

**Minutes of the Northern Snowdonia Local Access Forum Meeting  
Held on Monday 2nd December 2019 at 5.45p.m  
At Glasdir, Llanrwst**

**Present - Members:**

Mr Edwin Noble	Mr Edgar Williams
Mr Arthur Davies	Mr John Gladston
Ms Katy Haines	Mr Dafydd Gwyndaf
Mr Eryl P Roberts	Mrs Hilary Davies
Mr R. J. Collister	Mr Tom Hutton
Mr Denis McAteer	Cllr Jason Parry
Mr David Firth	Mr Robin Parry
Mr Neil Martinson	

**Officers / Speakers/  
Guests:**

Peter Rutherford (SNPA)	Molly Lovatt (NRW)
Rhian P Williams (SNPA)	Duncan Barrett
Ioan Davies (SNP)	Simon Rodgers (Ogwen Partnership)

Paul Frost (Denbigh/Conwy LAF member)  
Dafed Taylor (GLAS)

**1. Apologies:** Mr Richard Williams

*EN thanked everyone for their attendance this evening and welcomed the various guests and speakers particularly PF from the Conwy/Denbighshire LAF.*

**2. Previous Minutes**

*DMcA confirmed that he did give his apologies for the last meeting.*

PR apologised and that he would amend the minutes accordingly.

**Approved.**

**3. Matters Arising**

**i) Slate Trail Ultra Marathon run**

PR informed members that following a request from DG he had been in communication with the race organisers and had asked them to touch base with the relevant Community Councils along the route. This is a comparatively small event with about 80 alpine type runners and will be run on the 21<sup>st</sup> next February. This is 89 miles in total.

*DG stated that this was sensible especially as runners were passing through villages at night.*

**ii)** PR showed some original late 1960's photographs of the parking issues in Pen Y Pass – with considerable unregulated roadside and verge parking.

He informed the members that a consultant was to be commissioned by the Snowdon Partnership to review the current parking and transport provisions around Snowdon. This would also have a wider remit to include Ogwen, Betws and Capel Curig. Undoubtedly this will make interesting reading and he hoped that people would get the opportunity to contribute their ideas to this including the LAF members.

iii) Ffridd Uchaf works have begun on the surfacing and re routing of the existing bridleway. This will serve as a safer route (and shortcut) between Lon Gwyrfaï junction at Gors and the Rhyd Path on onwards in both directions and hopefully dissuade people from walking on the main road.

*DF confirmed that there has been a significant increase in people walking on the road in recent years between Rhyd Ddu and the Gors car park area. He suggested that possibly more information about Lon Gwyrfaï should be available in the Rhyd Ddu car park.*

PR stated that this was a really good idea so he would discuss this with the interpretation section to see what can be done as the old boards in the RD car park were due for renewal. He acknowledged that all the information for LG was only across the road and this may be adding to the confusion.

#### **iv) Dog's information on the NP website.**

A LAF member had recently raised the point about the lack of information pertaining to sheep gathering which could be added to the current information for dogs on the SNP website. So they will look to update that section.

*DG suggested that as there were so many types of signs then could we produce a generic one that fits all. The farming unions also had their own.*

PR acknowledged that this was an issue as he knew of at least of three or four types. He would bring the suite of signs to the next meeting for a discussion. He may also have an internal discussion between the NP services.

ID added that the Wardens also used one or two differing ones.

*NM suggested that it may be also prudent to ascertain why some people tended to ignore the existing signage. He suggested that here may be a lack of connection between dog owners and landowners so there may scope for personalising these with the landowners family explaining the messages needed. Possibly it may be useful to experiment with this type of approach.*

*RC added that some of the older signage is very graphic indeed but they made the point clearly.*

*TH commented that most dog owners obeyed signage but unfortunately there was a small minority that didn't and this has the potential to cause a disproportional amount of damage. Getting the messages to that small group is important but difficult.*

#### **v) Pen Y Pass – Pont Cromlech**

PR mentioned that a member had asked where this line was between the two sites – pen Y Pass and Pont Cromlech and what the status of the link was.

He stated that this link had existed for a very long time and was denoted on the OS maps in a black dotted line - originally as a *defacto* route and is not a Public Right of Way – and since 2000 it is now within CRoW access land.

He stressed that although this would be part of the Cylchdaith Y Wyddfa (the Snowdon circular) it would not become a higher status path – it would remain simply a walked line only. This is currently available but is not promoted. However, the numbers of people walking on the road between the two sites is increasing and possibly we should review this. Establishing the lower section links onwards and down towards Nant Peris involves far more complex issues and will take some time to reconcile.

*RC added that although the route nearer PyP is established and is walked it is not obvious to the general public that it's available.*

*EN commented that he had seen for himself many campers vans recently in Ogwen particularly and wondered if these were the people on the road and was this was legal as it blocked up many parking places.*

ID added that there was a lot of information circulated between the camper van fraternity who highlighted sites where parking was either cheap or for free in Snowdonia. This was also an issue for other areas such as Betws Y Coed but acknowledged that it was difficult to manage.

*RP commented that this is of concern in the Llanberis area as many leave their refuse in the local bins and use the public toilets to deposit their waste.*

PR commented that overnight or successive parking for a few nights in Nant Peris was also problematic given that there are no toilets in that area.

vi) The marking of the **Snowdon Pillars** is still outstanding as the weather at the end of the season has made this activity difficult. They would now get this done as soon as the train is running in the May half term and when it's dry. They are looking at some form of reflectivity in a lighter colour something like off grey rather than black. This would be more obvious.

*JG added that there was a suggestion from the Llanberis Mountain Rescue Team (MRT) that the Bwlch Y Moch post should be moved.*

PR stated that the original spot had been agreed with the Llanberis MRT and that he had already moved this twice. But they would consider doing this again if necessary. A new post design would be more costly. He stressed that the `people dynamics` at Bwlch Y Moch were always difficult given its close proximity to the Crib Coch turn off.

*RC asked exactly what the problem was.*

PR stated that the junction with Crib Coch (CG) complicated matters and possibly the post needed moving further west towards the double stile or back and giving a different direction for PyP. He favoured moving this to slightly further west and nearer the double stiles which would be less ambiguous.

*TH asked if it was possible to erect another further up on the Crib Coch route itself to say CG.*

ID added that one of the major issues was that once more competent walkers turned off for CG then many people tended to follow them without much thought. The new wall had made a difference but possibly it was not enough to align people in the right direction and to follow the Pyg Track.

*KH added that it may also be an idea to ask people who didn't know quite where they were on site to determine their decision making process at that point.*

PR added that there was already a smaller pillar further up which had Crib Coch written on it. Extending the wall with a gate may also be an option. He suggested that we have a small sub group from the LAF membership to go and view this area with PR.

*EN asked members if they would volunteer for this.*

**Agreed** - DF, RC, DF, TH, NM and PR would convene something as soon as the weather allowed a little later in the New Year. They would take Warden from PyP along as well if available.

*EN asked if we could have photos of this for March if possible.*

PR would gather some together.

**9)** PR mentioned that the **National Parks Visitor Monitoring Report (2018)** figures were not so easy to find as these were under the `press releases` section of the NP's website. He would try to get these moved to a page on the website that is easier to find. He confirmed that these stats are freely available to anyone as long as the SNP gets an acknowledgment as the source. He had also added the link to the minutes.

#### **4. Correspondence**

##### **Welsh Government Sustainable Farming and our land – LAF's joint response.**

PR informed the members that this was done through directly via the LAF Chairs as unfortunately the timeframe for the response did not coincide with the LAF meetings. So they had got together to discuss this.

In terms of `access` the paper was poor and access generally was not addressed as a single topic. Given that it was difficult to respond to this it was decided that a number of points should be made generally.

This included the lack of importance attached to PRoW as public assets and the networks positive contribution to the outdoor recreation sector and the health agenda, the lack of any mention of CRoW access land, the lack of reference to the legal framework and processes required for any proposed changes in the PRoW network and users and landowners' responsibilities. The lack of reference to cross compliance and also the potential for improving the network across multiple land holdings. It also highlighted the potential advantage to landowners if PRoW were to be included within

any future agri-environmental schemes and the positive role that the LAF's could play in deciding on changes to the network.

This response was then signed off by the LAF Chairs.

## **5. Lost Ways presentation – Duncan Barrett.**

DB explained that in 2000, the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (CROW Act 2000) was introduced in England and Wales. Section 53 of the Act provides for a cut-off date of 1st January 2026 for registering many historical routes that are omitted from the current network of PRow.

The Lost Ways project is about finding and recording these routes that may be deemed to have been lost to the public as they were not included on the definitive map when the Community Councils were made to record their Public Rights of Way in 1949.

The recording of PRow by the various Community Councils also created certain anomalies in the countryside where some routes, which were clearly tracks or footpaths, were frequently excluded from the `definitive map<sup>1</sup>` at the time for one reason or another.

He emphasised that many inconsistencies are evident - whilst some CC's recorded routes as important neighbouring CC's did not therefore many cross boundary routes changed status and ended up dead ended, simply disappeared altogether or changed status at community boundaries. I.e. they went from being a bridleway to footway. Those inconsistencies are still evident today and can be seen from simply looking at any OS map.

To this end he and a significant number of other people over England and Wales are trying to research and record as many of these routes as possible before this cut off date of 2026 as there is a danger was that many may be lost for good.

He cited some examples from the Llanfair TH in the Conwy valley area and showed the succession of similar maps (from 1895 onwards) clearly showing his example and how this route had been `lost` during re registering by the community councils.

He explained that evidence for lost ways can be accumulated from various sources such as tithe maps, community or parish council records, older legal maps and the original Ministry of Transport road maps (1923) which also recorded all the unclassified roads (UCR's) many of which we still have today.

He stressed that finding these routes could be of great advantage to a range of users such as walkers, cyclists and horse riders. So he would urge people to help with this exercise.

PR commented that the 2026 date would (from what he had heard) would not be the cut off date in Wales. The Rights of Way Officers themselves had recommended that the

---

<sup>1</sup> A `definitive map` is a map prepared and kept by a `highways authority` which is the legal record of the Public Rights of Way network.

2016 date be ignored and they had also recommended that all cases could still be brought and added to the list and then assessed on a case by case system.

*DB acknowledged that there are significant budgetary constraints faced by local authorities and he was not hopeful that many can be recorded in the near future.*

*HD made the point that it would take many years to investigate and process these claims and the resources required (which are significant) are not available. It would be a tragedy to lose some of the more useful ones – especially those that linked to others but a simple example in Conwy took almost two years to complete. Conwy Council already had a significant backlog of legal claimed rights and surely this will only add to their problems.*

*EN thanked DB for his presentation and time to present his findings to the LAF on this interesting topic.*

## **6. Presentation on the Idwal Partnership**

SR introduced himself as the Ogwen Partnership Officer and is based in the Cwm Idwal office in Ogwen.

This is a partnership between the National Trust (NT), Natural Resources Wales (NRW) and the Snowdonia National Park (SNP).

The Partnership was formed in 2010 as previously the three organisations managed this separately which was inefficient. So one point of contact was agreed to simplify the day to day management of the site. In terms of the infrastructure the NT is responsible for capital works such as the paths and boundaries. The SNP are loosely responsible for the information building, the educational material and interpretation within it and the NRW is responsible for the nature and conservation issues and from which he can tap into any of the organisations for assistance when required.

He further explained that Cwm Idwal has numerous designation in terms of nature conservation and geology both national and international: It is a Natural Nature Reserve (NNR) and the first in Wales designated in 1954, a Ramsar site<sup>2</sup>, a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and is part of the Eryri Special Area of Conservation (SAC) under the European Habitats Directive) and contains many interesting and rare plants, interesting geological and glacial features. It is regularly used as an outdoor classroom for all levels of interest and also a well known walking and climbing area.

His particular focus is in being the public interface between those organisations and the public users. His priorities are linking people with the sense of place and to encourage people to get outdoors and minimising their impact on this environment. He also advises visitors on routes or other information. This can be difficult without trying to be seen as `policing` this area but some activities are detrimental to the site – barbeques & fires, dogs off leads, paddle boards, inflatable kayaks, wild swimming, wild camping and issues with drones – disturbing nesting birds and noise are the main two. There is also

---

<sup>2</sup> Ramsar sites are wetlands of international importance that have been designated under the criteria of the [Ramsar Convention \(Iran 1971\) on Wetlands](#) for containing representative, rare or unique wetland types or for their importance in conserving biological diversity.

some sheep straying that occurs from other parts of the mountain which is dealt with by the shepherd.

The educational of the public is also an important element of his work and giving groups talks and leading walks around the Cwm is all part of his role in educating the public and students of all levels. He also assists with some research on the site through the NRW and other conservation projects.

He informed the members that there are planned changes occurring in the SNP visitor centre with less emphasis on technology and more on information panels.

There are also developing car and cycle electric charging points in the car parking area.

The site now has its own website for which he is also responsible.

In terms of access the sites paths are well maintained by the NT team and the new bridge over Idwal stream was the only contentious issue of late but it does facilitate easier access for people who care to venture slightly further up towards Devils Kitchen and to then walk around the Cwm at a slightly higher level. It also avoids additional erosion at that river crossing point.

Cwm Idwal's visitor numbers are around 90,000 a year and this may be slightly higher as there are a number of different access points. Facilitating access to Idwal is important as long as it does not have a detrimental effect on the features that are so carefully managed. He believed that the more people visited such places and learn about its special qualities then the more they will respect the environment generally.

The Partnership has worked closely with organisations such as the British Mountaineering Council (BMC) in formulating the 'Winter Climbing Conditions' project. Ice climbing in particular can be damaging to certain plants if there is sufficient snow/ice covering. Unfortunately many rare plants grow on the rare cliffs so they have devised a system to avoid damaging the turf ledges whilst ice climbing. Conditions must be right for the activity to take place and which does not damage the rare plant species. The climbing conditions information is gained from the temperature probes placed at those locations and via the BMC website this enables climbers to make more informed decisions.

There are other issues to be addressed such as the roadside parking and dogs off leads. It is interesting to read the old meeting notes from the late 50's which highlighted these same issues we see today (60 years later).

In terms of parking this is compounded by the lack of any public transport to the area and may exclude local residents without cars from accessing Idwal even from nearby towns such as Bangor or Bethesda.

*DF thought that generally there had been improvements in Cwm Idwal but for many years he had taken many students into that area but since the reduction in sheep grazing more grass is apparent and it was harder to find those rarer plants.*

*NM commented that frequently the public have no idea about the various designations of that area. This was not restricted to Cwm Idwal and thought that this was an area*

*which needed work to improve public perception. Additional signage may be required to change behaviour and raise people's awareness of those designations.*

*RC added that the best way to protect the various plant communities in Cwm Idwal was to have good well maintained paths and to keep people on them. Fortunately they are well maintained.*

ML suggested that any accommodation providers could ask for and be supplied with information relating to any NNR such as Cwm Idwal and to help get those messages about the site into the public mindset. She could make them available if necessary.

*DF added the putting up more relevant information in the centre was crucial to promoting the understanding of the site generally.*

PR thanked SR for his interesting presentation. However he had worked there himself in 199.... Sadly the problems remain the same. He added that there is no statutory right of access to inland water so as landowners the NT could easily regulate this if they choose to do so. *Granted last years hot summer did contribute to this phenomena and was reflected equally across the NP.*

*TH suggested that possible they could be encouraged to `swim` responsibly.*

SR added that undoubtedly the very hot summer of 2018 contributed to this but they were not unduly worried about this. Certainly the various articles on wild swimming circulating in social media may not have helped. It was possible to control `by signage` but could prove difficult to police and may not be necessary and may be detrimental to the integrity of the site.

*RC recommended a `Jaws` solution! But mentioned that it is important that areas such as CI are maintained in their natural condition and should not become urbanised through unnecessary signage. CI and its surroundings gives people a sense of freedom which is its biggest asset and where there is no sense of overbearing control and is something which we should not loose.*

*EN thanked SR for his interesting presentation and looked forward to an update next year.*

## **7. Updates on:**

### **i) Welsh Government Access Reform Advisory Group (ARAG) update**

PR explained that the WG has now concluded the appointment process for the steering group and this was made up of specialists from the field. They will be asked to look at how more significant changes to access rights should or can be implemented and also to look at the simplification of the legal processes associated with managing PRoW and to reduce the bureaucracy and costs to local authorities.

This group will have some technical sub groups to discuss specific issues.

Many of current ideas were highlighted by the LAF's and others during the original Access & Outdoor Recreation Green Paper in 2014 and also in subsequent

consultations since. In terms of the access legislation the All Wales Rights of Way Officers (ADEPT) group had also submitted a number of technical points (50) that required amendment and these had recently been discussed and resubmitted by the group.

PR would report back to the LAF's on how those deliberations were going as their conclusions could have significant affects in Wales in relation to the management of PRoW in the future.

*DG mentioned that it was disappointing that there is no representation on this group from the Welsh farming unions which seemed somewhat odd. However, they have made representations to WG regarding this specific issue (copy of letter given to PR this evening).*

PR added that possibly WG may change this. *He also thought that this specific issue had been raised at the recent LAF Conference.*

## **ii) Access to Inland Water Advisory group**

PR informed the members that the WG had decided to allocate the discussion for access to inland water in Wales to the National Access Forum (NAF) sub group. It was disappointing that this issue had been not been included in the main access reform discussions (above as item 1) and the group and timeframe were independent of those other deliberations.

However, there was a recognition that the current status quo – i.e. that no statutory rights exist for access to inland water in England & Wales for recreation was not working and also recognises that there is continual friction between the different stakeholder groups.

WG are looking for practical solutions and have indicated that for now they are not minded to initiate legislation but have not ruled this out if practical workable solutions cannot be found. The timeline for this is March 2021.

He was also on this panel along with the Access Officer from Brecon Beacons NP.

PR would report back to the LAFs as things progressed.

*RP commented that the last two points within the paper were interesting i) the do nothing approach was not an option and therefore not to leave the status quo as it was and that ii) that legislation was not being considered. IT was interesting that they were looking for new solutions. There were some ideas put forward by the fishing fraternity on the Conwy such as seasonal access – end of January to April, May – September a fishing season only or where landowners can decide to allow canoeing or not or during floods. October to Jan closed rivers due to running and spawning.*

PR reiterated the Ministers comments

*"I have not ruled out future legislation on access particularly if I am not satisfied of reasonable progress within 18 months. "*

He added that the group was not tasked with finding a legislative approach to this just to recommend practical solutions. If there were no workable solutions then they have not ruled out legalisation and this was an important point.

*DF commented that any solutions may have to be done on a river to river basis as the dynamics vary so much. He could think of some examples of faster winter rivers where access was straightforward where simply practical solution can be applied. However, there are some stretches of water where the physical characteristics of the river are different and where there may be other opportunities for open canoes/kayaks. The lower Glaslyn is ideal for those activities in the winter periods.*

PR added that the previous recommendations for access to water had recommended a number of main points – two of these included having adequate water levels at all times and conservation assessments. If the Glaslyn was a candidate at any time then these tests would have to be applied particularly as the lower estuary section was important for wintering bird populations. Any egress point on the river as an example would have to be higher up. It is not dissimilar to many other river/sea confluences.

### **iii) Highways Act – section 31/25 proposals for improving the processes for modifications around farmyards.**

PR mentioned that this short paper was one that he had originally submitted to the Rights of Way group and others in 2013 and that at the time this was only partially supported. However, this has now been included in the recommendations for the Access Reform technical group.

This paper recommends a process that can address issues around PRow that run through busy farmyards when an alternative line can be made to avoid all the inherent dangers of large machinery and stock. This is a simple mechanism that could provide alternatives for the future and assist land owners and users alike.

The current mechanisms are bureaucratic, prohibitively expensive and can be subject to legal (and sometimes spurious) challenge. Developing new mechanisms could be easier, far less expensive and would encourage landowners and others to come forward with ideas. However, he stressed that any changes must be `mutually beneficial` to landowners and users and should not be exclusively beneficial to one party or another.

Another was that on proved successful after a trial period – for say 12 months then they could come to the LAF for formal approval and the Community Council then final process would be conclude where the legal line can be moved and the definitive map corrected to suit at minimal costs.

*EN commented that the current situation is not acceptable as agricultural yards are industrial areas as such and having the ability making it easier to move lines would be greatly beneficial to all parties.*

*DF asked if the LAF could support this paper officially.*

*KH commented that she had issues with the definition of the term `holding` as lots of people have routes near their properties and they may attempt to move PRow using this mechanism.*

PR stated that this specific issue was addressed within the paper in that any proposed changes would have to be mutually beneficial and not be exclusively advantageous for the landowners or users.

*KH asked how this would work in terms of process.*

PR relied that there would be a pilot period for any case probably for 12 -18 months then it should be for the LAF to review a particular case (and site visits) and either support it or not for the legal order to continue.

ID added that this type of issue is a common problem across the NP and certainly a simpler system would be very welcomed and useful.

*HD asked if there were cases that came forward then who would start the negotiations and enable this.*

PR thought that either the NP or local authority would be able to enable these or work together to complete the process required once the LAF has deliberated on a case by case basis. He believed that they would have a major role to play here.

*EN asked for a show of hands in support of this paper.*

**Agreed to support this paper by majority.**

## **8. Any Other business**

### **i) Recreational Strategy update.**

PR explained that this was still a working progress and he would bring a draft to the March meeting for their perusal and observations.

**ii) Re selection of LAF membership.** PR informed the members that their membership tenure was due to come to an end in March 2020 (as their last meeting). Applications for membership would be advertised (as required in the CRoW Act legislation) and people could apply as before.

He stressed that the LAF's were important to the NP and it was important that they reapply having gained so much experience and knowledge that was not easy to accumulate. Membership criteria stated that the membership should be balanced between landowners and users and was laid down in the LAF Regulations. Additional one representative from the disability sector was also required.

The `Authority` nominated members will remain in place. I.e. Gwynedd & Conwy Council representatives and the NP Authority nominee.

The selection would be made as per normal practice by a small sub group of Authority members and is not in the hands of the Secretary. A paper was going to the Authority this week with advertisements going out in the New Year.

ML commented that possibly there was a need for a greater balance between males/females on the group and was this membership number considered adequate. Reference made to "top heavy blokes"

PR reiterated that it was for the Authority panel to decide on the membership but there were criteria to be followed. People are chosen for their specialist sector knowledge and are not there as representatives of specific bodies or organisations. Although some clearly have those affiliations they are not a deciding factor.

*DG commented that it was local people that were required as LAF members as they have a greater understanding of the local issues pertaining to access.*

*NM added that there may be some potential in advertising the LAF membership in local colleges and schools or other groups who may be interested in becoming a member.*

PR added that within the WG legislative review they would be looking at the tenure period of LAF membership. The LAFs had recommended that this change from three years five to enable more consistency. And that LAF Chairs tenure should be up to the individual LAFs to decide. I.e. one year or three. Having to go through this process essentially every two and a half years is onerous for Secretaries and they can lose their continuity and expertise which then becomes difficult and wasteful.

**iii) Recommended dates for next years meetings:**

As follows

**2<sup>nd</sup> March, 8<sup>th</sup> June, 7<sup>th</sup> September & 7<sup>th</sup> December (to avoid RWAS Winter Fair)**

**Agreed.**

**iv)** RC mentioned that the Snowdonia Society had organised a clear up of litter and general rubbish in the beginning of September in the Cwm Clogwyn area of Snowdon with over a dozen volunteers. A considerable amount of litter has blown down from the summit area and there was also some agricultural materials. They had hoped that most of this could be lifted out by helicopter during the next lift. Over three tons was lifted from Cwm Hetiau during the last heli lift recently by the NP.

*EW asked what agricultural materials had been recovered at that point.*

*RC stated that they had recovered various rolls of wire fencing and old posts. It may have come from higher up the hill.*

*PR would pass any photos to EW if required once he had received them from RC.*

**v)** RC asked ML what the position was regarding the PRow running through the clear NRW felled woodland adjacent to the Abergwyngregin. It appeared that this line was now incorrect and had changed on the ground.

ML stated that the line of this path may have moved over the years but she would look at this and report back.

*KH stated that in such instances the legal line of the PRow does not `move` regardless of what happens or what is on the ground it remains the definite and legal line.*

*EN asked ML to report back on this particular issue.*

**9. Recommended Agenda items for next meeting**

- a) Catrin Glyn to update us on the Snowdon partnership Transport and Parking review.
- b) Gwynedd ROWIP – a sub group may be required (already selected)
- c) SNPA Access Strategy Review draft
- d) Dog signage
- e) Carneddau HLF update
- f) Mountain Bothies Association update (if possible)

**10. Date of next meeting – 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2019 – venue to be confirmed**

***EN thanked all members, speakers and Officers for contribution this evening and over the year and wished everyone a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.***

-----  
-----

-----  
-----

-----

-----

-----