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

European Union
European Regional
Development Fund
Investing in your future

NORTHERN IRELAND ANDTHE BORDER REGION OF IRELAND
EU PROGRAMME FOR PEACE & RECONCILIATION
(2014 - 2020)
CCI No: 2014TC16RFPC001

MINUTES MONITORING COMMITTEE MEETING
Wednesday 2nd March 2016

Attendance

A list of attendees and apologies is attached at Annex II.

1. Welcome and introduction by Chairperson

The Chair welcomed attendees to this inaugural meeting of the PEACE IV Programme Monitoring Committee 2014 -2020, and introduced the **European Commission Desk Officer, Tamara Pavlin.**

The Chair introduced herself as CEO of the Special EU Programmes Body (SEUPB); her appointment in September 2015 coincided with the implementation of the new PEACE IV Programme.

The Chair provided background on the SEUPB and explained the significance of today's meeting in the context of this 21st year of PEACE Programmes in Northern Ireland and Ireland. During this period there has been £2.2 billion invested in the eligible region, between EU and national contributions, and significant impact on the lives of beneficiaries.

The Chair mentioned the forthcoming EU Referendum. SEUPB is a cross-border body with DPER and DFP as Sponsor Departments, and as such must align to Government policy. The SEUPB, the NI Executive, the Irish Government and the EU Commission have approved the 2014 – 2020 Programmes and the SEUPB will implement them in line with that instruction until advised otherwise.

2. Code of Conduct and Conflict of Interest Declaration

The Chair requested that completed Code of Conduct and Conflict of Interest forms, circulated prior to the meeting, be returned to the SEUPB Secretariat, and that in the interim any Conflicts of Interest be declared verbally; none were declared.

3. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

4. Overview presentation of the PEACE 2014 – 2020 Cooperation Programme.

The **Managing Authority (MA) Director** provided an overview presentation on the structure and content of the PEACE IV Programme.

He thanked Member States and Accountable Departments for their assistance in developing the Programme, and the **EU Commission Desk Officer** for her guidance and extensive personal commitment throughout the period of Programme development.

The Chair opened the floor to comments.

Members of the Monitoring Committee made the following observations;

- Welcomed the new output/result focus of the Programme and the steps to reduce the administrative burden;
- Voiced concerns that if the Shared Education objective focused solely on partnerships in school, it may exclude applications from educational bodies such as NICIE;
- In relation to the Shared Spaces Objective, queried the implementation of shared spaces in rural areas; and the eligibility of smaller scale projects in a number of locations;
- Queried whether the Local Authorities are required to conduct public consultation in relation to their Plans, including sharing the Plan's methodology;
- In the context of noted previous underspend of the Local Authority Plans, the removal of a large project at the latter stages of the programme and the delayed timing of opening PEACE IV, it is important that applicants put in sufficient efforts to produce high quality applications, carry out an efficient consultation process and establish partnerships at an early stage to ensure timely implementation.

- Given the 'late' opening of the programme, there will be significant pressure on SEUPB and the Steering Committee to process applications in a timely manner. At this point, the timetable provided to Members omitted some dates in terms of the process.
- Stressed the importance of the integration of Sustainable Development within the Local Action Plans.

The Chair and **MA Director** provided the following responses;

- In relation to the Shared Education Objective, discussions are still ongoing with the Departments of Education in relation to the structure of the call, this will be considered at a Steering Committee for approval in due course.
- In terms of the Shared Spaces Objective, whilst physical segregation can be more obvious in urban areas, it is recognised that it also occurs in rural areas. Therefore, project ideas in relation to shared spaces in rural areas is welcomed.
- Given that a large element of the programme will be delivered through Local Authorities (over a third), organisations developing local projects were advised to liaise with their Local Councils or the SEUPB Joint Secretariat (Brenda Hegarty – Acting Director).
- In relation to the Local Authorities, they are required to demonstrate that they have carried out an open and meaningful public consultation process, however, the Programme allows them the flexibility to conduct this in a manner which is most appropriate to their local area.
- In relation to the need for timely applications, a significant level of work has already been carried in terms of a project pipeline that would meet the outputs of the Programme.
- The simplification measures which have been introduced (page 14-15 of the Citizen Summary), include a 2 stage application process. The relatively straightforward stage 1 application ensures that applicants know at an early stage whether their proposal is progressing to Stage 2, where a full business plan in required.
- The SEUPB has already provided (during 2015), an extensive training programme for potential applicants to ensure that they are knowledgeable about the Programme and how to apply. The Joint Secretariat has also worked intensively with the Local Authorities since autumn 2015 in terms of the preparation and development of their Plans.
- The call timetable provided to members notes 'not later than' dates and where possible, these will be brought forward. The timetable will continue to be updated in terms of omitted dates.

- There is recognition that there challenges ahead in terms of 'catching up', due to the delayed start of the Programme, however, given the likelihood of this being the last Peace Programme, SEUPB are determined to ensure that the programme fully meets all its targets and leaves a lasting legacy.
- In terms of Sustainable Development, all applicants, including the Local Authorities, are required to demonstrate how their applications address the Programme's two horizontal principles of Equality and Sustainable Development. SEUPB are currently running seminars on each principle to assist potential applicants.

In conclusion, **the Chair** advised that the official signing ceremony for the programme took place on 14 January 2016 with Commissioner Crețu with the Junior Ministers from Northern Ireland and representatives from Ireland in attendance.   A joint public launch of this programme and the INTERREG IVA Programme took place on 22 January and was attended by the Ministers from Northern Ireland, Ireland and Scotland. This is an indication of the high level of interest in the programme and the commitment of all concerned to ensure its success in making a difference to the lives of people in the eligible area.

5. Overview of roles and responsibilities of the Monitoring Committee <u>and</u>

6. Rules of Procedure of the Monitoring Committee

The **MA Director** provided a brief presentation on the roles and responsibilities of the PEACE IV Monitoring Committee and the contents of the Committee's Rules of Procedure.

The **EU Commission representative** thanked the MA Director for his presentation and made the following comments relating to the Rules of Procedure document;

- She suggested that the paper be amended to include clarification on the use of Written Procedure for committee business. She advised that this should not be used in relation to significant implementation issues;
- She suggested that the paper include a paragraph mandating the PMC to conduct business relating to the 2007-2013 Peace III Programme;
- She advised a change of wording in point 4.1, amending reference that the PMC "manage" the Programme to "monitor" the programme.

Action Points 1-3: MA

The Chair thanked the EU Commission representative for her comments and welcomed further comments.

The **NILGA representative** asked that a contact list of Members be circulated for the use of the Committee. The Committee agreed SEUPB may share their contact details for this purpose.

Action point 4: MA

Members and their Alternates were asked to complete and return of their Code of Conduct and Conflict of Interest forms, and advised that Committee training will take place in advance of the next PMC meeting. In addition, Members were advised of SEUPB's obligations in promoting Equality of Opportunity in accordance with Article 7, EU Regulation 1303/2013. In this context, PMC Members shall shortly receive Equality Monitoring forms from SEUPB's HR department, for completion and return as soon as possible.

Action Point 5: PMC Members/Alternates

,
The Monitoring Committee;
- **Approved** the Rules of Procedure document, subject to incorporation of the EU Commission representative's comments

7. **Steering Committee Membership, nomination of representatives**

The JS Acting Director provided a presentation in relation to the Steering Committee covering the following points;

- The role of the Monitoring Committee in appointing the Steering Committee;
- The required jurisdictional representation;
- The Committee's roles and responsibilities;
- The secretariat function (JS) including the frequency of meetings and quorum;
- The level of commitment and time required by Steering Committee members; and
- The nomination process.

Following the presentation, the Monitoring Committee made the following observations;

- Requested clarification on the proposed dates of the Steering Committee meetings and expressed concerns in relation to the 10 day notice period in issuing the agenda. Suggested that dates should be confirmed 6 months in advance to ensure member's availability;
- Sought clarification in relation to the frequency of monitoring and updating conflicts of interest in relation to members;
- Queried whether there would be Equality and Environmental working groups in this programming round;
- Questioned whether membership was only limited to Monitoring Committee Members;
- Requested that reference to four Regional/Sub-Regional/Local Government Interests be amended to include the text "two from each jurisdiction"

In response, the following clarifications were given;

- The Steering Committee dates shown are indicative only, and are in line with the Programme's 36 week assessment process. Suitable dates would be agreed with Steering Committee members in advance of each meeting;
- Conflicts of interest would be monitored and updated. In addition, members would be required to excuse themselves from parts of meetings in which they have declared a conflict of interest;
- The appointment of working groups falls under the remit of the monitoring committee and therefore had not yet been decided;
- Steering Committee members must be either Programme Monitoring Committee members or alternates; and
- Agreed to amend the reference to four Regional/Sub-Regional/Local Government Interests to "two from each jurisdiction".

Action Point 6: MA

The Chair requested the completion and return of Steering Committee nominations by the end of the current week.

The Monitoring Committee:

- **Approved** the Steering Committee Rules of Procedure; and
- **Agreed** the arrangements proposed for Steering Committee membership.

8. Communication and Information Strategy Approval

Members were advised that the Communications Strategy document circulated is a working draft, and requires the addition of further detail in a few sections. The **MA Director** provided a brief presentation on the aims and objectives of the Strategy.

Following the presentation, Members made the following comments;

- Commended the structure of the Communications Strategy;
- Recommended increased use of social media as the Programme is relatively youth focused and they would be main users of this communications platform;
- Recommended using Public Participation Networks (PPNs) in the Border Region as an effective method of communicating the Programme message to community groups in their areas;
- Requested that the Strategy also shares and profiles the work conducted on indicators to measure the outputs and results as they often present problems in terms of programme management.
- Asked for information on plans to ensure the collaboration of Community and Voluntary organisations, particularly in the Border Region, in terms of networking and working together on potential applications;

In response to the last point raised, the **MA Director** stressed the importance of the role of the local authorities in engaging with local Community and Voluntary groups during their public consultations. He also advised that SEUPB have held a number of public meetings in the eligible area, including the Border Region, to raise increased awareness of the Programme. He welcomed any suggestions to further increase this awareness but noted that previous programme experience has not identified any issues in receiving applications from across the Border Region.

The Chair thanked members for their valuable input, confirming that all comments would be taken into consideration in preparing the final Strategy. She advised that Members would be issued the final document following today's meeting and would be requested to approve it by written procedure in advance of the May 2016 deadline.

Action Point 7: MA

The Monitoring Committee;
- **Noted** the Communication and Information Strategy.
- **Noted** circulation of the final document for approval via written procedure in due course.

In addition, Members made the following comments;

- Queried whether the 15% match funding is secured for the programme;
- Asked if the Local Government reforms were sufficiently embedded to enable the PEACE IV work to commence and if relations between the Northern Ireland authorities and Border Region authorities has been affected by the reforms.

In response to the first point, the **MA Director** confirmed that match funding has been agreed for the programme. Every project, whether single jurisdiction or cross-border in nature receives funding which utilises the EU allocation and contribution from Northern Ireland and Ireland. The **DFP representative** elaborated, stating that match funding is held in a central pool in Northern Ireland. If flexibility is required in the distribution of match funding, mechanisms are in place to address this.

In response to the second point raised, the **NILGA representatives** confirmed that the councils which they represent are capable of meeting the requirements following the reforms and strong alliances have been maintained following the process.

The **JS Acting Director** advised that correspondence has been received from all the Local Authorities confirming that they are in an advanced stage in their preparation and will be in a position to submit plans prior to the SEUPB deadlines.

9. Programme Rules

The Chair and **MA Director** introduced the Programme Rules paper, as circulated to Members in advance of the meeting, and asked Members to note that the Rules are applicable to both the PEACE IV and INTERREG VA Programmes.

Based on relevant EU regulations, the Rules seek to provide information in a user friendly format and were shared with potential applicants early in the process.

The Monitoring Committee;
- **Noted** a common set of rules have been developed and are available to applicants.
- **Noted** the rules are common with the INTERREG VA Programme.

10. Update on Programme Regulatory Implementation Arrangements

Under this agenda item, the **MA Programme Manager** updated members in relation to the following regulatory requirements:

- Designation;
- Evaluation;
- E-Cohesion.

In response to the update, the **EU Commission representative** requested clarification on the target date of the end of 2016 for the new e-cohesion system, compared to the earlier date stated in the papers.   The **MA Manager** confirmed that there has been some slippage since the paper was written and the date has changed. SEUPB and DFP are working with the contractor to achieve a clear delivery schedule.

The **DFP representative** discussed the complexities of implementing the database with five different programme requirements within Northern Ireland.

The Monitoring Committee;

- **Noted** the progress on the Programme Regulatory implementation arrangements.

11. Assessment Process & Review Procedure for Unsuccessful Applications

The **MA Director** introduced the paper noting that:

- Assessment process has been shorten to a two-stage process totalling 36 weeks;
- Assessment at Stage One was a maximum of 8 weeks;
- Stage 2 assessment examinees examines the proposed project's Business Plan.
- The final decision on funding rests with the Steering Committee;
- Rejected applicants have the right to request a review of the Steering Committee decision;
- The PMC will be requested to nominate Members, who are not involved with the Steering Committee, to sit upon the Review Panels.

The **EU Commission representative** welcomed the streamlining of the process, which was previously a concern during the 2007-2013 Programme period.

Following this, Members made the following comments;

- Requested further details on the composition and requirements of the Review Panel and the frequency of review meetings held;
- Queried whether a project can be refused a review; and
- Queried the number of applications which had been successful in stage 1 and stage 2

The following clarifications were provided;

- The Review Panel considers the decisions taken by the Steering Committee in relation to Stage 1 and Stage 2 unsuccessful applications, at the request of the project promoter;
- Reviews must be requested on the basis of one or both of the following grounds;
    1. The outcome was a decision that no reasonable person would have made on the basis of the information provided to the Steering Committee; and/or
    2. That there was a failure in adherence to procedures or systems that materially affected or could have materially affected the decision.

  To date, no request for a review had been refused.
- The Stage 1 application does not result in an award of funding. Therefore, reviews are carried out by written procedure where the review panel will meet and consider all documents available to the Steering Committee and a written submission by the applicant outlining the rational for the review request.
- At Stage 2, the applicant is invited to give an oral presentation. The JS are also invited to provide an oral presentation on the Steering Committee's reasons for rejection.
- Review Panel meetings are arranged as required. Applicants are provided with a detailed debrief meeting during which the JS provide the Steering Committee feedback. Experience to date has shown that few applicants request a formal review following this meeting. To date, one review has been requested in the INTERREG VA Programme following 5 Steering Committee meetings;
- In relation to applications received into the INTERREG programme, there has been around a 70% success rate for stage 1 applications, Stage 2 Steering Committee meetings are yet to take place.

The Monitoring Committee:

- **Approved** the assessment process and assessment models.
- **Approved** the Review Procedure.

12. Project Selection Criteria

The **JS Acting Director** provided a presentation on the key principles in relation to the selection criteria and project assessment.

Following the presentation, Members raised the following points;

- Requested greater detail on the assessment process carried out by the Steering Committee;
- Asked if the Steering Committee decision must be reached by consensus;

The following clarification was provided;

- In terms of the assessment process;
  - o Following receipt of an application, the JS produce an assessment report against the 5 criteria, and award an indicative score;
  - o The application and assessment report are uploaded to the Steering Committee Members' area of the SEUPB website at least 1 week in advance of the meeting;
  - o At the meeting, the Steering Committee reflect on the report and the JS provide a brief presentation on the conclusions of the assessment report;
  - o The Steering Committee make a collective decision and score the application.

- Decisions are generally made by consensus – where this is not possible, a majority decision is taken.
- Whilst the JS present their recommendation based on the application and any additional information received during the application process, the decision to fund a project rests solely with the Steering Committee.

Members also raised the following;

- Questioned why the criteria did not include information on project longevity beyond funding;
- Queried the level of detail involved in the second stage of the process in comparison to the first;
- Asked if Steering Committee deliberation often changed the original JS assessment;
- Questioned the level of JS resources dedicated to project assessment.

The following clarifications were provided;

- In terms of project longevity, not all interventions are sustainable and therefore details on the exit strategy and where appropriate longevity are rigorously examined within either the project design or value for money criteria in stage 2. Each call will be different with some having outputs required to be achieved during the project duration and others monitored beyond the project duration.
- The second stage process is much more comprehensive with a higher level of expectation for information through the Business Plan with timely interventions from the policy/accountable departments. It may be necessary to seek technical advice depending on the nature of the project.
- The JS assessment presented to the Steering Committee is as robust as possible with the issues already identified and the indicative scores considered relevant and appropriate. However, it remains the right of the Steering Committee within stage 1 and stage 2 to amend the scoring, if they deem it appropriate.
- In terms of JS resources, there are 22 staff across both programmes with 12-14 dedicated to the application assessment. The SEUPB has recently reallocated staff internally to meet the needs of the accelerated assessment timetable.

The **NWRA representative** discussed his experience on the Steering Committee for the previous Programme, and informed Members that it is not uncommon for the Steering Committee to make adjustments to the scores. In relation to the assessment criteria, it is important to strike a balance in the number of criteria. Areas such as project longevity can be captured and assessed within an existing criterion, for example, value for money.

Members then raised the following;

- Questioned why the horizontal principles of Equality and Sustainable Development appear only in stage 2 which could present them as a secondary consideration;
- Requested that reference to Section 42 of the Irish Human Rights and Equality Commission Act (2014) be added to the paper alongside references to the Northern Ireland Section 75 legislation;
- Commented that project sustainability and need appear to be missing from the criteria and questioned if such areas are incorporated within the project design criteria and if so, is there a more detailed subset of how each criterion is scored?
- Queried the process for ranking projects within a competitive process particularly in relation to projects that may have achieved the same score. Would there be an issue in

relation to the value for money criteria if such projects have their budgets reduced? Would there be engagement by the Secretariat to discuss such situations with applicants?

- Questioned whether there is scope for JS to feedback to applicants suggestions for improving their applications before they are presented to the Steering Committee.

The following clarifications were provided;

- The horizontal principles are not included in the Stage 1 in order to keep the stage 1 application form as brief and concise as possible this is not an indication of the importance attributed to them.. The call information released to all potential applicants does advise that projects will have to address both principles within their project. SEUPB provide training on both principles at the beginning of the calls to ensure that applicants are considering how to embed the principles throughout the design and implementation stages;

- References will be updated be include reference to Article 42 of the Irish Equality Act (2014);

Action point 8: MA

- The detailed guidance provided to applicants contains prompt questions which includes areas such as how their project will meet the need determined by the Cooperation Programme and potential applicants are advised of these at the workshops offered for each call.

- It is anticipated that the two stage process would reduce the situation of over-subscription at Stage 2. However, projects would be ranked in order of their scores. In the event of over-subscription and projects achieving the same scores, the JS would agree more refined criteria with the Steering Committee to apply to such projects. This would be brought to the attention of the applicants concerned.

- The JS cannot be involved in an iterative process with an applicant during the assessment process as it would be unfair to other applicants. Very detailed feedback is given to applicants who have been successful at the end of stage 1 to facilitate high quality applications for stage 2. JS may contact the applicant at either stage for a point of clarity but there is no opportunity to develop the project.

The Monitoring Committee;

- **Approved** the selection criteria to be utilised during project assessment.

13. Timetable for calls for applications <u>and</u> agenda item 14 the first calls for applications

The **JS Acting Director** provided a brief presentation of the Programme timetable, focusing on the three calls requiring approval at today's meeting.

Following the presentation, the **DFP representative** questioned whether it is possible to bypass stage 1 and move to stage 2 for closed calls such as the Victims and Survivors call. He stated that the time may be better spent working with the applicant at an early stage to produce a more robust business plan.

The Chair and the **JS Acting Director** both responded, emphasising the importance of Stage 1 assessment. Also, the VSS proposal must be assessed and approved by the Steering Committee in line with procedure and under the same conditions as other applicants.

Members then made the following comments:

- Questioned whether the deadline for the Regional strand of Building Positive Relations could be extended to facilitate the development of high quality regional collaborative applications;
- Voiced some concern that the Regional strand is unique in encouraging genuine collaboration which takes time and queried whether there would be future or staggered calls to assist those who need time to establish this;
- Asked if the Regional strand could have three call dates similar to the Local Authorities' call.

The **Chair** thanked the representatives for their comments and agreed to reflect on the suggestions made in terms of the Regional strand.

She advised that three dates have been provided to Local Authorities as the budget allocation for each has already been agreed and therefore there is no competition in relation to the allocation. Taking a similar approach in the Regional strand could disadvantage applicants who are not ready as there is a potential that all the funding may be allocated in the first call.

The **Wheel representative** asked if it would be possible for the allocation to be divided across calls throughout the programme period.

The **Chair** explained that SEUPB are working to an accelerated timetable in order to reach financial targets in 2018 and 2023. Delays create the risk of failing to meet these targets and therefore financial penalties to the Programme. There would be a consideration of options to assist applications for this call.

The **Wheel representative** noted that a sectoral workshop for the regional strand is being held on 5 April 2016, and asked for some clarification in terms of what these involve. He felt that this would be an opportunity to communicate call options such as an extension of deadline.

The **JS Acting Director** provided a description of the workshops, which are advertised to potential applicants via the SEUPB website, and provide information on the relevant call and the processes for applying to the call. It is anticipated that the workshops will be attended by 80 to 100 delegates. SEUPB will consider hosting more than one workshop if there is an extension to the deadline of the call.

In response to this, the **Wheel representative** suggested a collaborative workshop between the Irish Environmental Network, the Wheel and SEUPB to ensure maximum reach to organisations in the region.

The **Chair** thanked the representative for his offer, and reiterated that the SEUPB will reflect on the regional strand prior to the 5th April workshop.

The **Environmental Pillar representative** informed SEUPB she attends monthly meetings of the Local Community Development Committee (LCDC), and she has received no communication from Local Authorities regarding PEACE IV funding. As such they were unaware of the application deadlines and feel the opportunity to apply may be missed.

The **MA Director** and **JS Acting Director** discussed SEUPB's meetings with Local Authorities in December 2015, and advised that the councils are working at different paces. Those Local Authorities who are sufficiently prepared may apply by the March deadline, while others may apply in May or June. The SEUPB will further engage with Local Authorities to ensure that they are carrying out a meaningful engagement and public consultation process. In addition, DECLG are also instructing their Local Authorities in relation to communicating the information.

Members asked for clarification in relation to the Victims and Survivors strand as follows;

- Whether the VSS will have a cross-border remit and if so, do they have sufficient familiarity with community structures on both sides of border in order to implement the proposed activity?
- Whether there was opportunity for the VSS to submit a number of smaller, staggered projects to absorb their €15m allocation, rather than one project spanning the seven year Programme period as there is a small timeframe for them to submit a proposal.

The following clarification was provided;

- While the VSS is the lead delivery agent, it will seek potential partnerships in the border region in order to ensure appropriate regional outreach. This approach has been agreed with the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade in Dublin and OFMDFM in Northern Ireland and all are conscious of the need for such services to be rolled out on a cross-border basis. SEUPB are working with the VSS in this regard and are confident that it will be reflected in their stage 1 application.
- SEUPB has been engaged with the VSS since summer 2015, and they will engage with other service providers if and when required. The VSS are running PEACE IV activity in conjunction with their own statutory funding, and delivering a suite of activities.
- The VSS is subject to the same Programme requirements and application process as any applicant to the PEACE IV funding, further details about the services are included in an annex to the Cooperation Programme. They must develop an application which meets the requirements of the programme and annex and this will be monitored.
- In the previous programme, projects were responsible for demonstrating the need for their project, whereas as mentioned earlier (Section 12 – page 13), identification of need has already been determined in developing the Cooperation Programme, and therefore they must demonstrate how they will meet that need.

The **EU Commission representative** reminded members that the VSS is mentioned in the CP because negotiations revealed it is uniquely positioned to execute the activity. There is an agreement with the EU Commission that the capacity and governance structure of the VSS will be assessed before project approval. It is considered as a Lead Beneficiary like any other under Article 13 of the regulation.

The **DFP representative** discussed the need for balance in terms of an efficient assessment process where applicants have time to consider and submit their proposals but also receive decisions on a timely basis. The need for such projects for victims and survivors was identified

during consultation and through the political process, it is therefore incumbent on those that voiced the need to produce plans to address that need. The Monitoring Committee plays a key role in monitoring and where appropriate challenging the process throughout the programming period.

The **Chair** thanked all Members for their comments, and agreed to reflect on the issues raised, including increased communications activities to build awareness of the Programme in border counties.

T**he Monitoring Committee;**

- **Noted** the timetable for calls for applications;
- **Approved** the call for local authorities;
- **Approved** the call for Victims and Survivors;
- **Agreed** that further consideration be given to the regional call and the amended version be considered by the Steering Committee.

15. PEACE III (2007-2013) Implementation and Closure

The **Chair** introduced this agenda item by explaining the PEACE IV Monitoring Committee's responsibilities include the closure of the previous (PEACE III) Programme.

The **MA Director** then provided an update on closure of the PEACE III Programme including details on the final expenditure for the programme, the number of projects yet to close and the closure timeframe.

The **DFP representative** congratulated the SEUPB on 99% commitment in PEACE III, considering the loss of larger projects towards the end of the Programme period.

The **Chair** extended her thanks to colleagues in **DFP**, **DPER** and **DSD** who have been working closely with the SEUPB to maximise expenditure.

The **EU Commission representative** also congratulated SEUPB for meeting targets and in their progress in closing the Programme and asked if PEACE III project examples could be shared with this Committee.

The **Chair** agreed to share a video which was shown at the PEACE IV Programme launch at the next PMC meeting.

Action Point 9: MA

The Monitoring Committee;

- **Noted** progress in closing the PEACE III Programme

16. A.O.B.

Under this final agenda item, the **Chair** reminded Members to submit their Steering Committee nominations as soon as possible. The SEUPB hope to schedule the first Steering Committee meeting within the following fortnight, and training will be provided to members.

The **Chair** took this opportunity to extend the SEUPB's heartfelt thanks and best wishes to the **NWRA representative, Gerry Finn**, who announced his retirement. Mr Finn has provided significant support and guidance to SEUPB through service on previous Programme Monitoring and Steering Committees over a number of years.

Gerry Finn thanked **the Chair** for her kind words, expressing his enjoyment of working on the Programmes. He encouraged Members to participate on the Steering Committee as membership allows hands-on interaction with the programmes. Mr Finn discussed the change that has occurred in the region over the programme period, and the contribution the PEACE Programmes have made to that positive change.

The SEUPB will be in contact with Members in due course regarding the Action Points discussed today.

The next meeting will be held in October or November 2016, in Dundalk.

ACTION POINTS/ISSUES OF CLARIFICATION
ARISING FROM MONITORING COMMITTEE

Wednesday 2nd March 2016, Riddel Hall, Belfast

ACTION POINTS

ACTION	TIMING	RESPONSIBILITY
Action Point 1 The Monitoring Committee Rules of Procedure will be amended to reflect the use of Written Procedure to conduct parts of Monitoring Committee business	ASAP	MA
Action Point 2 The Monitoring Committee Rules of Procedure will be amended to include a paragraph mandating the PEACE IV PMC to conduct business relating to the previous PEACE III Programme (2007-2013)	ASAP	MA
Action Point 3 Reference to the word 'manage' the Programme will be amended in paragraph 4.1 of the Rules of Procedure document.	ASAP	MA
Action Point 4 Members to be provided with a contact list of other PMC Members	ASAP	MA
Action Point 5 Committee Members to complete and return Equality Monitoring Forms to the Secretariat	ASAP	PMC Members/Advisors/ Observers
Action Point 6 Regional/Sub-Regional/Local Government Interests section of the Steering Committee structure to be amended to include "two from each jurisdiction"	ASAP	MA
Action Point 7 Final Communications Strategy to be issued to the PMC for approval	ASAP	MA
Action Point 8 Reference to Irish Equality legislation to be added	ASAP	MA
Action Point 9 PEACE III Programme Summary video to be shown at the next PEACE IV PMC meeting	At next PEACE IV PMC	MA

Attendance – PEACE IV Programme Monitoring Committee, 2nd March 2016, Riddel Hall, Belfast

Chair

Gina McIntyre   SEUPB

Members

Alderman Angus Carson   NILGA
Ivan Cooper   the Wheel
Cllr Dermot Curran   NILGA
Michael D'Arcy   IBEC
Cllr Frank Dolan   Northern Western Regional Assembly (NWRA)
Alderman Freda Donnelly   NILGA
Pamela Dooley   ICTU Northern Ireland
Damian Duffy   Confederation of British Industry (CBI)
Frank Duffy   Department of Finance and Personnel (DFP)
Gerry Finn   Northern Western Regional Assembly (NWRA)
Hazel Francey   the Equality Commission for Northern Ireland (ECNI)
Shaun Henry   Managing Authority, SEUPB
Cllr Garath Keating   NILGA
Stefania Minervino   Irish Human Rights and Equality Commission (IHREC)
Seamus McAleavey   NICVA
Jenny McEneaney   NICVA
Paddy McGinn   Pobal
Dr Aedín McLoughlin   Environmental Pillar
David Oliver   Ulster Farmers Union
Siobhan O'Higgins   Department of Public Expenditure & Reform (DPER)
Cllr Sean Smith   Northern Western Regional Assembly (NWRA)
Emily Smyth   Council for Nature Conservation & the Countryside (CNCC)
David Oliver   Ulster Farmers Union

Advisors

Andrew Bell	Department of Education (DE)
Donna Blaney	OFMDFM
Karen Flynn	Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government (DECLG)
Brenda Hegarty	Joint Secretariat, (Acting Director), SEUPB
Edel Hendry	NISRA
Marian Mulholland	Certifying Authority, SEUPB
Patricia McIntyre	OFMDFM
Tony McKibben	Department for Social Development (DSD)
Laurence O'Grady	Department of Education and Skills (DES)
Tamara Pavlin	European Commission
John Thompson	Managing Authority, SEUPB
John Williamson	Department of Education (DE)

Observers

Ken Bishop	Northern Ireland Local Government Association (NILGA)
Teresa Canavan	Rural Development Council
John Carson	International Fund for Ireland
Colette Fitzgerald	Northern Ireland EU Commission, Belfast
Cathy Geagan	Department of Public Expenditure & Reform (DPER)
Marie Matthews	OFMDFM
Sean McAteer	North South Ministerial Council (NSMC)
Emer McGeough	North South Ministerial Council (NSMC)
Kieran Ormond	Department of Education and Skills (DES)
John O'Farrell	ICTU Northern Ireland
Lee Williamson	OFMDFM

Secretariat (SEUPB)

Ian Boden	Managing Authority
Jonathan McCarron	Managing Authority
Tara McCormick	Managing Authority (minutes)

<u>Apologies</u>

Patrick McCauley	ICTU Ireland
Wesley Aston	Ulster Farmers Union
Cllr Tommy Byrne	Eastern & Midlands Regional Assembly
Tom Lavin	Irish Rural Link
John McCandless	SEUPB Communications Manager

ANNEX III

Glossary of acronyms used in the minutes:

CNCC	**Council for Nature Conservation and the Countryside**
DARD	**Department of Agriculture and Rural Development**
DECLG	**Department of Environment, Community and Local Government**
DETI (NI)	**Department of Enterprise, Trade and Investment**
DFP	**Department of Finance and Personnel (Northern Ireland)**
DHSSPS	**Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety**
DJEI	**Department of Jobs, Enterprise and Innovation**
DOE (NI)	**Department of the Environment**
DoH	**Department of Health**
DPER	**Department of Public Expenditure and Reform**
DRD	**Department of Regional Development**
ICTU	**Irish Congress of Trade Unions**
NICCY	**NI Commissioner for Children and Young People**
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**

NWRA   **Northern Western Regional Assembly**

SCVO   **Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations**

SEUPB   **Special European Union Programmes Body**

JS   **Joint Secretariat**

MA   **Managing Authority**

VSS   **The Victims and Survivors Service**