

## CRITERIA FOR USE OF BRAND: SUMMARY OF STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK

Meetings were held with a variety of stakeholder groups in November and December 2004 to discuss possible criteria for use of the brand.

Three potential routes were outlined as a basis for discussion:

Option 1 - The brand would be widely available for use subject only to design guidelines and geographical criteria.

Option 2 - Criteria for use of the brand would be based on appropriate existing accreditation schemes in a variety of sectors.

Option 3 - A bespoke accreditation scheme would be developed.

A summary of the discussions is detailed below:

<b>Association of Cairngorms Community Councils</b>	<b>Individual Opinions</b>	<b>General Conclusions</b>
<b>Option 1</b>	Might be better to allow free use, and then remove right to use if there are complaints. Would allow a Park for All. What about piracy?	'Free for all' approach would be better for small business, such as B&Bs, who do not want to be quality assured. Support for this option, possibly with the right to remove if used wrongly.
<b>Option 2</b>	This could put people off using and be divisive. Would be a better way of ensuring the brand means something – to safeguard brand values. Better to roll out slowly according to rules than to do so quickly and make mistakes. Better to look for quality standards from the beginning. Using existing criteria – such as Visit Scotland – could be detrimental to the take up of the brand. What about sectors where there is no accreditation?	Some criteria will be necessary at some point, even if we go for a 'negative' approach of allowing anyone to use the brand but then withdrawing it. Moderate support for this option.
<b>Option 3</b>	This could be costly, slow, and mean duplication.	Not much support for this option.
<b>General comments on criteria</b>		No consensus. Many felt that the brand should be open to everyone. Others that they would much rather be associated with an exclusive quality brand.

<b>CNPA Staff</b>	<b>Individual Opinions</b>	<b>General Conclusions</b>
<b>Option 1</b>		Very little support.
<b>Option 2</b>	Important to ensure that brand is only used in ways that support aims of the Park. So choice of existing schemes that we make use of needs to be carefully managed.	
<b>Option 3</b>	This could be the best way to ensure that the brand really supports the Park. Very bureaucratic and expensive, and not necessarily enabling.	
<b>General comments on criteria</b>		Opinions divided between options 2 and 3. Consensus that great care should be taken in roll out to ensure that the brand supports the aims of the Park.

<b>ABSC Marketing</b>	<b>Individual Opinions</b>	<b>General Conclusions</b>
<b>Option 1</b>	Businesses that care about their marketing will not use a brand over which there is no control.	
<b>Option 2</b>	This makes most sense.	
<b>Option 3</b>	Don't need a new scheme. Don't want another level of bureaucracy.	
<b>General comments on criteria</b>	We will have to work quite hard to get operators to use the brand at all. There could be demand to use the lettering separate from the graphic.	Some version of option 2, perhaps with add ons for industries with no QA schemes, would be best.

<b>CNPA Food Marketing Group</b>	<b>Individual Opinions</b>	<b>General Conclusions</b>
<b>Option 1</b>	Simplest option. Does not reflect quality.	Probably not appropriate.
<b>Option 2</b>	Should standards vary from industry to industry (Food has more stringent standards anyway)? What criteria should be used? Would it ensure consistency and eating quality?	Could work, but may need to be supplemented with bespoke criteria.
<b>Option 3</b>	Wanted costings for the scheme. Could this include 'green' credentials.	Too time-consuming and costly. Need to make things simple for users.
<b>General comments on criteria</b>		Discussion focused on criteria for food marketing, specifically beef and lamb.

<b>Cairngorms Chamber of Commerce</b>	<b>Individual Opinions</b>	<b>General Conclusions</b>
<b>Option 1</b>	'Free for all' could undermine brand. Might be better for some smaller businesses.	
<b>Option 2</b>	Would make sense to use existing criteria. Some way needs to be found to ensure that the brand values are maintained.	Need to be very careful in choice of schemes to be used. For sectors without QA schemes, bespoke criteria may be necessary ('option 2 plus')
<b>Option 3</b>	Would be expensive, and businesses may not welcome 'yet another' quality assurance scheme.	
<b>General comments on criteria</b>		Meeting was divided between options 1 and 2. Offered to set up a small working group to assist with devising a workable scheme.