

## **GOOD RELATIONS PARTNERSHIP**

**MONDAY, 8th OCTOBER, 2012**

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

- Members Present: Councillor Hendron (Chairman);  
Alderman Rodgers; and  
Councillors Hanna and Reynolds.
- External Members: Ms. O. Barron, Belfast Health and Social Care Trust;  
Mr. S. Brennan, Voluntary/Community Sector;  
Ms. A. Chada, Minority Ethnic Groups;  
Mr. R. Galway, Confederation of British Industry/  
Shorts Bombardier;  
Mr. P. Mackel, Belfast and District Trades Council;  
Mrs. M. Marken, Catholic Church;  
Mr. B. McGivern, Belfast City Centre Management;  
Mr. P. Scott, Catholic Church;  
Ms. M. De Silva, Voluntary/Community Sector; and  
Mr. U. Tok, Northern Ireland Inter-Faith Forum.
- Also attended: Ms. D. O'Loan, Community Relations Council/Pobal.
- In attendance: Mrs. H. Francey, Good Relations Manager;  
Mr. I. May, PEACE III Programme Manager;  
Mr. D. Robinson, Senior Good Relations Officer; and  
Mr H. Downey, Democratic Services Officer.

#### **Apologies**

Apologies for inability to attend were reported from Alderman Stoker, Councillors Attwood and Kyle, Reverend L. Carroll and Mr. M. O'Donnell.

#### **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of 10th September were taken as read and signed as correct.

#### **Declaration of Interest**

Mr. S. Brennan declared an interest in respect of agenda item 3, viz., Good Relations Grant-Aid Fund, in that he was a part-time student at the Queen's University of Belfast, which had submitted an application for funding, and sat on the Hazelwood Community Partnership, of which the Greater Whitewell Community Surgery, which had also applied for funding, was the lead partner and took no part in the discussion.

**Good Relations Partnership  
Monday, 8th October, 2012**

**Welcome**

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Alderman Rodgers and Councillor Hanna who were attending in place of Alderman Stoker and Councillor Attwood respectively.

**Re-Imaging Communities Project**

The Partnership was reminded that, at its meeting on 6th August, it had approved funding for five small artwork projects aimed at enhancing the Lower Shankill area of the City. The Partnership had been advised that the Arts Council of Northern Ireland's Re-Imaging Communities project, which had in the past provided funding for such initiatives, had been suspended and, accordingly, the Partnership had agreed that a letter be forwarded to the Special European Union Programmes Body requesting that it be re-instated at the earliest opportunity.

The Good Relations Manager informed the Partnership that correspondence had now been received from the Chief Executive of the Programmes Body confirming that a Letter of Offer had, on 1st August, been issued to the Arts Council in respect of the aforementioned project.

Noted.

**PEACE III – Implementation Update**

The Partnership considered the undernoted report:

**“Purpose of report**

**The purpose of this report is to update the Partnership on implementation of the Belfast PEACE III Plan.**

**Progress on Phase II projects**

**A summary of each of the approved Phase II projects has been circulated to the Partnership. This includes key activities and expenditure as at 31st August, 2012, together with a commentary on progress and financial update on the last quarter.**

**Review Session**

**A review session is scheduled to take place the morning of Wednesday, 17th October. It is proposed that agenda items will include:**

- **Consideration of the Draft Phase 1 post-project evaluation report;**
- **Progress review by theme;**
- **Monitoring and Evaluation Framework Update;**
- **Partnership Development; and**
- **Communications.**

**Consultation on EU Structural Funds 2014-2020**

A public consultation on the European Territorial Co-Operation Programmes for 2014 – 2020 was launched by the Special European Union Programmes Body on 28th August. This includes a proposed EU Programme for Peace and Reconciliation 2014 – 2020 (PEACE IV). The public consultation is to obtain the views of key stakeholders and members of the general public on the content, implementation and delivery mechanisms for the new programmes. The consultation period will close on 20th November, 2012.

The EU regulations which will cover these programmes are at draft stage and have yet to be approved by the European Council and European Parliament. The draft regulations may be amended during this process. The overall EU budget has not yet been agreed, and, therefore, there can be no certainty as to the budget allocation to any programme at this time. In addition, whilst there is provision within the draft regulations for a future PEACE programme, the two Member States (UK and Ireland) are required to formally request the inclusion of the programme. This programme planning will run in parallel with final negotiations on the regulations and budget.

A further statutory public consultation will provide an opportunity to comment on the draft operational programmes, as well as the strategic environmental assessments and the equality impact assessments. This is likely to be held in the spring / summer 2013.

A briefing note on the process and some key issues have been forwarded to the Partnership.

**Forthcoming Events**

17th October, 2012 – Belfast PEACE III Plan Review Session,  
The Mount Conference Centre

19th October, 2012 – All Projects Forum Meeting, Holiday  
Inn, Belfast

13th November, 2012 – PEACE III Conference and Exhibition,  
City Hall.

**Change Request – Youth Engagement Project(YEP) (ref: 34054)**

Within the original Economic Appraisal for YEP, family counselling and support services and volunteer mentoring services were recommended for funding under the Interventions package. Following the city-wide mapping and community engagement exercise recently completed by Copius Consulting, the project has identified the need for additional support services which could be funded. These additional support services would address youth

**Good Relations Partnership  
Monday, 8th October, 2012**

unemployment, education and training and local capacity building, provide a comprehensive programme for young people and their families and ensure the implementation of the 'wrap-around' approach to service delivery as proposed in the economic appraisal.

The exercise identified the need for the following services:

- Diversion and motivation programme (already procured and currently being delivered);
- Youth mentoring services (rather than a volunteer mentoring services);
- Family counselling and support services;
- Youth employment, training and education support services; and
- Local training and capacity building programme.

Funding for the additional two programmes can be facilitated within the current budget and no additional resources are required. The benefits of the proposal are summarised as follows:

- Increased value for money, enabling the delivery of additional services within the agreed budget;
- Enhanced service provision- delivery of more bespoke services that are responsive to need, have been shaped by local communities and will ensure greater community buy-in;
- Development of a model of integrated service delivery based on similar youth engagement models that operate in other part of the UK e.g. Glasgow, Lambeth, Birmingham; whereby an extensive list of high end intervention and support services are offered to young people and their families to help bring about lasting lifestyle changes; and
- Address legacy issues for the project through the establishment or additional support for parent support networks, training peer mentors to continue to work in communities when YEP funding ceases.

It is recommended that approval is given to procure for additional services as part of the YEP intervention, tender package, as follows:

- 1 contract for family counselling and support services for up to £141, 120;
- 1 contract for youth mentoring services (rather than volunteer mentoring services) for up to £12,000;

**Good Relations Partnership  
Monday, 8th October, 2012**

- 1 contract for youth employment, education and for up to £123, 840; and
- 1 contract for local training and capacity building services for up to £ 91, 880.

A detailed report on the project changes has been prepared by the Project Manager and has been forwarded to the Partnership.

**Resource Implications**

**Financial Implications**

None at present.

**HR Implications**

None at present.

**Equality Implications**

None at present.

**Recommendations**

The Partnership is requested to note the information provided relating to implementation of the Belfast PEACE III Plan.

The Partnership is requested to note the results of the mapping exercise and approve the proposed change relating to the Youth Engagement Project (ref: 34054).”

After discussion, the Partnership adopted the recommendations and agreed, in order to ensure that any future PEACE programme was aligned to existing policy development in areas such as arts and leisure, community development, education and rural and urban regeneration, to receive at a future meeting presentations on the Council’s Community Development Programme and the Community Planning process.

**Consultation on Human Trafficking and Exploitation**

The Partnership considered the undernoted report:

**“Relevant Background Information**

Lord Morrow has proposed a Private Member’s Bill entitled ‘Human Trafficking and Exploitation (Further Provisions and Support for Victims) Bill.’ This report summarises the key points of the draft Bill and a proposed Council response to the consultation paper is attached.

**Good Relations Partnership  
Monday, 8th October, 2012**

Human trafficking is defined as ‘the forced removal of people from their communities and exploiting them using violence, deception, coercion, the abuse of power or the abuse of someone’s vulnerability’. It is an international crime undertaken for a variety of purposes, including sexual exploitation, forced labour, domestic servitude, enforced criminal activity or benefit fraud.

The ease of passage across the land border between NI and Ireland is known to be used by traffickers and presents particular difficulties to authorities in both jurisdictions, being highly profitable for the organisers. Human trafficking is on the increase in NI, where trafficking for purposes of sexual exploitation has been identified as a particular problem.

The Partnership will be aware from previous reports that staff from the Good Relations Unit have become concerned with this issue over the past year. The Council’s Good Relations and Community Safety Units are working with partners, including the PSNI, the Law Centre, Migrant Help and Women’s Aid, to develop briefings for key staff to raise awareness of the indicators of human trafficking and draw up internal procedures on reporting such activity.

**Key Issues**

There is strong consensus around the need to tackle human trafficking, exemplified by a debate and the creation of an all-party group on the issue at Stormont in February, 2012.

A European Directive requires NI to ensure that it is prosecuting traffickers and caring for victims. Consequently the Department of Justice (DOJ) has proposed new offences in the current Criminal Justice Bill to ensure that (i) when offences are carried out abroad, individuals can be prosecuted in NI and (ii) that internal trafficking within the UK is made a crime. These follow the changes introduced in England and Wales in January which made similar provisions.

Lord Morrow wants the law to go further, to secure convictions of traffickers, to care for the victims and to address the demand for trafficked services. His Bill’s proposals generally strengthen the protection afforded to victims of human trafficking and cover the following issues:

- allow courts to take aggravating factors into consideration when passing sentence
- extend the definition of other exploitation to include forced begging
- bring in a new offence of paying for the sexual services of a prostitute

**Good Relations Partnership  
Monday, 8th October, 2012**

- ensure no prosecution is brought for a criminal offence committed by a trafficking victim as a direct consequence of being trafficked
- require training and investigative tools to be made available for police and prosecutors
- define a victim of trafficking
- set out what assistance and support is required for victims of trafficking
- require clear compensation procedures
- require each child victim to have a legal advocate to support them through the relevant criminal, immigration and compensation procedures and ensure they receive suitable assistance
- provide 'special measures' for trafficking victims if they act as witnesses
- require the Department of Justice to produce an annual strategy on raising awareness and reducing trafficking in human beings.

The proposed consultation response, which was developed following informal consultation with partners in Migrant Help, the Law Centre and the PSNI, is attached. We welcome all of the provisions contained in Lord Morrow's proposed Private Member's Bill with the exception of the proposal to bring in a new offence of paying for the sexual services of a prostitute.

The Partnership may wish to note that Harriet Harman MP proposed outlawing prostitution back in 2007 but the proposals did not succeed in getting through Westminster. In Scotland, a Labour MSP attempted a similar move but her bid to get a ban fast-tracked through the Holyrood Parliament was rejected in June.

Some people are of the view that such a proposal is likely to drive prostitution further underground, putting those engaged in this activity, already marginalised, in greater risk. Others believe that such a law would be almost impossible to enforce and would make it harder to identify, and therefore to protect, vulnerable women who might need help. On the other hand, the current situation is clearly not acceptable and human trafficking appears to form part of this wider problem.

We recognise that there are arguments both for and against this proposal and have left the decision on this aspect to the political party groups to include in their responses.

**Timescale**

Consultation closes on Anti-Slavery Day i.e. 18th October. The Council has requested a few days extension to allow a response to be considered during the standard Committee process in October.

**Resource Implications**

None for Belfast City Council

**Equality and Good Relations Implications**

If the proposals in this Bill pass into legislation then this will have a positive impact on equality and good relations for victims of human trafficking.

**Recommendation**

The Good Relations Partnership is requested to approve the attached response to the consultation.

**'HUMAN TRAFFICKING AND EXPLOITATION (FURTHER PROVISIONS AND SUPPORT FOR VICTIMS) BILL'**

**COUNCIL RESPONSE**

Belfast City Council welcomes the opportunity to respond to this Private Member's Bill proposed by Lord Morrow. Please find below our responses to each of the consultation questions.

**Question: Do you agree that there is a case for further legislation to prevent and tackle human trafficking and support victims?**

Yes  No  Unsure

**Comments:** The increase in reported incidents of human trafficking in NI over the past number of years supports the view that there is a case for further legislation to prevent and tackle human trafficking and to support victims. People trafficking is the largest and fastest growing industry after the drug trade and it is crucial that the Assembly ensures that NI is prosecuting traffickers and caring for victims who require protection. Without legislation, there is no guarantee that resources will be put into tackling human trafficking and assisting victims.

**Questions on Consent**

*Do you agree that there should be a list of circumstances outlining when evidence of agreement to travel and be trafficked is irrelevant?*

Yes  No  Unsure



**Comments:** The list of the circumstances proposed - i.e. threats, abduction, fraud, deception, abuse of power or vulnerability, where payment was made or where the victim was a child – is useful and in line with the European Directive. Most victims of trafficking are in a position of vulnerability and in such circumstances evidence of agreement to travel or be trafficked should be considered irrelevant as this would be important in safeguarding victims. As the Bill states, the person ‘has no real or acceptable alternative but to submit to the abuse involved’.

*Which ones do you think are the most important?*

All circumstances where threats, force or other forms of coercion are used, are important.

**Questions on Aggravating Factors.**

*Do you agree the Judge should be forced to take into account certain factors that make the crime worse?*

Yes  No  Unsure

**Comments:** There are certain factors which increase the seriousness of an offence and these should be taken into account during sentencing; e.g. where the victim was a child or a vulnerable adult.

*Do you agree that these factors make the crime worse?*

Yes  No  Unsure

Should some of these proposed factors be removed?

Yes  No  Unsure

Do you agree that these factors should mean that the Judge must give longer sentences?

Yes  No  Unsure

**Comments:** Aggravating factors must be taken into account when sentencing a criminal convicted of human trafficking and should result in longer sentences.

**Question on Expansion of Definitions**

Do you agree the definitions related to exploitation should be expanded as proposed?

Yes  No  Unsure

**Comments:** Belfast City Council believes that it would be useful to expand the definitions particularly increasing this to include forced begging and criminal activities.

There is anecdotal evidence that children are being trafficked for the purposes of enforced begging and street crime. A number of children and adults involved in begging and street performances can now be seen in Belfast city centre and the Council would welcome the inclusion of enforced begging in trafficking legislation as it would strengthen the ability of statutory agencies to address this issue. At present, such activity is not identified as related to exploitation and this can result in difficulty in taking action.

**Questions on Making Paying for Sexual Services Illegal**

*Do you agree that paying for sexual services of a prostitute should be illegal?*

Yes                       No                       Unsure

Comments: The Council recognizes that the demand for paid sex is one of the main drivers of trafficking to NI. It is already illegal to buy sex from someone in NI if they are coerced, although in practice it can be difficult to provide proof of coercion.

The Council recognises that there are strong views both for and against this proposal. Some people feel that the criminalisation of paying for the sexual services of a prostitute risks driving prostitution further underground and will put people engaged in this activity at further risk. Others feel such a law would be difficult to enforce. On the other hand, the current situation is clearly not acceptable and human trafficking appears to form part of this wider problem. We have left the decision on this to the party political groups to make a response.

**Questions on Protecting Victims from Prosecution**

*Do you agree that the victim of trafficking should not be punished for crimes committed in specified circumstances?*

Yes                       No                       Unsure

Comments: Current legislation provides a loose protection for suspected victims of trafficking who are suspected of involvement in criminal activity in that the suspicions of trafficking will be investigated first before any criminal allegations are considered.

However, if the law accepts that a person who has been the victim of human trafficking has no real alternative other than to submit to the coercion/force of others (in these cases involvement in criminal activity) then they cannot have consented to involvement and should not be punished for crimes committed in these circumstances. Children should have total exemption.

Do you agree that children (up to the age of 18 years) should get an exemption for crimes committed that were a DIRECT CONSEQUENCE of the trafficking?

Yes                       No                       Unsure

**Questions on Investigation, Prosecution and Reducing Trafficking**

Do you agree that investigative tools and training be made available for investigators and prosecutors of human trafficking cases?

Yes  No  Unsure

Comments: As the Assembly has recognized that human trafficking is a growing issue in NI it should ensure that all necessary resources are made available to tackle this problem. Such resources should include tools and training for investigators and prosecutors.

Do you agree there should be a legal requirement for the Department of Justice to produce an annual strategy on raising awareness and reducing trafficking in human beings as part of the prevention measures?

Yes  No  Unsure

Comments: Human trafficking is a crime which is committed within communities. Raising awareness amongst the general public and all organizations/agencies who may encounter suspected victims of human trafficking is a crucial step in helping to prevent this crime. Belfast City Council is currently working with PSNI, Migrant Help and the Law Centre to develop a policy for reporting suspected cases of human trafficking and providing training on the issue for front line staff.

It is important that the range of agencies and organisations which have a role to play in preventing and reducing human trafficking should work together in a coordinated way. The production of a strategy would be an important means of ensuring better co-ordination of services. We suggest that this strategy be up-dated annually, rather than produced annually, to reduce the DOJ's administrative burden.

**Questions on Supporting and Assisting a Victim into Recovery**

*Do you agree that legislation should set out what assistance and support is required for victims of trafficking covering Article 11 of the European Directive?*

Yes  No  Unsure

Comments: It is vital that victims of human trafficking are given suitable assistance and support to make a full recovery, be able to act as witnesses and have access to compensation. The Bill proposes that legal aid should be available to victims; this reflects recent changes in the law in England and Wales and would meet the requirements of the European Directive.

Good Relations Partnership  
Monday, 8th October, 2012

Do you agree that legislation should require clear compensation procedures in line with Article 17 of the European Directive?

Yes  No  Unsure

Do you agree that each child trafficking victim should have a legal advocate to support them and ensure they receive suitable assistance, in line with Articles 14 and 16 of the European Directive?

Yes  No  Unsure

Comments: At present, the health trusts represent children who are suspected of being victims of human trafficking. However there is no legal advocate who represents the child during their engagement with different agencies and ensures that they receive suitable support and assistance. This would be an important step to safeguard child trafficking victims.

Do you agree that there should be "special measures" for trafficking victims if they act as witnesses, in line with Articles 12 and 15 of the European Directive?

Yes  No  Unsure

Comments: Most victims of human trafficking are in a vulnerable position and prosecution is difficult because of the challenges in finding witnesses willing to testify. The extension of 'special measures' - e.g. evidence by live link or screening the witness from the accused - to human trafficking cases would provide additional support for witnesses prepared to testify.

Questions on Human Rights & Equality Implications

*How do you think the proposed legislation will impact on human rights?*

Positively  Negatively  Not at all/not significantly   
Unsure

Comments: This legislation will help to protect the human rights of victims of trafficking. It will provide additional legislative and material support to individuals and will ensure that the prevention and reduction of trafficking is adequately resourced.

*How do you think the proposed legislation will impact on equality of opportunity?*

Positively  Negatively  Not at all/not significantly   
Unsure

**Good Relations Partnership  
Monday, 8th October, 2012**

**Comments:** This legislation will have a positive impact on equality of opportunity amongst victims of trafficking who are some of the most vulnerable in society by making additional support and resources available to address the issue of trafficking and to support victims.

**Other Questions**

*Do you have any comments on the likely cost / financial implications of the proposed legislation?*

**Comments:** Human Trafficking is a growing problem within NI; prioritisation of resources to address this may be required to develop a comprehensive strategy this, in view of the fact that victims are likely to be vulnerable and some are children.”

After discussion, the Partnership commended the foregoing comments as the Council’s response to the consultation.

**Good Relations Grant-Aid Fund**

The Partnership was reminded that, at its meeting on 8th May, it had approved expenditure in the sum of £82,304 under the first call of the Good Relations Grant-Aid Fund for 2012/2013. The Good Relations Manager reported that a second call for applications had been made on 6th August, with a closing date of Friday, 24th August. She advised that, at the closing date for the receipt of applications, a total of fifty-six applications had been received, requesting in total £210,956.70. Those had been assessed using pre-agreed criteria, following which fifty-two submissions had been recommended for funding.

Accordingly, she recommended that the Partnership agree that grant-aid of £113,232 be awarded under the delegated authority of the Chief Executive to the following organisations:

<b><u>Ref No</u></b>	<b><u>Organisation</u></b>	<b><u>Recommended Amount, up to £</u></b>
977/2802	Ballysillan Community Forum	2,000
1241/2798	Friends of the Fallen	800
1250/2823	JamLive Studios	1,000
915/2790	Ligoniel Family Centre	600
1238/2793	Peace & Reconciliation Group	1,000
508/2809	Women’s Resource & Development Agency	2,309
1246/2805	Woodvale Presbyterian Church	225
533/2812	Habitat for Humanity	3,200
336/2811	POBAL	3,000
305/2841	Shankill Women’s Centre	8,928
973/2813	Spectrum Centre	1,830
1257/2840	St. Agnes ABC	400

**Good Relations Partnership  
Monday, 8th October, 2012**

<b><u>Ref No</u></b>	<b><u>Organisation</u></b>	<b><u>Recommended Amount, up to £</u></b>
954/2792	Women's Common Path Network	2,628
1255/2837	Shankill Church of the Nazarene	400
1245/2804	Ardmonagh Women's Group	1,000
1159/2827	Belfast Metropolitan College	820
1252/2832	Christian Brothers School	1,000
1239/2794	St. Patrick's College and Belfast Boy's Model Community Relations Programme	1,950
1240/2795	Newstart Education Centre	690
1242/2799	NI Anti-Poverty Network	1,000
1247/2806	FASA	780
990/2825	Silver Threads	780
1253/2833	Cregagh Wanderers Youth Football Club	650
1254/2834	Include Youth	1,000
658/2836	Empire Residents Association	1,000
1073/2839	FACES – Family & Child Empowerment Services	872
373/2828	Ballymac Friendship Trust	5,000
1173/2824	Belfast South Community Resources	5,000
1251/2830	Just Books Collective Ltd	800
1087/2822	Lagan Village Somme Society	2,770
1173/2824	Opportunity Youth	950
850/2796	Royal Irish Rangers Old Comrades Association	1,000
568/2817	Sandy Row Residents Association	1,935
908/2815	The Belfast Boxing Ring	4,700
808/2816	The HUBB Community Resource Centre	4,360
1087/2819	Ullans Academy	3,000
243/2826	Ballymacarrett Arts & Cultural Society	5,000
1215/2844	Crossover Basketball	5,000
1237/2791	NI Football Tennis Open League	1,000
1256/2838	Queen's University Belfast, Student's Union	1,000
764/2845	Short Strand Partnership	1,000
1215/2807	South Belfast Alternatives	3,000
795/2829	Success Dragon & Lion Dance Association	1,000
674/2835	YouthCom	5,000
1002/2808	Greater Whitewell Community Surgery	5,000
608/2810	Arts for All	1,620
1128/2842	Clarendon Development Association	995
1249/2820	Horn of Africa People's Aid Northern Ireland	1,000
1243/2800	Men of the North	740
1157/2821	Ocean Youth Trust Ireland	1,000
870/2818	Tar Isteach	8,500
1248/2814	Youthworks CIC	3,000
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>113,232</b>

**Good Relations Partnership**  
**Monday, 8th October, 2012**

During discussion, a Member highlighted the fact that an application for funding, which had been submitted by a local football club, had been rejected on the basis of the Partnership's decision of 8th May in that no applications would be considered which had been completed by consultants. He pointed out that such applications were accepted under the Council's Support for Sport scheme and suggested that it would be beneficial to obtain a legal opinion on whether the criterion used under the Good Relations Grant-Aid Fund could be extended to other Council Departments.

In response, the Good Relations Manager explained that the Partnership's decision had been taken on the grounds that officers within the Good Relations Unit possessed the necessary expertise to assist in completing funding applications and that organisations were encouraged to work with them throughout the process, rather than employ a consultant. However, she undertook to engage in discussions with those officers responsible for the Support for Sport scheme to ensure that there was a consistency of approach across the Council and to seek the views of the Legal Services Section in relation to the validity of the Partnership's decision.

The Committee adopted the recommendation and noted that a report on the outcome of those discussions would be submitted to a future meeting.

**Intercultural Cities Conference**

The Partnership was advised that the Council of Europe and the European Commission had, in 2008, developed an initiative entitled Intercultural Cities which sought to stimulate new ideas and practice in relation to the integration of diverse communities. The Good Relations Manager reported that that approach had centred on the concept of diversity advantage, by regarding migrants and minorities not only as vulnerable groups in need of support but also as a social and economic resource which could be realised through intercultural integration and was now being used by over sixty cities across Europe.

She explained that the Irish Government was hosting from 6th till 8th February, 2013, as a key element of its presidency of the European Union, a conference which would be attended by Elected Representatives, professionals and experts from member cities of the Intercultural Cities Coalition and those wishing to become involved in the future. The event would, amongst other things, review the progress of the participating cities to date and identify remaining challenges and how those could be addressed in partnership with other networks and organisations. She suggested, in view of the work which the Council had undertaken within Belfast in terms of the establishment of the Migrants' Forum and related issues, that it would be beneficial for the Good Relations Partnership to be represented at the conference. She added that no fee would be charged for attending the event and that travel and accommodation costs would be in the region of £250 per delegate. Those would be met from within the Good Relations Unit's budget.

**Good Relations Partnership  
Monday, 8th October, 2012**

The Partnership agreed, subject to confirmation of the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee, that it be represented at the Intercultural Cities Conference by the Chairman and the Good Relations Manager (or their nominees) and agreed also that, in future, all reports relating to such events include any associated costs.

Chairman