

Minutes of CALLP Scheme Delivery Committee Meeting

Tuesday 5th November 2019, 10am-12pm, Coigach Community Hall, Achiltibuie

1 Welcome, introductions & apologies

Present

Ann Marie Firth-Bernard (AMFB) – CCDC, Local Development Officer Fiona Saywell (FS) - CCWT Project Officer (part time), CALLP Education Manager (job share)

Gordon Sleight (GS) - Historic Assynt, Director

Lucy Graham (LG) - SWT, Head of Development

Malcolm Bangor-Jones (MBJ) - Assynt Foundation, Director

Mark Foxwell (MF) - SWT, Highlands & Islands Reserves Manager

Peter Lowe (PL) –Woodland Trust, Senior Outreach Advisor/Ancient Woodland Lead Scotland

Peter Muir (PM) - Coigach Salmon Fisheries Limited

Sarah Robinson (SR) – SWT, Director of Conservation (Chair)

Romany Garnett (RG) – JMT, Quinag Conservation Officer

In Attendance

Anne Campbell (AAC) – CALLP Sustainable Crofting & Rural Projects Co-ordinator

Boyd Alexander (BA) - CALLP Scheme Manager

Elaine Macaskill (EM) - CALLP Woodland Manager, Woodland Trust

Laura Traynor (LT) - CALLP Assistant Scheme Manager (Minutes)

Meryl Carr (MC) - SNH, Operations Officer, Wester Ross and Skye

Vickii Campen (VC) – CALLP Training, Events and Volunteer Co-ordinator

Apologies

Dave McBain (DMB) - Historic Assynt, Chair

Don O'Driscoll (DOD) – JMT, Quinag and Sandwood Land Manager

Jorine van Delft (JvD) – CCWT, Director

Julia Campbell (JC) – Coigach Community Development Company, Local Development Officer

Katrina Martin (KM) - CALLP Education Manager (job share)

Lewis Macaskill (LM) - Assynt Foundation, Chair

Richard Williams (RW) – JMT, Land Operations Manager

2 a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting (1st August 2019)

Minutes of previous meeting on 1st August 2019 <u>agreed</u> by committee that they are a true account of the meeting, subject to the following amendment:

Add Gordon Sleight to apologies under section 1

Action Points from 1st August 2019 and other matters arising not covered by agenda.

National Lottery Heritage Fund Monitor Update Latest meeting with NLHF monitor held on 12 th September 2019. BA stated NLHF were receptive to a day rate framework for certain project costs, particularly for woodland work, pathwork, and crofting. An action point from the meeting is to produce a framework for next meeting with the NLHF monitor, scheduled for 5 th December. The NLHF monitor asked for a reforecast budget to the end of the scheme. Reforecast budget on agenda for SDC meeting. EM raised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however much of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale why they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye pertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas should be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor strongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be	A to ask Highland Council if waiving planning fees could count as in kind contribution and to ask for a steer regarding what types of in-kind contribution they might consider. A to circulate response to SDC. A to circulate response to SDC. A stated NLHF were receptive to a day rate framework for certain project costs, articularly for woodland work, pathwork, and crofting. An action point from the meeting to produce a framework for next meeting with the NLHF monitor, scheduled for 5th ecember. The NLHF monitor asked for a reforecast budget to the end of the scheme. Reforecast budget on agenda for SDC meeting. M raised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached in a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however such of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the andscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale thy they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye ertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas mould be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor trongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be		Actions points: See Action Point Summary Table at end of minutes.	
and to ask for a steer regarding what types of in-kind contribution they might consider. BA to circulate response to SDC. National Lottery Heritage Fund Monitor Update Latest meeting with NLHF monitor held on 12 th September 2019. BA stated NLHF were receptive to a day rate framework for certain project costs, particularly for woodland work, pathwork, and crofting. An action point from the meeting is to produce a framework for next meeting with the NLHF monitor, scheduled for 5 th December. The NLHF monitor asked for a reforecast budget to the end of the scheme. Reforecast budget on agenda for SDC meeting. EM raised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however much of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale why they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye pertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas should be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor strongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be	AP1 BA AP1 BA		Matters arising:	
BA to circulate response to SDC. National Lottery Heritage Fund Monitor Update Latest meeting with NLHF monitor held on 12 th September 2019. BA stated NLHF were receptive to a day rate framework for certain project costs, particularly for woodland work, pathwork, and crofting. An action point from the meeting is to produce a framework for next meeting with the NLHF monitor, scheduled for 5 th December. The NLHF monitor asked for a reforecast budget to the end of the scheme. Reforecast budget on agenda for SDC meeting. EM raised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however much of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale why they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye pertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas should be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor strongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be	At to circulate response to SDC. ational Lottery Heritage Fund Monitor Update attest meeting with NLHF monitor held on 12 th September 2019. A stated NLHF were receptive to a day rate framework for certain project costs, articularly for woodland work, pathwork, and crofting. An action point from the meeting to produce a framework for next meeting with the NLHF monitor, scheduled for 5 th eccember. The NLHF monitor asked for a reforecast budget to the end of the scheme. Reforecast budget on agenda for SDC meeting. My raised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however such of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the endscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale why they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye ertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas mould be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor trongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be exceptable to the NLHF.		BA to ask Highland Council if waiving planning fees could count as in kind contribution	
National Lottery Heritage Fund Monitor Update Latest meeting with NLHF monitor held on 12 th September 2019. BA stated NLHF were receptive to a day rate framework for certain project costs, particularly for woodland work, pathwork, and crofting. An action point from the meeting is to produce a framework for next meeting with the NLHF monitor, scheduled for 5 th December. The NLHF monitor asked for a reforecast budget to the end of the scheme. Reforecast budget on agenda for SDC meeting. EM raised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however much of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale why they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye pertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas should be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor strongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be	ational Lottery Heritage Fund Monitor Update atest meeting with NLHF monitor held on 12 th September 2019. A stated NLHF were receptive to a day rate framework for certain project costs, articularly for woodland work, pathwork, and crofting. An action point from the meeting to produce a framework for next meeting with the NLHF monitor, scheduled for 5 th ecember. The NLHF monitor asked for a reforecast budget to the end of the scheme. Reforecast budget on agenda for SDC meeting. My raised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however such of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the endscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale they they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye ertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas mould be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor trongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be exceptable to the NLHF.		and to ask for a steer regarding what types of in-kind contribution they might consider.	
Latest meeting with NLHF monitor held on 12 th September 2019. BA stated NLHF were receptive to a day rate framework for certain project costs, particularly for woodland work, pathwork, and crofting. An action point from the meeting is to produce a framework for next meeting with the NLHF monitor, scheduled for 5 th December. The NLHF monitor asked for a reforecast budget to the end of the scheme. Reforecast budget on agenda for SDC meeting. EM raised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however much of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale why they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye pertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas should be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor strongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be	A stated NLHF were receptive to a day rate framework for certain project costs, articularly for woodland work, pathwork, and crofting. An action point from the meeting to produce a framework for next meeting with the NLHF monitor, scheduled for 5 th ecember. The NLHF monitor asked for a reforecast budget to the end of the scheme. Reforecast budget on agenda for SDC meeting. Meraised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however such of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the landscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale why they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye erraining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas mould be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor trongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be exceptable to the NLHF.		BA to circulate response to SDC.	AP1 BA
BA stated NLHF were receptive to a day rate framework for certain project costs, particularly for woodland work, pathwork, and crofting. An action point from the meeting is to produce a framework for next meeting with the NLHF monitor, scheduled for 5 th December. The NLHF monitor asked for a reforecast budget to the end of the scheme. Reforecast budget on agenda for SDC meeting. EM raised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however much of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale why they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye pertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas should be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor strongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be	A stated NLHF were receptive to a day rate framework for certain project costs, articularly for woodland work, pathwork, and crofting. An action point from the meeting to produce a framework for next meeting with the NLHF monitor, scheduled for 5 th ecember. The NLHF monitor asked for a reforecast budget to the end of the scheme. Reforecast budget on agenda for SDC meeting. My raised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however butch of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the andscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale why they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye extraining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas mould be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor extrongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be exceptable to the NLHF.	3	National Lottery Heritage Fund Monitor Update	
particularly for woodland work, pathwork, and crofting. An action point from the meeting is to produce a framework for next meeting with the NLHF monitor, scheduled for 5 th December. The NLHF monitor asked for a reforecast budget to the end of the scheme. Reforecast budget on agenda for SDC meeting. EM raised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however much of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale why they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye pertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas should be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor strongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be	articularly for woodland work, pathwork, and crofting. An action point from the meeting to produce a framework for next meeting with the NLHF monitor, scheduled for 5 th ecember. The NLHF monitor asked for a reforecast budget to the end of the scheme. Reforecast budget on agenda for SDC meeting. My raised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however butch of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the landscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale why they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye certaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas mould be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor trongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be exceptable to the NLHF.		Latest meeting with NLHF monitor held on 12 th September 2019.	
is to produce a framework for next meeting with the NLHF monitor, scheduled for 5 th December. The NLHF monitor asked for a reforecast budget to the end of the scheme. Reforecast budget on agenda for SDC meeting. EM raised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however much of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale why they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye pertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas should be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor strongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be	to produce a framework for next meeting with the NLHF monitor, scheduled for 5 th eccember. The NLHF monitor asked for a reforecast budget to the end of the scheme. Reforecast budget on agenda for SDC meeting. Meraised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however butch of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the andscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale thy they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye certaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas bould be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor trongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be exceptable to the NLHF.		BA stated NLHF were receptive to a day rate framework for certain project costs,	
December. The NLHF monitor asked for a reforecast budget to the end of the scheme. Reforecast budget on agenda for SDC meeting. EM raised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however much of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale why they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye pertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas should be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor strongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be	the NLHF monitor asked for a reforecast budget to the end of the scheme. Reforecast budget on agenda for SDC meeting. M raised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however much of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the andscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale thy they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye certaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas mould be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor trongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be exceptable to the NLHF.		particularly for woodland work, pathwork, and crofting. An action point from the meeting	
The NLHF monitor asked for a reforecast budget to the end of the scheme. Reforecast budget on agenda for SDC meeting. EM raised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however much of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale why they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye pertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas should be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor strongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be	the NLHF monitor asked for a reforecast budget to the end of the scheme. Reforecast budget on agenda for SDC meeting. M raised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however much of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the andscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale thy they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye certaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas mould be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor trongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be exceptable to the NLHF.		is to produce a framework for next meeting with the NLHF monitor, scheduled for 5 th	
budget on agenda for SDC meeting. EM raised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however much of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale why they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye pertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas should be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor strongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be	M raised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however much of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the endscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale why they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye certaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas mould be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor trongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be acceptable to the NLHF.		December.	
EM raised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however much of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale why they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye pertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas should be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor strongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be	M raised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however much of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the andscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale thy they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye extaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas mould be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor trongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be acceptable to the NLHF.		The NLHF monitor asked for a reforecast budget to the end of the scheme. Reforecast	
with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however much of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale why they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye pertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas should be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor strongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be	with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however much of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the andscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale thy they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye extraining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas mould be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor trongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be exceptable to the NLHF.		budget on agenda for SDC meeting.	
much of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale why they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye pertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas should be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor strongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be	nuch of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the andscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale thy they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye ertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas mould be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor trongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be acceptable to the NLHF.		EM raised with the monitor that the Woodland Expansion project had been approached	
Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale why they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye pertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas should be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor strongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be	andscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale thy they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye ertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas mould be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor trongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be exceptable to the NLHF.		with a proposal to protect woodland at Elphin and Knockan common grazings, however	
why they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye pertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas should be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor strongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be	thy they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye ertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas nould be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor crongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be exceptable to the NLHF.		much of this fell outwith the CALLP area. The NLHF monitor queried whether the	
pertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas should be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor strongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be	ertaining to the two townships, and ideally, the associated common grazings areas nould be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor crongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be exceptable to the NLHF.		Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) assessed these areas and if there was a rationale	
should be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor strongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be	nould be included. Only the inbye was included in the project area. The NLHF monitor crongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be exceptable to the NLHF.		why they weren't included in the CALLP area. The LCA suggested that the inbye	
strongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be	crongly suggested that a change to the CALLP area at this stage would be unlikely to be exceptable to the NLHF.			
	cceptable to the NLHF.			
accompable to the NULIC			,	
acceptable to the NLTF.			acceptable to the NLHF.	

a. **NLHF Finance Report**

SR suggested treating this paper as for info as it was produced before the reforecasting exercise was undertaken.

Expenditure in Year 3 Quarter 4 (1st July to 30th September 2019) was £192,795, bringing the total scheme expenditure to date to £2,202,557.

b. **Match funding report**

The amount of match funding confirmed appears healthy with only £12,531 remaining to secure, however SR highlighted there were additional figures to add in such as the SNH funding now confirmed for years 4 and 5.

Match funding received to date stands at £1,486,016.70.

Project leads were reminded that efforts to secure 40% of the funding (match funding) for each project should continue.

c. Tenders & Changes

P04 High Value Open Habitats (HVOH)

BA presented a paper for the updated brief for the High Value Open Habitats project. PL has suggested some edits in relation to forestry. PL to provide edits to forestry for consideration in HVOHS brief.

AP2 PL

MF asked for further clarification for how the work will differ from previous surveys, for example NVC surveys. BA stated the work uses a new technique for identifying habitat types from aerial imagery to make on ground surveying faster.

AP3 BA

PL asked about accuracy in relation to woodland. BA to ask SNH for more information regarding accuracy of aerial surveying in relation to woodland.

PL suggested WT could provide match funding if the project would be beneficial to the Woodland Expansion project.

PM queried why map areas were only in Assynt when brief says Coigach as well. BA to update HVOH brief to remove references to Coigach as only areas in Assynt have been identified to use this technique.

AP4 BA

PM queried whether there was scope for work in Coigach. MC stated that the areas selected are ones that haven't been surveyed previously so there would likely already be data for similar sites in Coigach.

Decision: SDC approves the High Value Open Habitats project brief following removal of Coigach from description and edits to forestry to be supplied by PL.

Decision 1

ii) P11 Sustainable Deer Management – Venison Marketing New Brief

BA presented the new brief for the Venison section of the Sustainable Deer Management project. FS stated that the brief was developed with input from AW, MF, RW, RG, and DOD.

PM queried how much focus there would be on encouraging people to eat venison. FS stated this will be covered with a community survey to find out attitudes to venison plus adult hill to grill activities to encourage the use of venison.

PM stated his disappointment as he perceived that the venison marketing survey had been watered down in the new brief.

<u>Decision: SDC approves the Venison Marketing brief for submission to NLHF.</u>

Decision 2

iii) Clachtoll Ranger Hut

LT stated the Clachtoll Ranger Hut brief was not yet finalised and looking to circulate for approval by email before next SDC meeting.

AP5 LT

iv) Digital App Project

BA presented brief on replacement for app project. The brief comprises several strands including holding "Sense of Place" workshops to establish key messages from the community, developing content for the Local Guide audio app, and a walks booklet.

PM queried what happens to the content produced by the project after the end of project. BA stated that digital outputs would be available for 5 years in line with the NLHF funding conditions. PM queried if there was funding for the legacy of the app after the end of the project. LG stated that the maintenance budget for the scheme was fixed and that NLHF Scotland do not allow for increases (she noted that this is handled differently by some other NLHF regions, for example North England). BA to speak to the people behind the Local Guide app to ensure legacy servicing is provisioned as part of contract fee.

AP6 BA

MBJ highlighted the need to make sure a wide amount of people in the community are involved in the consultation regarding key messages to avoid negative perceptions. FS highlighted that the existing content on the Local Guide app wasn't done in conjunction with the local community and that this was an opportunity to involve the community in what was promoted to visitors.

<u>Decision: SDC approves the project brief for the App Project, unless SR and BA deem changes to legacy provision to be significant enough to require SDC approval.</u>

Decision 3

v) P28 Music & Tales of Coigach & Assynt

BA presented paper from CCDC requesting enhanced intervention from NLHF funds for the Music & Tales of Coigach & Assynt project for planned activities in Year 4. CCDC have been unable to secure further match funding due to long term staff absence. The amount requested is £6,856.74.

RG queried how the fèis element would work given the existing fèis in Ullapool. AMFB stated the proposal would be to have a weekend fèis similar to the now defunct Scourie fèis.

<u>Decision: SDC approves the intervention of £6,856.74 from NLHF funds to the Music & Tales of Coigach & Assynt project.</u>

Decision 4

d. **Budget Reforecast**

Order of agenda items altered for ease of discussion.

ii) Projects contingency request

BA presented a paper detailing 3 requests for use of contingency. The Outdoor & Woodland Learning project (OWL) needs to (i) provide accredited CPD training not just general training due to revised Highland Council training policy; and (ii) a wooden storage building as a replacement for the present damaged container for storage of project resources.

SR asked about whether OWL storage shed would need maintenance considerations. FS stated the shed should last well due to anticipated high quality of build.

Clachtoll Broch project requests £4,500 retrospectively for experimental archaeology.

GS explained further on Clachtoll Broch request. A number of experiments were carried out relating to flooring, building methods, and destruction by fire. Access to stone locally

was limited so additional costs were encountered employing someone to bring stone in. It was not possible to delay the experiments due to the weather window and commitments of involved parties. Lessons learnt from the experiments included that when the broch caught fire all floors in the broch would be alight with 10-15 mins – hence quick evacuation of people and the large amount of finds.

<u>Decision: SDC approves all requests for contingency detailed in paper: OWL teacher CPD budget, OWL storage shed, and Clachtoll Broch experimental archaeology.</u>

Decision 5

i) Reallocation of Project Underspend

BA stated that all projects were contacted to provide a reforecast of their expected spend to the end of the CALLP scheme. The paper summary shows the projects' original budget, expected new budget, and secured match funding.

LT stated that the original budget figures have been calculated using new information from NLHF regarding the treatment of VAT, inflation, contingency, and maintenance, and therefore may be slightly different to the figure project leads were expecting.

LG stated that although the report suggests only a further £12,511 of match funding is needed to be secured in order to fully fund the scheme there is still a presumption that partners will continue to seek the 40% match funding required of them, particularly in regards to new projects.

LG stated that SWT have effectively exceeded their fundraising targets to ensure programme viability. From this point, as more match funding is brought in to the scheme, it would be the Scottish Wildlife Trust's intention to reallocate some of those funding pledges towards supporting additional CALLP projects in the CALL area, for example additional woodland planting. All of this would be done in a transparent way (for NLHF) and remaining compliant with any donor restrictions.

The focus of the discussion was to confirm the SDC is confident that there is £183,792 of underspend that can be used for agreed additional projects or works.

LT explained the updated figures for the Clachtoll Broch, following an update on additional costs associated with the viewing platform received on 4^{th} November. The tender response quoted the works at £99,987.60 including VAT, which was £50,000 less than the budgeted amount. A revised budget allocating the £50,000 was previously confirmed with NLHF and HES to reserve £20,000 for platform contingency, use £20,000 for extra archaeology works, and use £10,000 for interpretation and a contribution to match funding for the Clachtoll Ranger Hut.

GS suggested HES should be approached for additional funding. GS to update HES about increase in viewing platform costs and to ask about further funding for the Clachtoll Broch Project.

LG asked about the expected schedule for platform delivery and installation. GS stated this would likely be late spring due to weather considerations.

AP7 GS

GS to prepare and have circulated for approval from the SDC a contingency request for additional viewing platform costs before 5th December monitor meeting.

AP8 GS

FS queried if match funding is being sought for the app project as no match funding is shown against this project in the table. BA stated he will speak to Scottish Wildlife Trust Grants Fundraising Manager for suggestions of possible funding sources.

SR requested for any potential match funding to be added into the table.

EM asked whether FGS grant figures should go into the table if she receives confirmation of these figures before the December 5th meeting. LG suggested EM supply FGS figures to LT and will work out if needed when preparing for meeting.

AP9 EM

<u>Decision: SDC approves figures in the table to be used in meeting with NLHF monitor and for use in discussions regarding reallocations.</u>

Decision 6

iii) Possible Additional Projects

SR stated that the projects suggested by partners totalled more than £500,000. SDC to vote on projects. LT requested clarification on voting eligibility. SR clarified that each partner organisation present was eligible to allocate 1 set of votes.

BA explained his scoring of projects in the paper, which included measures for compatibility with CALLP and NLHF outcomes, whether the NLHF monitor had requested it, whether the new project builds on an existing project, whether it sets groundwork for a future project, and whether match funding had been identified.

PM queried why the Reiff path was scored last despite the popularity of the route. BA stated that this was because it was similar to other paths, had not been requested by the NLHF monitor, did not build on an existing project or produce a project after, and there is no match funding currently identified. In additional to the factors used in the scoring there was concern about the likelihood of gaining landowner permission.

SR highlighted that the feasibility of each project has not been scored and raised the question of whether the proposed projects can be delivered by September 2021, the end of the current CALLP scheme. FS stated that it was unlikely to be able to deliver all of the Peatland Project proposal within this timescale but that it may be possible to carry out the education work and therefore suggested the SDC consider just the education element of the Peatland Project.

MBJ queried whether the SDC votes and BA's ranking will be taken together or if one more important. SR stated that it is only the SDC votes that will determine which projects are shortlisted. BA's ranking of the projects can be used to inform the SDC decision on how to vote but will not be used in conjunction with the votes.

EM gave update on the habitat restoration project submitted by the Woodland Trust (Eisg Brachaidh) and **stressed the confidential nature of the project proposals**. Eisg Brachaidh estate is one of the partners of CALL and has been involved from early on. The estates motivation has been to improve the condition of the SSSI woodlands on the estate. A proposal to improve the condition of 35ha of existing woodland has been discussed and is being worked through with Scottish Forestry, via the estate resuming the

area from the tenant. Over 2-3 decades the family have looked at a large number of possibilities to improve the condition of the woodlands and have at the same time established what is legally possible. This preferred option is to fence the entire estate boundary and to manage deer within the fence to limit the impact on adjacent landowners. Due to the difficulties of getting funding for a private landowner, with a tenant, the only identified way to fund this proposal would be with assistance from CALLP. The large cost is due to the length of fencing required and the inclusion of a cattle grid across the public road. The proposal has been preliminarily discussed with NLHF monitor. One of the aims of the CALLP scheme is landscape scale restoration which is unable to happen without deer control. Fencing this area would protect other habitats as well as the woodland and would facilitate deer management across the whole Eisg Brachaidh estate.

RG queried what deer management would take place. EM stated the density of deer would reduce to 1 per km2. PL stated this proposal was a big part of the jigsaw for current and future landscape scale restoration. MF queried reason for putting so much into one member of the Deer Management Group (DMG) and whether the aim should be to reduce deer numbers across the whole DMG. EM stated that the required reduction in deer numbers had been proposed at a previous Section 7 meeting but not adopted. RG queried the current density of the DMG concerned. MF stated the density is current 4 deer per km2 which sounds low but still results in a high impact on habitats due to the features of the land concerned, in particular winter grazing, which resulted in all seedlings being heavily browsed.

Paper K detailed all the submitted sixteen additional projects that were to be considered for allocation of the identified underspend. 12 of the 16 additional projects had provided approximate costs. As this amount totalled to a far greater amount than was available the SDC were asked to identify a shortlist of projects that would be requested to provide further details to the SDC including a more accurate budget for the project with details of any match funding they may have or anticipated identifying.

A representative of each organisation present was asked to select six projects that they wished to see supported and allocated underspend from the CALLP budget. Of the six projects the SDC were asked to identify one project as their 'top project'. FS asked if members could vote for their own organisation's projects. SR stated they could.

SDC partners voted on the proposals and the projects with the most votes were:

- Little Assynt All Access Path and Culag Woods upgrade and Signage
- Coigach & Assynt Signage
- Reiff Right of Way Core Path RC01.02
- Assynt Fishery Oral History
- Recommissioning Composting toilet at Little Assynt
- (Eisg Brachaidh) Habitat Management Boundary Fencing.

No cost figures were supplied for Reiff Path and Coigach & Assynt Signage projects, these will be calculated as the briefs are developed further.

All of the top voted projects are likely to be able to have 60% of their costs covered by CALLP with the exception of the Restoration project (Eisg Brachaidh). This project would receive a contribution to the overall cost. Discussion will be required with the NLHF monitor as to whether the CALLP Scheme budget can be increased to accommodate the addition of this particular project as its total cost will take the budget of CALLP beyond its current total (which includes NLHF moneys, match funding and in-kind contributions).

Given that it had been stated that the only way to fund the Restoration project (Eisg Brachaidh) was through CALLP the SDC had a discussion about how project budget and the contribution to CALL would work. PL asked if WREN funding could be a source of match funding. LG stated there were new guidelines for WREN. EM to discuss with WREN about the possibility of attracting match funding for Eisg Brachaidh fencing.

AP10 EM

MBJ asked if a possible solution would be to ringfence a certain amount for Eisg Brachaidh and then see if further funding could be sought. If further funding was not available then the ringfenced amount would be released to other projects. An appropriate timeframe for this was discussed to ensure other projects could be assigned underspend and deliver in the timeframe of CALLP should the additional funding needed for the restoration project not be found. SDC discussed whether the ringfence applied to Eisg Brachaidh specifically or if it applied to the Woodland Expansion project in general, i.e. if Eisg Brachaidh did not go ahead the ringfenced amount could go to another woodland scheme. No conclusion was reached. A deadline for starting the work would also need to be set, for example January 2021, as it is estimated that the work will take 8 months to carry out.

MBJ queried the accuracy of the costings in the additional projects paper. SR stated all but 2 projects have estimated figures. EM stated that the Eisg Brachaidh costings have been put together by CKD Galbraith and are deemed to be as accurate as they can at this stage.

SR proposes that if the SDC agree in principal to ringfence a proportion of the CALLP underspend for Eisg Brachaidh and support the five further shortlisted projects, that the following process is undertaken:

- Shortlisted projects are asked to provide further details of their projects with budgets and delivery schedules..
- These details will be provided to the SDC for a final consideration and the remaining underspend amount calculated.
- The SDC will be asked to confirm that they are happy the remaining underspend is ringfenced until May 2020 SDC meeting for Eisg Brachaidh.
- These decisions will be made via correspondence.
- The information will then be taken forward to the NLHF Monitor meeting on the 5th of December.

MBJ highlighted the need to have projects that are ready to go to use shortfall quickly should Eisg Brachaidh be unable to go ahead.

<u>Decision: SDC approves taking forward the projects that received the most votes as</u> detailed above. The projects will be summarised in a paper and circulated to the SDC

Decision 7

	for approval. The budget remaining after five of the six shortlisted additional projects	
	have been supported will be calculated and shared with SDC who will be asked to	
	confirm they wish to see the money ringfenced for use for the Eisg Brachaidh proposal	
	until May 2020 SDC meeting.	
	BA to produce paper summarising the additional projects as recommended by the voting	4044 04
	process and circulate to the SDC for approval.	AP11 BA
5	Project Progress Register (October 2019) – Updates by exception	
	BA stated that budget column RAG rating had not been updated because this rating is	
	shown in the NLHF Quarterly Finance Report as discussed earlier.	
	BA to update format of Project Progress Register for next SDC meeting to incorporate	
	RAG rating over time following the example given in the Mid Scheme Review report.	AP12 BA
	Updates to projects requiring discussion by the SDC covered elsewhere in the meeting.	
6	Risk Register (November 2019) – Full review	
	District the state of the second state of the	
	Risk register to have full review at next SDC meeting due to the over-running discussions of earlier agenda items and no update being made to the Risk register following the	
	August SDC meeting.	
	August 3DC meeting.	
	The following changes are still required from the August SDC meeting:	
	By exception review of Risk Register undertaken and the following changes made:	
	1. Clarify current risk position by moving additional actions to current controls.	
	2. Add in new risk about underspend. Include work currently being undertaken to	
	control risk e.g. reforecasting budgets	
	LT to update risk register with changes from August SDC meeting.	AP13 LT
7	AOCB	
	BA highlighted several upcoming events:	
	 Saturday 9th November, 2-4pm, Elphin Community Hall – "A Journey Through 	
	Elphin" Wall Hanging Unveiling (Community Grant Scheme Recipient)	
	 Friday 22nd November, 7:30-10:30pm, Lochinver Village Hall – CALL/National 	
	Lottery 25 th Birthday quiz	
	 Saturday 30th November, 12:30-3:30pm, Little Assynt Tree Nursery – Big Climate 	
	Fightback event (Woodland Trust) with tree planting and refreshments.	
	LG highlighted an update made to the mid scheme review paper. After the paper was	
	presented to the last SDC meeting it was noted that the statistics for target and actual	
	volunteer time didn't look right. An investigation highlighted an error in the Monitoring &	
	Evaluation Framework (which had omitted volunteer targets for several projects). The	
		AP14 BA

	Monitoring & Evaluation Framework has been updated for future use. BA to circulate to the SDC the corrected version of Mid Scheme Review report.	
	LT and RG to check accuracy of the reporting of JMT volunteer time in project hubs.	AP15 LT, RG
8	Date of the next meeting(s)	
	· Tues 4th Feb 2020, Inverness	
	· TBC May 2020, Lochinver	

