



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

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

MINUTES MONITORING COMMITTEE MEETING

**Wednesday 22 October 2008,
Loughgiel Millennium Centre, Loughgiel**

Introduction

I The **Chair** welcomed everyone to the third Monitoring Committee meeting of the programme.

II Apologies are listed in Annex II.

1 Project Presentation

1.1 Angela O'Hagan, Manager of Loughgiel Millennium Centre, gave a brief presentation on the work of the Centre and the Loughgiel Community Association. The Centre had been part funded by the PEACE III Programme.

1.2 The **Chair** thanked Angela for providing an insight into the vital work carried out by the centre and for her kind words.

2 Agenda

2.1 The agenda was agreed.

3 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

- 3.1 The **Chair** noted that no substantial changes had been made to the minutes and asked that the Members agree them.
- 3.2 The Members agreed that the minutes were an accurate reflection of what had occurred at the previous meeting.

4 Matters Arising

- 4.1 The **Chair** noted the matters arising from the minutes of the last meeting:
 - A minor changing of words in the Project Selection Criteria, raised at point 4.4 of the minutes of the last meeting. This was now completed.
 - Summaries of approved projects had been provided for the Members via the SEUPB website, the **Chair** noted that unsuccessful project summaries had not been provided but could be if they were requested.
 - The information reports published by the Commission had been made available to the Working Groups.
 - The definition of the Public Equivalent Status had been made available on the SEUPB website.
 - The composition of the Steering Committee for Theme 1.1 did not include a Unionist Representative. NILGA nominated the Local Government Representatives using the D'hondt system but it was not SEUPB's intention that there would be no representation from the Unionist community. It was agreed that the Steering Committees should have representation from the two main communities. The Managing Authority has consulted NILGA, Local Representatives and social partners and proposed to allocate one further member to the Theme 1.1 Steering Committee from the Unionist community. NILGA would nominate that Member.
- 4.2 The **Chair** noted that in order to ensure appropriate representation at Monitoring and Steering Committees, the Managing Authority should have been clearer in explaining its intention to NILGA.

- 4.3 The **Local Representative (UUP)** stated that it would be useful to see summaries of rejected projects and noted that there seemed to be an absence of funding for victims or former members of security forces.
- 4.4 The **Chair** noted that there was a lot of activity in that area that would be highlighted during the course of the meeting.
- 4.5 The **Chair** then asked the Members to consider the proposed additional member of the Steering Committee.
- 4.6 The **Local Representative (SDLP)** noted that although his party was committed to the D'hondt system, he felt this was the best way to deal with this issue and stated that lessons should be learned from this in terms of clarity of the processes for appointment to these types of committees.
- 4.7 The **Local Representative (DUP)** noted that he was happy with this outcome. He then referred to point 5.10 of the minutes of the previous meeting. He noted the last sentence, *'none have raised objections to this issue'*, and highlighted that he had raised objections with the Minister. He commented that while this account may have been correct as a minute, it was not correct as a statement.
- 4.8 The **Chair** thanked the representative for pointing that out and stated he would be happy to amend the minutes to reflect this. The Chair then noted that the Members were in agreement as to the way forward with the Steering Committee for Theme 1.1.
- 4.9 The **Local Representative (UUP)** referred to points 5.15 and 5.16 of the minutes and noted that he had not received any paperwork as he had requested. He thought that he would have received the paperwork in advance of having to write to SEUPB.
- 4.10 The **Chair** noted that it was an oversight and stated that the information was available and would be provided.

5 Programme Progress Reports

5.1 The **Chair** invited the Director of the Managing Authority, the Director of the JTS and the two representatives of the Consortium to give their presentations on the progress of the programme.

5.2 The **Director of the Managing Authority** gave an overview of the programme highlighting current activity and targets to be met. He highlighted the N+2 target, the level of participation within the programme and monitoring that was taking place.

5.3 The **Director of the JTS** gave a detailed presentation on the progress of Themes 1.1, 2.1 and 2.2 highlighting:

- The number of applications received, considered, approved, rejected, withdrawn, deferred and under assessment.
- 11 Steering Committees had considered applications and a further three have been scheduled.
- That calls had been opened and closed on all themes by 5 September 2008.
- Approved projects, Lead Partner and value grant awarded.
- That one project had requested a review and the decision to reject had been upheld.
- The strategic interventions in place to enable the programme to reach participants and communities that are under-represented.
- The high level of commitment indicating that the N+2 target should be achievable.

5.4 The **Representatives of the Consortium** then gave a detailed presentation on the progress of Theme 1.2 highlighting:

- Three Steering Committees had taken place.
- The ongoing liaison with the Victims Commissioners.
- Consultation with relevant stakeholders.
- That the theme had been spilt into three strands.
- That there is a high level of activity within each strand.
- 26 applications had been approved and 2 deferred.

- That there were some challenges and how they would try to overcome these.
- 5.5 The **Chair** thanked all for their presentations and welcomed comments and questions from members.
- 5.6 The **DG Regio Representative** noted that the information was very useful and asked if the presentations could be provided electronically. He then asked if the project promoters of the rejected projects received any feedback. He referred to the figures within the Progress Report and asked that the Members be provided with one figure to show commitment across the whole programme. Finally, he commented on the recent financial crisis and asked if it would be a challenge to find funding for the PEACE III Programme.
- 5.7 The **Chair** stated that the presentations could be made available and he also confirmed that the promoters were given feedback.
- 5.8 The **Director of the JTS** stated that every applicant has a debriefing session where the JTS discuss and explain the Steering Committees decision. Where appropriate, the applicant is encouraged to rework the proposal.
- 5.9 The **Chair** also highlighted that the rejected applicants are notified of their right to appeal.
- 5.10 The **Director of the Managing Authority** noted that there were three figures that made up the total. For Theme 1.1 €78m was committed and €46.39m was committed for Theme 2.1. The paper being referred to was issued prior to the Consortium's Steering Committee and those figures were not included in the paper, therefore an extra €13.6m needed to be added which brought the total commitment through Steering Committee to approximately €138m, exclusive of technical assistance. This equates to approximately 47% of the programme.
- 5.11 The **Chair** noted that he had taken on board the need for clarity of the figures in the papers and he would look into how best to present that for the future. He then referred to the financial crisis issue and stated that the nature of the programme is such that the match funding comes from public money and is

provided for, in total, by voted estimates in the budgets of the Accountable Departments.

- 5.12 The **DFP Representative** confirmed that match funding was provided through Accountable Department budgets.
- 5.13 The **DoF Representative** stated that their position was the same and the Department of Finance do not anticipate any problems for the programme. The North/South activity would have been given priority in the consideration of the budgets.
- 5.14 The **NICVA Representative** asked how substantial the delays were between the process of sign-off by the Accountable Department and issuing the Letter of Offer. She noted that in the past the independence of voluntary and community organisations had always been recognised but it was now her understanding that organisations are being asked for an endorsement from a statutory body for some parts of Theme 1.2. She asked if it could be clarified if and why this was happening.
- 5.15 The **Director of the JTS** noted that while projects are recommended for approval by Steering Committee, Letters of Offer cannot be issued until the Accountable Departments are satisfied that they can put their money forward. He noted that the delay varies between departments and themes. He acknowledged that most difficulties were in relation to Theme 1.1.
- 5.16 The **Chair** stated that it was important to note that things are being done differently in this programme with much larger, more strategic projects and therefore the approval processes are much more stringent. He noted that SEUPB were working very closely with the Accountable Departments to address any issues and there is full participation and co-operation.
- 5.17 The **Consortium Representative** stated that there is no unilateral requirement for endorsement from a statutory body. However, the Consortium would consult with a statutory body with the responsibility for the particular sector in the interests of ensuring complementarity and avoiding duplication. He noted that there would be consultation around certain applications on a case by case basis, explaining that on some occasion's groups might be asked to get

endorsements themselves. It was agreed to discuss this with the NICVA Representative separately.

- 5.18 The **Local Representative (SDLP)** referred back to the issue of the financial crisis. He commented that banks would have a different view on the issue which may lead to less support and therefore an impact on councils, community groups and so on. He asked if there would be any consideration and flexibility in terms of how this issue was managed? He then asked if it would be possible for departments to fast-track any capital projects? Finally, he raised concern that there did not appear to be any kind of regional project relating to victims combating sectarianism in Theme 1.1.
- 5.19 The **BMW Representative** stated that issues may arise in relation to local government and the credit crunch. He highlighted that their financial circumstances may have changed significantly and they may not have the same capacity to promote projects. He felt that it might be a good idea for SEUPB to discuss possible issues with them to bring projects forward in different ways.
- 5.20 The **Chair** stated that he had discussions with the SOLACE Group in relation to funding issues and the cash-flow implications of some of this work for local authorities in Northern Ireland. He noted that it had not happened yet for the Irish councils but stated that SEUPB would be meeting with them. He stated that SEUPB are looking at ways to address these issues and it is understood how important it is that money is available so that projects can proceed with their work, as they have been contracted to do in the Letter of Offer. He noted that this was an issue across the whole programme. He reiterated that there was no issue of the availability of funds for the programme. He explained that it was SEUPB's responsibility to ensure that the money is made available in a timely manner and in compliance with public finance management procedures.
- 5.21 The **Chair** then stated that fast-tracking particular projects could be considered. He highlighted that SEUPB are anxious to get these projects started as they are major contributors to N+2.
- 5.22 The **Chair** then discussed the issue of victims and noted that the Local Authority Action Plans do contain provision for opportunities to do work with the

victims groups and across the clusters there are indications of work in this area.

- 5.23 The **Consortium Representative** confirmed that the plans do contain elements where victims groups can bid. However, he did note that the councils were mindful of the role of the Consortium and wanted to avoid duplication. He explained that the Consortium has a dual role; one as a funder and the other as a development and support unit. He noted that they do urge any council, that has issues that it cannot fund, to approach the Consortium for discussion. He revealed that the Consortium are trying to encourage region wide bids and that they will accept bids from councils. He highlighted that there was difficulty in generating this because of the infrastructure within victims and survivors groups but explained that they are working to pull together regional strategic bids under Strand 1 that involves a number of different agencies.
- 5.24 The **Local Representative (SDLP)** noted that local authorities have to reflect progress back to the community and felt that the issue needed to be addressed as some people might see the provision of support for the ex-prisoners as an imbalance.
- 5.25 The **Local Representative (UUP)** asked about the process of advance payments and if the Local Action Plans would be flexible enough to allow for the outcome of the Review of Public Administration (RPA) as clusters are likely to change. Finally, he referred to the ex-prisoner funding and commented that there were two separate applications; one for republican prisoners and one for loyalist prisoners; he asked if any thought had been given to taking these as one unit.
- 5.26 The **Chair** stated that state guidelines on managing public money states that advances are not available. However, there is a provision for special cases where resources are to be made available to ensure provision of services. He noted that SEUPB will look at the requirements of any organisation that it enters into a contract with, to ensure that they are resourced properly.
- 5.27 The **Chair** explained that the Local Action Plans and RPA issue has been considered. SEUPB have committed to reviewing progress towards RPA at the end of 2009, meeting with clusters, Lead Partners and other participants to

consider the situation. The Chair noted the concerns raised and SEUPBs need to be sensitive to these concerns.

- 5.28 Finally, the **Chair** confirmed that SEUPB did explore the possibility of funding one single ex-prisoners project. He explained that in both there were elements across both communities. He noted that there were specific issues and needs which would be best addressed as two separate projects but that they work closely together. He revealed that provisions had been made for CFNI to be lead partner in both cases and through them integration, complementarity and interaction would be achieved. They also provide a strong element of governance in relation to the spending of the monies.
- 5.29 The **Director of the JTS** noted that this is a major step forward from PEACE II where there was a proliferation of different ex-prisoner groups and the idea was to merge these as effectively as possible.
- 5.30 The **Local Representative (DUP)** asked about the role of the Victims Commissioners.
- 5.31 The **Chair** vouched that frequent and intense contact has been entered into with the Victims Commissioners. This has proved to be helpful and co-operative; in addition the Consortium also liaises closely with the Commissioners.
- 5.32 The **NICVA Representative** asked if the contents of the Letters of Offer were similar to those of PEACE II. She had been shown a PEACE II Letter of Offer recently which contained a line that the payee would carry the responsibility for any errors made by the payer. She referred to a recent incident where a problem had arisen because of this and asked if this line was included in PEACE III Letters of Offer.
- 5.33 The **Chair** stated that it would be something that would have to be looked into and SEUPB would be more than happy to do so.
- 5.34 The **Director of the JTS** noted that the terms and conditions is a weighty document and he would like to take the time to look and satisfy himself about that.

- 5.35 The **Local Representative (UUP)** raised concerns about duplicate applications from the same organisation.
- 5.36 The **Director of the JTS** stated that this is looked at closely and Economic Appraisers are asked to consider this.
- 5.37 The **Local Representative (UUP)** requested that his concern that the application from ILEX was not a peace-building project be noted.
- 5.38 The **Local Representatives (DUP)** and **(Sinn Fein)** also raised concerns in relation to the application from ILEX.
- 5.39 The **Chair** proposed that this project make a presentation at the next Monitoring Committee meeting to provide further information.
- 5.40 The **Local Representative (DUP)** then asked what the position was in relation to the project.
- 5.41 The **Chair** confirmed that the project had gone through full Steering Committee assessment; an Economic Appraisal has been undertaken; Accountable Department and Ministerial approval has been granted. A Letter of Offer has been issued and is with the project applicant.
- 5.42 The **Local Representative (DUP)** commented that this means that the Monitoring Committee cannot change anything in relation to this project.
- 5.43 The **Chair** confirmed that the decision has been made to support this project and the implementation would be monitored very closely.
- 5.44 The **Independent Member** explained as an evaluator he questions how social infrastructure projects can have peace-building effects. However, following a site visit and reviewing the project application, he does not share the concerns that have been expressed by other Members.
- 5.45 The **BRA Representative** noted that the Monitoring Committee has mandated the Steering Committee to approve/reject applications and he was concerned

that this project, after going through all stages of approval, was still raising concerns.

5.46 The **Chair** confirmed that the Steering Committee has been delegated authority by the Monitoring Committee and the decision making process is clearly defined. The Chair reassured the Members their concerns had been noted and would be taken seriously with an opportunity to address them to the project at the next Monitoring Committee.

5.47 The **Local Representative (DUP)** asked what the role of the Monitoring Committee was.

5.48 The **Chair** explained that the Monitoring Committee is responsible for the overall management and monitoring of the programme. Furthermore, Members are involved in the Steering Committees or in nominating members to the Steering Committees and therefore are involved in decision making. This has been agreed with the two Members States and the European Commission within the Operational Programme.

5.49 The **DG Regio Representative** confirmed the strategic role of the Monitoring Committee and that it has approved the functions and how the decisions will be taken. He explained that if the Monitoring Committee feels that something that has been decided has not been implemented or has not followed correct procedures then they can review this. He stated that the Monitoring Committee cannot review decisions that have already been taken but they can review the selection process. He noted that a valid point had been raised if it had not been the intention of the Monitoring Committee for such projects to be approved and this would then be for the Monitoring Committee to address.

5.50 The **Chair** also pointed out that the Steering Committee operates on the basis of consensus and if consensus is not achievable then it can and should be referred back to the Monitoring Committee for consideration.

5.51 The **Local Representative (DUP)** highlighted that it was stated that Members of the Monitoring Committee nominated members to the Steering Committees. However, in relation to the Local Authority Representatives it was NILGA that nominated. Overall, he felt this process was confusing.

- 5.52 The **Local Representative (Sinn Fein)** clarified his position in that his concerns related to the project's contribution not the decision making process.
- 5.53 The **DFP Representative** confirmed the roles of the Monitoring and Steering Committees. He noted that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to withdraw a Letter of Offer from a project that has gone through the process correctly.
- 5.54 The **DFP Representative** then referred to the role of NILGA in nominating Members to the Monitoring and Steering Committees and noted that all political parties were written to advising them of this approach. Any changes to the approach would require a change to the first paper that was agreed in relation to the Steering Committees.
- 5.55 The **Director of the JTS** confirmed that the Steering Committees have engaged fully and take their decision making role very seriously. With regard to the ILEX project, there was a lengthy debate and there was a unanimous decision that it should be funded.
- 5.56 The **Local Representative (UUP)** clarified that he was not criticising the Steering Committees and his concerns arise from three/four years ago when the same project was brought forward but was rejected.
- 5.57 The **Chair** noted the clarification and pointed out that PEACE III is a different programme with different priorities. Such projects are now eligible to apply.

The Monitoring Committee:

- 1) **Noted** the progress of the programme.

6 Report from Working Groups

- 6.1 The **BMW Representative** gave a brief overview of the activity of the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group. The group has met twice since the

last meeting. James Daly was appointed Chair and Pauline Donnan from OFMDFM joined in an advisory capacity. The main areas discussed were programme implementation, monitoring and evaluation plans, Good Relations Indicators and the Aid for Peace Approach. He noted that the next meeting was scheduled for 16 December 2008.

- 6.2 The **RCN Representative** gave an overview of the Equality Working Group noting that it had met twice since the last Monitoring Committee. The group considered its work-plan including the equality responses and scoring of applications to date; identifying recommendations to Managing Authorities; conducting an equality audit; and reviewing and updating the 'Mainstreaming Equality' guide. It was agreed that there would be two sub-groups; one to look at the guide and the other at equality responses. The next meeting will be in early 2009.
- 6.3 The **Local Representative (UUP)** asked if the examination of equality responses and scoring applications to date in the proposed work-plan was available as a separate sub-section.
- 6.4 The **RCN Representative** stated that the group examined a number of equality responses from applications received to date and looked to see if the responses met the groups understanding of equality. He explained that it was to make recommendations to promote equality.
- 6.5 The **Local Representative (UUP)** clarified that the information he was seeking was to understand why projects that fell short on the equality section still progressed especially if the Monitoring Committee is actively promoting equality.
- 6.6 The **RCN Representative** felt that this is something that would be best left with the JTS.
- 6.7 The **Chair** clarified that the Local Representative was looking for an analysis of the issues and would consider how this could be presented at future meetings.
- 6.8 The **RCN Representative** explained that the working group is working through each equality sub point and ask what are the key indicators that they need to

see? He explained that the group have identified some things that are missing and all this will be coming forward in the work report.

- 6.9 The **Local Representative (Sinn Fein)** asked if there were indications of inequality on all of the groups and sub-groups.
- 6.10 The **RCN Representative** stated that at present he did not have full information, but, for example, there was a possible gender inequality on some of the groups. He would report that back as soon as the analysis and information is received.
- 6.11 The **Chair** noted that this is an issue which needs to be monitored in order to make sure that anything that needs to be done is being done to correct any imbalance.
- 6.12 The **CNCC Representative** gave a brief overview of the work of the Environmental Working Group and stated that the group was across all Structural Funds. She highlighted that the group had met once since the last meeting and its discussions concentrated on its proposed work-plan, production of guidelines on environmental policies, the Strategic Environmental Assessment compliance and indicators and the reports on the cross-cutting themes. She also highlighted that she had attended the Annual Environmental Ireland Conference in Dublin and the Open Days in Brussels. She noted that the Open Days were very useful but felt she could have attended though a video-link and proposed that this be set up for future conferences.
- 6.13 The **Chair** felt that this was an interesting challenge in terms of looking at the amount of travel that is undertaken.
- 6.14 The **Local Representative (UUP)** asked for the draft document on how to write an Environmental Policy to be made available.
- 6.15 The **Comhar Representative** explained that research on local and regional indicators for sustainable development is due to be published in November 2008 and he is happy to keep the Environmental Working Group briefed in regards this. He also invited Members to Comhar's Annual Conference.

- 6.16 The **DG Regio Representative** stated that he would be happy to bring the proposal of introducing web-links to the Commission.
- 6.17 The **Chair** stated that decentralisation of Open Days is one that did occur this year. He noted the potential to further use technology.
- 6.18 The **RCN Representative** referred back to the Equality Working Group and noted that the equality question on the application is being answered in terms of the equality impact on the group rather than the projects, that is one of the key things learned and key recommendations coming back.

The Monitoring Committee:

- 1) **Noted** the progress of the Working Groups.

7 Progress on Regulatory Requirements

- 7.1 The **Director of the Managing Authority** gave a brief overview on the progress of the regulatory requirements. He highlighted the documents required, those that had been submitted and approved and those still to be submitted. He highlighted the Article 71 report which is a very important document that is still in preparation but which will be submitted by 6 November 2008. He also highlighted the Annual Control Report which is produced by the Audit Authority and is due to be submitted on 31 December 2008.

The Monitoring Committee:

- 1) **Noted** the progress on Regulatory Requirements.

8 Report on Communications

- 8.1 The **Communications Manager** gave a brief presentation on the information and publicity of the programme. He highlighted that the Communication Plan had been submitted and approved by the Commission. He noted the various

requirements including: the official launch of the programmes on 14 April 2008; the SEUPB website was in the process of being updated to be more interactive and easier to use; SEUPB were taking part in various information road shows to inform the general public about the programme; networking was taking place with training exercises and network meetings; the development of a web-based TV programme; publicity through newspapers; and the development of the Your EU magazine.

- 8.2 The **Local Representative (SDLP)** asked what the proposed budget was for the plan.
- 8.3 The **Communications Manager** stated that the proposed budget for the PEACE III Programme was €1.6m and noted that this was taken from technical assistance.
- 8.4 The **Local Representative (UUP)** asked if the Communication Plan could be communicated to Members.
- 8.5 The **Chair** stated that there was a detailed presentation of the Plan made at the last meeting before it was submitted to the Commission and that this would be made available directly to the Representative.
- 8.6 The **ICTU Representative** suggested that the papers from previous meetings be included in the members section of the website alongside the papers for the upcoming meeting. He also noted that it could be useful to supply any presentations in this area as well. He then stated that he felt that Web TV is a different medium to normal TV and noted that he was a little sceptical about the efficacy of Web TV, although it is worth exploring.
- 8.7 The **Chair** noted that SEUPB are exploring ways of making the website more interactive and noted that SEUPB can and should provide a broader range of content in the members section. He noted that SEUPB are committed to the principle of better content management on the website. He highlighted that the EUTV was seen as part of the web strategy rather than a panacea in relation to the TV element.

- 8.8 The **Communications Manager** explained that the idea of the WebTV came from the feedback of a stakeholder survey.
- 8.9 The **BRA Representative** asked if EUTV would concentrate solely on Northern Ireland.
- 8.10 The **Chair** stated that this was a web-based initiative and would be therefore widely available. He highlighted that SEUPB input would include all the eligible area but DFP are the driving force behind it.
- 8.11 The **DFP Representative** noted that the department are tendering for it and it will showcase projects within all the programmes within Northern Ireland and will include any PEACE III or INTERREG IVA project from their full eligible area.
- 8.12 The **BRA Representative** asked if it could possibly cover the BMW region and its Operational Programme.
- 8.13 The **BMW Representative** stated that there was no reason why not and agreed to look into it. He commented that there is the potential to get all the EU structural funds centralised onto the website.
- 8.14 The **DFP Representative** stated that care needed to be taken over the North/South co-operation and the way in which these programmes are set up to operate through that. He stated that there was no reason why it shouldn't include the areas where co-operation is already happening, for example Transnational EU programmes.
- 8.15 The **BRA Representative** asked if it was going to concentrate on all the EU Programmes in Northern Ireland.
- 8.16 The **DFP Representative** stated that it has included all of the Northern Ireland programmes and that it brings in those that have the border region as part of their eligible area. He stated that DFP had not had any discussion with Ireland about extending that to cover all EU Programmes within Ireland or with the North/South Ministerial Council sector that oversees the North/South Programmes.

- 8.17 The **Chair** asked if the BRA Representative was concerned about the coverage of southern involvement in PEACE and INTERREG.
- 8.18 The **BRA Representative** stated that he was concerned that it would be covering all of the EU money in Northern Ireland and only some of the money in the south for PEACE and INTERREG.
- 8.19 The **Chair** stated that he could only answer on behalf of the Managing Authority of PEACE and INTERREG but commented that it would be worthwhile entering into discussions with the partners in Ireland about the potential of extending it.
- 8.20 The **Chair** explained the reasons for the strategy highlighting that genuine physical evidence of implementation needed to be provided in an attractive and meaningful way. SEUPB have tried to do this with Your EU but also recognise that there is a need to move more towards internet and technology based solutions and there are significant opportunities being presented for that.
- 8.21 The **DFP Representative** noted that the department's budget for this year is £50,000 and the nature of the amount of the EUTV needs to be set in that context rather than the overall budget of €1.6m.
- 8.22 The **BMW Representative** highlighted that there are links between all the websites and it is easy to navigate from one programme to another.

The Monitoring Committee:

- 1) **Noted** the progress of Communications.

9 Any Other Business

- 9.1 The **Local Representative (DUP)** referred to the letter sent to PEACE III Partnerships on 10 October 2008 and raised concern in reference to paragraph

six which relates to a partnership ratifying a recommendation and if the partnership is not able to ratify the recommendation then that decision should be endorsed by at least 65% of the members of the joint committee. The concern was that this was stepping outside normal procedure and he felt there would be no point in the Joint Committee meeting if some of the members do not attend.

- 9.2 The **Chair** noted that SEUPB were in discussion with the PEACE III clusters in Northern Ireland in relation to this and are looking at the practicalities of how the implementation of their work can respect two very important principles; Partnership; and the role of Local Authorities as accountable and responsible entities for the monies that have been transferred. The Chair explained that this was a unique dimension to PEACE III. The Chair explained that the letter was intended to set down the principles that govern the PEACE III Programme in relation to what is required by the Operational Programme with no prejudice to the independence of local authorities in terms of the way in which they manage themselves. The Chair explained that the clusters have set themselves up on a voluntary basis, they have nominated a Lead Partner, they received the Letter of Offer which is signed and endorsed by that Lead Partner on behalf of the cluster and how the cluster organises itself then is a matter for discussion.
- 9.3 The **Local Representative (UUP)** raised concerns that a particular cluster, in either accepting or rejecting something, needs a two third majority. He asked if the two thirds were of the attending membership or of all members.
- 9.4 The **Chair** noted that in the case where a cluster sets up a Joint Committee, which it is not obliged to do, there is a provision under the Act that states that there is a requirement that 65% of the Members should be elected representatives. He noted that where a Joint Committee is taking a decision in relation to not ratifying a proposal or recommendation then evidence will be required to indicate that the decision was widely spread among the elected representatives. The Chair explained that advice had been taken on this and SEUPB are looking at solutions that respect the two principles. He noted that there had been some very constructive discussions with the Partnerships and the elected representatives. He also highlighted the important constituency of the Chief Executive of the Local Authorities who are accountable officers.

- 9.5 The **Local Government Representative (UUP)** asked if questions were still ongoing.
- 9.6 The **Chair** confirmed that that was the case.
- 9.7 The **Local Government Representative (DUP)** stated that the issue was discussed at his recent Joint Committee meeting and noted that it was very seldom that they would have a complete 100% turnout. He commented that the way in which the letter was worded referred to the whole Joint Committee and therefore if two members do not attend, then he feels that there is no point in the Joint Committee meeting.
- 9.8 The **Chair** explained that he had asked colleagues to set up meetings with each of the clusters to discuss in detail the practical implementation of these particular issues. He noted that the Trade Unions had raised some concerns also and he had meetings with representatives of the Trade Union Congress and other social partners to work through these issues.

10 Date of Next Meeting

- 10.1 The **Chair** highlighted that the Managing Authority had been looking into giving Members a number of meetings in advance for planning purposes. He noted that the Managing Authority are proposing to hold the next three meetings on Wednesday 22 April 2009, Wednesday 21 October 2009 and Wednesday 21 April 2010. SEUPB are currently looking at locations and will come back to the Members as soon as possible with that information.
- 10.2 The **Chair** thanked everyone for attending and formally ended the meeting.

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

Wednesday 22 October 2008, Loughgiel Millennium Centre,

Loughgiel, County Antrim

ACTION POINTS

ISSUE	ACTION	TIMING	RESPONSIBILITY
Composition of Theme 1.1 Steering Committee	Selecting a Unionist Member	Immediately	SEUPB/NILGA
Minutes of last Monitoring Committee meeting	Amend Point 5.10 to reflect objection of Local Representative (DUP)	Immediately	SEUPB – Managing Authority
Provision of information	Provide information to UUP representative	Prior to next meeting	SEUPB – Managing Authority and Communications
Presentations	Provide members with copies of presentations	Before each meeting on the website	SEUPB – Managing Authority
Commitment figures	Provide members with one overall figure showing commitment across entire programme	Before/At each meeting	SEUPB – JTS/Managing Authority
Endorsements from Statutory Bodies	Consortium and NICVA discussions to clarify the role of statutory bodies in voluntary sector applications.	Immediately	Consortium and NICVA
PEACE III Letters of Offer	Check document to see if it contains a line in reference to the payee carrying responsibility for	Immediately	SEUPB - JTS

ISSUE	ACTION	TIMING	RESPONSIBILITY
	errors		
Project Presentation	Project promoters to make presentation to Monitoring Committee members	Next meeting	ILEX project promoters, SEUPB
Equality	Further information to be presented	Next meeting	SEUPB - MA
Environmental policy best practice	Circulate best practice environmental policy to Monitoring Committee members.	Immediately	CNCC Representative/MA
Members section of website	To provide all relevant information for the meeting in one place	Immediately	SEUPB – Managing Authority

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 22
October 2008, Loughgiel**

Chair

Pat Colgan (SEUPB – Managing Authority)

Members (North)

Bill Pauley (Department of Finance and Personnel)
Martin Tyrrell (Department of Finance and Personnel)
Tim Atwood (Local Government Representative - SDLP)
Sammy Brush (Local Government Representative – DUP)
Charlie Casey (Local Government Representative - Sinn Fein)
Bob Stoker (Local Government Representative - UUP)
Pamela Dooley (Irish Congress of Trade Unions)
Denis Galway (Joint Business Council)
Lucinda Blakiston Houston (Council for Nature Conservation and the Countryside)
Michael Hughes (Rural Community Network)
Frances McCandless (Northern Ireland Council for Voluntary Action)
Gina McIntyre (Certifying Authority)

Members (South)

Niall MacSweeney (Department of Finance)
Karl Ryan (Department of Finance)
James Daly (Border Midlands & West Assembly Regional Authority)
Matt Donnelly (Border Regional Authority)
Gerry Finn (Border Midlands & West Assembly Regional Authority)
Noel Casserly (Comhar)
Frank Vaughan (Irish Congress of Trade Unions)

Independent Member

Kenneth Bush (Independent Advisor)

Advisors

Declan Bourke (Department of Environment Heritage and Local Government)
Roberta Dalton (Office of the First Minister/Deputy First Minister)
Alison Hanna (Department of Social Development)
Celeste McCallion (Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency)
Cormac Woods (Department of Community, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs)

Advisors European Commission

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

Observers

Kenneth Bishop (Northern Ireland Local Government Association)
John Carson (International Fund for Ireland)
Jim Dennison (Community Relations Council)
Pat Kelly (North South Ministerial Council)
Tristen Kelso (Jim Allister's Office)
Seadhna MacHugh (International Fund for Ireland)
Paddy McGinn (Border Action)
Hilary O'Brien (Department of Foreign Affairs)

Secretariat (SEUPB)

Roger Hope (Communication)
Howard Keery (JTS)
Christine Markey (Clerical Supervisor – Minute Taker)
Lisa McMullan (Programmes Manager, Managing Authority)
Adrian McNamee (Director, Managing Authority)
Andrew Minnis (Programme Officer, Managing Authority)
Eimear Murphy (Programmes Manager, JTS)

Apologies

Members

Carol Baxter (Equality Authority)
Brian Callanan (Joint Business Council)
Angela Holohan (Community Workers Co-operative)

Deputies

Rachel Mullen (Equality Authority)

Advisors

Siobhan Stack (Department of Community, Rural and Gaeltacht
Affairs)

Observers

Laura Leonard (Belfast City Council)
Kevin Murphy (Department of Agriculture and Rural Development)

Glossary of acronyms used in the minutes:

BMW Assembly	Border, Midlands and West Assembly
BRA	Border Regional Authority
CFNI	Community Foundation Northern Ireland
CONSORTIUM	Border Action/Community Relations Council
CNCC	Council for Nature Conservation and the Countryside
DEL	Department of Employment and Learning
DFP	Department of Finance and Personnel (Northern Ireland)
DG REGIO	Directorate-General for Regional Policy (European Commission)
DOE	Department of the Environment
DOF	Department of Finance
DSD	Department of Social Development
ICTU	Irish Congress of Trade Unions
JBC	Joint Business Council
NICVA	Northern Ireland Council for Voluntary Action
NILGA	Northern Ireland Local Government Association
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
RPA	Review of Public Administration
SEUPB	Special European Union Programmes Body

SOLACE

Society of Local Authority Chief Executives and Senior Mangers

ANNEX IV

INFORMATION AND PROJECT SUMMARY OF THE ILEX PROJECT

ILEX Urban Regeneration Company Limited (ILEX) was set up in 2003 by the Office of the First Minister Deputy First Minister (OFMDFM) and the Department for Social Development (DSD) to plan, develop and sustain the economic, physical and social regeneration of the Derry City Council area.

Urban Regeneration Companies (URCs) are independent companies, whose principal aim is to engage the private sector in a sustainable regeneration strategy, working within the context of a wider strategic regeneration framework, which takes full account of the problems and opportunities for an entire area.

ILEX URC was established to promote the physical, economic and social regeneration of Derry~Londonderry and has specific responsibility to manage and re-develop two former military bases of Ebrington (26 acres) and Fort George (14 acres). Mixed-use development is envisaged for both sites and revitalisation of the riverfront is a key objective.

Further information is available on <http://www.ilex-urc.org/index.cfm/do/home>