
CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

MINUTES OF THE BOARD MEETING held at the Visitor Centre, Glenlivet Distillery on Friday 19th March 2010 at 11.30am

PRESENT

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

In Attendance:

David Cameron	Gavin Miles
Murray Ferguson	Fran Pothecary
Bob Grant	Claire Ross
Jane Hope	Hamish Trench

Apologies:

Jaci Douglas

Welcome and Introduction

1. David Green welcomed everyone to the meeting and commended Glenlivet Distillery on the provision of an excellent meeting venue. He extended a particular welcome to Fran Pothecary who had returned to the organisation after a six month break.

Minutes of Last Meeting – approval

2. The minutes of the previous meeting (22nd January 2010) were approved with no changes.

Matters Arising

3. Two actions were reported following up on the previous meeting:

- a) Paragraph 10a: an outline proposal on the future of the training project had been taken to the Finance Committee on the 19th February and an approval in principle given to enable officers to work with partners to put together a funding package. A full proposal would be brought back to the Board later in the year.
- b) Paragraph 16: the Convener had led a small group of Members in a discussion to help officers identify further options for redeploying transport budgets from the Heather Hopper to other projects. There was nothing further to report at this stage.

Declarations of Interest

4. A number of declarations were made of interest which were all considered to be indirect. Paper 1 – Alastair MacLennan and Lucy Grant were both members of the Chamber of Commerce; Paper 2 – Marcus Humphrey and Dave Fallows were both Directors of COAT; Paper 4 – Geva Blackett was married to the Factor of Invercauld Estate.

Cairngorms Business Partnership – Progress Update (Paper 1)

5. Hamish Trench introduced the paper which took stock of progress to date with the Cairngorms Business Partnership, following previous discussions by the Board over the last two years. The Cairngorms Business Partnership (CBP) was due to be formally launched on the 20th April 2010; however, as a loose grouping of existing organisations it had already been delivering projects with funding from the CNPA and other partners over the last year. The notion of bringing businesses together into one pan-Park organisation was a straightforward aspiration which had been widely agreed; the implementation had proved to be less straightforward and had involved a complex process of organisational change. The CNPA had supported the principle as there were clear long term benefits for the Park. It had been equally clear that it was for the business community to work out how to best deliver a single organisation. A number of lessons had emerged over the last year or so, mainly that “one size fits all” was clearly not emerging easily as a solution and in practice it was much more complex to bring together a wide range of existing arrangements; and success in getting the single organisation up and running would rely on continuing collaboration between the public sector, led by the CNPA, and other organisations.
6. Essentially it was work in progress. The launch in April would formally bring together in the first instance the Chamber of Commerce and the ACDMO whose assets and staff would be merged into the CBP. The RDCDMO had decided not to be part of the CBP but remained interested in working on projects. In practice the RDCDMO looked towards Aberdeen City as much as it did towards the National Park and was not in the same position as the ACDMO which was wholly contained within the National Park. Other organisations remained interested and tailored solutions were being looked at carefully for Glenlivet and the Cairngorms, the Ballater Business Association, Cairngorms Hostels, and others who were apparently keen to join.
7. The role of the CNPA would continue to be to work alongside businesses and help support the CBP by recognising and pooling respective and complementary strengths.

The creation of the CBP remained work in progress, and part of the role of the CNPA was to continue to ensure the organisation became genuinely pan-Park. It was important to recognise that only once the CBP was up and running would the full potential be clear to others and for further funding and membership to be forthcoming. The Board were asked to note the progress with the CBP, and to agree the basis for the CNPA's future support for and engagement with the CBP, the principles of which were set out at paragraphs 33-35.

8. In discussion the following points were made:
 - a) It was important to recognise that the evolution of the CBP was taking place against a constantly changing and evolving situation.
 - b) Some concern was expressed that, as described, this was not genuinely a Park-wide collaboration; one player (RDCDMO) had significant concerns. The evolution of the CBP had moved forward at a pace that suited some but not others and the suggestion was made that these developments had to move at the pace of the slowest if there was to be genuine collaboration. The counter view was expressed, namely that the Chamber of Commerce was already Park-wide and the CBP therefore had a Park-wide element to it. Moving at the pace of the slowest brought difficulties and begged the question how long one should wait for the slowest to catch up. The public sector was constantly criticised for moving too slowly, and it was important to make progress against a background of a continually changing landscape with other DMOs emerging all the time.
 - c) The concern was expressed there would now be competition between the CBP and the DMO on Deeside for recruitment of businesses. The counter view was that competition already existed and businesses were continually approached by, for example, those trying to sell web space and other business services. Indeed there already existed a number of different local business associations. It was quite reasonable for businesses in Ballater to be covered by two groupings but each with a different focus for activity, and it was entirely reasonable that each business would need to make its own decision about which groupings to join and which services to buy.
 - d) There was some discussion about the handling arrangements set out at Paragraph 21. The point was made that Scottish Enterprise funding was only made available for part of the Park; it was never provided on the basis of being pan-Park and was only therefore awarded to the RDCDMO. It was noted that while this was true, the funding from all the different public sector bodies had been provided to deliver particular sets of outcomes, and this was done by providing the funding to particular existing organisation. The original intention was that if those organisations all became part of delivering pan-Park then to all intents and purposes those individual streams of funding from public sector bodies were all part of contributing to that pan-Park delivery. The comment was made that this separation of the funding streams explained why the RDCDMO had not joined, i.e. it was logical for them to follow the funding which was coming from Scottish Enterprise and which was available now. The counter view was expressed, namely that the RDCDMO concerns were not just about funding, and were more fundamental.
 - e) Clarification was sought concerning the issue of the website. The web portal was envisaged as a "way in" to information about the Cairngorms National Park, and would provide access to a wide range of information. That concept still existed and the CNPA were leading on delivering that. A key element of that

information was the website for visitors and that was what the CBP were leading on and developing. It remained the case that the RDCDMO website should have equity of access to the Park web portal.]

- f) The long term viability of the CBP was a crucial factor. It was important there should be a business plan, and the public sector should be confident that the organisation was viable in the long term if it was to invest public money. Officers confirmed that the business plan did exist and that this was predicated on the goal of the CBP being self sufficient in that membership fees would cover their costs and they would be self sustaining. There would always be scope for the CBP to deliver work on the National Park Plan, and that was what the CNPA had provided funding for (and other partners); they were not funding the CBP to simply exist.
- g) Two Members questioned whether the model was wrong. Others took a different view and argued that the aspiration was still the right one and that we should be celebrating successes achieved to date while acknowledging there was still a way to go. Working with the private sector to deliver the National Park Plan clearly involved risks but the CNPA had to be innovative. It had been recognised nationally that DMOs were a good way forward and the CNPA was leading the way on this by encouraging the development of a single DMO based on the assets of the National Park. For the private sector and the CNPA to be showing leadership side by side was the right way forward.
- h) It was recognised that there was likely to be a lot of interest from businesses in joining CBP, and indeed a number may join CBP plus another grouping. CBP would slowly evolve and it was unreasonable to expect to achieve the ultimate goal in a single step.
- i) It was noted on page 10 of the paper under Raising Awareness and Understanding of the Park there was an aspiration for the CBP to help deliver the achievement of “more people across Scotland being aware of the National Park”. It was suggested that we should not set our sights too low and that we should not just be looking Scotland-wide, but world-wide.
- j) It was very much part of the CNPA’s role to promote a single organisation and unified approach.
- k) It was noted that in addition to funding individual projects, the CNPA was loaning a member of staff. It was recognised that the loan of a member of staff was a highly effective way of supporting the organisation, reinforcing the sense of partnership, and helping to influence the work of the CBP. In particular it was noted that one of the skills developed within the CNPA over the last seven years was working with partners and taking people along with projects as they developed. That was seen as being an important role the CNPA would assist with through the loan of a member of staff.
- l) There was some concern expressed about the CBP being perceived as Aviemore centric. This was refuted by others who pointed to the fact that it took a considerable time for the Chamber of Commerce to move from being Aviemore based, to being Badenoch and Strathspey focused, to becoming pan-Park. The development of the CBP across the whole Park was the next logical step and it was clear businesses in other parts of the Park were interested.
- m) On financing it was noted that the £70,000 referred to in the paper was for the current year for delivery of six priorities as set out in Annex 2. The Finance Committee had considered a progress report on this earlier in the year and were content. The £40,000 referred to was for the next year (2010/11) and the

paper was not seeking formal approval to this; this would be brought to Finance Committee in due course in the normal way.

- n) The point was made that the CBP needed to cover all businesses not just those in tourism.
 - o) The point was made that if benefits were given away free without a need for businesses to buy them, then the organisation providing those benefits would not get the “buy-in” and would therefore not be sustainable.
 - p) It was important to attach criteria to future funding and staffing support as a way of addressing some of the legitimate concerns about ensuring good use of public money.
9. The Convener summed up noting that the paper was a report on a work in progress. While progress had not been quite as anticipated and in practice had proved more difficulty, the aspiration remained correct and one that the CNPA should continue to support. There would be members in other organisations such as the RDCDMO for whom there were clear benefits in being part of projects such as the business barometer etc. which were generating important information for business across the National Park. It was quite right that those members were able to choose to belong to the CBP or not, regardless of whether they were also part of the RDCDMO. The real challenge was to get individual businesses into the CBP rather than particular and pre-existing groupings. The presentation from the CBP to the Finance Committee in February had been reasonably reassuring; while it was obviously not a risk free venture it was nevertheless still going in the right direction. Given the difficulties which had been flagged up in terms of managing some relationships across the Park, the Convener suggested there should be a fixed term working group involving a small number of Members with a particular interest: David Green, Peter Argyle, Fiona Murdoch, Dave Fallows, Eleanor Mackintosh (as Chair of the Finance Committee) Bob Kinnaird. (Alastair MacLennan was invited to attend if he wished to given the point about representation of non tourism businesses). The Convener confirmed this was not a decision making group; it was merely there to help with building and maintaining working relationships. He also noted that the tourism landscape was changing very rapidly with potential DMOs emerging all around the National Park. He had had a meeting with the Tourism Champion with ACSEF as well as with the RDCDMO.
10. **The Board agreed the recommendations of the paper as follows:**
- a) **Noted the progress towards the launch of the Cairngorms Business Partnership;**
 - b) **Agreed the basis for the CNPA’s future support for and engagement with the Cairngorms Business Partnership, the principles of which were set out at Paragraphs 33-35. Included in these principles should be that the CBP should encompass a wide range of businesses and not just those concerned with tourism.**
 - c) **Agreed the formation of a short term working group comprising David Green, Peter Argyle, Fiona Murdoch, Dave Fallows, Eleanor Mackintosh, Bob Kinnaird (and Alastair MacLennan if available).**

11. Action:

- a) **Hamish Trench to draw up remit of short term working group and arrange first meeting.**

Core Paths Planning (Paper 2)

12. Bob Grant introduced the paper which sought the Board's formal adoption of the Core Paths Plan and highlighted the next steps towards implementation and monitoring. The Minister for the Environment had approved the Cairngorms Core Paths Plan and has now formally directed the CNPA to adopt this. Bob noted that thanks were due to the Local Outdoor Access Forum (LOAF) who had provided sound advice throughout the process. The implementation of the Plan would now continue over the coming years through discussions with the Cairngorms Outdoor Access Trust in refining the programme of work that would result in a high quality network of paths. The means by which improvements to the Core Paths Network would come about were outlined at Paragraph 11 of the paper. The Board would continue to receive updates on progress through the regular reports to the Board on delivery of the National Park Plan. The methodology for monitoring progress was set out at paragraphs 13 and 14 of the paper.
13. The paper also described how the CNPA was working with communities to update and improve the wide range of community path leaflets. The CNPA had been leading on design guidance which followed national best practice on presentation of text, images and maps. It aimed to produce a consistent template that would allow the development of a recognisable family of branded Cairngorms Community Path leaflets allowing each community to promote its identity within the National Park. The draft guidance had been piloted and advice had been taken from the LOAF.
14. In discussion the following points were made:
 - a) Staff were to be congratulated for a huge piece of work which had been very thorough.
 - b) The work on community leaflets has been an excellent example of the CNPA acting in its enabling role. The pilot with Explore Abernethy had shown that the CNPA worked well with communities and on a genuinely collaborative basis with the community being very much part of the decision making.
 - c) There was no prescribed plan for rolling out path leaflets to all the communities in the National Park, and the process relied on communities approaching the CNPA, often when the current print run of leaflets ran out. The approach was proving a good opportunity to promote the Cairngorms National Park brand and to allow communities to position themselves within the National Park.
 - d) Paragraph 23 set out the role of the project in delivering a Park for All. The staff were commended for all the effort put into ensuring that signage and leaflets were genuinely accessible to all.
 - e) The adoption of the Core Paths Plan was a considerable achievement not least because people were still engaged even though they did not necessarily secure their own wishes. Over time the implementation of the Core Paths Plan would therefore be a huge asset for visitors and communities.
 - f) There was some discussion about the connections between the Cairngorms Core Paths Plan and those outside the National Park. The CNPA had made it known on a previous occasion to the Scottish Government that there would be benefits of early scrutiny by Ministers to ensure that the 34 Core Paths Plans throughout Scotland were linked with each other. Unfortunately there was no scrutiny process to ensure this. Scottish Government guidance recommended that authorities should consult with neighbouring authorities to ensure this linkage, and indeed the CNPA had accordingly instituted a cross border working

group. In the end the only path that may not get resolved in this fashion was the Spey but decisions on its designation outside of the National Park are still to be taken by Ministers.

- g) Various suggestions were made for other linkages in the Paths network: the Deeside Way which currently runs from Aberdeen to Ballater would be an excellent link from Aberdeen to the whole of the National Park if there was a better link between Ballater and Braemar. Similarly a link between Loch an Eilein and Glen Feshie along the Thieves Road was also suggested as an obvious missing link. Both these were noted as potential additions to the network in the future. There was only so much that could be delivered in the next two years, but thereafter those other links would be considered as part of the review process.
- h) The Core Paths Plan was of great significance to the National Park and represented a fundamental measure of the success of the Authority in its enabling role. There was potentially a huge economic benefit from the path network given that walking had already been identified as the activity which the majority of people engaged in when visiting the Park. The monitoring arrangements should try and capture the economic and social benefits that arose from the path network, and this in turn would help better justify expenditure. Businesses also needed to recognise that this was an extremely valuable resource for them bringing economic benefits and in the future they might wish to consider how they might contribute to maintenance.
- i) The target set out at Paragraph 14 of “increasing the proportion of paths in the network that are fit for purpose to 90% by 2012” was recognised as a very stretching target. Feedback from a pilot in Upper Deeside suggested that 30% were currently fit for purpose. However, it was assessed that this number would increase to 70% if signage alone could be resolved. So it would appear that a relatively small amount of investment could rapidly increase the percentage of paths fit for purpose. The target remained stretching but it was quite right it should be so given that the fundamental aim was to reduce the barriers to people getting outside and taking exercise.
- j) Paragraph 25 noted the significant financial contribution which the CNPA had already committed over the next two years. While it was quite appropriate to invest substantially in the path network, it was noted that good leverage was essential to justify this; the COAT (Cairngorms Outdoor Access Trust) had already achieved considerable leverage to the tune of the project being worth £0.5million each year.
- k) It was suggested that leaflets should be downloadable to mobile devices.
- l) In resolving the signage issues it was noted that this was partly a matter of funding but also partly a matter of seeking agreements from land owners and land managers, often in the public sector.
- m) Of the paths in the Cairngorms Core Path network 14 went across the Park boundary and it was suggested it might help to show how those linked into the national system of paths. While this was recognised as a good idea, in the short term this was not possible as the neighbouring authorities had not received approval for their Core Paths Plans. But more fundamentally, the CNPA had never regarded a Core Paths Plan as a promotion tool in itself, and had taken the view that promotion was for others; community paths leaflets were a manifestation of exactly this approach at a local level. There were other leaflets such as the Scotways Hill Tracks leaflet which also helped to promote to the public the opportunities for walking.

15. In summing up the Convener commended all the work set out in the paper and acknowledged the support of the LOAF.

16. The Board approved the recommendations of the paper as follows:

- a) **Adopted the Core Paths Plan for the Cairngorms National Park;**
- b) **Noted how the Plan would be implemented and monitored; and**
- c) **Noted the development of guidance for Community Paths leaflets**

Review of the National Parks Plan (Paper 3)

17. Gavin Miles introduced the paper which set out in broad terms the approach to taking work forward on the next National Park Plan which would run from 2012 to 2017. The Board's endorsement was sought for this as well as for the proposed approach for engaging with the public and stakeholders. The main points to note were that the process would be much more focused on outcomes than the previous Plan; there would be a much clearer monitoring framework from the start; and the next National Park Plan would be tied in to the existing Scottish Government Outcome and the Single Outcome Agreements of the neighbouring local authorities.

18. Paragraph 23 set out three themes as a basis for consultation, and while there had already been some comment on the titles of these themes, the essential point was to try and provide some meaningful structure on the process while recognising there was no perfect solution as there would always be overlap between the themes.

19. In discussion the following points were made:

- a) It would be important to engage people on issues outwith settlements, in other words, communities of interest had a role as well as communities of place. An engagement pack was proposed (see Paragraph 44) which would outline the questions including the big strategic questions which everyone could answer and engage with, regardless of where they lived.
- b) CVOs (Community Voluntary Organisations) were being engaged to help with the consultations, given their proven track record in this area. It was noted that to ensure communities were thoroughly on board would require meetings to be very thoroughly advertised. Engagement with Perth and Kinross was already in hand via the Association of Cairngorms Community Councils.
- c) Experience to date was that a considerable amount of work was needed beforehand to make sure meetings were productive. It was particularly important to engage Inclusive Cairngorms and to make sure that the groups who often feel excluded were properly involved. The experience the CNPA had gained through its early BOVOF (Ballater One Voice Our Future) exercise needed to be built in.
- d) The cost of the consultation was difficult to estimate but it was likely to be in the area of £25,000. It was noted this was not just for one Plan; this was about producing a vision for the communities which then was reflected in the National Park Plan, the Local Development Plan and other associated work. The objective was not just a one off response to a consultation but about keeping people engaged with the Park.
- e) It was confirmed that the areas of work described at Paragraph 13 were not referring to **all** the work that was required to provide the evidence base for the

National Park Plan and the Local Development Plan, but to those major pieces of work which were crucial.

- f) The engagement pack referred to at Paragraph 44 needed to assume that recipients knew nothing of the Park or the National Park Authority; it should be designed to enthuse people and explain why it was important they engage with the process. It should also explain linkages to other plans. It was a good opportunity to promote the “story” of the Cairngorms National Park.

20. The Board approved the recommendations of the paper as follows:

- a) **Endorse the proposed approach for the development of the National Park Plan; and**
- b) **Endorse the proposed approach to engagement.**

Informal Camping in the Cairngorms National Park (Paper 4)

21. Murray Ferguson introduced the paper which updated the Board on issues concerning informal camping in the Cairngorms National Park, and proposed how the Park Authority should work with land managers and other organisations to address these. The important points to keep in mind was that the Cairngorms was a huge National Park; and a great many people came to the Park and enjoyed it and caused no problems. However, there were a few problems and this was the subject of the paper. The reasons for bring the paper were set out at Paragraph 2. Many land managers dealt effectively with potential problems and were not for this there would be many more issues to deal with. The CNPA already invested around £150,000 a year in supporting the Ranger Services across the Park who helped to ensure this generally satisfactory situation. Having said that there were two particular problem areas and it was important for everybody to work together to ensure that these did not escalate. Paragraph 17 of the paper set out the proposed approach and the role of the CNPA which was very much to assist where appropriate and support the various other parties who were involved.

22. In discussion the following points were made:

- a) There was no effective ranger service in Braemar.
- b) Some particularly troublesome activities were not covered by the Access Code.
- c) It was difficult to get a true picture of the scale of the problem because of two successive bad summers. At the moment a watching brief was proposed but with the recognition that a review would be needed if the problem escalated as a result of a good summer.
- d) The anti social behaviour which was the essence of the problem seemed to result from a coincidence of circumstances. In particular if it was known that easy camping was available in remote areas which were not policed then this type of behaviour was bound to be concentrated in these areas. The CNPA had discussions with Aberdeenshire Council but they did not regard this as a priority for their ranger services. To have an effective ranger presence at weekends and evenings at the Clunie Flats, would be difficult as these were a long way from Ranger Bases. Unfortunately, if the site was left unmanaged it would increasingly become known as a place to go with a group where unruly behaviour was unchallenged.
- e) The issue was not the CNPA’s sole responsibility; the solution had to come from working with Ranger Services and communities. It was essential to understand

the nature of the problem and the motivations of the people involved, as implied at Paragraph 17. It seemed likely that there was a need for dispersed sites which were limited in size. It was suggested that local communities could usefully take on some responsibilities for the alternatives sites, albeit with help. Work on this issue should be linked into discussions at Community Planning Partnerships.

- f) It was important not to use Rangers as police. Face to face intervention was of limited value in solving this problem. There were some deterrent actions that could be taken such as the provision of ditches; there could also be more positive measures such as providing alternatives. Unless these positive steps were taken there would be serious displacement issues.
- g) It was noted that if further funding were to be deployed on this issue it would be best to channel this through existing mechanisms and avoid creating additional parallel mechanisms.

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

- a) **Endorsed the broad approach to informal camping as defined by the actions set out in Paragraph 17 of the paper;**
- b) **Agreed to consider the matter again to determine what progress had been made in a period of two years.**

2010/11 Budget and Operational Plan (Paper 5)

24. David Cameron introduced the paper which sought approval to the budget figures for the 2010/11 Budget and Operational Plan. The paper represented the finalisation of work which had been taken through the Management Team and Finance Committee earlier in the year. The Operational Plan for 2010/11 represented the third year of the existing Corporate Plan, and was therefore based on a well established framework. In practice the Operational Plan was a difficult balancing act; there was no scope for either overspending or under spending; the Budget had to ensure delivery over a wide range of subjects and was therefore complex; and there was a continuing requirement from the Scottish Government to find a 2% efficiency saving each year. The Finance Committee had already approved the Budget; the endorsement of the Board was now sought that the Plan struck the right balance. The point was also made by the Convener that considering this third year of the existing Corporate Plan should stimulate thought on future years, which would need to be addressed shortly.

25. The Board approved the 2010/11 Budget and Operational Plan as set out in the Paper.

Low Carbon Cairngorms – Analysis of Potential Carbon Savings (Paper 6)

26. Hamish Trench introduced the paper which updated the Board on partnership work to analyse potential carbon savings in the National Park. The paper was for information and was duly noted by the Board.

Response to the Royal Society of Edinburgh Inquiry “Facing up to Climate Change” (Paper 7)

27. Gavin Miles introduced the paper which proposed a response to the Royal Society of Edinburgh's Inquiry on how Scotland could respond to climate change. A lot of wide ranging questions had been posed as set out Annex 1 but the response proposed was short and focused specifically on the National Park.

28. In discussion the following points were made:

- a) Paragraphs 10 to 12 were welcomed about the relationship between the nature of housing tenure, and the scope for increased energy efficiency in housing.
- b) It was noted that response tended to focus on technical issues while in reality dealing with climate change was essentially founded in behavioural change. The public sector could learn from the retail sector in this respect and this was essential to bring about a seachange in behaviour.

29. The Board were invited to make any further comments to Gavin Miles within the next two weeks, but subject to that, approved the response.

Internal Greening Group Update (Paper 8)

30. Andy Rinning introduced the paper which was for information, and provided an update of the work of the Internal Greening Group. Comments were made about the need to increasing use video conferencing where possible; and in relation to Paragraph 2, the possibility of offsetting the carbon cost of travel. The paper was for information and was duly noted.

AOCB

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

- a) The good rating of the CNPA in the Sunday Times Survey of Best Public Sector places to work was welcomed.
- b) David Green reported on his attendance at three sessions held around the Park to raise awareness among the public of the forthcoming Board appointments round. Sessions had been held at Braemar, Boat of Garten and Blair Atholl and had been supported by Andrew Rafferty, Bob Kinnaird, Anne MacLean, Duncan Bryden, Willie McKenna, Sue Walker and Eric Baird.
- c) David Green had attended a Sustainable Tourism Forum at Holyrood. He also noted that the new Chair of VisitScotland was Mike Cantlay, the current Convener of the Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park Authority. This was a good outcome for Scotland's two National Parks.
- d) Paul Gray, the new Director General of Rural and Environment at Scottish Government had visited the Park Authority and met a number of Board Members and staff.
- e) Duncan Bryden had attended a seminar for Planning Conveners in Edinburgh in the course of which the profile of National Park Authorities had been raised alongside those of Local Authorities as the more usual Planning Authorities.
- f) Eric Baird had attended an outdoor access event/workshop and noted in passing that a great number of event managers were keen to run events in the Park. He had also attended a SMILE Advisory Board and a meeting of the Access Forum. He had also attended the Scottish Government Committee on Climate Change, a

Carbon Seminar organised by the CNPA, and the Staff Consultative Forum which had used the video link between Ballater and Grantown.

- g) Drew Hendry had represented the CNPA at a BBC Trust meeting where he had made a plea for greater recognition of the National Park.
- h) There was some discussion surrounding the latest version of the Cairngorms National Park Visitor Leaflet which was prepared by Visitscotland with funding from the CNPA. There was considerable concern around the Board table about inaccuracies and the failure to represent the whole of the Park, as it seems to be almost exclusively focused on the West side of the Park. Officials were charged with raising these concerns with Visitscotland and seeing whether the leaflet could be withdrawn. [Post meeting note, Murray Ferguson took this forward with Visitscotland and reported back to all Board Members after the meeting.]

Date of Next Meeting

32. The 14th May in the Grant Arms Hotel, Grantown-on-Spey.