

# Annual Report and Accounts 2004-05

Erratum: Please note the following corrections

**Page 8 The Learning Journey: Our Education and Community Engagement Strategy**

**The first sentence under this heading should read:**

This year, our education and community engagement programmes have continued to expand, attracting 22,934 people, including 10,089 to Wildlife for All drop-in projects.

**Page 18 The last paragraph:**

This innovative 'Adopt a Duck' scheme at St James's Park has raised pledges of over £6,000, which will allow the Agency to buy a quarter of the waterfowl they need to maintain the desired populations.

**Page 37 The results as given in the table under key target 2 (quality and cleanliness) should read as follows:**

Key Target	Progress
2	<p>Each park to score at least 85% for quality and cleanliness as assessed by visitor satisfaction survey.</p> <p><b>Partially achieved:</b> In 2004 we changed our survey methodology. We are now surveying four Parks each year, so each will be assessed biannually but in more detail than in the past. This year overall quality scores of excellent or good were: Greenwich – 95%; Bushy – 93%; St James's – 93%; Green – 94% (Average 94%). Cleanliness scores were: Greenwich – 94%; Bushy – 81%; St James's – 83%; Green – 88% (Average 86%).</p>

**Page 39 An amended version of this page is reproduced overleaf.**

**Page 40 The Financial Targets table should read as follows:**

Financial targets	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
	<b>Increase income</b>			
Target	£4.941m (increase of 10% on the 2000/01 level from all sources except recharges and VAT refunds)	£5.435m (increase of 10% on the 2001/02 target from all sources except recharges and VAT refunds)	Interim target £5.6 million. Increase self-generated income to £7 million by 2005/06 (=29% of DCMS grant)	Interim target £6.6 million. Increase self-generated income to £7 million by 2005/06 (=29% of DCMS grant)
Outturn	£4.8m	£5.5m	£5.3m	£6.5m

**Page 41 The first bullet point target under objective 5 (Manage effectively; improve financial base) should read:**

- Increase self-generated income (excluding grants) from £6.5 million to £7 million by 2005/6.

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
<b>Soft landscape presentation</b>				
Target	89%: Target no less than 85% for each Park	89%: Target no less than 85% for each Park	Each Park to score at least 85%	Each Park to score at least 85%
Outturn	89%: Actual scores ranged from 84% to 91%	90%: Actual scores ranged from 87% to 91%	Actual scores ranged from 88% to 91%	Actual scores ranged from 88% to 91%.
<b>Overall quality of Parks</b>				
Target	89%: Target no less than 85% for each Park	89%: Target no less than 85% for each Park	Each Park to score at least 85%	Each Park to score at least 85%
Outturn	85%: Actual scores ranged from 79% to 90%	86%: Actual scores ranged from 80% to 89%	Actual scores ranged from 81% to 92%	Actual scores ranged from 93% to 95%. See notes below.
<b>Cleanliness in the Parks</b>				
Target	89%: Target no less than 85% for each Park	89%: Target no less than 85% for each Park	Each Park to score at least 85%	Each Park to score at least 85%
Outturn	85%: Actual scores ranged from 79% to 88%	88%: Actual scores ranged from 81% to 91%	Actual scores ranged from 84% to 97%	Actual scores ranged from 81% to 94%. See notes below.

**Importance ratings**

	Absolutely vital	Very important	Total
Green Park	28%	53%	81%
St James's Park	21%	57%	78%
Bushy Park	26%	56%	82%
Greenwich	28%	59%	87%

	Absolutely vital	Very important	Total
Green Park	23%	57%	80%
St James's Park	19%	51%	70%
Bushy Park	21%	62%	83%
Greenwich	24%	63%	87%

**Notes**

Following the National Audit Office (NAO) report on The Royal Parks' visitor research programme, we have reviewed the processes by which we benchmark the Parks. A much more detailed set of Key Performance Indicators has been developed, along with a scoring regime that is easier for people to understand.

Visitors were asked to rate the Parks excellent, good, satisfactory, poor or very poor. The percentage figures in the Quality targets above give the number of people rating the Parks either excellent or good. We also asked people how important each metric is to them.

Another key NAO recommendation was to undertake research in four Parks per annum, to allow a more in-depth analysis in each Park. We have adopted this methodology and have included results for the first four Parks surveyed in this new manner:

The Key Action Areas the visitor research highlighted were as follows:

**Greenwich Park**

- Quality and number of toilets
- Quality of catering
- Staff visibility and friendliness

**The Green Park**

- Quality and number of toilets
- Information on park features

**Bushy Park**

- Quality and number of toilets
- Quality of catering

**St James's Park**

- Quality and number of toilets
- Quality of catering