



**EU PROGRAMME FOR PEACE & RECONCILIATION
NORTHERN IRELAND AND THE BORDER REGION OF IRELAND**

**2007-2013
CCI No. 2007CB163PO049**

MINUTES MONITORING COMMITTEE MEETING

**Tuesday 6th November 2007,
Altnaveigh House, Newry**

Introduction

- I. The **Chair** welcomed everyone to the 1st Monitoring Committee meeting of the Programme.
- II. Apologies are listed in Annex 1.
- III. The **Chair** stated that it was common practice for the papers to be distributed 15 days before the Monitoring Committee. Therefore, an extra number of days would be allocated to the Committee for deliberation and comment on these papers. He added that this issue would be discussed further during the Rules of Procedure item.
- IV. The **Chair** highlighted that the PEACE III Papers, in particular the Selection Criteria and Steering Committee papers required approval from the Northern Ireland Executive. He explained that approval is expected on the 22nd November 2007 during a meeting of the Executive.

1.0 Agenda

- 1.1 The **Chair** outlined the agenda. The agenda was agreed.

2.0 Overview of Programme (PMC/01/01)

- 2.1 The **Director of Managing Authority** presented a detailed overview of the PEACE III Programme.
- 2.2 The **Chair** invited the committee to make comment on the overview of the programme.
- 2.3 The **DG Regio representative** noted that some projects had been short listed in the pipeline. He requested clarification on the status of the project pipelines highlighting that any offers of funding would not hold any legal bearing as the Programme had only been agreed by the Commission that morning. He referred to the example of Priority 2.1 where a workshop had already taken place for 20 shortlisted applications. He asked if Priority 2 had already been exhausted.
- 2.4 The **DG Regio representative** asked why CRC and Border Action had been shortlisted as organisations to receive the Global Grant and not any others.
- 2.5 The **Chair** explained that the shortlisted projects have no status within the Programme. He assured the group that no money had been committed by the Programme to date as the programme had not been approved prior to the Monitoring Committee meeting. He added that no movements would be made on allocating funding without the authorisation of the Monitoring Committee who will delegate this responsibility to the Steering Committees. However, he explained that it was prudent for the Managing Authority to ensure that adequate numbers of projects were expressing interest in the programme as €70-€80m will have to be spent on the programme by the end of 2009. He added the N+2 targets will become even more challenging as the New Programme is much smaller.
- 2.6 The **Chair** made reference to the DG Regio representative's question with regard to CRC and Border Action. He explained that these two organisations had been selected due to the nature of their work. He highlighted that it had been agreed with the two Member States, to allocate the Global Grant to Border Action and CRC as they had previous experience in this area. He explained that they are to act as an Implementing Body as opposed to a Joint Technical Secretariat. He added that they would be receiving a global grant and would have delegated responsibility from the Member States and the Managing Authority to manage a part of the Programme.
- 2.7 The **NICVA representative** clarified that projects who had submitted applications previously under the expressions of interest which had been rejected can apply again under the Programme. However, she explained that it would be beneficial for the projects to be made aware of this to allow them to submit a new application. She requested clarification on the role of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister in the Programme. She added that the Shared Future policy is no longer a Government Policy in Northern Ireland, and the addition of a mainstream policy to transform Northern Ireland is now

independent. She explained that this needs to be taken into consideration with regard to what the Programme will deliver.

- 2.8 The **Chair** clarified that the Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister have responsibility over match funding, and would show a close interest in how the Programme progresses. He added that OFM/DFM are responsible for several other Programmes similar to the work implemented by SEUPB and that it would be prudent for all organisations to work together avoiding duplication.
- 2.9 The **Chair** explained that as policies are updated within Northern Ireland, they would be noted by the organisation.
- 2.10 The **DFP representative** highlighted that the Programme in its entirety had been agreed fully by the Northern Ireland Executive during a recent meeting.
- 2.11 The **JTS representative** clarified that an open rolling call would be issued in the press during the weeks following the Monitoring Committee meeting in respect of “creating Shared Public Spaces”, giving an opportunity for all applications to resubmit proposals. He assured the Committee that any project who applied to the programme previously would be notified.
- 2.12 The **Local Government representative (UUP)** asked for clarification on Measure 2.1. He asked if it was possible for a community group to apply for funding under this theme. He also asked if there would be any disadvantage to the group as 20 projects had already been shortlisted. He added that in his opinion several of the shortlisted projects did not meet the selection criteria. The representative also expressed concerns over the lack of involvement from Local Authorities within the Steering Committees.
- 2.13 The **Chair** clarified that projects will be able to apply under Measure 2.1 as no commitment has been given to any project. He reassured the Committee that project selection would be the decision of the Steering Committee who will follow the selection criteria guidelines. He advised that the issue of Local Authorities involvement within the Steering Committees would be addressed later in the meeting.
- 2.14 The **BMW representative** suggested that conversations should take place between the European Commission and the Executive in order to avoid duplication with regard to the changing of focus and policies e.g. Shared Future.
- 2.15 The **CWC representative** stated that it is important for peace and reconciliation action plans to be prominent within the documentation of the Programme.

The Monitoring Committee noted:

- The overall structure of the PEACE III Programme.

- The approach taken to date by SEUPB in relation to the development of the project pipeline.

3.0 Rules of Procedure for PEACE III Monitoring Committee (PMC/01/02)

- 3.1 The **Director of Managing Authority** highlighted paragraph 2.2 of the paper which outlined the main duties of the Monitoring Committee. He explained that details of membership had been outlined in Annex 1 of the paper, enabling all members to take an active role in decision making. He highlighted that the Managing Authority would be responsible for chairing and providing the secretariat to the Monitoring Committee. It was mentioned by the Director that, by Regulation, the Monitoring Committee must meet twice yearly and decisions made by the Monitoring Committee would be by consensus.
- 3.2 The **Chair** commented on page 2, item 2.2G with regard to the role of the Monitoring Committee. He explained that the term 'Financial Profile' is not a good indicator of what the role of the Monitoring Committee will be. He clarified that 'Financial Profile' refers to the agreed level of spend between the Commission and the Member States. He assured the Committee that this would be changed to reflect the terminology set in the Regulation.

The Monitoring Committee agreed:

- The Rules of Procedure as outlined in the paper

4.0 Project Selection Criteria (PMC/01/03)

- 4.1 The **Director of Managing Authority** presented an outline of the Selection Criteria.
- 4.2 The **Chair** referred to points raised during a previous meeting with regard to the weighting of scores on page 7 of the paper. He explained that 40% would be attributed towards cross-cutting themes and 60% towards efficiency and effectiveness. However, he highlighted that there was a feeling amongst those in attendance at the earlier INTERREG IV Monitoring Committee meeting that it would be possible to obtain project approval over the 65% threshold by focusing on efficiency and effectiveness and not so much on the cross-cutting themes. He explained that it was agreed by consensus that 65% should be spread across the matrix, and that applicants would need to obtain an average of 65% on the cross-cutting themes as well as efficiency and effectiveness in order to surpass the threshold.
- 4.3 The **Chair** referred to 2.6 in the paper in relation to eligible lead partners. He explained that the lead partner should be a Public Body of a Public Sector equivalent body. A definition of this was tabled with the committee.
- 4.4 The **Chair** highlighted a drafting error on 2.6 of the paper – 'where possible', this description does not make sense and will be removed.

- 4.5 The **Local Government representative (UUP)** shared concerns over the exclusion of the community and voluntary sector when asking for lead partners to be a Public Body or a Public Sector equivalent body.
- 4.6 The **Chair** clarified that it was not the intention of the Programme to exclude the community and voluntary sectors.
- 4.7 The **NICVA representative** further clarified that point 3 explained that any voluntary or community organisation would be subject to management supervision including economic appraisal depending on the size of the project. Therefore, she explained any community organisation could still qualify for funding and she was satisfied that no organisation would be excluded.
- 4.8 The **Local Government representative (UUP)** highlighted that a number of community organisations were now trading as companies making themselves economically sustainable.
- 4.9 The **NICVA representative** explained that because community organisations are non profit distributing, they would be non commercial, thus making them eligible.
- 4.10 The **CWC representative** explained the concept of the “Peace Plans”, where the County Councils will consult with grass-root groups who wish to continue working in the peace and reconciliation arena. She hoped that there would be a security blanket of the funding, ensuring that the projects will have a quick roll over to new funding.
- 4.11 The **Chair** explained that the action plans would have to meet the strict requirements of the Programme. He added that there is an onerous responsibility on the Local Authorities on both sides of the Border to ensure the inclusion of the community and voluntary sectors.
- 4.12 The **NICVA representative** raised a point with regard to paragraph 2.3, ‘were it is appropriate a project will be subject to a full economic appraisal’. She explained that the nature of the Programme is such that an economic appraisal will only inform the value for money elements of the score as opposed to the overall value. She added that clarification was needed with regard to the verification of single identity projects, as this could cause confusion at a later stage.
- 4.13 The **JTS representative** highlighted that there needed to be some form of economic appraisal included but in some cases further complementary assessments may be necessary.
- 4.14 The **Chair** explained that it was important for provisions to be established to support single identity projects within the Programme. Also, he added that a comprehensive set of guidelines would be written in relation to project selection for applicants.

- 4.15 The **BRA representative** highlighted a typo on page 6 referring to the inclusion of Scotland in the Programme area. He stated that this caused confusion.
- 4.16 The **Chair** explained that this was an administrative error during the drafting of the paper, and it would be removed.
- 4.17 The **ICTU representative** asked for clarification with regard to the application process. If a project submitted an application form with errors, would it be returned to the project for correction? She further asked if the public equivalent status included Trade Unions.
- 4.18 The **Chair** confirmed that the first point was procedure. He added that Trade Unions would meet the definition of public equivalent as they are a 'not for profit' organisation.
- 4.19 The **Local Government representative (Sinn Fein)** raised concerns over the scoring bands in relation to the cross-cutting themes. He asked if the cross-cutting themes were notional, optional or obligatory. He explained that his party was of the view that all 5 aspects would have to be met in order to secure funding.
- 4.20 The **Chair** clarified that it had been agreed that 65% would have to be achieved on both aspects of the Programme and that the 9-12 band should be included.
- 4.21 The **Local Government representative (SDLP)** highlighted that it was his hope that Trade Unions would be a potential public equivalent body. However, he stated that the definition of Trade Unions would need to be rewritten in order to allow for this.
- 4.22 The **Chair** explained that there was no intention to exclude a Body such as the Trade Unions, and welcomed project applications from them.

The Monitoring Committee:

- Approved the Project Selection Criteria as outlined in the paper.

5.0 Steering Committee (PMC/01/04)

- 5.1 The **JTS representative** explained that the composition of the Steering Committee and the decision making process would be delegated from the Monitoring Committee. He highlighted that it would be the JTS responsibility to assist the Steering Committee to ensure that they fulfill their role. He explained that lessons had been learned from the PEACE II Programme, in particular the inclusion of a number of Intermediary Bodies which gave the perception of an overly complex Programme. He explained that as the budget of the Programme was significantly reduced, there was a need for a change in

the way the Programme was implemented. He clarified that persons appointed to the Steering Committee would receive a full induction to clarify their roles and responsibilities. He explained that there would be a significantly high work load from economic appraisals and other relevant paper work. He added that it was crucial for the nominated members to be dedicated and prepared for the anticipated high level of responsibility.

- 5.2 The **JTS representative** was hopeful that the Executive would approve the Selection Criteria on the 22nd November, allowing inductions to take place on the 23rd November. He explained that the JTS will be responsible for the duties once carried out by the Implementing Bodies. The representative highlighted that there was a proposal for 3 Steering Committees to be established based around the main Priorities. He explained that one of the Steering Committees will be focused on “acknowledging and dealing with the past” and will be implemented by Border Action and CRC. He stated that both organizations would be involved in the establishment of the Steering Committee comprising of 4 members from the Management Committee of both organizations. He added that there would be representation from OFM/DFM and DCRGA with SEUPB acting as an observer.
- 5.3 He concluded by outlining the final two Steering Committees whose remit would be “Building positive relations at the local level” as one Steering Committee and “contributing to a shared society” as another. In respect of the former it was envisaged that a small number of strategic and legacy leaving projects would be funded to leave a lasting memory of the Peace Programme. The composition of these Steering Committees would include the Member States, Accountable Departments, Local Representation, social partners, representatives of the cross cutting themes and will be chaired by SEUPB. The representative explained that it would be prudent to take into consideration issues such as gender and geographical spread when nominating representatives.
- 5.4 The **Chair** stated that all Monitoring Committee members would have the opportunity to influence the Programme by being involved in the Steering Committee, Review Group and Working Groups. He requested agreement from the Monitoring Committee to allow the work load to be distributed evenly ensuring representation from all key sectors. He explained that if a person had been nominated for the Review Group, they could not be a member of the Steering Committee.
- 5.5 The **Chair** explained that during discussions in the INTERREG IV Monitoring Committee meeting, it was agreed that the Programme should be operational by early 2008. He referred to paragraph 7.1 which detailed the composition of the Steering Committees, and explained that an extra chairperson would not be required. He highlighted that there would be two seats for the Member States, 2 seats for representatives from the Accountable Departments (as a legal requirement) with an additional advisory seat for a representative from the Accountable Department should the Committee require it.

- 5.6 The **Local Government representative (UUP)** agreed that it made sense to reduce the number of Steering Committees although caution would be needed so as the Steering Committees did not move towards a dictatorship with the removal of local representation. He expressed concern over local representation and in particular, who would be selected if only one seat was available. He suggested that 4 seats should be made available on both Steering Committees to accommodate all Political Parties as they are on the front line of local issues.
- 5.7 The **Chair** explained that as a cross border committee, there would be Southern local representation. He stated that the observations would be taken into consideration.
- 5.8 The **Local Government representative (Sinn Fein)** highlighted that there needs to be representation in the North from all of the political parties.
- 5.9 The **BMW representative** suggested that the local representation from the Republic should be increased by one member.
- 5.10 The **NICVA representative** recommended that an internal balance should be kept as community groups are also working on the ground, and the issue affects all Social Partners. She highlighted that as stated by SEUPB during a previous meeting of the INTERREG IV Programme, 12 representatives from the Monitoring Committee was a perfect number, as there were only 10 representatives allocated for PEACE this allows room for variance. She suggested that allowing 4 seats for the political parties would prevent disagreement further into the Programme period.
- 5.11 The **Chair** clarified that the PEACE Programme and the INTERREG Programme have different composition as the INTERREG Programme involves Scotland.
- 5.12 The **BMW representative** asked for clarification with regard to the volume of workload for the Steering Committee including details with regard to the frequency of the meetings. He concluded by asking what voting mechanisms would be used in order to resolve disagreements.
- 5.13 The **Chair** explained that the workload would be considerable with a large amount of paper work. He detailed the types of work expected to be completed by the representatives adding that 2 local representatives from the North and 1 from the south would be included in both Steering Committees. He suggested that representation would be decided by all 4 parties as 2 representatives will sit in each group.
- 5.14 The **NICVA representative** clarified that representation would not necessarily be an individual who already sits on the Monitoring Committee.
- 5.15 The **DFP representative** explained that local authority representatives would be requested to oversee the implementation of the Programme on behalf of the Local Government sector albeit from differing political perspective. He added

that all committees would work on a consensus basis against an agreed scoring sheet completed by all in attendance. He explained that members would be required to complete individual scoring sheets for audit purposes.

- 5.16 The **Local Government representative (UUP)** stated that party politics were never mentioned during discussions. He explained that traditionally any decisions taken previously had been made with a high level of openness, fairness and transparency. He added that political opinions would not be included in any decisions made. Decisions would be made purely on merit. He explained that although the parties would be representing Local Government, they would be also aware of the needs at the local level throughout the whole community.
- 5.17 The **Chair** clarified that all previous meetings held have reached agreement by consensus. This is a culture that will be brought forward to the new programmes. He requested that the Committee agree with the suggestion that one additional local authority representative would be added to both Steering Committees which would enable 4 Local Authority Representatives to be spread across the committees.
- 5.18 The **Local Government representative (Sinn Fein)** explained that he will represent the community for whom he had been elected. However, he explained that he would not be taking a party political view point on anything that affects the 32 counties of Ireland. He maintained that the four parties had been elected by the local community and he would be continuing the role to the best of his ability.
- 5.19 The **Chair** stated that a proposal had been made during the previous INTERREG IV Monitoring Committee meeting that the Social Partners would be increased to 3. He requested agreement from the Social Partners
- 5.20 The **Chair** proposed that the local authority representation would increase to 3 which would reflect the INTERREG IV Programme.
- 5.21 The **Local Government representative (UUP)** disagreed with the increase of representation for the local authority.
- 5.22 The **Chair** explained that the agreement would allow a total of 6 representatives from the local authority on the Steering Committees in question, 2 from the South and 4 from the North.
- 5.23 The **Chair** requested an alternative proposal. He explained that there was a desire to keep the numbers of attendees for the Steering Committee to a minimum for decision making purposes. He added that there would be a requirement for nominations for the Review and Working Groups.
- 5.24 The **Local Government representative (DUP)** requested clarification into the volume of work proposed and questioned opinions as to whether the Managing Authority believed that the Elected Representatives could cope with the work load due to other commitments.

- 5.25 The **Chair** explained that it was not a reflection on the ability of the Local Representatives. He felt that the workload would be heavy in volume, but manageable.
- 5.26 The **Local Government representative (UUP)** suggested that as local representation was the first port of call for applications, 2 representatives should be allocated.
- 5.27 The **BRA representative** agreed with the proposal.
- 5.28 The **Chair** clarified that the committee had reached consensus. He concluded by explaining that there would be 2 representatives from the South and 2 representatives from the North.
- 5.29 The **Chair** explained that the nomination forms should be completed and returned by Wednesday 14th November.
- 5.30 The **BMW representative** expressed concerns over the minimal time allocated for the return of nomination forms as an Assembly meeting will need to be held. However, a temporary nomination will be made with confirmation to be given after an Assembly meeting.
- 5.31 The **Chair** commented on Steering Committee number 2. He explained that the Steering Committee would work in a similar capacity to the Implementing Bodies on the previous Programme. He clarified that the management of implementation had been awarded to a joint consortium of Border Action and CRC. He explained that the consortium would work in accordance with provisions and regulations set by the Managing Authority in the Operational Programme. He highlighted that this arrangement had been agreed by the Member States and the Managing Authority. He added that Steering Committees under this area of the programme would be managed by the joint consortium and he anticipated having no difficulty in allowing members of the Monitoring Committee to attend as observers.
- 5.32 The **Local Government representative (UUP)** questioned why the Monitoring Committee would have no role in decision making especially in a sensitive area such as “dealing with the past”. He explained that the Local Representatives are at the forefront of the community and it was hard to understand why they are not included.
- 5.33 The **Chair** reminded the Committee that it would be their responsibility to monitor the progress of that particular Steering Committee, and the Steering Committee will have a responsibility to update the Monitoring Committee on their progress.
- 5.34 The **Border Action representative** explained that both Border Action and CRC have local representatives on their Management Board which would include local representation.

5.35 The **Chair** concluded by confirming a provisional date for an induction workshop for the Steering Committees on 23rd November.

The Monitoring Committee:

- Agreed the establishment of two Steering Committees
- Noted that technical expertise will be appointed as and when required to aid the Steering Committee decisions.
- Proposed and agreed membership of the Steering Committees as detailed below:

Chair (SEUPB)	1
Member States (DFP and DOF)	2
Accountable Departments	2
Local Representation	4
Social Partners	3
Cross Cutting	1
Total	13

6.0 Working Groups (PMC/01/05)

6.1 The **Director of Managing Authority** outlined the role of the Working Groups. He explained that a Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group would be established and would encompass both the PEACE and INTERREG Programmes. He stated that one of the first duties of the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group would be to establish a monitoring and evaluation plan. He invited nominations for members to sit on regional level Working Groups which main themes include; Environment, Equality, Innovation and Mainstreaming.

6.2 The **Chair** explained that complementarity was an objective of the new programmes which was supported through the Working Groups. He highlighted that this would be possible through shared innovative methodologies between the two programmes and from other regional programmes.

6.3 The **DG Regio representative** suggested that two additional joint Working Groups should be established which would adopt the themes of Publicity and Sharing Experience. He explained that it would be beneficial for other EU regions to learn from the experience of the new programmes.

6.4 The **Chair** updated the Committee on recent open days held in Brussels which provided the opportunity for the PEACE Programme to share its

experiences with regions throughout Europe. He highlighted that there was a considerable amount of interest for a European Network which would allow for a sharing of experiences.

- 6.5 The **Local Government representative (Sinn Fein)** supported the suggestion of experience sharing.
- 6.6 The **Local Government representative (SDLP)** explained that it was very important for expertise to be passed throughout other programmes especially for other countries coming out of conflict.
- 6.7 The **NICVA representative** maintained that the suggestion of further Working Groups was a good idea. However, she expressed concerns over the logistics of attending a high number of Working Groups and Review Groups. Therefore, she suggested that 'Publicity' could be combined with 'Monitoring and Evaluation', and 'Sharing Experience' could be combined with 'Innovation and Mainstreaming'.
- 6.8 The **BMW representative** agreed that by dealing collectively with key themes the process would be more manageable. He added that there could be an opportunity to share lessons learned in the PEACE Programme and this could be supported under INTERREG.
- 6.9 The **Chair** explained that the broad experience of the whole Programme would be beneficial to many European regions. He added that discussions had taken place with the Commission and a concept paper was in creation.

The Monitoring Committee:

- Approved the establishment of a Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group that will work across both the PEACE and INTERREG Programmes;
- Approved that representatives from the Monitoring Committee participate on the three Working Groups identified for Northern Ireland;
- Considered any other areas that may require the establishment of a Working Group;
- Completed the nomination form in relation to participation on the Working Groups

7.0 Review Procedures (PMC/01/06)

- 7.1 The **Director of Managing Authority** outlined the Review Procedures paper to the Committee.
- 7.2 The **Local Government representative (UUP)** requested clarification with regard to whether or not Measure 2.1 will be re-advertised.
- 7.3 The **Chair** clarified that there had been no agreement on funding to any project to date. He explained that an open call would be advertised in the local press.

The Monitoring Committee:

- Approved the review process described in the above paper for the PEACE III Programme.
- Approved the nomination of two Monitoring Committee members to the Review Panel who are not members of the Steering Committees.

8.0 Any Other Business

- 8.1 The **DG Regio representative** requested clarification as to when a launch event would be taking place.
- 8.2 The **Chair** anticipated that a launch event will be held at the end of the year depending on availability of members.
- 8.3 The **NICVA representative** requested clarification as to when the review papers would be issued.
- 8.4 The **JTS representative** explained that these papers are in the process of being created and would be provided in the near future
- 8.5 The **CWC representative** requested clarification as to whether or not Steering Committee papers will be uploaded to the website for all members.
- 8.6 The **Director of the Managing Authority** agreed that the website is a useful resource and would be used where possible. A detailed update paper on programme progress would be tabled at each Monitoring Committee meeting.

9.0 Date of next Meeting

- 9.1 Expected to be held in April 2008

**ACTION POINTS/ISSUES OF CLARIFICATION
ARISING FROM MONITORING COMMITTEE**

Tuesday 6th November, Altnaveigh House,

Newry, Co. Down

ACTION POINTS

ISSUE	ACTION	TIMING
Local Authority Representation on the Steering Committees.	2 representatives from the North and 2 from the South for both Committees.	Immediately
Rules of Procedure Page 2 paragraph 2.2G	'Financial Profile' will be changed to reflect terminology in the regulation	Immediately
Project Selection Criteria paragraph 2.6	Removal of the phrase 'where possible'	Immediately
Project Selection Criteria Page 6	Inclusion of Scotland in the programme area to be removed	Immediately

Attendees at the Monitoring Committee meeting of the EU Programme for Peace and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland and the Border Region of Ireland (PEACE III Programme) – Monitoring Committee held on Tuesday 6th November 2007, Newry

Chair

Pat Colgan (SEUPB – Managing Authority)

Members (North)

Bill Pauley (DFP)
Martin Tyrrell (DFP)
Charlie Casey (Local Government representative - Sinn Fein)
Frances McCandless (NICVA)
Bob Stoker (Local Government representative - UUP)
Sammy Brush (Local Government representative - DUP)
Rachael Mullen (Equality Authority)
Pamela Dooley (ICTU)
Tim Atwood (Local Government representative - SDLP)
Gina McIntyre (Certifying Authority)
Denis Galway (JBC)

Members (South)

Niall MacSweeney (DoF)
Angela Holohan (CWC)
Brian Callanan (JBC)
Gerry Finn (BMW Regional Assembly)
James Daly (BMW Regional Authority)
Terry Savage (Border Regional Authority)
Gerry Crawford (Border Regional Authority)

Advisors

Drew Haire	(OFM/DFM)
Alison Hannah	(DSD)
Declan Bourke	(DEHLG)
Dairmuid Murphy	(DHELG)
Celeste McCallion	(NISRA)
Cormac Woods	(DCRGA)

Advisors European Commission

Kyriacos Charalambous	(DG Regio)
-----------------------	------------

Observers

Jim Dennison	(CRC)
Paddy McGinn	(Border Action)
Teresa Lennon	(NILGA)
Tristen Kelso	(Jim Allister's Office)
Sean Kelly	(NICVA)
John Carson	(IFI)

Secretariat (SEUPB)

Adrian McNamee	(Director, Managing Authority)
Howard Keery	(Director, JTS)
Andrew Minnis	(Programme Manager)
Sarah Reid	(Programme Officer)
Stephen Rice	(Clerical Supervisor – Minute Taker)

Apologies

John Anderson	(CNCC)
Kenneth Bush	(Independent Advisor)
Linda MacHugh	(DSD)
Noeleen McDonnell	(NSMC)
Matt Donnelly	(Border Regional Authority)

Noel Casserly

(Comhar)

Martin Smyth

(Irish Rural Link)

Lisa Ryan

(Comhar)

Glossary of acronyms used in the minutes:

ADM/CPA	Area Development Management/Combat Poverty Agency (Border Action)
Belfast LSP	Belfast Local Strategy Partnership
BMW Assembly	Border, Midlands and West Assembly
CFNI	Community Foundation for Northern Ireland
CWC	Community Workers Co-operative
DARD	Department of Agriculture and Rural Development
DCAL	Department of Culture, Arts and Leisure
DCRGA	Department of Community, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs.
DCMNR	Department of Communications, Marine & Natural Resources.
DEL	Department of Employment and Learning
DEHLG	Department of Environment Heritage and Local Government
DETI	Department of Enterprise, Trade and Investment
DFA	Department of Foreign Affairs
DFP	Department of Finance and Personnel (Northern Ireland)
DG REGIO	Directorate-General for Regional Policy (European Commission)
DHSSPS	Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety

DOF	Department of Finance
DRD	Department for Regional Development
DSD	Department of Social Development
ICTU	Irish Congress of Trade Unions
LSP	Local Strategy Partnership
NDP / CSF	National Development Plan / Community Support Framework
NICVA	Northern Ireland Council for Voluntary Action
NISRA	Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency
NSMC	North South Ministerial Council
OFM / DFM	Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister
SEUPB	Special European Union Programmes Body