

## **NPF 19<sup>th</sup> September 2005 Agenda item 5**

### **NPF Working Agenda 2005/6 and modus operandi: *discussion paper***

**1** The Forum is scheduled to meet four times in the 05/06 session with this being one of those meetings. Having agreed a Business Plan, it is important that we now settle on a programme of activity for the remainder of the year. In past years we have taken a straw poll and identified ‘popular’ topics. The image of planners and planning remains an issue that we have yet to unpack, the natural resource aspects of spatial planning, sustainability appraisals and SEA/EIA issues are all timely. Within the broad sweep of culture change and recognising our *usp* as a cross sectoral body, suggestions are still welcome from colleagues where we can make a difference and where a difference is needed. Please email Graeme Bell or Henry Oliver before the meeting with your nominations, to enable a focussed debate to be achieved. [secretary@natplanforum.org.uk](mailto:secretary@natplanforum.org.uk) or [Henryo@cpre.org.uk](mailto:Henryo@cpre.org.uk)

**2** Your Executive is also considering a review of the working practices of the Forum. This is appropriate two years following the re-launch during which time we have gained a better idea of what works better or less well. It is also timely following the establishment of a realistic budget and the appointment of a Secretary who will be able to offer three days a week to the job.

**3** The views of colleagues are therefore sought on:

- Whether Forum membership needs to be reviewed-do we have any organisations missing?
- Whether all organisations should be limited to one delegate?
- Should membership be limited to those organisations that pay a membership fee-and if so what should that be?
- Should we model ourselves on Heritage Link or the Wildlife and Countryside Link with fewer meetings and more informal networking?
- Can the Forum be streamlined, with working groups to take forward ideas from the plenary for operationalisation?
- Is the venue suitable? Would a boardroom style make for better debate?

There will be other questions and points to consider and your contributions are welcome on the day or in advance.