



Subject:	Appointment of Members to Partnership Boards
Date:	21 st June 2019
Reporting Officer:	Stephen McCrory, Democratic Services Manager
Contact Officer:	Stephen McCrory, Democratic Services Manager

Restricted Reports	
Is this report restricted?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If Yes, when will the report become unrestricted?	
After Committee Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
After Council Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
Some time in the future	<input type="checkbox"/>
Never	<input type="checkbox"/>

Call-in	
Is the decision eligible for Call-in?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

1.0	Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues
	To consider the appointment of Members to the four Partnership Boards.
2.0	Recommendations
2.1	The Committee is recommended to: 1. Approve of the use of the Quota Greatest Remainder method to identify those parties entitled to nominate representatives to the Forward South Belfast and Eastside Partnership Boards, based upon the number of Members returned at the Local Elections for the District Electoral Areas coterminous with the Partnerships' areas.

	<p>2. Approve of the Party allocations for the Forward South and Eastside Partnerships as set out in Sections 3.1.5 and 3.1.6 of the main report.</p> <p>3. Approve of the compromise arrangement for the appointment of Members to the West Belfast and Greater Shankill Partnership Boards and to the Party allocations under this arrangement as set out in Sections 3.1.7 to 3.1.9 of the main report.</p>
3.0	Main report
3.1	<u>Key Issues</u>
3.1.1	The Council, in 2011 and again in 2015, made nominations of Members to serve on the 5 Partnership Boards (North, South, East and West Belfast and Greater Shankill). These nominations were made from the Members returned for the related District Electoral Areas (DEAs) at the Local Elections, depending upon the political party strengths in those DEAs.
3.1.2	<p>The representation in 2015, taking account of the new DEAs established as a result of the redrawing of the boundaries as part of the Review of Public Administration, was:</p> <p>North Belfast Partnership – 6 Members from Castle and Oldpark DEAs South Belfast Partnership – 8 Members from Botanic and Balmoral DEAs East Belfast Partnership – 8 Members from Lisnasharragh, Ormiston and Titanic DEAs West Belfast Partnership – 8 Members from Black Mountain and Collin DEAs Greater Shankill Partnership - 6 Members - 4 from Court DEA (excluding the 2 SF Members) and 2 Unionist Members from Oldpark DEA</p>
3.1.3	The North Belfast Partnership no longer exists and therefore no nominations are to be made from the Council. The South Belfast Partnership has been renamed as Forward South Partnership and only now require 5 Members from the Council rather than 8. The East Belfast Partnership has been renamed as the Eastside Partnership and still requires 8 Members.
3.1.4	The Committee is recommended to again adopt the Quota Greatest Remainder system of proportionality to determine the party representation to the Partnership Boards in South and East Belfast as set out below.

3.1.5 Forward South Partnership Board (5 Members)

The appointees are drawn proportionately from the Parties represented in the Balmoral and Botanic DEAs.

The strengths of the Parties in these DEAs is set out below, together with the number of places which the Parties would be entitled to on the Board based upon the strict application of proportionality.

Party	Number of Members	Representation
DUP	3	(1.50) 2
ALL	2	(1.00) 1
SF	2	(1.00) 1
SDLP	2	(1.00) 1
Green	1	(0.50) 0
	10	5

Four of the five seats are allocated automatically and, in accordance with established practice, the party with the greatest remainder figure should be given the additional seat. Accordingly, it is recommended that the extra place is allocated to the DUP.

3.1.6 Eastside Partnership Board (8 Members)

The appointees are drawn proportionately from the Parties represented in the Lisnasharragh, Ormiston and Titanic DEAs.

Party	Number of Members	Representation
ALL	7	(2.95) 3
DUP	6	(2.53) 3
UUP	2	(0.84) 1
Green	2	(0.84) 1
PUP	1	(0.42) 0
SDLP	1	(0.42) 0
	19	8

Four of the eight seats are allocated automatically (2 ALL and 2 DUP). The ALL, UUP, Green and DUP have remainder scores of .95, .84, .84 and .53 respectively and are allocated the next 4 seats.

3.1.7 West Belfast Partnership Board (8 Members) and Greater Shankill Partnership Board (6 Members)

The redrawing of the DEAs for the new Council had a particularly significant effect in the West and Greater Shankill areas of the city and, similarly, with the consideration of the appointment of Members to the West Belfast and Greater Shankill Partnership Boards.

The area covered by the Greater Shankill Partnership Board encompasses most of the Court DEA, excluding the Lower Falls area, as well as parts of the Oldpark area. The West Belfast Partnership by contrast includes Black Mountain and Collin DEAs as well as the Lower Falls part of the Court DEA. It is therefore very difficult to identify DEAs which are coterminous with the area covered by the two Boards.

Given this disparity, it is considered that the best way to proceed is to take the 8 places on the West Belfast Partnership Board and the 6 on the Greater Shankill Partnership Board together and allocate places based upon the Party strengths across the Black Mountain, Collin, Court and Oldpark DEAs. Accordingly, the representation to the West Belfast and Greater Shankill Partnership Boards would be:

Party	Number of Members	Representation
SF	15	(8.40) 8
DUP	4	(2.24) 2
PBPA	3	(1.68) 2
SDLP	2	(1.12) 1
PUP	1	(0.56) 1
	25	14

Twelve of the fourteen seats are allocated automatically. The PBPA and PUP, with the greatest remainder figures of .68 and .56 respectively, are allocated the remaining two seats.

Following a meeting of the Party Leaders concerned, the following compromise agreement has been reached:

3.1.8 West Belfast Partnership Board (8 Members)

Party	Representation
SF	7
PBPA	1

<p>3.1.9</p> <p>3.2</p> <p>3.2.1</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>3.3.1</p>	<p><u>Greater Shankill Partnership Board (6 Members)</u></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="276 219 1067 430"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="276 219 671 253">Party</th> <th data-bbox="671 219 1067 253">Representation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="276 253 671 286">DUP</td> <td data-bbox="671 253 1067 286">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="276 286 671 320">SF</td> <td data-bbox="671 286 1067 320">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="276 320 671 353">PBPA</td> <td data-bbox="671 320 1067 353">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="276 353 671 387">SDLP</td> <td data-bbox="671 353 1067 387">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="276 387 671 421">PUP</td> <td data-bbox="671 387 1067 421">1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Financial & Resource Implications</u></p> <p>None associated with this report.</p> <p><u>Equality or Good Relations Implications/Rural Needs Assessment</u></p> <p>None associated with this report.</p>	Party	Representation	DUP	2	SF	1	PBPA	1	SDLP	1	PUP	1
Party	Representation												
DUP	2												
SF	1												
PBPA	1												
SDLP	1												
PUP	1												
<p>4.0</p>	<p>Appendices – Documents Attached</p>												
	<p>None</p>												