



European Union

European Regional
Development Fund
Investing in your future

**Minutes of the
Stage One PEACE IV Review Panel Meeting**

Thursday 25 May 2017, 10.00am
DPER Offices, Merrion Row, Dublin

In Attendance:	Gina McIntyre	SEUPB (Chair)
	Sean Kelly	MC Panel Member (via TC)
	Ivan Cooper	MC Panel Member
	Philip Graham	Independent Member
	Sarah Reid	SEUPB (Secretariat)

1. Introductions

The Chair welcomed Members to the Stage 1 Review Panel meeting of the PEACE IV 2014 – 2020 Programme which was convened to consider 2 Stage 1 applications; *Piping and Drumming in the Whole Community* (RSPBANI), submitted under the Children and Young People (14-24 years) call and *Newforge Community Complex* (PSNI), submitted under the Shared Spaces Capital Development call.

2. Agenda

Members agreed the agenda.

3. Register of Interests/Conflicts of Interest

No Conflicts of Interest were declared.

4. Review 1

Applicant: The Royal Scottish Pipe Band Association

Application: *Piping and Drumming in the Whole Community*

The Chair reminded the panel that the applicant has requested a review on the grounds 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 Chair also drew Members’ attention to the fact that the applicants had refused the opportunity to submit a written submission outlining their reasons for requesting the review.

The Chair confirmed that in line with the Review Procedure, the panel can only consider information which had been originally provided in the application – no new information can be considered.

The Panel discussed the application and agreed that there was no justification for the review request and given the numerous issues with the quality of the application, an in-depth analysis was unnecessary.

They made the following observations;

- There appeared to be a poor understanding in relation to the completion of the application form;
- They appeared to have missed the essence of the call and did not align with it;
- The application focused on teaching pipes and drums with little evidence of the development of piping and drumming into cultural areas;
- The majority of budget appears to be allocated to members of the organisation and only presents figures for one year;
- There remained no logical reason to approve the application.

The panel agreed that based on the information presented to the Steering Committee and that presented to the Review Panel, the decision of the Steering Committee was not unreasonable and therefore should be upheld

5. Review 2

Applicant: Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI)

Application: Newforge Community Complex

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

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

The Panel considered the application against the first ground for appeal, i.e. 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 Panel considered whether the score of 1 out of 5 against the Quality of Project Design criterion was reasonable and made the following comments;

- The Panel agreed that some of the terminology used in the assessment report could have potentially influenced the Steering Committee decision particularly in relation to the proposed location which is in an affluent area;
- The Panel agreed that repeating the terminology such as the '*Newforge Country Club*', which the applicant had used in the application form, could have potentially swayed the tone of the assessment;
- The Panel agreed that the location proposed could be very advantageous in bringing schools and community groups together;
- The Panel questioned the assessment assumption that groups may not wish to attend at the proposed location and '*socialise with the police*';

- The Panel believed that there are potential advantages in the PSNI engaging with all communities and the project could therefore be an exemplar;
- The Panel agreed that the location of a project of this nature which has a regional reach can be located anywhere and should not be judged against its postcode;
- The Panel agreed that whilst the applicant had cited other approved projects in relation to their location, the application must be reviewed on the basis of the information provided to the Steering Committee only.

The Panel agreed that based on the information provided to the Steering Committee, the score of 1 was unreasonable and that, although the review panel was not re assessing the application, the members believed there was merit in the project, and given the issues raised above the application should be referred back to the steering committee.

The Panel considered whether the score of 2 out of 5 against the Value for Money criterion was reasonable and made the following comments;

- The assessment under this criterion links the scoring to the issues regarding location of the project which the Panel agreed could have been potentially influenced by the tone of the assessment (as outlined above);
- The Panel agreed that the cross-community aspect of the project could have been better developed by the applicant;
- The Panel questioned whether the target groups proposed had been sufficiently acknowledged by the assessor as they appeared to demonstrate an inclusive approach;
- The Panel agreed that whilst the project partnership extended beyond the PSNI, the assessor may not have fully understood this, however it was noted that it may have been more advantageous for the applicant to have fully reflected the wider trust partnership in their title and descriptions;
- The Panel noted that they would have expected to see support from organisations outside the security forces but this could have been developed for the stage 2 application.

The Panel agreed that based on the information provided to the Steering Committee, the score of 2 was unreasonable, and should be revisited by the steering committee.

The Panel considered the application against the second ground for appeal, i.e. that there was a failure in adherence to procedures or systems that materially affected or could have materially affected the decision and made the following comments.

- Shared concerns regarding potential ambiguity in relation to the interpretation of required character count/word count;
- The information provided which was not assessed due to the applicant breaching the character count may have materially affected in a positive way ,the Steering Committee's decision;
- The Panel questioned whether guidance provided in terms of completion of the Stage 1 application was sufficiently clear, particularly as there was a new application form introduced;
- The Panel questioned whether there had been clarity regarding the requirement for 'mandatory information' following the revised application form;
- The Panel agreed that the 'mandatory information' issue only related to the capital build element (value for money) and does not deal with some of the issues presented around need or location;
- It was accepted that all applications had to comply with the character count limit and therefore all applications were assessed equally against this requirement, however the panel questioned if all applicants had been given adequate information regarding the character count.
- The two issues of character count and the absence of sufficient information outlining the need and cross community aspect of the project were inter linked.

The Panel agreed that the Steering Committee should ensure that there is sufficient clarity in relation to guidance provided to applicants during both stages of the application process, however concluded that in the absence of the full facts regarding information about whether the applicant was given appropriate advice regarding the character count and if all applicants had been treated fairly, they could not reach a decision on a breach in process. However given the issues cited in relation to procedure and how this information, if considered admissible, may or may not have materially affected the

decision of the Steering Committee, the panel decided that sufficient doubt existed, and therefore the steering committee should re consider the application.

In line with the Review Procedure, the Review Panel are required to make their decision based on the information provided to the Steering Committee and on this basis, the Panel agreed that the decision of the Steering Committee was unreasonable and therefore should be overturned.