
CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING **held at the Community Hall, Boat of Garten** **on Friday 13th December 2013 at 10.30am**

PRESENT:

Duncan Bryden (Convener)
Angela Douglas
John Latham
Katrina Farquhar
Gregor Rimell
Mary McCafferty
Kate Howie

Bill Lobban
Eleanor Mackintosh
Willie McKenna
Fiona Murdoch
Martin Price
Gordon Riddler
Gregor Hutcheon

In Attendance:

David Cameron
Murray Ferguson
Francoise van Buuren
Pete Crane
Lynn Anderson (Minute Taker)

Hamish Trench
Grant Moir (Chief Executive)
David Watson
Elspeth Grant

Apologies:

Brian Wood
Jeanette Gaul
Peter Argyle
Dave Fallows

Welcome and Introduction

1. Duncan Bryden welcomed everyone to the meeting. The Convener introduced Elspeth Grant, Education and Inclusion Officer who showed a short film celebrating the schools media project which raises awareness of the Park and helps develop some skills in film production in line with the curriculum for excellence. This project has been run 5 times now and the short clip celebrates 10 years of the National Park.
2. The Convener introduced three new members of CNPA staff who were in attendance at the board meeting, Jacquie Barbour, Visitor Services Officer, Doug Stewart, Outdoor Access Officer and Lee Haxton, Community Support Manager.
3. As part of his introduction the Convener mentioned the joint presentation to the Board from Brendan Dick, Director BT Scotland, Mark Tate, Director, Community Broadband Scotland and Stuart Robertson, Director of Digital, HIE which had taken place on Thursday night. Feedback from the Board members he had spoken to was very positive.

4. The Convenor completed his introduction by mentioning the new approach to the Board papers, the format of the papers gives more focus on the high level issues and the strategic approach that is provided by staff to the Board. Any comments from Board members would be welcome.

Apologies were noted as above.

Minutes of Last Meeting held on 27 September, 2013 – Approval

5. A Board Member referred to Matters Arising, Paragraph 4, and in particular the sentence, “It was agreed that the CNPA should be able to give advice where it will help to deliver good outcomes”
6. The Board Member thought that it had been agreed at the meeting of 7 June, 2013 that the CNPA shouldn’t be giving advice where they might be treading on commercial ability to give advice.
7. The Convenor asked Hamish to clarify this. At the meeting on 7th June it was agreed that the CNPA should be giving advice where there was clear public benefit, that otherwise we didn’t think would be delivered, ie CNPA would step in when commercial advice was unlikely to deliver the outcome we would be looking for.
8. A Board Member suggested amending the wording of the sentence in Paragraph 4 to read “It was agreed that CNPA should be able to give advice where it will help to deliver good quality outcomes that others are not able to provide”.
9. The Convenor asked the Board members if they were content with this small caveat to the wording of the sentence.
10. **The Board Members indicated that they were content with this change.**
11. A Board Member referred to Paragraph 14 b) the word show was omitted after the word Aberdeenshire.
12. A Board Member referred to Paragraph 17 b) and the sentence “was concerned we are suggesting removing the need to be quality assured”. The Board Member felt the words “are suggesting” should be removed from the sentence.
13. The Chief Executive explained that as this had not been approved by the Board, it was only a suggestion, and the wording should remain as it is.

Matters Arising – Review of Committee Membership

14. David Cameron circulated a paper explaining Page 7, Paragraph 19 of the minutes with particular reference to the above review. Paragraph 19 of the minutes refer to the members of the subcommittees which were agreed at the board meeting. Following this Board agreement the subcommittees have elected the following as Convenor:

- a) Staffing & Recruitment Committee – Brian Wood
 - b) Audit Committee – Gordon Riddler
 - c) Finance Committee – Kate Howie
15. Paragraph 35 of the standing orders refer to the Board agreeing to the Convenor and Vice-Convenor of each subcommittee that the Board operates, however by the Board agreeing that the Committees elect their own Convenor at the first Committee meeting after the Board Meeting, the standing order had been met.
 16. A Board Member thought that the standing orders should be amended to reflect this process. The Board Member felt, it was not correct just to set aside the standing orders as and when.
 17. David explained that Paragraph 35 of the standing order did state that the Board shall decide the remit, membership, chairmanship and deputy chairmanship of committees. The paper brought to the board in September included the remit that was agreed for the Committees and also included, as part of the paper, the process of electing the Convenor.
 18. The Convenor asked the Board Members present if they were content with this approach.
 19. A Board Member felt that the standing orders should still be amended to reflect this process, they felt that for any new Board Member reading the standing orders, it would be very unclear to them how Chairmanship of Committees are elected.
 20. David explained that one of the reasons he had brought this paper to the Board, under matters arising, was to identify to the Board the Convenor's elected since September by the sub committees and to highlight to the Board that the process agreed by Board Members in September had been carried out. Any new Board Member reading the standing orders would see the audit trail from the board meeting in September to the paper being brought under matters arising today.
 21. The Convenor felt it was important to ensure that all understood and were happy with the process of electing the Convenor's of the sub committees. There is a need to remove the ambiguity of the wording in Paragraph 35 to make it clearer.
 22. A Board Member felt the standing order should be made clearer and that it would not take a lot to make it clearer.
 23. The Convenor went on to ask Board members present the following two questions:
 - a) Do the Board think that the current arrangement with an audit trail is satisfactory?
Or
 - b) Does the Board want a paper brought to the next Board meeting amending Paragraph 35 of the standing orders?
 24. Following a show of hands by the Board Members present, it was agreed that a paper be brought to the next board meeting that changes the wording in Paragraph 35 of the standing orders.

25. A Board Member reminded the Board Members present that it had been agreed that Board Members and their committees would be headed by a Convenor and not a Chairman.
26. The Convenor asked the Board members present to agree the elected Convenors of the sub committees.
27. **The Board Members present agreed these Convenor posts.**
28. The Convenor summarised the outcome of the discussion by saying that a paper would need to come to the next Board Meeting which clarifies Paragraph 35 and changes all the use of the word Chairman to Convenor.
29. Part of the Review of Committee Membership was the length of time the Convenor serves on the Planning Committee. No period of time is specified in the Planning Committee standing orders and historically this has been a 3 year term. However a paper submitted to the Planning Committee in November 2012 supporting the last election, included the statement “the duration of the office of a Committee Convenor or Deputy Convenor is generally one year, unless the Board agree otherwise” . No decision was recorded in the minutes.
30. The Convenor asked the Board members present to consider the length of term the Convenor and Deputy Convenor should serve, the Convenor recommended that the length of term should be 3 years and that the Planning Committee standing orders should reflect this. The Convenor also mentioned that currently the Convenor and Vice Convenor of the Planning Committee had been in post for over a year.
31. David suggested, in his paper, holding elections in January with the new Convenor and Vice Convenor taking up their position from the February meeting.
32. A Board Member felt it would be more sensible to bring elections for these positions in line with elections for the other sub committees, currently September. The Board Member felt the standing order should be amended to 3 years if that is the Board agreement.
33. There was some discussion from Board Members around extending the current term of the current Convenor and Vice Convenor until 2015 however it was agreed, in the absence of the Vice Convenor, this would be unfair.
34. The Convenor asked David to bring a proposal to the next Board Meeting and in the interim the Board agreed to extend the term of the Planning Committee Convenor and Deputy Planning Convenor until September 2014.
35. A Board member referred to Paragraph 3 of the minutes of 27 September, and asked why the draft minutes had not been circulated earlier. A Board Member asked that the draft minutes be circulated no more than 2 working weeks from the date of the Board Meeting.

36. A Board Member referred to Paragraph 33 of the minutes. The sentence should end “hosted by Cameron McNeish”.

Declarations of Interest

37. None declared

Cairngorms Economic Diversification and Development Strategy: Draft for Consultation (Paper I)

38. The Convenor asked the Board to endorse the key themes of the strategy, he reminded the Board that the strategy is being delivered by Cairngorms Economic Forum (CEF) which is made up of a number of other bodies.
39. Murray Ferguson introduced this paper which sets out the key themes in the draft Cairngorms Economic Diversification and Development Strategy (CEDDS). Murray pointed out that it was not the strategy itself. The National Park Partnership Plan (NPPP) identified a need for an economic forum and economic diversification and development strategy for the Cairngorms National Park following feedback from the business community.
40. There is a feeling that the National Park is at the periphery of other areas economic strategies and that there are dynamics in the Cairngorms that are best addressed through an area specific economic strategy. It fits well with Scottish Government economic strategy that there is a regional strategy of this kind and we wanted to use the development of this strategy to pull in some of the bigger development partners such as HIE and Scottish Enterprise.
41. The Cairngorms Economic Forum (CEF) was set up earlier this year and has met 3 times so far. Research has been commissioned and work has been done on the strategy formulation in discussion with other groups.
42. The finalised draft strategy will go out for consultation in January 2014, led by the Cairngorms Business Partnership, it is hoped the final strategy will be brought back to the Board for approval in March 2014.
43. Annex I of the paper sets out where this strategy sits alongside the other strategic pieces of work already approved by the Board to help deliver the National Park Plan. The suggestion is that we look at these things alongside the single outcome agreements set up by Community Planning Partnerships in the 5 local authority areas.
44. The research commissioned showed that the economy of the Park had been resilient when other areas in Scotland had been less so. This research demonstrates that we are on the way to delivering what is set out in the Partnership Plan.
45. The Board Members are being asked to approve the outcomes set out on Table 4 of the Paper. Since the paper was sent out, HIE had suggested a couple of small amendments to the wording.

46. A Board Member asked why there had been no consultation between the CBP and the land managers. The Board Member was concerned that land managers played a big part in the themes emerging.
47. Murray explained that it had been hoped to have a meeting of the land manager's forum in November but this had not happened. Murray acknowledged that engagement with businesses is still light. There is concern that if CBP rushes the consultation there may not be sufficient business engagement. There will be a discussion with CBP to ensure that the consultation runs for enough time for adequate engagement with the business sector.
48. A Board Member felt it would be presumptuous for the strategy to go out for consultation without first having had a meeting with land managers.
49. Hamish responded saying there was a forthcoming meeting with Scottish Land and Estates where this item was on the agenda. Hamish agreed that land management groups are some of the key groups which need to be engaged with through the consultation.
50. A Board Member felt that by not having met with land management groups beforehand they will be less likely to engage with the consultation process.
51. The Convenor suggested that meetings with land management groups within the Park should take place before the consultation process goes much further.
52. Concern was raised by a Board Member about the success of Community Planning Partnerships.
53. A Board Member thought with reference to Table 4, Outcome 2, that not only should we be supporting small businesses, there should also be a focus on attracting small businesses. The Board Member mentioned that there should be some thought given to how Broadband could be included as part of new developments.
54. A Board Member felt that not only should Further and Higher Education opportunities attract young people to the area but also help retain the young people already in the park.
55. A Board Member asked whether there should be some form of monitoring as part of the strategy, thus ensuring sure we know where we are going through the process.
56. A Board Member asked the other Board Members to consider what they might be looking for to measure the success of the strategy. The Board Member also mentioned appropriateness and what the Board did not want to see. What might the checks and balances be that the Board need to put on?
57. The Convenor asked Murray to respond to some of the issues raised by Board Members.
58. Murray explained that Community Planning Partnerships were a topical issue at the moment and currently the Community Empowerment Bill is out for consultation. A

paper is being taken to Management Team to clarify the process we are going through. Information on this process will be circulated to Board Members for their information.

59. The Convenor wondered what support, information etc could be given to the 7 local authority members who sit on the Park Board to help them involve their authority in the Park in much more of a partnership arrangement.
60. Murray explained the key message should be the work the Park has done around the action plans in Annex I that contributes significantly to the relevant SOA's and Community Planning Partnerships.
61. The Chief Executive mentioned that there is a meeting between CNPA and Highland Council in January and Community Partnership Plans would be high on the agenda.
62. The Convenor summarised the discussion by saying, the themes cover many of CNPA priorities, these are themes produced by the Economic Forum, CBP and other partners, and are not specifically our themes, however, there is a need to ensure our interests are represented under these themes and broadly speaking they are. The Board have been asked to approve the key themes, so are we content these key themes broadly cover our range of interests.
63. A Board Member asked that the land manager theme be added with reference to that group of people.
64. Murray asked whether the Board Member thought this should be a whole separate category or that the land managers outcomes should be strengthened or the land managers contribution to the outcomes?
65. The Board Member thought the land management section has not been mentioned enough in Paragraph 14.
66. David Watson added that by looking at the key sectors identified, most of the land managers cut across many of those sectors. A lot of the key estates have been part of other discussions. Another key piece of work which will feed into this, is the questionnaire from Scottish Land and Estates. CNPA have significantly added to this questionnaire, which aims to really draw out what land managers and estates want.
67. The Chief Executive suggested organising a land manager's forum meeting making sure this item is on the agenda and the subsequent discussion it is fed into the consultation, which will decide the final strategy.
68. Murray confirmed this was already in hand.
69. **The Board members were content to endorse the key themes set out in the Paper with the caveat that the land management sector be given more prominence.**

Communications and Engagement Programme 2014 (Paper 2)

70. Françoise van Buuren introduced this paper which seeks Board approval for the proposed Communications and Engagement Programme 2014. This programme has been developed in conjunction with the Comms and Engagement Group.
71. Françoise mentioned the Comms and Engagement Strategy which concentrates on raising awareness of the Park, creating a sense of closeness and getting people involved and caring about the Park. With this in mind the paper sets out the proposed campaigns programme for 2014 as well as the proposed Corporate Communications and Events Programme. The paper also incorporates the progress report for 2013.
72. The programme set out in this paper supports both the National Park Partnership Plan (NPPP) and the work of the CNPA's Corporate Plan.
73. It is proposed that the focus will be on 3 campaigns for 2014 building on the success of the campaigns in 2013. The aim of these campaigns is to help raise the national profile of the Park by providing a set of clear messages with maximum impact.
74. The 3 campaigns will focus on what makes the Park special and the benefits of getting involved.
75. In 2014 the 3 campaigns will focus on:
 - a) Make It Yours – aimed at Teams Cairngorms, working alongside the CBP this campaign will focus on local business, visitor attractions, Rangers and other individuals to highlight the benefits and added value of using the Park Brand.
 - b) Cairngorms Nature – this will be a public facing campaign which will focus on raising awareness of the Park as an outstanding place for nature through encouraging more people to get involved.
 - c) Active Cairngorms – will look to promote the park as an outstanding place for cycling for all abilities in all 5 areas of the Park. This campaign is also about getting people active both visitors and people living in the Park.
76. To help promote the work of the Park Authority it is proposed to run a programme of stakeholder engagement and events which aims to build strong support for the Park through partners and possible Park champions.
77. In addition both the planning function and planning service improvement plan will be heavily supported, improvements will be made to the website and digital communication plan and the use of social media will be enhanced. In addition work will be on the development of the Park Brand
78. With this strong focus on these 3 campaigns there will be some other things we simply can't do.
79. Those campaigns which will run on a national basis, outwith the park boundary will need the support of our Partners, eg Visit Scotland, SNH, LLTNP, RSPB, FCS.

80. Board Members can support this, in particular, the Make It Yours and Brand Ambassador role to encourage people to promote the Park, and help support the wider stakeholder engagement.
81. In conclusion, success would be businesses and communities promoting the park, as well as themselves, to deliver a better visitor experience and they gain benefit from that. Success would be more visitors engaging with nature and more people cycling within the park.
82. A Board member who sits on the Comms and Engagement Group explained to the board why they had decided on these 3 campaigns which are very different in character. The Make It Yours campaign, led by CBP will be largely behind the scenes, if we can get these targeted individuals to get enthusiastic about being in the park this will rub off on visitors to the park.
83. Cairngorms Nature is a campaign where everyone can get involved and will be the major campaign that everyone will notice and really connect with.
84. The cycling campaign can also involve health and well being benefits.
85. It is hoped the success of these campaigns will be a step in the right direction and give people the sense of closeness, awareness and also a sense of pride in the park.
86. A Board Member stresses the importance of ensuring that we span all generations young to old.
87. A Board member asked why there was such an emphasis on cycling.
88. Francoise explained cycling was chosen partly because of comms capacity i.e. we could make a bigger impact by concentrating on cycling and really establish the park as a great place for cycling. However, this does not mean that nothing will happen on other subjects but cycling will be a focus. . Also cycling is on the rise and 2014 is Commonwealth Games year where cycling will feature significantly and the Park could benefit from this.
89. Concern was raised by a Board Member that we need to ensure cycle routes are promoted park wide.
90. Board members also asked whether there were enough safe cycling routes within the park to meet any increased demand.
91. A Board member wondered whether we should market the area to corporate groups.
92. A Board Member welcomed the longer term view of the programme, however they would like to see what might happen next in terms of the programme.
93. A Board Member was unclear how the 3 years strategy fitted in with the Year 1 Focus.

94. Francoise explained that the 3 campaigns are likely to last more than a year and how the campaigns evolve will depend on their success and this success will determine what happens next.
95. A Board Member commented that they would like to have seen a bigger table in paragraph 13 showing themes that we are not looking at in 2014, but might in future years.
96. A Board Member commented that the website for Cairngorms Nature is absolutely critical to the success of that campaign.
97. A Board Member queried why there had been a change of policy and no press releases were to come from board members unless it comes from the Board Convenor or Vice-Convenor for Park issues or the Planning Convenor or Vice-Convenor for planning issues.
98. The Chief Executive responded to this by saying there had been a discussion about press releases and it was agreed that Park Issues and Planning issues would come from the Convenor and Vice-Convenor's of these groups as appropriate however, board members would be used if they were on a specific group. The guidance issued was to clarify who might respond to what.
99. A Board Member felt all board members could be chosen and should be involved with the issue of a press release.
100. A Board Member felt that it was important that local people comment on local issues.
101. A Board Member suggested that Board Members who were representatives at various Forums should be asked to put their name to comments on Press Releases relating to these.
102. The Convenor asked Francoise to pick up on the Board Member's views on press releases and re phrase the guidance, saying that if is a local issue it would be appropriate to use the local Board Member in that press release.
103. **In conclusion the Board Members were content to approve recommendations as set out in Paragraph 6 of the Paper with the caveat that the timetable in paragraph 13 be expanded on and to continue with the Comms and Engagement Working Group.**

Cairngorms Fund (Paper 3)

104. David Cameron introduced this paper which seeks agreement from the Board to begin the process of the establishment, registration and operation of a Cairngorms Fund.
105. The paper follows on from discussions which took place in August 2012 bringing together an idea that had been raised by a few board members. The discussions at that point were around setting up a "Common Good Fund". This fund would allow

financial donations from any source and would also provide a more transparent way of funding to projects supporting the National Park Partnership Plan. This would very much operate as a piece of financial infrastructure within the Park that would avoid funding collection and disbursement mechanisms being drawn together for each individual activity that may be brought together in looking for donations of that kind.

- I 06. Consultations have taken place with our stakeholders over the past year about this and we have received some general support.
- I 07. It has also been recognised that the setting up of a Cairngorms Fund could help to provide further sources of funding to deliver projects outlined in the NPPP.
- I 08. The paper sets out the ways in which this Fund could be set up and how it could be administered.
- I 09. It is proposed that there will be a facilitated discussion with the Board towards the end of February to discuss how wider governance arrangements would work across the Park, considering the role and responsibilities of National Park Authority Board members alongside the other bodies who deliver various other aspects of the priorities of the National Park.
- I 10. The Board were asked to give consideration to the nomination of 2 Board members who could become Directors of the Fund on its establishment.
- I 11. A Board Member asked if legal advice had been taken in regards to the establishment of this fund.
- I 12. David confirmed this had happened in 2012 and Scottish Charitable Incorporated Organisation (SCIO) was the best mechanism for an activity like this.
- I 13. Some Board Members thought Cairngorms Fund was not the correct title for this fund. People may think it is a fund to support the mountain rather than projects in the National Park.
- I 14. David confirmed the title could be changed and any suggestions would be welcome.
- I 15. A Board Member felt that until the facilitated discussion took place they would feel more comfortable that this Paper and discussion was deferred to the Board meeting in March.
- I 16. A Board Member was confused to the content of Paragraph 12.
- I 17. David explained that there had been some discussion of how involved the Park could become in attracting funds. The more passive approach would be to have the financial infrastructure in place where we could accept donations and a group with decision making responsibility would decide what projects these donations would fund.

118. The other option would be to actively go out and fund-raise to raise donations. It was felt however that this could potentially mean working in direct competition with the donation-seeking activity of other organisations.
119. A Board Member asked David to clarify what types of project the money would go to.
120. David confirmed that any donations would remain in the Fund and the Board of Trustees would decide where this money would go on the basis of applications received. The memorandum and articles would make it clear that projects to be supported have to be in line with the priorities of the NPPP. It would be seen as a Fund that would contribute to projects and funds could be used to help match fund projects.
121. One of the success measures in this process going forward will be, not only the amount of funding received but also the amount of funding levered in through the way these donations are used.
122. A Board Member felt it would be an onerous job having to process all the applications. And it might be better to have one application process for both their EU funding and their match funding, otherwise it is just another complication when applying for funding.
123. A Board Member questioned the sustainability of this fund, in the long term, it may end up costing more to run than the donations received.
124. A Board Member asked for clarification of Paragraph 13 of the paper with particular reference to LEADER and its administration.
125. David explained that the Local Action Group operating within the park which already has a grant awarding mechanism and there is an opportunity to consider approaching a LEADER LAG that could administer these donations rather than setting up a new piece of infrastructure. There are potential efficiencies in this and it could become a one stop shop for grant applications. The risk with this is around clarity of image and understanding, any donations received would lose much of the transparency of process if they become part of a bigger pot.
126. A Board Member was very much in favour of the idea of the proposed Fund, however as a Board the terms of reference of the SCIO must be made very clear and the Board member felt this was not the right time to agreeing to a SCIO when we do not know what these terms of reference will be.
127. A Board Member questioned the costs of setting up this Fund and felt £3000 may not be a realistic budget.
128. The Convenor sensed that the Board members present thought the Cairngorms Fund a good idea but the landscape and terms of reference needed to be right, before we can decide the greater detail about the proposed SCIO.

129. David confirmed to the Board that we are some months away from this Fund being set up. The reasoning behind this Paper is for the Board to agree to commit some more staff time and a small amount of finance to draft the terms of reference and memorandum and articles of association.
130. David was confident that the budget of £3000 to set up the Fund is a realistic figure. He continued by saying that following the discussion on governance implications of NP operations in February he would expect to go back to the Board in June 2014 to finalise the terms of reference and memorandum and articles.
131. The Board members agreed to allow the groundwork to begin.
132. The Board Members provisionally agreed that Gordon Riddler and Angela Douglas become Board representatives.
- 133. In conclusion Board members present agreed to the recommendations set out in Paragraph 6, 7, 8 and 9 of the paper with a timescale caveat and not signing off until Board Members see the wider governance context.**

Branded Merchandising (Paper 4)

134. Francoise van Buuren introduced this paper which seeks Board approval to explore opportunities to use Cairngorms National Park branded merchandise to help raise the profile of the park.
135. There is a clear outcome in the National Park Plan which is about people enjoying the park and having an outstanding visitor experience. In the Corporate Plan we have a specific role to play in building the brand and the visitor experience. These are 2 key areas that we are focusing in on.
136. In regards to the Brand Development work, the aim there is to deliver the best possible visitor experience by meeting and ideally exceed expectations and to provide a means for businesses and Communities to have a general advantage of being in the Park and to create a sense of ownership and inspiration, creating a real connection with the Park.
137. In 2012 the brand management group name was changed to the Brand Development Group to build on progress and to deliver the values in particular. The Brand Development Group were asked to look at a number of things including the potential future for merchandising.
138. In 2006 the Brand Management Group had some research done which at that time suggested the brand was at too early a stage to go into merchandising. Over the past 7 years the brand has become much more established and this might make merchandising more attractive at this stage.
139. Francoise asked the Board to consider whether, through the Brand Development Group, there might be opportunities to develop the Brand.

140. A Board member thought the key issue around this is about confidence and control over the Brand however they would be happy to test the market with this licensing agreement, on the understanding that the necessary checks and balances are in place
141. A Board Member asked what the next step would be. There is mention of testing but how far would that take us before it came back to the Board for agreement.
142. The Board Member wondered what has been done in the way of research to change our minds since 2006 and the Board Member wondered if the push for this was coming from staff.
143. Francoise explained that in terms of taking this forward the next step would be a more detailed discussion at the Brand Development Group meeting in January. The hope would be to build a partnership with a single merchandising agency, with a clear licensing agreement.
144. One way of doing this would be to prepare a licensing agreement and put this out to tender.
145. A Board Member questioned the length of time a partnership would last.
146. The Chief Executive explained this would be for a limited time based on a commercial negotiation in the tender document.
147. Francoise commented that if no one came forward to tender it would mean that the Park would continue not having branded items.
148. A Board Member said they were not clear what is being delegated to the Brand Development Group and what would be coming back to the Board.
149. The Chief Executive confirmed that should the Board be content that we investigate the possibility of merchandising, we would develop the tender, making sure the Brand Development Group are happy with it and it would be put it on the public website in terms of procurement. There will then be a discussion on who we appoint, what the produce, how much and for how long. There will have to be work done around the legal agreement and at that point we would be in a position to take this back to the Board for approval. However this will take some time.
150. A Board Member thought it would be difficult to find anyone to tender for this as the brand may be too much of a gamble. The Board Member thought that the sensible way to sell branded goods would be to approach retailers, if they have a product which would sell better by promoting the Park then these retailers give the Park a commission.
151. A Board Member wondered if through the Brand Development Group both options could be considered.
152. The Chief Executive confirmed there are a number of ways of doing this and the option set out in this Paper does not preclude any other option, it is about seeing what works for us.

153. It was agreed by those present that this would come back to the Board for approval.
154. **In conclusion the Board agreed to the recommendations of the Paper as set out in Paragraph 7 a).**
155. **The recommendation in Paragraph 7 b) would come back to the Board for approval at a later board meeting.**

Capital Investment Plan (Paper 5) – For Discussion

156. Hamish Trench introduced the paper which updated the Board on progress on the development of a Capital Investment Plan for the National Park. The working draft attached to the paper set out the headline areas identified following a meeting of the Strategic Delivery Group.
157. The aim of this Plan is to guide any future capital investment by CNPA and its Partners in the Park. This will mean a more collaborative approach to investing in the priorities.
158. The Board were asked to consider whether the draft provided an appropriate basis at a strategic level to ensure capital investment is well targeted to deliver the National Park Partnership Plan.
159. A long term planned approach to investment will ensure the right priorities and effective co-ordination between organisations. It will also allow us to be more proactive in seeking capital investment from other sources.
160. It has been a challenge to get some of the partners looking at this in the way we had hoped and most of the discussion is still on-going. The work that is still required over the next few months, in particular, lies principally with enterprise agencies and local authorities around Community Planning and a clear sense from enterprise agencies about the priorities for investment.
161. We are looking to come back to the Board with the completed plan in March and we are looking to get a steer from the Board that the scope of this is emerging as they might expect and a steer to ensure we get sufficient buy-in from Partners to make this genuinely collaborative and make sure we have common priorities.
162. The Chief Executive continued by saying the finalised plan will have estimated costings against it and that it will give us the ability, once we look at priorities, to get projects worked up to the stage that they are “shovel ready”, both the short term shovel ready and the longer term strategic direction.
163. The main task for us is to gather all the information from the public sector and getting that information from the key economic sector has not been easy. There is still work to be done with our key partners about what the key priorities are in the Park and how do we all play a part in delivering this.
164. The Convenor told Board Members the challenge for them is to make that point to various partners.

165. Hamish explained that projects which come under the heading Community Development would be included as part of the final plan. There is ongoing discussion with local authorities to narrow down the priorities where capital investment would make the difference.
166. A Board Member thought there should be mention of talking to local organisations as well as local authorities, to make people feel involved in the Plan.
167. A Board Member commented that as part of the Capital Investment Working Group they had had no input into this paper, the group had only met once and involving Board Members might have made getting the buy-in from Partners easier.
168. A Board Member thought that the headings in Paragraph 14 and the table should be consistent with the headings in the NPPP. The Board Member asked whether the action plan from the LDP been taken into consideration in this plan.
169. A Board Member welcomed this piece of work but it seemed to them that this was Community Planning. In view of that they were surprised there was a problem with engaging with the enterprise agencies.
170. A Board Member asked to what consultations there had been with Community Development Trusts in this? The Board Member felt contact should be made with the Trusts, they have projects which would be suitable for the list and the Trusts themselves have money which could be matched with capital expenditure.
171. Hamish confirmed that on the East side of the Park, Nick Mardall, Community Development Officer had fed into this process.
172. The Convenor commented that there are 3 questions for consideration in Paragraph's 7, 8 and 9 of the paper. The Convenor referred to the useful checklist in Paragraph 15 against which projects will be assessed. One other suggestion would be to consider whether the project had real pulling power as these are the projects we are going to be looking for when we have limited capital but where we are going to make a real difference.
173. The Convenor pointed out that some of the bigger more ambitious projects are easier to fund, however smaller projects are easier to deliver therefore we need to ensure we off-set delivery against ambitiousness.
174. Finally we need to make sure we get the right buy-in from partners, Board members need to think about strategies to deal with that.
175. A Board Member questioned how the ongoing sustainability of these projects would be managed.
176. Hamish confirmed that sustainability will be part of the criteria assessment and will be used to decide whether it is a priority or not.

177. The Convenor summarised the discussion that Board Members recognised there was still work to be done and it is still very much a work in progress however this draft was a good basis to progress.

AOCB

178. Alan Rankin presented to the Highland Council Area Committee and Nairn Ward Forum on the work of the CBP.
179. The new building at the Highland Folk Museum has now been completed.
180. There is a Native Woodland Discussion Group which has been running for 40 years. It is having its annual excursion from 21st – 25th May, 2014. This will be based in Kingussie and there is an open invitation to all Board members to come along. The theme will be looking at tangible projects from woods and forests.
181. There is a Airwick partnership with UK National Parks which starts in January, there will be TV ads screening in February. The Chief Executive's of the National parks will meet at the end of January to discuss the use of that money to go out and find further sponsorship to increase the amount of money coming into National Parks across the UK.
182. A Board Member asked for an update on the election of a new Board Member.
183. The Convenor confirmed they will be short listing for this position on Friday 20th December with interviews to be held in January.

Date of Next Meeting

184. Next formal Board meeting to be held on 21st March at the Macdonald Holyrood Hotel in Edinburgh.
185. Meeting ended at 14.00