



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



European Union  
European Regional  
Development Fund  
Investing in your future

**NORTHERN IRELAND, THE BORDER REGION OF IRELAND AND WESTERN  
SCOTLAND  
INTERREG VA PROGRAMME  
(2014 - 2020)  
CCI No: 2014TC16RFCB047**

**MINUTES MONITORING COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> December 2015, Crowne Plaza Hotel, Dundalk**

**Welcome and Introduction by Chairperson**

The Chair welcomed attendees to the second meeting if the INTERREG VA Programme Monitoring Committee, including those who attended the morning session of PMC induction training as an essential aspect of PMC membership.

She discussed the Evaluation Plan on today's agenda as the main item of business, requiring PMC approval before the February 2016 deadline. She conveyed apologies from the European Commission Desk Officer, Maria Jose Doval Tedin, who has submitted comments on the evaluation plan in her absence.

The Chair welcomed new Members to the Monitoring Committee;

- John Maxwell replaces Jim Milliard as the Scottish Government representative
- Blair Horan is attending his first meeting of the INTERREG VA PMC representing the Irish Congress of Trade Unions in Ireland
- Owen Lyttle replaces Brendan Forde as an Advisor, representing the Department of the Environment (NI)

**Apologies** are noted within Annex 1.

## **1. Agenda**

The Committee agreed the agenda

## **2. Conflict of Interest**

**The Chair** asked Members to declare any potential Conflicts of Interest, and encouraged Members who had not yet completed a Code of Conduct or Conflict of Interest form to obtain them from the SEUPB Secretariat.

No conflicts of interest were declared.

## **3. Minutes of Previous Meeting – 29 July 2015**

**The DFP representative** requested consistency between references to Action Point 5 in the main body of the minutes and in the Annex

Secondly, **the DFP representative** asked that his earlier request that Member States be provided with advanced notification of all future workshops be reflected among the minutes' Action Points.

**The IBEC representative** asked if his earlier suggestions regarding project applications via video presentations had been considered.

**The Chair** provided a response, stating that the SEUPB had considered video applications however, felt that standardised paper applications remained the most fair application method and allowed for equal assessment.

The Committee **approved** the minutes of the previous meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> July 2015.

The approved minutes will be made available on the SEUPB website.

**Action Point 1: DFP representative's request for advanced notification of future workshops to be reflected in minutes of the previous meeting.**

**Action Point 2: Approved minutes to be added to the SEUPB website**

#### **4. Matters Arising**

**The Chair** outlined the Matters Arising from the previous meeting individually.

All matters have been addressed with the exception of Action Point 5 in relation to Communications activity in Western Scotland. The activity will begin when Letters of Offer commence in 2016.

#### **5. Update on progress in implementation (2007 – 2013 programmes)**

**The Chair** provided a progress update on implementation of the INTERREG IVA Programme, SEUPB's previous Programme which is in the final stages of closure; the progress paper was provided to Members in advance of today's meeting.

**The Chair** reminded Members that it was agreed at the last meeting that this PMC will take on the role of monitoring closure of the 2007-2013 programmes.

##### **The Monitoring Committee:**

- **Noted** the Progress in implementation and closure of the Programme
- **Noted** the upcoming communication events for the Programme

## **6. Update on progress in implementation (2014 – 2020 Programmes)**

**The JS Director** updated the committee on the progress in implementing the INTERREG VA 2014 – 2020 Programme; the progress paper was provided to Members in advance of today’s meeting.

**The Highlands and Islands Enterprise representative** informed Members of significant Scottish interest in relation to the Health and Life Sciences objective and offered Inverness as a potential venue for a workshop if it could be arranged.

**The Chair** responded, stating that further workshops are planned and advised members that previous workshops had been live-streamed via YouTube for those who could not attend.

She also informed Members of information events on the Horizontal Principles of the programme. An equality seminar took place in Belfast on 24 November with three subsequently planned to take place during 2016 in Dundalk, Derry-Londonderry and Glasgow. There will also be four Sustainable Development seminars taking place in the same locations across 2016.

**The JS Director** advised that SEUPB has been working closely with Caroline Coleman, the National Contact Point for Scotland, to offer meetings with potential applicants in Scotland. The Contact Point has also been working with the JS to address pre-application queries to encourage accurate and effective information sharing.

**The SEPA representative** encouraged the use of live-streaming to access all but expressed concern that the broadband quality among organisations in the Scottish Highlands and Islands may not support live streaming of events, and face-to-face seminars would address the need to hold seminars equally across the three jurisdictions.

**The JS Director** confirmed that the SEUPB would hold seminars in Scotland if a number of applicants require assistance.

**The Scotland Europa representative** asked for clarification and follow-up from **the JS Director** as to whether the seminar under discussion was a continuation of the pre-application workshops or an additional session planned for Scotland, being aware of the need to cover all three eligible regions equally.

**The JS Director** agreed to follow up this discussion with **the Scotland Europa representative**.

**The Environmental Pillar representative** queried why a low number of applications were received for the call on SME innovation capacity.

**The JS Director** explained that the Programme requirement sought an organisation or partnership of organisations which could deliver the entirety of the SME work as an overall strategic project; therefore the scale of the project has limited the number of potential applicants. However, the benefits will filter to a wide range of SMEs during implementation.

Of the three applications submitted, the two which progressed represent a partnership arrangement of organisations with the capacity to deliver on project activity.

**The Ulster Farmers Union representative** queried the level of communications activity taking place to publicise the opening of calls in all three regions.

**The Wheel representative** discussed the twenty one applications to the Health: Cross-Border Heath and Social Care objective, stating his belief that increased awareness of the calls would have resulted in a larger number of applications. He offered the Wheel's assistance in publicising future events, accompanied by a general seminar focused on remaining opportunities in the Programme for the Community and Voluntary sector.

**The MA Director** welcomed offers of assistance and expanded upon the issue of holding meetings in Scotland. He reminded Members of SEUPB's funding of the Scottish National Contact Point, a dedicated resource unique to Scotland, which applicants should be made aware of. He agreed the SEUPB would hold seminars in Scotland if there was a demand beyond the live-streaming of workshops.

With regards to publicising the calls, **the MA Director** expressed his confidence in the quality of the applications being generated by the publication activity currently in place. He stated his belief that the current calls are generating a low number of high quality, applications which demonstrate effective cross-border implementation, compared to a high level of poor quality applications which did not meet the cross-border criteria of the programme. He stressed that the pre-application workshops were an effective way of helping organisations understand the criteria of the programme to help decide if it is appropriate for them to apply.

**The Wheel representative** stated his concern over the timetable for the Equality and Sustainable Development workshops, when applicants should integrate these two horizontal principles into their projects from the outset.

**The Director, MA** informed members that the first Equality workshop took place on 24 November 2015 and the initial Sustainable Development workshop will take place in January 2016. A programme of further dates will then follow.

The SEUPB are encouraging applicants to attend these workshops as quickly as possible. Although applicants are required to address Equality and Sustainable Development in Stage 2 of the application process, the horizontal principles should be at the forefront of their consideration throughout Stage 1 application.

**The NWRA representative** queried if a review has been requested by the unsuccessful applicant under the R & I: Enhancing SMEs Innovation theme.

Secondly, **the NWRA representative** commented on the challenges the Steering Committee face in the change of scale to a lower number of larger projects, and ensuring project partnerships are soundly constructed and spread throughout the eligible region.

**The Chair** provided a response, stating that the unsuccessful applicant received feedback from the SEUPB and it anticipated that they will appeal the decision.

She reiterated that the smaller number of larger projects is consistent with the nature of the Programme and it's very clear focus on results and outputs. Also, the calls are advertised in the press prior to their release, and SEUPB welcomes any assistance offered in further awareness- raising.

**The Scottish Government representative** asked if the Monitoring Committee would have sight of the timetable for workshops, including details of dates and venues.

**The Chair** confirmed the timetable is available on the SEUPB website. She reminded members that the workshops will increase in number as the PEACE IV Programme was recently adopted, and will feature its own schedule of calls and similar workshops during 2016 implementation.

**The SCVO representative** discussed the frequent referrals to the SEUPB website and queried whether, in her role as PMC member, she should actively research Programme progress on the website, such as the appeal of the unsuccessful R & I project, or if the information would be provided to her.

**The Director, MA** confirmed that the website features dates of Steering Committee meetings, the calls for applications, applicant workshops etc. However, he agreed a method could be developed to inform PMC members when new information is added to

the website. Steering Committee members are more knowledgeable in terms of progress as they meet more frequently than the PMC.

He continued to say that the details of unsuccessful applications, their appeals and Review Panel decisions are not publicised on the website, and the PMC would be informed of the outcome of reviews.

**The Environmental Pillar representative** suggested a weekly newsletter summarising progress such as committed expenditure, opening of calls etc. and reminded members to check the website for updates.

**The MA Director** agreed to consider mechanisms for effective information sharing with the PMC, however, there would not be sufficient resources to provide weekly updates.

**The CNCC representative** asked for guidance on confidentiality around Steering Committee business.

**The Chair** clarified Steering Committee business should remain confidential, at least until the applicant has received formal notification of the outcome of decisions taken.

**The Director, JS**, reminded members that application is a competitive process and cautioned against a wide circulation of information, as this may affect the assessment of individual projects. To this effect, she asked that application information remain confidential until the assessment process has concluded.

The JS will aim to manage any specific Member questions and release relevant information in the appropriate public forum.

**The Director, MA**, reiterated that Members should direct any queries regarding the project assessment process to **the JS Director** and JS team, to remain aware that the assessment process is active until Stage 2 has completed, and to refrain from commenting until then.

**Action Point 3: The JS Director will further discuss the Scottish pre-application workshops with Scotland Europa**

**Action Point 4: The SEUPB are to develop a mechanism of providing PMC members with regular updates on Programme implementation**

**The Monitoring Committee:**

- **Noted** the Progress in implementation of the Programme

- **Noted** the progress in implementing the communications strategy for the programme.

## **7. Evaluation Plan (2014 – 2020 programmes)**

**The Chair** introduced the draft INTERREG VA Evaluation Plan for Committee approval, as provided to Members in advance of the meeting.

She repeated that the Evaluation Plan is subject to a February 2016 deadline for submission to the EU Commission, and **the EU Desk Officer** has provided her comments for consideration and integration.

**The MA Director** explained the intervention logic for the Programme and the Monitoring and Evaluation process, which assesses the achievement of Programme result indicators against planned output indicators and the actual outputs achieved.

He elaborated upon the complex relationship between the planned outputs and the actual impact achieved in the region, and acknowledged that the result indicators may be affected by external factors.

Evaluation is a key tool in examining the effectiveness and impact of the Programme, proposing alternatives if the desired impact is not being achieved, and providing learning for any future Programming period. **The MA Director** summarised the draft Evaluation Plan in the following key points:

- The draft Evaluation Plan proposes commissioning four separate impact evaluations, at thematic level, for each of the Programme themes: Research and Innovation, Environment, Transport and Health.
- The SEUPB aim to appoint evaluators early in the Programme period, who would report to the SEUPB and the Monitoring Committee in 2018, 2020 and at Programme end.
- The Evaluation Plan also proposes an implementation evaluation which would report in the early 2016, 2017 and 2018 Programme years, assessing Programme implementation and identifying if measures to reduce the administrative burden of the Programme (outlined in Section 7 of the INTERREG VA Cooperation Programme) are successful.
- The Evaluation Plan mentions the quality assurance mechanisms around monitoring and evaluation. **The EU Commission Desk Officer's** comments mostly request assurance that the Evaluation Plan aligns with EU Commission guidance and some points require expansion as a result however, **the Desk Officer** has not raised any other substantive issues.

- Section 7 details the dissemination arrangements for the evaluation findings. **The MA Director** emphasised the importance of disseminating the findings through the publication of Citizen Summaries and via workshops to inform stakeholders, with the hope of influencing public policy going forward.
- Section 8 details the evaluation timetable as follows;
  - The implementation evaluation will be commissioned in 2016, and evaluators will produce joint reports with the PEACE IV Programme in 2016, 2017 and 2018.
  - The priority axis impact evaluations will be commissioned in late 2016/2017, with evaluators being appointed in 2017.
  - Impact evaluation reports will be produced in 2018, 2020 and 2022
  - The SEUPB must provide the EU Commission with an Evaluation Summary Report in 2022.
- Section 9 details the preliminary budget for evaluation at €700,000. The actual amount of expenditure is dependent on the evaluation cost, as procured through either of two methods: public procurement or a competitive grant aid call under Technical Assistance (a grant aid system).
- Annex 1 puts forward typical examples of potential evaluation questions, with an overall aim to keep future evaluations focused and precise, with a system of core questions.
- The Evaluation Plan proposes establishing an Evaluation Steering Group (ESG) in 2016. The ESG will be comprised of nominated or volunteer PMC members, supplemented with external expertise to guide the Group through the evaluative process. The Group will assist in the Evaluation procurement process and oversee the Evaluation Plan.

**The DFP representative** stated he feels unable to approve such a complex plan at present, and requires more time to give it further consideration.

**The MA Director** explained the Monitoring Committee are being asked to approve the plan in advance of the Commission's 13 February 2016 deadline, which marks one year since the Programme's adoption.

The SEUPB will accept PMC's comments and advice on how to proceed in approving the plan, and are flexible in editorial changes which may improve the Plan's quality.

**The MA Director** explained **the EU Desk Officer's** comments requested clarification and do not change the structure of the plan. He assured members that comments made today would be addressed before finalising the plan and re-circulating to this PMC's ahead of 13<sup>th</sup> February.

**The Intertrade Ireland representative** expressed his view that the Committee had sufficient time to examine the comprehensive plan prior to today's meeting, and agreed with approval, subject to consideration of any amendments requested via email.

**The DFP representative** compared the evaluation budget estimate of €700,000 to the €20,000 spent on evaluation in the previous INTERREG IVA Programme. He expressed concern with the cost effectiveness of increased expenditure and number of evaluations, and the case for a public procurement method in favour of engaging with research institutions. He requested more detailed consideration in this regard.

**The Scotland Europa representative** requested clarification on the process of setting up the Evaluation Steering Group (ESG) following initial PMC approval of the Evaluation Plan.

**The Chair** confirmed the Committee should approve the Plan in principle at today's meeting, and the ESG would address comments provided prior to the 13 February submission.

She assured members the indicative budget, which was based on SEUPB's market research, may only be spent with approval from Member States and the ESG. She informed the Members that the SEUPB had responded to Member State comments on the Evaluation Plan previously, and requested Committee approval today, in the knowledge that the practical aspects of procurement and expenditure would be further ratified by the ESG.

**The NWRA representative** queried the difference between public procurement and grant assistance.

**The Director, MA,** provided a response consisting of the following key points:

- The SEUPB may utilise two mechanisms of engaging with evaluators; a traditional public procurement process and a grant aid system
- With regards to public procurement, experience of the Mid-Term Evaluation for the previous Programmes and the Ex-Ante for this INTERREG VA Programme

has shown a low level of interest from potential evaluators, and therefore ineffective competition.

- Previously, evaluations appointed by public procurement also produced reports which were not as informative as the SEUPB would have preferred. Both these reasons prompted the SEUPB to examine alternative models.
- The SEUPB noted other public sector bodies' engagement with research and academic institutions over prolonged time periods, via a grant aid system, which allows:
  - Researchers to gain a greater understanding of the Programme.
  - Interaction with the researchers to improve Programme quality during implementation.
  - Researchers access to required data.
  - Undergraduate and postgraduate students to access the findings to develop research and publish academic papers.
- Robust evaluation will allow the SEUPB to be better informed when negotiating any potential future INTERREG Programmes in 2018/19, with an advanced knowledge of effective cross- border interventions.
- The ESG will develop the method of engaging with the evaluators once appointed in the New Year.
- There has been a significant increase in budget provision, not budget spend. The €700,000 cited is a maximum amount, and expenditure shall be approved and incurred in line with normal approval processes. **The MA Director** explained the previous approach to evaluation is no longer in line with Commission guidance and expectations for this Programming period. Any evaluation work undertaken will also be funded under the Programme's Technical Assistance budget, and is therefore subject to an 85% ERDF intervention rate.

**The Scottish Government representative** stated that the increased budget may attract greater interest through public procurement than experienced previously, and to judge the use of the public procurement exercise accordingly.

**The Scottish Government International Innovation representative** advised the Committee and the SEUPB, given the commencement of the evaluation timetable in 2016, to establish the ESG at an earlier stage than the next PMC meeting.

**The CNCC representative** emphasised the importance of using evaluation to improve outcomes in current and future programmes. While the representative acknowledged the difficulty of assessing gender impacts and creating variables against which to measure sustainable development impacts, she advised the SEUPB to avoid the “tick-box” feel of previous evaluation relating to the horizontal principles of equality and sustainable development.

**The IBEC representative** asked if the approved evaluation criteria would remain static until the end of the Programme, or if there would be future opportunities for adaptation, given ongoing economic changes across the three jurisdictions.

Secondly, **the IBEC representative** stated he found the proposed evaluation questions failed to gain sufficient insight into the technical nature of the specific sectors under examination, for example, around employment and economic activity. He asked where the PMC might provide feedback in this regard.

Furthermore, he advised the SEUPB to develop links between businesses and the research institutions to demonstrate that the academic work is applicable in the market place. He felt that the Programme should demand more of applicants in terms of pragmatic outputs from the outset of their project.

**The Chair** suggested setting an 8<sup>th</sup> January 2016 deadline, allowing the Committee to provide comments on the Evaluation Plan, which the SEUPB would combine with the Commission’s comments and re-circulate to the Committee.

**The Wheel representative** reiterated that the outcomes and their indicators should be expanded upon and established as soon as possible: he believed the framework from page 21 of the Evaluation Plan requires further examination and acknowledged the difficulty in this task.

**The Wheel representative** also suggested the immediate establishment of the ESG and recruitment of sectoral experts to guide the Group.

**The NWRA representative** advised the SEUPB and fellow Committee members to be realistic in their expectations of Programme evaluation as the Commission apply one rule for evaluation across all EU Programmes, and INTERREG VA is a cross- border programme among a number of other national programmes and interventions.

He also advised the SEUPB to avoid a “top-heavy” ESG composition, rather to retain a small number of members with key evaluation experience.

He continued to reassure Members that the Plan was open to mid-term evaluation and therefore adaptation of the Programme at mid-point, and stressed the importance of also measuring the strength of partnerships and cooperation across the borders of the three jurisdictions when measuring Programme impacts.

Lastly, **the NWRA representative** expressed his confidence that the ESG will effectively assess and monitor the procurement of external evaluators, and acknowledged that previous expenditure on evaluation did not yield robust results

**The Equality Commission NI representative** also acknowledged the discussion and reminded the Committee that the comments made apply to the next stage and are for the ESG to progress towards the February 2016 deadline.

She returned to approval of the Evaluation Plan as requested, expressing her opinion that the basic framework was in place, however, some points require clarification. She suggested the SEUPB further emphasise that the proposed evaluation questions and the indicative budget are indicative only and open to the incorporation of comments made today, at the decision and discretion of the ESG.

**The Chair** took this opportunity to refer to NISRA, with whom the SEUPB would work closely on Programme Monitoring and Evaluation.

**The NISRA representative** agreed that the ESG should be established with immediate effect, and the Evaluation Plan is a process and is a draft only, which can absorb Member comments.

**The Chair** repeated her suggestion to establish a cut-off date of 8<sup>th</sup> January 2016 for two points of business;

1. To take Member comments and suggestions on the Evaluation Plan via e-mail
2. To accept volunteers and nominations to the Evaluation Steering Group, with a view to the first meeting being held in January 2016 to review and amend the

Evaluation Plan. The Plan will subsequently be re-issued to the PMC before submission to the EU Commission in February 2016.

**The Scottish Government International Innovation representative** queried how many nominees would be included on the ESG, whether the three jurisdictions would be equally represented, and if there is a requirement for specific expertise.

**The MA Director** and **the Chair** responded, with the assumption that all three Member States would be represented, as well as three other nominees from across the eligible region. He asked for balanced representation, as well as relevant experience in managing evaluations. Nominations will be accepted at today's meeting or via e-mail until 8<sup>th</sup> January 2016; the SEUPB will send a subsequent e-mail to request such nominations. The Group will meet in mid-January to amend the document with Member comments prior to the 13 February deadline, provided they are empowered to do so by the PMC.

Also, **the MA Director** agreed the Evaluation Plan would include a clear statement, emphasising that the Evaluation Plan will be presented to the PMC for review and approval on an annual basis, and is not a static document for one approval only.

**The Chair** thanked Members for their contribution.

**Action Point 5: SEUPB to circulate an e-mail following the PMC meeting, requesting nominations and volunteers to the Evaluation Steering Group (ESG) before the 8<sup>th</sup> January 2016.**

**Action Point 6: All final comments on the Evaluation Plan should be sent to SEUPB before the 8<sup>th</sup> January.**

**Action Point 7: SEUPB to circulate the final draft Evaluation Plan to the PMC in advance of the 13 February deadline.**

**The Monitoring Committee:**

- **Approved** the Evaluation plan for implementation in the INTERREG VA Programme, subject to incorporation of Commission, PMC and ESG comments on the budget, outcomes and procurement method.

## **8. A.O.B**

**The IBEC representative** commented on the forthcoming referendum on the UK leaving the EU and asked if SEUPB required PMC guidance in terms of the position of projects funded should the situation arise.

**The Chair** stated that it is anticipated that should this arise, it would take a number of years for the UK to leave the EU which should not impact on the current round of programmes.

**The Scotland Europa representative** reiterated that, through her organisations other engagement with EU Programmes, there is no suggestion of the Commission taking into account future EU membership when considering funding.

**The Chair** concluded the meeting by explaining the next meeting of the INTERREG VA Programme Monitoring Committee would be scheduled for early summer of 2016, and the SEUPB would be in contact in relation to the other points of business discussed today.

She thanked Members for attending and wished them a Merry Christmas.

## **ANNEX I**

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

**Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> December 2015, Crowne Plaza Hotel, Dundalk**

#### **ACTION POINTS**

<b>ACTION</b>	<b>TIMING</b>	<b>RESPONSIBILITY</b>
<b><u>Action Point 1</u></b> DFP representative's request for advanced notification of future workshops to be reflected in minutes of the previous meeting	As soon as possible	MA
<b><u>Action Point 2</u></b> Approved minutes to be added to the SEUPB website	As soon as possible	MA
<b><u>Action Point 3</u></b> The JS Director will further discuss the Scottish pre-application workshops with Scotland Europa	As soon as possible	JS
<b><u>Action Point 4</u></b> The SEUPB are to develop a mechanism of providing PMC members with regular updates on Programme implementation	As soon as possible	MA
<b><u>Action Point 5</u></b> SEUPB to circulate an e-mail following the PMC meeting, requesting nominations and volunteers to the Evaluation Steering Group. All nominations should be sent to MA before the 8th January.	Immediately following meeting	MA/PMC Members
<b><u>Action Point 6</u></b> Any further comments on the Evaluation Plan should be sent to MA.	Before the 8th January	PMC members
<b><u>Action Point 7</u></b> SEUPB to circulate the final draft Evaluation Plan to the PMC following ESG consideration.	In advance of 13 February submission deadline	MA

## **ANNEX II**

### **Attendance – INTERREG VA Programme Monitoring Committee –9<sup>th</sup> December 2015, Crowne Plaza, Dundalk**

#### **Chair**

Gina McIntyre (SEUPB)

#### **Members**

Wesley Aston	Ulster Farmers Union
Cllr Alex Baird	NILGA
Anne Buchanan	Scottish Government International Innovation
Alison Cairns	SCVO
Avril Hall Callaghan	Irish Congress of Trade Unions (NI)
Prof Sue Christie	Council for Nature Conservation & the Countryside (CNCC)
Robin Clarke	Highlands and Islands Enterprise
Ivan Cooper	The Wheel
Martin Cronin	Intertrade Ireland
Sean Cronin	Environmental Pillar
Michael D'Arcy	IBEC
Frank Duffy	Department of Finance and Personnel (DFP)
Sarah English	Scotland Europa
Jenny Faichney	Scottish Environment Protection Agency
Dr Maura Farrell	Irish Rural Link
Gerry Finn	Northern Western Regional Assembly (NWRA)
Blair Horan	ICTU Ireland
John Maxwell	Scottish Government
Dominic McCullough	Department of Finance and Personnel (DFP)
Geraldine McGahey	The Equality Commission for Northern Ireland (ECNI)
Cllr Dermot Nicholl	NILGA
Siobhan O'Higgins	Department of Public Expenditure & Reform (DPER)
Cllr Sean Smith	Northern Western Regional Assembly (NWRA)
Andrea Thornbury	NICVA
Jason Watts	Scottish Natural Heritage

Celeste Wilson

Scottish Government

### **Advisors**

Emer Connolly	Dept. of Environment, Community & Local Government (DECLG)
John Farrell	Dept of Health, Social Services & Public Safety (DHSSPS)
Owen Lyttle	Department of the Environment (DoE)
Edel Hendry	NISRA/ SEUPB
Shaun Henry	MA, SEUPB
Louise Kenny	Department of Health
Owen Lyttle	Department of the Environment (DoE)
Alison Moore	North South Ministerial Council (NSMC)
Lorraine McCourt	Joint Secretariat, SEUPB
Marian Mulholland	CA, SEUPB
Derek O'Neill	Department of Transport, Tourism & Sport (DTTAS)
Wendy Robinson	DHSSPS
Mark Stranaghan	Department of Regional Development (DRD)
Jim Sutherland	Department of Regional Development (DRD)
John Thompson	MA, SEUPB
Tim Weir	Department of Regional Development (DRD)
Gerry Wrynn	Department of Jobs, Enterprise & Innovation (DJEI)

### **Observers**

Gerry Bradley	Department of Finance & Personnel (DFP)
Caroline Coleman	Scottish Contact Point
Sean Kelly	Council for Nature Conservation & the Countryside (CNCC)
Stefania Minervino	Irish Human Rights & Equality Commission (IHREC)
Damien Ryan	DETINI
Sylvia Ryan	ICTU Ireland

### **Secretariat (SEUPB)**

Sarah Reid	Managing Authority
Tara McCormick	Managing Authority (minutes)

### **Apologies**

Ken Bishop	NILGA
Niall Powderly	Confederation of British Industry (CB)
Maria Jose Doval Tedin	EU Commission
Carole Sullivan	The Irish Human Rights and Equality Commission
John Farrell	DHSSPS
Emer McGeough	NSMC

### **ANNEX III**

#### **Glossary of acronyms used in the minutes:**

<b>CNCC</b>	<b>Council for Nature Conservation and the Countryside</b>
<b>DARD</b>	<b>Department of Agriculture and Rural Development</b>
<b>DECLG</b>	<b>Department of Environment, Community and Local Government</b>
<b>DETI (NI)</b>	<b>Department of Enterprise, Trade and Investment</b>
<b>DFP</b>	<b>Department of Finance and Personnel (Northern Ireland)</b>
<b>DHSSPS</b>	<b>Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety</b>
<b>DJEI</b>	<b>Department of Jobs, Enterprise and Innovation</b>
<b>DOE (NI)</b>	<b>Department of the Environment</b>
<b>DoH</b>	<b>Department of Health</b>
<b>DPER</b>	<b>Department of Public Expenditure and Reform</b>
<b>DRD</b>	<b>Department of Regional Development</b>
<b>ICTU</b>	<b>Irish Congress of Trade Unions</b>
<b>NICVA</b>	<b>Northern Ireland Council for Voluntary Action</b>
<b>NILGA</b>	<b>Northern Ireland Local Government Association</b>
<b>NISRA</b>	<b>Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency</b>
<b>NSMC</b>	<b>North South Ministerial Council</b>
<b>NWRA</b>	<b>Northern Western Regional Assembly</b>
<b>SCVO</b>	<b>Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations</b>
<b>SEUPB</b>	<b>Special European Union Programmes Body</b>
<b>JS</b>	<b>Joint Secretariat</b>
<b>MA</b>	<b>Managing Authority</b>