



European Union

European Regional
Development Fund
Investing in your future

Minutes of the Stage Two PEACE IV Review Panel Meeting

15 May 2018
SEUPB Offices, Belfast

3.2 Shared Spaces Capital Development Project Applicant – Monaghan County Council (MCC) Project Title – Peace Campus

In Attendance:	Gina McIntyre	SEUPB (Chair)
	Sean Kelly	MC Panel Member
	Ivan Cooper	MC Panel Member
	Maureen Brennan	Independent Member
	Mark Feeney	SEUPB (observing)
	Gráinne Vallely	SEUPB (minutes)

1. Introductions

The Chair welcomed Members to this Stage Two Review Panel meeting of the PEACE IV 2014 – 2020 Programme.

2. Register of Interests/Conflicts of Interest

No conflict of interest was noted.

3. Review

The Chair reminded the panel that the applicant had requested a review on both grounds, i.e.:

- (a) There was a failure in adherence to procedures or systems that materially affected or could have materially affected the decision; and
- (b) The outcome was a decision that no reasonable person would have made on the basis of the information provided to the Steering Committee (SC).

The Chair confirmed that in line with Section 4.9 of the Review Procedure, the panel would consider ten-minute presentations from both the applicant and the Joint Secretariat (JS); both parties then joined the meeting.

The Chair introduced the Panel to Nicola Payne, Paul Clifford and Fintan McPhillips representing Monaghan County Council (MCC), and Paul Boylan and Brenda Hegarty, representing the Joint Secretariat (JS).

The project representatives proceeded to provide a ten minute PowerPoint presentation which outlined their reasons for requesting a review of the Steering Committee decision. The main points of the presentation were;

- MCC attended a pre-application workshop where they state they were informed by SEUPB that an Economic Appraisal would not form part of the assessment, and that assessment would be based on the application and business case alone. The subsequent reliance on the Economic Appraisal to form part of the assessment represented a failure to adhere to process.
- The output indicator guidance was not made available to applicants in advance of the deadline for applications.
- The Economic Appraisal of the project application contained inaccuracies and information unrelated to the project, and did not go far enough to describe the anticipated peace and reconciliation activities, expected outcomes and PUL engagement of the project.
- MCC were not afforded the opportunity to address inaccuracies or provide additional information or points of clarity for the Economic Appraisals that would have increased their score.

The Chair thanked the applicants for their presentation and invited the JS to provide a ten minute verbal response, which included the following main points;

- There has been no change in process. Slide 66 of the PowerPoint presentation used at the pre-application workshop mentioned, sets out the assessment process and mentions that an Economic Appraisal may be used.
- The output indicator guidance was available on SEUPB's website throughout the application process.

- SEUPB acknowledged that there were some inaccuracies within the Economic Appraisal, however these inaccuracies did not have a material impact upon the determination by the Economic Appraiser or Assessment Team.
- MCC were afforded the opportunity to address inaccuracies and provide additional information, however the responses lacked the clarity required to assist in the assessment process.

The Chair thanked the JS for their presentation and opened the meeting to further questions and discussion.

The Review Panel asked if the Steering Committee had seen the Economic Appraisal, the points of clarity questions raised during the assessment, and the responses. The JS confirmed that the Steering Committee received all documentation relating to the assessment of the project.

The Chair thanked the applicant and the JS, and they withdrew from the meeting.

The Review Panel discussed a number of areas including;

- Guidance to applicants – what guidance and support was made available through workshops and online content during the application process.
- Economic Appraisal - the extent to which the Economic Appraisal is standardised and the part it plays in informing the assessment report.
- Inaccuracies within the Economic Appraisal - it was noted that there were a number of inaccuracies however it was unclear if these materially impacted the specific area in which the application fell down.
- Letters of Support - whether these were specific enough in demonstrating need for a shared space.

The Review Panel concluded that they could not reach a determination on the complex matters raised during the meeting, at this time. Therefore it was agreed that SEUPB would conduct an independent assessment of the issues raised within the review meeting, as discussed above. In particular the assessment would consider if need had been adequately demonstrated by the applicant. The outcome of that independent assessment would be brought back to the review panel for a decision.

The Chair thanked the Panel and concluded the meeting, noting that she would reconvene the meeting upon receipt of the independent evaluation.