

# **Conservators of the River Cam**

## **Business Plan**

**April 2013 to March 2018**



**Conservators of the River Cam**

**Baits Bite Lock**

**Fen Road**

**Milton**

**Cambridge CB24 6AF**

## **Executive Summary**

This Business plan summarises the current status of Conservancy income and expenditure. It seeks to identify key business risks which will be addressed during the life of the Plan, and proposes a way forward to address these risks, providing a timetable for the Plan's implementation.

The income and expenditure summary describes a business heavily dependent on income from craft registration income, and in particular from the commercial punt sector. River maintenance accounts for the highest level of expenditure, with capital expenditure varying from year to year. During 2011/12 (the last full year for which figures are available) it accounted for some 44% of Conservancy expenditure for that year.

The key business risks identified fall broadly into one of three business areas: management of the navigation, funding and customer liaison.

Management issues include, as a priority, a recommendation to review the staff structure to meet the challenges of the next 5 year period. Also included under management issues is the need to initiate a review of Conservancy Byelaws, which is needed to improve regulation of the navigation and provide for more customer friendly visitor licence arrangements.

There is a pressing need to develop a comprehensive asset management system to facilitate improved capital planning, which will build on existing asset condition information and in turn contribute to improved financial planning. In addition, a review of service delivery is proposed, with the objective of ensuring a cost effective delivery across all services. These two measures, together with a potential increase in income from Conservancy owned property, could make a significant contribution to the funding of river management by the Conservancy, within the life of this Plan.

It is recognised that there is a demand from customer groups for greater openness in the Conservancy decision making process. To meet this challenge it is proposed that the Conservancy develops a more outward facing, customer focussed stance in our dealings with river users and on proposals which may affect them. The development of a Cam River Users Group is recognised as a valuable way forward and the Conservancy will encourage greater engagement by all river users with this group to provide a forum for discussion on all navigation related matters.

Cash flow prediction indicates a slight risk to the level of reserves held by the Conservancy during the life of this Plan. However, it is also recognised that action can be taken to reduce or eliminate this risk. To inform decisions on the issue of the appropriate level for Conservancy reserves it is proposed, for the first time, to establish a target range for reserves. This will be based on financial risk and if adopted would provide for a minimum cash reserve target of £300k and a maximum of £600k within the life of this Plan.

Included in the Plan is a proposed timetable for implementation, which provides a framework for key actions and identifies who will be responsible to lead on the various actions. The Plan also establishes a formal feedback requirement to ensure Conservators and others are able to assess progress on Plan implementation.

## **Mission Statement**

A mission Statement was defined in the Business Plan 2003-2008. The Conservators:

- Will maintain the River Cam between Mill Pit and Bottisham in a navigable state to suit the size and number of boats legally entitled to use this stretch of the river.
- Will aim to strike a balance between the needs of the various river users, and between them and riparian owners
- Will seek to manage the river in a manner sensitive to environmental interests, and ensure compliance with relevant legislation

Whilst many things have changed in the intervening decade since the above Statement was developed, the fundamental role of the Conservancy is largely unchanged. It is therefore recommended that the Mission Statement should be upheld in its current form.

### **1.0 Purpose of this Plan**

The purpose of this Plan is to set out the current status of the Conservancy as a business, to identify business risks and liabilities, and to identify a way forward to manage these risks and liabilities. The Business Plan will cover the period 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2018 inclusive.

The Plan will set out proposals for the review of all aspects of the business, prioritised according to business risk, with the objective of producing a blueprint for the future development and management of the Conservancy.

The first part of the Plan will provide a description and brief analysis of the current status of the Conservancy and the second part of the Plan will detail the proposed the way forward.

### **2.0 Background to the Plan**

The Conservancy has, historically, produced Business Plans covering a period of 5 years and the current Plan will expire on 31 March 2013.

The current Plan sets out the priorities of the Conservancy over the 5-year life of the Plan, covering the following 6 business areas:

- Constitution
- Staff and Administration
- Operational and non-operational assets
- Work programmes
- Licensing
- Finance

During the life of the current Plan, in April 2010, the Plan was reviewed and updated. The purpose of the review was to assess progress against targets set out in the 2008-2013 Plan and to update financial information. Much of the 2010 review focussed on asset liabilities and projected income and in doing so identified a high risk to the long term financial viability of the Conservancy if no action were taken to increase income.

The review of registration charges and subsequent implementation of a new charging regime in April 2012 was the first step in addressing the risk identified to Conservancy finances.

The 2013-2018 Business Plan will build on the review of the current Plan, with a particular focus on Conservancy liabilities and business risks.

### **3.0 Current Status of the Conservancy - Business Overview**

The information provided in this section is based on the best available information and provides a snapshot of where the Conservancy derives income and where this income is spent. It should be recognised that, whilst Conservancy income and expenditure remain relatively stable from year to year, no two years will be the same. This is particularly the case for capital expenditure. These figures will be subject to continuous refinement during the development of the Business Plan and beyond.

Financial information is provided in Table 1 of this Plan for 5 business areas: craft registration, river maintenance, properties, Byelaw compliance and other miscellaneous income and expenditure. All income and expenditure figures relate to the financial year 2011/12, which are the most recent full year figures available.

<b>Business Area</b>	<b>Income</b>	<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>Net Income/Expenditure</b>
<b>Craft Registration</b>	£266k	-£34k	+£232k
<b>River Maintenance (revenue)</b>	£69k	-£165k	-£96k
<b>River maintenance (capital)</b>	£0k	-£280k	-£280k
<b>Properties (non- operational)</b>	£50k	-£21k	+£29k
<b>Properties (operational)</b>	£0k	-£36k	-£36k
<b>Byelaw Compliance</b>	£0k	-£33k	-£33k
<b>Miscellaneous income and expenditure</b>	£22k	-£62k	-£40k
<b>Total (incl. Capital Expenditure)</b>	<b>£407k</b>	<b>-£631k</b>	<b>-£224</b>
<b>Total (Excl. Capital Expenditure)</b>	<b>£407k</b>	<b>-£351k</b>	<b>+£56k</b>

**Table 1 – Summary of Conservancy income and expenditure 2011/12**

### **3.1 Craft Registration**

A coarse breakdown of income from craft registration by boat type is given in Table 2 below and shows a heavy dependency on income from commercial punts, with powered craft and rowing craft providing most of the remaining registration income.

<b>craft licence income 2011/12</b>	<b>% income by Craft type</b>	<b>Income by craft type</b>
Canoe and rowing dinghy	1%	£3,792
Punts	59%	£157,089
Rowing craft	13%	£33,565
Sailing craft	2%	£4,357
Powered craft	24%	£62,585
Unspecified	1%	£4,612
<b>Total income</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>£266,000</b>

**Table 2 – Breakdown of craft licence income by boat category 2011/12**

Expenditure provides an indication of the cost of licence administration, licence enforcement and legal costs associated with prosecution for non-registration.

## **3.2 River Maintenance**

This business area will always account for the greatest expenditure for the Conservancy, as it is core business.

The River maintenance business area includes revenue maintenance, much of which is carried out in-house, capital expenditure and works carried out by Conservancy staff for a third party.

Revenue costs for 2011/12 are broadly in line with other recent years, although capital expenditure was unusually high due principally to the major projects completed at Clayhithe and Baits Bite.

Given the high costs of asset maintenance, this area of the business will always carry with it the greatest financial risks to the Conservancy. As such, it is essential that we develop an understanding of our assets and the financial liabilities that they carry. We have made some progress in this area in recent years in understanding the Conservancy's operational assets, but more needs to be done before we have a robust and comprehensive asset management plan.

Work for third parties by Conservancy staff has declined in recent years. The principal change in this business area has been in the work carried out on behalf of the Environment Agency, which has declined as the Agency now carry out a greater proportion of their work in-house. Other third party work includes work carried out for Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council.

It is in the nature of third party works, that such contracts are discretionary on the part of the client and all income generated by the Conservancy from this work should be regarded as being at risk in the medium to long term.

## **3.3 Properties**

The Conservancy owns both operational and non-operational properties; operational properties include the Baits Bite office and the Clayhithe depot and House. Non-operational properties include Jesus Green Lock House, the two Baits Bite Lock cottages and three grazing meadows, all of which are let at commercial rates.

All non-operational properties are let at commercial rates, which generate a useful additional income for the Conservancy. It has been recognised by Conservators that there is a need to review the Conservancy property portfolio and to develop a long term plan for

use, development or disposal of assets. Accordingly, a property review was commissioned to accompany this Plan and recommendations from the review will be considered by Conservators. Any action agreed will be delivered during the life of this Plan.

### **3.4 Byelaw Compliance**

This business area includes staff and legal costs associated with Byelaw enforcement, excluding those costs associated with non-registration prosecution (which are included within the Craft Registration figures). Byelaw compliance costs were high in 2011/12 due to a number of costly prosecutions, unrelated to registration.

### **3.5 Miscellaneous Income and Expenditure**

This business area includes income from pontoon licensing and bank interest, offset by routine business expenditure such as insurances, telephone, stationary, IT costs etc. In addition, in 2011/12, there was a one-off expenditure of £34k covering the cost of the ECORYS study.

The ECORYS study aside, income and expenditure for this business area remain reasonably stable from one year to the next and beyond ensuring value for money across all goods and services involved. Such expenditure is an unavoidable and part of running a business.

Overall, the above overview of Conservancy finances for 2011/12 describe a business significantly dependent on income from craft registration, with river maintenance accounting for the highest expenditure. This is very much what one might expect for a navigation authority. During the sample year, the Conservancy incurred a net expenditure over income of £224k. This figure was in line with expectations in a year with unusually high capital expenditure.

If capital expenditure is excluded from the 2011/12 figures, we see a net operational surplus of £56k for the year. Typically, this surplus is in the range £50k to £70k per year.

The income and expenditure summary above emphasises the importance of Conservancy reserves, which allow expenditure over income without the need for borrowing.

## 4.0 Business Risks

The purpose of this section is to identify business risks which should be considered during the life of the 2013/14-2017/18 Business Plan.

Section 3.0, above, identified a number of financial risks to the business, which included capital costs associated with operational assets and the potential loss of income from work carried out by Conservancy staff on behalf of third parties.

Financial risks will be considered in greater detail in Section 5.0 of the Plan.

In addition to purely financial risks, there are other risks to the business which need to be considered in this Plan. These include:

- **Staff resources** – it has long been recognised that additional office based resources are needed to manage individual workloads down to an acceptable level. Progress towards achieving this objective has been hampered by a number of factors, not least the lack of staff time available to implement and manage change. The situation is further complicated by the lack of available office work space. Efforts have been made to increase the available work-space; however arrangements at the Baits Bite office remain far from satisfactory.  
Resolving this issue is a priority for the business, as the delivery of many of the initiative outlined in this Plan is dependent on creating a staff structure with the necessary time and capability to complete the job in hand. This issue will be considered in greater detail in Section 5.0.
- **Health and Safety** – linked to the point above, progress on the implementation of the Conservancy's recently adopted Health and Safety Policy has been affected by the availability of staff time to fully embed the new policy into the business. Whilst some progress has been made, the rate of progress to date in implementing the new Policy must be considered a business risk.
- **Asset Management** – it was noted in Section 3.0 of this Plan that the cost of maintaining operational assets can account for significant capital expenditure. In order to properly plan such expenditure requires a robust asset management plan, based on a proper understanding of asset condition.  
Progress has been made in recent years in the development of an asset management plan, based on asset condition. However, the absence of detailed asset information in certain key areas does represent a business risk which must be addressed during the life of this Plan.

- **Business Efficiency** – the Conservancy has been challenged by various groups from within the boating community to demonstrate business efficiency, the charge from some groups being that the Conservancy could do more to reduce costs and increase income, thereby reducing/limiting increases to registration fees. Business efficiency makes good economic sense and whilst the Conservancy does run a ‘tight ship’, there is always room for improvement. This Plan will therefore consider business efficiency in a more formal way than has been the case in the past and will set how we propose to progress this issue in the future.
- **Conservancy Byelaws** – there is a growing awareness that certain aspects of the current set of Conservancy Byelaws are inhibiting proper regulation of the navigation: these include the low maximum level of fines for non-registration, which equates to a maximum fine lower than the registration tariff for many craft; the inability for the Conservancy to offer short term visitor licences due to Byelaw restriction; and the inability to remove unlicensed vessels from the navigation. These and other Byelaw restrictions have led to the point where it is now felt that a Byelaw review is necessary.
- **Governance Issues** – whilst not perhaps a business risk in the strictest sense, the fact that the Conservancy is viewed by some river users as being somewhat remote as an organisation is a matter of concern and is a matter to be addressed during the life of this Plan. It is important that, as we develop the business over the coming 5-year period, river users are properly informed of proposals which may affect them, and that as far as possible, river users support the proposed way forward.  
To address the issue of Conservancy Governance as outlined above will require greater liaison with river users and improved partnership working. The recently established ‘Cam River Users Group’ will, in the future, form a central plank in bringing river users together in a forum which enables matters of common interest or conflict to be addressed in a manner which not possible at the quarterly meetings of Conservators. Aligned to this, the development of partnership working will offer the possibility of bringing together a wider group of interested parties to develop and deliver an agreed development strategy for the river. The starting point for greater partnership working will be the development of a ‘Waterspace Strategy’ for the River Cam.

## **5.0 The Way Forward 2013-2018**

### **5.1 Strategic Vision for future Management of the Conservancy**

In developing the business over the coming 5-year period it is vital that we have a clear vision of where we need to be as a business by 2018. All future actions should be tested

against the strategic vision to assess the contribution (or otherwise) that such actions will make.

To develop a shared vision requires input from the individuals and groups affected by the proposed way forward. However, as a starting point an interim vision is proposed which can then be refined early during the implementation phase of the Plan.

- That the Conservancy is structured in a manner to deliver agreed business priorities
- That the Conservancy financing provides long term, viable levels of funding for the management and development of the navigation
- That the Conservancy demonstrably delivers services in a cost effective and efficient manner
- With partners, that the Conservancy plays its part in the implementation of a Waterspace Strategy

### **5.3.1 Priorities for Action – Conservancy Funding**

This action will build on the work already carried out in the development of a robust understanding of Conservancy finances and future funding requirements. Capital expenditure is the greatest variable for Conservancy expenditure from year to year and key in the development of a robust funding strategy for the Conservancy will be the development of a comprehensive Asset Management Database. Such a database would provide greater confidence in medium and long term financial planning. Officers currently hold some asset condition survey information, but data held is far from comprehensive and importantly lacks detailed information on the condition of Baits Bite Lock, the most used and the most costly asset owned by the Conservancy.

Actions for the delivery of this objective will include:

- The commission of a detailed asset condition survey of Baits Bite Lock. We have the results of a diving survey, which indicate a potentially costly problem related to underwater scour, but a more detailed survey is required to assess the extent and severity of the problem.
- Use survey data, both that held and that to be commissioned, to develop an Asset Management Database, which will be used to drive investment on operational assets during the life of this Business Plan.
- Use information provided by the recently completed property review to inform investment decisions on other assets, both operational and non-operational.

- Use all of the asset management cost information in the development of medium and long term investment and charging decisions.

### **5.3.2 Priorities for Action – Cost Effective Service**

This will require a review of all activities and service levels carried out by the Conservancy, to be conducted over the life of the Business Plan in an agreed priority order. The purpose of the review in each case will be to assess the cost and benefit of each activity and the service level that we apply to it, set against the priorities agreed in the Business Plan.

This will challenge the way that the Conservancy currently operates and is likely to lead to changes in what we do, and as important, what we will stop doing. We will then be in a position to reprioritise how resources are allocated according to business need.

The proposed priority for action will be discussed with interested parties and adopted by Conservators as part of the implementation of the Business Plan.

All of the business areas consider in Section 3.0 of the Plan will be included in the review and will include:

- Licence administration; in-house or contracted out
- Enforcement; the level of service and the use of seasonal staff
- River maintenance; level of service provided
- Property management; consideration and implementation of recommendations from the property review
- Third party works; assess cost benefits to the business against other staff resource priorities
- Byelaw compliance; review cost effectiveness of current practices, consider current levels of service
- Miscellaneous expenditure; ensure value for money in all office/admin support expenditure

### **5.3.3 Priorities for Action – Organisational Structure**

The current Conservancy staff structure comprises of one River Manager, one Deputy River Manager, one full-time River Bailiff, one River Foreman and one River Operative, supported

in 2012 by a seasonal River Bailiff. In total a staff of 5.5 full-time-equivalents (FTEs): two office-based management/admin and three and a half field-based operational staff.

The progress against the objective given in this Business Plan will depend on the level of staff resources and staff skills available for delivery.

It has already been observed, in Section 4.0 of this Plan, that the current deficit in management/administration staff resources represents a significant business risk. The staff skill set required for the delivery of this Plan will exacerbate this deficit. Given current level of Conservancy funding, and in the challenging financial climate that we face, there is no prospect of funding the additional member staff within the life of this Business Plan.

The challenge for the Conservancy will therefore be to develop a staff structure with the necessary skills to deliver the Business Plan objectives within the current staff complement of 5.5 FTEs.

To achieve this aim will require either a shift of staff resources from field-based operational staff, to more office-based management/administrative staff, with the consequential change in the way field-based operational services are delivered, or outsourcing some office-based administrative activities to free up time of existing management/administrative staff (e.g. craft licensing and payroll). One consequence of the latter option would be an increase in administration costs to fund the outsourced services and such costs would need to be found from within the proposed staff cost budget.

To move this matter forward it is proposed that the Business Plan Sub-group consider potential staff structures and bring forward proposals for consideration by Conservators.

#### **5.3.4 Priorities for Action – Byelaw Review**

In a sense the review of Byelaws is linked to business efficiency, in that the current set of Conservancy Byelaws do inhibit some aspects of regulation which have a consequential cost to the Conservancy. For example, the low level of fines available for non-registration are a poor deterrent to would-be offenders and legal costs to the Conservancy associated with the prosecution of repeat offenders is significant. The risk of incurring a higher level of fines, more in line with that of other navigation authorities, is likely to encourage more boat owners to register their craft before prosecution.

In addition, the ability to issue 'fixed penalty' notices for more minor Byelaw breaches, such as over staying on visitor moorings, would greatly reduce enforcement costs to the Conservancy.

The process of Byelaw review is likely to be somewhat protracted and at this point costs are unknown. It is proposed that advice should be taken to establish likely costs associated with Byelaw review and a decision on how to proceed on this matter taken in light of this advice.

### **5.3.5 Priorities for Action – Improve customer focus**

To meet the legitimate aspirations of river users, many of whom contribute to funding the work of the Conservancy, it is proposed that the Conservancy develops a more outward facing, customer focussed, stance in our dealings with river users.

This action will include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Greater use of face-to-face meetings with river users to discuss navigation related matters and the development of a way forward
- Encourage support for the Cam River Users Group
- Greater use of the Conservancy website to provide information to river users

### **5.3.6 Priorities for Action – the development of a Waterspace Strategy**

A Waterspace Strategy is a mechanism to bring interested parties together to develop a shared vision for the River Cam and to agree how, and by the actions of whom, the vision can become reality.

The Conservancy will play a key role in the development and delivery of a Waterspace Strategy, but the success of the initiative will depend on the development of a funding partnership, into which many partners make a contribution.

Actions will include:

- The Conservancy will promote the concept of a Waterspace Strategy with potential partners
- Working with partners to develop a funding plan for the development of a the Strategy
- Agree which organisation will take a lead role in the management of Strategy development; it is felt that the Conservancy is not the body to take on this role

## 6.0 Conservancy Finance – Predicted Cashflow, 2013-2018

The financial summary given at Appendix 1 provides income and expenditure predictions for the period April 2013 to March 2018 and is expressed across the 5 business areas introduced in Section 3.0 of this Plan.

The figures given assume an annual inflation of 3% per year, with the exception of craft registration income in years 2013/14 and 2014/15, which assume an increase of inflation plus 2% (as previously agreed). Table 3 below summarises cash flow predictions.

	20013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
<b>Income</b>	£411k	£428k	£441k	£454k	£467k
<b>Expenditure</b>	-£413k	-£587k	-£444k	-£401k	-£416k
<b>Conservancy Balances at year end</b>	<b>£442k</b>	<b>£283k</b>	<b>£280k</b>	<b>£333k</b>	<b>£384k</b>

**Table 3 – Conservancy income, expenditure and cash balance prediction 2013/14 to 2017/18**

Inevitably there are a number of assumptions in the figures given and overall the above cash flow projections should be regarded as a cautious appraisal of Conservancy finances. It is prudent to take a cautious approach to future cash at this time, due to the level of uncertainty surrounding some elements of income and expenditure.

The principal uncertainty surrounds income from craft registration, expenditure linked to capital projects and the impact of the proposed service delivery review.

**Craft registration Income** – due to a fall in the number of commercial punt registrations in 2012/13, income from craft registration is predicted to be £282k, a fall of approximately £24k against target. The predicted shortfall is related primarily to loss of income from punt operators formerly located at Garret Hostel Lane.

Unless a means can be found to recover the lost income, the starting point for cashflow projects in this Business Plan will be based on a craft registration income of £282k at close of business on 31 March 2013, rather than the previously budgeted figure of £306k.

It follows that if this lost income were to be recovered, it would yield an additional income of approximately £25k per year for each year to 2017/18.

**Capital expenditure** – the most costly capital project programmed for delivery during the life of this Business Plan will be the stabilisation of the Baits Bite Lock upstream apron and wing walls. A diving survey has indicated scouring which could undermine the integrity of the upstream lock apron (the lock apron is in effect part the concrete foundation which supports the lock wall). Provisional estimates suggest a project cost in the range £125k to £250k and the high end of this range has been included in cash flow projections given above. A key action early in the life of the Business Plan will be to commission a full asset condition survey of the Lock to allow a project cost estimate to be made.

**Review of Service Delivery** – at this point the development of the Plan, the level of efficiency saving which will accrue from the review of service delivery is unknown, therefore no allowance has been made for such savings in estimates given in Table 3. The estimates given in Table 3 will be updated and refined on an annual basis as real efficiency savings are made.

## **6.1 Conservancy Reserves**

The Conservancy do not have an agreed policy for the appropriate level of reserves. During the early years of the current Business Plan reserves remained in the range £500k to £600k, but following the high level of capital expenditure incurred during 2011/12, this figure fell to £410k.

To inform any decision regarding an appropriate level of reserves, it is recommended that the Conservancy adopts a reserve policy based on potential expenditure during a 5-year Business Plan cycle. The target for reserves should be comprised of two elements, one related to likely one-off costs associated with large capital projects, and a second element, equal in size, required to provide a minimum figure, below which reserves should not fall. The rationale for this is that, following the delivery of a large capital project, sufficient reserves should be preserved to cover other major one-off costs, thus avoiding the need for borrowing.

The level of recent capital expenditure suggests that a provision of £300k should be made for one-off expenditure on large projects, e.g. the outturn cost of the recently completed Clayhithe and Baits Bite Landing Stage project was approximately £280k. To ensure that future high one-off project costs of a similar order do not expose the Conservancy to very low reserves, it is recommended that a further £300k should be added to the target for reserves. Taking both of these figures would suggest a target for reserves of £600k.

It is therefore recommended that the reserve target should be set at £600k, at least for this Business Plan, and that income and expenditure targets are adjusted to ensure (a) that

reserves do not fall below £300k and (b) increase to a target of £600k, during the course of a capital planning cycle, which might be longer than the 5-year Business Planning cycle.

## **6.2 Cash Flow Projection Summary**

Overall the cashflow predictions given at Appendix 1 indicate a risk of depletion of reserves to a figure slightly below the proposed £300k target minimum, but that action can be taken during the life of this Plan to ensure that this does not happen.

There is an option to recover income from craft registration and if this is combined with the possibility of a Baits Bite project outturn cost towards the lower end of the cost estimate, would result in reserves between £125k and £250k higher than shown above.

No provision has been made in the cashflow projection which would take account of reduced cost due to efficiency measures or increased income due to partnership funding. It is proposed that a programme of Business Plan review be adopted, which would allow all aspects of the Plan to be updated as appropriate.

## **7.0 Timetable for Implementation of the Plan**

Details of the proposed timetable of the implementation are given below in Table 4. There are number of dependencies between actions within the Plan, the key dependency being the need to restructure the team to create capacity within the team to take forward many of the action in the Plan.

As part of implantation of the Plan, it is proposed to formalise the process of Plan review. This will ensure that agreed actions in the Plan are taken forward to timetable and to ensure that any delays in implementation are understood and report to Conservators.

<b>Initiative</b>	<b>Implementation Date</b>	<b>By Whom – Lead Role</b>	<b>Initial Review date</b>
<b>Develop Team Restructure Plan</b>	January-March 2013	RM* and Conservators**	April 2013
<b>Implement Team Changes</b>	April –Dec 2013	RM and Conservators	July 2013, plus update Sept. 2013
<b>Health and Safety</b>	On-going	RM and team	All quarterly mtgs. of Conservators
<b>Business efficiency review</b>	September 2013 onwards to agreed priority order	RM and Conservators	Half yearly from January 2014
<b>River User Liaison</b>	June 2013 onwards	RM	Quarterly update to Conservators
<b>Asset Management Database and Capital programme</b>	June 2013 to January 2014 for database, plan to follow	RM and Conservators	Quarterly update to Conservators
<b>Waterspace Strategy Development</b>	December 2013 onwards	RM and Conservators	Quarterly update to Conservators
<b>Property review Implementation</b>	June 2013 onwards	RM and Conservators	Quarterly update to Conservators
<b>Byelaw Review</b>	September 2013 onwards	RM and Conservators	Periodic update to Conservators
<b>Review of Business Plan</b>	April 2014	RM and Conservators	Annual review at the April meeting

**Table 4 – Timetable for implementation of the Business Plan**

\*River Manager, \*\*All mention of Conservators in a lead role will be delegated to the relevant sub-group

### Appendix 1 - Summary of Conservancy Cash Flow 2013/14 to 2017/18

<i>Year</i>	<i>2013/14</i>		<i>2014/15</i>		<i>2015/16</i>		<i>2016/17</i>		<i>2017/18</i>	
<b>Business area</b>	<b>Income</b>	<b>Expend.</b>								
<b>Craft Registration</b>	£294k	-£36k	£308k	-£37k	£318k	-£38k	£327k	-£39k	£337k	-£40k
<b>Revenue River Maintenance</b>	£41k	-£173k	£41k	-£179k	£43k	-£184k	£44k	-£190k	£45k	-£195k
<b>Capital River maintenance</b>		-£81k		-£245k		-£90k		-£38k		-£43k
<b>Property (non-ops.)</b>	£53k	-£22k	£55k	-£23k	£56k	-£24k	£58k	-£24k	£60k	-£25k
<b>Property (ops.)</b>		-£38k		-£39k		-£41k		-£42k		-£43k
<b>Byelaw Compliance</b>		-£33k		-£34k		-£35k		-£36k		-£37k
<b>Miscellaneous /overheads</b>	£23k	-£30k	£24k	-£30k	£24k	-£32k	£25k	-£32k	£25k	-£33k
<b>Total</b>	£411k	-£413k	£428k	-£587k	£441k	-£444k	£454k	-£401k	£467k	-£416k
<b>Conservancy Balances (£444k at 2012/13)</b>	<b>£442k</b>		<b>£283k</b>		<b>£280k</b>		<b>£333k</b>		<b>£384k</b>	