



European Union

European Regional
Development Fund
Investing in your future

**Final Minutes of the
PEACE III Review Panel Meeting**

Wednesday 22 September 2010, 11:30
SEUPB Offices, Belfast

In Attendance:	Pat Colgan	SEUPB (Chair)
	Noel Casserly	Programme Panel Member
	Peter Archdale	Programme Panel Member
	Maire Hunt	Independent Panel Member
	John Cherry	SEUPB (Secretariat)
	Marcia Maguire	SEUPB (Secretariat/minutes)

1. Introductions

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2. Agenda

The Agenda was agreed.

3. Register of Interests/Conflicts of Interest

None

4. Review

The Review of National Museums Northern Ireland (NMNI) – Facing the Past
Project Ref: 002853

Representatives from NMNI, BBC, WAVE and the Consortium (Pobal & CRC) were invited to enter the room.

In Attendance:	Paddy Gilmore	(PD)	(NMNI)
	Mark Adair	(MA)	(BBC)
	Adam Smyth	(AS)	(BBC)
	Sinead McKenna	(SM)	(WAVE)
	Sandra Peake	(SP)	(WAVE)
	Adam McBride	(AM)	(WAVE)
	Frank Murphy	(FM)	(CRC)
	Patricia Armstrong	(PA)	(CRC)
	Gordon Walker	(GW)	(CRC)
	Donnacha McSorley	(DM)	(Pobal)

After introductions, the Chair outlined the procedures to be followed and then invited the Project promoters to outline the reasons for their request for a review.

The representatives for NMNI thanked the panel for the opportunity for a review and proceeded to present their case. The main points included:

- Scoring actually decreased after proposal was further refined following CRC consultation
- Further discussion may be required to clarify issues of Value For Money
- Limited contact with partners during the process
- Options for delivery not discussed
- The call stated that this was an “Expensive”/flagship project.
- Misconception of the role of BBC in archiving and the resources available within BBC for on-line activity.
- Issues with rationale for 3000 hours of digitisation.
- WAVE represents value of experience and expertise.
- Potential lost opportunities for victims/survivors especially aging population & practitioners in the tertiary groups.
- Opportunity to develop the Troubles Gallery, in consultation with key stakeholders

- Opportunity to harness the resources, skills and expertise to deliver a major physical resource
- Opportunity to utilise a recognised major national and neutral venue in the museum.

The Chair thanked the project promoters for their presentation and invited the Consortium to respond.

Representatives from the *Consortium* made the following points:

- All completed applications were subjected to a robust assessment process as per established procedure.
- Based on all the information provided, the Steering Committee awarded the 'Facing the Past' application an overall score of 60%.
- The Steering Committee felt that the project had merit in terms of preserving and improving accessibility to television and radio recordings for future generations and providing victims and survivors the opportunity to tell their stories.
- The Steering Committee felt that the proposal as presented failed to clearly demonstrate efficiency and effectiveness (score 26). In particular they felt that the overall cost of the project was high (c£2.3m) and the project failed to provide value for money especially in relation to salary costs which were in excess of £600k and the £1m being requested to digitise 3,000hrs of BBC archive material.
- The Steering Committee also expressed concern regarding the need for and the expense associated with digitising 3,000hrs of BBC material and how the project would reach and maintain linkages across the entire eligible region post the PEACE III funding period.
- Steering Committee stated that they would welcome further applications from the National Museum when the Measure reopens.

The Chair thanked the Consortium for their comments.

The Chair stated that his understanding for rejection was based on the value for money of digitalisation and sought further clarification as to the context of expensiveness.

The Consortium representative confirmed that the Steering Committee believed that the project was too expensive based on the estimates provided by the promoters. He explained that there was a standard Green Book Economic Appraisal carried-out which did not include the technical assessment of these costs.

The Chair enquired how the value for money element can be determined without the technical assessment.

The Consortium explained that the total value of the call was €10m, and this one project represents 25% of the overall budget. The impact and output of this project was also to be determined.

The Chair commented that the call was looking for flagship projects which usually means a small number of rather costly projects and asked if the projects were scored on an individual basis.

The Consortium confirmed that this is the case; each project is scored in its own merits.

A Review Panel Member noted that there were two projects put forward for review today and that one had withdrawn, namely the State Apart project, proposed by the BBC and asked if there is a link between these two projects.

The project promoters explained that the two projects are linked and the decision to withdraw from the appeal was made because the State Apart project is co-dependent on the Facing the Past project. It was added that the Facing the Past Project is not co-dependent and is the means to put forward the BBC archive content of over 40 years of footage in relation to the Troubles freely online.

The Chair asked to applicants to explain the need to digitalise 3000 hrs of archive material.

The project promoter stated that the project represents an opportunity to provide a wider and richer account of the Troubles. He explained that this is an indicative amount because it will involve detailed accounts, for example, how the editing process happened in 1974. He said that would be too complicated to decide what will be included or excluded from the material available and there was an increase in output of programmes over the years.

A Review Panel Member outlined that it was important to identify the beneficiaries and understand the outcomes and impacts in order to be satisfied that there is a need and that it will be met.

The project promoters explained that the NMNI receives nearly 600,000 visitors a year and identified the need to further develop a Troubles Gallery taking into account a larger number of people, exploring personal testimonies and present day history. The museums engaged with the BBC and WAVE because of their expertise and experience. A representative from WAVE explained the therapeutic benefit for not only those who tell their story but also for those who listen to it and are looking for a better understanding of what happened. A BBC representative added that the material include interviews, with not only victims and survivors, but others such as police officers, Housing Executive officials and other members of society to draw a greater and wider experience of the time and the whole society during the decades of the Troubles.

The Chair stated that need and impact were addressed and asked if the Consortium had further comment.

The Consortium noted that the Steering Committee supported the project but felt that the application did not present a compelling argument and there are issues with cost, value for money and reach, as there were not enough evidence that the project would reach the cross-border area.

The project promoters explained that stories are being collected from the cross-border area and there are protocols in place to gather this material. Also the material would be catalogued online and there are initiatives to explore

partnerships with other organisations such as NI Libraries. It was explained that there are issues with rights of material fully available online and costs involved.

A Review Panel member asked how the project would continue beyond funding.

The project promoter explained that further resources would be needed to take the exhibitions to the countryside but there are other delivery mechanisms and strong resources to develop the theme locally and add local elements to the project.

A Review Panel member asked if the project could be scaled down in terms of hours being digitalised.

The project promoter stated that the objective was to provide an encompassing account of what happened and it would be difficult to select and edit the material. He explained the need for completeness as this project represents a significant legacy which will forever be available.

The Chair then asked for any final comments from both the project promoters and the Consortium.

The Consortium stated that an independent consultant was asked to carry out the Economic Appraisal and the scoring in the assessment report is based on clear evidence available. The assessment is limited to the information presented and the scoring changed because of the Steering Committee further dwelling on and analysing additional information provided by the project promoter. The project was recommended for rejection because the applicants did not address issues outlined in the Economic Appraisal.

The project promoters refuted the issues raised in the Economic Appraisal and said that all the information requested was provided. The value for money element was ambiguous in the EA as the appraisers didn't understand costing provided the BBC. They added that this was indeed a flagship, ground-breaking wider project with intrinsic value housed in a neutral dwelling (the museums),

using BBC archive and telling powerful stories to be collected in the whole eligible region by WAVE.

The Chair thanked the project promoters and the Consortium for their participation and asked if they were happy with the way the Review Panel had been conducted, and if they felt they had been given the opportunity to convey all the main points of their argument. Both the Project promoters and the Consortium confirmed that they were happy with the process.

The Chair commented on the presentation given by the project promoters as they presented a well structured argument and demonstrated enthusiasm and passion for the project.

The Project promoters and the Consortium exited the room.

The Review Panel discussed the application and information presented and noted:

- The promoters presented a strong case for this project.
- The panel felt the promoter did not address the question of value for money in relation to impact and outputs but identified the merit and potential of this project.
- Issues related to revising and editing the material for digitalisation could be addressed to justify scaling down the project's cost.
- Despite the claims of support by the Consortium, the project didn't score very high in relation to objectives, outputs and impacts.
- It appears that there were issues of communication, timescale and attention to detail between the Consortium and the Promoters during the assessment process.
- The project promoters demonstrated strong partnership, capacity to deliver and ability to explore opportunities.

The Panel recognised that there were issues of communication, timescale and attention to detail between the Consortium and the Promoters during the assessment process.

Therefore, the Review Panel concluded that there had been 'a failure in the adherence to procedures or systems that materially affected or could have affected the decision'.

The Panel therefore recommend that:

- The applicant be given the opportunity to submit further clarification in relation to objectives, outputs, reach and value for money including examination of the potential for a scaling-down of the costs of digitalisation; and
- The Consortium will re-assess the application and present to the Steering Committee for consideration.

Therefore, the Review Panel request that the Consortium facilitate this process by liaising with the applicant.

5. Any Other Business

None

6. Conclusion

The Chair thanked the Review Panel members for attending and informed them that he would write, on behalf of the Review Panel, to inform both project applicants and the Consortium of the Review Panel's decisions. He also stated that the minutes from the meeting would be e-mailed to Review Panel members in due course for their approval.