



European Union
European Regional
Development Fund
Investing in your future

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

Friday 30 September 2011, 11.00am
SEUPB Offices, Belfast

In Attendance:	Pat Colgan	SEUPB (Chair)
	John Anderson	MC Panel Member
	Matt Donnelly	MC Panel Member
	Dominic Mullan	Independent Member
	Sarah Reid	SEUPB (Secretariat)
	Anna Slotwinska	SEUPB (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 the Intercultural Youth, Health and Sports Exchange – Interface
Exchange (Ref: 29453)**

*Representatives from Suffolk Lenadoon Interface Group (SLIG) and the Joint Technical
Secretariat (JTS) were invited to enter the room.*

In Attendance: Harry Maher, SLIG
Barry Smith, SLIG
Robert Crowe, SLIG
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 from SLIG presented their case. The main points included:

- The project would transform a derelict, contested space into a shared education, shared training, shared health and a shared community facility with peace building as it's ethos.
- The facility would create opportunities for training for local communities and for interface communities throughout Northern Ireland; it could act as a catalyst for alleviating social poverty.
- The training facility would also accommodate the SLIG Youth Trainee Programme which is delivered in partnership with DEL and University of Ulster.
- SLIG currently works across interfaces in West, North and East Belfast, as well as rural interfaces such as Riverbrooke, Sligo and Fermanagh.
- The intention of the 'Interface Exchange is to provide a facility that delivers training on mediation and peace-building, as well as education and training for employment. The inclusion of residential accommodation was never a consideration for the 'Interface Exchange'. The location of the 'Interface Exchange is 0.3 miles from Balmoral Hotel, 1.2 miles from Beechlawn hotel and 4.4 miles from a number of hotels in Belfast City Centre.
- The proposed development also seeks to develop entrepreneurship from within the local areas.
- SLIG is working with community catalysts regarding the formal establishment of social economy training and developing a social economy business.
- The project believes that the capacity to provide a 'lasting legacy to the PEACEIII Programme' is significantly detailed within proposal.
- The proposed development which would service regional, national and international service users is iconic by its nature and therefore would provide a legacy for the European Peace initiative.

- SLIG regularly host visitors, contribute to seminars and conferences throughout Ireland and further afield. SLIG has, at the request of many bodies and agencies, including OFMDFM, hosted visitors from around the world.
- SLIG's work and approach to peace-building is continually referenced as an exemplar of peace-building by the Northern Ireland Executive and its associated government departments.
- Funding secured for redevelopment of the Glen Community Complex is a separate entity to this proposal. SLIG's Strategic Development Manager completed both applications – the first for Glen Community Complex as an employee of the Department for Social Development (DSD), the second as SLIG's Strategic Development Manager. This is acknowledged and detailed throughout the application.
- SLIG is now in negotiation with Atlantic Philanthropies (AP) with regard to securing funding to enable service provision up until the date when the proposed project will enable SLIG to become self financing and profit making.

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

Representatives from the JTS made the following points:

- JTS provided background for the decision.
- The theme was significantly over-subscribed with a high success bar and rejection rate of around 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.
- There is lack of secured and confirmed funding.
- There is lack of residential facilities.
- A further factor is its similarity and proximity to the Glen Community Complex which has been supported under the Programme.
- JTS noted that an application for a peace and reconciliation centre on the site of the former Maze prison has been received under Priority 2.2 and if this proposal were to

proceed to economic appraisal stage the appraisal would need to consider potential duplication of provision.

- The combined score under Programme and Priority/Theme of 48.75 fails to meet the 65% threshold; therefore, the application has not been scored further under Efficiency & Effectiveness and Cross Cutting Themes. It is not recommended to proceed for economic appraisal.
- The SC agreed that the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient strength to merit scores in the upper evident band under the two Programme objectives and the Priority objective of *acting as a catalyst for transforming the local community*.
- SC members considered that the proposal's potential under the Priority objective; *to be iconic with a capacity to provide a lasting legacy* was less evident, given that it was not sufficiently evident that the project would have the regional and international impact which the promoter intended.
- JTS noted that the application submitted by SLIG made no reference to the Balmoral and Beechlawn hotels and it is unreasonable to introduce them at this stage as a factor in challenging the reasonableness of the concerns which were expressed by the SC.
- In relation to the Glen Community Complex it is not unreasonable for the SC to adopt a strategic view of Priority 2.1 and to take into account the location of one proposed project in an application for funding vis-a-vis the location of another project which has already been supported for funding under the Priority.
- JTS referred to the Maze's application and noted that it would appear that SLIG has misinterpreted the penultimate paragraph in the Concluding Comments/Recommendation for the JTS assessment report. The paragraph refers to the SLIG proposal not the Maze proposal.

The Chair thanked the JTS for their comments.

The Chair asked for clarification with regards to the Lead Partner for the project.

The promoters stated that DSD is a Lead Partner.

The JTS noted that Part A of the application form states that SLIG is Lead Partner and DSD is co-applicant.

A Review Panel member noted that a numbers of the proposed facilities are related to entrepreneurship and asked if the promoter has any letter of support from Invest NI or other regional development departments.

The promoter stated that they do not have any letters of support but they are working with community catalysts to identify opportunities. They also stated that this would be a social economy project with income which would be used to self finance the project.

A Review Panel member asked if the promoter has any evidence of need for this. The promoter stated that the need was not identified as they would be carrying it out to sustain project.

A Review Panel member asked if there is any document to show this and promoter stated that this need had been identified in the Business Plan.

A Review Panel member asked if there was any evidence of need for training and promoter stated that training needs were research through catering and beautician schools.

A Review Panel member asked if there is not an obligation on State bodies to provide this training.

The promoters stated that State bodies would have contracts with such organisations for training.

A Panel Review member asked if the project promoter has any letter of offer for additional funding from Atlantic Philanthropies.

The promoters stated that they negotiate additional funding with AP and they shore up investments to identify opportunities.

A Panel Review member asked if the project had any evidence of guaranteed funding from AP if Peace III funding is secured.

The promoters noted that few projects would have this in place until a full EA has been completed but they believed that if project were approved, they could get additional money from other partners.

A Panel Review member asked JTS if the interpretation of the paragraph in relation to the Maze proposal was the issue.

The Chair clarified that the interpretation was the issue, however asked why Maze was raised in relation to Economic Appraisal.

The JTS stated that when projects presented to SC, JTS must provide overview of all pending applications and update SC. SC were advised that there was similar project (Maze) under priority 2.2. They would be assessed at EA stage.

The Chair asked if JTS took into account the fact that there was another project on table when scoring.

The JTS noted that application was scored on the basis of programme and priority objectives, based on evidence presented in application.

A Panel Review member said that project promoters stated that if Bacon Factory had been raised as an issue by JTS they would not have applied.

The JTS stated that they had raised this issue and had advised that as there was a similar project in that proximity, they must demonstrate that there was a real need for their project.

The promoters stated that they demonstrated in application the differences between those two projects. The Glen Community project focuses on the Suffolk and Lenadoon communities only, while the Interface Exchange aims to target interface communities at a national and international level and there would be no duplication.

The Chair stated that the projects had a different focus and that a project should not be disadvantaged on the basis of iconicity.

JTS noted that the overall objective of the project is the international dimension; however, there is a mismatch of local activities such as hairdressing and catering training. In relation to the issue of iconicity, the Operational Programme outlines the funding of between 8-10 such projects across the programme. The approval of this project would have resulted in 2 iconic projects located side by side.

A Review Panel member noted that as the promoters were involved in both projects, there was a potential for bringing the projects together. He also stated that under the section in relation to iconicity, they had perhaps set the bar too high.

The project promoters noted that it is difficult to determine in advance of EA, and also noted that the overall objective of the project is peace building and the retail aspect is there to provide sustainability and opportunity to highlight work to other interface areas.

The Chair asked for clarification in relation to why DSD was not present.

The project promoters stated that DSD would have been at the meeting; however it did not occur to the project to have them present

The Chair asked if DSD had written to JTS.

The JTS stated that DSD sat on the SC which recommended rejection of the project.

The promoters stated that project was requested by Alex Atwood.

The Chair asked if it was a ministerial request.

The promoters noted that Alex Atwood requested the project as a local councillor.

A Review Panel Member questioned the extent to which the project would be contributing towards the wider objectives of the programme, given the large capital element of the project.

The promoters noted that there were synergies in the programme such as trainees from other communities bringing their children with them to use the on site crèche. The promoters also stated that this year they have been able to extend their services to North and East Belfast as a part of a programme that will create leaders to work in their own communities and create employment. They also stated that current facilities cannot be extended for such work.

The Chair asked from Programme point of view what is difference was between the two projects, given that they are both locally driven and both focussed on regeneration.

The promoters stated that Glen Community Complex project has much smaller development and it is a community centre. The promoters noted also that there would not be enough capacity for SLIG to deliver this project from that location. Project would build the international aspect from what has been developed by the Glen Community Project.

A Review Panel member refers to application page 2-3 and stated that all activities provided are local.

The promoters stated that they will build local activities and capacity to deliver services across the interface area. Model may not be transferable to other areas but skills can be shared.

The Chair stated that the project brings a capital element.

The promoters stated that this allows SLIG to have a centre to grow the programmes and bring in the international aspect.

A Review Panel member asked if other communities need the same type of facilities.

The promoters stated that their project would enable capacity building for individuals to roll out practice in their own existing spaces.

The Chair invited both parties to summarise.

The JTS summarised as follows;

- They recognised the interface area and that this was a good project. project
- SC felt it was not sufficiently advanced in demonstrating sustainability and that there was an Imbalance of the international aspect against the capital build.
- It was extremely competitive theme and 13 projects were approved out of 87 applications.

The promoters summarised as follows;

- They felt that the decision had been prejudiced due to both the Glen Community Development project and the Maze project, and not based on the sole merit of the application.
- They confirmed that part of the retail space is focussed on peace building.
- They believed that the project should go forward for EA to demonstrate need.
- They confirmed the need for retail space as a means to sustain the overall project.

The Chair then asked the Project promoters and the JTS if they were content with the manner in which 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 content with the process.

The Project promoters and the JTS exited the room.

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

- The international aspect was not fully explained.

- Only conference facilities are identified for long term use, however, if a hotel is built as part of the plan – this could provide these facilities.
- There is a little evidence of buy-in from retail community for commercial units.
- Seems to duplicate activities in the Glen Community project.
- The Chair believed that project was prejudice on basis of duplication given area and also that EA would have looked at need, however, the SC could only make judgement on information presented in the application form and the information did not demonstrate the need for the application to progress to EA.
- The DSD involvement was unusual and if DSD is a Lead Partner they should be present to strengthen the application and should have stated conflict of interest at SC.
- The applicant did not demonstrate the delivery of an iconic dimension.

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.

The Review Panel did however recognised that some of the wording used in the assessment report could have been open to misinterpretation; however, they felt that this did not materially impact the decision taken.

The Review Panel agreed that the Steering Committee's decision to reject the application should be upheld.

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. Review

The Review of the Market Yard Peace and Reconciliation Centre (Ref: 20668)

Representatives from Coleraine Borough Council and the Joint Technical Secretariat (JTS) were invited to enter the room.

In Attendance: Maurice Bradley, Coleraine Borough Council
 Richard Baker, Coleraine Borough Council
 Moira Mann, Coleraine Borough Council
 Helen Perry, Coleraine Borough Council
 Roger Wilson, Coleraine Borough Council
 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 Coleraine Borough Council presented their case. The main points included:

- The project promoters believe that project is very good.
- There are 15 schools within 1 mile radius of MY PARC project and a total of 17 within the town boundary.
- The promoters referred to buy – in evidence and stated that the 21 PEACE III target groups include CRUN involved in developing the brief and creating heritage resources for MY PARC during Pre-Development Phase.
- The project referred to issue of consultation with CRUN and noted that both applications contain different project objectives. CRUN have been a consultee during public consultations since 2005. As an umbrella community organisation CRUN are both a targeted group and benefiting group.
- 26 PEACE III target groups as well as 43 schools from across the Borough will benefit from MY PARC as detailed and summarised in application.

- The project provided details of a range of programmes developed with target groups to promote reconciliation through dialogue, sharing histories, skills development and creating learning resources with their stories.
- Pre Development Phase demonstrates engagement with:
 - 21 PEACE III target groups, through participation in and co-creation of heritage programmes
 - 26 PEACE III target groups as well as local schools will be engaged following a similar methodology
- Since 2000 Borough consulted:
 - Over 29 PEACE III target groups
 - 22 local and 5 regional schools
 - Voluntary, community and business sectors, local residents and general public through public workshops, meetings and open days.
- The MY PARC project is one involving the social regeneration of an area of dereliction and sectarianism, reconnecting people and place through use of unique history, unique facilities and shared community engagement.

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

Representatives from the JTS made the following points:

- The JTS provided background for the decision.
- 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 JTS noted that this project was presented to SC and was recognised as a good project and recognised that in this area there would be a gap in Peace funding. The JTS indicative score was 58.75% and SC had opportunity to increase scores, but reduced the score for *Act as a Catalyst for transforming the local community – creating a genuine shared space* from 12 to 10 which reduced the overall score to 56.25%; leading to the proposal being rejected.

- The JTS noted that one of SC member was not sure of location of schools and that a member of SEUPB staff who was from the same area, was brought in to explain the location of schools.
- In relation to buy-in, the JTS stated that the assessment was referring to the Operational Programme targets, not projects. The SC noted that two applications had been received under this call seeking funding for projects in Coleraine. Members expressed disappointment at the apparent lack of consultation between the Council and the CRUN. It was confirmed that the Council had stated in its application that CRUN was involved in the development of the proposal and was listed as a representative organisation on the project steering committee. Members considered that the capacity to provide a legacy shared space project for Coleraine under the Priority could have been enhanced by greater co-ordination between the two applicants.

The Chair thanked the JTS for their comments.

A Review Panel member stated that they got the sense that there had been extensive consultation with the community during the development stage, however, once the project gets up and running, the Council would be heavily involved, not the community.

The promoter noted that the community would be involved through the Steering Group which would eventually become part of the management committee which would be involved with the running of the project. The promoter also stated that an annual programme will be delivered through resources that will help to sustain the work beyond the life of PEACE III. My PARC project will give a physical presence to Coleraine, where people can take ownership. It will be about getting people to engage and share where they are from. Centre would not survive without this engagement.

The Chair noted that he got a sense that there was some anger on the part of the project in relation to the time and effort put in by them to provide information that fully demonstrated the worth of project. He asked the JTS to clarify why project was in this situation as project presentation would suggest that the project did demonstrate need.

The JTS noted that the SC takes their role very seriously and SC felt that in relation to CRUN they could not understand why they did not present a joint application. SC felt that the project had not moved from original application sufficiently.

The promoters noted that in relation to the stated theme limitations, the availability of funding should not be a consideration. The promoters also noted that in relation to the location of schools the SC member should have come back to project for clarification.

The JTS stated that due to the limited funds a strict criterion was utilised. Currently 8 projects are under assessment seeking funding of €42m where €10m is available. The JTS noted that they appreciate the situation in relation to the schools locations; however, this did not negatively impact the decision.

A Review Panel member stated that they got the impression that the 2010 application just required tweaking to have it approved.

The promoters stated that they received good feedback from first application and noted that there were issues mainly in relation to the iconic peace criteria. They confirmed that a completely new application was written to provide enhanced information.

The JTS stated that the previous application score enabled it to progress to Economic Appraisal. It was then taken to SC with EA but was rejected as it scored 58.7%. New application was scored on its own merits and members were aware of previous application.

The promoters stated that they were surprised their application failed and that the scoring was completely differ from the first application.

The JTS stated that first application was scored against all criteria on entire application scoring 58-75%, second application was judged against Programme and Priority Objectives scoring 56.25%.

The promoters clarified that CRUN is a capital project actively seeking final phase of funding and saw opportunity of Peace funding. If they had thought that it would have

been detrimental to project, they would have not applied. The promoters noted also that they are utterly surprised by the scoring of a much enhanced application.

The Chair asked for clarification in relation to where the application had been enhanced.

The promoters stated that the application reinforced a project that could really make a difference.

A Review Panel member asked for clarification in relation to a perceived change of criteria.

The JTS stated that this application was not put through the efficiency & effectiveness section as agreed with the Member State to reduce the burden on resources and also reduce the number of EA's carried out on projects that may not necessary fit within the programme. That was agreed in advance and all applicants were informed.

The Chair stated that project need to know why did not meet the minimum.

The JTS acknowledged that was a marginal project which was brought to the SC with 3 scores of 12 and one of 11,the SC choose to reduce one of the scores.

The Chair asked JTS what made SC reduce the score.

The JTS stated that the SC members felt that there was duplication in the applications, given the location and that both applications considered at the same meeting.

A Review Panel member asked if this had been considered in advance of the CRUN project would it have made a difference.

The JTS noted that SC chooses to conclude that the fact that there were 2 applications questioned the capacity to create real shared space.

The promoters asked if the applications should not be judged on their own merit and stated that there is significant peace work going on throughout the area. This Project will

leave a legacy and show what the Peace III programme has done for the area. The promoters also stated that there was ample evidence through their presentation that the project fully demonstrated everything required.

JTS clarified that the definition of marginal scoring in this case was the upper end of evident. The JTS also stated that if the project was a genuine community project with a bottom up approach, why was there a second application in the same location.

A Review Panel member asked if it is accepted that both projects are about shared space.

The promoter clarified that the CRUN project is a capital build, whereas My Parc is about providing a shared space for community activities.

The Chair stated that from the SC point of view there are 2 similar projects presented.

A Review Panel member asked if there are other museum facilities within the town or Borough.

The promoter confirmed that there are no other similar facilities within their location and that they currently have to take groups to Ballymena.

A Review Panel member asked if the project would mirror the Down Museum approach.

The promoter noted that the Down Museum use their project as an example.

A Review Panel member asked how the project fulfils the objectives of the PEACE III Programme.

The promoter stated that reconciliation work is going on throughout the Borough, however, their aim is to provide a shared space for these types of groups to come together. Currently, the only facilities available are the Town Hall and Orange Halls which are not ideal. The promoter also stated that they recognise that the PEACE III Programme is reaching target groups that are extremely hard to reach and the My Parc project can complement this work and continue to develop relationships. They stated

that due to their involvement in the 1.1 Local Peace Plan, they recognise how the project can be cohesive to this.

The Chair asked for any final comments.

The JTS made a final statement and key points are:

- Acknowledged the time and effort put into the application.
- Acknowledge need for shared space in Coleraine.
- It was very competitive process.
- JTS scores marginal (upper end of evident) – opportunity for SC to score above, SC chose to reduce one of the scores.
- CRUN had the opportunity to put in an Express of Interest.
- Application undermined by fact that there were two put in for the same location.
- Confirmed that the school issue did have a negative impact on the score.
- Recognised the types of groups identified in the application, however, it was not clear how they related back to target groups identified in the Operational Programme.
- All projects scored against the same criteria.
- Projects have to clearly identify how they meet the Programme & Priority objectives

The Chair noted that is unfortunate that there were two applications and the project did not provide sufficient information to move scores from evident to very evident.

The promoter summarised as follows;

- They fully appreciated the limitations and high demands for funding;
- They hoped that they had demonstrated their passion rather than anger and need for project in the area.
- There are significant social issues in the area and application was put together to address this.
- Application is very evident of criteria and promoters encouraged panel to go through application

The Chair then asked the Project promoters and the JTS if they were content with the manner in which 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 content with the process.

The Project promoters and the JTS exited the room.

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

- The project had made their points well.
- The project provided the evidence of their work in the application.
- Valid that SC saw two projects in the same area.
- Capacity to deliver very evident.

The Panel recognised the fact that there were two 'shared space' applications, located half a mile apart, presented to the Steering Committee at the same meeting. This they felt could have potentially prejudiced the Steering Committee's decision.

The Panel therefore recommended that the application be re-assessed by JTS and re-presented to the Steering Committee for consideration.

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 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.