

GOOD RELATIONS PARTNERSHIP

FRIDAY, 10th OCTOBER, 2008

MEETING OF THE GOOD RELATIONS PARTNERSHIP

- Members present: Councillor Long (Chairman); and
Councillors C. Maskey, McCausland and Stoker.
- External Members: Ms. J. Hawthorne, Northern Ireland Housing Executive;
Ms. H. Smith, Protestant Churches;
Ms. A. Chada, Ethnic Minority Groups;
Mr. P. Mackel, Belfast Trades Council;
Ms. L. Coates, Belfast City Centre Management;
Mr. M. Wardlow, Voluntary/Community Sector;
Mr. L. Reynolds, Voluntary/ Community Centre; and
Mr. S. Brennan, Voluntary/Community Sector.
- In attendance: Ms. H. Francey, Good Relations Manager;
Ms. C. Wilson, Conflict Transformation Project Manager;
Mr. D. Robinson, Good Relations Officer; and
Mr. J. Heaney, Committee Administrator.

Apologies

Apologies for inability to attend were reported from Councillor Kyle and Mr. P. Scott, the Rev. S. Watson, Mr. R. Galway, Mr. P. Bunting, Ms. E. Wilkinson, Mrs. M. Marken and Ms. M. De Silva.

Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the 5th September were taken as read and signed as correct.

Good Relations Grant Aid Fund

Arising from discussion of the minutes, the Good Relations Manager reminded the Partnership that, at its meeting on 5th September, it had agreed that a limit be set on the amount of grant aid which might be awarded in respect of the Good Relations Grant Aid Fund to an individual group during any one financial year. Accordingly, she recommended that, in order to minimise any disruption to the work of the groups which might apply for funding, that the maximum amount which any one individual group could be awarded during one financial year be £15,000.

The Partnership adopted the recommendation in this regard.

Interface/Peace Walls

The Good Relations Manager advised the Partnership that the Council, at its meeting on 3rd March, had adopted a Notice of Motion which had been proposed by Councillor Maginness and seconded by Councillor Long in regard to the reduction and ultimate removal of the so called "Peace Walls" and barriers that divided the City. This matter had been referred to the former Good Relations Steering Panel.

She reported that several members of staff from the Good Relations Unit were participating currently in the Interface Working Group, which was an inter-agency organisation established at the end of 2007. Representatives on the Group included the Northern Ireland Office, the Police Service of Northern Ireland, the NIHE, North Belfast Community Action Unit and the Belfast Community Safety Partnership with the Community Relations Council acting as a co-ordinator.

The aims of the group were to:

1. draft a policy and process for potential new interfaces which would take on board the various learning initiatives being developed;
2. develop key principles and indicators to monitor and review the existing peace walls; and
3. support all practical actions to achieve the above two points.

The Good Relations Manager reported further that the Interface Working Group had commissioned a report which sought to bring together all information which had been gathered to date on interfaces throughout the City into a practical working document. The contents of the report would be circulated to all relevant community groups and organisations as soon as possible. She pointed out that interface work formed a major element under "Contested Spaces" within the Council's Peace III Plan and that funding for future activities to address interfaces/peacelines issues had been reserved under that programme.

The Partnership was advised that the Interface Working Group had agreed recently that it would be useful if a further mapping exercise/audit were to be undertaken of those groups or organisations working at various interfaces throughout the City, in order to establish which practitioners/groups/networks were in existence and which might have the capacity to be involved in any major programme or action plan seeking to address interface issues. The Working Group had also considered the possibility of identifying possible pilot projects for future work.

It was reported the Dr. N. Jarman, Institute of Conflict Research, and Mr. T. Macaulay, Independent Consultant, were in attendance and they were welcomed by the Chairman.

Dr. Jarman outlined the various aspects of the Community Relations Council's report entitled "Towards Sustainable Security Interface Barriers and the Legacy of Segregation in Belfast". He outlined the background to the report and defined what was meant by segregation and security barriers in the City. He pointed out that the research had sought to identify and compile a list of all security and segregation barriers throughout the City, together with all other structures which acted as barriers between the communities within Belfast. The report had sought also to quantify the level of violence which had taken place at the various interfaces and, where possible, to identify the reasons for such violence.

The Members were informed that the report attempted to identify the obstacles which existed regarding the removal of the physical barriers. Dr. Jarman pointed out that it was important that any removal of barriers should be as a consequence of, or accompanied by, the regeneration of the area. He stated also that there should be a presumption that any re-development or regeneration at an interface area should aim

to remove barriers and physical divisions rather than consolidate existing ones or create new barriers.

The report addressed the various attitudes to interface barriers, in particular, it considered the reasons why people believed the walls/barriers should remain and what factors would be required to increase support for the removal of the peace barriers or walls.

In conclusion, Dr. Jarman stated that the review of the interface areas had highlighted the scale and diversity of the existing security architecture across the City and had identified that, to date, there was no overall strategy designed to remove the existing barriers or prevent new barriers being constructed. He indicated that it was vitally important to consult with the local community and with their political/community representatives prior to developing strategies for the removal of the barriers.

Mr. Macaulay presented to the Members a discussion paper which he had developed independently and which proposed a five stage process for the removal of the peace walls throughout Northern Ireland. The five stage process included mapping, consultation, local interface development plans, implementation and support and normalisation. He outlined the main aspects of the five stages and highlighted the roles and responsibilities of the various stakeholder groups, including the Northern Ireland Office, the Community Relations Council and the City Council, in regard to the removal of the barriers throughout the City.

Dr. Jarman and Mr. Macaulay answered various questions from the Members in relation to the report and discussion paper and agreed with the Members that it was vitally important that the views of the people living directly at the interfaces and the young people of the areas were taken into consideration prior to any action plans being put into operation. Dr. Jarman pointed out that his report was a draft document for consultation purposes and that the suggestions of the Members would be taken into consideration prior to the publishing of the final report. He and Mr. Macaulay thanked the Partnership for receiving them and they retired from the meeting.

After discussion, the Partnership noted the information contained within the reports and agreed that a further audit/mapping exercise of the groups or organisations working in interface areas be commissioned by the Good Relations Unit in accordance with the Council's and the European Union procurement procedures. The Partnership noted also that a further report in this regard would be submitted to the Partnership for its consideration in due course and that copies of Dr. Jarman's and Mr. Macaulay's draft report/discussion papers would be available for inspection on the Modern.Gov intranet site.

**Correspondence between the Partnership
and the Special European Union Programmes Body (SEUPB)**

The Partnership was reminded that, at its meeting on 15th August, it had agreed that a letter be sent to the SEUPB outlining the Partnership's concerns over the delays associated with the introduction of the Peace III Programme, the possible cash flow implications for the Council and the consequential negative repercussions for communities in the City.

**Good Relations Partnership,
Friday, 10th October, 2008**

The Good Relations Manager submitted for the Partnership's consideration a copy of a letter which had been sent to Mr. Pat Colgan, Chief Executive of the SEUPB addressing the Council's concerns and a copy of the response which had been received from Mr. Colgan.

Several Members pointed out that the letter from Mr. Colgan had failed to address the concerns which had been raised by the Partnership and it was agreed that a further letter be forwarded to the SEUPB reiterating the Partnership's concerns. It was agreed also that the matter be raised with the SEUPB's at the Monitoring Committee meeting.

The Good Relations Manager informed the Partnership that she had recently received the formal Letter of Offer relating to the award of £6.3 Million under 1.1 of Peace III and she was consulting with the financial audit and legal services of the Council to ensure that the conditions of the offer could be fully met.

Peace III Small Grants Programme

The Partnership considered the undernoted report in respect of the development of a Small Grants Programme under Peace III:

“Relevant Background Information

Members will recall that at its meeting on 15th August 2008, the Good Relations Partnership agreed that the Good Relations Officers should commence drawing up the criteria and application process for the proposed Small Grants programme that will form part of Peace III funding.

As the staffing structure required to administer Peace III will not be in place until November at the earliest, the main bulk of the Peace III funding will not be available until the spring of 2009. If the Small Grants element can be progressed in advance of this, it would provide an important source of funding for community based organisations in the interim. This would also assist in alleviating pressure on the Council's main Good Relations Grant Aid Fund.

Key Issues

During public consultation on the initial Peace Plan, the Council's proposal of offering small grants, including potential salary costs, was widely supported and welcomed by the community and voluntary sector as a means of supporting locally based initiatives.

The SEUPB have stated that “small grants” in Peace III may be up to £25,000 each; an allocation of £850,000 for open calls and small grants has been included within Belfast's final approved Peace Plan.

A key issue is whether the small grants proposal should support salary/employment related and overhead costs for applicant groups and whether this should be capped. It is acknowledged that many organisations, particularly smaller groups, are finding it increasingly difficult to access funding for salary costs; a small grant of £25,000 could provide organisations with the opportunity to employ a member of staff. SEUPB guidelines allow for employment costs to be proportionate to the project being delivered.

We considered several options:

Option 1: That the small grants scheme supports only project related costs that meet the Peace III objectives. This was felt to be unfair and overly restrictive.

Option 2: That the small grants scheme includes provision for the support of employment related costs capped at £15,000, that all eligible expenditure is based on real costs, is proportionate to the project, represents value for money and meets the Peace III objectives.

Option 3: That the small grants scheme includes provision for salary/employment related costs up to a maximum gross sum of £20,000, based on NJC pay scales, that all eligible expenditure is based on real (evidence based) costs, is proportionate to the project, represents value for money and meets the Peace III objectives.

Following discussion with representatives from the Community Relations Council/Border Action Consortium, appointed to provide specialist advice to SEUPB on Peace III, Option 3 is the recommended option for the Peace III small grants element of the Council's Peace programme, as it provides maximum flexibility to applicants. The draft guidance notes, application form and scoring matrix based on option 3 are attached for information.

An amount for programme costs must be included. Apportioned salary costs are more likely to be eligible. Match funding with other non-EU funding sources will be considered.

The Good Relations Partnership should be aware that minor textual changes may have to be made to the final document if required by SEUPB.

Financial Implications

As the vast majority of applications are likely to be from smaller organisations, advance payments may be required; we are awaiting SEUPB guidance on this. Each application will be dealt with on an individual case level and is recommended that the maximum advance if required should be 25% of the applicant's first year's anticipated expenditure.

The Small Grants programme is included within the Peace III allocation of £6.3m. and may be reclaimed at 100% from the SEUPB.

There are no overall costs to the Council but there may be cash flow issues pending recoupment from the SEUPB.

Recommendations

The Good Relations Partnership is requested to approve the recommended option as outlined above and agree the following conditions :

In view of the first spend target of September 2009, that the sum of £500,000 (out of a total of £850,000 for the first 2 years of the Peace III Programme) be made available at this stage and this will be a competitive process, with the highest scoring applications receiving funding

That a limit of one application per group/organisation be set at this stage, in view of the likely demand, to ensure the broadest possible take-up, unless in exceptional circumstances

That a call for applications will be made in mid-November with a closing date early in January 2009 and recommendations to the Good Relations Partnership in February 2009

That the position be reviewed in the summer of 2009, i.e. after 6 months, to ensure that the delivery of the small grants element is manageable within the Peace III resources and provides value for money within the overall Peace Plan.

All decisions will be at the discretion of the Good Relations Partnership.

Officers to contact for further information

David Robinson, Good Relations Officer. (ext: 6030)
Leish Cox, Good Relations Officer. (ext: 6028)"

During discussion, the Good Relations Manager advised the Partnership that the Consortium, made up from staff from the Community Relations Council and Border Action which had been appointed to provide specialist advice to SEUPB on Peace III, had requested that it be permitted to send observers to any meeting of the Partnership during which consideration was being given to the Peace III matters.

After discussion, the Partnership adopted the recommendations contained within the report and agreed that Consortium be permitted to send a representative to the Partnership, in an observer capacity only, when items of business relating to the Peace III Programme were under discussion.

Conflict Transformation Project – Closure Report

The Committee considered the undernoted report in respect to the work of the Conflict Transformation Project:

“Relevant Background Information

In December 2006, Belfast City Council was successful in its 3 applications to the Belfast Local Strategy Partnership to draw down funding under Measure 3.1 of the EU Programme for Peace & Reconciliation in Northern Ireland (Peace II) Extension 00-07. The total grant-aid was almost £750,000 to support the Conflict Transformation Project.

The 3 programmes within the Conflict Transformation Project were:

- **Addressing Divisions**
- **Conflict Transformation Learning Consortium**
- **Towards a Shared City.**

This project formally closed at the end of June 2008 and the final evaluation, expenditure and audit reports have now been completed.

Key Issues

The overarching aim of the 3 programmes contained within the Conflict Transformation Project was to build a foundation for a series of collaborative good relations activities in the city, between Council departments and with other statutory bodies in the city. This was both in terms of an evidence base, as well as political and agency consensus on priorities for the city. This was designed to support the future implementation of the Peace III programme and community planning.

Delivery

Five staff were appointed to deliver the project and its 30 targets. These covered a range of objectives including the formation of ad-hoc networks; organisation of seminars and workshops; production of research reports; publicity campaigns; and the development of a series of recommendations for action. Of these 30 targets, 23 were fully achieved or exceeded, 3 were partially achieved and 4 were not achieved. These 4 targets were substituted with 4 new targets, in agreement with BLSP; these were all fully achieved.

The main constraint in achieving all of our targets was time and BLSP agree that we were perhaps over-ambitious in our original applications. The independent evaluators agree with this conclusion. Four additional outputs were delivered during the course of the project, including the elected Members' study visit; the UK study visit; the collaborative working partnerships seminar series; and the research on mobility and connectivity. These were all funded from savings made elsewhere within the programmes and BLSP agreed that they enhanced the overall aim of the project.

Key outputs include:

- Over 300 people, drawn from the statutory, community, private and academic sectors participated in 16 seminars over the 12 months. These seminars focussed on shared space, economic regeneration, inter-cultural cities, inclusive decision-making and good practice in conflict transformation;
- 6 research projects on shared space, mobility, local area planning and transformative service delivery. These reports included 124 recommendations and have been widely disseminated through the website and partner agencies;
- A photographic exhibition exploring the diversity of the city exhibited at the Waterfront with over 4000 visitors and attracted significant positive media coverage at its launch in June. It asked a range of people where they considered the 'heart' of the city to be. This is currently in store and will be used at other locations;
- 2 study visits to Chicago, USA (Oct 07 & May 08). The first visit was for senior public officials (20 participants) and the second visit was for elected representatives (17 participants). Both of these visits were hosted by the Mayor's Office in Chicago and included a high-level of contributors from public office, advisory councils, academia and economic regeneration experts;

- A study visit to Leicester, UK (Feb 08) for 22 senior operational staff examining good relations, economic competitiveness, shared space and community cohesion. This was hosted by Leicester City Council and the Institute for Community Cohesion;
- 12 inter-agency meetings to build consensus on priorities for good relations in the city, in line with the existing objectives of the Good Relations Plan;
- The establishment of an inter-agency forum, led by the CRC, on a co-ordinated regeneration approach in those communities at the interface;
- A pilot with over 40 participants from the community and statutory sectors exploring the synergies between peace-building and local area working; and
- 4 international good practice visits to explore heritage; divided societies; city-making; and gang-related violence;
- 6 articles in relevant publications and a web-site highlighting the work of the project;
- Participation in 6 meetings of the BLSP Conflict Transformation Network with the academic and community sectors to examine linkages between funded projects;
- Formal presentations at 5 conferences, including the high-profile UK-Ireland Planning Research Conference;
- 14 claims with supporting documentation were successfully submitted to BLSP to re-coup expenditure.

BLSP praised the project for its range of outputs and the in-depth nature of the discussions and issues addressed.

Partners and participants

A number of ad-hoc networks were established during the project. The 12 key agencies represented were:

- Belfast Education Library Board;
- Belfast Health and Social Care Trust;
- Belfast Metropolitan College

- Community Relations Council;
- Department of Social Development;
- Department of Environment;
- NI Council for Integrated Education;
- NI Council for Voluntary Action;
- NI Housing Executive;
- OFMDFM;
- Police Service NI;
- Queen's University Belfast; and
- Strategic Investment Board.

Throughout the project, a range of participants were drawn from the academic, community and voluntary sectors. This included, amongst others: Belfast Interface Project; Greater Shankill Community Council; Intercomm; South Belfast Roundtable on Racism; and Mediation NI. The private sector was also represented at a number of seminars.

Expenditure

The total expenditure on each of the 3 programmes was:

1. £205,057 – Addressing Divisions (82% LoO grant-aid £249,950)
2. £178,860 – Learning Consortium (71.5% LoO grant-aid £249,950)
3. £196,428 – Towards a Shared City (78.5% LoO grant-aid £249,910)

A major reason for the under-spend was that, in practice, the project was only fully operational for 12 months as opposed to the planned 18 months. This was due in part to the funder's requirement for a public staff recruitment process and the longer lead-in time required to build partners' participation in the process. Also, the project staff ensured that all study visits and events were delivered at best value, in line with strict procurement requirements. Several high-profile international speakers generously contributed their time at no cost to the project.

BLSP were appropriately informed regarding projected under-spend and any changes to spend profiles were agreed in advance, as required.

Emerging themes

A number of key themes emerged from the study visits, inter-agency meetings and commissioned research.

Fundamentally, it is important that the city leadership balances the need to deal with its past effectively as well as creating the vision for the future. The visits to Chicago and the commissioned research repeatedly stressed the importance of positive political leadership in transforming a divided city. It is commonly agreed that it is important to have a comprehensive good relations agenda in Belfast, led by the Council, in order to improve the quality of life for its citizens and for it to become a competitive city within a wider Europe, with an image as tolerant, clean, green and safe.

The Conflict Transformation Project has enabled the Council to clearly demonstrate the cross-cutting thematic nature of good relations. The good relations agenda cross-references other city-wide agenda, including economic development, health improvement, open spaces and promoting a safer city. The direct connection between the good relations agenda and city prosperity agenda were clearly and repeatedly demonstrated. Council is currently considering adopting a thematic approach to work planning as it prepares for community planning.

The challenge facing Belfast is to ensure that all of its citizens are able to share the new opportunities and 'feel-good' factor. There are still many areas within the city where the change has been much slower and deprivation remains. There is a clear desire to build a vision of a shared and better future between local communities in the city as we enter the next phase, moving from conflict management to city transformation.

Generally, there is a growing openness to the concept of shared space and an increased recognition amongst providers and users that duplication of services is an inefficient and unsustainable method of delivery. Unsurprisingly, territoriality and safety remain key concerns. The promotion of sharing in public spaces would also ease the pressure on the mixing in residential areas. It is recommended that the economic and social value of sharing should be more explicitly promoted by statutory agencies when planning, delivering and managing shared spaces in the city.

The significance of transport and connectivity was stressed in terms of promoting access to shared spaces in the city. There is a need to comprehensively plan a safe 'path network' (public transport, cycle ways and pedestrian routes) between sites of employment, leisure and services in the city, as well as ensure individual safety at the destination. This is important for the major regeneration sites at Titanic Quarter, Giant's Park, Crumlin Road/Girdwood and Springvale.

Independent evaluation

An independent evaluation was completed by Williamson Consulting, as required by our funder. They conducted 30 meetings with a number of stakeholders and reviewed the materials from the project.

Generally, the evaluation was very positive about the implementation and management of the project, the quality of seminars and study visits and the focussed discussions on transforming a divided city. Inevitably, given the short time scale for the project, they concluded that the emerging recommendations will need to be done through a range of alternative mechanisms to ensure that the learning from the project continues to create benefit and, ultimately, demonstrates value for money and a lasting legacy.

Their key recommendations were grouped under four headings: Structures; Planning; Partner Organisations; and other recommendations. They included:

1. A forum for political leaders to consider how opportunities could be created for Councillors to continue discussions started during the Chicago visit. It is critical that the Council continues engagement with internationally-recognised experts on good relations/conflict transformation, to support the political and strategic leadership of the city to reflect on progress. It is suggested that the CRC also be included in such a forum;
2. As a framework for Community Planning continues to develop, it must centrally recognise the importance of good relations and provision of shared services and spaces;
3. Council and its partners must continue to develop community engagement models which deliver good relations outcomes as well as fulfil a service delivery need, for example, in local area working;

4. Consideration is given to the further dissemination of the research. Some of those consulted felt that the presentation was too academic and would benefit from a more 'user-friendly' format;
5. Councillors who have participated in the project could present its main findings to a group of MLA's at the NI Assembly; and
6. All of the statutory agencies involved in the project recognise that Belfast City Council should take a key role in civic leadership and are happy for Council to co-ordinate and facilitate ongoing work which is focused on the city as a whole. It is recommended that Belfast City Council supports the ongoing role of such a group. Its primary purpose would be to develop and monitor the implementation of the city's Good Relations Plan.

The full evaluation reports are available on the website at:

www.belfastcity.gov.uk/conflict

Recommendations 3 and 5 have been incorporated into the Council's recent application to SEUPB under the 2.2 priority of the Peace III programme (see below).

Discussions are ongoing with the CRC regarding recommendation 4. It is proposed that summaries of all of the research are prepared for publication in their regular Shared Space Journal.

SEUPB will be conducting a further audit and evaluation of the projects. This is part of a standard sampling procedure for all grant-aided projects under the EU Peace Programmes.

Next steps

The key outcome of the project is the informal agreement by partner agencies that the Council is best placed to lead the priority-setting and implementation of collaborative good relations planning in the city. This is in line with the new Council Corporate Plan 2008-2011, which outlines our commitment to demonstrate civic leadership in this complex area.

Following the Members' visit to Chicago, a number of broad headline areas of action were recommended. These will now be developed into a series of indicative actions and draft objectives. This will be presented to the appropriate Council Committees for agreement in due course.

The Good Relations Partnership granted authority for an application to be made under the 2.2 priority of the Peace III programme (Key institutional capacities are developed for a shared society). This application outlines an inter-agency leadership, learning and development programme building on the work of the Conflict Transformation Project, as well as examines models of community engagement in a peace-building context. This proposal, entitled 'A Learning City', has been submitted to SEUPB for consideration, as recommended by the Good Relations Partnership at its meeting in August 2008.

An ad-hoc group of Chief Executives of statutory agencies in Belfast has been central to the implementation and strategic direction of the Conflict Transformation Project. It is proposed that the Council's Chief Executive will brief them on progress at the next available opportunity.

Externally, the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee granted authority to the Chief Executive to initiate discussions with the appropriate partner agencies and the Northern Ireland Good Relations Panel, chaired by the Head of the NI Civil Service, on the contribution partner agencies will make to the delivery of the plan. It is proposed that the Chief Executive seeks an agenda item at a future meeting of the Panel, to present the 'next generation' Belfast Good Relations Plan.

Conclusion

In overview, the Williamson Consulting evaluation report concluded that:

'The Project was an ambitious project which sought to bring about significant change... It recognised the political importance of creating a critical mass whereby people who had sufficient authority and a shared vision could bring about major change.'

Finally, they remarked:

'The Project has had many successes; however the true benefit of this work will only come about if the learning is taken forward in a range of practical ways.'

All of the information from the project, including the full research reports are available at:

www.belfastcity.gov.uk/conflict

Resource Implications

Financial

The project was 100% grant-aided under the Peace II extension programme through BLSP.

Human Resources

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

Recommendations

The Partnership notes the report and considers the independent evaluator's recommendation regarding a briefing for MLA's.

The Partnership recommends to the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee that the research is prepared for publication in partnership with the Community Relations Council.

Key to Abbreviations

BLSP - Belfast Local Strategy Partnership
CRC - Community Relations Council
LoO - Letter of Offer"

After discussion, the Committee adopted the recommendations contained within the report.

Bonfire Management Programme

The Partnership agreed to defer consideration of a report in respect of the Bonfire Management Programme to a future meeting of the Partnership in order to permit Members to give due consideration to the matter.

The Partnership agreed also that an invitation be extended to representatives from a number of the communities involved in the programme to deliver a presentation to the next meeting of the Partnership in respect of the community's role in the development of the programme.

Progress Report on the Implementation of the Council's Good Relations Strategy

The Good Relation Manager, in accordance with the Council's Equality Scheme and Good Relations Strategy, submitted for the Partnership consideration a report detailing the work of the Good Relations Unit for the period from 1st April till 30th September, 2008.

**Good Relations Partnership,
Friday, 10th October, 2008**

She highlighted various aspects of the report, including the establishment of the Good Relations Partnership, the work which had been carried out in relation to the European Programme for Peace and Reconciliation – Peace III Programme, the allocation of funding under the Good Relations Grant Aid Fund, the Conflict Transformation Project, the Bonfires Project, together with work which had been undertaken in relation to the St. Patrick’s Day Small Grants Scheme, the St. Patrick’s Day Concert, and the Showcase event. In addition, she reported on the work of the Unit in providing assistance and information to Migrant Workers, the project associated with the Eurocities Initiative, the organisation of various conferences, the Book of Honour and the Shared Neighbourhood Programme and, most recently, the work in relation to Interface problems and the removal of Peace Walls.

The Good Relations Manager advised the Members also of the work undertaken in respect of equality issues, including the production of the Equality Reference guide for employees and Year 2 of the Disability Action Plan, together with the hosting of a number of equality-related events.

The Committee noted the information which had been provided.

Polish Picnic

The Partnership was advised that the Polish Picnic, an event which was organised by the Polish Community within the City, would be held in St. Georges Market on Sunday, 19th October. The Good Relations Manager advised the Partnership that the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor (Councillor Hartley) would be attending the event and that all Members of the Partnership had been invited to attend.

The Partnership noted the information which had been provided.

Chairman