



European Union

European Regional
Development Fund
Investing in your future

Minutes of the Stage Two PEACE IV Review Panel Meeting

14 June 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)
	Ivan Cooper – by teleconference	MC Panel Member
	Maureen Brennan	Independent Member
	Mark Feeney	SEUPB (observing)
	James Russell	SEUPB (observing)
	Gráinne Vallely – by teleconference	SEUPB (minutes)
Apologies:	Sean Kelly	MC Panel Member

1. Introductions

The Chair welcomed Members to this Stage Two Review Panel meeting of the PEACE IV 2014 – 2020 Programme. Ivan Cooper joined the meeting by teleconference. Sean Kelly was unable to attend, however had forwarded his comments in advance of the meeting to be included in the discussion.

2. Independent Evaluation

The Review Panel met to discuss this application for review on 15 May 2018, however, they deferred their decision pending an independent evaluation matters raised as part of the review process, and of the information provided within the project application.

The Chair informed the Panel that an independent evaluation had been conducted by SJ Cartmin, who reviewed the application; points of clarity and responses; the economic appraisal; the assessment report; notes from the debriefing meeting; and request for review documentation.

SJ Cartmin also reviewed a successful Stage 2 application under Shared Spaces for purposes of comparison of the standard required.

A report was produced and issued to each of the Review Panel Members for consideration in advance of the meeting.

3. Review Panel Discussion

The Review Panel discussed the independent evaluators report and agreed that:

- A thorough review had been carried out and that the independent evaluation was fair;
- The first ground had been answered fully, and confirmed the view of the Review Panel; that there had been no failure in process or procedure that affected the decision; and
- It was noted that while the Economic Appraisal was not perfect, the Review Panel agreed that the recommendation was reasonable.

4. Conclusion

On the first ground of appeal, the Review Panel found no evidence of procedure or systems failure that affected the Steering Committee decision and therefore did not agree with the appellant that this was a legitimate ground for appeal.

On the second ground of appeal, that the outcome was a decision that no reasonable person would have made on the basis of the information provided to the Steering Committee. The Review Panel concluded, following their deliberations, that the original decision of the Steering Committee should be upheld.

The Chair ended the meeting and thanked the review panel members for their time and input to this review procedure.