

GOOD RELATIONS STEERING PANEL

MINUTES OF MEETING

FRIDAY, 7th MARCH, 2008

Members present: Councillor Long (Chairman); and
Councillors Kyle, C. Maskey, McCausland and Stoker.

External Members: Rev. D. Baker, Presbyterian Church;
Canon B. Dodds, Church of Ireland;
Rev. S. Watson, CALEB;
Mr. P. Scott, Catholic Church;
Mrs. H. Smith, Methodist Church;
Mr. K. Salem, Northern Ireland Council
for Ethnic Minorities; and
Dr. D. Morrow, Community Relations Council.

In attendance: Ms. H. Francey, Good Relations Manager;
Miss A. Deighan, Good Relations Officer;
Mr. D. Robinson, Good Relations Officer;
Miss C. Wilson, Conflict Transformation
Project Manager; and
Mr. J. Heaney, Committee Administrator.

Apologies

Apologies for inability to attend were reported from Councillor Hanna and Mr. Galway.

Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of 8th February were taken as read and signed as correct.

Notice of Motion

Reduction and Removal of Peace Walls

The Steering ~~Panel~~Group was reminded that the Council, at its meeting on 3rd March, in accordance with Standing Order 11(e) had referred to the Good Relations Steering Panel the undernoted Notice of Motion which had been proposed by Councillor Maginness and seconded by Councillor Long:

“Belfast City Council resolves that it is now time to begin to work towards the reduction and the ultimate removal of the so called ‘peace walls’ and barriers that presently divide our City.

To this end, the Council therefore agrees to establish a working group to explore ways and means to initiate such a process and to report back with proposals by September, 2008.”

NOM <->

The Good Relations ~~Manager~~Officer advised the Members that ~~_work in relation to the Notice of Motion would be undertaken by~~ the Good Relations Unit would prepare

~~and that a report in relation to the Notice of Motion and would thereon would be submitted~~ to the Panel in due course for its consideration.

The Panel noted the information.

Peace III – Proposals for Recruitment and Selection of Representatives for the Good Relations Partnership

The ~~Steering Panel~~Committee considered the undernoted report in relation to the recruitment and selection of representatives for the Good Relations Partnership:

“Relevant Background Information

The Steering Panel will recall that at its last meeting it agreed the composition of the proposed Good Relations Partnership, which will replace the current Good Relations Steering Panel. Members should be aware that the use of the term ‘partnership’ does not signify and is not intended to form a legal partnership between the parties.

Members will be aware that in some cases, the method of selecting appropriate sectoral representatives will be relatively straightforward, as nominations may be sought from particular organisations or relevant umbrella organisations. In these cases, letters have already been issued inviting nominations.

<u>Sector</u>	<u>No. to be appointed</u>	<u>Method of recruitment and selection</u>
<u>elected Councillors</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1 representative from each party group</u>
<u>statutory agencies</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Letter to Chief Executives’ Group inviting nominees</u>
<u>trade unions</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Letter to ICTU inviting nominees</u>
<u>private business sector</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Letters to CBI and BCCM inviting 1 nominee each</u>
<u>minority faith groups</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Letter to NI Inter-Faith Forum inviting nominee</u>
<u>churches</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Meeting to be held with church reps re best method of securing 2 nominations</u>
<u>voluntary/community sector</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>Posts to be advertised and applicants short-listed and interviewed by panel</u>
<u>minority ethnic groups</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Post to be advertised and applicants short-listed and interviewed by panel</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>20</u>	

However, in other cases there are no generally agreed and acceptable umbrella organisations and this is particularly true of the voluntary and community sector. At its last meeting, in regard to this sector, the Steering Panel agreed that ‘the Council will set the criteria for the representatives to be appointed and will undertake the associated recruitment process itself.’

This paper sets out proposed options for the recruitment and selection of representatives from the voluntary/community and the minority ethnic group sectors.

Key Issues

Public advertisements will be placed inviting nominations, using the same electronic media as those used to promote the consultation process for the Peace Plan, to encourage a wide range of candidates to apply. A full recruitment and selection process will then be undertaken for these nominations.

To allow us to compare candidates in an equitable fashion, short-listing will be done on the basis of information provided on the application form alone; CVs will not be accepted and we may choose to reject any forms which are not fully completed. All applicants must also complete monitoring forms for Equal Opportunities.

Candidates who are short-listed and chosen for interview may, as part of the selection process, be asked to prepare a presentation.

The selection process will be in 2 stages¹. Selection on merit is a fundamental principle; the first stage is based solely on merit and is designed to identify those candidates who are suitable for appointment. Decisions at this stage will be made in accordance with the requirements outlined in the person specification (attached). The second stage is to ensure that membership of the Panel is representative of the diversity of the Council area and the criteria for the final selection and subsequent appointment can take account of the need to include a balance of backgrounds and skills.

The Council is aware of its statutory obligations under disability legislation and is particularly keen to encourage disabled people to participate on the Partnership.

Members should be aware that there may be considerable interest in these places and we may expect large numbers of applicants, which will mean substantial time being spent on short-listing, interviewing etc.

¹ Based on *Appointment of independent members to District Policing Partnerships and Belfast District Policy Partnership Sub-groups: Code of Practice*, Northern Ireland Office, November 2007

Composition of Interviewing Panel

There are various options:

1. The interview panel could be made up of one or two Elected Members and one external member. There should be a mix of gender and community backgrounds and they must all have received training in Council recruitment and selection procedures. The interview panel would also include an experienced member of the recruitment staff from the Council's Human Resources Service, to ensure that the process is absolutely fair and transparent and satisfies all relevant guidelines and legislation. It may be preferable for the HR officer to chair the interview panel. The whole process would be supported and serviced by staff from the Good Relations Unit.
2. A member of staff from the Community Relations Council could act as observer only on the interview panel (as agreed with SEUPB) to provide a level of impartiality to the process, ensuring that the Council cannot be accused of political favouritism or partisanship in the selection of Partnership representatives.
3. An external recruitment agency could be engaged to manage and undertake the process. Members should note that this would be considerably more expensive and it is not certain that SEUPB would be prepared to pay this additional cost.

Recommendation

That the Good Relations Steering Panel considers and selects one of the options outlined above, so that public advertisements may be devised and placed within the next few weeks, to commence the recruitment process."

REPORT 2 <>

The Good Relations Manager advised the Committee that, following negotiations with the various Church representatives, it was recommended that the number of Church representatives on the Partnership be increased from two to four ~~persons~~, that is, two from the Catholic Church and two ~~persons~~ to represent the various Protestant denominations. She explained that at the meeting with the Church representatives it had also been suggested that it would be beneficial if a Churches Forum ~~were~~ formed to ~~consider~~ look, not only ~~at~~ Good Relations issues, but all matters ~~relat~~ pertaining to the Council. She undertook to examine the possibility of establishing such a Forum for Belfast.

The Good Relations Manager reported that she had taken advice from both Legal Services and Human Resources in preparing the report. The Human Resources

Section was prepared to assist but had pointed out that their own resources were currently under pressure; they had suggested using the services of AS Associates, who have already been commissioned under a standard tendering procedure to provide additional HR recruitment and selection services to the Council. The Good Relations Manager advised the Steering Panel that the SEUPB had now confirmed that it would meet 100% of the costs of commissioning such an external recruitment agency to assist in this process and she recommended that AS Associates be requested to support the interview panel in this process. She undertook to bring back a report outlining the suggested process in more detail to the next meeting of the Steering Panel.

The Steering Panel indicated that they wanted to generate the widest possible pool of applicants for the Partnership and were keen to take part in the interview process.

After discussion, the Steering Panel agreed:

- (i) to engage AS Associates an external recruitment agency to facilitate the administration of the interview process by providing all the necessary forms and advertisements and supporting the interview panel as required. draft application forms, preparing relevant advertisements, and drawing up the personnel specification;
- (ii) that the interviews would be carried out in line with Option 1 incontained in the foregoing report and, if possible, that a representative from the Community Relations Council act in an observer capacity only on the interview panel; and
- (iii) that an additional two Church representatives be includpermitted on the Good Relations Partnership as outlined.

that the Good Relations Unit should examine the possibility of establishing a Churches Forum for Belfast.

Peace III Update on Progress

The Good Relations Manager reported on a meeting she had that held recently a meeting had taken place with representatives of the Community Relations Council and Border Action to discuss the Council's Peace & Reconciliation Plan (Peace Plan)-Good Relations Action Plan. She explained that those organisations, acting on behalf of the Special European Union Programmes Body (SEUPB), had starequested that the Peace Plan should be much more detailed, setting out which organisations are to receive funding, how much they are to receive and when this is to be allocated over the three year period 2007-2010. greater detail from the Action Plan including specific examples of the objectives, timescale and proposed budgets. She reminded the Steering Panel that the Plan currently outlined the areas of work the Council intended to concentrate on and the groups with whom we might be likely to work, but specific details of the level required by the SEUPB could However, it was not be provided at this stage as that would pre-empt the decisions of the Partnership, which was still in the process of being established.

In addition, no firm budget allocation had yet been confirmed so detailed planning was impossible. It appeared that the possible allocation might be £6 million, half of the Council's bid amount and the Good Relations Manager reported that she was concerned that that this amount had been decided on in advance of the SEUPB having sight of any Peace Plans.

~~_____ pointed out that this might be difficult as the partnership had not yet been formed and no budget had been agreed. The Panel was advised that the SEUPB had set a deadline of 31 March timescale for the submission of Peace the Plans was 31st March and it appeared that, despite repeated requests made to SEUPB, this date would not be altered. The Good Relations Manager stated that, given the work already undertaken by the Council and the work which still remained to be completed, it would not be possible practical for the Plan to be completed to the level of detail demanded by the SEUPB at this stage.~~

~~_____ finished within the proposed timescale. However, the Good Relations Managershe reported that the SEUPB had now confirmed that it would meet 100% of the costs of commissioning external consultancy support, subject to their normal procurement procedures, to assist in providing additional information which required to be included in the Peace Plan. She therefore recommended that an external consultant be 100% funding would be made available to appointed consultants in order to ensure that thise work cwould be completed as soon as possible.~~

~~_____ The organisations had indicated further that they were content with the consultation exercise which had been carried out. However, they indicated that the Cross Border element of the Plan remained light.~~

~~_____ The Members were advised further that information had been received indicating that the budget for the implementation of the Plan would be £6 million as opposed to £12 million which had been indicated previously. The Good Relations Manager informed the Panel that it was indicated clearly within the draft plan that it could only be regarded as indicative at this point and the plan could not pre-empt the decisions of the partnership which would be appointed at a later date.~~

Several Members expressed their concern at the deadlines set by the SEUPB and suggested that the matter should be raised with the relevant Minister (Department of Finance & Personnel) and that representatives from SEUPB be invited to address the Panel in relation to the Peace III Programme.development of the Peace Plan.

After further discussion, the Steering Panel noted the information which had been provided, agreed that external consultancy support be sought as outlined and agreed that an invitation be forwarded to Mr. P. Colgan, Chief Executive of ,the Special European Union Programmesject Bodyard, to attend a special meeting of the Steering Panel to discuss the Members' concerns in relation to the Peace Plan.

Conflict Transformation Project

The Conflict Transformation Project Manager provided an update on the work which had been undertaken to date in connection with the Project. She outlined the background to the establishment of the Project and how it integrated with various Council plans and initiatives. She pointed out that the Project was an inter-agency partnership, the aim of which was to promote coherent, sustainable and effective partnership working which would support conflict transformation and good relations work in the City by strengthening current good practices and promoting the strategic use of available resources.

The Panel was advised of the actions which had taken place during the previous 12 months, including the delivery of sixteen seminars, four research reports, the holding of several meetings of senior officers and the organisation of study visits to Chicago and Leicester. The Project Manager outlined the findings of the research and advised the Members how the Project linked with other Council agendas, including

place-shaping and urban regeneration, wealth creation, health improvement, community safety and democratic participation. The Members were advised that within the next few months several other elements of the Project would be instigated, including further study visits and a return visit ~~and to Belfastthe City~~ by representatives of Leicester City Council. Research would be instigated also in relation to connectivity and mobility, various photographic and poster exhibitions would be organised and an evaluation of the Project would be undertaken. In conclusion, the Members were advised of the emerging recommendations from the Project in relation to governance, the development of shared spaces and interface regeneration.

In response to several Members' questions, the Conflict Transformation Manager indicated that there was a close working relation with other Council Departments and other statutory agencies throughout the City in order to facilitate the work of the Project.

After discussion, the Steering Panel noted the information which had been provided and agreed that a return visit to ~~Belfastthe City~~ by Representatives from Leicester City Council be organised.

Elected Members Study Visit

The Committee considered the undernoted report in relation to a study visit to Chicago:

“Relevant Background Information

In December 2007, Belfast City Council was successful in its application to the Belfast Local Strategy Partnership to draw down funding under Measure 3.1 of the EU Programme for Peace & Reconciliation in Northern Ireland (Peace II) Extension 00–07. The total grant-aid was almost £750,000 to support the Conflict Transformation Project.

As part of this project, a visit for senior officers of 15 public agencies in Belfast was facilitated by the Council in October 2007 to Chicago, Illinois.

Key Issues

1. Within the programme for the Conflict Transformation Project, a visit for elected Members is planned for the week commencing 26th May 2008 to Chicago, Illinois. In discussion with Members, it has been agreed that this will allow us to consolidate the messages emerging from the first senior officers' visit to Chicago, namely, the strong inter-linkages between good relations and economic competitiveness.

Chicago offers opportunities to learn from their city's experiences in managing inter-ethnic relations, as well as exploring concepts of leadership, effective governance in contested arena and building global competitiveness.

Throughout the first study visit to Chicago for senior officers, it was stressed that political leadership in this complex area is critical. This visit to Chicago would offer

an opportunity for debate on the various issues that this important agenda presents.

The aim of the visit would be to engage the city's elected representatives in discussions on the task of transforming a divided city and the leadership skills needed to deliver collaborative good relations programmes for the city. The opportunities for cross-party dialogue on the commissioned research and outputs of the officers' visit will be critical in ensuring that the elected leadership of the city are able to engage with these complex and challenging issues.

2. Why Chicago?

Segregation in the Chicago metropolitan area persists in the 21st Century in much the same way as it persisted in the 20th Century. Chicago ranks among the ten metropolitan areas with the most Black/White segregation, and Latinos in Chicago live in more pronounced segregation than Latinos in any other major metropolis. Research on changes in the metropolitan area over the past 10 years show that there are plenty of opportunities for racial and ethnic integration to take hold in the metropolitan area. Notwithstanding this, in 2006, Chicago was rated by the Financial Times as the fastest growing city in North America, in terms of economic competitiveness, largely shaped by Mayor Daley's 'growth-is-good' leadership. Chicago is seen as a city that had transformed itself around these agendas, albeit with many problems remaining, particularly within the Southside African-American communities and continuing problems of residential segregation.

The core assumption in Chicago is that the most successful cities have taken an integrated approach to the core challenges of global competitiveness, social inclusion and community cohesion, underpinned by co-operative systems of governance. Talent, a key driver of city development, wants a 'tolerant, safe, clean and green' place to live in so that competitiveness also depends on the quality of the environment and the quality of life within that environment. Chicago points to what is possible and may enable creative thinking about practical projects that could address some of the more serious problems in Belfast.

3. Draft Purpose of the visit:

- To engage Belfast's elected representatives in discussions on the task of building a welcoming, peaceful, prosperous and open Belfast.

4. Draft Objectives

1. To learn from the other experiences of managing inter-ethnic relations and processes of social regeneration in Chicago;
2. To reflect on the experience of governing a contested city and further develop inter-party dialogue on the Good Relations Plan;
3. To explore the political challenges of promoting increased shared services and public spaces;
4. To sustain the project's recommendations into the political arena and mainstream within corporate planning processes.

Further discussion will take place with Members over coming weeks to further refine these objectives and plan the programme.

5. Participation

Initially, the budget was designed to facilitate the participation of one member from each of the 6 political groups in the Council. As the Conflict Transformation Project reports to the Good Relations Steering Panel, the 6 elected representatives from the Panel have agreed to participate. However, with savings in other parts of the budget, it is possible to invite an additional representative from each party group. Members within the Council will be aware that there are a series of agenda competing for priority; it is recommended that by engaging a broader group of elected Members, we will be able to effectively demonstrate the cross-cutting thematic nature of good relations to the development of the city.

A facilitator for the visit will be tendered through the standard Council procedures.

Resource Implications

Financial

The project is 100% grant-aided under the Peace II extension programme through BLSP. A detailed spend profile has been submitted to the BLSP and monthly meetings are held with the Council's Chief Executive's Business Support Manager to monitor spend.

<u>Flights</u>	<u>18 persons x £500</u> <u>Direct flight Dublin – Chicago</u>	<u>9,000</u>
<u>Accommodation</u>	<u>18 persons x 5 nights x £200</u>	<u>18,000</u>
<u>Food</u>	<u>18 x £70 x 5 days</u>	<u>6,300</u>
<u>Internal transport</u>		<u>1,500</u>
<u>Venue costs</u>		<u>1,500</u>
<u>Facilitation</u>	<u>£350 x 10 days</u>	<u>3,500</u>

<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>£39,800</u>
---------------------	-----------------------

All services will be sourced in accordance with BLSP's strict quotation requirements.

Human Resources

All posts are 100% grant-aided under the Peace II extension programme through BLSP.

Recommendations

The Steering Panel recommends to the Strategic Policy & Resources Committee that elected Members participate in this study visit as outlined above.

Key to Abbreviations

BLSP – Belfast Local Strategy Partnership.”

REPORT 5 <->

After discussion, the Steering Panel recommended that the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee approve the Members' participation of the Members and up to four officers in the aforementioned study visit.

Bonfire Management Programme

Mr. Robinson, Good Relations Officer, reminded the Members that the Bonfire Management Programme was a Council-led initiative which sought to bring about greater management of bonfires in Belfast. He stated that, following the Council's approval for the continuation of the Programme in November 2007,¹⁷ information and guidelines had been issued to all of those groups who had participated in 2007. This had provided for a two-month consultation period within each participating community on the aims, guidelines and implications for the continuation of their participation in the Programme. The first target date for the groups to declare their intentions had been 15th February and, at that time, fourteen groups had indicated their willingness to participate. These were:

- Sunningdale
- Tigers Bay
- Woodvale
- Shore Crescent
- Highfield and Springmartin
- Inverary
- Pitt Park

- Annadale
- Suffolk
- Taughmonagh
- Finaghy (Benmore)
- Donegal Road
- Donegal Pass
- Sandy Row

The Panel was advised that funding for the 2008 Programme had already been secured from various sources, including the Northern Ireland Housing Executive (£25,000) and the Police Service for Northern Ireland (£25,000).

The Members were ~~informed advised further~~ that the Community Safety ~~U~~unit of the Northern Ireland Office had provided £7,500 to be administered by the Good Relations Unit to assist bonfire committees to tackle anti-social behaviour and provide diversionary activities for young people over the Easter holiday period. ~~would include within its draft 2008/2009 budget a contribution towards the Programme and a further application would be made to the Community Relations Council for funding in respect of the "reflect and capacity building" element of the Programme.~~

The Good Relations Officer advised the Members that the first meeting of the inter-agency group had taken place in January and had included representatives from several key stakeholders. ~~H~~~~in addition, he~~ informed the Panel that the Council had undertaken a significant piece of internal work to identify how different sections of the organisation might co-operate in a more efficient manner to provide better service delivery for the Programme.

The Good Relations Officer indicated that, in addition to those organisations which had indicated their willingness to participate in the Programme, ten further communities had expressed an interest. While it had not been possible to include these communities within the formal programme, some engagement on bonfire issues had already taken place with the groups involved.

After discussion, the Steering Panel noted the progress which had been achieved to date in respect of the Bonfire Management Programme and agreed that the Good Relations Unit administer the funding allocated to bonfire committees by the Community Safety Unit of the Northern Ireland Office for diversionary activities for young people over the Easter holiday period.

Re-Imaging Communities Scheme

Ms. A. Deighan, Good Relations Officer, provided a report in respect of the Re-imagining Communities Programme. She outlined the background to the ~~i~~initiative which had been scheduled to run from July, 2006 till July, 2009. However, she pointed out that the Arts Council of Northern Ireland had, without consultation, changed the end date and this had now been brought forward to March, 2009.

The Good Relations Officer reported that during Phase 1 of the Project the Council had received £24,000 to carry out an extensive feasibility scoping study to identify and co-ordinate projects throughout the City and that, following a procurement exercise, the New Belfast Community Arts Initiative had been engaged to carry out a citywide study which had commenced in Spring, 2007. Following receipt of the report, a total of eighteen separate applications had been made to the Arts Council of Northern Ireland for funding. Of those applicants, six had proved viable and could therefore be completed within the required timescale. Four required to be extended beyond the March, 2009 deadline, three were still awaiting decisions, three had been deferred, one project had been requested to reduce its budget and one had been rejected. Funding applications totalling £328,325 had been submitted and to date awards in the sum of £193,025 had been made.

The Good Relations Officer advised the Panel that funding had been secured for the employment of one Project Officer and for one Facilitator, rather than the two which had been requested. ~~In addition, the Council had requested two facilitators but had~~

~~been awarded funding for one.~~ The Good Relations Officer pointed out that this would ~~hamper/inhibit~~ the smooth running of the Programme, ~~which would be delivered in association with staff from the Development Department's Culture & Arts and Planning Units.~~

After discussion, during which several Members expressed concern about the proposed timetable and the shortfall in the funding ~~for officers~~, the Panel agreed that the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee be recommended to provide additional funding, up to a maximum of £15,000, to secure the services of an additional officer on a part-time basis ~~Project Officer~~ for a one-year period to ensure that the expectations of local community groups regarding this scheme were met. The Good Relations Manager confirmed that the Good Relations Unit had made provision for this expenditure within its budget. The Steering Panel ~~and~~ approved the programme as outlined and agreed further that the Arts Council of Northern Ireland be requested to extend the deadline for submission of projects.

Good Relations Grant-Aid

The Good Relations Manager submitted for the information of the Panel a report detailing a summary of applications to the Good Relations Grant-Aid fund, together with the associated recommendations.

After discussion, the Steering Panel agreed unanimously that the grant-aid be awarded, under the delegated authority of the Chief Executive, to the following organisations:

<u>Reference Number</u>	<u>Organisation</u>	<u>Recommendation £</u>
307/1132	Northern Ireland Tolerance, Education Cultural Association (<u>NI-TECA</u>)	£1,842
675/1138	Education Welfare Project Team	£960
676/1139	A-Freek-A Limited	£3,600
680/1147	Lower Falls Youth Providers (in partnership with Village Focus Group)	£10,000
	Provisional t Total this Month	<u>£16,384</u>

Intercultural Week – Proposed Information Event on Migrant Communities

The Good Relations Manager submitted for the Panel's attention a report in relation to the Intercultural and Anti-Racism Week which would take place ~~during the period~~ from 7th till 13th April. ~~The event was organised by the Equality Commission for Northern Ireland, the National Consultative Council on Racism and Interculturalism in Ireland and key social partners both the North and South.~~ The aim of the Intercultural Week was to challenge people to face up to issues around racism and discrimination and to look beyond stereotypes and myths surrounding migrant workers and their families.

~~To mark it was pointed out that as part of the~~ Intercultural Week, the Good Relations Unit in conjunction with the South Belfast Round Table was proposing to host an information event for migrant workers in Belfast at St. George's Market on 9th April between 5.30 p.m. and 8.30 p.m. ~~_an information event for migrant workers in Belfast.~~ ~~The format of the~~ event would involve bringing together key statutory and voluntary partners across the City who would each host a stand offering advice and information. As recommended by the Multi-Cultural Resource Centres, interpreters in the Polish, Slovak and Lithuanian languages would be available.

The Good Relations Manager outlined the partner organisations which would be participating and pointed out that the cost of the event would be £4,000, provision for which had been included within the Unit's Revenue Budget.

The Steering Panel endorsed the holding of the event.

Ongoing Issues: Update

St. Patrick's Day Events

Mr. D. Robinson, Good Relations Officer, reported that the Good Relations Unit had been charged by the Council with the organisation of the Carnival Parade which formed part of the Council's St. Patrick's Day celebrations. He reported that 550 people had indicated their willingness to ~~take part participate~~ in the Parade in 2008 and pointed out that those ~~participants persons~~ were from a range of various groups from all over the city. ~~sections of the community.~~

The Chairman thanked all those persons responsible for the work in relation to the St. Patrick's Day event which had seen the celebrations becoming more inclusive, with participants drawn from all sections of the community.

"Local Governments in Conflict Prevention, Peace-Building and Post-Conflict Reconstruction" Resolution Conference

The Good Relations Manager advised the Panel that correspondence had been received in connection with the holding of the first annual ~~"The role of Local Governments in Conflict Prevention, Peace-Building and Post-Conflict Reconstruction Conference" to be held in The Hague, The Netherlands from 11-13 June 2008~~ Conflict Resolution Conference' in the Hague, The Netherlands and requesting that a representative of Belfast City Council participate.

After discussion, the Steering Group agreed that the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee be recommended to approve the attendance at the Conference of the Chairman of the Good Relations Steering Panel Panel and the Good Community Relations Manager (or their nominees) and to approve the payment of the conference fees, together with the appropriate travelling and subsistence allowances in connection therewith.

Chairman



