
CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING held at The Panmure Arms Hotel, Edzell on Friday 15th June 2007 at 11.30am

PRESENT

Eric Baird
Stuart Black
Geva Blackett
Duncan Bryden
Nonie Coulthard
Angus Gordon
Lucy Grant
David Green
Marcus Humphrey
Bob Kinnaird
Bruce Luffman

Mary McCafferty
Eleanor Mackintosh
Alastair MacLennan
William McKenna
Sandy Park
Andrew Rafferty
David Selfridge
Richard Stroud
Susan Walker
Ross Watson
Bob Wilson

In Attendance:

David Cameron
Pete Crane
Murray Ferguson
Bob Grant

Jane Hope
Fiona Milligan
Chris Taylor
Francoise van Buuren

Apologies:

Sheena Slimon
Anne MacLean
Basil Dunlop

Minutes of Last Meeting – approval

1. Minute of the meeting held on the 20th April 2007 were approved with no changes.

Matters Arising

2. Matters arising not otherwise on the agenda:
 - a) At paragraph 26 members had been asked to let Jane Hope know if they wished to sit on a particular Advisory Forum. Members were reminded that expressions of interest were still needed.

Declarations of Interest

3. Bob Kinnaird noted two interests which did not require him to leave the meeting; namely in respect of paper 1 he was a Director of an organisation using the Cairngorms Brand, and in respect of paper 2 he noted that CairngormMountain Ltd (his employer) were mentioned in the annex to the paper. Alastair MacLennan noted that as a director of the Cairngorms Farmers Market he had an interest in paper 1, but not relevant to the decision at issue. Marcus Humphrey declared an interest in paper 4 as a Director of UDAT but noted this was only relevant in respect of paragraph (c) of the recommendations.

Park Brand Strategy Development (Paper 1)

4. Prior to the discussion of Paper 1, a number of presentations were taken to set the context for the discussion on marketing and branding of the Cairngorms National Park. A presentation was made by Alistair Gronbach, Head of Marketing at Visitscotland, on the Scottish tourism market and the role of Visitscotland. Chris Taylor also gave a short presentation on the role of the CNPA in marketing. The main points to emerge were:
 - a) Competition in the world tourism market is very fierce. Scotland is currently competing with two hundred or so other countries. The market is constantly trying to satisfy the wish of customers to find new destinations, new experiences etc.
 - b) The UK is essentially a short break market.
 - c) The Scottish market is dominated by visitors from within the UK. 86% of visits are from people within the UK and 71% of the spend. So the biggest market for Scotland is on its doorstep. Nevertheless half the people in the UK have never been to Scotland.
 - d) The Visitscotland mission is to increase the value of tourism throughout Scotland by 50% over the next ten years.
 - e) The key communication is focused on establishing the idea that Scotland is a good destination for a short break. The strategy focuses on the reasons for visiting Scotland such as walking, golf, etc.
 - f) Individual regions within Scotland have strengths and this is important in the marketing of the country as a whole. However, Visitscotland focuses on the reasons for coming, not the destinations per se.
 - g) Part of the CNPA's role was to help the marketing of the Park as a renowned international destination. While noting the mission of increasing tourism by 50% over ten years, the target audience for the CNPA had to recognise the social inclusion aspect and the educational aspect. The Brand wheel exercise which had

been undertaken at the start of the Park's existence concentrated on making a connection with people.

- h) Visitscotland.com charted places to visit in Scotland but it was noticeable that the National Parks got no mention. The CNPA was working closely with Visitscotland and Visitscotland.com to take advantage of the huge marketing opportunities offered by the creation of the Cairngorms National Park.
 - i) The CNPA had limited cash and its work depended heavily on building partnerships with the industry, destination management organisations, and Visitscotland to help deliver the proposition in the Brand wheel of inspiring and connecting with people. The CNPA recognised that the Park could be fitted within the Visitscotland portfolio of activities in many different ways. The National Park got varied and multiple coverage in this way, more than it would if it was simply marketed as a single destination.
 - j) It was essential that the National Parks featured on the Visitscotland.com website; Visitscotland were happy to feed this point back.
 - k) It was still very early in the life of the Scottish National Parks, and customer perceptions of National Parks were still not known. It was pointed out that precisely because National Parks were new to Scotland, the awareness within Scotland might be relatively low, and a bigger response might be expected in England where National Parks had been in existence for fifty years.
 - l) Visitscotland marketed Scotland; and it marketed through portfolios not destinations. The CNPA's role was to market the destination within these portfolios, this provided opportunities, and was not necessarily a problem.
 - m) The Visitscotland research on market segmentation might usefully recognise the category of second home and timeshare owners who all spent significant income within Scotland.
 - n) There was some discussion as to whether the segmentation used by Visitscotland was appropriate and relevant to the National Park. It was pointed out that the CNPA's own visitor profile showed a good fit between those coming to Scotland and those coming to the National Park.
 - o) There was some indication from research that the single biggest reason for not returning to Scotland was midges; however; this did not emerge in the research by Visitscotland which identified the weather as the single biggest drawback.
 - p) The CNPA valued the partnership working with Visitscotland, especially on sustainable tourism which was extremely important to the Park.
5. Fiona Milligan introduced Paper 1 explaining that the paper was in two parts: the first followed up the February Board meeting discussion on Brand Development and updated the Board on progress of further work taken forward on developing the Brand; the second part sought the Board's agreement to terms of reference and membership of the Brand Management Group.
6. In respect of the first part of the paper, Fiona Milligan reminded the Board that the Brand Management Group had been approached a little while ago by destination management organisations and the Cairngorms Farmers Market to see if they could include the identity of the Park within their own identities. This reflected the wish of those organisations to align themselves with the values associated with the Park Brand,

and also recognising that they had a major part to play in delivering the National Park Plan. That work had been taken forward by the Brand Management Group and discussed with the Board at their February Board meeting. The current paper was not seeking a decision but updating the Board on further progress. The views of Navyblue (the company which originally developed the Park Brand) had been sought on the various risks and opportunities of the work the Brand Management Group were doing in developing a “family” of brands. Two presentations were then given, one by Navyblue, and one by Sally Dowden as the Chair of the Brand Management Group, both offering views on the development of the Brand.

7. The presentation by Navyblue made the following points:
 - a) The Cairngorms National Park Brand had three elements: the osprey, the word Cairngorms, and the word National Park. Those three elements comprised the Brand identity, and represented the values of the National Park.
 - b) Three years was not a long time to establish a Brand identity.
 - c) With a successful Brand, audiences have a deep and emotional connection with the Brand.
 - d) There were two proven routes used, well understood by customer organisations, for developing brands:
 - i. Sub-branding. In this approach there is a master brand under which sit a number of sub brands which include an extra word for a particular related product. (For example Cairngorms National Park Trails, Cairngorms National Park sausages etc.) There is a product or service directly related to the parent brand, and the parent brand is retained in its original form.
 - ii. Co-branding. In this approach two organisations have a common goal and the two brands support each other.
 - e) The approach being developed through the Brand Management Group was neither sub-branding or co-branding but represented a third approach. In the three “family” brands already approved, the typeface and the position of the words had changed from the original Park Brand. Navyblue’s view was that this approach would not work and certainly was not proven. They recognised that pioneering work could happen and they suggested that in trying something new the Park Authority would be well advised to do some further work to clarify the risks and benefits.
 - f) Their view currently was that the risk of the family approach was the potential dilution and fragmentation of the Brand with the concurrent loss of the linkage in people’s minds with the National Park. Association in people’s minds might be with the osprey rather than with the National Park. There could be short term advantage but at the expense of limiting future growth opportunities. The opportunities of the family approach were recognised as being the ability to encourage buy-in and working in partnership with other stakeholders. It was reassuring that a relatively large number of people were keen to use the Brand. There was also potentially greater Brand exposure (of the osprey, and it was questionable whether this included the National Park). It was also a way of maximising the very limited budget available.

- g) There were risks with drawing back from the existing family approach, most noticeably the fragmentation and break down of relationships. And there was potentially less Brand visibility and exposure if other businesses were reluctant to use the Brand as a free standing 'kite mark', as opposed to incorporating it into their own identity.
 - h) The opportunities of continuing with the original Cairngorms National Park Brand in non-modified form were establishing absolute clarity and understanding with the audience; the ability to build long term brand equity; the building of partnerships based on mutual benefit (recognising that what mattered in the end was the long term viability of the Brand); creating leverage with the Cairngorms National Park name; protection and ownership of Brand.
8. In summary, Navyblue's view was that there are some proven ways of developing Brands, and if the CNPA wished to develop alternatives to this it would be advisable to undertake some further research.
9. Sally Dowden made a presentation on behalf of the Brand Management Group, and made the following points:
- a) The "family" of Brands had emerged from the approach by organisations within the National Park wanting to align themselves very closely with the Cairngorms Brand and all it stood for. They were therefore in effect incorporating elements of the Brand into their own logos, thereby raising the exposure in effect to the Cairngorms Brand. Turning down this approach would result in those organisations developing their own logo and identity as quite separate from the Cairngorms National Park Brand and therefore losing that close association.
 - b) The Cairngorms National Park appeared to be the only National Park that was separating out the identity of the Park from the identity of the National Park Authority. That separation allowed all the stake-holders in the Park to associate very closely with the values of the National Park.
 - c) There were many good examples in practice of Brand and logo overload. Where logos were used as kite marks to show some form of accreditation, it was not unusual to see large numbers of such logos on websites and letterheads and in these cases the ability of any one logo to stand out was very limited. So if the Cairngorms Brand were to only be used in this way its impact would be diluted.
 - d) The Cairngorms National Park Brand as originally devised comprised three elements and Navyblue's advice was that those three elements should be kept together. However, in practice some elements of the Brand had already been detached and used on their own, for example the bird had been used on small entry point markers, and on some publications.
 - e) The Brand Management Group had not taken its decisions lightly, and had thought long and hard. Its motivation had been to deliver the ethos of working in partnership, and enabling all the stakeholders in the Park to demonstrate their acknowledgement of the Park's Brand values; and also the need to maximise the exposure of the Brand given a limited budget compared with the advertising budget of many multinational corporations. And in the final analysis, the Park Brand was not equivalent in marketing terms to a consumer product such as a packet of soap powder.

10. Fiona Milligan summed up by suggesting that the presentations revealed the differing views on the development of the Park Brand. Navyblue's view was in a draft report which was to be finalised and considered by the Brand Management Group. Nevertheless, what appeared to be emerging was that some further work might be required to resolve the difference of view and clarify if the development of the Brand was going down the right route. She suggested that a final report could come back to the October Board meeting for a decision.
11. In a very brief discussion the following points were made:
 - a) Any further research could not simply be a purist view of Branding but must take account of the particular circumstances of what the CNPA was trying to do with a Brand for the Park.
 - b) The Board was not at this meeting being asked for a decision on expenditure for a further research project.
 - c) Any further work to gather evidence needed to be worthwhile bearing in mind that at this early life in the Brand's existence consumer awareness was bound to be equivocal. It was confirmed that any further work would focus on the question of whether or not there really was confusion with the development of the family of Brands, and it would not be on the same scale as the original work undertaken to develop the Brand.
 - d) It was essential to do research on the right thing. The Brand was all about what the Cairngorms National Park stood for; the Brand values were the things that people needed to know about, but it was probably too early for consumers to understand this.
12. The Convener summed up as follows:
 - a) There were two clear positions; on the one hand the advice that developing the family of Brands risked losing the essential message; and on the other hand if we did not work with other stakeholders in developing the Brand in ways they would use, we risked losing Brand exposure and the potential to raise awareness widely.
 - b) No decision on the development of the Brand was being sought through this particular paper and the Board was currently just invited to note progress.
 - c) The next step was for the Brand Management Group to consider the final report and decide whether or not to do further work (and what form this might take).
 - d) An informal Board discussion should follow to allow a full consideration of all the issues.
 - e) It was then for the Board to decide as soon as possible on further development of the Brand, taking account of advice from the BMG and any further work done.
 - f) Further development of the Brand (in the sense of approving further use of derivatives of the family) should await the decision of the Board at (e), as set out at Paragraph 23 of the paper.
13. Turning to the second element of the paper, the Board were asked to agree the terms of reference for the Brand Management Group as set out in Appendix 1. In discussion a number of points were made:

- a) The terms of reference at Paragraph 31 should include a fourth bullet point making clear that the remit of the Brand Management Group should be to make recommendations to the Board on strategy [post meeting clarification: the Board meeting of the 11th February 2005 agreed that the Brand Management Committee should “take decisions about how the Brand should be implemented and used”.]
- b) Paragraphs 1 and 2 in Appendix 1 were inconsistent in suggesting the BMG implemented actions, but also determined those actions. It was suggested that this was a problem with semantics and that the intention was quite clear that the Board set the strategy and the BMG would then implement that strategy.
- c) The recommendation was that the number of Board Members on the BMG should increase to five. Members were invited to indicate to the Convener or the Chief Executive if they were interested on sitting on the BMG; the point was made forcibly that Members should be prepared to attend meetings consistently. Attendance in the past had been patchy.

14. Subject to clarification of these points the terms of reference for the Brand Management Group were agreed.

15. **The Board agreed the recommendations of the paper as follows:**

- a) **Noted progress in the development of a Management Strategy for the “family” of Brands;**
- b) **Agreed the terms of reference for the Brand Management Group subject to the following;**
 - i. **Additional bullet point to be added to paragraph 31, and wording of Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Appendix 1 to the paper to be changed to the effect that the role of the Board was to set strategy and role of the BMG to implement that**

16. **Action:**

- a) **Brand Management Group to meet shortly to consider the final report from Navyblue, and consider what further work (if any) was needed.**
- b) **An informal Board discussion to take place to ensure the Board was aware of all the issues.**
- c) **Further paper to be brought to the Board as soon as possible (October at the latest) for a decision on how to move forward from the current position with the Cairngorms National Park Brand.**

Tackling Climate Change/Promoting Sustainable Living and Working in the Cairngorms National Park (Paper 2)

17. Jane Hope introduced the paper which took forward the outcome of recent informal discussions by the Board to decide what the CNPA’s role should be in respect of climate change issues. It therefore set out a proposed role for the CNPA at paragraph 31 of the paper and as a corollary to this, sought agreement from the Board that additional staff resources should be allocated to this work.

18. The role proposed for the CNPA had 4 elements:

- a) Ensuring that the guiding principle of climate change is embedded in the work of the National Park delivery team;
- b) Communicating the message of climate change, its importance to the Cairngorms National Park and what we (collectively as partners) are doing; what individuals can do; the progress we are making;
- c) Offering financial support to effective projects through a “sustainability” fund;
- d) Making sure that our own activities as an organisation are sustainable.

19. The paper proposed allocation of an additional 1.5 posts to take this work forward.

20. In discussion the following points were made:

- a) Climate change had rapidly become politically high profile, as set out at paragraph 28, and it was appropriate for the CNPA to devote resources to this work as the paper proposed. The question was asked as to whether additional Grant-in-Aid would be available from government to support this work; it was noted that the National Parks in England and Wales received an additional £200,000 or so specifically to support projects on sustainability.
- b) The point was made that in allocating additional resources to the work on climate change, additional resources could be brought in with specific expertise, or alternatively the additional resources could simply release the expertise that was available internally. While noting that an additional 1.5 full time equivalents (FTEs) was required, it was also noted that how precisely that resource was allocated should be a matter for the Management Team.
- c) Given the wide range of actions by different organisations in respect of climate change, an important role for the CNPA would be to demonstrate the impact of those activities. Work associated with the National Park Plan on developing performance indicators was therefore important, as was the task of then providing feedback to show people what progress was being made. The use of carbon footprint data had been proposed as a possible monitoring tool; this might be rather too coarse an indicator and something finer might well be needed. It was noted that the monitoring work, the delivery of the National Park Plan, and the provision of feedback were all tasks that fell within the Strategy and Communications Group, enabling a coordinated approach.
- d) The work on communication and feedback needed to be precisely targeted at particular groups, for example young people, but there may be others in addition. Trying to communicate with everyone with no particular focus was liable to lead to dissipation of effort.
- e) The notion of a dedicated fund was flagged up at paragraph 12 of the paper. The equivalent funding provided to the National Park Authorities in England and Wales had been evaluated recently and it was interesting that the most effective projects were found to be the larger ones which left a distinct legacy.
- f) Of the 1.5 new posts, the new post in communications was clear in its role. The suggestion was made that the 0.5 FTE should be used not as an internal post but as a consultant to provide specialist advice in working up the sorts of projects indicated at paragraph 12. The point was also made that it was not the advice that was in short supply, but the need for pairs of hands to actually make things

- happen. On the other hand, the 0.5 FTE could be used to provide a temporary post to get some work underway, for example on Sustainable Design,
- g) The approach for the CNPA as set out in the paper was not questioned but there was a question as to whether 1.5 new posts were required to deliver this. As the paper recognised, there were many other organisations already doing work on climate change. The Park Authority's role was indeed to ensure that this work was reflected and embedded in the National Park Plan. The communications function within the CNPA already had a relatively high resource allocation, and arguably functions such as the planning system and the Local Plan provided plenty of opportunities to get messages across. Additional staff inevitably meant that those funds were then not available for project work. The counter argument was that in order to make things happen, one needed staff.
 - h) The essential point to focus on was that any work undertaken needed to "make a difference".
 - i) The last paragraph in the Annex was not seeking the CNPA's agreement to put funding into a Centre for the Mountain Environment; this was simply used to illustrate the way in which a visitor attraction could be used to get messages across to the public about climate change. Any development of this idea would need to come back to the Board.
 - j) The communication function referred to in the paper was all about enhancing the value of the activities already being undertaken by other partners in the National Park and as such was highly appropriate for the CNPA.
 - k) It was essential that the CNPA started by making sure its own activities as an organisation were sustainable.
 - l) The idea of a one-stop-shop for advice was welcomed.
 - m) In respect of the role for the CNPA set out at paragraph 31, it was suggested that the first of these which referred to ensuring that the guiding principle of climate change was embedded in the work of the National Park delivery teams should be extended into the work of the Planning Committee. The Local Plan and the Sustainable Design Guide were very powerful tools in this respect.
 - n) Further thought needed to be given to how the Board resources could be brigaded better to help deliver the CNPA's role on climate change as set out in the paper.
 - o) There was clearly a dilemma in agreeing to additional resources but given the Board's clear statement previously about the importance of climate change to the Cairngorms National Park and the need for the CNPA to play its part, it had to be prepared to allocate adequate resources to "make a difference". The current staffing complement was at 50 FTEs in line with what had been agreed three years previously for the current Corporate Plan. There needed to be a clear justification for increasing staff numbers above this; on the other hand the Board was clearly of the view that climate change represented an important piece of work. There was some head room currently, give the ebb and flow of staff on secondment and career breaks etc. But with the discussion on the new corporate plan due shortly, that would be the opportunity for the Board to make the difficult judgements on what the priorities were for CNPA resources. If staff numbers were to be kept at approximately the current levels, then some difficult

decisions would need to be made about those strands of work that might need to be de-prioritised.

- p) The proposed work on climate change was essential. While paragraph 5 suggested that the CNPA should not claim to be leading work in this field, given the activities by so many other organisations, it was nevertheless inherent in the CNPA's role with the National Park Plan that there was an element of leadership and coordination, and an ability to influence partners.

21. The Convener summed up the discussion with the following points:

- a) There was general agreement to the paper, including the role for the CNPA and the need to allocate additional resources. The organisation could only deliver if it had the staff to do so.
- b) While agreeing the additional resources of 1.5 new posts, there was some flexibility within that which would be for Management Team to deploy.
- c) This was a very visible policy area, and it was vital that the CNPA took its role in this seriously.

22. While there was general agreement to allocating additional resources to this work one Member recorded the fact that they did not agree the second recommendation of the paper referring to the allocation of additional resources of 1.5 new posts.

23. The Board agreed the recommendations of the paper as follows:

- a) **The role of the CNPA as set out at paragraph 31 namely. Our role in respect of climate change should comprise the following 4 elements:**
 - i) **ensuring that the guiding principle of climate change is embedded in the work of the National Park Delivery Teams;**
 - ii) **communicating the message of climate change – its importance to the CNP, what we (collectively) are doing; what individuals can do; progress we (all partners in the Park) are making;**
 - iii) **offering financial support to effective projects through a “sustainability” fund; and**
 - iv) **making sure that our own activities as an organisation are sustainable**
- b) **Agreed additional staff resources should be allocated – the equivalent of 1.5 new posts in the area of Communications and Corporate Services.**

Approval to Deposit Local Plan (Paper 3)

24. Don McKee introduced the paper which sought the Board's formal approval to deposit the Cairngorms Local Plan in line with the resolution of the Planning Committee. He explained by way of background that a number of local sessions were planned to enable communities to understand the process and a brief guide was also being developed to help people understand the Local Plan.

25. Meetings would be held during the consultation period with interested parties. After the consultation period, a report would be compiled as modifications to the draft Plan for the Board to consider.

26. **The Board agreed the recommendation of the paper as follows:**

- a) **The Board ratified the decision of the Planning Committee (4th June 2007) and formally approved the Local Plan for deposit and the associated work and publicity associated with depositing the Plan.**

Establishment of a Park-wide Trust and Approval of Expenditure on Glenmore Off-Road Route (Paper 4)

27. Murray Ferguson introduced the paper which dealt with two issues; firstly approval of expenditure on the Glenmore Off-road route and secondly the establishment of a Park-wide Trust. In respect of the Glenmore Off-road route the Board agreed that the decision on funding should be delegated to the Finance Committee leaving the other Members of the Board free to make a decision on the planning application when this came before the Planning Committee.

28. In respect of the Park-wide Trust, the paper summarised the work that had been undertaken to carry forward actions to establish the Park-wide Trust, and it made recommendations to facilitate its establishment. At its previous meeting the Board had approved establishing a Park-wide Trust on condition that there was sufficient partnership support and that a business case was submitted for approval. Since then it had been established that there was a good degree of partnership support for the Trust and the paper presented a draft Framework document along with the business case.

29. In discussion the following points were made:

- a) Annex 1 set out a draft Framework Document for the establishment of the Park-wide Trust. Paragraph 3 of that Annex set out the objective of the Trust. It was noted that this in effect only made reference to the first of the four aims of the National Park and it was suggested that for completeness this should refer to all four aims. However, it was also noted that one of the tests of the charity regulator would be that the proposed Trust was separate and independent from any other organisation with separate objectives and a definite and specific purpose. Therefore the objectives of the Trust, while they might well relate to those of the National Park (bearing in mind that the aims of the Park were not the same as the statutory purpose of the Park Authority) they would need to be distinct.
- b) It was suggested that the objective of the Trust as set at paragraph 3 should also specify best practice, and include a reference to openness and transparency in business dealings and administration.
- c) It was noted that the proposed Trust might well seek its own branding. In other National Parks where a similar trust had been established, the Trust was branded in a very different way from the National Park leading to confusion. It was suggested that the current work on the Cairngorms National Park Brand might usefully shed some light on this point.
- d) The Board of Directors for UDAT was very small and tightly focused, with only 4 Directors. Paragraph 21 of the draft Framework recognised that the overall size of the Board needed to be such as to ensure it remained effective and efficient

and the notion of an optimum number may be more relevant than a maximum number. The draft Framework did not set a maximum simply because of the recognition of the need for flexibility. The counter point was also made that there was a view that the very small number of Directors of UDAT led to it being perceived as lacking inclusivity.

- e) The Trust clearly needed to be independent of the Park Authority or any other funding partners. As a point of clarification, it was noted that paragraph 27 of the draft Framework was referring to the Chair of the Board of Trustees, not the Chair of the CNPA Board.
- f) UDAT had generally welcomed the paper but now needed to consider due diligence in disposing of its assets etc.
- g) The liability of the Trustees was expected to be Limited by Guarantee in the usual way to a nominal amount. However, following concerns arising from other examples referred to (which may have related to liabilities incurred as a result of repayment of European funds) this would be investigated further.
- h) There were other organisations carrying out similar operations to those proposed for the Park-wide Trust. The best and most obvious fit was with UDAT, but there were other Trusts in existence on a smaller scale. There was no question of the Park-wide Trust “taking over” these other organisations; it required the active cooperation of both sets of directors. This was not ruled out for the future but it was stressed this could only happen by agreement.
- i) The meeting with partners referred to at paragraphs 2 and 3 of the main paper revealed good support from other partner organisations. Highland Council were unfortunately not present, but subsequent discussions suggested support at officer level, and this was being followed up. It was difficult to know how much funding partners would be prepared to offer in the absence of specific proposals. But the approach was seen as being the correct one, and given the levels of support in principle, the detail of specific commitments on funding would have to follow in due course.

30. The Board agreed the recommendations of the paper as follows:

- a) Noted the degree of partnership support for the establishment of a Park-wide Trust, as described in paragraphs 2 to 5;**
- b) Approved the establishment of a Park-wide Trust, as described in the Draft Framework document at Annex 1 and Business Case at Annex 2, subject to final confirmation and consideration of any further detailed matters by the Finance Committee;**
- c) Approved that, in establishing the Trust, officers pursue an approach that is based, as far as possible, on enabling a transition from the Upper Deeside Access Trust subject to confirmation by the Finance Committee.**

Angus Glens Ranger Base (Paper 5)

31. Pete Crane introduced the paper. The Board concluded that any decision on grant support for the development of the facility should be made by the Finance Committee and that those Members should then be excluded from the discussion by the Planning Committee of the planning application. It was noted in passing that the principle of

having a ranger base in the Angus Glens had been considered in a previous financial year and had been agreed. The only reason the issue was returning to the Board was because a short-fall in EU funding had meant that the project had had to be re-evaluated, down-sized and re-costed. It was noted that a number of other factors had changed and would need to be considered by the Finance Committee, namely the preparation of the Outdoor Access Strategy; the increase/importance of Climate Change; the proposal for a Park Wide Trust; the policy on social inclusion.

Election of Deputy Convener (Paper 6)

32. Jane Hope introduced the paper which sought the Board's agreement to the timetable for election of the Deputy Convener.

33. **The Board agreed the recommendations of the paper as follows:**

- a) **The Board agreed to defer the election of Deputy Convener to the Board meeting on the 5th October 2007, and also agreed that Standing Orders should be changed to allow for this.**

Action

34. **A further paper for agreement to be brought to the CNPA Board in August with proposed changes to Standing Orders**

Vocational Training Support for Young People (Paper 7)

35. This paper was for information and updated the Board on the CNPA's Vocational Training Support Project to date and looked forward to further actions with partners.

36. **The Board noted the contents of the Paper.**

Operational Plan 2006/07, Quarter 4 (Paper 8)

37. The paper was for information and presented a final update on progress on the 2006/07 Operational Plan over the course of the year. The contents of the paper would appear in the Annual Report and Accounts for 2006/07 a draft of which would be circulated to Members shortly.

38. **The Board noted the contents of the Paper.**

Action

39. **Draft Annual Report and Accounts to be circulated to Members in July**

Developing Links with Community Planning (Paper 9)

40. This paper was for information and updated the Board on work undertaken to link Park Plan activity with community planning arrangements.

41. The Board noted the contents of the Paper.

Landscape Partnership Project (Paper 10)

42. This paper was for information and updated the Board on the outcome of the CNPA's "expression of interest" application to the Heritage Lottery Fund as part of the agreed Stage 1 Application process for the Landscape Partnership Project. The paper noted that the Heritage Lottery Fund had made a number of comments, namely: that the area chosen for the CNPA bid was too large, and that the Landscape Partnership Project process was being streamlined and a new process would be in place towards the end of the year. There would be a report back to the Board in the autumn on a proposed way forward.

43. In discussion a number of points were made:

- a) Paragraph 11 explained that the current views of HLF would require the CNPA to look for a project which covered only part of the Park; it also referred to the difficulty of doing this within the Park in a way that ensured "various parameters were fairly applied". The point was made that this was not an issue of being equitable, and it would be perfectly possible to find smaller projects in specific parts of the Park. It was noted that the Angus Glens had potential for an interesting project; equally the Braes of Glenlivet to Strathdon was also a potential project area. In reply it was explained that the paper was simply updating the Board on where things currently stood. There was the potential for flexibility, and we would continue to monitor changes to the HLF Funding Regime and the EU Funding Programmes and then take a view on the best approach. We would continue to look for the possibility of a Park-wide bid, but if this was not possible, then work would inevitably focus on specific areas within the Park.

AOCB

44. None

Date of Next Meeting

45. 10th August 2007 in the Village Hall, Laggan.