



LIFE11 ENV/IE/922
Burren Tourism for Conservation
Minutes of Meeting

Project	Steering Group Meeting	
Date	11/3/2013	
Location	Clare County Council Offices, New Road, Ennis, Co. Clare	

Attendance	Person	Organisation	Abbr.
Apologies	Phil Deegan	Shannon Development	PD
Yes	Flan Quilligan	Shannon Development & Failte Ireland	FQ
Yes	Sarah Gatley	Geological Survey of Ireland	SG
Yes	Michael Fitzsimons	Failte Ireland	MF
Yes	Carleton Jones	NUIG	CJ
Apologies	Gabriel Cooney	UCD	GC
Apologies	Beatrice Kelly	Heritage Council	BK
Apologies	Margaret Keane	National Monuments Service	MK
Yes	Christine Grant	National Monuments Service	CHG
Yes	Hugh Carey	National Monuments Service	HC
Apologies	Paul McMahan	Office of Public Works	PMcM
Apologies	Ken Curley	Office of Public Works	KC
Apologies	Enda Mooney	National Parks & Wildlife Service	EM
Apologies	Emma Glanville	National Parks & Wildlife Service	EG
Yes	Congella McGuire	Clare County Council	CMcG
Yes	Shane Casey	Clare County Council	SC
Yes	Mary Burke	Clare County Council	MB
Yes	Tracey Duffy	Clare County Council	TD
Yes	Joan Tarmey	Clare County Council	JT
Apologies	Sean Lenihan	Clare County Council	SL
Yes	Tina O'Dwyer	Consultant to Geopark	TO'D
Yes	Brian Callinan	Consultant	BC
Yes	Carol Gleeson	Burren Geopark/Clare County Council	CG
Yes	Eamon Doyle	Burren Geopark	ED
			NOTE

<p>1.0</p>	<p>Welcome and apologies. Minutes of previous meeting were reviewed and there were no proposals for amendment. Minutes proposed by SG and seconded by SC.</p> <p>CG welcomed Michael Fitzsimons, who has replaced Kevin Kidney as the Fáilte Ireland representative on the project.</p> <p>CG distributed and discussed diagram on how B1, B2 and B3 are integrated through the project, and highlighted the benefit in them being viewed as one project, rather than 3 separate elements.</p>	
<p>2</p> <p>2.1</p> <p>2.2</p>	<p>Action B3: Habitats & Monuments</p> <p>Criteria & Selection CG summarized the discussions that took place in the subgroup that met to draw up a shortlist of sites. Group decided to adopt an holistic approach to sites, and to consider them in relation to their surrounding areas and so 'areas' rather than sites were selected. CG outlined rationale for selection of the areas, and also distributed a summary of locations, key characteristics and their 'demonstration value'.</p> <p><u>Submission on behalf of Dysert O'Dea working group:</u> Dick Cronin (Conservation Officer at Clare County Council) addressed the group to propose extending the map to include the Dysert O'Dea project, and outlined a number of arguments to support this (the project was assured 2 years ago that Dysert would be included in the Burren and had worked on that basis since; site attracts 12,000 visitors a year and will be marketed as 'The Jewel of the Burren' in 2013; is an archaeological site of significance and houses the Clare Archaeology Centre).</p> <p>Group agreed to extend the proposed Kilnaboy area to include Dysert and to identify it as a Gateway area. Group also adopted CHG's suggestion that the Dysert experience of community involvement could be considered as a case study/background learning to the whole project.</p> <p>Discussion and input on the areas that are shortlisted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flaggy Shore: MB highlighted that this is a shellfish water area of significance and group really needs to look at the carrying capacity of this location given higher visitor numbers. SC highlighted the potential for aquaculture in the Flaggy Shore area – bear this in mind when developing anything for tourism. MF pointed out that the Western Fisheries Action Mgt Group (FLAG) looking at the development of aquaculture in Galway Bay and that there was some funding available through there. Seamus Breathnach in BIM is the contact person and MF to send on details. • MF: highlighted that FI will be doing a lot of work in access, signage capacity, visitor management as part of the Wild Atlantic Way. 	<p>CG</p> <p>MF</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a general appreciation for the demonstration values table that was circulated as it helps to clarify what outcomes are sought from each location. SG suggested adding the geological sites for each section and it was agreed that each partner should add information relevant to their area that might be important to the location. • BC advised the group that this was a shortlist only, which provided a framework to work within. A much deeper assessment of these sites is now required (impacts, costs, financial implications, affordability). For example, a value for money criteria would now need to be introduced. • CHG highlighted that a number of desired outcomes would be cost-neutral, and also proposed that the group place a value in determining good approaches and processes, and not focus exclusively on outcomes – achieve a balance between the two. <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CG to further develop the demonstrations spreadsheet with an expanded set of variables that each partner could populate as relevant. It is now for the partner to identify anything pertinent they know about each location, what they would like to see as an outcome of including this location and what they could contribute to each location. It is important that each partner provides feedback on whatever data is already there and that the central administration can collate this in a usable way. Each partner must take account of both tourism and conservation implications at each site – it is imperative to adopt an holistic approach to each area bearing in mind that the project is about the interaction between tourism & conservation. The group will reconsider this at the next meeting and will continue work on it over the summer. • At a minimum, each partner should feedback their initial reaction to the information already received and identify the priorities for each organization by the next meeting in April. 	<p>CG</p> <p>All partners</p>
<p>3</p> <p>3.1</p>	<p>B1 Tourism enterprises</p> <p>TO'D updated on a number of items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SUSTAIN: the European Tourism Indicator System which was launched by the European Commission in February. This is a comprehensive set of indicators designed to benchmark and measure sustainable destinations. IT provides a framework within which the B&CofM Geopark and the EU Life project can measure progress on its sustainability journey. It presents a number of advantages: ready-made templates, reporting templates, destination comparison potential, EU framework, potential destination certification. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STEP Green Communities is a package that is offered by Sustainable Travel International (STI) whereby it is possible for the destination to 'licence' the certification scheme and manage it locally in a way that is financially sustainable. Awaiting scenario costing from STI in order to assess further. • Geopark Code of Practice: This has been discussed with the Executive of the Burren Ecotourism Network and is being updated based on the feedback of the Life Partners and the Network Executive. • Burren Food Trail – a Geopark initiative – will be launched in April 2013 and will include both Network and non-Network members, highlighting the potential of the Geopark, through the tourism enterprises, to lead destination-level projects that can encourage more and more businesses to engage with the sustainability project. 	
4.0	<p>Action B3: Some discussion took place on GC's proposals on an ECTS-based programme. CJ advised the group that GC's proposal corresponded to what he thought initially (as discussed at the first meeting) and agrees that UCD should lead this action. Felt NUIG could operate better at the level of specialised, packaged training tailored to the needs of communities. CJ highlighted that UCD was already quite involved with communities through the MA in Heritage Management and is best positioned to lead B3; NUIG has specialisation in Burren-based archaeology and is positioned to contribute best in action B2 (e.g. field work on case studies, community training). How the two elements fit under Action B3 can be discussed directly between CJ and GC.</p> <p>Carlton will get involved in next subgroup discussion with GC, CG, TO'D and Brigid Barry of Burren Beo. TO'D to circulate Burren Beo review of heritage education to the group.</p> <p>Partners should also include information on policy and relevant training in the spreadsheet that is being circulated.</p>	<p>CJ/GC</p> <p>CJ</p> <p>TO'D</p> <p>All Partners</p>
5.0	<p>Administration Matters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CG to resend all information to MF. - CG to circulate timesheets again. All partners should submit them at the next meeting and they must be signed. They should be submitted once a quarter; all time allocated to the project (not just time in meetings) should be included. 	<p>CG</p> <p>All Partners</p>
6.0	<p>Geopark Advisory Committee (G.A.C.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agreed to amalgamate the G.A.C. with the Geopark Steering Committee. - G.A.C. recommended to expand itself to include other influential 	

	<p>people in the area; use as a panel of experts; also act as ambassadors in the area; meet twice a year; very structured meetings and including other events e.g. seminar, field trip</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A.C. And Steering Group to meet twice a year at above mentioned events. 	
7.0	<p>Launch of LIFE programme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - April 27th will go ahead as a Geopark Information evening and launch of a number of Geopark funded initiatives. - It is planned to launch the LIFE programme at a public life event in October – details yet t.b.c. 	
7.0	<p>Budget</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CG and BC are now working on budgets and outcome will be included in the inception report. • NPWS do not expect an allocation so no need to redistribute. • Two matters need to be resolved before greater clarity on budget can be gained. The first is what exactly will happen with Shannon Development allocation when that organisation is merged with Failte Ireland. The second is the need to decide the management structure and personnel that are required to run the project and the associated costs. • CHG highlighted that the task of filling in the sheet referred to above would be easier if the partner had an idea of budgets and money that might be available to work on projects. • However, budget can't really be determined until all information from partners has properly been collated and we have a clear picture of what needs to be spent where. 	CG/BC
8.0	<p>Next Meeting 17th April. 1st joint meeting of merged Steering Groups. Venue: Ennis; Training Room, Clare County Council</p>	