



Special EU Programmes Body
Foras Um Chláir Speisialta An AE
Boord O Owre Ocht UE Projects



European Union
European Regional
Development Fund
Investing in your future

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

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

MINUTES MONITORING COMMITTEE MEETING

**Wednesday 21 October 2009,
Stephenstown Pond, Knockbridge, County Louth**

Introduction

- I The **Chair** welcomed everyone to the fifth Monitoring Committee meeting of the programme. He then invited Geraldine McCullagh, the Project Manager of the Celebrating Diversity Project to give the Members some information on Stephenstown Pond and the projects that have been funded.
- II Geraldine thanked everyone for attending and for the funding that has been provided. She outlined the previous and current projects, highlighting their success and the impacts they have had.
- III The **Chair** thanked Geraldine for her presentation. He then highlighted the current economic climate noting that SEUPB were in close, daily consultation with all government departments involved as co-funders of the programme. He stated that the budgets for 2010 are available and that it is the Member State and SEUPBs intention that no EU monies will be lost as a result of the economic environment. The Chair noted that he will keep the Monitoring Committee informed if anything should change.
- IV Apologies are listed in Annex I.

1 **Agenda**

1.1 The agenda was agreed.

2 **Project Presentation**

2.1 Paddy Donnelly and Paddy Drumgoole, PEACE III Programme Managers with Louth County Council, gave a brief presentation on the work of the County Louth Peace and Reconciliation Plan.

2.2 The **Chair** thanked Paddy for providing an insight into the work being carried out and noted that 76% was a high level of commitment and commended Louth County Council for their work in getting the programme up and running.

2.3 The **DG Regio Representative** asked what was meant by the term New Communities.

2.4 Paddy Donnelly stated that New Communities referred to non-Irish nationals that are now resident in County Louth.

2.5 The **Chair** stated that non-Irish communities were growing in the Border Region, the PEACE III Programme has recognised the change in the context of some of the projects and the Action Plans have specific measures to address those issues.

2.6 The **BMW Representative** asked if the PEACE III grant would affect the funding received from the government on a yearly basis.

2.7 Paddy Donnelly stated that the grant provides additionality and complementarity to the work they already do.

2.8 The **CNCC Representative** asked if Louth County Council had managed to work with any of the North/South Bodies to achieve the objectives.

2.9 Paddy Donnelly stated that the council had a variety of cross-border partners but that they did not work with any of the North/South bodies.

2.10 The **Chair** highlighted that the work of the PEACE III Programme would not normally cross-over the work of the six North/South Bodies.

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 **Director, Managing Authority** noted the matters arising from the minutes of the last meeting:
- Complete a review of information contained within the project summaries – This has been completed and was issued to the Monitoring Committee in August 2009.
 - Amendments to the AIR – All changes have been made.
 - Provision of Kenneth Bush's presentation – this was sent to the Monitoring Committee in May and is also available on SEUPBs website.
 - Equality issues of the make up of Monitoring Committees, Steering Committees and Working Groups – DFP are currently conducting an equality audit which will assist with the completion of this.

5 Programme Progress Reports

- 5.1 The **Programmes Manager, Managing Authority** gave an overview of the progress of the programme highlighting the applications received, LOOs issued and value of commitment across the whole programme and within each priority. He also highlighted the indicators within each priority in terms of programme targets and cumulative project targets.
- 5.2 The **Local Government Representative (SDLP)** asked why there was such a large variation between what had been set as a target and what was going to be achieved.
- 5.3 The **NISRA Representative** stated that the targets had been set in 2007. At that time NISRA had been looking at the types of activity that had been occurring under PEACE II. PEACE III funding was reduced dramatically and

targets were set with that in mind. There was a lot of activity within PEACE II in 2007 and 2008 that was not taken into account. Once the project level targets have been agreed programme targets need to be reviewed.

- 5.4 The **Chair** stated that it was difficult to set a baseline because full information was not available at the time.
- 5.5 The **DG Regio Representative** accepted NISRAs comments but referred to the level of participants at events and asked how an event financed to host 50 people ended up hosting almost 16 times that.
- 5.6 The **Director, Managing Authority** noted that the figures being referred to are the targets included in the project applications. The projects are being over-ambitious and the achievement will be somewhat less. Definitions of indicators are also an issue; this is being worked through at project level.
- 5.7 The **Chair** stated that there has always been discussion and debate surrounding indicators. SEUPB will continue to have this discussion and are working with NISRA. This will be monitored and it is recognised that changes may be needed to the Operational Programme.
- 5.8 The **DG Regio Representative** stated that it is important to introduce these changes to the Operational Programme but also to complete a critical assessment of what went wrong to help in setting targets for the future.
- 5.9 The **Chair** stated that an analysis has been completed and SEUPB are aware of how these figures were set. He reiterated that the high figures are aspirational targets by project applicants and this will be revisited at future Monitoring Committees.
- 5.10 The **CWC Representative** clarified initial concentration on the delivery of the small grants programmes by the Local Authorities. This has led to a huge interest in the workshops offered by the programme which will lead to further take-up of the programme. She then suggested that the term 'workshop' requires clarification and could possibly be undertaken by through the evaluation process.

- 5.11 The **JBC Representative** stated that the number of events was high for the length of the programme and seemed unrealistic.
- 5.12 The **Director, Managing Authority** stated that PEACE III is a large programme with a large number of actors involved and therefore lots of activity on the ground. He also stated that there could be issues of definition and perhaps a stricter definition of the term events would lower the number. These issues would be identified through the Aid for Peace work.
- 5.13 The **ICTU Representative** asked what the reasons were for the slow progress of the capital projects within Theme 2.1.
- 5.14 The **Chair** stated that practical issues such as planning permission, recruitment and tendering were major factors but they are beginning to make significant progress and there would be a jump forward over the next month.
- 5.15 The **Director, Managing Authority** highlighted that significant work was happening within these projects in getting the planning approvals and regulatory issues in place.
- 5.16 The **Programmes Manager, JTS** stated that these large projects have to go through European tendering arrangements which can mean a 12-15 month lead in period. For many, the contractors are now in place and everything is progressing. More significant financial spend will result in the Theme 2.1 projects next year.
- 5.17 The **BRA Representative** referred to the Sligo Peace and Reconciliation Plan and asked why their level of commitment is so low compared to the rest of the Border Counties.
- 5.18 The **Programmes Manager, JTS** stated that Sligo have committed further money in terms of tenders and awards among the partners. Commitment will rise significantly in next month's figures. Sligo are on target and have met their revised spend target in relation to N+2.
- 5.19 The **DG Regio Representative** stated that if the Commission can report these figures, a very strong case for the PEACE Programme will be made. Credibility can be enforced by evaluation on the ground and he asked if there were any specific proposals for evaluation.

5.20 The **Chair** highlighted that SEUPB have a comprehensive evaluation strategy which was submitted to and approved by the Commission and the Member States. Part of that evaluation programme has already been implemented through the initial study completed by Fitzpatrick Associates. The figures will be revisited and will provide credibility. The Chair stated that he was satisfied that there is a comprehensive strategy for evaluation within the programme.

5.21 The **DoF Representative** referred to the report and highlighted:

- Theme 1.1 - the challenge for the clusters to commit the remainder of the budget during 2009/10 and to achieve current expenditure targets. The expenditure target of €5million will be challenging and the ongoing recognition of this is welcome.
- Theme 2.1 – challenge of the significant capital expenditure projects.
- Theme 2.2 – the slow progress at this stage, DoF look forward to the ongoing assessment and improvement in the commitment.

5.22 The **Chair** thanked the DoF Representative for his comments and noted that he was right to identify the significant challenges ahead.

5.23 The **Programmes Manager, JTS** also thanked the DoF Representative for his observations and confirmed there is a significant challenge ahead with the 14 clusters. SEUPB had originally intended a spend profile of 20%, 40% and 40% over the years 2009, 2010 and 2011. The initial 20% has been brought back to just under 10% because of difficulty getting started. There is a revised spend target of €5million for this year and currently there are claims for €4million. SEUPB are optimistic that the €4.5million target will be achieved. That will leave a spend over the next two years of €45million, this is significant but SEUPB are optimistic now that the systems are in place and payments will flow into 2010 and 2011.

5.24 The **Chair** noted that the complexity of bringing voluntary clusters together was underestimated at the start of the programme. There are eight operational clusters in Northern Ireland with multi annual plans, a spend programme and all technical issues dealt with. Similarly, the Border Counties have introduced new approaches to engagement with partnerships broadly across the communities

which presented challenges. The Chair noted that he was confident that targets will be met.

- 5.25 The **Local Government Representative (Sinn Fein)** stated that he is joint chair of the Southern Partnership and highlighted the difficulties that there were at the start. The Southern cluster partnership is now confident that they are on target for their spend programme through the Small Grants.
- 5.26 The **DG Regio Representative** referred to the AIR and clarified that it has been deemed admissible; however the Commission have sent comments about improving the content.
- 5.27 The **Chair** thanked the DG Regio Representative for the clarification and noted that the AIR is an essential trigger which enables SEUPB to make claims for payment on the programme.

The Monitoring Committee:

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

6 Finance Management (N+2)

- 6.1 The **Director, Managing Authority** discussed the financial management, the main points were:

- The N+2 target for this year is €19.8million which is 100% value.
- The Managing Authority are managing to a slightly higher target of €20.7million to allow for slippage.
- Expenditure to date is €7.8million and expenditure currently being processed is €6.2million totalling €14million.
- There is a shortfall of €6.7million. The situation is being monitored very closely and there is a high degree of confidence that expenditure will come through during the next six or seven weeks.
- Risks include €3million in Theme 2.1, the majority of that is associated with the Peace Bridge.
- Risks also include €1.6million in Theme 1.2 and €1.4million associated with Technical Assistance; both are largely under the management of the

Consortium. The Consortium have assured SEUPB that expenditure will come through over the next four or six weeks.

- Another risk is €0.5million within the Local Action Plans, SEUPB are confident that the outstanding claims will be coming in over the next number of weeks.
- One other risk is the exchange rate. For every cent of movement in the exchange rate it exposes the programme to about €150,000. Depending when claims are submitted to the Commission the programme is potentially exposed to somewhere in the region of €500,000 and €700,000 on exchange rate risk alone. SEUPB can cope with the exchange rate moving down to about €1.05. SEUPB are addressing that through co-operation with the Certifying Authority and are submitting claims to the Commission on a regular basis.

6.2 The **Consortium Representative** stated that they have a target of €4million and are confident that this will be achieved as they are in regular contact with projects to determine forecasted expenditure and have also carried out their own analysis. The Consortium staff are visiting the groups to help support and guide to increase spend and are confident that the targets will be achieved. SEUPB staff are vouching Technical Assistance expenditure and there should be a marked increase on that budget over the next week.

6.3 The **DG Regio Representative** asked if there were any internal deadlines for projects to submit claims.

6.4 The **Director, Managing Authority** stated that SEUPB are very aware of the processing time involved. He noted that the first cut off date was the 10 October 2009 to get all the claims in from the Local partnerships. SEUPB are working with different cut off dates for different parts of the programme. The Consortium has said that their expenditure will be on the system by 15 November 2009. The Certifying Authority will be submitting claims on regular basis.

6.5 The **Director, Certifying Authority** stated that SEUPB will continue to submit claims as soon as any expenditure has been vouched and verified through the system. A claim of €6million has already been submitted to the Commission.

- 6.6 The **CNCC Representative** asked if the match funding element increased the risk.
- 6.7 The **Director, Managing Authority** stated that match funding element would not increase the risk because it is supplied in sterling.
- 6.8 The **DoF Representative** asked for comments in relation to the N+2 going forward in 2010.
- 6.9 The **Director, Managing Authority** stated that SEUPB have carried out some initial forecasts for N+2 in 2010. The initial assessment notes that it should be easier to meet the target as the capital build projects are coming on stream during the course of next year. Also, the Local Partnerships are largely up and running and they have a very strong expenditure profile for next year. Any potential problems will be in 2011/12. SEUPB need to make sure there is a very strong project pipeline coming through. SEUPB will be tabling much more detailed analysis at the next Monitoring Committee.
- 6.10 The **JBC Representative** referred to Technical Assistance and noted that it had been stated that the Managing Authority are currently actively incurring further expenditure in order to contribute to N+2 targets. He asked if this was essential spend.
- 6.11 The **Director, Managing Authority** stated that in normal years SEUPB would close off the Technical Assistance expenditure by 30 September. This year SEUPB have decided to carry on including Technical Assistance until the 30 November 2009.
- 6.12 The **Local Government Representative (SDLP)** referred back to the economic downturn and asked what the risks are to funding if the government budget cuts come through and asked if there is anything can be done to press the message?
- 6.13 The **Chair** stated that he was happy that both departments are working actively and proactively in a supportive way with SEUPB to address these problems as the programme moves forward. The risks are that an individual government department may find some of the voted expenditure under threat. The cash flow is an issue but SEUPB are in day to day contact with the finance departments in relation to this.

- 6.14 The **DFP Representative** stated that all EU receipts in Northern Ireland are fully additional to the Northern Ireland bloc so at present the priority remains to draw down all EU receipts that are available. The department do not foresee any cuts being made to departmental baselines that would jeopardise the ability to draw down the EU resources.
- 6.15 The **DoF Representative** stated that the situation in Ireland in relation to public expenditure remains very grim. The government has been meeting twice a week in the run-up to the budget and focus is on expenditure reductions. €4billion is being taken from the expenditure profiles in relation to 2010, €4billion in 2011 and €3.5billion in 2012. There is going to be an ongoing difficulty in relation to public expenditure for the remainder of the programme. The government is also committed to maximising the EU drawdown and the availability of receipts. The government will be making decisions in relation to the expenditure options going forward at each departmental level which includes the funding for these particular programmes in the context of the budgetary and expenditure reduction process. He confirmed that if there is to be an impact in relation to the PEACE Programme, DoF will be hoping that other departments will be able to identify alternative priorities within their departmental spend that they can substitute for particular projects.
- 6.16 The **BMW Representative** stated that match funding for the BMW Programme which comes through the exchequer and government departments is very difficult at the moment. He highlighted that Local Authorities have their own particular expenditure issues. He then asked if SEUPB are encountering any difficulties in processing claims.
- 6.17 The **Director, Managing Authority** stated that it was not a significant issue to date. The claims coming in are satisfactory but there are small amounts of ineligible expenditure. SEUPB have eligibility rules drawn up to programme level and are working through them to see that perhaps parts of those need to be adjusted to make the system smoother. SEUPB are working through minor adjustments to those rules to eradicate issues relating to eligibility.
- 6.18 The **BMW Representative** noted that the economic circumstances have changed traditional working relationships and timetables. The crisis, particularly in Ireland is very significant, it has to be open and more needs to be done this

year and next year. These are challenges that have been faced before but not on such a high level.

- 6.19 The **DG Regio Representative** stated that the Commission has already adopted some measures in response to the crisis which relate to the Operational Programmes for Structural Funds. There are still discussions at the European Union level for additional measures. As it stands SEUPB should continue to try and meet the N+2 targets. If a political decision is taken it will be an added bonus.
- 6.20 The **CWC Representative** reminded everyone that most of the applications are led by the voluntary and community sector which is under serious threat in Ireland. A lot of those applications are partnership approach with the social partners. She asked DoF to bear this in mind when undertaking a review. At the moment it is very important that the work of the PEACE Programme is not overlooked on the ground.
- 6.21 The **Chair** thanked the CWC Representative for her comments. He confirmed that during the preparation of the programme there was concern whether or not the community and voluntary sector would be able to engage. He noted it was good to hear that there is a lot of active enthusiasm, but the threats and the problems raised have also been recognised.

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 in particular those associated with the ILEX bridge; and
- 3) **Noted** the steps that the Managing Authority has put in place to monitor progress towards expenditure targets.

7 Reports from Working Groups

Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group

- 7.1 The **BMW Representative** presented the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group paper highlighting Programme performance; Analysis of Implementation 2007-2013 Programmes; PEACE III Indicators; Community Uptake Analysis;

- Attitudinal Survey; and other possible evaluations. The BMW Representative also thanked SEUPB and the Committee Members for the contributions.
- 7.2 The **Programmes Manager, Managing Authority** then gave a presentation on the Implementation Analysis of the 2007-2013 Programmes highlighting the main findings and issues arising.
- 7.3 The **DG Regio Representative** asked if the Implementation Analysis Report would be made public.
- 7.4 The **Programmes Manager, Managing Authority** stated that SEUPB wanted to share the main findings with the Monitoring Committee and given the approval of the Monitoring Committee the document will be made available to the public.
- 7.5 The **Chair** noted the frustrations of this evaluation process in relation to the datasets dating back to February 2009. SEUPB are in a position to be able to update these figures as the programme moves forward.
- 7.6 The **RCN Representative** noted that geographical spread is particularly significant to rural communities. There are few rural applications but that may shift when the Local Action plans are incorporated. He asked how often these would be updated and stated that if there are inequalities, they need to be addressed quickly.
- 7.7 The **Chair** agreed with the RCN Representative and noted that the evaluation strategy that is within the programme is designed to enable SEUPB to do that in a way which could not be completed in previous programmes. The whole purpose of this exercise is to enable SEUPB to see if changes to targets are needed.
- 7.8 The **Programmes Manager, Managing Authority** stated that SEUPB have the dataset that was used and can update that dataset. It will show how the programme is progressing and SEUPB can bring updates on that at further Monitoring Committees.
- 7.9 The **CNCC Representative** asked if the definitions of rural and urban that are going to be used could be shared.

- 7.10 The **Director, Managing Authority** stated that this analysis has been completed by Local Government area. It is not SEUPBs onus to define rural and urban.
- 7.11 The **RCN Representative** referred back to the uptake of community and voluntary sector and noted that while it is good to see, it is the bigger community and voluntary groups that are taking it up. It would be interesting to see how many of the smaller groups are getting involved. A bigger impact will be when the community and voluntary sector at local level are involved and that change will be evident with new datasets when the local action groups get up and running.
- 7.12 The **Chair** stated that his understanding of the CWC Representative's comments earlier was that the Small Grants programmes are reaching down into the small groups within the communities.
- 7.13 The **BMW Representative** stated that the voluntary and community sector would be targeted for cuts according to the McCarthy Report in Ireland. This needs to be considered as in the PEACE Programme, it is the community where the impacts happen.
- 7.14 The **BRA Representative** stated that it is the way in which they go about the rationalising that will be interesting because if they tackle it in the way proposed it will do enormous damage.
- 7.15 The **BRA Representative** noted that it had been stated that there would be consultation with NISRA with the document going forward but the same should apply to the Border Region.
- 7.16 The **Chair** stated that NISRA are providing SEUPB with technical support in terms of managing datasets, indicators, implementing the Aid for Peace approach and generally with evaluation techniques. They cover the whole of the 12 counties.

Environmental Working Group

- 7.17 The **CNCC Representative** presented the Environmental Working Group Paper highlighting Europe Wide Environmental Indicators; Greenhouse Gasses

Indicators; Developmental Path Analysis; Strategic Environmental Assessment Reports; and SEA Seminar Attendance.

7.18 The **Chair** acknowledged the contribution of Lucinda Blakiston Houston over many years. He then referred to DPA and noted that efforts had been made to improve the quality of the use of DPA within the programmes but it is something that needs to be looked at again and standardised.

Equality Working Group

7.19 The **RCN Representative** presented the Equality Working Group paper highlighting the revised Mainstreaming Equality Guide, NISRA are carrying out an equality audit and the equality monitoring forms have been issued to projects and are now being returned.

7.20 The **RCN Representative** highlighted that as members of the Monitoring Committee we need to be setting an example in returning the equality monitoring forms.

7.21 The **NISRA Representative** stated that although the deadline for submitting the equality monitoring forms was 7 October 2009, there was a very poor response rate; it was under 50% across all the Monitoring Committees and Working Groups. Though the deadline has passed any members that have yet to return the form can still do so and it will be included.

The Monitoring Committee:

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

8 Update on the Implementation of the Communications Plan

8.1 The **Communications Manager, SEUPB** presented the paper on the implementation of the Communications Plan highlighting the website development; information road shows; networking; journalist briefings; media relations; training publicity workshops; information and publicity guides; publications; conferences/major communication events; review of PEACE III Programme beneficiaries Communications Plan; stakeholder surveys; and future activities.

- 8.2 The **CWC Representative** noted that she had attended the information road show in Monaghan the day before and congratulated the Communications team for their work. She highlighted that she thought the website was excellent. She then suggested the possibility of doing some co-ordinated publicity on the programme next year on the UN International Day for Peace.
- 8.3 The **Communications Manager** stated that this was an excellent idea and will definitely be included within the Communications activity in the next year.
- 8.4 The **Chair** highlighted that he appreciated the feedback on the website and invited all the members to make any comments.
- 8.5 The **JBC Representative** referred to the proposed conference scheduled for January, noting that it should be more inclusive. It would be an ideal opportunity to give the media a better feel for what is happening on the ground.
- 8.6 The **Communications Manager** stated that there would be a media dimension to the conference. There will also be a number of different workshops at the conference that will touch on different aspects which will be of value to the projects themselves.
- 8.7 The **Chair** highlighted that the JBC Representative's comment was to widen out the list of invitations and that certainly would be the intention.
- 8.8 The **Local Government Representative (Sinn Fein)** stated that the Your EU publication was excellent and very informative.
- 8.9 The **DG Regio Representative** referred to the budget review and noted that the Commission needs to be made aware of any changes to the Communications Plan. The Communications Plan is a regulatory requirement but it also something that SEUPB should want to do. He then referred to the venue and noted that he could not find any sign to show that it had been funded through PEACE.
- 8.10 The **Chair** thanked the DG Regio Representative for his comments and noted that there were signs in the room the meeting was held in an also in the coffee shop. He highlighted that there were over 7000 projects in PEACE II and while

the level of compliance was very good there is a lot of work still to be done in this area.

- 8.11 The **Communications Manager** stated that SEUPB have commissioned a number of different plaques that were distributed to the projects for them to display prominently.
- 8.12 The **Director, Managing Authority** noted that the awareness survey currently being undertaken has shown that there is a high awareness of the PEACE Programme having been funded from EU sources. The benefits of EU funding are very widely recognised throughout the region. He then referred to the Communications Plan going forward and stated that it is good public sector management to keep future plans under review at all times and we also constantly look at what is the most cost effective way of rolling out the plan.
- 8.13 The **ICTU Representative** stated it might be an idea to bring the ordinary people on the ground that have had successes on some of the projects to tell us about what has actually happened at the conference in January.
- 8.14 The **Communications Manager** noted that this was the intention of SEUPB. Different case studies have been interwoven with the running order for the conference, with a minimum of three different projects talking about what they are doing and what successes they have had.
- 8.15 The **RCN Representative** acknowledged the high level of work from the Communications Officer, Michelle Rea and wishes her all the best in her new post.
- 8.16 The **DG Regio Representative** stated that the Commission needs to have prior notification of any changes because the plan has been approved by the Commission.
- 8.17 The **CNCC Representative** referred to the Your EU and asked that if it was going to be online to make sure that it is not too big a download. He also highlighted that the publication was very good.

The Monitoring Committee:

- 1) **Noted** the progress in implementation of the Communications Plan.

9 Any Other Business

9.1 None

10 Date of Next Meeting

10.1 The next meeting is due to take place on Wednesday 21 April 2010 in the Dungannon area, a venue will be confirmed at a later date.

10.2 The **Chair** then formally ended the meeting and thanked everyone for their contribution.

**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 21
October 2009, Knockbridge**

Chair

Pat Colgan (SEUPB)

Members (North)

Peter Archdale (CNCC)
Tim Attwood (NILGA)
Charlie Casey (NILGA)
Pamela Dooley (ICTU)
Denis Galway (JBC)
Michael Hughes (RCN)
Gina McIntyre (SEUPB, Certifying Authority)
Martin Tyrrell (DFP)

Members (South)

Pat Casey (DoF)
James Daly (BMW)
Matt Donnelly (BRA)
Tony Ferguson (BRA)
Gerry Finn (BMW)
Angela Holohan (CWC)
Frank Vaughan (ICTU)

Advisors

Declan Bourke (DEHLG)
Jim Dennison (CRC)

Robert Kidd	(DSD)
Celeste McCallion	(NISRA)
Siobhan Stack	(DCRGA)

Advisors European Commission

Kyriacos Charalambous	(DG Regio)
Stephen Langley	(DG Regio)

Observers

Kenneth Bishop	(NILGA)
John Carson	(IFI)
Pat Kelly	(NSMC)
Kevin Murphy	(DARD)
Seadhna MacHugh	(IFI)

Secretariat (SEUPB)

Shaun Henry	(MA)
Brenda Hegarty	(JTS)
John McCandless	(Communications)
Adrian McNamee	(MA)
Sarah Reid	(MA)
Christine Markey	(MA)

Apologies

Members

John Anderson	(CNCC)
Kenneth Bush	(Independent)
Brian Callanan	(JBC)
Noel Casserly	(Comhar)
Frances McCandless	(NICVA)
Bill Pauley	(DFP)
Martin Smyth	(IRL)
Bob Stoker	(NILGA)

Advisors

George Burke	(DEHLG)
Drew Haire	(OFMDFM)
Paddy McGinn	(Pobal)

Observers

Isaac May	(Belfast City Council)
-----------	------------------------

SEUPB

Howard Keery	(JTS)
--------------	-------

Glossary of acronyms used in the minutes:

BMW Assembly	Border, Midlands and West Assembly
BRA	Border Regional Authority
CONSORTIUM	Pobal/Community Relations Council
CNCC	Council for Nature Conservation and the Countryside
CWC	Community Workers Co-operative
DARD	Department of Agriculture and Rural Development
DCRGA	Department of Community, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs
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 (Ireland)
DSD	Department of Social Development
IFI	International Fund for Ireland
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
JTS	Joint Technical Secretariat
MA	Managing Authority