



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

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

MINUTES MONITORING COMMITTEE MEETING

**Wednesday 23 April 2008,
Tullyarvan Mill, Buncrana**

Introduction

- I. The **Chair** welcomed everyone to the 2nd Monitoring Committee meeting of the Programme.
- II. Apologies are listed in Annex II.
- III. The **Chair** welcomed the Independent Member to his first Monitoring Committee meeting.
- IV. The **Independent Member** stated that his work and research in the area of evaluation was the reason he was in attendance. He specifically highlighted the Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment and commented on the uniqueness of the PEACE III Programme.
- V. The **Chair** thanked the Independent Member for his words and noted that the work of the PEACE Programmes is a credit to the Member States and the European Commission.
- VI. The **Chair** stated that the PEACE III and INTERREG IV Programmes had been launched on Monday 14 April in Belfast by Commissioner for Regional Development Danuta Hubner, Northern Ireland Finance Minister Peter Robinson and Ireland's Finance Minister and Tanaiste, Brian Cowen.
- VII. The **Chair** stated that the launch of the programmes coincided with the official opening of Measure 1.2 and the Northern Ireland Task Force Report. The Commission and the Northern Ireland authorities agreed that the experience of the Peace Programme should be shared with the rest of Europe. The Chair mentioned the open day in Brussels last year and stated that SEUPB hope to repeat this in 2008.

VIII. The **Chair** then outlined the Agenda.

1.0 Project Presentation

- 1.1 The **Chair** invited Dan Crowley to give an introduction on Tullyarvan Mill.
- 1.2 Dan Crowley gave a brief introduction on the history of the Mill, the funding received from the Peace Programmes and how that funding has contributed to the local community.
- 1.3 The **Chair** noted that the Tullyarvan Mill had received almost €300,000.00 in funding.

2.0 Agenda

- 2.1 The **Chair** asked the Members to agree the agenda.
- 2.2 The agenda was agreed.

3.0 Minutes of Previous Meeting 6 November 2007

- 3.1 The **Chair** asked the members to agree the minutes of the previous meeting.
- 3.2 The **Local Government Representative (UUP)** stated that he was unhappy with the make-up of the Steering Committees, Working Groups and Review Panel. He referred to page seven, item 5.4 of the minutes of the previous meeting. He stated that he had filled in a self-nomination form and returned it by email. He stated that he had then been informed that the Local Authority representatives were not nominating themselves. This process had been delegated to NILGA. He stated that it did not mention anywhere in the minutes that the Monitoring Committee were passing over this process to NILGA.
- 3.3 The **Chair** proposed to deal with this issue under agenda item 5.
- 3.4 The **Local Government Representative (UUP)** stated that the issue was arising out of the minutes.
- 3.5 The **Chair** asked if the minutes reflected the Local Government Representative's (UUP) understanding of what was agreed at the previous meeting and the Local Government Representative (UUP) confirmed that they did.
- 3.6 The **Chair** stated that his issue dealt with implementation and would be referred back to under agenda item 5.
- 3.7 The **NICVA Representative** referred to page five, points 4.5 to 4.7 of the minutes and referred to a conversation at the previous meeting in relation to the public equivalent status. She was confident that voluntary and community organisations would not be disbarred from being a lead partner and asked that SEUPB acknowledge that as their official position.

- 3.8 The **Chair** stated that this was an important point and made it clear that voluntary and community organisations were not disbarred from being a lead partner and that this was indeed the official position of SEUPB.
- 3.9 The **Chair** asked all the members if the minutes were accepted. The minutes were accepted.

4.0 Matters Arising

- 4.1 The **Chair** stated that there were a number of matters arising from the minutes. The first matter related to the issue that the Local Government Representative (JUP) raised at point 3.2 above. At the previous meeting it was agreed that there would be two representatives from the north and two from the south on the Steering Committee.
- 4.2 The **Chair** noted three other matters arising:
- Redrafting of the phrase “financial profile” in the Rules of Procedure.
 - Removal of the phrase “where possible” in the Project Selection Criteria.
 - The erroneous inclusion of SEUPBs reference to Scotland.

All these matters arising have now been amended.

- 4.3 The **NICVA Representative** referred to page five, points 4.5 to 4.7 of the minutes. She stated that there was some confusion about the public equivalent status. She wanted to confirm that in Section three of the document provided at the previous meeting which says:

*“The body would either be financed for the most part by the State, Regional or Local Authorities or other bodies governed by public law **or** subject to management supervision by those bodies.”*

she noted the ‘or’ in bold and confirmed that there is no financial threshold above which an organisation would need to be in receipt of public funds before it could qualify, that this is purely around management supervision by statutory bodies.

- 4.4 The **Chair** confirmed that the word OR is correct and that there is no financial threshold that would apply.
- 4.5 The **Chair** stated that public equivalent status is agreed terminology used by the Commission and EU programmes. The intention was to exclude consultancies, profit organisations and private companies from benefiting from European funds. It does have a reference to governance issues which is where the management of public money comes in.
- 4.6 The **NICVA Representative** requested that this definition be repeated verbatim on the SEUPB website.
- 4.7 The **Chair** stated that he recognised and accepted that point and noted that its intention is to provide clarity.

5.0 Progress Report

- 5.1 The **Director of the Managing Authority** presented a detailed overview of the implementation of the PEACE III Programme so far. He talked about the progress on decisions that were made at the previous PEACE III Monitoring Committee, the implementation of the individual priorities and themes and the regulatory framework. The Director stated that all four themes were now open, Steering Committees were active and making decisions and that SEUPB were on course to meet the European Commission's Regulations. The **Chair** noted the excellent co-operation of the Local Authorities, Chief Executives and elected representatives. He highlighted that an Article 71 Report now replaced the Programme Complement and a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan was in place instead of a mid-term evaluation.
- 5.2 The **Local Government Representative (UUP)** referred back to his earlier point. He noted that it was his understanding that Local Authority representatives could self-nominate to become members of Steering Committees. After nominating himself he was informed that the process of nomination would be completed by NILGA. He stated that he had not agreed to NILGA acting as a nominating body.
- 5.3 The **Chair** asked for comments and observations.
- 5.4 The **Local Government Representative (Sinn Fein)** stated that a valid point was being raised due to the interpretation of the minutes. He also fully accepted that NILGA were the nominating body and his party had followed this process.
- 5.5 The **BMW Representative** stated that it was his understanding that the Steering Committee would comprise two Local Authority representatives from the north and two from the south.
- 5.6 The **Chair** confirmed this and stated that a certain composition of the Steering Committees had been agreed by the Monitoring Committee. It would represent Member States, Accountable Departments, Local Authorities, social partners and cross-cutting themes.
- 5.7 The **Local Government Representative (UUP)** stated that it was clear from the minutes and the Annual Implementation Report that members were asked to nominate themselves or other representatives.
- 5.8 The **Chair** stated that from the SEUPB perspective, the Monitoring Committee Members were nominated by their sector. Certain nominating bodies were invited by the Member States to nominate for the Monitoring Committee. NILGA was the organisation that was invited by the Member State to nominate the Local Authority Representation.
- 5.9 The **Local Government Representative (UUP)** disagreed and stated that it was the political parties in Northern Ireland that nominated one representative from each party.
- 5.10 The **DFP Representative** stated that NILGA approached political parties and asked them to nominate. To ensure fairness and representative participation, NILGA took the decision over who should sit on the Steering Committees. It was his understanding that three political parties that were represented at this Monitoring Committee from Northern Ireland and are currently on the Steering Committees, the SDLP, Sinn Fein and the DUP and none have raised objections to this issue.

- 5.11 The **Chair** stated that SEUPB did invite self-nomination on the basis that the Steering Committee composition would consist of representatives from various sectors but that members needed to go back through their nominating body.
- 5.12 The **Local Government Representative (UUP)** asked to see papers that show that the Monitoring Committee delegated authority to NILGA to nominate.
- 5.13 The **Local Government Representative (SDLP)** stated that he had received the form to self-nominate and he then forwarded that on to his party. He then asked if the Local Government Representative's (UUP) self-nomination form had been accepted as being valid.
- 5.14 The **Chair** stated that the self-nomination form would have been received and would then have been sent to NILGA. There were four potential Local Authority representations on the Steering Committee. NILGA facilitated this process and his understanding was that NILGA used a D'hondt system to do this.
- 5.15 The **Local Government Representative (UUP)** requested to be supplied with the papers that have delegated the authority to NILGA as the nominating body.
- 5.16 The **Chair** stated that he would be more than happy to provide the Local Government Representative (UUP) with any paperwork that was involved in this. He confirmed that the decision regarding who the nominating bodies should be had been taken by the Member States.
- 5.17 The **Chair** invited the Local Government Representative (UUP) to write to him formally and, if he felt it necessary, to write also to the Minister. The Chair stated that, on receipt of his letter, he would take it up with the Minister and would write back to the Local Government Representative (UUP) and report back to the Monitoring Committee.
- 5.18 The **BMW Representative** asked if there was a procedure where members could alternate or change and where subs or replacements could be appointed.
- 5.19 The **Chair** stated that there is a clear procedure in relation to the Monitoring Committee for the nomination of alternates. It is quite a simple process and the same principle applies to the Steering Committees.
- 5.20 The **NICVA Representative** referred to the consortium of Border Action and the Community Relations Council. She asked if the Steering Committee would have access to those within the consortium at the forthcoming meeting in May. She raised this because concerns had been raised about the level of consultation in some of the Local Actions Plans.
- 5.21 The **Director of JTS** stated that this can be facilitated at future meetings. He stated that the Steering Committee had intended to consult the consortium on the same basis as they bring consultants along to other areas.
- 5.22 The **Programme Manager of JTS** confirmed that a Steering Committee meeting on 12-13 May 2008 will incorporate presentations and suitability statements by the consortium which will encompass how the process was developed right through to the level of consultation.
- 5.23 The **RCN representative** concurred with the NICVA representative in this matter.

- 5.24 The **Chair** stated that the nature of the Local Action Plans is that they are predominantly strategic plans outlining a number of areas of intervention. They are expected to be modified based on the roll out of additional consultation. SEUPB will make it absolutely certain and clear in the selection criteria that consultation must be evidenced; and, that the community and voluntary sector must have been involved.
- 5.25 The **Local Government Representative (SDLP)** stated that it was his understanding that SEUPB are now talking to clusters, councils and Local Authorities to ask them to prioritise their plans. He raised concerns that because SEUPB want maximum consultation but there is now pressure on the council's to prioritise. There is also concern about consultation that needs to be addressed before people can prioritise.
- 5.26 The **Chair** acknowledged the point. However, he stated that SEUPB have a limited budget and eight plans on the table. The amounts of money that are being asked for are simply not available. Some basis for negotiation on budgets for the initial Local Action Plans is needed. In that negotiation process the local authorities gave an indication of where to prioritise. Consultation and the subsequent roll out need to be taken into account and it is from that point of view that prioritisation has taken place.
- 5.27 The **RCN representative** asked if there was a clear definition of the word regional. He raised concerns that there seems to be some ambiguity.
- 5.28 The **Director of JTS** stated that this had been discussed at the last Steering Committee meeting. The view of the Steering Committee was that a regional project is one that is in the 12 county model. There were a number of projects out there which did not meet the 12 county model and it was proposed that SEUPB would go back to each of those and show them how they could fit this model, or if that was not possible, consider the fit with local plans.
- 5.29 The **Local Government Representative (UUP)** referred to measure 2.1 and felt that the turnaround for receipt of applications and their approval was very quick. His main concern was that an induction training session did not occur until 24 January 2008, after projects had been approved. He raised another concern in relation to the River Foyle Foot and Cycle Bridge asking what relevance it had to peace and reconciliation. He highlighted that the Monitoring Committee need to monitor what is taking place and where money is being spent.
- 5.30 The **Chair** highlighted that SEUPB must meet their first demanding N+2 target in September 2009. He noted that the Monitoring Committee were aware of the project pipeline process. To ensure that SEUPB meet that target, there were projects put onto the system at the initial stages.
- 5.31 The **Chair** noted that the Steering Committee training had actually happened on 12 December 2007. The process of approving a project was very strict and that very clear criteria had been set. Projects would not have passed through that process unless they met all the criteria.
- 5.32 The **Chair** then commented on the issue of government spend. He stated that the PEACE Programme was absolutely not an alternative spending pot for government departments; projects must meet all the peace and reconciliation criteria.
- 5.33 The **Director of JTS** highlighted the River Foyle Foot and Cycle Bridge project. It would open up two parts of the city that were traditionally divided. He also stated that as the chair of the Steering Committee, he could give the Monitoring Committee assurance that the Steering Committee would not allow the programme to become

an alternative spending pot. All of the projects were looked at professionally and were given a very rigorous examination.

- 5.34 The **Chair** felt that it may be a good idea to provide a little more detail to the Monitoring Committee on the projects that have been brought forward to the Steering Committee. The Chair suggested providing the Monitoring Committee with a one page summary on those projects that have been approved and those that were rejected. The Monitoring Committee are then more informed and a detailed discussion could then take place.
- 5.35 The **Independent Member** had examined the application from the River Foyle Foot and Cycle Bridge. He stated that when he looks at any project he always starts with the negative aspect and evaluates how the project proves that it is not a money grab. In relation to the River Foyle project, he stated that it did an outstanding job of explaining why it should be understood within the context and parameters of what the interests are in terms of peace and reconciliation.
- 5.36 The **Local Government Representative (SDLP)** agreed with having a short summary of the projects. He then asked if Lead Partners were provided with information in relation to why their projects were rejected. He felt that it would be beneficial to them to have it broken down so that when applying with other projects they could make adjustments to meet the criteria.
- 5.37 The **Director of the JTS** stated that there is a very detailed debrief given to all projects that are rejected and the JTS explain to them where the Steering Committee felt that their application fell down. He noted that a project is not rejected for good. The projects can come back again in a new form taking on board the comments given to them. He stated that a very open and constructive discussion is held with the rejected applicants.
- 5.38 The **Chair** highlighted that SEUPB also have a review procedure in place. He commented that a Review Panel meeting had already taken place. He was the chair of this meeting which involved two members of the Monitoring Committee and one independent Review Panel member. He noted that there had been a detailed engagement with the project. The project had the opportunity to make their points and SEUPB, subsequently, explained why the decision was taken.
- 5.39 The **BRA Representative** explained that he had taken part in that Review Panel and he assured the rest of the members that it was treated as though it was a fresh submission. Both sides of the argument were presented and the Review Panel were quite satisfied with the decision that they were making.

The Monitoring Committee:

- 1) **Noted** the progress to date on the implementation of the Programme.

6.0 Report from Working Groups

6.1 Monitoring and Evaluation

- 6.1.1 The **BMW Representative** provided information on the progress of the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group. The group is made up of 14 members assisted by the Managing Authority. One meeting had already taken place on 1 February 2008. It was agreed that the chair would be

appointed at the next meeting. The main discussion points were outlined in the report on page three. Other issues that had been discussed were updated versions of the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, PEACE III and INTERREG IV, the work plan for the coming year and the dates for the forthcoming meetings.

- 6.1.2 The **Chair** stated that this was an important working group. He stated that in the past there were very useful research reports produced and is looking forward to similar reports with this working group. He then stated that he very much appreciated the work that individuals put into this.
- 6.1.3 The **DG Regio Representative** stated that from the minutes of the previous meeting it was suggested that publicity would be taken under this working group. He asked if this had been taken forward.
- 6.1.4 The **Chair** stated that the working groups are cross-programme. There are various complexities with different demands from a communications perspective for PEACE and INTERREG. There are different networks that SEUPBs communications manager needs to tap into, and therefore it is not appropriate for publicity to fall within the remit of this working group.
- 6.1.5 The **Director of the Managing Authority** stated that the remit of the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Groups was quite broad and they would have a lot of work to do in relation to the implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. The Communication Plan would be addressed under agenda item 8 and he stated that it was agreed that there would be a communications group that would take that element forward.
- 6.1.6 The **DG Regio Representative** asked if SEUPB would be creating another working group and asked how that would be dealt with. His understanding of the discussion was that publicity is good and there would need to be a working group or committee to look after this. He then stated that SEUPB had submitted a Communication Plan for both programmes showing complementarity and felt that a common committee for both PEACE and INTERREG could be set up.
- 6.1.7 The **Chair** stated that the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group would be evaluating the programmes and would be making suggestions in terms of implementation of the Communication Plan. He noted that the publicity of the programmes must be compliant with the regulations. The Chair then stated that a communication network could be set up to provide updates and reports on publicity.

6.2 Equality Working Group

- 6.2.1 The **RCN Representative** presented the report on the Equality Working Group. He stated that the group had met on two occasions. At the second meeting, the chair and vice chair had both been appointed. The main focus of the meeting was developing the terms of reference for work. Once the terms of reference have been agreed the next task and the focus at the next meeting will be to develop a programme of work and associated budget.
- 6.2.2 The **NICVA Representative** asked that the Equality Working Group pay particular attention to gender. She noted the cross-over between the

Monitoring and Evaluation and Equality Working Groups and stated that it might be advantageous for both working groups to work together at times.

- 6.2.3 The **Chair** agreed that this was a point well made and stated that the NISRA representative would deal with that in her presentation at agenda item 7.

6.3 Environmental Working Group

- 6.3.1 The **CNCC Representative** presented the report on the Environmental Working Group. The group has met twice across both programmes with the chair and vice chair agreed at the last meeting. On advice and guidance from DFP to adopt the Development Path Analysis, the draft terms of reference were agreed. A proposed budget was discussed with a work plan to be discussed at the next meeting. Also on the agenda for discussion will be the importance of sharing best practice across the community and work produced by Comhar on environmental indicators.
- 6.3.2 The **Chair** noted that the commission had published a report on best practice in evaluation of structural funds programmes which provides good guidelines that the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group may find useful. He also highlighted the DG Regio's news sheet which generally looks at the matter of environmental issues in structural funds programmes that the Environmental Working Group may find useful.
- 6.3.3 The **Comhar Representative** stated that Comhar are considering sustainable development indicators at local and regional level and it may be helpful to the Monitoring Committee. Comhar would be completing some work on counting the cost of carbon and are happy to keep the Monitoring Committee briefed through the Environmental Working Group.
- 6.3.4 The **CWC Representative** stated that the European Anti Poverty Network have issued a very useful set of guidelines for monitoring poverty and the effects on these programmes. These are available on their website at www.eapn.ie.
- 6.3.5 The **DG Regio Representative** referred back to the minutes of the previous meeting and stated that he had not seen or understood any report from the innovation and mainstreaming working group. This group was to be looking after Sharing Experience of the Peace Programme.
- 6.3.6 The **Chair** replied that these working groups also cross the competitiveness and employment programmes in Northern Ireland. He noted that SEUPB need to give thought to sharing experience more widely in relation to the peace network. SEUPB also need to look at how the Monitoring Committee can be involved in that.

The Monitoring Committee:

- 1) **Noted** the progress of the Monitoring and Evaluation, Equality and Environmental Working Groups.

7.0 Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

7.1 The **NISRA representative** presented a detailed and comprehensive overview of the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. Key points were highlighted including the purpose of the plan and the nature of ongoing monitoring and evaluation. The monitoring and evaluation plan was recommended by the European Commission. The Managing Authority realise that this is an extremely useful document that is reviewed on a continuous basis. It is suggested that programme evaluation take place in late 2010 and early 2011. The key to success of evaluation is good monitoring information.

7.2 The **Chair** stated that Programme Managers and the Monitoring Committee have three important aspects of the programme to note:

- N+2;
- Audit; and
- Evaluation.

Evaluation is an essential element of SEUPBs role. Evaluation measures, records and provides information on lessons learned for the future.

7.3 The **NICVA Representative** agreed that monitoring is central to the role of the Monitoring Committee. She did feel, however, that there was a bias towards quantative information. She noted the Aid for Peace methodology and stated that she hoped this would provide more qualitative results. She also referred to the Letter of Offer and asked if it would take the Aid for Peace methodology into account.

7.4 The **Chair** stated that indicators for evaluation have been a problem for the PEACE Programme since the beginning. SEUPB have had discussion and debate with the Commission of how peace and reconciliation are measured. This was one of the reasons that SEUPB commissioned a report last year by PriceWaterhouseCoopers on best practice in evaluation. It was found that in the discussions with the Commission there is no other best practice out there apart from what SEUPB are trying to do.

7.5 The **NISRA Representative** noted that the indicators at a strategic level are quantative in nature, rather than qualitative. Realising the importance of qualitative information the Aid for Peace approach has been adopted. She then stated that within that, there will be both quantative and qualitative information being gathered.

7.6 The **BRA Representative** asked how monitoring and evaluation of the programme would take place in the border region. He felt that the plan was geared more towards Northern Ireland. He referred specifically to the uptake of the programme by the Protestant community and asked if that would be covered by this evaluation plan.

7.7 The **NISRA representative** stated that the plan covers both jurisdictions equally and she did not see any difference between Northern Ireland and the border region. She noted that the border Protestant uptake has always been very difficult to measure and NISRA realise that there is a need to consider that further. At the moment she could not provide an answer on that other than what was provided in the previous report.

7.8 The **Chair** stated that in the past SEUPB have completed Community Uptake Analysis reports. The Minister in DFP has stated that he would like to see these reports continued and provided that the Monitoring Committee wishes to do so, SEUPB could continue to adopt this approach.

- 7.9 The **Local Government Representative (UUP)** stated that he had concerns about the quality of the information. He felt that there was no standard of judgement on the quality of the work that was undertaken especially in interface areas. He felt that the Monitoring Committee needs to have some sort of independent report or structure from the participants on the ground. The Monitoring Committee need to know the actual difference that is being made on the ground.
- 7.10 The **RCN Representative** stated that a column entitled 'what difference has been made' could be added. He noted that the people on the ground can explain the differences that have been made and they need to be asked continuously about these differences. He stated that it will require a huge investment but if the Monitoring Committee are really serious about learning the lessons then time, resources and commitment need to be invested on an ongoing basis.
- 7.11 The **DG Regio Representative** stated that in terms of indicators the Commission recognises that both a quantitative and qualitative approach is needed. The Commission supports the gathering of qualitative information and realises that it should be done with some flexibility and an open mind. He then commented on the Community Uptake Analysis and referred back to one of the previous PEACE II Monitoring Committee meetings in which a previous member stated that we had moved on from such reports.
- 7.12 The **Independent Member** stated that the indicators would end up being a mix of both qualitative and quantitative. Some of those will be general across cases, different projects and programmes and some will be specific to the projects themselves. Another thing that is important to underscore is that indicators will be developed through participatory engagement with the projects. It is important to get a sense of the types of impacts these initiatives are having. He then stated that one of the unique features of this approach is that it is so participatory and there are layers of engagement and connection all the way through. Finally he mentioned the possibility of using a mapping exercise to determine what the risks are in the areas that we are working in or where the projects are coming from. Not just to look at risks but also at opportunities, to map out the ways in which engagement with those communities occurs.
- 7.13 The **CWC Representative** stated that the Monitoring Committee need to learn from PEACE II, in particular the Distinctiveness Working Groups. She stated that a lot of the projects took on the self-evaluation process in which the projects questioned themselves based on the five strands. She stated that those self-evaluations may give the Monitoring Committee the opportunity to produce some models in relation to qualitative information.
- 7.14 The **Chair** agreed that this was a point well made and stated that SEUPB will make sure that the work of the Distinctiveness Working Group and all the outputs from PEACE II are fed in through the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group for PEACE III.
- 7.15 The **Local Government Representative (UUP)** asked for clarification in relation to the context indicators. He asked how reliable the baseline figures were and highlighted the indicator in relation to people admitting that they were racially prejudiced.
- 7.16 The **NISRA Representative** stated that the source of the information was the Northern Ireland Life and Times survey and noted that 25% of those surveyed admitted that they were a little prejudiced. The information is produced by the usual

sampling methodology and it is as accurate as it can be.

- 7.17 The **Local Government Representative (Sinn Fein)** noted that it was essential to have proper monitoring and evaluation as the Monitoring Committee need to be aware of where the money is going. The Monitoring Committee needs to know that this is money well spent.
- 7.18 The **Chair** stated that the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group are actively looking at the points that have been raised because it is important that the Monitoring Committee are kept aware of these issues.
- 7.19 The **Director of JTS** asked the NISRA representative how to measure the impacts of those projects that will not see the effects or differences made until long after the programme has closed.
- 7.20 The **NISRA Representative** stated that they have to try and produce some monitoring and evaluation information for the Monitoring Committee within the lifetime of the programme. While the longer term impacts will not be apparent, the initial impacts will be.

The Monitoring Committee:

- 1) **Noted** the content of the Draft Monitoring and Evaluation Plan.

8.0 Communication Plan

- 8.1 The **Communication Officer** provided a presentation of the Communication Plan that had been submitted to the Commission on 6 March 2008. She went through the various aims and objectives. A brief clip was shown to the members from the Programme Launch at Stormont Hotel in Belfast on Monday 14 April 2008.
- 8.2 The **Chair** invited the members to make any comments.
- 8.3 The **Local Government Representative (SDLP)** stated that it is absolutely vital that information is shared not just in Northern Ireland and Ireland but across other conflict zones. This links into the Communication Plan as there are issues within this about sharing expertise and good practice and there is a wealth of information from the evaluations. He states that we need a very distinct, focused Communication Plan on how to share that information.
- 8.4 The **Chair** stated that SEUPB have been asked by the two Member States to put a formal proposal to them in relation to how a Peace Network might actually be shaped. The Peace Network would include regions and cities throughout Europe and further a field to share the experience of Northern Ireland. There have been 27 regions identified that are interested in working with SEUPB on these.
- 8.5 The **DG Regio Representative** stated that the Communication Plan was a very comprehensive document and he was confident in it and commented on its good quality. He stated that the Commission would respond formally within the deadline.

The Monitoring Committee:

- 1) **Noted** the contents of the Communication Plan.

9.0 Annual Implementation Report

- 9.1 The **Programme Officer** gave a presentation on the 2007 Annual Implementation Report. This is an important regulatory requirement that must be approved by the Monitoring Committee and then submitted to the Commission by the end of June.
- 9.2 The **Chair** asked for any comments from the members.
- 9.3 The **DG Regio Representative** stated that the Annual Implementation Report has to be approved by the Monitoring Committee before it could be submitted to the Commission.
- 9.4 The **Chair** acknowledged that approval was required and asked the members to approve the Annual Implementation Report.
- 9.5 The Annual Implementation Report was approved.
- 9.6 The **Chair** noted the Local Government Representative's (UUP) issues under item 5 and stated that those would be addressed in the manner previously discussed.

The Monitoring Committee:

- 1) **Approved** the content of the Annual Implementation Report for 2007.

10.0 Any Other Business

- 10.1 The **Chair** stated that the date of the next meeting had been set as 22 October 2008 and noted that there had been a request to hold both the PEACE III and INTERREG IVA meetings on the same day. He stated that SEUPB would be very happy to facilitate that.
- 10.2 The **Director of the Managing Authority** stated that the PEACE III Monitoring Committee would be held in the morning and the INTERREG IVA in the afternoon to facilitate those colleagues that are travelling from Scotland.
- 10.3 The **Chair** then thanked everyone for attending and formally ended the meeting.

ANNEX I**ACTION POINTS/ISSUES OF CLARIFICATION
ARISING FROM MONITORING COMMITTEE****Wednesday 23rd April 2008, Tullyarvan Mill,****Buncrana, Co. Donegal****ACTION POINTS**

ISSUE	ACTION	TIMING	RESPONSIBILITY
Project Selection Criteria Section 3	The use of the word OR is in fact and OR and not an AND	Completed (see point 4.4)	SEUPB – Managing Authority
Definition of term Public Equivalent Status	To have a definition placed on the SEUPB website to make SEUPB position clear and official	Immediately	SEUPB – Managing Authority
Project Selection and Rejection	Provide Monitoring Committee with one page summary on all projects that are brought to the Steering Committee		SEUPB - JTS
Information Reports for Working Groups	Reports published by the Commission which may be of use to the Working Groups in making decisions. Working Groups should access these.		Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group and Environmental Working Group

ANNEX II

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 Wednesday 23 April 2008, Buncrana

Chair

Pat Colgan (SEUPB – Managing Authority)

Members (North)

Martin Tyrrell (Department of Finance and Personnel)
Charlie Casey (Local Government Representative - Sinn Fein)
Bob Stoker (Local Government Representative - UUP)
Tim Atwood (Local Government Representative - SDLP)
Frances McCandless (Northern Ireland Council for Voluntary Action)
Gina McIntyre (Certifying Authority)
Paul Noonan (Equality Commission)
John Anderson (Council for Nature Conservation and the Countryside)
Michael Hughes (Rural Community Network)
Denis Galway (Joint Business Council)

Members (South)

Annette Connolly (Department of Finance)
Angela Holohan (Community Workers Co-operative)
Tony Ferguson (Border Regional Authority)
Matt Donnelly (Border Regional Authority)
James Daly (Border Midlands & West Assembly Regional Authority)
Michael McCauley (Border Midlands & West Assembly Regional Authority)
Vincent Edwards (Equality Authority)
Noel Casserly (Comhar)
Tom Gillen (Irish Congress of Trade Unions)
Martin Smyth (Irish Rural Link)

Independent Member

Kenneth Bush (Independent Advisor)

Advisors

Drew Haire (Office of the First Minister/Deputy First Minister)
Alison Hanna (Department of Social Development)
Diarmuid Murphy (Department of Environment Heritage and Local Government)
Celeste McCallion (Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency)
Paddy McGinn (Border Action)
Pat Kelly (North South Ministerial Council)
Kevin Murphy (Department of Agriculture and Rural Development)

Advisors European Commission

Kyriacos Charalambous (Directorate General for Regional Policy – European Commission)

Observers

Sarah-Jayne Smith (Belfast City Council)
Tristen Kelso (Jim Allister's Office)
John Carson (International Fund for Ireland)

Secretariat (SEUPB)

Adrian McNamee (Director, Managing Authority)
Howard Keery (Director, JTS)
Lisa McMullan (Programmes Manager, Managing Authority)
Brenda Hegarty (Programme Manager, JTS)
Niall Smyth (Accountant)
Andrew Minnis (Programme Officer, Managing Authority)
Michelle Rea (Communications Officer)
Christine Markey (Clerical Supervisor – Minute Taker)
Ciaran Rice (Clerical Officer – Minute Taker)

Apologies

Bill Pauley (Department of Finance and Personnel)
Niall McSweeney (Department of Finance)
Sammy Brush (Local Government Representative – DUP)
Pamela Dooley (Irish Congress of Trade Unions)

Brian Callanan

(Joint Business Council)

Carol Baxter

(Equality Authority)

Frank Vaughan

(Irish Congress of Trade Union)

Glossary of acronyms used in the minutes:

BMW Assembly	Border, Midlands and West Assembly
BRA	Border Regional Authority
CNCC	Council for Nature Conservation and the Countryside
CWC	Community Workers Co-operative
DARD	Department of Agriculture and Rural Development
DEL	Department of Employment and Learning
DEHLG	Department of Environment Heritage and Local Government
DFP	Department of Finance and Personnel (Northern Ireland)
DG REGIO	Directorate-General for Regional Policy (European Commission)
DOF	Department of Finance
DSD	Department of Social Development
ICTU	Irish Congress of Trade Unions
IFI	International Fund for Ireland
JBC	Joint Business Council
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
RCN	Rural Community Network
SEUPB	Special European Union Programmes Body