



European Union

European Regional
Development Fund
Investing in your future

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

Friday 2 September 2011, 11.00am
SEUPB Offices, Belfast

In Attendance:	Pat Colgan	SEUPB (Chair)
	Carol Baxter	MC Panel Member
	Brian Callanan	MC Panel Member
	Audrey McKeown	Independent Member
	Sarah Reid	SEUPB (Secretariat)
	Christine Markey	SEUPB (Secretariat)

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 Sticky Fingers – Childrens Museum and Theatre Project (Ref: 29124)

Representatives from Sticky Fingers and the Joint Technical Secretariat (JTS) were invited to enter the room.

In Attendance: Grainne Powell, Sticky Fingers
Conor Haughey, Newry and Mourne District Council (NMDC)
Howard Keery, JTS
Brenda Hegarty, JTS
David Clarke, JTS

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

The representatives for Sticky Fingers presented their case. The main points included:

- The site was part of the conflict and has been disused for the last 10-15 years. The council has no plans for any work on the site and donated it to Sticky Fingers.
- It is an iconic landmark that is in the centre of the city that has no links to either community. All the evidence gathered over the last 10 years is that a space for children is needed. It will be a symbolic gesture within the city.
- There has been extensive research and consultation with the communities and this site was deemed appropriate.
- There is currently no venue and Sticky Fingers are running duplicate events.
- Newry is commonly known as a nationalist city. Stranmillis College are comfortable in bringing their students into the city for events.

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

Representatives from the JTS made the following points:

- The theme was significantly over-subscribed with a high success bar and rejection rate of 75-85%.
- The assessment process has changed. There was an initial assessment against programme and priority, if projects failed to meet the 65% threshold they were presented to SC for rejection.
- The application had been rejected in a previous call. The project had a debrief then and were offered advice on improvements however, this application is almost the same as the previous one.
- The applicant failed to provide detail on the proposed £260k programme budget and activity. This was requested but was not received in time for the assessment; it was however, included in the presentation to the SC.
- The SC referred to Stranmillis College and questioned the ability of this to attract the Unionist Community.

- The location and the lack of facilities was accepted, however it was still felt that the project was less evident in being able to demonstrate the potential to be iconic with a capacity to leave a lasting legacy.
- The programme activity was not deemed to be sufficient; peace and reconciliation was not intrinsic to the project; there was a lack of evidence to demonstrate protestant buy-in.

The Chair thanked the JTS for their comments.

The Chair asked for clarification on the role of NMDC.

The promoter noted that a new social enterprise will be created. Sticky Fingers will receive the Letter of Offer and NMDC undertake the financial management. They will be equal Lead Partners.

The Chair noted that the promoter had only provided financial information for 2 years.

The promoter noted that this was an oversight.

A Review Panel member asked how the Unionist community felt about the project.

The promoter noted that their reaction was very positive, and Danny Kennedy had written a letter of support which was included.

A Review Panel member asked about the make-up of the Board.

The promoter stated that there are six people on the board, two of which are protestant.

A Review Panel member referred to a contradiction in the SWOT analysis noting that the location was both a threat and an opportunity and also asked for clarification on the impact on the project if a member of the board drops out.

The promoter noted that at the time of writing the application there was a possibility of losing team members but since the council came on board there is a strong

management ethos and that is no longer a threat. The location is a threat because the area is disadvantaged with a lack of investment, but it is also an opportunity because it could become a catalyst for investment and encourage people back into the area.

A Review Panel member asked where they would go if they were not successful.

The promoter stated that they were not sure given the economic climate; they noted that for the long term they could go to DCAL but that that can take years to come to fruition which means that young people will miss out by the time it is ready.

A Review Panel member asked what specific research had been completed, who are the local groups consulted and who are the key beneficiaries.

The promoters noted that they work directly with a number of local community groups. They also liaise with parents and grandparents on what is needed.

The Chair asked if there had been any formal research and if it had been provided.

The promoters noted that there was lots of research and recently DARD had formally commissioned a piece of research. It was not completed at the time of submission but it was mentioned in the application.

A Review Panel member asked if the Southern Regional College (SRC) had been consulted as it would be key that they are involved otherwise there could be duplication.

The Promoter noted that they had consulted with the SRC and confirmed that there would be no duplication. There has also been consultation between SRC and Stranmillis.

The Chair asked for clarification in relation to the SC comment on the ability of Stranmillis to attract the unionist community.

The JTS noted there was a recognition by the SC that there was a need for shared space in this area but the only recognition of buy-in from the protestant community was through Stranmillis.

The promoter noted that Stranmillis offers a programme of a certain quality and it draws people in. It is an iconic gesture that they are setting up a campus in a nationalist area.

The JTS noted that it should not have been an exclusive attraction.

A Review Panel member asked what activities the promoter would be planning on having years down the line within the building to meet the peace and reconciliation and promote cross-community relationships.

The promoter stated that their concept was common place in other EU cities and creative play acts as a catalyst to enhance development. The World Congress of Performing Arts is a key partner and there has been a lot of research completed. There will be interactive displays that will focus on the two main cultures as well as ethnic minorities. The displays are about celebrating culture and developing children in terms of identity. Sticky Fingers have worked with the Orange Lodge in Kilkeel to explore all traditions. There will also be specific programmes for special needs.

The Chair asked if these activities made up the £260k.

The promoter noted that the £260k was specifically for the interactive displays.

The JTS stated that the SC were looking for a breakdown of what the £260k is used for.

The promoter noted that they had provided extra detail. They then noted that to say they are definitely going to do something was against the ethos of what they were trying to do. The ideas have to be developed with children.

A Review Panel Member asked if the promoter can cover the other areas outside the £260k from their own budget. The promoter confirmed that they could.

A Review Panel asked what would happen if funding is cut.

The promoter noted that they were working on a detailed Business Plan and the building was being designed as a social enterprise with a car-park, restaurant and retail outlets which would generate income. Sticky Fingers is an invaluable organisation and it would not be envisaged that funds would be cut. Sticky Fingers can be sustainable and the programming will be protected.

A Review Panel member asked how they would guarantee that the building is used as a shared space in the future.

The promoter noted that they are unable to meet demand for the programme activities at the minute and there is a petition with thousands of signatures for this space.

The Chair asked the JTS how they can justify the low score given that this is an organisation that have a concept that no one doubts is at the core of PEACE III; it is about children, in an area with a protestant community as a minority; an area with a significant ethnic minority; it is an established bona fide accredited deliverer; and they have consulted widely.

The JTS noted that the application as presented did not contain the information that was presented at this meeting. The JTS also noted that it scored in the evident band and there is no question of the credibility and contribution. The SC, however, wanted confidence that the project can deliver and that it would be a genuine shared space.

A Review Panel member referred to the letter from Danny Kennedy and the mention of the Orange Order in Kilkeel and asked if that was not a good indication of buy-in.

The JTS noted that the protestant community needed to be included at the design stage. There needed to be evidence of genuine cross-community engagement. At the very least the board should have had equal representation.

The promoter noted that it is not possible to have a 50/50 make-up in Newry. If individual letters were required, Sticky Fingers could have provided these.

The JTS questioned if it was really a shared space. The minority community are what make it a shared space. The JTS noted that it is a huge investment and there has to be confidence that it will happen.

The Chair asked for any final statements.

The JTS noted that the application had come in previously and essentially this was the same project. It is not a bad project but the fit with the programme has not been as evident as with others. They acknowledge the contribution of the project and that the southern cluster are supporting their activity. The key question is, is there a need for the building.

The promoters stated that this was a project for children that is needed. There is currently no space to bring everyone together to challenge the past and look to the future. Children need to come together to grow, develop; feel safe; and to respect each other's cultures. There is a lot of support. This will lead to a better future for children. This is a centre of excellence; it is the children's city and a multi-cultural society. It will celebrate diversity which is a part of PEACE III.

The Chair then asked the Project promoters and the JTS 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 JTS confirmed that they were happy with the process.

The Project promoters and the JTS exited the room.

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

- The applicant could have developed the programme activity.
- There could have been better engagement by NMDC.
- They promoter presented well and are passionate but that information was not in the application.
- The NMDC were weak and could have endorsed it better.
- There will be a car park and restaurant in years to come but Sticky Fingers could be gone and therefore the activity is gone.

- There could have been more evidence of consultation.

After considerable deliberation, the Review Panel concluded that the Steering Committee decision had not been unreasonable. It also confirmed that there had been no failings in the procedures followed.

It should be noted that the presentation made by the applicant was well received by the Review Panel, however, on balance it was agreed that the application presented to the SC did not articulate the same level of information. The SC have to make their decision based on the information available to them in the application and as such the panel felt that the decision taken had been reasonable and could not be overturned.

The Review Panel recognised the value of the work of the organisation and that it had a good fit with the PEACE III Programme.

5. 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 JTS 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.