



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

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

MINUTES MONITORING COMMITTEE MEETING

**Wednesday 22 April 2009,
Signal Centre of Business Excellence, Bangor**

Introduction

I The **Chair** welcomed everyone to the fourth Monitoring Committee meeting of the programme. He referred to the current economic climate noting that its effect was consistently being monitored and no public expenditure can be taken for granted. SEUPB are conducting a strategic review of the programme with the Member States to see what implications the economic change might have, particularly in terms of availability of public expenditure over the next 2-3 years.

II Apologies are listed in Annex II.

1 Agenda

1.1 The agenda was agreed.

2 Project Presentation

- 2.1 Jan Nixey, PEACE III Programme Manager with North Down Borough Council, gave a brief presentation on the work of the North Down, Ards and Down PEACE III Partnership and Local Peace Action Plan.
- 2.2 The **Chair** thanked Jan for providing an insight into the work being carried out noting that this was a good example of one of the 14 Local Peace Action Plans. It gave an idea of what was happening across Northern Ireland and the border region.
- 2.3 The **Local Representative (Sinn Fein)** congratulated Jan on the work being completed. The Chair also noted his own appreciation to both Jan and her counterparts in the other clusters.
- 2.4 The **Local Representative (SDLP)** asked Jan if there was any help or advice that the Monitoring Committee or SEUPB could give to assist in implementing the plan.
- 2.5 Jan explained that the main obstacle was to clarify the legal issues that remain outstanding and noted that the support received from the Consortium had been very positive.
- 2.6 The **Chair** recognised the complexity of some of the legal issues and stated that SEUPB have been working through those and are making good progress.
- 2.7 The **NICVA Representative** also congratulated Jan but highlighted that the complexities built into the programme related to achieving long term peace-building outcomes on extremely short term funding horizons and this needed to be recognised.

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 minutes were accepted.

4 Matters Arising

4.1 The **Chair** noted the matters arising from the minutes of the last meeting:

- Composition of Theme 1.1 Steering Committee – Councillor Derek Hussey from Strabane District Council was nominated on 2 February 2009. The Chair appreciated the co-operation from all the members in making this possible.
- Minutes of the meeting on 23 April 2008 – Point 5.10 has been amended accordingly.
- Information for the UUP Representative – All the information requested has been provided.
- Presentations – Copies of the presentations have been provided in hardcopy and in future will be available through SEUPBs website.
- Commitment Figures – This figure has been provided in the Programme Progress Paper and is also given in the Monthly Reports.
- Endorsements from Statutory Bodies – This issue has been resolved after discussions between NICVA and the Consortium.
- PEACE III Letters of Offer – The LoO's have been checked and there is no reference to the payee carrying responsibility for errors.
- Equality – The planned survey of the PMCs and working groups has not yet been finalised, this is an ongoing process.
- Environmental Best Policy Practice – This has been circulated and is also available for download from the SEUPB website.
- Members Section of the website – All information is available in one place and members were informed of this by email on 17 February 2009.
- Project Presentation – A site visit to the ILEX project was held on 2 March 2009. This was considered more effective than a presentation to the PMC.

4.2 The **Chair** highlighted his appreciation to Mo Durkin and her colleagues at ILEX for a stimulating tour and noted that the discussion with the representatives of the surrounding communities was very interesting.

4.3 The **Local Representative (Sinn Fein)** stated that he attended the site visit and felt that it was a worthwhile initiative. He commented on the speculation around the naming of the bridge and felt that the Peace/Peoples Bridge would be most appropriate.

- 4.4 The **Local Representative (DUP)** also stated that initially he had been sceptical of the bridge but after the site visit he was convinced it should be supported. He referred to the naming of the bridge and agreed that politics should not play a part.
- 4.5 The **Local Representative (SDLP)** asked if SEUPB were responsible for the naming of the bridge. The Chair confirmed this.
- 4.6 The **Local Representative (SDLP)** noted that wide consultation needed to take place with the people of Londonderry to ensure the bridge is named appropriately.
- 4.7 The **CWC Representative** commented that she was very impressed and noted the huge potential of the bridge and the surrounding area. She encouraged anyone that was still sceptical to pay a visit to the site. She then asked about the commitment of money for the remainder of the site.
- 4.8 The **Chair** highlighted that DSD were taking the lead in developing the Ebrington barracks site and a substantial budget has been allocated for that purpose although he highlighted again that public expenditure could not be taken for granted. The Chair then referred to the launch of the bridge and apologised for not referring to the city as Londonderry emphasising that there was no intention to offend.

5 Programme Progress Reports

- 5.1 The **Chair** stressed the difference in terms of reporting formats between the old and new programmes. PEACE III allows for much more in depth analysis and a more strategic focus.
- 5.2 The **NICVA Representative** noted the exchange rate that was being used and asked what the impacts were on N+2 and what it means for the programme.
- 5.3 The **Chair** explained that the exchange rate was a significant issue for the management of the programme but, at this early stage of the programme, did not constitute a significant threat. SEUPB are working on the basis of £1.00 =

€1.10 which has been agreed with both Member States as a planning rate. This rate will be reviewed as the programme moves forward and the Monitoring Committee will be kept informed of changes and impacts in any financial reporting and discussions.

- 5.4 The **Chair** then invited the Director of the JTS, the Consortium and the Programme Manager of the Managing Authority to give their presentations on the progress of the programme.
- 5.5 The **Director of the JTS** gave a detailed presentation on the progress of Themes 1.1, 2.1 and 2.2 highlighting:
- the high level of applications received to date with most of these already considered by 17 Steering Committees;
 - two further Steering Committees are planned to consider the remainder of the applications;
 - full implementation is underway;
 - priority 2.2 is still open with the other themes due to re-open in autumn 2009;
 - details of the approved applications within each priority;
 - strategic interventions; and
 - 40 LoOs have been issued with 3 more due in the coming weeks.
- 5.6 The **Consortium Representative** then gave a detailed presentation on the progress of Theme 1.2 highlighting:
- progress to date within each of the 3 Strands;
 - all strands are operational;
 - 45 projects have been supported and 32% of funding requested has been committed;
 - there is capacity to re-open calls later in 2009 and early 2010;
 - more victims and survivors groups are being funded; and
 - the challenges in relation to public policy, guidance, sustainability and N+2.
- 5.7 The **Programmes Manager, Managing Authority** then gave an overview of the whole programme highlighting:
- the number and value of applications received, approved and LoOs issued across the whole programme and by individual priorities;
 - technical assistance;

- regulatory requirements and the documents that have been submitted to the Commission;
- that 5 project reviews have taken place, 3 of those were upheld and 2 recommended for reassessment; and
- information and publicity which has taken place. Various events have taken place and sample press articles were circulated to members.

5.8 The **NICVA Representative** referred to Theme 1.2 and noted the frustration of groups at the speed at which applications were progressing.

5.9 The **Consortium Representative** stated that the Consortium was aware of and understood the frustrations of groups. However, the Consortium are required to carry out pre-contract checks to ensure the projects have the correct systems in place to drawdown and manage monies. He noted that he would be happy to speak with NICVA in relation to any particular group or project. He also highlighted that they have been working with groups and have embarked on advance payments.

5.10 The **Equality Commission Representative** asked if there were any concerns in relation to the low level of expenditure and the quality of applications in Theme 2.2 and if so how these would be addressed.

5.11 The **Director, JTS** stated that they are aware that this theme has been slow in getting off the ground. A Steering Committee will be taking place in May during which 15 applications will be assessed. This will help gauge if there is a serious difficulty. If it is discovered that the applications are not meeting the requirements then discussions will take place with the Managing Authority about the possibility of moving monies.

5.12 The **Independent Member** noted that it would be useful to know what was going on on the ground and asked if the project description within the one page summaries could provide more detail.

5.13 The **Director, Managing Authority** stated that they would like to keep the project summaries on one page but that as implementation moves forward information will be gathered which will be available in various reports.

5.14 The **BMW Representative** commented on the role of the Steering Committee and issues that had arisen. He made three points:

- Use of Economic Appraisals – these should only be commissioned when the secretariat are satisfied that the project has a reasonable prospect of being successful.
- Quality of applications – some projects led by public bodies and local government under Theme 2.1 are failing to address the issues of peace, the next call needs to place greater emphasis on the objectives of the programme.
- Review Panel and Economic Appraisals – applicants should only be allowed to correct factual information.

5.15 The **Chair** noted that he was also the Chair on the Review Panels and that it was his understanding that the applicant should not have any input into the independent decision taken by the Economic Appraisers. However applicants should be given the opportunity to ensure information they provide is understood by the appraiser. He then referred to the Economic Appraisals in the broader sense and accepted the comments. SEUPB are in discussions with the Member States about this. He also accepted the points made on the quality of applications and stated that the set criteria would help filter applications.

5.16 The **Director, JTS** confirmed that the next call for Theme 2.1 would ask for Expressions of Interest to allow the JTS to filter the applications and take potentially good ones forward.

5.17 The **DFP Representative** referred back to the Economic Appraisals and stated that it was not value for money to commission an Economic Appraisal for a project that appears to have failed. Where a project has an indicative score well below the pass mark then an Economic Appraisal is not needed to assess the project. If the Steering Committee decides that the score was wrong then it can request an Economic Appraisal but there should be a threshold point. He also highlighted the independence of an Economic Appraisal which was vitally important and is set out in guidance issued on all EU programmes. A project should be presented accurately in an Economic Appraisal but it should not engage in the process. If factual information is incorrect, the applicant can look at the relevant parts but the Economic Appraisal must maintain independence.

- 5.18 The **Local Representative (SDLP)** asked about accessing hard to reach groups and whether participation and applications received had increased from those groups? He noted that a regional bid from victims groups had still not appeared and it would be interesting to see if any conversations had taken place with these groups. He noted that equity was very important and asked if anything was being done to reach victims groups that have not applied to the programme and if there is additional support to assist them in applying.
- 5.19 The **Director, JTS** noted that there has been activity with former members of the security forces and an application is in the process of being submitted under Theme 1.2. He also highlighted that the Orange Institutions were working up 2 applications, one under Theme 1.1 and the other under Theme 2.1.
- 5.20 The **Director, Managing Authority** emphasised that work is ongoing within Strand 2 of Theme 1.2 and there are significant numbers of bids coming in from victims groups. The organisation, WAVE, could be seen as a regional project with a number of applications supported. He noted that it was difficult to identify a Lead Partner at regional level but SEUPB were encouraged by large strategic bids coming from the West of Northern Ireland.
- 5.21 The **Consortium Representative** stated that the recognised victims groups in the North have made applications. He also noted that there will be funding left in 2010/2011 and that a regional bid could be addressed at that stage. He highlighted that there is one significant approach which would combine a number of key players and that is being led by the Victims Commission.
- 5.22 The **Consortium Representative** also noted that a lot of the projects were Northern Ireland focused and they were taking measures to remedy this.
- 5.23 The **Local Representative (DUP)** asked if there was still an imbalance between the amounts of money going to ex-prisoner groups.
- 5.24 The **Chair** highlighted that there was a total commitment of €22m to victims groups under Theme 1.2. The commitment made to ex-prisoner groups under

Theme 1.1 amounts to €6.7m going to 'Conflict Transformation from the Bottom Up' and €3.2m to 'From Prison to Peace: Building on Experience'.

- 5.25 The **Local Representative (DUP)** then referred to the project summaries and noted that a number of Theme 1.2 projects had amounts recommended that were higher than the amounts requested and asked why this was this case.
- 5.26 The **Consortium Representative** explained that during the appraisal process and pre-contract check stage the amount required by a project can be more than was initially requested. He emphasised that this would go back to the Steering Committee before it was approved. If the amount recommended is marked N/A, the pre-contract checks will not have been completed.
- 5.27 The **Chair** proposed to complete a review of information provided in the project summaries and provide a report to the PMC.
- 5.28 The **CWC Representative** stated her appreciation of advance payments as projects that applied over a year ago are now faced with a different economic climate. She highlighted the plight of hard to reach groups who have been told they have been awarded a small grant but have yet to receive any money. Advance payments are very welcome to such groups.
- 5.29 The **Chair** noted the comments that had been made and stated that SEUPB are aware of the difficulties on the ground. He then requested that the Members note the progress of the programme to date.

The Monitoring Committee:

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

6 Finance Management

- 6.1 The **Director, Managing Authority** gave a presentation on the financial management of the programme to date highlighting:
- LoOs issued, money committed and how to convert this into expenditure;
 - current targets, after a 2.5% advance the N+2 target has been reduced for 2009 to €19,811,000 but this is still a significant challenge;

- the targets by priority and the chances of achieving these;
- where the expenditure will take place;
- risks have been identified in Themes 1.1 Local, 1.2 and 2.1; and
- the programme is on track to achieve its N+2 targets for 2009.

6.2 The **DG Regio Representative** made three comments:

- emphasis needs to be placed on projects to spend because money will be lost at the end of the year if they do not;
- the advance payment will make 2010 a more challenging year; and
- there is a possibility of another advance payment from the Commission although that is not official.

6.3 The **Chair** underlined the more demanding target for 2010 and although additional advances are helpful there is also the negative aspect that projects see that as having more time. This is important for the Managing Authority, JTS and Consortium to manage.

The Monitoring Committee:

- 1) **Noted** the progress to date towards meeting the N+2 2009 target of €19,811,000.
- 2) **Noted** the risks and significant challenges identified by the Managing Authority in relation to achieving this target.
- 3) **Noted** the steps that the Managing Authority has put in place to monitor progress towards expenditure targets.
- 4) **Noted** that the Managing Authority will have to decommit funding from those Lead Partners failing to meet their expenditure forecasts if the N+2 target is not achieved.

7 Report from Working Groups

7.1 The **JBC Representative** gave an overview of the work of the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group highlighting:

- Programme Implementation
- Aid for Peace Indicators

- On-going evaluation, a sub-group had been set up to take forward the attitudinal survey, contextual data in the border region and the implementation analysis.
- 7.2 The **Chair** then invited Fitzpatrick Associates, consultants commissioned to undertake an analysis of the implementation of the programme, to give their presentation on their findings to date.
- 7.3 Fitzpatrick Associates then gave a detailed presentation on the work they had been commissioned to complete highlighting:
- the context and aims of the analysis;
 - the requirements by the programme, what needs to be analysed;
 - the challenges or dimensions of the analysis;
 - the specific steps that are to be undertaken;
 - the level of detail and how the information will be presented; and
 - the timeframe to complete the work.
- 7.4 The **Chair** thanked Fitzpatrick Associates for their presentation and highlighted that they had been appointed as a result of a lengthy tender process during which ten tenders had been received from throughout the eligible area as well as Scotland and Europe. He noted that it was crucial to have this data for the PEACE III Programme as early as possible because of the strategic nature of the programme.
- 7.5 The **DG Regio Representative** stated that it was his understanding that on-going evaluation would be similar to the mid-term evaluation of PEACE II which also looked at the procedures of the programme. He asked if this could be included in this analysis and asked if this would replace the Community Uptake Analysis.
- 7.6 The **Chair** stated that this analysis was not a community uptake analysis. This piece of work is to ensure that the programme is on course to meet its targets and to identify any gaps. He stated that the processes and procedures would be looked at later in the year. He also noted that a community uptake analysis is an important element as SEUPB need to ensure that the programme is

equitable and is reaching all the communities. SEUPB can take the experience of community uptake analysis from PEACE II and integrate it into this process.

- 7.7 Fitzpatrick Associates noted that at this early stage it is important to do this kind of analysis as it may show up administrative issues that need to be looked at.
- 7.8 The **Director, Managing Authority** noted that the Working Group are implementing the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and are looking at commissioning another three evaluations. One of these will be monitoring activity across the cross-cutting themes. With the Local Action Plans coming to an end in 2010, this would be the time to look at the position of the programme and what needs to be achieved over the final years. He stated that this might be a more appropriate time to look at procedures.
- 7.9 The **DG Regio Representative** noted that it is important to look into the procedures as SEUPB and the Commission have always maintained to support the bottom up approach and to continuously look at the delivery mechanisms to ensure this is respected. He then asked why the consultants were not looking at the indicators for PEACE III.
- 7.11 The **NISRA Representative** stated that the Aid for Peace approach is being used to develop indicators and this takes time for individual projects. Therefore the final indicators are not yet available. Evaluation will be undertaken once the indicators are finalised.
- 7.12 The **Independent Member** added that it is essential for the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group to ensure its own indicators are calibrated specifically to peace. He highlighted that it was also important to note that the PEACE III Programme can contribute to division as well as unity if the PMC are not watching for the right things.
- 7.13 The **NICVA Representative** noted the equality elements and the reliance on the self survey from which it has proved difficult to obtain information. She highlighted that there is an opportunity in this analysis to look at how and what kind of data is collected and learn lessons from the last programme.

- 7.15 The **Director, JTS** asked if the consultants would be looking at both successful and unsuccessful applications. He highlighted that gaps could have been filled by projects that have been rejected. SEUPB can then see if specific work needs to be completed to address any gaps.
- 7.16 Fitzpatrick Associates noted that they would be looking at all the applications; however, they would look at the successful ones in more detail.
- 7.17 The **BMW Representative** emphasised that the PMC needs to be aware of geographical areas that are not applying to the programme and discover why this is. He also noted that mid-way through the programme would be a better time to look at the procedures.
- 7.18 The **Chair** emphasised that the monitoring of procedures is an on-going issue which is of great value and importance and it will be completed formally at a later stage. He also highlighted the differences between PEACE II and PEACE III in terms of scale, size and focus. PEACE III is much more strategic and therefore much more qualitative data is needed.
- 7.19 Fitzpatrick Associates noted that it is not known at this stage where money will be spent as tenders are still being processed for a number of projects and noted that it was important to not over-interpret data.
- 7.20 The **Independent Member** wanted to clarify the distinction between successful and unsuccessful projects. He noted that an unsuccessful project is not just one that failed to get funding but also includes projects that have received funding but failed to meet the objectives of the programme.
- 7.21 The **DG Regio Representative** recognised that it may be too early to undertake a review of the procedures now but that it is something that needs to be considered at this stage.
- 7.22 The **SEUPB Representative** then gave a brief overview of the work carried out by the Equality Working Group highlighting:
- the Equality Guidance Note;
 - the Mainstreaming Equality Guide;
 - the review of the selection process; and

- the equality audit of programme bodies.

7.23 The **Chair** referred to the paper, paragraph 3.2 and clarified that the statement about DFP tendering for a contractor was a slight overstatement and there was still a little way to go.

7.24 The **CNCC Representative** gave a brief overview of the work carried out by the Environmental Working Group highlighting:

- the Strategic Assessment of Offshore and Marine Renewable Energy;
- the Strategic Environmental Assessment progress;
- indicators – Table of Comparison;
- the Greenhouse Gasses indicator;
- the Guidelines on Environmental Policy;
- the Development Path Analysis Reports; and
- the European Open Days.

The Monitoring Committee:

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

8 Annual Implementation Report

8.1 The **Chair** noted that the Annual Implementation Report is a regulatory requirement that must be submitted to the Commission by 30 June 2009. He asked for any comments or suggestions and noted that these could be taken verbally or in writing. He asked that the Members approve the AIR in principal subject to any amendments and highlighted that if any substantial changes were needed this would be done by written procedure.

8.2 The **JBC Representative** highlighted 2 minor amendments; on page 4 the date should read 2009 and in Annex 1 his deputy in 2008 was William Poole.

The Monitoring Committee:

- 1) **Approved** the Annual Implementation Report.

9 Report from Kenneth Bush, Independent Expert

9.1 The **Independent Member** gave a presentation on placing the Aid for Peace Approach into a wider context. He highlighted:

- what the Aid for Peace Approach is;
- the initiatives that Aid for Peace refers to;
- that overall it is about impact;
- lessons to be learned in respect of conflict-generating aid and peace-nurturing aid;
- how to tell the difference between development indicators, peace indicators and conflict indicators;
- the do's and do not's of the Aid for Peace Approach; and
- peace and conflict assessment.

9.2 The **Chair** thanked Kenneth for his presentation and also took this opportunity to congratulate him on his new role as Research Director at INCORE within the University of Ulster.

9.3 The **CWC Representative** stated the presentation was very interesting and asked for copies to be provided. She also noted that it was important to be aware of the Aid for Peace Approach in terms of evaluation.

9.4 The **NISRA Representative** welcomed the presentation especially the focus on relationships as this was one of the main discussion points with projects in relation to Aid for Peace. They are looking at how best to measure the development of relationships and a working group will be set up to take this forward.

10 Any other Business

10.1 The **JBC Representative** noted that in the project summaries a project had received a high score of 71.5 but had been rejected and asked why this was the case.

10.2 The **Consortium Representative** noted that the project applications must score highly in three areas and while this project scored well in two of those areas it fell down greatly in the area of efficiency and effectiveness.

11 Date of the next Meeting

11.1 The **Chair** noted that the next meeting would take place on Wednesday 21 October 2009 and would be in the border region. A venue would be confirmed at a later date. He also asked the members to note that the date of the sixth meeting had been scheduled for Wednesday 21 April 2010 and would be taking place in the Dungannon area.

11.2 The **Chair** then thanked everyone for attending and formally ended the meeting.

ANNEX I

ACTION POINTS/ISSUES OF CLARIFICATION ARISING FROM MONITORING COMMITTEE

Wednesday 22 April 2009, Signal Centre of Business Excellence,

Bangor, County Down

ACTION POINTS

ISSUE	ACTION	TIMING	RESPONSIBILITY
Report on projects	Complete a review of information in the project summaries highlighting why scores, amounts etc have changed and put this into a report	Complete within 8 weeks and present at next meeting	SEUPB/Consortium
AIR Amendments requested by JBC representative	Make the changes	Immediately	SEUPB – Managing Authority
Provision of Kenneth Bush presentation	Forward copy of presentation to Members and place on website	Immediately	SEUPB – Managing Authority
Equality	More information on the make up of MC, SC, WG and so on	Ongoing	Equality Working Group

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 April 2009, Bangor

Chair

Pat Colgan (SEUPB – Managing Authority)

Members (North)

John Anderson (Council for Nature Conservation and the Countryside)
Tim Attwood (Local Government Representative - SDLP)
Sammy Brush (Local Government Representative – DUP)
Charlie Casey (Local Government Representative - Sinn Fein)
Pamela Dooley (Irish Congress of Trade Unions)
Denis Galway (Joint Business Council)
Frances McCandless (Northern Ireland Council for Voluntary Action)
Gina McIntyre (Certifying Authority)
Paul Noonan (Equality Commission)
Martin Tyrrell (Department of Finance and Personnel)

Members (South)

Tony Ferguson (Border Regional Authority)
Gerry Finn (Border Midlands & West Assembly Regional Authority)
Angela Holohan (Community Workers Co-operative)

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)
Deaglán O'Briain	(Department of Community, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs)

Advisors European Commission

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

Observers

Jim Dennison	(Community Relations Council)
Pat Kelly	(North South Ministerial Council)
Tristen Kelso	(Jim Allister's Office)
Frances Kiernan	(Department of Foreign Affairs)
Seadhna MacHugh	(International Fund for Ireland)
Isaac May	(Belfast City Council)
Thomas McCauley	(Department of Agriculture and Rural Development)
Paddy McGinn	(Border Action)
Pamela Rooney	(Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency)
Lynn Watson	(Department of Agriculture and Rural Development)

Secretariat (SEUPB)

Fiona Buggy	(Clerical Officer, Managing Authority)
Howard Keery	(Director, JTS)
Christine Markey	(Clerical Supervisor – Minute Taker)
Lisa McMullan	(Programmes Manager, Managing Authority)
Adrian McNamee	(Director, Managing Authority)
Andrew Minnis	(Programme Officer, Managing Authority)

Apologies

Members

Carol Baxter	(Equality Authority)
Brian Callanan	(Joint Business Council)
Pat Casey	(Department of Finance)
Noel Casserly	(Comhar)

Matt Donnelly	(Border Regional Authority)
Bill Pauley	(Department of Finance and Personnel)
Martin Smyth	(Irish Rural Link)

Deputies

Danny Brady	(Border Regional Authority)
Padraig Maguire	(Border Regional Authority)
Reg McCabe	(Joint Business Council)
Karl Ryan	(Department of Finance)
Lisa Ryan	(Comhar)

Advisors

George Burke	(Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government)
Diarmuid Murphy	(Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government)
Maire Ni Chonghaile	(Department of Community, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs)
Siobhan Stack	(Department of Community, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs)

Observers

Kenneth Bishop	(Northern Ireland Local Government Association)
Kevin Murphy	(Department of Agriculture and Rural Development)
Hilary O'Brien	(Department of Foreign Affairs)

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
SEUPB	Special European Union Programmes Body