording around to measure improvement on indicator	Tony Hams	3rd December	We cannot tie our success measure to the indicator, which will be affected by factors outside our control,is not monitored at quarterly intervals, and lags well behind the actions taken in a given year	No	Board
1.3.1 English MPAs	State of Seas report.- check that this worked with JNCC UK seas report.	Joe Horwood	3rd December	Amended to clarify relationship to Defra's "Charting Progress 2"	Yes	Board
1.3.2 Marine BAP work	Page 15- MSFD is very different from WFD reference need to make clear Natural England's role and the link with the EA needs unpicking. Drop MSFD or rework the point.	Joe Horwood	3rd December	text amended further following CoD discussion.	Yes	Board
2.1.1 Appreciation of Natural Environment	need an additional key milestones in 2.1 covering a new corporate partnership on Occupational Health.	Guy Thompson	3rd December	Not a KPI for 10/11 but now covered in narrative.	Yes	Board
	guard against creating hostages to fortune. Need to create more hooks for "non believers" - we don't emphasise the need to get people to value the environment enough - we also must not overlook the other non Natural England volunteers. Must create more references to value and changing behaviours and the impact on everyday lives.	Pam Warhurst	3rd December	Taken on board. 2.2 widened to cover explicitly: working directly with vols (2.2.1); and Natural England's role in wider enironmental volunteering (2.2.2)	yes	Board
2.2.1 Engaging People to conserve and enhance	2.2 looks weak. Need to create more balance between 2.1 and 2.2. What about including some of the wildlife gardens and other initiatives. What are the new outreach officers contributing to this - people will be looking at the numbers - and saying only a 100, should it be a larger number or % growth to give a more compelling impression	Doug Hyler	3rd December	Taken on board. 2.2 widened to cover explicitly: working directly with vols (2.2.1); and Natural England's role in wider enironmental volunteering (2.2.2)	Yes	Board
2.2.1 Engaging People to conserve and enhance	Why is diversity not included in the key target milestones?	Tony Hams	3rd December	discussed with Jim burt. Diversity is covered in the Outdoors for All Milestone - no change.	No	Board
2.2.1 Engaging People to conserve and enhance	2.2 only 100 extra volunteers (number is too low) and can we use use Access2Nature to beef this section up.	Lynn Crowe	3rd December	Taken on board. 2.2 widened to cover explicitly: working directly with vols (2.2.1); and Natural England's role in wider enironmental volunteering (2.2.2). Numbers refer to 10/11, increase for three year target. Cannot report on A2N in 2 places.	Yes	Board
2.3.1 Strategic Understanding Access	More about rights of way and stakeholders such as National Access Forum and in third key milestone there appears to be a lot hidden which needs expanding and explaining.	Lynn Crowe	3rd December	Included reference to 'England Access Forum'	Yes	Board
	page 24 2.3 - national trails and NNRS - have these been agreed are we holding ourselves hostage to these things here?	Lynn Crowe	3rd December	National Trails Delivery Review is a KPI for Natural England as NE Commitment letter runs out end 10/11 and we need a way forward agreed. SWG not a KPI for 10/11 - taken out.	Yes	Board
3.1.1 Spatial Framework	Where is the reference to the IPC, how do we include it because its important but we need to be cautious over the wording.	Tony Hams	3rd December	Included in para 2 of Who we Will work with.	Yes	Board
	4th bullet rh column pg 27 - avoid the use of "route map	Christopher Pennell	3rd December	Text revised	Yes	Board
3.1.1 Spatial Framework	4th Key milestone - more about what this means - might achieve 150 - can you count them anyway - what does natural England actually contribute will these happen anyway through others?	Lynn Crowe	3rd December	This target records the additional outcomes as a result of our intervention. It does not record what would happen anyway, and the narrative in our reporting will explain this.	None	Board

Comments from Board, Defra, OGD and External Stakeholders on 2010/11-2012/13 Corporate Plan

Target	Change requested	By	Date of coment	Response	Action	Source
3.1.2 Energy	top of page 30 long list of business and government bodies for a page and then as an afterthought and a bit of a whimper the NGO's - third target milestone should and can be taken into account.	Christopher Pennell	3rd December	Amended to boost NGO section and changed 3rd target miletones to 'can and should be taken into account'.	Yes	Board
3.2.2. Agri-environment delivery	3.2.2 - does this cross reference with Biodiversity targets - it should say it does much more strongly?	Tony Hams	3rd December	No target in 3.2.2 explicitly cross references to biodiversity. The 70% UAA coverage, the 35% UELS coverage and the 80% classic conversion targets are not derived or driven by biodiversity targets. The links with biodiversity will be made through the LMPP pipeline work during the year.	No	Board
3.2.2. Agri-environment	- 3.2.2 second Key milestone - 13% is the wrong number (remove for draft to stakeholders) take out for now and get the correct figure.	Peter Allen	3rd December	Text to be amended	Yes	Board
3.2.3 Land Management	Page 35 references to land managers - should be more consistent refer please to farmers and land managers each time.	Peter Allen	3rd December	Text to be amended	Yes	Board
3.3.1 Standards to Protect Marine Environment	key milestones second bullet avoid MSC - perhaps use "environmental certification" greenpeace for example not happy with MSC.	Joe Horwood	3rd December	Amended	Yes	Board
4.1.1 Integrated Vision	4.1 nervous about the process for the vision launch. To avoid some of the political sensitivities and some resource issues could we work with other Defra NDPBs who might bring money and resources and be doing something similar. Have we enough comms support to make this work and where are the voices of young people.	Lynn Crowe	3rd December	sensitivities recognised we have revised lunch date to Nov. We are working with Defra to join up with Greener society vision. We will explore opportunities to engage with young people and do this with others.	No	Board
4.2.1 Long Term Challenge	4.2.1 – who we will work with No NGO's / voluntary sector – draft for stakeholders put NGOs and voluntary sector	Lynn Crowe	3rd December	Text to be amended	Yes	Board
	Page 43 typo on lh column 7th line as not s.	unknown	3rd December	delete additional s	Yes	Board
4.3.2 Evidence Base	could cross reference our own 50% target	Christopher Pennell	3rd December	Not relevant here as not an evidence or delivery of resilient natural environment issue. Referred to in DPB.	None	Board
	Page 48 care over independent? Is it the right word	Catherine Graham-Harrison	3rd December	Suggest text remains as is to be consistent with how this section has been presented in previous years (same text0	No	Board
A.1.2 Relationships Stakeholders	A1.2 key milestone perhaps say MPs in a new parliament?!	Christopher Pennell	3rd December	Text amended to reflect comment	Yes	Board
A.1.3 Our People	A1.3 pg 51 2nd key milestone staff are confident	Christopher Pennell	3rd December	Text amended to reflect comment	Yes	Board
	C1 - page 57 where are we now - should we say we have reduced charges from SSD and have prepared the case for further savings	Christopher Pennell	3rd December	Now included.	Yes	Board
C.1.4 Financial Management	C1.4 who we will work with - end sentence after National Trust. Then should read "We will work with funding bodies, in particular BIG..."	Christopher Pennell	3rd December	CP Text amended	Yes	Board
C.1.4 Financial Management	C1.4 should we have implementation of IFRS in here	Christopher Pennell	3rd December	Paul Lambert has confirmed that whilst this measure will be included in the Finance Delivery agreement, it is not sufficiently important to warrant being included in the CP Narrative as a KPI.	None	Board
1.2.1 Biodiversity priority	we lose the pattern of presentation which is a good format - the clarification text after the bold target is very short in some instances and occasionally disappears altogether	Christopher Pennell	3rd December	Objectives 1.2 (biodiversity) and 1.3 (marine) have stuck to the laid down word limits. Objective 1.1 is a wordy four pages, double the length. Within the two page limit we have done the best we can	No	Board
2.1.2 Deliver Access Grant Schemes	we lose the pattern of presentation which is a good format - the clarification text after the bold target is very short in some instances and occasionally disappears altogether	Christopher Pennell	3rd December	Clarification text added in to A2N	Yes	Board
1.1.1 Understanding of landscape and godiversity	3rd bullet point P.8 - Reflects commitment in Soil Strategy, but strange that have concentrated on this rather than the NE position on soils – is this really the most important issue?	Dan Osgood	10th December	This bullet point is all about the evidence base & research work (& not 'position') that NE will do & the soil biota work will reflect NEs soil strategy & position. The position work is adequately covered in 1st bullet point at bottom of P8/top P9( where 'soil position' is specifically mentioned). NB the 'Soils' position should be endorsed by Board in Q4/Q1-2010 so this CP predominantly covers advocacy & technical guidance.	No	Defra
1.1.1 Understanding of landscape and godiversity	P9 2nd bullet point - For our clarification: will the review/update of National Character Areas have an impact on HLS targeting?	Dan Osgood	10th December	We will make sure that you get this clarification.	No	Defra

Comments from Board, Defra, OGD and External Stakeholders on 2010/11-2012/13 Corporate Plan

Target	Change requested	By	Date of coment	Response	Action	Source
	P12 2nd column, 2nd para - ES is a multi-objective scheme so would expect the Plan to aim to derive benefits for all scheme objectives, not just biodiversity. The current wording could be misunderstood by stakeholders as giving biodiversity a higher priority.	Dan Osgood	10th December	It is not the intention to imply giving biodiversity a higher priority within HLS. We propose changing the reference to say "we will work to make the most of benefits for biodiversity that Environmental Stewardship agreements offer"	Yes	Defra
1.2.1 Biodiversity privity	ES is a multi-objective scheme so would expect the Plan to aim to derive benefits for <u>all</u> scheme objectives, not just biodiversity. The current wording could be misunderstood by stakeholders as giving biodiversity a higher priority.	Dan Osgood	10th December	the text refers here to the biodiversity target, and what ES will do in support of it. Not intended to be a description of the function and purpose of ES - see 3.2	No	Defra
1.2.1 Biodiversity privity	P13 2nd milestone (90,000 ha) - Please could NE explain to us how was this figure derived? Also, is it consistent with that quoted at page 6 (bullet 9). Does this target mean that around 21% of HLS area coverage is devoted to biodiversity priority habitat, although most options are multi-objective? Doesn't explain why this figure is important, or the significance in relation to the objectives/targets set.  Shouldn't this statement cover new and existing HLS agreements not just new agreements? Defra contacts are Benika Raybould and Emma Clare	Dan Osgood	10th December	Will explain separately to Defra contact how the figures are derived - not for explanation in the Corp Plan	No	Defra
1.2.1 Biodiversity privity	p13 - ( 4th KPI) - the targets in the draft Plan are different from those which both NE and Defra have signed up to, as partners in the Campaign. This is a difficult balance: we do not want to appear that we are not supporting the Campaign, but at the same time we are not entirely responsible for delivering the targets ourselves. Perhaps wording like "with the other partners to the Campaign for the Farmed Environment, deliver..." might work? This is likely to be very important presentationally. Key Defra contacts here are Frances Bean and Kirsty Lord-Smith.	Dan Osgood	10th December	They are the targets which NE has set out to deliver, and have been following for three years. Text now includes reference to working "with the partners to the Campaign for the Farmed Environment and other regional farmland bird initiatives to ensure we maximise the benefits to biodiversity these can provide".	Yes (in part)	Defra
2.1.1 Appreciation of Natural Environment	Educational access - Include figures for numbers of visitors to farms (mainly schoolchildren ) through HLS/CSS educational access-major contributor to the "1 million children" target.	Dan Osgood	10th December	Done	Yes	Defra
2.1.1 Appreciation of Natural Environment	P21 - in the following two years section - Need to include CSS in this statement as majority of farms delivering educational access are still in this scheme. Why is this planned for the two years following 2010/11, rather than more quickly?	Dan Osgood	10th December	reference to CSS now included	Yes	Defra
2.3.1 Strategic Understanding Access	P25 - deliver a quantitative increase in area wide access and linear access..." - what does this mean for HLS - clarification needed.	Dan Osgood	10th December	2.3.1 is not here referring to HLS	No	Defra
	Outcome 3 introduction - Need to include references to NE's role as delivering agri-environment schemes on Defra's behalf.	Dan Osgood	10th December	text amended to reflect this	Yes	Defra
	Need to include references to NE's role as delivering agri-environment schemes on Defra's behalf.	Dan Osgood	10th December	Text is now streghtened to include references to managing schemes on Defra's behalf.	Yes	Defra
	P27 - Where are we now 6th bullet - clarification for our benefit: Please could NE clarify which reports this refers to. AE Schemes in England report? What others?	Dan Osgood	10th December	Reference is now limited to the key one on the effectiveness of AE schemes.	Yes	Defra
	Where are we know section - no mention of the creation of the new ELS Training and Information Programme (ETIP) in this section	Dan Osgood	10th December	That's right but delivery through ETIP is covered as a key milestone for 2010/11	No	Defra
3.1.1 Spatial Framework	2nd KPI - Clarification for our benefit: could NE tell us whether this includes agri-environment?	Dan Osgood	10th December	No, it does not. Agri-environment is picked up under 3.2.	None	Defra
3.1.2 Energy	3rd KPI - does this include biomass and biofuels	Dan Osgood	10th December	Guidance will apply to all forms of energy that can impact on our interests, so yes.	None	Defra
3.2.1 Agri-Environment development	P32 - Reference to successor programme to RDPE is premature. Although the mid-term evaluation is important, we don't think that this is the major priority for 2010/11	Dan Osgood	10th December	We do not see this as a large piece of work but do plan to speak to regional staff about their experiences of RDPE to date so that we can respond quickly to any requests from Defra - we have already received some such requests.	No	Defra
3.2.1 Agri-Environment development	P32 - "through analysis/review of levers and tools" - What is this? More clarity needed	Dan Osgood	10th December	This work is complementary to work done on the future CAP. It is looking at what non CAP levers might be available to help achieve our objectives and how these might be integrated with CAP levers.	No	Defra

Comments from Board, Defra, OGD and External Stakeholders on 2010/11-2012/13 Corporate Plan

Target	Change requested	By	Date of coment	Response	Action	Source
3.2.1 Agri-Environment development	Ref to limiting changes in ES - all planned changes have been completed/now being introduced. Not aware of further changes planned for after the start of the renewals process in August 2010, so clarification needed e.g. " <i>To avoid disruption during the peak of ELS renewals we will minimise changes to application processes unless these help to deliver agreements more smoothly and effectively. We will of course continue to examine scheme delivery to ensure that it is as effective in delivering environmental outcomes as is possible</i> ". Alternatively this paragraph should be deleted.	Dan Osgood	10th December	Agreed. Text revised	Yes	Defra
3.2.1 Agri-Environment development	Complete full review of land management levers - unclear what this is for and what is involved. Clarity needed.	Dan Osgood	10th December	See comment on levers above	No	Defra
3.2.1 Agri-Environment development	Changes to ES - See overall comments. suggest wording (if remaining as bullet point) should be along the lines of: "... <b>implement changes to ES as agreed with Defra, and as approved by the European Commission.</b> "	Dan Osgood	10th December	CP text now updated to reflect this wording	Yes	Defra
3.2.2. Agri-environment delivery	No mention of ES contribution to climate change mitigation in previous or following milestones	Dan Osgood	10th December	Have added a new milestone that refers to current project looking at how ES might better reflect goals of CC mitigation and adaptation - we propose to implement an action plan agreed with Defra in Q1.	Yes	Defra
3.2.2. Agri-environment delivery	No mention of classic schemes in this section. Need to be included, as large numbers in uplands still have agreements (some continuing until 2014).	Dan Osgood	10th December	The 3.2.2 text already says that 'the Countryside Stewardship Scheme and Environmentally Sensitive Areas) form a key part of Natural England's work to ensure land is managed in a way that delivers environmental services alongside other benefits'.	no	Defra
3.2.2. Agri-environment delivery	Figures look odd.UELS in 80% of SDA by 2015 looks too distant, and 13% of SDA in UELS by 2011 looks too low. Suggest have a target for the amount of SDA in <u>agri-environment</u> rather than just UELS?	Dan Osgood	10th December	80% in 2015 was taken directly from the Defra Impact Assessment prepared for the introduction of UELS. The 13% figure will be increased, but the 46% in the impact assessment for December 2010 is too large, given that agreements will not begin until July. The figure is being resolved, urgently, with Defra (this includes agreeing the actual SDA figure to be used for the 80% calculation, as these vary in Defra sources between 1.2m ha to 1.6m ha.).	no	Defra
3.2.2. Agri-environment delivery	Working with RPA - Need to include reference to delivering efficient payment of funds to land managers as well as managing within EU rules.	Dan Osgood	10th December	Included in para 2 of Who we Will work with.	yes	Defra
3.2.2. Agri-environment delivery	working with stakeholders in Uplands - last sentence doesn't make sense and needs clarification. Why is specific reference given to the Moorland Association (which provides limited input)?	Dan Osgood	10th December	Reference to Moorland Association removed.	yes	Defra
3.2.2. Agri-environment	UAA - insert "68%" after "...schemes from..."	Dan Osgood	10th December	Now included.	yes	Defra
	<b>Climate change mitigation targets for Environmental Stewardship:</b> we have agreed with NE colleagues (Dave Thompson, Geoff Radley) that we should not quote figures for the total greenhouse gas saving from Environmental Stewardship, as the figures are not sufficiently robust. Instead, we think that a more appropriate target for 2010/11 would be along the lines of "Climate change mitigation fully integrated into our delivery of Environmental Stewardship", although we would also welcome a further discussion with Natural England colleagues as to exactly what this would mean in practice. Defra contacts here are <i>Mark Baylis and Benika Raybould</i> .	Dan Osgood	10th December	Have added a new milestone that refers to current project looking at how ES might better reflect goals of CC mitigation and adaptation - we propose to implement an action plan agreed with Defra in Q1.	Yes	Defra
	P35 - Reference to ELS Training and Information Programme (ETIP) should be included here as it is an important source of information	Dan Osgood	10th December	ETIP is referenced	No	Defra
3.2.3 Land Management Advice	P35 who we will work with 4th para (cross compliance) clarification needed for our benefit re: NE role in ensuring improved understanding of cross compliance	Dan Osgood	10th December	This is explained in target to "• Manage the provision of 4,000 technical advice contacts on basic environmental standards and obligations under cross compliance"	No	Defra
3.2.3 Land Management Advice	P35 who we will work with 7th para (references to EIA and Heather & Grass Burning regs) need to strengthen wording for this section to reflect that NE is the regulatory body for these regulations. Also need to include reference to working with RPA on grazing inspections.	Dan Osgood	10th December	Text now amended	Yes	Defra
3.2.3 Land Management	P35 who we will work with 8th para (Commons Councils) Suggest amend wording to "...We will work with key and <b>local</b> partners..."	Dan Osgood	10th December	Text amended to just say "partners"	Yes	Defra

Comments from Board, Defra, OGD and External Stakeholders on 2010/11-2012/13 Corporate Plan

Target	Change requested	By	Date of coment	Response	Action	Source
3.2.3 Land Management Advice	Partnerships - are all these targets for NE alone to deliver, or in partnership with others, or through others?	Dan Osgood	10th December	Text now makes clearer where we are managing contract6s and working with others to deliver	Yes	Defra
3.2.3 Land Management Advice	P35 1st KPI - should refer to ELS Training and Information Programme (ETIP), not Environmental Information and Training Programme. At the end of bullet under ETIP objectives need to add plus deliver best practice training and information. Also no mention of the training/information provided specifically for UELS.	Dan Osgood	10th December	Reference to ETIP ammended. Refernce to UELS coverered in "who we will work with" section	Yes	Defra
3.2.3 Land Management	Land Manager Contacts - need clarification as to whether this includes "care and maintenance" visits, and/or other advice delivery mechanisms.	Dan Osgood	10th December	Text amended to clarify the focus of the target	Yes	Defra
4.3.2 Evidence Base	Would be helpful to expand references to the <b>Partnership Project on Peat</b> (not Peat Partnership as in draft) as NE have played major role in Phase 1 (completing at end of 2009) developing new/revised peat mapping; plans for improving use/understanding and other initiatives e.g. new peatland restoration delivery forum Plan should include a reference to ongoing commitment in Phase 2 (2010 onwards) of the project.	Dan Osgood	10th December	Amended to reflect in part, although our work on partnership project on peat goes beyond climate change and is better covered under 1.1.1 (as it was in the 09/10 CP).	Yes	Defra
4.3.2 Evidence Base	P45 - We don't think this is the most important issue to include here, as NE have a more important role to play in this area. For our benefit, could NE clarify whether this reflects NE contribution to research being led by JNCC or is a separate NE project.	Dan Osgood	10th December	Text to be amended to include the peatland GHG monitoring programme within the wider monitoring milestone and made clear that it refers to the JNCC-led work.	Yes	Defra
4.3.2 Evidence Base	We would expect to see this as a priority for the 2011-13 period, similar to the commitment on p.42 in relation to ecosystem services and agri-environment	Dan Osgood	10th December	Require further clarification on what is meant on this point.	No	Defra
	There is no mention of specific agri-environment training requirements (e.g. Genesis/ a-e 'sales') from the LMPP project	Dan Osgood	10th December	We have considered this but feel that a specific mention of training and LMPP is rather internally focussed. Instead we have referred to the changes we will make and the impact that this will have on getting faster processing and better targeting.	No	Defra
1.1.2 Protected landscapes	<b>general comments:</b> no reason to expect the way that the Association and AONBs have helped NE deliver it strategic objectives and business plan targets should change. As with many areas of the public service at the moment this will of course depend on how the resource base of both the NAAONB and the individual AONB partnerships changes in the light of the public expenditure cuts at both Departmental, Agency and local authority level. Hopefully NE will at the very least maintain its current level of funding to AONBs, as this is a very cost effective mechanism for achieving some of your own strategic objectives which by and large are identical to that of the AONBs. <b>~Editing point: National Association for AONBs not of.</b>	Mike Taylor, NAAONB	10-Dec	Agree with general comments about maintaining partnership working with NAAONB & AONB partnerships (& this will be done through MOU/MOAs but cannot yet commit to new 3 year deal). The CP does not include comments on budget, or state/commit to maintaining any level of funding with any Partner (but does infer through 'support' & joint working). Editing point noted & changed on P10.	Yes	stakeholders
	some good overarching stuff here which reads very positively. However a lot of the targets belie what is really going on. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'93% SSSI area is now in favourable or recovering condition' (but this includes a lot of sites for which a management plan has just been written).</li> <li>'75% of BAP species for which Natural England hass a lead role are meeting recovery plan objectives' (what does this actually mean, most species are still in decline).</li> </ul> <p>There is still a huge reliance on Environmental Stewardship to deliver, this being the only real mechanism for funding, but it is not enough.</p>	Charlotte Owen, Wildlife Trusts	23-Dec	We will pick up these points in ongoing discussion with the WT		stakeholders
	Good to see mention of the International Year of Biodiversity 2010 but very disappointed at the weakening of the original Government target - it was originally 'halt the loss of biodiversity' and now it has become 'significantly reduce the rate of biodiversity loss. Good to see mention of the Defra review of wildlife networks - we need to make sure this piece of work actually moves things on.	Charlotte Owen, Wildlife Trusts	23-Dec	Text strenghened and refered to in introduction	Yes	Stakeholders

Comments from Board, Defra, OGD and External Stakeholders on 2010/11-2012/13 Corporate Plan

Target	Change requested	By	Date of coment	Response	Action	Source
	A lot of emphasis on access and people, which we don't necessarily disagree with, but there are some contradictions and a lack of true integration in the way NE seem to be focusing their efforts. It seems as if all the focus is on encouraging people to visit 'high quality environments' with various targets to increase the numbers of people visiting NNRs for example. Yet this will hugely increase the pressure these 'jewels in the crown' are under. It would be better to promote 'new' access land through initiatives like green infrastructure to buffer and protect special sites, rather than pile thousands more people on to them.	Charlotte Owen, Wildlife Trusts	23-Dec	Increased numbers of people to NNRs will be managed. It should not be assumed that conservation and access are in conflict. We are also working to promote local greenspace etc but not as a KPI.	No	Stakeholders
	<p><b>general key points:</b> We welcome the inclusion of a section on partnership working up-front in the corporate plan, complemented by proposals for partnership working throughout. The development of effective strategic partnerships is essential to the delivery of Natural England's objectives.</p> <p>However, our experience to date would suggest that Natural England do not tend to involve partners at an early enough stage to facilitate effective engagement. This can lead to duplication of effort. For example, whilst we warmly welcome the Uplands Vision, we are concerned this work has duplicated a lot of the work we have been doing with the Lake District Partnership.</p> <p>Whilst we have developed good relationships with Natural England at a number of levels, we would welcome a closer strategic relationship at a national level. Our organisations share a common purpose, and therefore we feel it would be useful to develop a shared understanding of our respective strategic directions and work through a programme of joint delivery. This should not be over-engineered, but we could start by meeting more regularly and sharing opportunities more. We identify three key areas below where closer working will be essential.</p> <p>You asked whether the Corporate Plan helps stakeholders to understand Natural England's delivery priorities for 2010-2013. The milestones within each section are helpful, but we suggest a summary of all milestones at the beginning or end of the document would provide a useful overview. Furthermore, although the plan describes longer term aspirations, it is disappointing that milestones have only been included for the coming financial year. It would be useful to have a longer term view of delivery plans.</p> <p>We also welcome the actions outlined under objective B1 on people leadership. We are still experiencing problems associated with high turnover of staff at Natural England. This has disrupted the development of relationships, particularly on the ground where a longer term understanding of the work of the National Trust is more difficult to build up if the personnel keep changing. We are contributing to the Value Leadership Programme which we hope will help address this.</p>	National Trust	23-Dec	Detailed general points about our lack of partnership working and joint delivery and high staff turnover will be dealt with in response from stakeholder relations. Specific points - We do not intend to include a specific point summary list of mllilestone in the corporate plan it self but may publish this seperatly as "quick guide". Presenting the milestones as one year targets is deliberate. Longer term aspirations is covering in our Strategic Direction.	No	stakeholders
1.2.1 Biodiversity priority	<p><i>Landscape scale habitat restoration</i></p> <p>We warmly welcome commitments within the plan to create a further 1000ha of new BAP habitat, through major landscape scale habitat restoration projects. Groups of land owners working over large areas and long time periods with an agreed set of aims is the only way we are likely to adapt successfully to climate change impacts and deliver ecosystem services. For example, the recent proposals for a landscape scale approach to long term management, in partnership, of The Lizard are very positive, and we are keen to develop similar projects across the country.</p> <p>We would recommend that Natural England moves to a more proactive and promoting stance to deliver more projects on the ground. We are keen to work with you to demonstrate in real terms how a new and integrated approach to planning and managing natural resources could work, in partnership with others, to shape a longer term agenda for ourselves and the Government.</p>	National Trust	23-Dec	This is a supportive comment which does not require an amendment to the plan draft	No	stakeholders

Comments from Board, Defra, OGD and External Stakeholders on 2010/11-2012/13 Corporate Plan

Target	Change requested	By	Date of coment	Response	Action	Source
	<p><i>The role of agriculture in mitigating climate change</i>                      We are disappointed that the plan does not cover the role of agriculture in mitigating climate change in any detail. We believe that the agriculture and land management sector has a huge role to play in mitigating climate change, not least through the storage of carbon within soil.</p> <p>Our Wimpole Farm Manager, Richard Morris, is one of your Carbon Champions, and we are helping to pilot the CALM ES tool on our Wallington estate. We are also working together through the Rural Climate Change Forum to drive policy and action in this important area. The forthcoming reform of CAP and development of targets through the Low Carbon Transition Plan present major opportunities to move this agenda forward. We would therefore like to see actions on this topic included within the plan.</p>	National Trust	23-Dec	We agree that agriculture has a role to play in climate change. We do mention the the Rural Climate Change Forum and the need to work up local solutions with partners. There is unfortueatle not the space we need to mention all this work specifically. Will respond seperately to NT.	No	stakeholders
	<p><i>Reconnecting people with the natural environment</i>                      We believe a key challenge for Natural England now is very similar to the one the National Trust is experiencing - how to harness the strong public emotional connection to the natural environment and connect that to the important work we are doing to protect it. We therefore welcome the range actions set out under Outcome 2 to help address this.</p> <p>However, we believe that these actions need to be accompanied by a culture change within the organisation. There is a long history of conservation specialists throughout the sector communicating in terms which the general public struggle to relate to. We are embarking on a major change within the National Trust in the way we present our work in the countryside and on the coast – from ‘conservator’ to ‘enabler’ – providing opportunities for people to experience and enjoy the outdoors in ways they want to, with excellent conservation as the means not the end. We would be delighted to work with you to achieve this.</p>	National Trust	23-Dec	Points made by NT are being taken forward by Natural England. (Working with NT referred to in 2.1.1.- will embrace all O2 oppourtunities)	No	stakeholders
1.1.2 Protected landscapes	Page 10 first column, penultimate bullet. UK-GAP: should clarify that the website is being developed through the UK Geodiversity Action Plan partnership as JNCC is developing the website.	Marcus Yeo JNCC	24-Dec	text ameded	Yes	Stakeholders
1.2.1 Biodiversity prority	final para - Recorder is software for recording biodiversity, not a database. NBN is a system for providing access to multiple databases, rather than a database itself.	Marcus Yeo JNCC	24-Dec	Amended text to pick up suggested correction	Yes	Stakeholders
	marine section should mention your partnership with us and the other conservation bodies in the monitoring programme for elements of marine biodiversity. (This is a significant programme (£9million over 4 years) amongst all conservation bodies. A reference to this work before 1.3.2 'we will work with the MMO, CEFAS, research institutes and other collectors of marine data to ensure the acquisition, collation and analysis of data is done in ways that can contribute to our monitoring and asesment work' would seem appropriate. For example, 'NE are working with JNCC and the other conservation bodies, within the UK Marine Monitoring and Assessment Strategy, to develop an integrated marine biodiversity monitoring system (for habitats, seabirds and cetaceans) to meet multiple and future policy needs. The driver of MSFD is mentioned in 3.3.1, but a reference to the work there would also be relevant.	Marcus Yeo JNCC	24-Dec	Amended along lines requested	Yes	Stakeholders
1.3.1 English MPAs	MPA network: should clarify that NE will 'take the lead' in English territorial waters (not offshore waters)	Marcus Yeo JNCC	24-Dec	Amended	Yes	Stakeholders
4.2.1 Long Term Challenge	Could perhaps mention working with JNCC to provide UK and international context.	Marcus Yeo JNCC	24-Dec	JNCC is not a key partner in this area of work	No	Stakeholders
4.2.2 Better Responses	who we will work with: surprising to see devolved governments mentioned here, but not SNH, CCW or JNCC.	Marcus Yeo JNCC	24-Dec	devolveds are listed. Inserted reference to JNCC	Yes	Stakeholders

Comments from Board, Defra, OGD and External Stakeholders on 2010/11-2012/13 Corporate Plan

Target	Change requested	By	Date of coment	Response	Action	Source
	We found the draft plan well written and presented, clearly recognising commonality between the work of Natural England and ourselves, particularly on RDPE; and where we are expected to work together. The importance of working closely with ourselves and other partners within the Defra network is clear and promotes a proactive approach on aspects of work within the Department's remit. We suggest a bit more detail on how Natural England plans to work with those partners to deliver their objectives would enhance the draft - although that detail might be in your annual business plan?	RPA	7th January 2010	Positive feedback, no response required	No	
	Despite saying that all their work is based on evidence and expertise, we don't see that happening on the ground. The plan needs greater emphasis on buiding the knowledge base of the organisation and the skill of its staff so it may give expert independent advice.	Wildlife Trust	24th December	A.1.4 already places sufficient emphasis on developing our evidence database and ensuring our staff have the knowledge they need to do their jobs.	No	Stakeholders
2.3.1 Strategic Understanding Access	Provision of access to the natural environment has generally improved over recent years but surveys suggest that user levels are decreasing. Do we understand why? What evidence do we have on the factors that either motivate or dissuade people to use the natural environment? What do we know about the effectiveness of different management techniques	Environment Agency	7th January 2010	MENE is refered to in 2.1.1 and will do this	No	Stakeholders
2.1.1 Appreciation of Natural Environment	amends made to para on pg 21, end ofr first column. As Pete Johnson knows we are unable to commit to a further year of funding in 2011/12 at this stage and as such I wouldn't want to see this in the document. I suggest we make it more general until we are able to confirm: 'We will strengthen our partnership with the Department of Health and delivery partners around the country to increase the numbers of sedentary people walking close to where they live. We will work with the Department of Health (subject to agreeing an MOU with DoH) to enable a significant increase in health walk participants per week. We will work up a programme to encourage people to become more active and engaged in their local area. We will explore ways to pull together the family of Walking for Health participants and walk leaders through themed days of activity and regional events.'	DoH	7th January 2010	Text amended.	Yes	Stakeholders
2.2.1 Engaging People to conserve and enhance	While it is good to see that Natural England propose to work with British Waterways in areas such as improving diversity, increasing volunteering, recreation and access provisions there is no mention about the overall role that NE should play in respect of our inland waterways - other than stating that the "natural environment" includes the freshwater environment. It would therefore seem reasonable to me for NE to indicate somewhere in this document that they will engage with those responsible for the management of the inland waterways ecosystem – BW, EA, Broads Authority etc – to encourage them to deliver their objectives in respect of the natural environment as set out in the Government's policy for the inland waterways - "Waterways for Everyone" which is currently being consulted on.	Martyn Webb – Inland Waterways	8th February 2010	Text amended. The 'Who we will work with section' now includes working with others on use of 'inland waterways'. Not appropriate to include specific reference to 'Broads Auth as this not the approach followed throughout the plan. We have referred to working at national and regional levels and have then specifically quoted national organisations eg BW and EA	Yes	Defra
1.3.2 Marine BAP work	The report makes reference to the BWEA (British Wind Energy Association) – who have changed their name to RenewableUK.	Jack Farnham - DECC Energy Development Unit	8th February 2010	Text amended	Yes	Defra

Comments from Board, Defra, OGD and External Stakeholders on 2010/11-2012/13 Corporate Plan

Target	Change requested	By	Date of coment	Response	Action	Source
1.3.2 Marine BAP work	“Implement a national risk-based monitoring programme across existing European Marine Sites (EMS), and undertake monitoring to obtain robust baseline information for new sites.” The preceding text mentions working with CEFAS and other bodies on marine monitoring, which is good – but i wonder whether the wording of the target itself could reflect joint working with the other relevant bodies. Is it possible to be even clearer in this section about NE’s specific added value role on marine monitoring given CEFAS, EA and others are also spending a lot of time and money on it.	David Cooper - Natural Environment Strategic Unit	8th February 2010	We understand the point raised but do not propose to alter the target wording at this stage. UK marine monitoring activity takes place in the context of an increasingly joined up approach under the UK Marine Monitoring and Assessment Strategy (UKMMAS). UKMMAS is a partnership, led by Defra, of organisations implementing a strategy on marine monitoring. Natural England’s main contribution is through the Healthy and Biologically Diverse Seas Evidence Group (HBDSEG). Natural England’s focus is to monitor and report on the condition and state of England’s inshore waters in support of a range of obligations which include, but are not restricted to, MPAs. Future requirements will include a leading role in reporting the extent to which a network of MPAs (MCZs, N2K, SSSI, and Ramsar sites) “contributes to the conservation or improvement of the marine environment in the UK marine area”. In undertaking our role we need information on pressures and impacts, but it is the role of relevant authorities to monitor activities in, and uses of, England’s seas.”	No	Defra
2.2.1 Engaging People to conserve and enhance	Recruit 100 new outreach volunteers to support the delivery of high quality experiences on our Destination NNRs. Recruit 100 new volunteers to support the delivery of our habitat and species conservation work . It would be good to be more explicit in this section about NE’s particular role in recruiting and training volunteers, in the context of the large voluntary sector infrastructure which is already in place do to this. Will NE use third sector infrastructure to recruit and train ? Or continue its own separate activity to do this ? I think the better position to be in, would be to use the third sector infrastructure.	David Cooper - Natural Environment Strategic Unit	8th February 2010	2.2.1 now refers specifically to our own volunteers. The work with the large environmental volunteering sector and third sector organisations is covered in 2.2.2 which now is covered by it own measure and which signals more clearly our regognition of the partnership approach and our published policy.	Yes	Defra
2.2.1 Engaging People to conserve and enhance	I would just like to reinforce David’s comment on Page 21 and agree with his view that partnering with existing third sector volunteering networks would be far more healthy and effective. The fact that NE recruits its own volunteers is a source of tension amongst the Third Sector which is understandable in my view. A partnership approach is also entirely consistent with NE’s recently published third sector policy statement	Simon Berry – Third Sector Team	8th February 2010	2.2.1 now refers specifically to our own volunteers. The work with the large environmental volunteering sector and third sector organisations is covered in 2.2.2 which now is covered by it own measure and which signals more clearly our regognition of the partnership approach and our published policy.	Yes	Defra
3.3.1	Welcome note to “work closely with Defra and DECC” to deliver sustainable energy, but note suggests that NE intend to “develop good practice guidelines for offshore renewable energy project developers and set minimum standards for environmental assessment and monitoring by September 2010”. Might be worth exploring how NE will link their guidance with NPSs and the MPS? Developers need a coherent message.	Jack Farnham - DECC Energy Development Unit	8th February 2010	Point noted. Links between our guidelines etc plus NPS and MPS is a given and we’re on top of it	No	Defra
3.3.1	Report states that NE will “Engage with the wave and tidal sector so that demonstration projects address environmental impact information gaps effectively and we work together on promoting the benefits”. All worthy sounding stuff but this basically equates to “we know very little about the Env effects of wave and tidal projects so those first in the water will carry the cost of extensive monitoring programmes”. If NE advocate a “deploy and monitor” approach for the greater good of the W&T industry then we might suggest that they set some money aside to fund their aspirations for information gathering. From a planning perspective we can only enforce monitoring conditions which meet the following tests...i. necessary; ii.relevant to planning; iii. relevant to the development to be permitted; iv. enforceable; v. precise; and vi. reasonable in all other respects. From a personal perspective I think the focus should be towards getting W&T projects in the water and seeing if they work. Costly monitoring programmes costing, say ½ million per annum are not a great incentive for developers to deploy in Eng and Wales.	Jack Farnham - DECC Energy Development Unit	8th February 2010	point noted.	No	Defra

Comments from Board, Defra, OGD and External Stakeholders on 2010/11-2012/13 Corporate Plan

Target	Change requested	By	Date of coment	Response	Action	Source
4.2.2 Better Responses	I wonder whether there should be a mention about NE active involvement in and support for the National Ecosystem Assessment which will be completed and published early in 2011.	David Cooper - Natural Environment Strategic Unit	8th February 2010			Defra
1.1.1 Understanding of landscape and biodiversity	Not for inclusion in the Plan, but it would be helpful if NE could clarify for us whether Not yet received clarification promised following ELM comments on 1st draft that reviewing NCAs will not have an impact on HLS targeting	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	We will make sure that you get this clarification.	No	Defra
1.2.1 Biodiversity priority	1st para- Should refer to " Defra's Environmental Stewardship Scheme" rather than "our Environmental Stewardship programme"	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	Text ammended so as not to refer to "our ES Programme"	Yes	Defra
1.2.1 Biodiversity priority	No clarification yet received on how this milestone was derived (promised following ELM comments on 1st draft) and whether this means 21% of HLS area coverage is to be devoted to BAP priority habitat.	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	Will explain separately to Defra contact how the figures are derived - not for explanation in the Corp Plan	No	Defra
1.2.1 Biodiversity priority	Still no links to Campaign for Farmed Environment Targets so our suggested amendment to 1st draft still stands	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	Text now includes reference to working "with the partners to the Campaign for the Farmed Environment and other regional farmland bird initiatives to ensure we maximise the benefits to biodiversity these can provide."	Yes	Defra
2.1.1 Appreciation of Natural Environment	Following ELM comments on 1st draft NE stated had added figures to 2nd draft for numbers of visitors to farms through HLS/CSS educational access (which is major contributor to "1 million children" target), but this has not happened	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	Educational access, is part of 'give 450,000 children under 16 a high quality learning expericence .....' and needs to be considered alongside other access contributions to this target eg NNRs and other outdoor learning oportunities. Including reference to all of the ways in which we are meeting this target would be too detailed. Numbers of educational visits are already included in the 'where we are now text' inthe introduction to Outcome 2 (p16) and we have inserted reference to the "signifcanant contribution educational access makes" on page 19	Yes	Defra
Outcome 3 Why we are doing it (paragraph4)	Fourth line should read "Through Defra's agri-environment schemes and farm advice....."	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	Text amended	Yes	Defra
Outcome 3 Where we are now	5th bullet: This should read " Introduced 21 new options, not 39. 7th bullet: ?clarification needed as to how have influenced CAP Health Check	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	Figure amended. Point on CAP health check dropped.	Yes	Defra
3.2.1 Agri-Environment development	NE response to ELM comments on 1st draft agreed to amend wording in line with our suggestion, but this has not happened.	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	Our Error. Text has now been updated to say: "We will minimise disruption during the peak of ELS renewals by limiting changes to application processes to those that help to deliver agreements more smoothly and effectively. "	Yes	Defra
3.2.1 Agri-Environment development	Response to our comments on 1st draft stated that NE do not see this as a major piece of work. If so why is it listed as the major priority? Suggest this should be given lower priority and climate change should be first milestone listed.	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	Text amended to re-order the milestone (but note that order of milestone does note imply higher priority)	Yes	Defra
3.2.2. Agri-environment delivery	Suggest amend wording in first para to "The agreements we administer with land managers under agri-environment schemes including (Environmental Stewardship)..."	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	Agreed. Text amended. to "The agreements administer with land managers under agri-environment schemes (Environmental Stewardship, Countryside Stewardship and Environmentally Sensitive Areas) form" a key part of Natural England's work to ensure land is managed in a way that delivers environmental services alongside other	Yes	Defra
3.2.2. Agri-environment delivery	In response to ELM Comments on 1st draft NE stated new milestone for climate change mitigation had been added in 2nd draft, but this has not happened	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	Our error. Reference to the work we will do on the current project looking at how ES might better reflect goals of CC mitigation and adaptation is in the body of the text not as a key target milestone.	Yes	Defra

Comments from Board, Defra, OGD and External Stakeholders on 2010/11-2012/13 Corporate Plan

Target	Change requested	By	Date of coment	Response	Action	Source
3.2.2. Agri-environment delivery	Have wrong dates for UAA targets. These should read “..68% in April 2010to 70% in March 2011..”	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	Text amended	Yes	Defra
3.2.2. Agri-environment delivery	Suggest adding after “SDA land” “in addition to land under existing CSS/ESA/ES agreements”	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	The 35% isn't in addition to existing ES agreements. It must include the existing ES land. A very large part of UELS uptake will be on land already in ELS, either at ELS renewal or in advance of renewal. However, the ESA and CSS land will not be eligible for UELS but will be eligible for transition payments.	No	Defra
3.2.2. Agri-environment delivery	Suggest include reference to care and maintenance visits for CSS/ESA/HLS agreements	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	<p>The former 'care and maintenance' process was based on a different way of delivering ES agreements to that which NE now operates. It encompassed contacts with agreement holders for a number of different purposes. Some of these purposes are still very relevant, but some are now out of date and have been superseded. Thus it would not be appropriate to include a blanket target for 'care and maintenance' in the corporate plan.</p> <p>Natural England has explicitly set a target for HLS indicators of success assessments. This programme has replaced the ad-hoc and inconsistent assessments that were formerly provided through 'care and maintenance' visits. We have included this explicit loS target in the corporate plan and we aim to increase the target number from 940 in 2009/10 to 1000 in 2010/11.</p> <p>We still devote staff time to discussions with agreement holders over capital works amendments. The LMPP programme will help ensure we target the level and type of contact we need with agreement holders. Overall, we are seeking to balance contacts with existing agreement holders with contacts with new farmers to enable them to obtain access to HLS funding.</p>	No	Defra
3.2.2. Agri-environment delivery	Cannot find the wording that NE stated following our comments on 1st draft was in this section relating to classic schemes i.e. “the Countryside Stewardship Scheme and Environmentally Sensitive Areas form a key part of Natural England’s work to ensure land is managed in a way that delivers environmental services alongside other benefits” however there is a reference in key target milestones to securing former classic scheme land into ES”. Still need reference in objective text to reflect this	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	Our error. The 3.2.2 text does now say "The agreements administer with land managers under agri-environment schemes (Environmental Stewardship, Countryside Stewardship and Environmentally Sensitive Areas) form a key part of Natural England's work to ensure land is managed in a way that delivers environmental services alongside other benefits."	Yes	Defra
3.2.3 Land Management Advice	Text not yet amended to strengthen this as promised following ELM comments on 1st draft. NE are the Regulatory Authority for these	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	Text now amended to say "As regulatory authority for the Weeds Act, Heather and Grass Burning Code and Environmental Impact Assessment regulations we will work with the RPA and Defra on ensuring compliance with them."	Yes	Defra
3.2.3 Land Management Advice	Text around advice generally is confusing, suggests that best practice training is only available for OELS, yet it is major part of ETIP for all ELS. Still no reference to ETIP and it's aims in main text yet listed as a milestone under refs to contacts.	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	Aditironal reference to ETIP added "The ELS Training and Information Programme will help farmers and land owners in the scheme implement their agreements effectively and adopt best practice as well as increasing scheme uptake and renewal rates and influencing the options selected by farmers on their holdings."	Yes	Defra
3.2.3 Land Management Advice	1st para: Suggest first sentence be amended to include reference to “and other partners” after “Campaign for the Farmed Environment”	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	Text amended	Yes	Defra

Comments from Board, Defra, OGD and External Stakeholders on 2010/11-2012/13 Corporate Plan

Target	Change requested	By	Date of coment	Response	Action	Source
3.2.3 Land Management Advice	Clarification needed as to what is meant by " monitor outstanding land" in para 7	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	Text amended to ""Under the inheritance tax conditional exemption scheme, we will work with HM Revenue and Customs and key partners including English Heritage, landowners, farmers and land managers to assess and monitor land of outstanding scenic, historic and scientific interest, provide advice on integrated land management and help deliver reasonable public access." Also look at <a href="http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/heritage/terms.htm">http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/heritage/terms.htm</a> where Natural England is identified as the advisor for land of scenic, historic or special scientific interest in England, and our website <a href="http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/heritagelandscapes">www.naturalengland.org.uk/heritagelandscapes</a> .	Yes	Defra
A.1.2 Relationships Stakeholders	?Premature to refer to a new Parliament. Suggest delete "new"	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	Text amended	Yes	Defra
B.1.3 Organisational Contract	3rd bullet: clarification needed as to what is meant by "Making our contract with the organisation"	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	Refers to ensuring people understadn that their "first contract is with the organisation" - a Natural england behaviour. Agree that this is rather obscure for an external document. Text amended.	Yes	Defra
3.2.3 Land Management Advice	We commented following 1st draft on the need for improvements to reference better targeting of ELS as a result of e.g. ETIP and the Campaign for the Farmed Environment (and specific reference to ETIP in main text related to advice)	Benika Raybould and Kirsty Lord-Smith	8th February 2010	Additronal reference to ETIP added "The ELS Training and Information Programme will help farmers and land owners in the scheme implement their agreements effectively and adopt best practice as well as increasing scheme uptake and renewal rates and influencing the options selected by farmers on their holdings."	Yes	Defra
3.2.2. Agri-environment delivery	We commented following 1st draft on the need for improvements to output/outcome targets to capture Defra/NE goals for HLS, through indicators of success and HLS targeting	Benika Raybould and Kirsty Lord-Smith	8th February 2010	As set out in our response to comments on the first draft, a fair point but one that is difficult to reflect in a plan that needs to capture both what we aim to achieve in the long term and <b>the immediate, short term and measurable things we have to achieve in-year</b> to make sure that the outcomes will follow. We will continue to look at ways that this can be done.	No	
C.1.4 Financial Management	We commented following 1st draft on the need for improvements to output/outcome targets to capture Defra/NE goals e.g. inclusion of target milestones on the efficiency of the schemes and suitable wording in the text for the 2011-13 period.	Benika Raybould and Kirsty Lord-Smith	8th February 2010	We belive that our intention is clearly set out in the objective text for 3.2 "We will do all this with a continued focus on improving the efficiency of our delivery and so contribute to our target to maximise the resources available for the natural environment." We also have a specific Corporate Plan target on efficiencies (C1.4) and a target for reducing the administrative burden on customer (a significant amount of which may be through more effecient scheme delivery)	No	Defra
1.2.1 Biodiversity prory	We flagged following the first draft that the targets used do not match with those that Defra and NE have signed up to as partners in the Campaign. The relationship still needs to be clarified: this is probably something around the drafting (e.g. "make a contribution to"), but we think it would be difficult to argue to stakeholders that the Campaign had not now superseded NE's previous targets in relation to the uptake of ELS in-field arable options. It would also be useful to set out how NE plan to help address the slippage in achieving the farmland birds target, and NE may also wish to consider referring to regional bird initiatives and the monitoring of their success.	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	They are the targets which NE has set out to deliver, and have been following for three years. Text now includes reference to working "with the partners to the Campaign for the Farmed Environment and other regional farmland bird initiatives to ensure we maximise the benefits to biodiversity these can provide".	Yes	Defra
2.3.1 Strategic Understanding Access	Following first draft comments there has been an improvement to references to the key role played by ES for landscape. However, there is still very little information about the contribution permissive access makes, and the amendments in relation to permissive and educational access which we were advised had been carried out in the second draft have not been done.	Dan Osgood	8th February 2010	See comment above. Amendments were made but 2.3.1 reference to agri-env access now strengthened further see proposed edit to text inmain text of 2.3.1. also note change from 'public' to 'permissive'.	Yes	

Comments from Board, Defra, OGD and External Stakeholders on 2010/11-2012/13 Corporate Plan

Target	Change requested	By	Date of coment	Response	Action	Source
3.2.2. Agri-environment delivery	We are still awaiting information from Natural England for UELS uptake profiles, and until this is received we are unable to agree Corporate Plan targets for UELS.	Rebecca Brione	8th February 2010	We are likely to change the 35% figure to 450,000ha simply because the figure against which our progress will be measured is open to debate. We and Defra are both now working to 1.2m ha (so 35% = c450k ha), but alternative figures in the public arena are 1.6m , 1.5m, 1.3m and 1m, depending on the circumstances.		Defra