

## **GOOD RELATIONS PARTNERSHIP**

**FRIDAY, 13th MARCH, 2009**

### **MEETING OF THE GOOD RELATIONS PARTNERSHIP**

- Members present: Councillor McCausland (Deputy Chairman)  
(in the Chair); and  
Councillors C. Maskey, McCarthy and Stoker.
- External Members: Rev. S. Watson, CALEB;  
Ms. M. Marken, Catholic Church;  
Ms. A. McKenna, Belfast City Centre Management;  
Ms. S. Bhat, Northern Ireland Inter-Faith Forum;  
Ms. J. Hawthorne, Northern Ireland Housing Executive;  
Ms. A. Chada, Minority Ethnic Groups;  
Ms. M. de Silva, Voluntary/Community Sector;  
Mr. M. Wardlow, Voluntary/Community Sector;  
Mr. L. Reynolds, Voluntary/Community Sector; and  
Mr. S. Brennan, Voluntary/Community Sector.
- Also attended: Ms. E. Dargan ) Consortium of Community Relations  
Mr. P. Day ) Council and Border Action.
- In attendance: Ms. H. Francey, Good Relations Manager;  
Mr. I. May, Peace III Programme Manager; and  
Mr. N. Malcolm, Committee Administrator.

#### **Apologies**

Apologies for inability to attend were reported from the Chairman (Councillor Long), Councillor Kyle, Ms. H. Smith, Ms. E. Wilkinson and Messrs P. Scott, R. Galway and P. Mackel.

#### **Expression of Sympathy**

The Good Relations Manager reported that the mother of the Chairman (Councillor Long) had died the previous week. The Partnership extended to her family circle its condolences and deepest sympathy.

#### **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of 13th February were taken as read and signed as correct, subject to Councillor Stoker's name being included under Members present.

Arising from discussion on the minutes, the Good Relations Manager informed the Partnership that the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee, at its meeting on 20th February, had refused to provide financial assistance to enable four representatives from the Partnership to attend the Forum for Cities in Transition due to be held in Boston in April. Accordingly, the Council would not be represented at the event.

**Belfast City Centre Management**

The Chairman welcomed Ms. Amy McKenna to her first meeting as Belfast City Centre Management's representative on the Partnership and informed the Members that she was replacing Ms. Leanne Coates from that organisation.

**Recent Events in Northern Ireland**

The Good Relations Manager referred to the fatal shootings of two soldiers and a police officer which had taken place during the previous week and praised the Irish Congress of Trade Unions for its organisation of Silent Protests against such activities in various locations across Northern Ireland.

**Peace III – Geographic Spread  
of Small Grants**

The Peace III Project Manager reminded the Partnership that, at its meeting on 16th January, it had requested that information detailing the location of organisations which had submitted applications and those which had been approved for funding be provided. Accordingly, maps providing this information had been circulated to the Members. In answer to a Member's question, he indicated that those organisations which had not been shortlisted to receive assistance had been debriefed or offered a debrief regarding the reasons why they had been unsuccessful.

Arising from discussion in the matter, the Peace III Project Manager agreed to provide to a future meeting information regarding the grounds upon which groups had failed to be shortlisted for the award of Small Grants.

**Peace III – Commissioning Process:  
Summary of Expressions of Interest**

The Partnership considered the undernoted report:

**“Purpose of paper**

**To inform the Partnership of expressions of interest received in key actions of the Belfast Peace & Reconciliation Action Plan and to make recommendations on development of select lists relating to each action.**

**Background information**

**The Partnership agreed to invite expressions of interest on key actions within the Peace III Plan at its meeting on 5th December 2008. The call for Expressions of Interest opened on 12 Jan with a closing date of 2 Feb. The call was publically advertised and details placed on Belfast City Council website.**

These key actions are detailed below under the relevant theme.

### **Transforming Contested Space**

Projects supported under this theme will seek to reduce inter-community tensions and conflict as well as support the peace-building initiatives necessary for the regeneration of those neighbourhoods located at the interface.

- 2.2 Local Mediation Capacity Building Process
- 2.3 Intercommunity forum including dialogue on removal of interfaces
- 2.4 Engagement Capacity Building
- 2.7 Youth Intervention Programme

### **Shared Cultural Space**

Projects supported under this theme will celebrate and respect difference and build a sense of belonging for all the different cultural backgrounds and expressions of identity in the city.

- 3.1 City of Festivals
- 3.2 Inter-faith work
- 3.3 Cultural Diversity in Sport

### **Building Shared Organisational Space**

Projects supported under this theme will build the capacity of organisations to be able to challenge prejudice, intolerance, sectarianism and racism in a shared society.

- 4.1 Voluntary and Community Sector Training
- 4.2 Citizenship Education Programme

### **Key Issues**

Expressions of interest received were assessed against the following criteria:

- 1 Proposed methodology and its ability to deliver the specific outputs to schedule
- 2 Capability and capacity of the organisation and previous relevant experience
- 3 Ability to work in partnership

An overview of summaries of each submission along with comments are presented as separate appendices to this report. This overview includes organisation, key dates and target area detailed by electoral ward. For reference the electoral wards cover the following areas:

	Any parts or part of
Balmoral	Blackstaff, Finaghy, Malone, Musgrave, Upper Malone, Windsor
Castle	Bellevue, Castleview, Cavehill, Chichester Park, Duncairn, Fortwilliam
Court	Crumlin, Glencairn, Highfield, Shankill, Woodvale
Laganbank	Ballynafeigh, Botanic, Rosetta, Shaftesbury, Stranmillis
Lower Falls	Beechmount, Clonard, Falls, Upper Springfield, Whiterock
Oldpark	Ardoyne, Ballysillan, Cliftonville, Ligoniel, New Lodge, Waterworks
Pottinger	Ballymacarrett, Bloomfield, Orangefield, Ravenhill, The Mount, Woodstock
Upper Falls	Andersonstown, Falls Park, Glencolin, Glen Road, Ladybrook
Victoria	Ballyhackamore, Belmont, Cherryvalley, Island, Knock, Stormont, Sydenham

All original documentation received is available for inspection by Members of the Partnership.

### Overview

#### 2.2 Local Mediation Capacity Building Process

The following organisations submitted an expression of interest in the local mediation capacity building process:

- Mediation NI
- Business in the Community
- Intercomm
- CARR (Cavehill Antrim Road Regeneration)
- East Belfast Partnership

Following assessment it is recommended that the following organisations are included on a select list relating to this action:

- Mediation NI
- Business in the Community
- Intercomm
- East Belfast Partnership

CARR has not been included on the basis of the proposed methodology.

### **2.3 Intercommunity forum including dialogue on removal of interfaces**

The following organisations submitted an expression of interest against this action:

- Suffolk/Lenadoon Interface Group
- Greater Shankill Community Council
- Falls Community Council
- Belfast Interface Project
- Business in the Community
- CARR (Cavehill Antrim Road Regeneration)
- Interaction Belfast

Following assessment it is recommended that the following organisations are included on a select list relating to this action:

- Suffolk/Lenadoon Interface Group
- Greater Shankill Partnership
- Falls Community Council
- Belfast Interface Project
- Business in the Community
- CARR (Cavehill Antrim Road Regeneration)
- Interaction Belfast

### **2.4 Engagement Capacity Building**

The following organisations submitted an expression of interest against this action:

- Corpus Christi College
- Business in the Community
- Ligoniel Improvement Association
- Intercomm
- Blu Zebra
- Springvale Training
- Forward Learning
- CARR (Cavehill Antrim Road Regeneration)

Following assessment it is recommended that the following organisations are included on a select list relating to this action:

- Business in the Community
- Ligoniel Improvement Association
- Intercomm
- Blu Zebra
- Forward Learning

Corpus Christi College has not been included on the basis of proposed methodology. Springvale Training has not been included on basis of proposed methodology. CARR has not been included on the basis of the proposed methodology.

## **2.7 Youth Intervention Programme**

The following organisations submitted an expression of interest against this action:

- Cliftonville Community Regeneration Forum
- Springvale Training
- Inner East Youth Project
- Habitat for Humanity
- Co-operation Ireland
- Scoutlink Trust
- Conservation Volunteers NI
- Business in the Community
- Youth Action
- Forward Learning

Following assessment it is recommended that the following organisations are included on a select list relating to this action:

- Cliftonville Community Regeneration Forum
- Springvale Training
- Inner East Youth Project
- Habitat for Humanity
- Co-operation Ireland
- Scoutlink Trust
- Conservation Volunteers NI
- Business in the Community
- Youth Action
- Forward Learning

### **3.1 City of Festivals**

The following organisations submitted an expression of interest against this action:

- Festival of Fools
- Young at Art
- Beat Initiative
- QUB
- Arts Ekta
- Springvale Training

Following assessment it is recommended that the following organisations are included on a select list relating to this action:

- Festival of Fools
- Young at Art
- Beat Initiative
- QUB
- Arts Ekta

Springvale Training has not been included on basis of proposed methodology.

### **3.2 Inter-faith work**

The following organisations submitted an expression of interest against this action:

- Ballynafeigh Community Development Association
- Irish School of Ecumenics

Following assessment it is recommended that the following organisations are included on a select list relating to this action:

- Ballynafeigh Community Development Association
- Irish School of Ecumenics

### **3.3 Cultural Diversity in Sport**

The following organisations submitted an expression of interest against this action:

- Belfast Activity Centre
- Belfast Community Sport & Development Network

Following assessment it is recommended that the following organisations are included on a select list relating to this action:

- Belfast Activity Centre
- Belfast Community Sport & Development Network

#### **4.1 Voluntary and Community Sector Training**

The following organisations submitted an expression of interest against this action:

- Short Strand Community Forum
- Corpus Christi College
- WEA
- Business in the Community
- ArtsEkta
- Intercomm
- BURC
- Trademark
- Forward Learning

Following assessment it is recommended that the following organisations are included on a select list relating to this action:

- Short Strand Community Forum
- WEA
- Business in the Community
- ArtsEkta
- Intercomm
- BURC
- Trademark

Corpus Christi College have not been included on the basis of proposed methodology.

Forward Learning have not been included on the basis of proposed methodology.

#### **4.2 Citizenship Education Programme**

The following organisations submitted an expression of interest against this action:

- NI Children's Enterprise Centre
- Ulster People's College
- GEMS
- School of Social Entrepreneurs
- Intercomm



- Co-operation Ireland
- Conservation Volunteers NI
- Nerve Centre Studio ON
- Business in the Community
- Belfast Metropolitan College
- Forward Learning

Following assessment it is recommended that the following organisations are included on a select list relating to this action:

- NI Children's Enterprise Centre
- Ulster People's College
- GEMS
- School of Social Entrepreneurs
- Intercomm
- Co-operation Ireland
- Conservation Volunteers NI
- Nerve Centre Studio ON
- Business in the Community
- Belfast Metropolitan College
- Forward Learning

#### Next Steps

Following consideration by the Partnership detailed specifications will be developed based upon required outputs and desired outcomes in the Peace Plan with invitations to tender issued to those organisations as required.

#### Resource Implications

Expenditure incurred by Belfast City Council in its capacity as Lead Partner can be 100% recouped from the SEUPB under the terms of the Letter of Offer.

#### Recommendations

The Partnership is requested to approve the following:

- That select lists relating to each action are developed on the basis of the assessment of Expressions of Interest as outlined in this report.
- That these select lists remain in place until December 2010.

#### Officers to contact for further information:

Isaac May, Peace III Programme Manager, Ext 6034"

**Good Relations Partnership,  
Friday, 13th March, 2009**

During discussion in the matter, several Members expressed concern that there were areas throughout the City which were not covered by those groups which had been shortlisted, the fact that similar applications had been submitted by different organisations, the small number of applications in the areas of “inter-faith work” and “cultural diversity in sport” and the poor representation by women’s organisations.

In response, the Programme Manager indicated that the concerns expressed would be taken into account when the expressions of interest were being considered. In addition, when the Council was preparing the detailed specifications it would ensure that, prior to contracts being awarded, the relationships between organisations referred to in applications were meaningful.

Following further discussion, the Partnership adopted the recommendations contained within the foregoing report.

**Peace III – Revised Guidance  
Issued by SEUPB**

The Peace III Project Manager informed the Partnership that the Special European Union Programmes Body had issued the undernoted revised guidelines relating to the implementation plans under Priority 1.1:

**“Delivery Methods**

**The PEACE III Operational Programme outlines the role of Partnerships in the delivery of Priority 1.1 Building Positive Relationships at the local level. Unlike the PEACE II Programme, Partnerships in PEACE III are not Intermediary Funding Bodies. The Priority provides for the allocation of funding to a Partnership for the delivery of a strategic operation in their area.**

**There are three delivery methods available to Local Partnerships in the Implementation of the Local Action Plan as follows:**

- (i) Partner Delivery Agent**
- (ii) Public Procurement**
- (iii) Small Grants Programme**

**i) Partner Delivery Agent**

**As a Delivery Agent a partner can incur costs in their own right and procure goods and services as long as the role and responsibility of the partner in the delivery of aspects of the plan is defined in the Partnership Agreement.**

**A proposal from any partner should be subject to a robust assessment by the Lead Partner and the Selection Committee as would be the case with any proposal for funding. The Partner should submit a proposal to the lead partner and this proposal**

would normally contain the Aim, Objectives, Activities, Delivery Approach, Timescales, Outputs, Outcomes, Impacts, Costs, Strategic Fit with the Programme, Option and Priority Analysis, Rationale for partner to deliver, evidence of capacity to deliver and adherence to the cross cutting themes.

Normal conflict of interest procedures will apply. Once ratified by the Joint Committee or Local Council, as appropriate, a contract will be issued by the lead partner to the partner describing the detail of the activity, outputs, outcomes and costs. In advance of finalising the Partnership Agreement, Partnerships may wish to consider co-opting additional partners onto the partnership.

ii) Procurement

The Lead Partner can procure for the delivery of goods and services. The Procurement of aspects of the plan must be in accordance with Guidance Note G4/Peace III Procurement and Tendering. In a procurement process, a specification for the goods or services to be provided should be outlined by the Lead Partner.

The project selection criteria outlined in Guidance Note G1 Project Selection is not applicable to the procurement of activity for the action plan. The criteria and weighting for the assessment of the tenders must be outlined in the tender documentation and can include cost, experience and methodology.

Members of the Partnership are allowed to engage in the tendering process that emerges from any public procurement initiative. This will ensure that a key player who has the competence and capacity to deliver an important part of the Plan will not be excluded from so doing because they are a member of the Partnership and because, in the interests of total transparency, a decision was taken to opt for public procurement.

It is essential that the public procurement process is conducted in a manner that conforms to the highest standards in the management of public money. A clean and transparent audit trail must be kept, procedures and processes for the retention of documentation that satisfy the audit requirements of the Programme must be in place and adhered to, and the decision making process must be robust, independent and free from any conflict of interest. It is suggested that Panels that are put in place for the assessment of tenders arising from a public procurement process for the delivery of the Plan should include an independent member and a representative of SEUPB.

**Members of the Partnership who are submitting bids should have no part in the assessment or decision making process and this must be evident from the audit trail provided.**

**iii) Small Grants Programme**

**The Operational Programme provides for a Small Grants Programme implemented at a local level if this is considered an effective response to local needs and is coordinated within a strategic partnership framework.**

**The Selection of projects under the Small Grants Programme must be in compliance with Guidance note G1 Project Selection. The maximum value of a small grants project must not exceed £100,000 (€125,000) and if possible be at the lower end of the scale. In an effort to safeguard the strategic nature of the programme, the Small Grants Programme should not exceed 50% of the value of the action plan.**

**For further information on any aspect of this memo please contact Brenda Hegarty, SEUPB, Omagh.”**

Noted.

**Peace III – Migrant and Minority  
Support Project**

The Good Relations Manager reminded the Members that the issue of migration was one of increasing importance in Belfast due to the significant increase in the number, background and diversity of migrant communities which had moved to Northern Ireland in recent years. The changing demographics which had resulted from this inward migration had presented opportunities and challenges. Accordingly, a number of projects and initiatives were being undertaken within the City and at a regional level which aimed to provide services to, and support the needs of, migrant communities.

She pointed out that, as part of the Council's Peace III bid, the Good Relations Unit had established a Migrant and Minority Ethnic Support Project which aimed to:

- (i) improve interagency cooperation within Belfast in order to address issues which faced migrant and minority ethnic communities;
- (ii) improve the awareness of migrant worker and minority ethnic issues with the Council;
- (iii) support work with other Council Departments to improve the delivery of services to minority ethnic communities;

- (iv) support the development of community-led initiatives which generated understanding and collaboration between new and host communities;
- (v) support migrant and minority ethnic communities to settle in the City and to support settled communities to adapt to changes within their community; and
- (vi) support the employment related needs of migrant workers through a cross-border support programme.

The Good Relations Manager reminded the Partnership that to facilitate the operation of the Project the Council had appointed an officer with specific responsibility for migrant and minority ethnic issues. It had also established and provided support to a Migrant Forum which encouraged inter-agency cooperation to address those issues facing the migrant communities in Belfast. She pointed out that a consultant would be appointed in May to work with the Forum and other agencies across the City to develop a collaborative action plan to address issues relating to migrant workers and to improve interagency cooperation.

In addition the Council had committed, in the Peace Plan, to commission work to establish a cross-border programme to support the employment-related needs of migrant workers. A tendering process in connection with this scheme would be issued in April. She pointed out that all of the costs associated with the Support Project would be recouped under the Peace III Programme.

Noted.

**Good Relations Grant Aid Fund –  
Revised Assessment and Scoring**

The Partnership was reminded that, at its meeting on 13th February, it had approved the reopening of the Good Relations Fund with immediate effect, with a maximum grant of £10,000 and a total amount of £350,000 being made available during 2009/10. In addition, it had been reported it had become necessary to make the minor adjustments to the assessment process which would be used in connection with the Good Relations Fund, details of which are set out hereunder:

- (i) officers who were involved in the development of applications with groups would not assess those applications;
- (ii) groups would be obliged, through their letter of offer, to re-profile any expenditure in advance of the completion of their project; and
- (iii) the scoring bands would be amended in order to channel the limited resources of the Fund into applications which achieved a higher score in the assessment process as follows:

**Good Relations Partnership,  
Friday, 13th March, 2009**

<b>Score</b>	<b>Adherence to Criteria</b>	<b>Revised Recommendation</b>
37-50	Excellent adherence to criteria	Up to 100% of funding requested
27-36	Good adherence to criteria	Up to a maximum of £5,000
18-26	Moderate adherence to criteria	Up to a maximum of £3,000
11-17	Poor adherence to criteria	Up to a maximum of £1,000
10 or less	Not evident	Nil

She pointed out that these changes would allow new groups to access the Good Relations Fund at an appropriate level, whilst awarding the maximum grant to those projects which showed evidence of best practice in the community engagement process and should also lead to better quality applications being received in the longer term.

The Partnership agreed the foregoing amendments.

**Shared By Design Framework**

The Partnership considered the undernoted report:

**“Relevant Background Information**

**In February, the Good Relations Partnership endorsed the broad principles of the action plan arising from the Study Visit to Chicago in 2008, entitled the Chicago Legacy paper. It was agreed that officers would prepare the detail for each of the areas of action.**

**Within the 10 action areas, there was agreement to develop a ‘Shared by Design’ Framework. This framework of principles and criteria would seek to promote a ‘shared by design’ approach to planning and service delivery in the Council, integrated into relevant internal and external strategies, e.g. place-shaping, asset management, human resources.**

**Key Issues**

**In line with the previous Good Relations Plan and the objective of ‘Building Shared City Spaces’ in the current Peace Plan, it is critical that the emerging place-shaping agenda in Belfast must acknowledge that the sense of place has been and continues to be contested. It is important to address central issues such as safety, accessibility and associated ‘chill factors’, particularly in those neighbourhoods located at the multiple interfaces in the city. Both plans acknowledge that social divisions in Belfast are deep-rooted and that it will require a joint approach from a number of agencies and sectors to effect change.**

Based on recent research commissioned by the Council, the Partnership will be aware that there is an increased recognition amongst service providers and users that the duplication of services is an inefficient and unsustainable method of delivery. There is also a growing openness to the concept of shared space and a willingness to share well-planned essential services with members of the 'other' group. It is also acknowledged that the promotion of sharing in public spaces would also ease the pressure on the mixing in residential areas.

Following exploratory conversations with other relevant agencies, initiated as part of the Good Relations Unit's previous Peace II funded research project, the Conflict Transformation Project, there is broad agreement amongst partner organisations that opportunities exist to develop this area of work sensitively.

It is therefore proposed that we commission a piece of work to develop a framework that will assist decision-makers to design, deliver and sustain a network of 'shared spaces' across the city. This would allow the economic and social value of sharing to be more explicitly promoted by statutory agencies when planning, delivering and managing shared spaces in the city.

The Community Relations Council has indicated that it would be willing to co-sponsor the piece of work.

The piece would examine the support necessary to sustain a network of shared spaces (in terms of security, transport, economic viability), on the basis of a flexible city-wide model. This study would draw from previous research, existing good practice, use case studies and design a framework for application. The terms of reference for the study would cover the following points:

1. Propose a joint vision on a shared, open, welcoming and peaceful Belfast with agreed good relations outcomes;
2. Develop 'shared by design' criteria against which to influence planning, investment and resource management decisions;
3. Develop a series of practical policy levers and incentives which would shape the management of spaces and services to support sustained sharing, especially in vulnerable neighbourhoods;
4. Identify practical measures to improve mobility and connectivity across the city;

5. Outline an agreed facilities management structure;
6. Identify mechanisms to measure the benefits and efficiencies of the 'shared by design'; and
7. Agree indicators and joint monitoring systems which ensure that progress toward a shared city is being made.

The principles for shared space are initially suggested as:

- **Welcoming** – where people feel secure to take part in unfamiliar interactions, and increase an overall sense of shared experience and community.
- **Accessible** – well-connected in terms of transport and pedestrian links within a network of similar spaces across the city and managed to promote maximum participation by all communities.
- **Good quality** – attractive, high quality unique services and well-designed buildings and spaces.
- **Safe** – for all persons and groups, which are trusted by both locals and visitors.

This definition is drawn from the learning emerging from the Conflict Transformation Project, including the discussions on the Demos report entitled '*Equally Spaced?*'<sup>1</sup> It is proposed that this working definition is a starting point which would be reviewed in due course as part of a broader evaluation process.

In order to reinforce that the piece has practical application rather than an academic exercise, it is recommended that the research focuses on a number of neighbourhoods located at the interface. These would cover the 4 areas of the city; north, south, east and west. It is suggested that these 4 case studies might include: Suffolk and Lenadoon; Whitewell and White City; Finaghy Crossroads; and Short Strand and Lower Newtownards Road.

This selection is based upon work that is ongoing in these areas, all at different stages of development, supported by the Council, the Community Relations Council and the NI Housing Executive through its Shared Neighbourhood Programme. It is proposed that this piece of work would assist in enhancing existing and future initiatives, particularly those supported by multiple agencies. It is intended, however, that this would be a flexible model with applicability across the city.

---



This piece of work could form one of the central planks of the next Belfast Good Relations Plan and would be in line with the new corporate objective of city leadership. There is potential to use this piece of work to influence the transfer of functions discussions, as part of the Review of Public Administration.

This is timely as the elected Members on the Partnership will be aware that a number of Council sessions on 'place shaping' in Belfast are planned in the near future. Moreover, the Council is currently looking at measures to improve our project governance structure and to meet construction excellence NI standards. It is intended that this work complement this process.

#### Resource Implications

##### Financial

The cost for commissioning this framework is estimated at up to £25,000.

The Community Relations Council has agreed to contribute £10,000.

The Council's contribution would be an eligible cost under the 4.4 Learning and Dissemination Programme objective of the Peace Plan and therefore recoupable at 100% from SEUPB.

#### Decisions required

- That the Partnership approves the proposal as set out above and recommend to the Strategic Policy & Resources Committee that an appropriate framework be commissioned, at a cost to the Council of £15,000, to be recouped at 100% from the SEUPB under the Peace III Programme, with funding of £10,000 from the Community Relations Council."

After discussion, the Partnership approved the proposal as set out in the foregoing report and recommended to the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee that an appropriate framework be commissioned, at a cost to the Council of £15,000 which would be recouped from the SEUPB under the Peace III Programme, together with funding of £10,000 from the Community Relations Council.

#### Chilean Mural

The Good Relations Manager informed the Partnership that, following a joint approach from Professor Rolston from the University of Ulster, Intercomm and the Northern Ireland Housing Executive, the Council had been requested to support the provision of a mural by Chilean artists who would be visiting Belfast from 20th till 23rd March. She pointed out that, following discussions between the organisations, South Belfast had been identified as the preferred location for the mural due to the large number of migrants living in the area and the Shared Neighbourhood Programme which had been developed by the Housing Executive in Ballynafeigh.

**Good Relations Partnership,  
Friday, 13th March, 2009**

Subsequently, a location on what had been the surround wall to the former walled garden, stack yard and stables at Ormeau House, which lay within Ormeau Park, had been identified as a possible site and the Parks and Leisure Committee, at its meeting on 12th February, had acceded to the request to locate in the Park on the understanding that a suitable location and surface could be identified.

She indicated that the mural would be painted on boards and then attached to the wall to ensure that the remains of the former Ormeau House were not damaged. She pointed out that the Council would not be funding any of the work associated with the project. However, she recommended that the Good Relations Partnership provide a maximum of £400 to enable hospitality to be provided on 22nd March when the mural would be unveiled by the Lord Mayor.

Following discussion, the Partnership adopted the recommendation.

**Attendance of the Chief Executive of the Community  
Relations Council at Future Partnership Meetings**

The Good Relations Manager reminded the Members that Dr. Duncan Morrow, Chief Executive of the Community Relations Council, had been a full member of the former Good Relations Steering Panel for several years and had been actively involved in its work. However when the Good Relations Partnership had been established in 2008, the Community Relations Council had not been included in the revised membership. She pointed out that, following discussions between the Community Relations Council and the Council's Chief Executive, it had been agreed that it would be beneficial for the Chief Executive of the Community Relations Council to attend future meetings of the Partnership, although he would not be present for any discussions which involved Peace III funding since that might prove a conflict of interest for him. Accordingly, she requested that the Partnership agree to Dr. Morrow's attendance at future meetings to ensure a good strategic fit and complementarity between the Council's good relations work and appropriate regional initiatives.

Following discussion, the Partnership offered no objection to Dr. Duncan Morrow, Chief Executive of the Community Relations Council, attending future meetings of the Partnership, subject to him not being present during discussions involving Peace III funding.

**Egyptian Society**

The Good Relations Manager reported that members of the Partnership had been invited to an intercultural dialogue event which was being hosted by the Egyptian Society on 8th April at Malone House.

Noted.

Chairman