
CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING held at the Albert Hall, Ballater on Friday 3rd September 2010 at 11am

PRESENT:

Peter Argyle	Marcus Humphrey
Eric Baird	Bob Kinnaird
Stuart Black	Mary McCafferty
Geva Blackett	Eleanor Mackintosh
Duncan Bryden	Alastair MacLennan
Jaci Douglas	Ian MacKintosh
Dave Fallows	Andrew Rafferty
Lucy Grant	Gregor Rimell
David Green(Convener)	Richard Stroud
Drew Hendry	Sue Walker

In Attendance:

Chris Bremner	Andy Rockall
David Cameron	Claire Ross
Murray Ferguson	Hamish Trench
Bob Grant	Francoise van Buuren
Jane Hope	

Apologies:

Willie McKenna
Anne MacLean
Fiona Murdoch

Welcome and Introduction

1. David Green welcomed everyone to the meeting, with a particular welcome to Eleanor Logan from The Soil Association Scotland who had provided support on Paper 3 about Food and Drink for Life. At the open evening on the previous night, the Board had received a presentation from Ballater Royal Deeside illustrating the many projects underway. Two key issues were raised: business rates and the disproportionate effect in Ballater; and the pending decision on the Old School Development in Ballater. There had also been some brief discussion about the Cairngorms Business Partnership which clearly had some support in this part of the Park.

Minutes of Last Meeting – approval

2. Two amendments were noted as follows:

- a) At Paragraph 23 of the Minutes, the Convener made it clear that he had been chairing a steering group in preparation for the ATTA Conference in October (Adventure Tourism Travel Association), and not the ATTA itself;
- b) Paragraph 27: the date of the next meeting should have read Friday 3rd September not the 23rd.

Subject to these minor amendments the minutes were approved.

Matters Arising

3. None.

Declarations of Interest

4. Paper 2 – Dave Fallows and Marcus Humphrey declared a direct interest as Directors of the Cairngorms Outdoor Access Trust and proposed to absent themselves from the discussion on the paper. David Cameron (Director of Corporate Services) declared an interest as a Director of COAT and proposed to take part in the discussion merely to answer questions. Eric Baird declared an indirect interest given that COAT had done work on Glen Tanar Estate (his employer). Alastair MacLennan declared an indirect interest as part of the Speyside Way passed over his land.
5. Paper 3 – Indirect interests were declared by David Green (a Board Member of SAC – (Scottish Agricultural College)); Alastair MacLennan (member of the Cairngorms Farmers Market); Jaci Douglas (a founder member of the Cairngorms Farmers Market).

Corporate Plan: Review of Current and Future Status (Paper 1)

6. Jane Hope introduced the paper on behalf of Management Team, seeking to extend the current Corporate Plan by one more year. This was one of several measures to manage the CNPA's operations through the hiatus of the next eighteen months resulting from the uncertainty over the spending review, and the emerging National Park Plan which would set objectives for the whole Park and its partners. The Management Team had undertaken a review of the current Corporate Plan and concluded that the Plan remained fit for purpose for a further year. Monitoring mechanisms were in place and showed good delivery of the current Corporate Plan. With some adjustment to account for those strategic objectives already achieved, and those that were not completely achieved but required some amendment to take account of changing circumstances, the Plan remained essentially fit for purpose subject to some modifications as shown in Annex 2. The extension of the Corporate Plan for a further year would allow the next Corporate Plan to be developed in conjunction with the next National Park Plan, with both starting from April 2012.
7. There were two further considerations in respect of managing the uncertainty of the coming months. Systems were in place to monitor spending commitments so that the organisation could continue to commit expenditure and move projects forward without the danger of over committing against a reduced budget in the future. Regular reports were taken to the Finance Committee to provide for this monitoring. The three funding commitments being sought through papers at the day's Board meeting were within the envelope of expenditure allowable on that basis. A further consequence of the economic cutbacks was the virtual freeze on external staff recruitment. In practice, as

staff departed their posts were not replaced and there would be some consequences for delivery of the Corporate Plan as a result. A set of working principles was set out in the paper to help decisions in these situations on which work to prioritise. The principles did not represent new thinking but were in effect restatements of the text of the 2008/11 Corporate Plan and were reminders of those functions which the Cairngorms National Park Authority had to keep as priorities regardless of other changes.

8. Some difficult decisions on prioritising work against a reduced budget would have to be taken over the next six months. It made sense to do this alongside the development of the new National Park Plan which would set the priorities for the Park as a whole – priorities for the CNPA and its partners.
9. In discussion the following points were made:
 - a) It made good sense to extend the Corporate Plan by a further year.
 - b) The Finance Committee were regularly monitoring the position with respect to forward commitments, which were being limited to 30% of the Operational Plan budget. The point was noted that commitments made now may well extend several years into the future and therefore affect what was available to spend on other projects in the future.
 - c) The paper presented for the first time a visible link between the CNPA's work and delivery of the Scottish Government Outcomes. This clear evidence was extremely helpful.
 - d) There was some discussion about KPIs (Key Performance Indicators). Underlying the numbers there remained the inevitable question about whether the relevant outcomes were being delivered. It was noted that the approach taken by the CNPA was to regard these as indicators showing a trend; they were not perfect measures and indeed it was very difficult to develop a perfect KPI without creating a bureaucratic industry in support. What the KPIs did not show was that in most cases a considerable amount of detailed and comprehensive work underlay the indicator to back up its validity. It was also noted that ideally a KPI needed an associated target. The difficulty was that ultimately one was trying to assess a contribution to an outcome; the danger with targets was that one ended up measuring delivery of the target as an end in itself. The approach taken by the CNPA had been therefore to concentrate on measuring direction of travel. It may not be perfect, but had been discussed and agreed with the Scottish Government who were content.
 - e) Similarly, there was some discussion about individual measures and milestones. Paragraph 15 showed a KPI linking to conserving and enhancing biodiversity and landscapes within the Corporate Plan, and to Scottish Government Outcomes 10, 12 and 14. The graph showed the rising proportion of 32 priority species adopted in the Cairngorms Local Biodiversity Action Plan for which positive conservation action was currently underway. It was noted that the LBAP itself contained over 100 species and this KPI therefore focused on a subset of these, as agreed with the LBAP group. The measure, which showed an increase from the Baseline, was therefore measuring a direction of travel on a limited number of species which were taken as a proxy for a much broader and wider outcome.
 - f) In Annex 2 there was some discussion about Strategic Outcome No 2, concerning the Cairngorms Biodiversity Recording System. It was noted that this, like many other elements of the Plan, represented work in progress. The recording system was currently limited in what it could tell us, and was not yet able to give a full picture of biodiversity status in the Cairngorms. Nevertheless,

NESBReC (North East Scotland Biological Records Centre) was a cost effective way of starting to build up a picture of the area. This was an important element of understanding what drives land management; it was not the end in itself. It was also noted there was other work in hand or planned with partners bringing more information in to give a more complete picture over a longer period of time.

- g) Outcome No 36 in the Corporate Plan (in Annex 2) gave some milestones relating to the planning service provided by the CNPA, and the timescales for determination of planning applications. It was noted that the timescale of four months was not the same as that quoted by the Scottish Government for all other planning authorities; this was because of the unusual call-in powers of the CNPA which meant that only the more complex applications were determined by the CNPA. As a result the Scottish Government had not required a target timescale and it was left to the CNPA to determine its own. While one could argue about what this should be set at, it was felt important to set a deadline.
- h) Outcome 22 in the Corporate Plan refers to the delivery of affordable and sustainable housing in the Park. It was noted that the milestones referred to affordable housing but omitted sustainable.

10. The Convener summed up by complimenting the amount of work represented by the paper, and observed that the CNPA was now in a much better position to be able to record and report on progress with delivery.

11. The recommendations of the paper were approved as follows:

- a) **The Board agreed the extension of the current Corporate Plan, with modifications as described, to March 2012;**
- b) **Noted the progress with delivery of the Corporate Plan as measured against milestones of the Plan and against KPIs (Key Performance Indicators) related to Scottish Government outcomes;**
- c) **Noted a set of CNPA working principles to describe how the CNPA goes about its work between now and March 2012.**

Cairngorms Outdoor Access Trust: Draft Business Plan 2011/15 (Paper 2)

[Dave Fallows and Marcus Humphrey left the meeting for this item]

- 12. Bob Grant introduced the paper which reported on the progress made by the Cairngorms Outdoor Access Trust (COAT) in delivering access-related work. It was now in its third year of operation and table 1 summarised the progress made by the Trust in leveraging in funding. Over three years the total budget secured had risen from £340,000 in year one to £773,000 in year three, with the CNPA's contribution falling from 44% to 24% in the same period. The Trust were now developing a four year Business Plan and to that end were having discussion with CNPA and other potential funder about contributions to ensure that key works arising from the Core Paths Plan could be delivered. The outline Business Plan was show at Annex 1. A summary of proposed contributions from the CNPA was given at table 2.
- 13. Because of the uncertainty about the outcome of the Spending Review, it was proposed that the CNPA made some contribution now as show in table 2 to facilitate the Trust's forward planning. The Board were requested to consider approving the commitment to funding to support the Trust's work on the Speyside Way management, and a further

allocation of £35,000 in 2011/12 to facilitate the Community Paths Project. It was suggested that detailed approval of how that £35,000 was deployed should be delegated to the Finance Committee.

14. Subject to approval of these proposals, it was suggested that the matter of any further approval of funding to the Trust's work could be considered again once the outcome of the Spending Review was known.

15. In discussion the following points were made:

- a) Table 2 showed the specific elements of funding for agreement at the meeting, (including an allocation to the Mountain Heritage Paths Project which had already been given previously). Other potential elements of funding would be considered again after the Spending Review.
- b) It was noted that the CNPA remained still the biggest funder of the Trust's work. It was important not to foster the notion that other partners had no role in this respect, nevertheless as the Access Authority it was perhaps not surprising that the CNPA should be a significant funder of the work of the Trust.
- c) COAT were commended for securing significant funding for the Mountain Heritage Paths Project. But it was important that in delivering their Business Plan the Trust did not become too narrowly focussed on high level footpath maintenance. It was essential to ensure that their money was benefitting as large an audience as possible.
- d) In Perth and Kinross there was a Countryside Trust operating over the whole area. There were discussions taking place about dovetailing the work of that Trust with the work of COAT but there was no desire on either part for a takeover. There were no immediate and pressing needs in the area of Perth and Kinross coming into the Park which were not already being met by the Countryside Trust.
- e) It was confirmed that COAT did not pursue projects for their own sake, and the Board Members were there to ensure that work was relevant to the National Park. Assurance was given that the process of delivery was a bottom-up community led process delivering what communities wanted.
- f) In table 2 there was some discussion about the line showing a commitment to community paths projects. It was noted that the £35,000 proposed allocation did not currently have specific paths set against it and while it was clearly for COAT to decide on its allocation, it was noted that the emphasis must be on work across the whole National Park. It was also commented that table 2 gave the appearance of there being no future funding for community paths. In reality, the table simply reflected that a decision on quantum in the future was still to come after the spending review; it was important to reinforce the CNPA's commitment to the community paths project.
- g) COAT had given considerable support to small communities and this was much appreciated.
- h) It was noted that the Speyside Way was still incomplete in part of Nethy Bridge and this should be borne in mind in the Trust's future work plan.

16. The Convener concluded the discussion by reiterating the CNPA's congratulations to COAT on their very effective work.

17. The Recommendations of the paper were approved as follows:

- a) **The Board noted the programme of works that have been delivered to date and the very significant leverage obtained from the CNPA investment;**
- b) **Approved funding for detailed elements in the four year Business Plan (in the table at Paragraph 12); and**
- c) **Noted that approval of the total CNPA contribution to the Business Plan would be brought to the Board once the future financial allocation had been determined.**

[Dave Fallows and Marcus Humphrey returned to the meeting]

Food For Life Development Plan – Next Steps (Paper 3)

18. The paper was introduced by Chris Bremner, supported by Eleanor Logan from the Soil Association for Scotland. It updated Members on the progress made on the Food for Life Development Plan for the Cairngorms National Park and sought agreement to a way forward including future CNPA support. The Board had received papers during 2009 which presented an outline of exploratory work on food and drink; this highlighted that there were significant opportunities as well as significant interest from the public sector and the Scottish Government in food and drink. The National Park Plan also highlighted opportunities, with a number of outcomes influenced by food and drink policy in some way. Following those papers to the Board in 2009, considerable progress had been made to build on the initial Action Plan. This was now presented in the Cairngorms Food For Life Development Plan. Importantly, a partnership project had been developed with the Soil Association Scotland to use their existing Food for Life Framework as a means of developing a more comprehensive regional development plan for food and drink in the Cairngorms National Park. This had generated considerable interest amongst local authorities. It offered linkages with land management, education, tourism, and communities. Given the interest, and the many linkages with other areas of work, the key strength of the plan was its ability to offer a way of integrating all of these interests, and the role of the CNPA would be to provide the necessary coordination, with partners being the primary deliverers of many of the individual actions.
19. The Plan detailed eight areas for development of action in section 3 page 30; these were also summarised at paragraph 8 of the covering paper. The implementation of the Plan was covered at paragraph 10 of the paper. A food group was being established to act as a steering mechanism to prioritise work set out in the Plan. The group was broadly based, and was due to meet on the 16th September. The role of the CNPA was to provide coordination.
20. It was proposed that this work in supporting the delivery of the Food for Life Development Plan should be given a high priority which would mean reducing the priority on a number of other streams of work, notably the work on promotion of the environmental plans for businesses, and visitor payback. This work would not be dropped, but would proceed at a slower pace. It was also proposed that alongside the staff resource to coordinate the project, some CNPA funding of £55,000 was provided over three years to help kick start some of the initiatives within the Plan. It was proposed that this would be used to match fund any LEADER bid.

21. In discussion the following points were made:

- a) The paper was broadly welcomed; this was an important subject, relevant and appropriate to the Cairngorms National Park.
- b) Coordination was essential, given the amount of work going on and the number of cross connections to be made. There were, for example, obvious links with the Cultural Heritage dimension, and there were also potential links with the training schemes covered in the previous paper to help producers sell their products.
- c) The approach proposed fitted well with the role of the CNPA in coordinating and facilitating work by a range of others.
- d) There was some discussion about the consequences for other work if the Food and Drink Plan work was prioritised. It was emphasised that the work on promotion of environmental plans remained important as there were ongoing difficulties with persuading small businesses to accept the Green Tourism Business Scheme (GTBS) which in turn had knock on effects for the use of the Brand. It was therefore important to find an alternative, and it was noted that this work should continue, albeit considerable further thought was required before anything could be taken forward. In the same vein, work on the visitor payback initiative remained important and it would have its own momentum from the business sector, and it was intended that the Cairngorms Business Partnership would pick this up as and when appropriate.
- e) It was noted there were some concerns with the proposal of a 50 mile radius from the National Park boundary being the definition of "local". Producers in the National Park would not be able to compete with those on better land outside the Park; the fragility of producers within the Cairngorms National Park was an essential consideration. It was also important that this rule was consistent with the rules of the use of the Brand, which was essentially restricted to those within the Park. The 50 mile limit had been a pragmatic approach, recognising that while wishing to source food locally, it was not possible to get everything from within the National Park. On a like-for-like basis, it was important to not lose this point about the distinctiveness of being within the National Park. The production of the Food Producers Guide by the Cairngorms Business Partnership had created considerable useful discussion on the criteria to be used, and this remained work in progress.
- f) On a related point there was some discussion about the use of a catering marque and the relevance of including the criterion of organic production when there was none within the Cairngorms National Park. There was a stronger argument for local produce than there was for organic produce in respect of the National Park. It was pointed out that the catering marque was optional and the organic factor only came into operation at the gold level. The point behind the marque was that it was there to encourage sustainability of which there were three limbs: local, seasonal, and unprocessed.
- g) The Cairngorms Brand had a vital role to play in differentiating food from within the Park from that without. This could be used to encourage producers to use the Brand in order to differentiate production from within the Park from that within the 50 mile radius outside the Park.
- h) Working with the Cairngorms Business Partnership on the delivery of this Plan was essential and was the way to go in taking this work forward.
- i) The Plan was very positive and rightly so. However, some analysis was required of the risks and how these could be mitigated. For example, the question of

what happened at the end of three years had to be addressed. It was agreed that one of the first jobs of the steering group was to consider potential risks.

- j) "Local" did not always necessarily mean low carbon although it was acknowledged that as a general principle, local food production helped to reduce food miles, and therefore contribute to the philosophy of low carbon. In this vein, it was noted that a means for measuring carbon footprint needed to be implemented very soon so that it was possible to measure the contribution of the work being done on the Food for Life Programme. It was agreed that work was needed on this in the near future.
- k) One of the major risks surrounded the management of expectations. Putting the work on food and drink into the next National Park Plan, would help greatly.
- l) It was noted in respect of the catering marque that the quality did not always sit easily with other considerations such as sustainability (for example, wild salmon may represent very high quality but would certainly not match the criterion of sustainability). Again, it was noted that the Food for Life catering marque applying nationally was voluntary. It was open to the CNPA and its partners to develop a different marque within the National Park. The obvious answer to this was the Cairngorms Brand.
- m) The focus on engaging schools was very welcome. There were some good examples of schools growing their own food, and an award set up to encourage this could be very helpful. There was also a potential link with catering courses.
- n) The point was made that attitude could take a long time to change and there was still an attitude in many areas of looking for the cheapest food.
- o) In encouraging local red meat consumption there was an important balance to strike given that one did not want to encourage overgrazing and the associated environmental problems which might flow from an increase in local demand,

22. The Convener summed up noting that this was potentially a huge agenda, but one that received widespread and enthusiastic support around the Board table. The important points to emerge were that the further work must consider future risks and the management of expectations.

23. The Recommendations of the paper were approved as follows:

- a) **The Board noted progress made with the Food For Life Plan and the future opportunity it provided for the Park;**
- b) **Agreed to put resources into implementing the Food for Life Plan and acknowledge that other project activity would be given a lower priority;**
- c) **Agreed the proposed staff resource to coordinate the project and CNPA funding of up to £55,000 over three years (£25,000 for 2010/11 and £15,000 per year thereafter).**

Future Training Delivery in the Cairngorms National Park (Paper 4)

24. Claire Ross and Andy Rockall introduced the paper which sought endorsement of proposed development of the training project for 2011 to 2013, and the associated funding package. The paper had been brought to the Board in January 2010 exploring how the CNPA should take forward its role in the development of training within the Park, building on the significant success of the Land Based Business Training Project (LBBTP) and the Cairngorms Awareness and Pride (CAP) Project. The Board had approved a set of guiding principles set out at Annex 1 and a set of training themes

(Annex 2) as the basis for further development work with partners. In February the Finance Committee had approved in principle up to £80,000 per year for three years as a working assumption so that in order to develop the project, match funders could be approached from a position of certainty.

25. The current paper now set the final proposals for the scheme over the next three years, noting that deadlines had dictated that an application had already been made to the ESF (European Social Fund) for the project outlined. The proposal for the project development was for three activities as set out at paragraph 18, comprising provision and promotion of information; signposting; and delivery. For the third of these, a further three strands of activity were set out at paragraph 19 as follows:
 - a) Developing young people whilst in employment with land based businesses;
 - b) Responsive support for the training of land based businesses;
 - c) Proactive delivery of training events.
26. Assuming that the application for ESF funding was successful, together with CNPA proposed funding of £80,000 per year, the project would be worth around half a million pounds over the next three years.
27. The Board were asked to endorse the three described strands of the future training project, to remit to the Management Team the detailed design of the project, and to approve the £80,000 a year for the each of the next three years to deliver the training project as described.
28. In discussion the following points were made:
 - a) There was some discussion around the matter of young people coming out of education and being unable to find employment. This was clearly likely to be a pressing problem in coming years and it would be helpful to see how the LBBT could help these people. It was noted that there were already some projects for young people in this situation within the National Park, and it was important that the CNPA avoided any duplication with these other schemes. (The guiding principles in Annex 1 (c) emphasised that the CNPA should take a proactive role where there was a gap in existing provision.) It was confirmed that the aim was for the CNPA to position the LBBT scheme so that its work complimented, and made links with, other schemes. An important aim was to bring the various other training providers together and make the linkages.
 - b) It was confirmed that in respect of proactive delivery of training events, the skills within the LBBT team would be used to ensure training in other areas of policy in which the CNPA had an interest, for example the work on food and drink.
 - c) On the guiding principles, at (f) it was noted that “ensuring all training is readily available to the groups that can make most impact in delivering actions within the Park Plan and that proper support measures are in place to minimise any barriers to uptake” was an aspiration and was not totally deliverable by the CNPA. It was agreed the wording should be changed accordingly, albeit the aspiration remained valid. The “barriers” took a variety of forms, and to a large extent the role of the CNPA as broker was to make sure partners were aware of these. For example, the CNPA tried to ensure that venues were chosen that were close to the people attending the course, that local providers were used, and that courses were not run at inappropriate time such as spring time which might clash with lambing.
 - d) There was some discussion about the proposed cap of £2,000 per business (see paragraph 31). The principle of this was to spread the benefit to as many

businesses as possible. General feedback suggested that this was acceptable for small businesses, while for large businesses with many employees the £2,000 may be less appropriate. The principle was sound, but it was agreed that its application may need further thought.

- e) Aberdeenshire Council was participating in a First Employee Scheme using Business Gateway funding. This was awarding £1,000 to businesses to take on a new employee and was therefore effectively money for training. Links with this scheme were suggested.
- f) Paragraph 47 considered some possibilities for the future of the training scheme beyond 2013. It was noted that if a trust appeared to be feasible, some time would be required to get this set up and work on this should start very soon. It was also noted that the Learning Centres recently set up offered potential.

29. The Recommendations of the paper were approved as follows:

- a) **The Board endorsed the three described strands of the future training project as set out at Paragraphs 18 and 19 of the paper;**
- b) **Approved £80,000 per year for each of the next three years to deliver the training project described;**
- c) **Delegated to Management Team the authority to agree details of the design of the project.**

The Cairngorms National Park Landscape Character Assessment (Paper 5)

30. Matthew Hawkins and Frances Thin introduced the paper which sought the Board's adoption of the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA). This provided a highly detailed factual description of the various landscapes within the National Park, and therefore a valuable baseline against which the impacts of development proposals could be made and assessed, and would be useful for developers as well as other planning authorities. It was a useful tool with a life of ten to fifteen years.

31. In discussion the following points were made:

- a) It was important that communities, who clearly had an interest in planning decisions, appreciated that this Landscape Character Assessment was available. It should therefore be made part of the planning training available to communities.
- b) The LCA represented a huge amount of work and was potentially very valuable.
- c) There was some discussion about how the LCA would be used in planning decisions and how much weight it would be given. In practice, the LCA could be used to assess how development would affect certain characteristics in the landscape. However the LCA was just a description, and was only the first part of a two stage piece of work which had been continuing for some time leading to the development of a Landscape Framework. This would allow engagement with communities to apply values to certain aspects of the landscape. Hence, once the Landscape Framework was in place, based on the Landscape Character Assessment, decisions on planning applications could be based much more on not just the effects on landscape but how people valued those changes in the landscape. The point about separating these two pieces of work was that the Landscape Character Assessment was just a description, and its integrity should be kept discrete and self contained, and not weakened or altered by changes in attitudes. The LCA was not judgemental, it was merely descriptive. It was

therefore a very useful first step, and step two was needed to have a complete planning tool.

- d) While it was unlikely that the local authorities would have to formally adopt the Landscape Character Assessment for the National Park, the European Landscape Convention places an obligation on all signatories to ensure that landscape is considered in all relevant plans policies and other strategies. If the partner local authorities were using the new Local Plan for the Cairngorms, it therefore followed logically that they would make use of the LCA.
- e) Linking this paper with the previous one, it was noted that it made sense to use the LBBT to run training events for Land Managers and help roll out awareness of the Landscape Character Assessment which could be useful in supporting applications for SRDP and other grants.

32. The Recommendations of the paper were approved as follows:

- a) **The Board approved the adoption of the Cairngorms Landscape Character Assessment.**

Corporate Plan Monitoring (Paper 6)

National Park Plan – 4-Monthly Progress Report No 6 (Paper 7)

Audit Committee Annual Report (Paper 8)

Notification of Changes to Standing Orders (Paper 9)

33. The above four papers were for information and noted without further comment.

AOCB

34. A number of points of information were made as follows:

- a) David Green reported on his attendance at the Grantown Show, which had been visited by the Cabinet Secretary, Richard Lochhead, who took a keen interest in the Woodfuel Initiative which was being demonstrated at the CNPA tent; he had attended the launch of the Grantown Learning Centre; he had Chaired the last steering group for the ATTA conference in Aviemore on the 4th October, which aims to attract 600 delegates from around the world and for which it was important to ensure a legacy.
- b) Eric Baird reported on his attendance at the opening of the Insh Marshes RSPB Hide; attended the Staff Consultative Forum; and attended the first day of the Windfarm Inquiry.
- c) Dave Fallows reported on his participation in a video conference link meeting with councillors on Harris who engaged in discussion on the possibility of a National Park for Harris.

Date of Next Meeting

35. Friday 29th October, Lonach Hall, Strathdon.