

## **SHARED CITY PARTNERSHIP**

**MONDAY 5th AUGUST, 2019**

### **MEETING OF SHARED CITY PARTNERSHIP**

Members present: Alderman Rodgers; and  
Councillors Smyth and M. Kelly.

External Members: Mrs. B. Arthurs, Community and Voluntary Sector;  
Mrs. O. Barron, Belfast Health and Social Care Trust;  
Mr. A. Cole, Good Relations, TEO;  
Mr. J. Currie, Community and Voluntary Sector;  
Miss. G. Duggan, Belfast City Centre Management;  
Ms. J. Irwin, Community Relations Council;  
Ms. H. McClay, Faith Sector;  
Mrs. J. Hawthorne, Northern Ireland Housing Executive; and  
Ms. A. M. White, British Red Cross

In attendance: Miss. N. Lane, Good Relations Manager;  
Mrs. D. McKinney, Programme Manager;  
Mrs. M. Higgins, Senior Good Relations Officer;  
Mr. R. Black, Director of Neighbourhood Services; and  
Mrs. L. McLornan, Democratic Services Officer.

#### **Apologies**

Apologies were recorded on behalf of Councillor Kyle and Mr. P. Mackel, Mr. I. McLaughlin, Supt McMillan, Dr. Y. Hanore, Mr. J. Donnelly, Mr. M. O'Donnell and Mr. J. Unsworth.

#### **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of 11th March, 2019 were taken as read and signed as correct.

#### **Declarations of Interest**

Mrs. B. Arthurs declared an interest in Item 3d, namely Peace IV Programme – Building Positive Relations in that she was associated with bids in respect of projects and took no part in the discussion.

Mr. J. Currie declared an interest in Item 3d, namely Peace IV Programme – Building Positive Relations, in that he was associated with bids in respect of projects and took no part in the discussion.

Mrs. J. Irwin declared an interest in Item 14, namely Good Relations Week, in that she was involved in co-ordinating the week and she took no part in the discussion.

### **Election of Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson**

It was proposed by Alderman Rodgers, seconded by Councillor Kelly and agreed that Councillor Kyle would remain as the Chairperson and that Councillor Smyth would be the Deputy Chairperson for the Shared City Partnership for the year until May 2020.

(In the absence of Councillor Kyle, the Deputy Chairperson, Councillor Smyth, took the Chair)

### **Presentation on Research Findings of Discrimination towards People from a Muslim Background in Belfast**

The Partnership was reminded that, at its meeting in March 2019, a report from the Institute for Conflict Research (ICR) had been considered on the findings and recommendations from research that the Good Relations Unit had commissioned to understand the experiences of people from the Muslim community in Belfast in relation to anti-Muslim hate and discrimination.

The Shared City Partnership had agreed that a further report be submitted to a future meeting regarding potential programmes which supported the research findings.

The Good Relations Manager advised the Partnership that Mr. N. Jarman, representing the ICR, was in attendance and he was welcomed to the meeting.

Mr. Jarman provided the Partnership with the context and the methodology for the research. He explained that interviews had been held with a number of people from a Muslim background, representatives from statutory agencies, the criminal justice system and political party representatives. The Partnership was also advised that the ICR had examined police data on hate crimes and had also reviewed literature and policy during the course of the research.

He explained to the Members that there was a growing and diverse population of people from a Muslim background in the City. He advised the Partnership that some people had articulated that they felt that Northern Ireland was behind the rest of the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland in that people in NI struggled to adapt to diversity, the absence of a refugee strategy in NI and the fact that the vast majority of support services were based in the south of Belfast.

The Partnership was advised that the most common form of abuse towards those from a Muslim background was verbal abuse, where women wearing hijabs were often seen as easy targets. Mr. Jarman advised the Members that abuse had been reported in schools and on public transport.

Mr. Jarman advised the Partnership that the research had shown that the perpetrators of abuse towards those from a Muslim background were mainly young and male and that more reports had come from predominantly unionist areas, but not exclusively, and that it would require further exploration. He added that there were some links with paramilitarism and with far-right ideologies.

In conclusion, Mr. Jarman explained that the ICR felt that the Council should continue to build on and extend its existing work with the Muslim community in the City. He advised the Partnership that the Eid celebrations in the City should be promoted similar to those of the Chinese New Year celebrations. He added that the City should seek to move beyond the

south Belfast focus and should continue to support relationship building in communities. The Partnership was also advised that the PSNI should seek to train officers to specifically record anti-Muslim abuse in order that trends could be identified, and that it was important that the PSNI built capacity outside of the south of the City.

The Deputy Chairperson thanked Mr. Jarman for his presentation and he retired from the meeting.

A number of Members explained that they felt it was important that the Council recognised the successes from events such as the community Eid in south Belfast, where over 500 people had attended and enjoyed the celebrations. They added that it had arisen from many years of work, learning and investment within south Belfast and that it would take some time before a similar approach could be taken across the City.

A Member added that it was important to reach out to those who would not usually attend similar events. A further member suggested that area-based approaches might be needed in other areas of the City, particularly in relation to reaching those from areas of high deprivation and a low socio-economic background. It was also suggested that it was important to involve schools and to involve children from a young age.

The Partnership considered the following report of the potential programmes which would support the research findings of the research:

**“1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues**

**1.1 Members will recall at their meeting in March 2019, a report was provided on the findings and recommendations from research that the Good Relations Unit commissioned to understand the experiences of people from the Muslim community in Belfast in relation to anti-muslim hate.**

**1.2 The purpose of this paper is to provide members with an update on actions arising from the research findings.**

**2.0 Recommendations**

**2.1 Members are asked to approve actions arising from the research document.**

**2.2 Independent members are asked to advise the Good Relations Manager if they wish to sit on the subgroup referred to in 3 which will be brought together to look at how civic leadership on this issue can be strengthened.**

**3.0 Main report**

**3.1 In March 2018 the Institute for Conflict Research was commissioned to research and provide a report on the following:**

- 1) the experiences of people from the Muslim community in Belfast in relation to anti- Muslim hate / discrimination**

- 2) the impact of anti-Muslim hate / discrimination at an individual and community level in Belfast
- 3) how widespread anti-Muslim crimes / incidents / bias / discrimination are, whether there are patterns of perpetration
- 4) the role of online activity in terms of anti-Muslim hate
- 5) clarity on what is known about those who commit anti-Muslim hate crime / incidents, what role if any, is played by organised groups
- 6) recommendations on how people from the Muslim community can be supported to report incidents / crimes / discrimination
- 7) to provide an overview of the completed research to relevant Council committees.

3.2 Early in 2019, the Institute for Conflict Research provided a report to the Council on their findings and these were presented to the Shared City Partnership in March 2019. More information can be found in the report in the conclusions page 51-55. It was agreed that Officers would submit a report to a future meeting of the Partnership regarding potential programmes which supported the research findings of the research into the experiences of the Muslim community in Belfast

### 3.3 Recommendations and Suggested Actions

An overview of the recommendations within the report is listed below with a corresponding action highlighted underneath.

Recommendation 1: Belfast City Council should consider the benefits of developing a programme to build the confidence and capacity of 'bystanders' to respond to hate crimes by reviewing similar programmes, such as Nottingham's #StandByMe.

3.4 Officers are exploring options to commission a training programme which will enable participants to develop the skills to move from by-standers to up-standers and to interrupt the negative attitudes that can lead to hate crime.

3.5 The Good Relations Unit is also working with the Education Authority to establish 4 new school's Shared Education Partnerships, that will develop shared education initiatives between eight schools as well as rolling out opportunities for young people to learn about diversity and develop their skills to interrupt hate related behaviour and attitudes.

- 3.6 **Recommendation 2: There is little published data on the number of hate crimes against people from a Muslim background. The PSNI should publish a broader sub-categorisation of recorded hate crimes, including annual figures for sub-groups and nationalities who are victims of racist and religiously motivated hate incidents and crimes.**
- 3.7 This recommendation will be shared with the PSNI representative on the Shared City Partnership and will also be fed into the Department of Justice's independent review of existing hate crime legislation when it meets with the Migrant Forum in September.
- 3.8 **Recommendation 3: Belfast City Council should engage with Belfast Islamic Centre and the PSNI to explore ways to extend their working relationship to other areas of Belfast. This should aim to encourage victims of hate crime to report incidents to the police and to increase cultural competencies and awareness of Muslim culture and traditions among police officers.**
- 3.9 Discussions have taken place with the Belfast Islamic Centre regarding the development of a structure, based on the Roma Tension Monitoring Model. The proposed structure, which would include other organisations working with people from the Muslim faith, would bring together inter-agency partners to monitor and take actions to prevent specific tensions and incidences of hate against people from the Muslim Faith.
- 3.10 **Recommendation 4: The PSNI should consider re-running their Islamic Awareness Course for police officers on the back of the growing population of people from a Muslim background in Belfast.**
- 3.11 Belfast City Council will provide the PSNI with a link to Faith Matters who work on integration, cohesion, hate crime and countering extremism projects. Faith Matters provides specific training for Police Forces on Islamophobia.
- 3.12 **Recommendation 5: Belfast City Council should take a lead in monitoring and reporting online hate abuse.**
- 3.13 This recommendation falls outside the remit and capacity of Belfast City Council, however officers have established a link with the 'Tell MAMA' project which is the leading service for recording anti-Muslim incidents and supporting victims. Officers have asked to be kept up to date with particular trends emerging in Northern Ireland, particularly Belfast.
- 3.14 **Recommendation 6: Belfast City Council should consider ways to encourage and support relationship building and cultural awareness programmes and activities involving local community organisations and groups representing the Muslim community as part of a process of reducing hate crimes and hate speech.**

- 3.15 This recommendation will be an important aspect of projects funded under the Peace IV Local Action Plan and in particular the LINCS project which is operating in four areas of Belfast and aims to build relations and familiarity between neighbouring new and host Communities.
- 3.16 Through the Council's Good Relations Programme, the Council will continue to support projects that build relations between the Muslim and host communities.
- 3.17 The Council will tie in with the Belfast Islamic Centre and NI Muslim Family Association as well as other smaller organisations that support people from the Muslim community to open up opportunities for communities to attend Eid and other celebrations and to widen participation in opportunities such as 'Visit my Mosque' day. Good Relations are also working with the Belfast Islamic Centre to develop a specific Muslim living library that will provide another opportunity for promoting contact and understanding between Muslim and Non-Muslim communities.
- 3.18 Through the Race Relations Officer post which is part funded by Council and based in EBCDA in East Belfast, the Council will work with the Officer to identify potential initiatives for promoting programmes between the Muslim and other communities.
- 3.19 Recommendation 7: Belfast City Council should convene a small working group that brings together people working on issues of hate crime in the city to review existing hate crime campaigns and initiatives and explore how such work might be developed and extended in the future.
- 3.20 This action will be taken forward through the Citywide Hate Crime Action Group, which includes representation from the Policing and Community Safety Partnership, Public Prosecution Service, Probation Board, PSNI and Good Relations.
- 3.21 Officers will also explore the possibility of developing recognition for those individuals who work to address hate crime in the City to highlight the importance of good relations being everyone's business.
- 3.22 Recommendation 8: Belfast City Council should review work on the DiverseCity project to ensure it is better tailored to the varied demography of the city.
- 3.23 Work around this is undertaken on an ongoing basis and officers will continue to seek ways to further target communities and participants as well as to widen the scope of events. A booklet containing information on events which have been planned for the year has been widely disseminated to agencies, libraries, community centres etc. A copy of the booklet will be available at the Shared City Partnership meeting.

- 3.24 **Recommendation 9: Belfast City Council should discuss with organisations within the Muslim community to explore how it might support and widen participation in the Eid celebrations.**
- 3.25 The Council worked with the Belfast Islamic Centre to host the Eid Celebration in City Hall in June 2109 and the Council is also supporting the Islamic Centre to open up the Eid al Adha (Greater Eid) event in August through the DiverseCity Programme. Support was also provided to Forward South to provide opportunities for other communities to attend the Eid celebration in the Holylands area, which was attended by the Lord Mayor.
- 3.26 **Recommendation 10:The report noted that Belfast City Council has taken many steps to show leadership and such activity needs to be sustained and expanded through continued participation in public events or by providing Civic Leadership through issuing media statements in response to acts of prejudice and bias.**
- 3.27 The Council will continue to seek opportunities for staff and members to engage with people from the Muslim Community and to take actions to ensure that Council services are sensitive to the needs of all communities.
- 3.28 In March 2019, the Partnership had agreed that a subgroup comprising of Elected Members, Independent Members of the Partnership, the Lord Mayor, the Council's Corporate Communications and a representative from the Executive Office should be established to consider how this aspect could be strengthened. Due to the local government elections and change of Lord Mayor in June, this will be convened in due course.
- 3.29 Independent Members are asked to advise the Good Relations Manager if they wish to participate on this subgroup.
- 3.30 **Recommendation 11: The report noted that Belfast City Council's Shared City Partnership is one established framework that could consider and promote more effective responses to hate crime against individuals of Muslim background in the city. As a partnership of the main political parties, alongside statutory, voluntary, business, trade-union and faith stakeholders it feeds into the Strategic Policy and Resources committee, and ultimately to the monthly meeting of the full council. It thus provides a vehicle for achieving a co-ordinated response to the challenges identified in this report.**
- 3.31 An update on progress of the proposed actions outlined in this report and impact of such interventions will be brought back to the Shared City Partnership on a regular basis.
- 3.32 **Recommendation 12: Belfast City Council should expand its participation within European wide networks, such as the Intercultural Cities network. This would be a further statement of**

**commitment and would expose it to the best practices in the management of cultural diversity which have evolved across Europe in the last decade.**

- 3.33 The Council is a member of the EuroCities Network and will use this and contacts in the ICOCO foundation to scope out best practice projects undertaken by other local authorities.

#### **Financial & Resource Implications**

Proposals arising from this paper will be covered within the annual Good Relations Action Plan, 75% of which is recouped by the Executive Office under the District Council's Good Relations Programme.

#### **Equality or Good Relations Implications**

This report intends to inform members, there are no anticipated negative equality and good relations implications.”

After further discussion, the Partnership:

1. noted the actions arising from the research document;
2. agreed that a further report be submitted to a future Partnership meeting, which would address the policy context and best practice
3. noted that the independent members of the Partnership should contact the Good Relations Manager if they wished to sit on the subgroup outlined in the paper which would be brought together to look at how civic leadership on the issue could be strengthened.

### **Peace IV Programme**

#### **Secretariat Update**

The Partnership considered the undernoted report:

**“1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues**

To provide the Shared City Partnership (SCP) with a progress report in respect of the PEACE IV Local Action Plan.

**2.0 Recommendations**

Members are requested to note the contents of the report and to recommend to the Strategic and Policy Resources Committee to:

- approve and agree to progress the Supplemental Agreement to the PEACE IV Partnership for new members
- approve the amended TSG governance and agree that representatives and advisors should be sought as outlined.
- approve the development and revision of the monitoring and evaluation framework in line with SEUPB and PEACE IV Programme requirements



### **3.0 Main report**

#### **Key Issues**

- 3.1 Implementation of the programme is continuing, with 12 out of 14 core projects now mobilised. Current participation across the programme is 1,133 participants, with 209 participants having completed projects. An overview of programme implementation is outlined in the Dashboard detailed in Appendix I – PEACE IV Dashboard.**

#### **Governance**

### **3.2 Shared City Partnership (SCP)**

**In line with PEACE IV Programme Regulations, a PEACE IV Partnership Agreement for the Shared City Partnership (SCP) as oversight body for the implementation of the PEACE IV programme was established in 2017 and signed by SCP members as at May 2018. Following the review of the SCP and the ongoing appointment of new members, a supplemental agreement to the Partnership Agreement is required to be established, as per Appendix II - Supplemental Agreement PEACE IV Partnership - Jul 19.**

- 3.3 SCP Members are requested to approve the Supplemental Agreement for new members and progress for signature.**

- 3.4 Members should also note that this supplemental agreement will be used in any future circumstance where new members are appointed to the SCP.**

### **3.5 Thematic Steering Groups (TSG)**

**As projects continue to mobilise, a review of the effectiveness of the TSG was considered by the PEACE IV Programme Board in April 2019 –Appendix III - PEACE IV Thematic Steering Groups Update - April 2019 refers. As outlined it is recommended that the responsibilities of the Thematic Steering Group are revised to a more strategic view, added knowledge and also to direct PEACE IV resources.**

- 3.6 To enable the TSG fulfil this role, it is proposed that membership of Thematic Steering Group is enhanced by:**

- (i) inviting the Community Safety Coordinator to attend all Thematic Steering Group meeting or nominate an appropriate Community Safety Officer to attend**
- (ii) requesting that the Shared City Partnership nominate two appropriate representatives with relevant expertise to each of the Steering Groups.**

(iii) identifying and inviting a minimum of two advisors from external organisations, with appropriate expertise not represented on the Shared City Partnership and approaches the advisors to sit on the Steering Group.

**3.7 The Thematic Steering Group for Building Positive Relations (BPR) and Children and Young People (CYP) has identified potential nominees as follows:**

**BPR - Representative from Community Relations Council and BHSCCT Representatives involved with BME communities and Centenaries, Advisor from Creative Arts**

**CYP - Representative from Education Authority – Youth Service**

**3.8 Members are requested to approve the amended TSG governance and agree that representatives and advisors should be sought as outlined bearing in mind any potential conflicts of interest.**

**3.9 Audit**

**The Audit Authority recently completed an Article 27 audit on the BPR theme. The audit confirmed that the project was implemented in accordance with approvals and conditions and no issues were highlighted.**

**3.10 Audit, Governance and Risk recently undertook an internal audit that examined the adequacy and effectiveness of controls over the PEACE IV governance arrangements, roles and responsibilities, procurement, contract and project management, monitoring and verification, claim processing and financial reporting. This extensive audit identified 5 medium priority issues relating to evidence and operational processes of procurement, monitoring and evaluation and claims procedures. Actions to address all issues are underway and should be completed by September 2019.**

**3.11 Monitoring and Evaluation**

**A verification of outputs of the Children and Young People theme was completed by SEUPB in May 2019. SEUPB has indicated they currently have no major concerns resulting from the verification exercise and have advised that a more detailed verification will take place in Autumn 2019.**

**3.12 Following the verification exercise and taking into account our experience of administering and reporting on SEUPB eMS system as well as feedback from project delivery agents (internal, partner and external), the PEACE IV secretariat has reappraised the current electronic system for recording outputs and outcomes and have identified necessary revisions.**

**3.13 The proposed revisions are to introduce:**

- a simplified paper based system;
- focus on project specific attitudinal surveys which are shorter and targeted to the outcomes of individual projects;
- provide a range templates to ensure consistent recording of outputs, targets, unique reference numbers and other information by all delivery agents.

**3.14 The revised system is currently being piloted with CYP3 as a new project. The revised monitoring and evaluation system will be fully compliant with PEACE IV monitoring and reporting requirements and is currently with SEUPB for review and approval.**

**3.15 In collating the information for the verification, the PEACE IV Secretariat identified issues regarding record keeping within CYP5 NIHE Local Area Networks project. We are working closely with NIHE to resolve the issues and through the provision of templates, the revised monitoring and evaluation system will also help address the issues.**

**3.16 Members are request to approve the development and revision of the monitoring and evaluation framework in line with SEUPB and PEACE IV Programme requirements, which will ensure long term and consistent collection and verification of auditable data across all three PEACE IV themes.**

**3.17 Financial & Resource Implications**

**As at 28 May 2019 (Period 18) claims totalling £907,277.01 have been submitted on eMS for reimbursement from SEUPB. To date £564,162.56 has been reimbursed to Council with payment for Claim 17 is being finalised. SEUPB is also verifying claims and progress reports for Period 18 (Feb–Apr 19).**

**Claims for period 19, (May-Jul 19) is to be submitted by 28 August 2019, forecasted spend for each theme is as follows:**

**Children and Young People £157,602.16  
Building Positive Relations £135,667.96  
Shared Space and Services £155,572.44.**

**3.18 Equality or Good Relations Implications/Rural Needs Assessment**

**The draft plan has been equality screened and discussed at the Equality Consultative Forum on 13 May 2015.”**

A Member requested that the Deputy Chairperson be referenced in Section 6.2 of the Partnership Agreement, as it had been omitted.

The Partnership approved and adopted the recommendations as amended.

## **Update on Children and Young People (CYP) Theme**

The Programme Manager provided the Partnership with a progress report in respect of the Children and Young People's (CYP) theme of the Peace IV Local Action Plan.

She explained that all projects within the CYP theme had now been mobilised. The Partnership was advised that current participation across all projects was 989 participants, with 162 participants having completed projects to date.

The Partnership noted the progress of projects and a map of delivery across the City.

She advised the Members of the key challenges to project delivery, which included recruitment and retention of participants, engaging youth providers and young people from the PUL community and differing levels of capacity of participants.

The Partnership was advised of particular challenges which had adversely affected the implementation and delivery of CYP1Tech Connects which had resulted in a shortfall in outputs and participant issues. The Members were advised that the project delivery agent and the Peace IV Programme Board had proposed a number of remedial measures to address the issues and these were detailed in the report.

The Programme Manager explained that the launch of the CYP1 Tech Connects project would take place on Tuesday, 27th August at 2 p.m. in the Ulster University, where all Members of the Partnership would be welcome to attend.

After discussion, the Partnership:

1. noted the issues affecting Peace IV Projects; and
2. ratified the revised implementation approach for CYP1 Tech Connects.

## **Update on the Shared Spaces and Services (SSS) Theme**

The Programme Manager provided the Partnership with a progress report in respect of the Shared Spaces and Services (SSS) theme of the Peace IV Local Action Plan.

She explained to the Partnership that a phased approach of the capital build had been adopted, with the current focus on Sections 2 and 3, located at Springfield Dam, Springfield Park, Paisley Park and Invest NI sites. She provided the Members with an overview of the emerging proposals of the Reconnecting Open Spaces scheme and explained that they had been subject to community consultation in January 2019 and that ongoing engagement would continue as each stage progressed.

The Programme Manager explained that the final design for the bridge at the Springfield Dam was to be completed in partnership with designers and the contractor. She explained that a formal response from the Department for Infrastructure (DfI) in relation to the planning permission for the Dam section was outstanding and, given that, planning permission was now likely to be delayed to September/October 2019.

She explained that procurement of the contractor for Springfield Dam was underway but that the appointment of the contractor could only be progressed once planning permission had been granted. The Partnership was advised that the procurement exercise included a social value clause in the contract to maximise benefit to the community.

The Partnership was updated in relation the key priorities for the capital aspect of the project. The Programme Manager also provided the Members with an overview of the community engagement as well as engagement with statutory agencies, local schools, political representatives and the wider community.

She advised the Members that the contract for a Youth Civic Education pilot project targeting young people around the Springfield Dam, Innovation Factory and Invest NI site had been awarded to Clonard Monastery Youth Centre in partnership with Forthspring Intercommunity Group.

She also advised that a Resource Allocation was an element within the “Reconnecting Open Spaces” project approved under the rebid in February 2019. The project element provided up to £6,000 per shared space site (for three projects on each site) to enable community led events and activities along the network of Shared Space.

The Resource Allocation would help to embed the learning from the programming element, enabling the volunteers to put into practice what they had learned and to encourage the community to lead on the ongoing development and sustainability of shared space.

She explained that the focus of the activities would be to build positive relations with and between the two main community backgrounds in the target area. The sites were those most directly affected by segregation, in close proximity to a number of interface barriers and where there remained live disputes over open spaces and rights of way.

A condition of the Letter of Offer was that the criteria and process for the Resource Allocation was to be agreed through the PEACE IV governance structure and approved by SEUPB. The Programme Manager outlined the criteria and process which had been agreed by the PEACE IV Programme Board and requested that Members approved the Resource Allocation criteria and process to enable final submission and formal approval by SEUPB.

After discussion, the Partnership:

1. noted the delays in planning permission; and
2. agreed the Resource Allocation criteria and process.

### **Update on the Building Positive Relations (BPR) Theme**

(Mr J. Currie and Mrs. B. Arthurs declared an interest in this item and did not participate in the discussion)

The Partnership considered the undernoted report:

#### **“1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues**

**To provide the Shared City Partnership (SCP) with a progress report in respect of the Building Positive Relations (BPR) theme of the PEACE IV Local Action Plan.**

#### **2.0 Recommendations**

**Members are requested to note the contents of the report and to recommend to the Strategic and Policy Resources Committee to:**

- (i) note the issues affecting PEACE IV projects
- (ii) ratify the 3 month extension, revised deliverable timeframe and flexible delivery approach for BPR1 Cross Community Area Networks – Partner Delivery with NIHE.
- (iii) approve the EU Study Visit criteria and process for BPR4 to enable final submission and formal approval by SEUPB
- (iv) agree to progress BPR5 Traveller and Roma elements as outlined
- (v) agree that a partner approach and/or collaborative partnership should be introduced for BPR5 Traveller and Roma elements, subject to options appraisal and legal opinion
- (vi) delegate authority to the PEACE IV programme board and Strategic Director of City to approve the identified delivery approach and project proposal for Traveller and Roma elements, ensuring compliance with PEACE IV programme regulations and timescales.

### **3.0 Main report**

#### **Key Issues**

**3.1 Implementation of projects within the Building Positive Relations theme is continuing with 3 of the key projects and one element of BPR5 now mobilised.**

### **3.2 BPR3 - Contract Award**

The contract for delivery of BPR3 Transform for Change Leadership Project has been awarded to NICVA and a consortium of partners comprising of West Belfast Partnership Board, East Belfast Development Agency and Forward South Partnership. Mobilisation of the project is underway.

**3.3 Current participation across mobilised projects is 144 participants, with 47 participants having completed projects. An overview of projects progress is detailed in Appendix I BPR Project Progress and a stakeholder map of project delivery across the city is outlined in Appendix II – BPR Stakeholder Map.**

**3.4 Key challenges to project delivery, includes**

- (i) recruitment and retention of participants
- (ii) commitment to meet the specified contact hours

The Council continues to work closely with all delivery agents to address issues as they arise.

### **3.5 BPR 1 – Cross Community Area Networks – Partner Delivery with NIHE**

A Partner Deliver Agreement was issued to NIHE on 10 April 2019 outlining a phased approach to project delivery over 36 months as

submitted and approved by SEUPB. NIHE subsequently raised concerns regarding the risks of implementation of the targets and deliverables within the reduced project timeline.

NIHE made a formal request in June 2019 to either revise the targets or extend the delivery timeframe before they could commit to the Partner Agreement.

Options for delivery, including reduced contact hours, participant targets and deliverables were explored with NIHE staff and considered by the PEACE IV Secretariat and Programme Board..

Following discussions at a senior level between NIHE and Council in July 2019, the following measures were confirmed as necessary to enable the delivery of the BPR1 project and the achievement of approved participant levels and targets

- 3.6** Given the time critical nature to mobilise the project and the operational risk to programme delivery. The PEACE IV programme board agreed, with legal advice, that the following measures are introduced, subject to final ratification by the SCP:
- (i)** Delivery timeframe is extended by 3 months from 31 December 2021 to 31 March 2022. This extended timeframe remains within the SEUPB Letter of Offer timeframe (30 June 2022) and is recommended on the understanding there will be no further extension requests and that assurances are provided from NIHE that the programme is delivered within the extended period; .
  - (ii)** Revised deliverable dates for key milestones are agreed with Council, NIHE and SEUPB.
  - (iii)** Flexible approach should be applied in relation to the delivery of approved activity. The delivery of the approved level contact hours and participant targets within the allocated budget and staffing level remain unchanged. This will be subject to advice and formal approval from SEUPB.
  - (iv)** Re-draft the Partner Agreement and Project Partners Delivery document outlining revised deliverable dates.
  - (v)** NIHE to sign acceptance of redrafted Partner Agreement and take steps to mobilise the project over summer period.
- 3.7** As such members are requested to note the issues affecting this project and ratify the 3 month extension, revised deliverable timeframe and flexible delivery approach.

### **3.8 BPR4 – Belfast and the World (BATW) – EU Study Visits**

As part of the rebid application, funding was approved in February 2019 for the EU Study visit element, which had previously been removed by SEUPB. This element provides participants with an opportunity to visit and explore sites of historical interest that have been discussed within the BATW programme and provide added value.

The aim is to develop increased knowledge and understanding of key anniversaries beyond local perspective into a European context. The first study visit is planned for October 2019 in Ypres, Belgium and will focus on visiting various historical sites relating to the legacy of World War I.

A condition of the Letter of Offer is that the criteria and process for the EU Study Visits is to be agreed through the PEACE IV governance structure and approved by SEUPB.

The criteria and process, as agreed by the PEACE IV Programme Board, is outlined in Appendix III. Members are requested to approve the EU Study Visit criteria and process to enable final submission and formal approval by SEUPB.

### **3.9 BPR5 – Traveller and Roma elements of Supporting Connected Communities**

The Traveller and Roma elements of BPR5 Supporting Connected Communities project were approved for delivery via a tendered approach. To date five different procurement exercises, of varying scope and scale, have been conducted with no contracts awarded, primarily due to nil responses to the tender calls. The changing and challenging environment of the target communities also adds a level of complexity to project delivery.

- 3.10** In considering feedback on the procurement exercises, it is the view of the PEACE IV Programme Board that all procurement approaches for these elements have now been fully exhausted and delivery via a tender / quotation approach is no longer a viable option.
- 3.11** Advice has been sought from SEUPB regarding options including changing the delivery method of these elements to either a possible partner delivery (involving one of the partners on the SCP) and/or the Council as Lead Partner establishing a collaborative partnership via a Service Level Agreement with appropriate delivery organisations. It should be noted that amendment of delivery to a partner approach has already been tried and tested with SEUPB by other Councils.
- 3.11** SEUPB has advised that the addition of a new project partner or Council establishing a collaborative partnership would be deemed



as a substantial change and a detailed and robust proposal is required. Any proposal will need to be approved by SEUPB's PEACE IV Steering Committee and the overall process could take up to 3 months. SEUPB also advised that they will endeavour to work with the Council with regards to changes and modifications in order to ensure the effective delivery of the approved project activities and deliverables.

**3.12** Given the time critical nature to mobilise these project elements, the PEACE IV Programme Board outline the proposed next steps as:

- (i)** ongoing discussions with TEO and DfC regarding support services for Roma
- (ii)** determine the most suitable method of delivery for the Traveller element of the project
- (iii)** identify possible partner members based on those currently working with target groups
- (iv)** scoping and discussions with SCP partner members
- (v)** re-shape project activity based on changing needs and within the budget available
- (vi)** commence drafting proposal in line with PEACE IV programme requirements
- (vii)** delegate authority to the PEACE IV Programme Board and Strategic Director of City to approve the identified delivery approach and project proposal

**3.13** To date, discussions have been held with DfC and TEO regarding support for the Roma community and with BHSCT and the Traveller Liaison Officer regarding support for the Traveller community. These discussions were additional to usual business activities and confirmed that PEACE IV is a separate, distinct project, from the support already provided for both these minority communities and will also help ensure a co-ordinated and collaborative approach.

Preliminary discussions are underway with organisations currently working with the target communities, also with a view to identifying a suitable delivery mechanism and project content.

**3.14** In order to progress these project elements and avoid any further delays members are requested to

- (i)** agree the next steps outlined above
- (ii)** agree that a partner approach and/or collaborative partnership should be introduced, subject to options appraisal and legal opinion
- (iii)** delegate authority to the PEACE IV programme board and Strategic Director of City to approve the identified delivery approach and project proposal, ensuring compliance with PEACE IV programme regulations and timescale.

Further updates on progressing these project issues will be reported further to the SCP.

### **3.15 Equality or Good Relations Implications/Rural Needs Assessment**

The draft plan has been equality screened and discussed at the Equality Consultative Forum on 13 May 2015.”

The Partnership approved and adopted the recommendations.

## **Update on Underspend**

The Partnership considered the undernoted report:

### **“1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues**

**1.1 To provide the Shared City Partnership (SCP) with an update in respect of the underspend in the PEACE IV Local Action Plan and to seek approval in relation to proposals to utilise the identified underspend to maximise programme spend.**

### **2.0 Recommendations**

Members are requested to note the contents of the report and to recommend to the Strategic and Policy Resources Committee to:

#### **1. Utilise the PEACE IV underspend – summarised as**

- (i) Extending CYP4 Young Advocates to include a placeshaping element for young people in East Belfast.**
- (ii) Providing additional connections, landscaping and engineering across the brownfield DfC site from Springfield Road to West Circular Road.**
- (iii) Approving addition £26,539 of funding to the Traveller and Roma elements of BPR5.**
- (iv) Extending BPR2 Creative Communities project to include an element comprises of a creative project based at St Comgall’s comprising of research, design and interpretation of a community exhibition.**

#### **2. Progress the underspend proposals for final approval.**

#### **3. Commence the development of mini application for submission to SEUPB**

### **3.0 Main Report**

#### **3.1 Background**

The Council has secured PEACE IV funding of approx. £14.56m across three themes as follows

- Children and Young People (CYP) - £3.06 m
- Shared Spaces and Services (SSS) - £5.17 m
- Building Positive Relations (BPR) - £6.33 m

Mobilisation of all projects have been continuing since the initial Letters of Offer (LoO) was received in January 2018 and revised LoO received in February 2019. A recent forecasting exercise has highlighted underspends across the three themes as follows.

- Children and Young People (CYP) - £129,902
- Building Positive Relations (BPR) - £196,489
- Shared Spaces and Services (SSS) - £185,207

The underspends are mainly attributable to reduced salary costs associated with delay in approvals from SEUPB and the appointment of staff to the PEACE IV programme.

Discussions with SEUPB on utilising the underspend advises that any proposed underspend activity should increase the scope of approved projects and should add value to existing approved projects as well as contribute to the objectives of each PEACE IV theme. SEUPB also advised that underspend monies has to be spent within the allocated theme and cannot be transferred to other themes of the programme.

#### **4.0 Underspend Proposals**

##### **4.1 Children and Young People Theme (CYP) – Projected underspend current estimate £129,902**

###### **CYP4 – Young Advocates – Placeshaping element**

The proposal for the CYP theme is to add value to the CYP4 Young Advocates project through the delivery of a place shaping project with a strong focus on good relations. The proposal aims to deliver a cross community place shaping project for young people aged 11-16 on Lower Newtownards Road, Short Stand and Walkway areas. The proposal aligns closely with the regeneration projects in the area including council work at Walkway and also the redevelopment of Sirocco Works.

The aim is to encourage young people to get involved in transforming the area by enabling young people to explore their aspirations and use the facilities in the local area. Key objectives of the project are:

- Breaking down the barriers that limit young people moving around the area
- Encourage cultural understanding and promote good relations
- Enabling young people to use the assets/facilities across the East Belfast area in a safe manner

- **Contribute to creating a more cohesive and shared society through place-shaping**

**The project content will include:**

- **Good Relations / Diversity training**
- **Design of creative placeshaping projects/activities, designed to encourage the young people to move around the local area. The activities will be co-designed and delivered by the young people and may include activities such as leisure, arts, drama.**
- **Visits to key facilities in the local area and a study visit to other locations for bonding purposes.**
- **Delivery of showcase event on agreed placeshaping project/activity.**

**Outcomes:**

- **Creates opportunities for young people from different community backgrounds to meet and develop positive relationships;**
- **Enhanced understanding of difference and respect for other traditions;**
- **Improved confidence and social interaction skills**
- **Shared ownership of local assets and investment in the area.**

**This proposed underspend activity is proposed as an extension and increase to the scope of the approved CYP3 Young Advocates project. The proposal will add value to this project by enabling young people to develop leadership skills through the design and development of placeshaping activities.**

#### **4.2 Shared Spaces and Services (SSS) – Projected underspend current estimate £185,207**

**The proposal to utilise the underspend is to move funding from the salary budget of the SSS theme to the capital budget to enable capital works as follows:**

- (i) replace the connections from the Springfield Rd through the INI site to Woodvale Park with a link from the Springfield Rd to Workman Ave.**
- (ii) provide additional pathway and cycleway connections to Paisley Park, West Circular Rd and the future Braidwater (housing development) site through the current derelict brownfield DfC site.**
- (iii) enable significant landscaping and engineering works by addressing topography and contamination issues at the brownfield DfC site through significant landscaping and engineering works to provide safe access and create a more welcoming shared space.**

The rationale for these additional elements is detailed below:

- (i) Consultation identified the Springfield Rd/Workman Ave as an important link to the INI site, Innovation Factory (IF) and Springfield Rd. The change in connectivity will facilitate the moving of the gate to allow increased access to the IF and closing of gate to secure site, which is currently experiencing significant anti-social behaviour issues. In addition, the linkage will enhance connectivity to the INI site and Springfield Rd for residents. Access will not be restricted by the hours of Woodvale Park opening and closing, which would have been the case in the original proposal connection.
- (ii) The additional connections between Paisley Park, West Circular Road and Braidwater Housing development will allow for higher level of community and resident access through this current brownfield site. This will improve connections between not only the proposed shared spaces sites, but also between communities and key locations such as Springfield Primary School and Belfast Met.
- (iii) The existing condition of the derelict DfC brownfield site includes a ravine and culvert with difficult topography and contamination issues. The additional funding will enable significant engineering and landscaping works to be carried out to ensure the site is safe to access. Simply creating paths and cycleway in isolation is not sufficient, the additional funding is required to transform this brownfield site into a new shared space, with several points of access.

As with all locations along the SSS route, the pathways and cycleways will be continuously branded and include lighting, to integrate with the current live capital project.

Outcomes:

- (i) Creates additional opportunities for the mobility of residents from different community backgrounds between inherently segregated areas (along the longest interface in Belfast)
- (ii) Help reduce spatial segregation because of existing disconnected open spaces, by providing additional opportunities of connectivity, specifically to public, shared spaces.
- (iii) Creation of new shared space

Please refer to Appendix I – Maps 1.1 and 1.2 that outline the extended connections, landscaping and engineering detailed above.

The current estimate for landscaping the site is £180k plus £36k for preliminaries and contingency. This cost includes designs fees, surveys and construction costs for landscaping of the site. The cost of these additional works is greater than the £185K underspend, any shortfall will be met by Council through the approved contingency fund.

**4.3 Building Positive Relations (BPR) – Projected underspend current estimate - £196,489**

The proposals to utilise the underspend in the BPR theme is to realign funding from the salary budget to two projects as outlined below.

**BPR5 – Connected Communities – the Council has undertaken numerous procurement exercises (via tender) for the delivery of projects aimed at the Traveller and Roma communities, all of which have been unsuccessful.**

Feedback from potential bidders highlighted there was insufficient budget given targets and timeline to cover the substantial work areas. The PEACE IV Programme Board has deemed that delivery of these project elements are no longer viable in their current format.

The current budget for the Traveller and Roma elements is £298,933.27, it is proposed that a further £26,539 is reallocated from BPR salaries budget to BPR5 to provide an overall budget of £325,472.27.

Delivery of this project will continue to be a significant challenge, this additional funding should enable the project to be rescoped within the available budget and redefined to address the needs of these marginalised communities. Discussions regarding the project elements are ongoing with SEUPB, TEO, DfC and BHSC. Final amendments to the project elements will be approved through the PEACE IV Governance Structure by the SCP.

**BPR2 – Creative Communities - A further proposal under the BPR theme is to extend the approved Creative Communities project to include a creative aspect based on translating the history past and present of the St Comgall's site, the conflict and peace process to provide a community based interpretative exhibition.**

This creative communities project will comprise of the research, design and interpretation. Targeting participants from Greater Falls, Shankill and surrounding areas, this project will bring groups together to explore the history of St Comgall's under the identified themes of:

- Background and scene setting
- Conflict related
- Life in General

- **Peace Process**

Through a series of workshops, seminars, study visits and the development of an exhibition, participants will work together to create the narrative of the history of the conflict from 1968 up to the second IRA ceasefire in July 1997.

A number of formats including interpretative panels, technology, news clips and archive footage will be used to create an interpretative exhibition that outlines the history of the building and supports the development St Comgall's into a community hub and visitor centre.

This proposed underspend activity aligns with SEUPB requirements of increasing the scope of approved Creative Communities project within the BPR theme. The proposal will also add value to the Shared Space theme by providing another potential connection to the current approved SSS project. In addition, the proposal adds value and aligns to Council's regeneration work at this site to transform the site into a visitor centre.

The proposed budget for the research, design and interpretation elements into an exhibition is approximately £169,950.

#### **4.4 Approvals process**

The proposals outlined above require approval through BCC governance structure before submission to SEUPB.

The proposed timeline for approvals is CMT approval in July, SCP/Council approval in August for submission to SEUPB and consideration by the Steering Committee in September 2019.

The proposals have been considered and approved by the Corporate Management Team on 30 July 2019.

SEUPB has indicated that a mini application is required for each proposal. The approval timeline for proposals which are an extension of approved projects may take 6 weeks via written procedure. However any proposal that is deemed outside of approved projects the approval process may take 3-4 months. Any extended approval timeframe may negatively impact on the delivery the proposed projects.

#### **5.0 Resource and Good Relations Implications**

##### **5.1 Financial & Resource Implications**

Failure to maximise the funding allocated through the PEACE IV programme may result in withdrawal of the underspend amounts from the Council's Letter of Offer, which could negatively impact the 12% staffing costs and corresponding 15% overhead rates.

## **Equality or Good Relations Implications/Rural Needs Assessment**

**The draft plan has been equality screened and discussed at the Equality Consultative Forum on 13 May 2015.”**

The Partnership approved and adopted the recommendations.

### **Update on the Review of the Shared City Partnership**

The Good Relations Manager provided the Members with an update in respect of the review of the Shared City Partnership, particularly in respect of the new membership.

She explained that, further to the Partnership’s agreement at its March meeting, correspondence had been sent to the PSNI outlining the importance of representation from the PSNI on the Partnership and asking for a nominee. She advised the Members that Superintendent Kellie McMillan had been nominated as the PSNI representative on the Partnership.

The Members were also advised that Ms. M. Greeves was the Belfast Chamber of Trade and Commerce’s nomination to the Shared City Partnership.

The Good Relations Manager explained that the Partnership had 2 representatives from the faith sector, one of which was fulfilled by the Interfaith Forum. In addition, she advised that the following individuals had been selected to represent the sector on a rotational basis, in line with the Council’s four year term, as follows:

- Year 1 – Church of Ireland – Hilary McClay
- Year 2 – Catholic Church – Father Eugene O’Neill
- Year 3 – Presbyterian Church – Karen Jardine
- Year 4 – Methodist Church – Rev. Andrew Irvine

The Partnership was advised that letters had been sent to those members whose term of service had been completed, thanking them for their commitment for good relations within the City.

The Partnership noted the update.

### **Findings from the Shared City Partnership Planning Day**

The Good Relations Manager provided the Partnership with an overview of the feedback and the actions which had arisen from the Planning Day which had been held on 1st February.

She explained that future meetings of the Shared City Partnership would, where possible, be held in 9 Adelaide as it was felt to be a less formal setting to encourage greater discussion and participation.

The Partnership was also reminded that “Presentation Days” had been suggested, where speakers would be invited to present on a day outside of the normal scheduled Partnership meetings, in order to allow more time for discussion.



The Good Relations Manager highlighted the recently published “Review of Sectarianism in Northern Ireland” by Dr Duncan Morrow of Ulster University in conjunction with members of the Sir George Quigley Fund Committee. In addition, she advised the Members that they had already agreed to invite the authors of the fifth Peace Monitoring Report (January 2019) to a meeting to discuss their findings. She therefore advised the Partnership that it might wish to invite the authors of both reports in to speak at a presentation day and then facilitate discussion about how the partnership could assist in any of the recommendations where appropriate.

After discussion, the Partnership:

- agreed that future meetings of the Partnership would meet in 9 Adelaide, where possible;
- agreed to hold a “Presentation Day”, with the authors of Sectarianism in Northern Ireland and the Fifth peace Monitoring Report invited to attend; and
- noted that officers would work with the newly elected Chair and Vice Chair to progress the request to meet with the Senior Management Team and Party Group Leaders to emphasise the strategic importance of the Partnership and good relations work, and to highlight that any work was in partnership with all levels of the Council.

### **Revised Good Relations Strategy**

The Good Relations Manager provided the Partnership with the results of the public consultation exercise regarding the draft Good Relations Strategy. She explained that the consultation had been launched on 17th January and closed on 11th April. The Members were advised that the consultation had been advertised across a range of platforms and that the overall process had encompassed a range of times, locations and sectors in order to maximise opportunities for residents and citizens to engage with the draft strategy. She pointed out that 85 people had engaged face-to-face with officers, with an additional 27 responses received online or via email.

The Partnership was advised that the overall feedback had been extremely positive with regards to the content of the draft Strategy with no major changes suggested. The Good Relations Manager explained that the draft Strategy had referenced all of the issues which had been raised during engagement and that she believed it had served to reinforce what had already been included in the draft which had been agreed by Members.

The Members considered the draft foreword to the document which the Good Relations Manager explained was required to be signed off by the Party Group Leaders prior to the publication of the Strategy.

The Partnership was reminded that the Council submitted a Good Relations Action Plan to the Executive office (TEO) annually in order to secure funding for good relations activity through the District Council Good Relations Programme (DCGRP). The Manager explained that the Plan was required to be needs-based, and that there was a requirement on the Council to carry out an audit of good relations need in Belfast every three years.

She explained that the audit would form the first part of the implementation plan for the Strategy. The Members were reminded that the Council had agreed, in April 2019, to undertake the audit this year to inform plans for 2020/2021 and 2021/2022, for which submission would be requested by February 2020 to the TEO. The Partnership was advised

that, following a quotation exercise, Rubicon Consulting had been appointed to carry out the audit between June and October 2019.

After discussion, the Partnership:

1. agreed the revised Good Relations Strategy, following the public consultation and engagement exercise;
2. agreed to include a foreword to the document, which would be signed by Party Group Leaders prior to the Launch;
3. agreed that the new Strategy would be launched during Community relations Week, in September 2019; and
4. noted the information relating to the upcoming Good Relations audit which would be dealt with in more detail in a separate report.

### **Good Relations Audit 2020 - 2023**

The Good Relations Manager provided the Partnership with an update on the progress which Rubicon Consulting had made with the aforementioned Good Relations Audit, covering the period 2020-2023, as required by the Executive Office as a condition of funding.

She explained that the objective of the exercise was to:

- Provide an assessment of the current and emerging good relations needs from both a citywide and neighbourhood level through statistical and qualitative means.
- To examine to what extent the funder (TEO) and partners on the Shared City Partnership can further collaborate through the leadership, development and delivery of the Programme;
- Provide recommendations, where appropriate, to Belfast City Council regarding any amendments or additions to the District Council Good Relations Programme which may be required to best meet good relations outcomes;
- To identify new mechanisms of implementation which could be adopted through the Programme to meet the T:BUC outcomes more effectively;
- To examine how the changing environment at a strategic, policy and political level may impact upon the development of the programme in line with the Governmental T:BUC themes, linking these within the Council's strategic themes with particular reference to the Belfast Agenda, Local Development Plan and draft Good Relations Strategy and area working model.

The Partnership noted the update and agreed that a participatory workshop be held in August/September 2019 in order to seek the views in relation to the audit, and that a roundtable discussion would take place as part of the October meeting to discuss the preliminary findings.

### **Update on the Bonfire Programme**

The Partnership considered the undernoted report:

#### **“1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues**

- 1.1 **To update members on those groups who participated in the 2019 Bonfire and Cultural Expression Programme.**

## **2.0 Recommendations**

- 2.1 To note the contents of the report and appendix and recommend to the Strategic Policy & Resources committee that Mr. J. Byrne is invited to attend the September meeting of the Shared City Partnership to provide an update on his evaluation report of the 2019 Bonfire & Cultural Expression Programme.**

## **3.0 Main Report**

### **3.1 2019 Bonfire and Cultural Expression Programme**

Council approved a draft District Council Good Relations Programme (DCGRP) Action Plan in February 2019. This included a Cultural Expression Programme under which engagement on the issue of bonfires could be delivered. In April 2019 Council approved a model for delivery of the programme that was in line with the 2018 model.

- 3.2 The programme model seeks to promote positive cultural expression through better bonfire management and cultural celebrations. Constituted groups accessed funding for community events and activities that promoted engagement on issues of cultural expression and diversity.**

- 3.3 The 2019 programme adopted an incentivised approach to support groups to meet the aims of the framework in relation to positive cultural expression, particularly in relation to the collection of materials, burning of tyres and burning of any items such as flags, emblems, election posters and items of clothing.**

Mr. J. Byrne was appointed - through an open quotation exercise – to carry out monitoring and evaluation of the programme which included visits to all participating sites on 10 and 11 July. Members are asked to recommend to SP&R that Mr. J. Byrne attends the September meeting of the Partnership to provide an overview of his evaluation of this year's programme.

- 3.5 This year 35 different events were held as part of the programme and 16 bonfire beacons were provided. The table below shows figures for the last 5 years.**

	Number of July Groups	Number of Beacons
2015	44	6
2016	32	10
2017	32	9
2018	28	11
2019	35	16

- 3.6 The evaluation will draw out more detail in relation to the operation of the programme but it is worth noting the significant increase in the number of beacons that were used as an alternative to traditional bonfires this year.**

### Composition of 2019 Review Panel

- 3.7 For the past number of years a review panel has met to provide the opportunity for groups who have failed to meet the guidelines of the programme to provide further information about the issues that they faced. This panel will consider the information provided and will make recommendations to the Shared City Partnership on whether each group:
- Should receive the final 30% of the first stage payment for activity already undertaken subject to receipt of all relevant documentation.
  - Should be eligible to receive the additional £500 for activities that develop community engagement and awareness on issues of positive cultural expression
  - Should be eligible to take part in a 2020 programme
- 3.8 The review panel is composed of three members of the Shared City Partnership, normally the Chair, vice Chair and one other representative. For the past two years an independent assessor also sat on the panel to provide a challenge function and independent advice to the review panel in relation to the issues that groups face in trying to meet the aims of the programme. The independent assessor makes observations on the decision making process to ensure that it is robust and takes a consistent, fair approach to all sites, they do not have a decision making function.
- 3.9 At the March SCP meeting, it was recommended that Council explore a process to appoint an independent assessor to this panel. Officers recommend that given the change in political representatives on the SCP, and therefore the panel as well as new SCP members, it would be useful to retain the previous independent assessor for 2019 as a way to ensure consistency. Officers will then explore a process to appoint an independent assessor and bring this back to the Partnership prior to the commencement of any programme in 2020.

### Finance and Resource Implications

Officers are liaising with a range of partners to secure additional finances for this programme. All activities outlined in this report were delivered in line with available resources.

### Equality or Good Relations Implications

All activity is part of the Council's Good Relations Action Plan, which has been screened for Equality, Good Relations and Rural Needs, and has been screened out."

**2019 Bonfire and Cultural Expression Programme – List of awards**

	<b>Applicant Name</b>	<b>Location/Detail</b>	<b>Detail</b>	<b>Award</b>
1.	Ballynafeigh Unionist Forum	Green area on Annadale embankment	Bonfire	£1,650.00
2.	Ballysillan Youth for Christ	Green space beside Silverstream Road, Silverstream Crescent & Benview Park	Community Event	£1,750.00
3.	Belfast City Mission (Island Street Hall)	Medway Street	Community Event	£1,750.00
4.	Belvoir Area Residents Group	Green space at entrance to Milltown estate	Bonfire	£720
5.	Brown Square Community Association	Melbourne Street	Beacon only	£0
6.	(Charter NI)	Clara Street	Beacon only	£0
7.	Connswater Community & Services Ltd.	N/A	Community Event	£1,250.00
8.	Consensus Restorative Justice	Dover Street	Bonfire	£1,750.00
9.	Consensus Restorative Justice	Boundary Walk	Bonfire	£1,750.00
10.	Consensus Restorative Justice	Lower Oldpark	Bonfire	£1,750.00
11.	Diamond Project (Charter NI)	Haig Street/Lord Street	Beacon	£1,750.00
12.	Dunmurry Community Association	Dunmurry car park, Glenburn Road	Bonfire	£1,250.00
13.	East Belfast Ladies Historical & Cultural Society (Bapaume)	Picardy Avenue	Beacon	£1,250.00

14.	East Belfast Ladies Historical & Cultural Society	Frome Street	Beacon	£1,250.00
15.	Eastside Women's Project (Charter NI)	Tamar Street walkway	Bonfire	£1,250.00
16.	Highfield Residents Association	Field beside c. centre, Highgreen	Beacon	£1,750.00
17.	The Hubb	Shore Crescent	Bonfire	£1,250.00
18.	Lower Oldpark Community Association	LOCA community centre	Community Event	£1,750.00
19.	Mount Vernon Community Development Forum	Mount Vernon Road	Beacon	£1,250
20.		Thistle Court	Beacon only	£0
21.	New Beginnings	Castleton Park	Community Event	£1,250.00
22.	New Beginnings	Premier Drive/Fortwilliam Parade	Community event	£1,750.00
23.	North Belfast Alternatives	Blackmountain Place	Beacon	£1,250.00
24.	Suffolk Events Circle	Kells Avenue	Bonfire	£1,250.00
25.	Sunningdale Bonfire Group	Ballysillan Road- facing Kilcoole Park	Beacon	£1,250.00
26.	Tullycarnet Action Group Initiative Trust (TAGIT)	Kinross Avenue	Bonfire	£1,750.00
27.	Tullycarnet Action Group Initiative Trust (TAGIT)	Granton Heights/Kings Road	Beacon	£1,750.00
28.	Tullycarnet Action Group Initiative Trust (TAGIT)	Ardcarn Green	Beacon	£1,750.00
29.	Twaddell Woodvale Residents Association	Woodvale Park	Bonfire	£1,250.00

30.	West Belfast Athletic & Cultural Society	Northumberland Street	Community Event	£1,250.00
31.	West Belfast Athletic & Cultural Society	Bellevue Street/Mountjoy street – green area	Beacon	£1,250.00
32.	West Belfast Athletic & Cultural Society	Junction of Ainsworth Avenue / Ceylon Street	Beacon	£1,250.00
33.	Westland Community Group	Waste Ground – Westland road	Bonfire	£1,250.00
34.	Wheatfield Action Project	Ballysillan Park - facing Wheatfield Drive	Beacon	£1,250.00
35.	Whitecity Community Development Association	Whitecity Play Park	Beacon	£1,250.00

The Partnership adopted the recommendations within the report and agreed to retain the previous independent assessor for 2019 as a way to ensure consistency. Officers would then explore a process to appoint an independent assessor and bring it back to the Partnership prior to the commencement of any programme in 2020.

### **Proposal for Support for NI Human Rights Festival**

The Good Relations Manager advised the Partnership that a request for funding had been received from the Human Rights Consortium in relation to the annual Northern Ireland (NI) Human Rights Festival, which was scheduled to take place between 8th and 14th December 2019.

She explained that, annually on 10th December, International Human Rights Day was celebrated across the globe, where civil society groups celebrate and mark the importance of human rights. The Members were advised that for the past seven years, a diverse range of organisations from across NI had collaborated in the development of a local programme of events during that week as part of the NI Human Rights Festival.

The Partnership was advised that the Consortium had requested funding from the Partnership of £6,000, which would enable it to ensure that a wide range of events were accessible to communities which may not currently engage in, or have access to, ongoing human rights issues.

The Good Relations Manager reminded the Partnership that funding for the District Council Good Relations Programme was based on the promotion of good relations between persons of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group. She added that actions must be tied to one of the four themes identified in the Together: Building a United Community (T:BUC) Strategy. The Members were advised that, while the programme for the Festival was not finalised yet, the proposal outlined a number of events which would fall within the parameters.

She highlighted that the current DCGRP had made provision for supporting events under a number of themes and that, therefore, the Partnership was asked to consider

allocating £3,000 towards events, as well as providing the City Hall for events, pending availability and suitability.

During discussion, a number of Members suggested that they would like to see outcomes arising from the Festival, with accompanying measures, and to ensure that the events held were promoted amongst typically underrepresented groups.

After discussion, the Partnership agreed to recommend to the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee that £3,000 be allocated towards events promoting good relations as identified by the TEO and the Council's draft Good Relations Strategy, as well as supporting the provision of a venue through the City Hall for particular events, pending availability and suitability. The Partnership noted that specific events were to be agreed with the group and the Good Relations Manager.

### **Request for a Contribution towards Restorative Practices Forum (NI) International Conference**

The Partnership considered the undernoted report:

#### **1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues**

**1.1 To advise members of a request to provide a contribution towards the cost of an international conference "Building a Vision for the Future of Restorative Practices" being organised by Restorative Practices Forum (NI) on 14th -15th November 2019 at the Park Avenue Hotel.**

#### **2.0 Recommendations**

**2.1 That members recommend to the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee that an amount of up to £1500 towards the costs of speakers, AV and lunches be awarded to the Restorative Practices Forum (NI) for the Restorative Practices Forum (NI) International Conference being held on 14th-15th November 2019 and;**

**2.2 That copies of any documents relating to peace building or emerging recommendations be shared with the Partnership.**

#### **3.0 Main report**

##### **Key Issues**

**3.1 The Restorative Practices Forum (NI) began life as the Restorative Justice Working Group which was formed in 1994 following a Restorative Justice Conference that year. The group aimed to establish restorative justice as an integral part of the criminal justice system and not just as an adjunct to it.**

**3.2 Following the '10 Years On' conference organised by the RJWG in 2004, the group re-established itself as a Forum, reflecting a change in emphasis, acknowledging that the day-to-day work is now being undertaken by a wide range of organisations and sectors.**



- 3.3 The RPF (NI) has brought a wide range of people and organisations together over the past 25 years to promote restorative justice, to offer opportunities to share best practices and to support research. It can claim that it has contributed to the rapid expansion of restorative practices over the past 20 years and to Northern Ireland's international reputation for high quality and innovative restorative approaches in a variety of sectors.**
- 3.4 A 25th Anniversary Conference entitled 'Building a Vision For the Future of Restorative Practices' has been organised at the Park Avenue Hotel on 14th-15th November 2019.**
- 3.5 This conference will provide an opportunity to bring together policy makers, practitioners and researchers from throughout the island of Ireland and visitors from Britain, Europe and beyond.**
- 3.6 The aim of the conference is to take stock of and celebrate what has been achieved; cast a critical eye on what could be improved and generate a vision to maximise the benefits of restorative practices throughout society.**
- 3.7 The conference will have local, regional and international speakers presenting on a number of issues. Keynote speakers will be Professor John Braithwaite, Founder of Regnet, the School of Global Governance & Regulation & the Centre for Restorative Justice at the Australian National University. For the last 15 years, he has concentrated on restorative justice in peacebuilding and in broader issues of governance. Professor Jennifer Llewellyn is currently the Director of the Restorative International Learning Community, an international alliance supporting the development and implementation of restorative justice in Canada, the United States, New Zealand, England and Australia.**
- 3.8 In terms of the potential of restorative practice to impact on peacebuilding, this has not really been highlighted to date; rather it is discussed more in terms of community safety outcomes. The conference would give the opportunity for restorative practice to be examined through this lens, including the impact on intercommunal and intercultural conflict as well as how communities/ neighbourhoods can become more welcoming and inclusive.**
- 3.9 The cost of the project is estimated at £26,700 with approximately £18,850 coming from fees. The group want to ensure that local communities can participate in the conference and have asked for assistance from a range of agencies. To date, the project has received funding of: £1.5k from the Health & Social Care Board; 1k from the Social Change Initiative and £4.8k from the NI Prison Service.**
- 3.10 Members are asked to consider making a contribution of up to £1,500 towards the cost of with a request that speakers expenses,**

**AV hire, lunches with the request that copies of any documents relating to peace building or emerging recommendations be shared with the Partnership.”**

During discussion, a Member suggested that it seemed as if the group had contacted the Council for funding due to a shortfall.

The Good Relations Manager advised the Partnership that the Council's funding would help free up some of their resources in order to provide a number of free places for those in the community and voluntary sector.

The Partnership adopted the recommendations within the report.

**Request for Support for Research into Adolescent Group Interactions, Attitudes and Behaviour**

The Good Relations Manager advised the Members that a request for support had been received from Dr S. McKeown Jones from the University of Bristol for a research proposal focusing on youth intergroup contact, attitudes and behaviour.

She explained that Dr McKeown was currently writing up a grant proposal for a new research project to the Economic Social Research Council which aimed to comprehensively understand, for the first time, the ways in which various individual factors and social contexts facilitated or inhibited social mixing amongst adolescents from different ethno-religious groups. The Partnership was advised that other researchers involved in the project included Queens University, Belfast.

The Partnership was advised that Dr. McKeown Jones had asked whether the Council would be interested in partnering with the team in this research. In practice, the Good relations Manager explained that it would mean submitting a letter of support to include in their application and ideally joining stakeholder related events. The letter would state that the Council endorsed the research and that it would potentially make a difference to the context in which we work. She explained that, in addition, the Council could assist in working collaboratively with organisations and work on impact activities.

During discussion, a number of Members expressed concerns that, while the request was not financial, it was important to acknowledge that the Community and Voluntary Sector would inevitably be involved in the research as part of this project and that those working in the sector were already being asked to do more for less.

After discussion, the Partnership agreed to recommend to the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee that the Council would support the research proposal, and that the letter would include a reference to the work of the Community and Voluntary sector as outlined.

**Community-Led Cross-Interface Event at Townsend Street**

The Good Relations Manager explained to the Members that the Department of Justice (DoJ) had re-convened the Lower Falls/Lower Shankill Forum in 2018 to explore a number of issues relating to the interface gates.

She explained that the Forum comprised of Residents' groups and community associations, a number of residents from either side of the interfaces, representatives from both the Council and the NIHE and that it was chaired by an independent consultant.

The Partnership was advised that, last year, a cross-interface community-led festival had been held on Townsend Street to promote it as a shared space.

The Good Relations Manager outlined that the festival had been held to enable the residents living on either side of the interfaces in the Lower Falls and the Lower Shankill to develop positive relationships before engaging in a conversation around potential barrier transformations in Townsend Street and the surrounding area.

She outlined that a request had been received from the DoJ asking the Council for a contribution towards a fun day event, which would include “a walk down memory lane” exhibition to be held on 21st September, 2019, to coincide with International Peace Day, Good Relations week and the installation of the replacement, see-through gates on Townsend Street.

The Partnership was advised that the gates between the Divis and Shankill areas would be unlocked for the day to bring together people of all ages from both sides of the interface. The event was hoped to be part of a wider push for improved community relations in the area and wider regeneration activity involving other statutory bodies.

The Members were reminded that, under the Shared Space theme in the Good Relations Plan, an allocation had been set aside to bring communities together to engage around interfaces and to impact on the development of shared space.

The Partnership agreed to recommend to the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee that up to £2,000 be awarded for the delivery of a community-led cross-interface festival on 21st September, subject to confirmation of similar match-funding from other agencies working with the Forum, noting that 75% of the costs would be recouped through the District Council’s Good Relations Programme.

### **Update on District Council Good Relations Programme 2019/20**

The Partnership considered the undernoted report:

#### **“1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues**

**1.1 To provide an update in relation to the District Council Good Relations Programme 2019/20.**

#### **2.0 Recommendations**

**2.1 That members note the contents of this report and appendices which provide details of grant awards made in Tranche 1.**

#### **3.0 Main report**

##### **Key Issues**

**3.1 As part of the TEO good relations strategy; Together: Building a United Community, each council receives support to deliver a District Council Good Relations Programme (DCGRP) that supports local approaches to identified good relations needs. The programme is funded 75% by TEO and 25% by each council area.**

- 3.2 Council submits an annual Good Relations Action Plan for consideration by TEO in February of each year; TEO then issues a Letter of Offer based on identified need in each Council area and the level of resource available. A Letter of Offer was received for approximately £570,000 on 1 April 2019. This will provide a total allocation of £740,860 for the action plan, which was amended, to reflect the level of resource available.
- 3.3 The action plan will deliver 10 projects including good relations grant aid funding. A summary of the programme is provided in Appendix 1 and a summary of awards made through Tranche 1 of Good Relations funding which covers activity from April 2019 until 30 September 2019 is available in Appendix 2.
- 3.4 Members should note that all grants have been awarded under delegated authority by the Strategic Director of City & Neighbourhood Services as customary and as agreed by Council.
- 3.5 Belfast City Council also administers Planned Intervention funding which is 100% funded by TEO and supports activity that reduces the likelihood of young people being involved in conflict over times of heightened tension. In previous years, a separate Letter of Offer was issued for Planned Interventions in the region of £100, 000.
- 3.6 For the first time, this year the Planned Intervention programme was delivered as part of the overall DCGRP Action Plan. This element will be 100% funded by TEO with an allocation of £65,000. This was a lower level of allocation than in previous years and the number of awards under Planned Intervention had to be reduced accordingly. Full details of all Planned Interventions awards can be found in Appendix 3.

#### **Financial & Resource Implications**

£205,273 is outlined in the revised action plan to support the Good Relations Small grants programme. Any allocation that substantially exceeds the amount would impact on the delivery of the wider Good Relations programme. The Summer Intervention allocation is £65,000.

In previous years, groups have claimed 90% of the funding award so allocations are based on this level of spend.

#### **Equality or Good Relations Implications**

All activity is part of the Council's Good Relations Action Plan, which has been screened for Equality, Good Relations and Rural Needs, and has been screened out."

The Partnership noted the contents of the report.

### **Good Relations Week – September 2019**

The Good Relations Manager advised the Members that Good Relations Week was a well-established annual week of events that was coordinated by the Community Relations Council. It was held annually in September and, this year, it was scheduled from 16th – 22nd September. She advised that, as in previous years, Councils and other organisations had been invited to stage events to highlight and promote the work being done to promote Good Relations.

The officer detailed that, subject to Council approval, the Council would be launching the Good Relations Strategy and PEACE IV Events Programme on Friday, 20th September from 1.30 p.m. – 3.30 p.m. at Crumlin Road Gaol. The process around the Council's Good Relations Strategy would be referred to at this event and she encouraged the Members of the Partnership to attend and to promote it within their various sectors.

As in previous years, the Council had organised a Living Library event on Wednesday, 18th September at the City Hall and the Members were invited to register with the Good Relations Unit if they wished to participate.

In addition, the Partnership noted that the CRC would be hosting a Shared Learning Forum on Tuesday, 17th September in the City Hall.

Noted.

### **Dates of Future Meetings**

The Partnership agreed that it would meet at 1.30pm on the following dates in 2019:

- Monday, 9th September;
- Monday, 7th October;
- Monday, 11th November; and
- Monday, 2nd December.

Chairperson