



European Union

European Regional
Development Fund
Investing in your future

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

Wednesday 24 March 2010, 13:30
SEUPB Office, Belfast

In Attendance:	Pat Colgan	SEUPB (Chair)
	Angela Holohan	Panel Member
	Paul Noonan	Panel Member
	Delia Van der Lenden	Independent
	Adrian McNamee	SEUPB (Secretariat)
	Christine Markey	SEUPB (Secretariat)

1. Introductions

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted that this would be Adrian McNamee's last Review Panel as he is leaving SEUPB. The Chair and Panel members congratulated Adrian on his new role and thanked him for his contribution and hard work over the years.

2. Agenda

The Agenda was agreed.

3. Register of Interests/Conflicts of Interest

None

4. Review

**The Review of North West Lifelong Learning Association (NWLLA) –
Defining Lives (Ref – 000991)**

Representatives from NWLLA and the Consortium of Pobal and Community Relations Council were invited to enter the room.

In Attendance:	Elizabeth McNerlin	NWLLA
	Katherine Kirk	Hands That Talk
	Collette Nulty	Consortium (Pobal)
	Patricia Armstrong	Consortium (CRC)
	Kelan McClelland	Consortium (CRC)

After introductions, the Chair outlined the procedures to be followed.

The Project promoters were then invited to outline the reasons for their request for a review.

The representatives for NWLLA presented their case. The main points included:

- There was no consideration of the highly specified nature of the target group.
- It is not a deaf project; the promoters will actively seek out other groups as well as the deaf.
- The Consortium narrowed the focus of the project from the initial clarification meeting.
- The score of 12 for Need is very low, especially when the Consortium have stated in their assessment that this is a story that has to be told.
- The assessment encourages other groups to actively engage with NWLLA. The promoters have tried to engage with such groups to no avail and do not believe they will be included in any approved project.
- The project is unique and innovative which will inevitably cost money.
- There was not a full understanding of the clarification points and the budget.
- NWLLA have a commitment letter from UTV, but they were marked down because they are not broadcasters themselves.

- The project will examine the impact of the conflict on all groups directly and indirectly, it is a new forward way of thinking that will have an effect on national, European and international networks.

The Chair thanked the Project promoters for outlining their points and invited the Consortium to respond.

Representatives from the Consortium made the following points:

- They gave a background of the Strand and the processes to date.
- The Steering Committee for this strand were looking for projects that would work throughout the whole eligible region; reach all sections of society; maximise the people engaged; have a clear understanding of the conflict; experience in story collecting; use a bottom-up approach; have appropriate technological standards; and collaborative approaches with media and IT partners.
- All applications were treated the same and given a robust assessment.
- The project failed under three criteria: programme; priority and theme; and efficiency and effectiveness.
- The project was not sufficiently strategic and there was not sufficient information on targets, groups and sectors.
- There was concern over the buy-in from UTV as the commitment was dependent on seeing the final product.
- The salary and overheads were not proportionate to the overall costs.
- There was concern over the ability to deliver the project.
- The Steering Committee were supportive, in principle, of the project but felt it should be smaller with the possibility of undertaking a pilot project. The Consortium would welcome an application in the future roll out of the Strand.

The Chair thanked the Consortium for their comments.

A Review Panel Member asked how realistic would it be to expect a broadcaster to give more commitment than UTV had done at the early stages?

The Consortium stated that the Steering Committee were looking for collaboration with and a significant level of commitment from a broadcaster.

The Chair asked if there was evidence that made sure the applicants were aware of this?

The Consortium stated that a detailed guidance note was issued at the initial stages outlining what would be required.

A Review Panel Member stated that the assessment by the Consortium referred to the fact that because a Broadcasting Company was not part of the partnership there was no guarantee that the documentaries mentioned in the application would be broadcast and that the project had been marked down on this basis. If having a broadcasting company was a pre-condition for funding, this should be made explicit in the guidance so that it is clear to all promoters exactly what is eligible.

The need for greater clarity was accepted by the Chair who stated that this would be taken on board for any subsequent calls for applications in this strand. .

The Consortium stated that there was difficulty with this as broadcasting was viewed in different ways. It did not necessarily have to be a TV company; it just needed to have the widest reach possible.

The Project Promoters stated that they had 15 years experience in the media and that they would not only be disseminating information via TV, they would have podcasts on the internet also. The project promoter also stated that it would be almost impossible for a community group to partner with a major broadcaster.

A Review Panel member asked how the project promoters propose to deliver the project and connect with groups in the whole eligible region?

The project promoters stated that the podcasts and programmes produced would be subtitled to ensure accessibility for all. The internet element will help to make the project international and reach the areas that UTV cannot reach.

A Review Panel Member asked if the Consortium had taken advice from people within the broadcasting industry in terms of what is a reasonable level of commitment?

The Consortium stated that they had a meeting with the BBC to seek advice in advance of issuing the guidance note.

A Review Panel Member asked if it would ever be likely that UTV would give more commitment?

The Consortium stated that they may have done and what the Steering Committee wanted to see was broadcasters being more integrated into the project such as sitting on advisory panels which could then guarantee that programmes would be broadcast.

The Chair asked the project promoters if they felt they had demonstrated the ability to broadcast?

The project promoters stated that they read the guidelines and felt that they fitted the criteria.

A Review Panel Member asked if the project promoters could clarify who the target groups were?

The project promoters stated that target groups would include deaf people and their families as well as those that work with the deaf to get all perspectives and then compare them. The project has used a consultant with links to groups throughout the eligible region.

The Chair asked what the story being told would be?

The project promoters stated that it would be the story of deaf people living through the troubles as well as the experiences of those that work with the deaf.

The Chair clarified that the story was of the deaf person in the conflict and asked if this is how the Consortium understood it.

The Consortium clarified that they did but that the Steering Committee were looking for one large project that would incorporate this as well as a range of other stories.

The project promoters stated that they believe the Consortium did not understand what the project was setting out to achieve.

A Review Panel Member asked how the project promoters would ensure that the podcasts would be viewed?

The project promoters stated that they have links with other deaf associations through the eligible region, Ireland and the UK. When the project is rolled out the word will spread across the communities and the associations.

The project promoters referred to the number of staff required and felt that this was not excessive. For the project to work, 4 deaf people needed to be employed and as a result, 4 hearing employees to accompany those.

The project promoters stated that their ethos is to tell untold stories; they would consider this a flagship project and encouraged the panel to reconsider the decision to reject.

The Consortium stated that they recognise this is a story that should be told and encouraged the promoters to consider re-applying.

The Chair asked the Project promoters and the Consortium 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 Project promoters and the Consortium exited the room.

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

- The project had a narrow focus.
- It was an expensive project.
- No thought had been given to the structure of the documentaries and programmes.
- The application would need more work if they were to re-apply.

The Review Panel concluded that in light of the information provided and the arguments put forward the Steering Committee decision was not unreasonable. The Panel also acknowledged that the proper decision making procedures had been followed.

The Review Panel recognised both the value and importance of the story and the need for this story to be heard. The Panel recommended that the project promoters work closely with the Consortium in forthcoming calls for applications and to reapply to the PEACE III Programme.

5. Review

The Review of Irish Congress of Trade Unions (ICTU) – Trade Unions in the Northern Ireland Conflict (TUNIC) (Ref – 003112)

Representatives from ICTU and the Consortium of Pobal and Community Relations Council were invited to enter the room.

In Attendance:	Peter Bunting	ICTU
	Frank Tipping	ICTU

Collette Nulty	Consortium (Pobal)
Patricia Armstrong	Consortium (CRC)
Kelan McClelland	Consortium (CRC)

After introductions, the Chair outlined the procedures to be followed.

The Project promoters were then invited to outline the reasons for their request for a review.

The representatives for ICTU presented their case. The main points included:

- The assessment did not consider the project in its entirety.
- Some of the assumptions and comparisons that the assessments are based on do not apply.
- The assessment undervalues and underscores the project in several key areas.
- The description of the Trade Union movement in the assessment does not accurately reflect the description provided in the application and clarifications.
- The capacity to mainstream and disseminate the benefits and outputs has not been considered.
- The project is not only focused on Trade Unionists, it will also engage PEACE III priority groups.
- The educational resource is not limited to trade union membership and extends to both the practice of teachers and delivery of the curriculum.
- The score of 6 for promoting reconciliation and good relations is a result of a one dimensional view of trade union membership.
- In terms of value for money the assumptions made in the assessment are not accurate or do not apply to the project.
- There was no consideration in the assessment of Still Films evidence on how the project will add new value.
- The assessment acknowledged that stories of older people needed to be collected, however, this was not under the Evidence of Need section.

The Chair thanked the Project promoters for outlining their points and invited the Consortium to respond.

Representatives from the Consortium made the following points:

- They gave a background of the Strand and the processes to date.
- The Steering Committee for this strand were looking for projects that would work throughout the whole eligible region; reach all sections of society; maximise the people engaged; have a clear understanding of the conflict; experience in story collecting; use a bottom-up approach; have appropriate technological standards; and collaborative approaches with media and IT partners.
- The project failed to meet the threshold score of 65%, while their score of 63% seems close this is not a true reflection of where the project failed. It failed to meet the threshold score under each of the three criteria: programme; priority and theme; and efficiency and effectiveness.
- The Steering Committee liked the idea of the project but were not convinced by the information provided by the promoter.
- It was felt that the project did not meet the criteria and did not fit with Strand 1.
- The Consortium and Steering Committee had asked for clarifications, when these were received it was felt that there was still a lack of clarity specifically in terms of participants beyond trade union members and the costings.

A Review Panel Member asked why the project promoters did not bring in a major broadcaster as the call asked for strategic partners?

The project promoters stated that they took advice on maximising the reach and they wanted to leave options to consider the best broadcaster.

The Chair asked the Consortium if they were satisfied with the broadcasting credentials?

The Consortium stated that the broadcasting element was a concern but it was not the main concern.

A Review Panel Member asked if it was realistic to expect this level of commitment in advance of funding being secured? If having a broadcasting company was a pre-condition for funding, this should be made explicit in the guidance from the Consortium so that it is clear to all promoters exactly what is eligible.

The need for greater clarity was accepted by the Chair who stated that this would be taken on board for any subsequent calls for applications in this strand.

The Consortium stated that the evidence in this application was compared against that in other applications for this Strand.

The project promoters stated that they couldn't be expected to give detail on commitment from broadcasters but noted that they have a proven relationship with a production company. A Review Panel member noted that the Trade Union Movement had been a key player in the Northern Ireland Conflict and asked about the links with organisations outside the Trade Union movement.

The project promoters highlighted a list of committees with which the movement has links and noted that some of these committees encompassed the PEACE III target groups.

A Review Panel Member noted the track record of the organisation in engaging with groups but stated that they also needed to look to the future and asked the extent to which the movement would engage with those outside the movement.

The project promoters stated that there is an ongoing process of engagement and that engagement would be with other Trade Unions and Institutions.

The Chair asked if the 250 participants highlighted in the application would be from the Trade Union?

The project promoter clarified that this is most likely the case but that it would be more like case studies than individual participants.

The Consortium stated that they felt that the spine of the project focused on the Trade Union movement and the call had asked for a strategic and international quality.

The Chair asked if this had the possibility of being strategic and international?

The Consortium stated that there would need to be clarity on how to capture and engage on a cross-border basis.

The project promoters stated that the Trade Union movement was irrelevant. The behaviours, attitudes and history that is going to be told is what is relevant.

A Review Panel Member referred to the educational resource and asked if the project promoters had considered engaging with CCEA as a relevant body?

The project promoters stated that they had been in contact with teachers through the Teachers Union and wanted the teachers to buy into the educational resource, once the project was up and running and the educational resource could be mapped to the curriculum at that point they would engage with CCEA.

A Review Panel member noted that the Consortium had stated that some of the professional and consultancy work already existed within the partners and that £30,000 could be saved.

The project promoter stated that one would be a development of the other and that there was no duplication in the work that the partners could complete.

A Review Panel Member noted the score for Added Value and asked why this was such a low mark as there was no comment in the text?

The Consortium stated that there was not enough evidence of additionality.

The Chair stated that the promoters as an organisation where cross-sectoral and could reach across the eligible region. The Chair stated that it was a unique perspective of the conflict and asked the Consortium if the slant toward the Trade Union movement takes away from what they are trying to achieve overall.

The Consortium stated that the organisation has the reach that is needed but that the project as it was presented did not make that case. The Consortium noted that the capacity of the organisation is considered but this is only part of the assessment and they have to look at what is presented on paper.

The project promoters stated that they had issues with the information supplied to the Steering Committee.

The Consortium noted that the Steering Committee would have received all relevant documentation including the full application; clarification requests and responses; and the assessment.

The project promoters stated that the committee agreed with the recommendation in the assessment and that they had issues with the assessment as outlined in their points above.

The Consortium reiterated that they and the Steering Committee were convinced of the importance of this project but that it did not fit within this Strand. They also stated that they would be happy to work with the organisation in the future.

The Chair asked the Project promoters and the Consortium 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 Project promoters and the Consortium exited the room.

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

- This was a story that should be told.
- It was clear that there was reach beyond the Trade Unions.
- There appeared to be a lack of understanding to the extent of the uniqueness of the project.
- Community activity was not seen in the application.
- The organisation could reach marginalised groups but they did not bring that out in the application and clarifications.
- The project promoters should engage with their critics.
- Although the project has an extraordinary reach it is still a particular perspective and not necessarily strategic.
- The work plan for the project was weak.
- The decision of the Steering Committee is understandable based on the information they received on the day.

The Review Panel concluded that in light of the information provided and the arguments put forward the Steering Committee decision was not unreasonable. The Panel also acknowledged that the proper decision making procedures had been followed.

The Review Panel recognised both the enormous value and importance of the story and the need for this story to be told. The Panel agreed that the project merits further consideration and for this reason would encourage the project promoters to work closely with either the Consortium or the Joint Technical Secretariat to identify opportunities in forthcoming calls for applications and to reapply to the PEACE III Programme.

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.