

Review of Peace II Project Evaluations

Commissioned by Border Action



Evaluation Report

01 March 2007

Please address all communications concerning the evaluation to:

Ms Garance Manguin

Rue de l'Eglise Saint Etienne, 19
1380 Ohain

manguin@channelresearch.com

Tel : 00 32 2 633 6529

Fax : 00 32 2 633 3092

channelresearch

19 Rue de l'Eglise St. Etienne 1380 Ohain Belgium

Tel +32 2 633 65 29 Fax +32 2 633 30 92

www.channelresearch.com

info@channelresearch.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS.....	6
I. TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	7
<i>Background.....</i>	<i>7</i>
II. MEASURE 1.3 ECONOMIC RENEWAL / NEW SKILLS AND OPPORTUNITIES	9
1. PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES.....	9
1.1. <i>Addressing the Legacy of the Conflict / Taking Opportunities from Peace.....</i>	<i>9</i>
1.2 <i>Actions – Areas, Sectors and Groups.....</i>	<i>10</i>
1.3 <i>Degree problem addressed (Outcomes – project level).....</i>	<i>11</i>
1.4 <i>Making a more normal, peaceful and stable society.....</i>	<i>12</i>
2 PAVING THE WAY TO RECONCILIATION	13
2.1 <i>Building Positive Relationships – (in order to impact positively on reconciliation)</i>	<i>13</i>
2.2 <i>Developing a Shared Vision of an Interdependent and Shared Society.....</i>	<i>14</i>
2.3 <i>Acknowledging and Dealing with the Past.....</i>	<i>15</i>
2.4 <i>Significant Cultural and Attitudinal Change.....</i>	<i>16</i>
2.5 <i>Social, Economic and Political Change.....</i>	<i>17</i>
2.6 <i>Use of an integrated approach to the 5 strands of reconciliation;.....</i>	<i>19</i>
2.7 <i>Overall comments on reconciliation.....</i>	<i>20</i>
3 HORIZONTAL PRINCIPLES.....	21
3.1 <i>Impact on Poverty.....</i>	<i>21</i>
3.2 <i>Equal Opportunities</i>	<i>22</i>
3.3 <i>Environmental Sustainability.....</i>	<i>22</i>
3.4 <i>Rural Development.....</i>	<i>23</i>
III. MEASURE 1.4 ECONOMIC RENEWAL / PROMOTING ENTREPRENEURSHIP	24
1. PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES	24
1.1 <i>Addressing the Legacy of the Conflict / Taking Opportunities from Peace.....</i>	<i>24</i>
1.2 <i>Actions – Areas, Sectors and Groups.....</i>	<i>25</i>
1.3 <i>Degree problem addressed (Outcomes – project level).....</i>	<i>26</i>
1.4 <i>Making a more normal, peaceful and stable society.....</i>	<i>28</i>
2 PAVING THE WAY TO RECONCILIATION	29
2.1 <i>Building Positive Relationships –(in order to impact positively on reconciliation).....</i>	<i>29</i>
2.2 <i>Developing a Shared Vision of an Interdependent and Shared Society.....</i>	<i>30</i>
2.3 <i>Acknowledging and Dealing with the Past.....</i>	<i>30</i>
2.4 <i>Significant Cultural and Attitudinal Change.....</i>	<i>31</i>
2.5 <i>Social, Economic and Political Change.....</i>	<i>32</i>
2.6 <i>Use of an integrated approach to the 5 strands of reconciliation;.....</i>	<i>34</i>
2.7 <i>Overall comments on reconciliation.....</i>	<i>35</i>

3 HORIZONTAL PRINCIPLES	36
3.1 <i>Impact on Poverty</i>	36
3.2 <i>Equal Opportunities</i>	37
3.3 <i>Environmental Sustainability.....</i>	37
3.4 <i>Rural Development.....</i>	38
 IV. MEASURE 2.1 SOCIAL INTEGRATION, INCLUSION AND RECONCILIATION)	
RECONCILIATION FOR SUSTAINABLE PEACE.....	39
 1. PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES	39
1.1 <i>Addressing the Legacy of the Conflict / Taking Opportunities from Peace.....</i>	39
1.2 <i>Actions – Areas, Sectors and Groups.....</i>	40
1.3 <i>Degree problem addressed (Outcomes – project level).....</i>	42
1.4 <i>Making a more normal, peaceful and stable society.....</i>	43
 2. PAVING THE WAY TO RECONCILIATION	43
2.1 <i>Building Positive Relationships –(in order to impact positively on reconciliation).....</i>	43
2.2 <i>Developing a Shared Vision of an Interdependent and Shared Society.....</i>	45
2.3 <i>Acknowledging and Dealing with the Past.....</i>	45
2.4 <i>Significant Cultural and Attitudinal Change.....</i>	47
2.5 <i>Social, Economic and Political Change.....</i>	48
2.6 <i>Use of an integrated approach to the 5 strands of reconciliation;.....</i>	50
2.7 <i>Overall comments on reconciliation.....</i>	53
 3.HORIZONTAL PRINCIPLES.....	54
3.1 <i>Impact on Poverty</i>	54
3.2 <i>Equal Opportunities</i>	54
3.3 <i>Environmental Sustainability.....</i>	55
3.4 <i>Rural Development.....</i>	56
 V. MEASURE 2.4C SOCIAL INTEGRATION, INCLUSION AND RECONCILIATION)	
PATHWAYS TO INCLUSION, INTEGRATION AND RECONCILIATION OF TARGET	
GROUPS OF THE PROGRAMME.....	56
 1. PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES	56
1.1 <i>Addressing the Legacy of the Conflict / Taking Opportunities from Peace.....</i>	57
<i>Actions – Areas, Sectors and Groups.....</i>	57
1.2 <i>Degree problem addressed (Outcomes – project level).....</i>	60
1.3 <i>Making a more normal, peaceful and stable society.....</i>	60
 2. PAVING THE WAY TO RECONCILIATION	61
2.1 <i>Building Positive Relationships –(in order to impact positively on reconciliation).....</i>	61
2.2 <i>Developing a Shared Vision of an Interdependent and Shared Society.....</i>	62
2.3 <i>Acknowledging and Dealing with the Past.....</i>	62
2.4 <i>Significant Cultural and Attitudinal Change.....</i>	63
2.5 <i>Social, Economic and Political Change.....</i>	64

2.6 Use of an integrated approach to the 5 strands of reconciliation;	65
2.7 Overall comments on reconciliation	68
3. HORIZONTAL PRINCIPLES	68
3.1 Impact on Poverty	68
3.2 Equal Opportunities	69
3.3 Environmental Sustainability	70
3.4 Rural Development	70
VI. MEASURE 2.6 SOCIAL INTEGRATION, INCLUSION AND RECONCILIATION)	
PROMOTING ACTIVE CITIZENSHIP	71
1 PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES	71
1.1 Addressing the Legacy of the Conflict / Taking Opportunities from Peace	71
1.2 Actions – Areas, Sectors and Groups	71
1.3 Degree problem addressed (Outcomes – project level)	72
1.4 Making a more normal, peaceful and stable society	73
2 PAVING THE WAY TO RECONCILIATION	74
2.1 Building Positive Relationships –(in order to impact positively on reconciliation)	74
2.2 Developing a Shared Vision of an Interdependent and Shared Society.	75
2.3 Acknowledging and Dealing with the Past	75
2.4 Significant Cultural and Attitudinal Change	76
2.5 Social, Economic and Political Change	76
2.6 Use of an integrated approach to the 5 strands of reconciliation;	78
2.7 Overall comments on reconciliation	80
3 HORIZONTAL PRINCIPLES	81
3.1 Impact on Poverty	81
3.2 Equal Opportunities	81
3.3 Environmental Sustainability	82
3.4 Rural Development	83
VII. MEASURE 2.7 SOCIAL INTEGRATION, INCLUSION AND RECONCILIATION /	
DEVELOPING WEAK COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE	83
1 PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES	83
1.1 Addressing the Legacy of the Conflict / Taking Opportunities from Peace	83
1.2 Actions – Areas, Sectors and Groups	84
1.3 Degree problem addressed (Outcomes – project level)	86
1.4 Making a more normal, peaceful and stable society	87
2 PAVING THE WAY TO RECONCILIATION	87
2.1 Building Positive Relationships –(in order to impact positively on reconciliation)	87
2.2 Developing a Shared Vision of an Interdependent and Shared Society	88
2.3 Acknowledging and Dealing with the Past	89

2.4 Significant Cultural and Attitudinal Change.....	89
2.5 Social, Economic and Political Change.....	90
2.6 Use of an integrated approach to the 5 strands of reconciliation;.....	92
2.7 Overall comments on reconciliation.....	95
3 HORIZONTAL PRINCIPLES	95
3.1 Impact on Poverty	95
3.2 Equal Opportunities	96
3.3 Environmental Sustainability.....	97
3.4 Rural Development.....	97
VIII. MEASURE 2.8 SOCIAL INTEGRATION, INCLUSION AND RECONCILIATION ACCOMPANYING INFRASTRUCTURE AND EQUIPMENT SUPPORT	98
1 PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES.....	98
1.1 Addressing the Legacy of the Conflict / Taking Opportunities from Peace.....	99
1.2 Actions – Areas, Sectors and Groups.....	99
1.3 Degree problem addressed (Outcomes – project level).....	100
1.4 Making a more normal, peaceful and stable society.....	101
2 PAVING THE WAY TO RECONCILIATION	101
2.1 Building Positive Relationships –(in order to impact positively on reconciliation).....	101
2.2 Developing a Shared Vision of an Interdependent and Shared Society.....	102
2.3 Acknowledging and Dealing with the Past.....	102
2.4 Significant Cultural and Attitudinal Change.....	103
2.5 Social, Economic and Political Change.....	104
2.6 Use of an integrated approach to the 5 strands of reconciliation;.....	105
2.7 Overall comments on reconciliation.....	106
3 HORIZONTAL PRINCIPLES	106
3.1 Impact on Poverty	107
3.2 Equal Opportunities	107
3.3 Environmental Sustainability.....	107
3.4 Rural Development.....	108
IX. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	109
Evaluation reports.....	109
Evaluation Report Content.....	110
Development workers reports.....	111
APPENDIX ONE.....	113

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ADM	Area Development Management (Ltd.)
CPA	Combat Poverty Agency
FÁS	Foras Áiseanna Saothair
HSE	Health Service Executive
VEC	Vocational Education Committee

I. Terms of Reference

Review of Peace II Project Evaluations

Background

Under the EU Programme for Peace and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland and the Border Region of Ireland (2000-2006) – known as the Peace II Programme – Area Development Management Ltd (Pobal) and the Combat Poverty Agency have responsibility for implementing a number of measures under the economic renewal; social integration and reconciliation; and cross-border priorities. Since 1996, ADM and Combat Poverty have worked in partnership as Border Action (formerly ADM/CPA) to implement the Peace I (1994-1999) and Peace II (2000-2006) programmes as well as some measures of Interreg III. In total Border Action committed €97.6m under the Peace II programme between 2000-2004. A further allocation of €40m will be committed under the Peace II Extension (2005-2006).

Most of the projects funded under Peace II were provided with a budget to commission an external evaluation. As this phase of funding is now coming to a close and a number of measures of Peace II have not been extended, Border Action is required to report on the “Peace Distinctiveness” and Peace and Reconciliation Impacts of the Peace II Measures for which it is responsible. The review of project evaluations is expected to be a primary data source for this reporting process.

This report provides a desk research report reviewing project evaluations for a number of the Peace II Measures for which Border Action is the Implementing Body. In total, 84 evaluations were considered. However, as different approaches were taken to the evaluations and they have been produced to varying standards, an initial scoping exercise was carried out and in-depth analysis was undertaken based on approximately 50% of the project evaluation reports.

Measure		Total Number of Project Evaluations
1.3	New Skills and Opportunities	20
1.4	Promoting Entrepreneurship	13
2.1	Reconciliation for Sustainable Peace	11
2.4c	Pathways to Inclusion, Integration and Reconciliation of Target Groups	11
2.6	Promoting Active Citizenship	11
2.7	Developing Weak Community Infrastructure	13
2.8	Accompanying Infrastructure and Equipment Support	5
		84

This report follows the format of the Peace Distinctiveness Reports required by the SEUPB and refers to the guiding questions in relation to each of the five strands of the reconciliation model. Although the primary focus of the review has been on the Peace and Reconciliation impacts, the reports also include comments on progress made in respect of the Horizontal Principles, where there is evidence to support this.

II. Measure 1.3 Economic Renewal / New Skills and Opportunities

1. Programme Objectives

Measure Objective for 1.3 : *To promote the objectives of the European Employment Strategy by supporting the economic transition of Northern Ireland and the Border Region, with a particular focus on the development of a lifelong learning culture.*

There are two overarching peace II programme objectives; 1) addressing the legacy of the conflict and 2) taking opportunities from peace. For many projects in this measure these two objectives were amalgamated as they were linked together through a common aim of redressing a lack of economic investment in the area due to the conflict and taking opportunities from peace in order to do this.

1.1. Addressing the Legacy of the Conflict / Taking Opportunities from Peace

Although most projects linked these two areas together in relation to economic development, there were a variety of approaches as to how this was achieved.

There were two predominant themes running through this measure; the first was to address the lack of economic investment in rural and border county regions and the second was to address the lack of skills training for economic development. The latter theme was targeted primarily at the long-term unemployed, displaced people arising from the conflict and people living in areas already experiencing social and economic disadvantage.

One of the key issues affecting both themes was the issue of rural depopulation as a consequence of both a lack of skills opportunities and a lack of economic investment. In addition to the downskilling of the formal economy another issue addressed, primarily through the training initiatives, was the risk that depopulation posed on reducing the social economy e.g. community / voluntary sector, CE programmes, community supports etc.

1.2 Actions – Areas, Sectors and Groups

The actions for these two groups are outlined as follows;

Lack of economic investment

Projects directly addressing the lack of economic investment, especially in the border regions, had mainly chosen to work at the individual level by supporting beneficiaries to the project who were self employed. However this was done very differently by each project with different sectors of the market being addressed.

Telecommunications investment – Both the Rossinver project **Integrated Services Project ()** and the **Farney Community Resource and Information Centre (950017)** identified a lack of investment in telecommunications as being a central issue in addition to the lack of training in IT for the areas. One of the key outputs for both projects was providing access to IT as well as running courses was an issue for groups. In one project (**Farney Community Resource and Information Centre (950017)**) the IT was an accompaniment course to other courses aimed starting your own business or becoming self-employed. The groups targeted under these two projects were people who were long term unemployed, ex-prisoners and their families and women.

Organic horticultural skills / support – the **Organic Centre Employment and Development Programme (950087)** in Rossinver, targeted self-employed organic farmers / small holders as well as individuals who wished to develop expertise in aspects of environmentally friendly living. This project also targeted schools for the training but offered support to Farmer's Markets and other networks of groups seeking to promote and develop environmentally living and farming in the region.

Tourism – Cavan/Monaghan Rural Development Co-operative Society's **Tourism Development Project (001964)** looked specifically at supporting entrepreneurial skills relating to the tourism sector. This project was again very targeted in its approach with all their activities and outputs relating to enhancing the tourism sector in this particular region of Cavan / Monaghan.

Skills training for enhancing employment opportunity

Projects that received funding for training were primarily piloting innovative and/or alternative styles of training or learning

methodologies. The ultimate aim was to improve employability of participants through upskilling and also developing confidence and self esteem. Most of the work in this section was accredited to ensure evidence of achievement was carried forward.

Projects ranged from **ITC Training in the Home (005580)** aimed at people with disabilities, women with caring responsibilities and rural groups. There were also centre based IT programmes targeting disadvantaged groups such as ex-prisoners, and displaced persons, in addition to the other target groups listed. (**Sligo Northside IT Project (002258,033242X)**, **Doorway Computer & Arts Project (010262)**)

One project **Monaghan Town Educational Disadvantage Consortium (002099)** acknowledged the difficulty that literacy and exam taking posed to many of their participants. In response they had initiated a pilot programme to use the modular based GCSE system as a way of introducing project based assessment and learning.

1.3 Degree problem addressed (Outcomes – project level)

The degree to which the problem has been addressed is again visible at the two different levels.

Lack of economic investment

Projects addressing economic investment tended to work with existing and / or newly established self-employed people in the region. The outcome would be immediate in terms of expanding businesses and/or re-orientating businesses in some situations.

A noted outcome for many projects was to promote the region as a desirable location to live and invest in, the **Tourism Development Project (001964)** project aimed specifically to revitalise the region through encouraging existing rural dwellers to stay and seek alternative self-employment rather than leave the region. Similarly the organic centre noted an increase and attraction of people living and moving into the area who were interested in environmentally friendly living. Even at project level the key issue of depopulation was directly being addressed.

Skills training for enhancing employment opportunity

One of the project outcomes under this heading was that many of the courses run by projects were accredited. This means that the learning remains transferable even with time delays to securing employment or progression onto further training.

One issue of concern that arose through the evaluations was the lack of sustainability and mainstreaming that some projects experienced, especially linking into organisations such as the local VEC or FÁS. This was particularly noticeable with **Monaghan Town Educational Disadvantage Consortium (002099)** and **Farney Community Resource and Information Centre (950017)** where the agencies, although invited, seemed reluctant to allocate time and resources to these projects. However other modules such as the **ITC Training in the Home (005580)**, which was piloted by FÁS, would almost certainly be mainstreamed into the FÁS national programme and the learning would have wider implications for other types of interagency programmes.

The main area that this sector would have an immediate outcome on would be the development of the social economy. The halting of depopulation especially of younger people (25-45 age group) due to opportunities to avail of training in the locality, as well as developing IT skills and entrepreneurial skills to encourage investment in both the social and formal economy of the region in the future.

The overall impact from this sector is perhaps longer term; since one of the problems with a lack of economic investment is that there are not necessarily jobs available even if people are have acquired appropriate skills and training.

1.4 Making a more normal, peaceful and stable society

The impact of the conflict was to depopulate this region rather than see engagement in active conflict. The Monaghan bombings and other events that happened on or near the border region, impacted negatively but resulted in people leaving through fear. The issue for groups primarily addressing these issues and especially through the economic development measures has been to re-invigorate a society in these areas as a symbol that peace is now prevalent in the region.

For groups working in Donegal with ex-prisoners and displaced persons project outcomes have been more focused on reintegrating people into society. A society that is sometimes unfamiliar to them and where the economy is struggling to expand.

Although many evaluation reports stated that addressing larger economic policy such as attracting government contracts or commercial investments in to the region, was beyond the scope of individual projects, there is probably still scope for many groups to work with both the business community and the government in order to secure long term employment opportunities.

2 Paving the Way to Reconciliation

Under measure 1.3 projects were addressing economic regeneration and renewal through new skills and opportunities. The level and impact of reconciliation work was mainly targeted at people interested in contributing to the formal economic sector, either through development and expansion of self-employment businesses or through skill training for local employment opportunities.

2.1 Building Positive Relationships – (in order to impact positively on reconciliation)

For most projects this strand was addressed through making and developing contacts amongst other agencies both North and South of the border or linking into business contacts. For many projects this is and will continue to be work in progress.

In **Monaghan Town Educational Disadvantage Consortium (002099)** the development of the GCSE module was done in partnership with Armagh although the lack of involvement with the local VEC meant that the full potential for cross border co-operation and reconciliation was not met. However according to the evaluation report DOCHAS did bring together an interagency group to work on the project that was cross border.

Projects such as **Tourism Development Project (001964)** and the organic centre viewed their natural target audience as being in a geographical hinterland that crossed both sides of the border. The existing reputation of both projects meant that they could expand

their contacts to include the local tourism networks (**Tourism Development Project (001964)**) and expand partnership links with Deveson Partnership in Fermanagh (**Organic Centre Employment and Development Programme (950087)**) and local schools on both sides of the border.

Several projects (**ITC Training in the Home (005580)**, **Sligo Northside IT Project (002258,033242X)**, **Doorway Computer & Arts Project (010262)**, and the **Integrated Services Project ()**) developed relationships with local specialist groups e.g. ex-prisoner organisations in order to recruit their selected target group of participants. This type of relationship seems to have worked particularly well enabling projects to reach marginalized groups not readily accessible and yet at the same time participants are supported through their own organisation, which can provide a space they are familiar with and feel safe in.

Overall most projects under this measure appear to have focused on very specific relationships to enhance their immediate task / outputs. The focus appeared, from the descriptions in the evaluation reports, to be limited to a practical level of immediate engagement i.e. discussions were practical and looking at the immediate issue rather than reflective and looking at reasons underpinning why the situation existed. In terms of reconciliation impact this approach will be limited to certain types of activities and could potentially miss underlying reasons affecting the viability of cross border and cross community commerce.

2.2 Developing a Shared Vision of an Interdependent and Shared Society

Many projects addressing lack of economic investment in the region had their focus on recreating a prosperous and viable community within the immediate locality. For many projects this hinterland of development crossed over the border e.g. the **Organic Centre Employment and Development Programme (950087)**, **Monaghan Town Educational Disadvantage Consortium (002099)** and the **Tourism Development Project (001964)**. These projects in particular were developing a concept that tourism needed to operate on both sides of the border and that a partnership approach to tourism was the most viable long-term option. **Tourism Development Project (001964)** had developed a focus on

advertising tourism and encouraging non-traditional groups to come together especially on a cross border basis.

The Organic Centre also had its own specific vision of environmental living and this was being promoted in Leitrim and Fermanagh as well as further field through their reputation.

Groups addressing training deficits held the vision of an integrated society for their target groups. There was the hope that by supporting skill development this would in turn be supported in the long term by both government and business sector investment. However at this stage the vision was only being held by the project with no link into possible investment groups or link to politicians to start lobbying.

2.3 Acknowledging and Dealing with the Past

As an economic measure the primary focus was redressing the lack of economic investment. For tourism in particular, but also for other forms of investment, events such as the Monaghan bombing had destroyed confidence and trust in the safety of the region for economic growth. Although Donegal also received funding under this measure many of the projects were in the Central border region and were addressing the effects that partition had on changing the natural economic and social hinterlands and the sudden development of the central border region as a peripheral area within the country.

Many of the evaluation reports highlighted that for people living along the border region there was not just a lack of investment but also a generational history of underemployment and low educational attainment. Many of the projects tackling skills training were also trying to break the cycle of low expectation passed down from families since partition and the construction of the border.

Areas such as Letterkenny in Donegal and Sligo Northside were also areas that received funding under this measure. Many of the target population were displaced people and /or ex-prisoners that had fled the conflict and moved into existing areas of disadvantage within these places. Economic development in these areas was already low given the peripheral nature of the areas, Donegal especially, and the unwillingness for either private enterprises or government to invest in the region.

In terms of reconciliation much of this strand focused on acknowledging the physical impact from the conflict and did not acknowledge attitudinal impact on people living or dealing with neighbours and/or business partners from other communities.

2.4 Significant Cultural and Attitudinal Change

This particular strand was addressed at two levels; the first set of outcomes focused on reintegrating and building acceptance of certain target groups of the programme in to mainstream society. The second set of outcomes focused on the reestablishment of natural geographical hinterlands of economic prosperity, rather than following traditional border boundaries.

Several projects worked with ex-prisoner organisations and marginalized / disadvantaged groups. The projects focused primarily on skill training however many evaluations reported how participants changed at an individual level in terms of believing that they were capable of entering the labour market or actively seeking employment. (**ITC Training in the Home (005580)** – FÁS,).

Sometimes the change the was not perceived as being positive one report in particular **Sligo Northside IT Project (002258,033242X)**, admitted that at management level targeting certain target groups was met with resistance and a fear that these marginalized groups would become a priority for accessing training in future, when the centre had been developed in an economically marginalized area and local people may not get accepted on future courses.

As part of the process of addressing attitudinal change some projects had initiated training at management level on reconciliation issues e.g. **Tourism Development Project (001964)**, whilst other groups had added on a module of reconciliation or conflict resolution e.g. the organic centre, **ITC Training in the Home (005580)**. However this latter approach was often questioned by participants as to the relevance of what they had signed up to i.e. skills training, and therefore attitudinal change was limited.

2.5 Social, Economic and Political Change

Groups funded under this measure were directly addressing the social and economic change with an indirect longer-term impact at political change.

Social Change

Many projects involved in training, especially those working with marginalized groups, were bringing about social change. This was apparent in projects like **FÁS ITC Training in the Home (005580)** where groups developed confidence in their own employability. Some members of the group were house bound due to caring and /or disability issues and had not envisaged that there was potential to be active in the work force with these restrictions. This project challenged stereotypes of employment and perceived barriers to further progression.

Similarly **Monaghan Town Educational Disadvantage Consortium (002099)** challenged the barriers posed by the traditional over dependence of literacy by exam boards, and changed the curriculum for more assessment-based learning. The lack of involvement by the VEC may have been due to the developments at that time of the FETAC modules, which were also developed in the South as a way of addressing this issue. Future work using FETAC might ensure the involvement of the VEC.

Most projects offering training to marginalized groups were also addressing issues of generational unemployment and underemployment. According to many evaluation reports, at the end of the training participants acquired a renewed sense of hope that there were employment options for themselves. However most projects were working at an individual level and the longer-term impact at group / community level would require other factors such as enthusiasm for employment being met with an increase in job availability in the region.

Economic Change

Measure 1.3 funded projects to directly affect and impact on economic change and therefore this was the primary function of all the projects. However some projects focused exclusively on direct economic change.

The **Tourism Development Project (001964)** project in particular recognised that economic prosperity for the region meant using a

cross border and cross community approach to diversify and create employment and sustainability in the region, for tourism. The **Organic Centre Employment and Development Programme (950087)** also chose to work across the border to develop environmentally living concepts within a geographical region rather than across jurisdictions and political boundaries. Both projects recognised that their own viability depended on a changed view of how traditional economic investment had been occurring, and that this change meant challenging issues such as the border.

A more immediate outcome was noticeable on projects focusing on beneficiaries who were or interested in becoming self-employed. These projects focused on economic conditions within their control and had a minimal dependence on outside factors such as government investments or large-scale corporations providing employment opportunities.

For projects focusing on training and skill development, the main area of focus was on developing social capital. Many projects appeared to have a longer-term goal that was to reinvigorate the economic climate by providing a skilled workforce, revitalising local confidence and promoting the option of staying in the locality, rather than seeking employment elsewhere. However although the workforce would be skilled through these projects, the longer-term impact on the region would only occur if investment followed. Otherwise the workforce trained through this project would have to seek employment elsewhere either temporarily or on a permanent basis.

Political Change

For many projects supporting skill development especially in the IT areas, the work needed to be supported by greater political involvement. The lack of cross border bodies has impacted hugely on the capacity for groups to change the local economic environment even with innovative skill training programmes.

The lack of involvement of the VEC or FÁS in certain cross border training programmes highlighted a lack of localised political will to engage with supporting these community initiatives. The lack of involvement may have been for a variety of reasons some of which were hypothesised earlier in the report, but ultimate sustainability and mainstreaming depends on these agencies.

There is still a lot of work to be done in developing acceptance of cross border qualifications and therefore the active promotion of a fluid cross border workforce.

2.6 Use of an integrated approach to the 5 strands of reconciliation;

(Building Positive Relationships; Developing a Shared Vision of an Interdependent and Shared Society; Acknowledging and Dealing with the Past; Significant Cultural and Attitudinal Change; Social, Economic and Political Change.)

Individual level

Many of the projects developing skill-training modules used the 5 strands at an individual level. – This included acknowledging the past of lack of training opportunities through being displaced or lack of investment in the area leading to low expectations of achievement or employment possibility. The project focused on developing a vision of an active workforce that anyone could participate in and that this would ultimately lead to challenging the lack of political will and subsequent economic inertia in regional investment.

The focus was on individual change although not necessarily at challenging deeply held personal views or prejudices in relation to differences between the North and South or between different communities.

Group level

Tourism Development Project (001964) was a noticeable and relevant project that worked on all 5 strands at a group level. It was targeted, realistic and focused (tourism) in both its economic focus and its use of reconciliation. It recognised that in order to develop affective partner relationships North and South then an understanding of the impact of the conflict in this region was vital to securing economic advancement.

The project applied the 5 strands holistically through a commitment to integrate reconciliation into the work of the project. This happened in a variety of ways starting with management training in understanding reconciliation. The issue of addressing the legacy was of not working and cooperating in the past and the closure of

natural hinterlands due to partition. Challenging attitudes in relation to developing the region along natural geography boundaries rather than politically ascribed ones. Developing a shared vision of tourism related development in the region and through that hoping to achieve economic and social change for the region.

Inter-community level

Many of the projects were at the early stages of intercommunity work. Some projects (**Organic Centre Employment and Development Programme (950087)**, **Tourism Development Project (001964)**) had started doing work in local schools on either side of the border. However as schools in the North tend to be one community or the other and schools in the South in this region tend to be primarily Catholic there was little work being done to address cross community issues directly. However partnership work was being started and the links with Northern business and development organisations was proving to be an appropriate inroad to gaining the trust and support of community groups and schools that might otherwise have been wary (Organic Centre / Deveson Partnership).

Political level

The weakest link for this sector according to the evaluation reports, was in the links to political structures. This was partly due to the fact that there aren't any, but also that in the absence of the cross border bodies, the two National political mechanisms are continuing to develop their own back to back development and investment policies for each jurisdiction. The ultimate economic development of the region is dependent on political will and the procurement of investment by National governments for the region.

2.7 Overall comments on reconciliation

Many of the projects appeared committed to economic development and cross border / cross community work but lacked a focus when it came to reconciliation work. This is probably because economic projects may need to develop their own model of reconciliation that actually looks at issues relevant to their work. This may be more focused on local cross border / cross cultural

history and assessing what used to work well and what has never been tried in the region before.

This could also be achieved by bringing groups of businesses together to specifically look at fears and concerns in relation to dealing, investing or advertising on the other side of the border. The historical impact of EU regulations and the real differences that jurisdictions / politics and currency all play in developing investment in the region.

This is probably more relevant and realistic for groups than modules of peace building or conflict resolution added onto existing skill training modules.

3 Horizontal Principles

In addition to the Peace and reconciliation impacts many of the projects also impacted on one of more areas of the horizontal principles.

3.1 Impact on Poverty

Poverty in the border county region has been addressed through this measure by project outcomes aimed at redressing the lack of economic investment and the subsequent high levels of unemployment and underemployment.

Some projects directly addressed specific target groups namely, ex-prisoners, women, displaced people and the long term unemployed. These projects were funded to provide skills training in IT or business development e.g. **Sligo Northside IT Project (002258,033242X)**, **Doorway Computer & Arts Project (010262)**, **Monaghan Town Educational Disadvantage Consortium (002099)**, **Farney Community Resource and Information Centre (950017)** and **Integrated Services Project (002062)**. However many of the projects were working at a deeper social level in addressing cultural attitudes towards employment and promoting a positive mental attitude towards both acquiring and retaining employment in the future.

Other projects focused on regional economic growth through developing small-scale businesses (**Tourism Development Project**

(001964)) or providing options for diversification in environmentally friendly farming and living (**Organic Centre Employment and Development Programme (950087)**). The Organic Centre has developed as a centre of excellence in green tourism and environmentally friendly living, and as such is attracting people to either move into the area or visit. This has benefited the local economy indirectly as well as beginning to redress local depopulation issues.

3.2 Equal Opportunities

Several projects funded under this measure addressed specific issues of equal opportunities and worked in partnership with organisations that specialised in working with distinct target groups.

Several projects targeted women as part of its groups along with younger people, ex-prisoners and older people (**Monaghan Town Educational Disadvantage Consortium (002099)**, **Farney Community Resource and Information Centre (950017)**, **Doorway Computer & Arts Project (010262)**). Sligo Northside also targeted Travellers and asylum seekers in addition to the above named groups.

FÁS ITC Training in the Home (005580) targeted people affected by rural isolation and those restricted to the house through either disability or caring responsibilities. As part of the progression route at least one member with a disability was encouraged to access NTDI home based learning programmes.

Of the nine grounds of discrimination covered by the Equality Authority in legislation in the South of Ireland, eight of the grounds were covered through this measure. No group acknowledged or proactively targeted members of the lesbian, gay or bisexual community.

3.3 Environmental Sustainability

The **Organic Centre Employment and Development Programme (950087)** was primarily funded to specifically promote and support environmental sustainability. The courses it operated targeted smallholders and small farmers who were interested in developing or diversifying in organic horticultural techniques.

In addition to the farming programmes the centre also ran a series of school and community orientated courses designed to promote a better understanding of environmentally friendly living. Although project participants were mainly targeted in the immediate locality of Fermanagh and Leitrim, there were also records of people attending from Donegal and other parts of the country. This project was funded under 1.3 however the centre also receives other supports from other programmes and operates a much wider programme of activities than those listed under this measure.

In addition to the organic centre the **Tourism Development Project (001964)** as a tourism project also indirectly promotes and encourages green tourism, and links into the organic centre through another project on environmental tourism.

3.4 Rural Development

Many of the projects funded under measure 1.3 were either directly or indirectly working on issues affecting rural development.

Most projects working on addressing the lack of economic investment were located in rural localities – e.g. **Tourism Development Project (001964)** which specifically focused on trying to encourage reinvestment and stem the tide of rural depopulation in the Cavan / Monaghan area.

The **Organic Centre Employment and Development Programme (950087)** was promoting environmental farming techniques that could be used in areas which traditionally had poor soil and which were difficult to farm productively, using traditional methods of farming.

FÁS ITC Training in the Home (005580) had targeted rural participants for its final training module. These participants were rurally isolated and couldn't access resources in the main town (Letterkenny). The training programme was aimed at encouraging not just the participants but also their families to become more computer literate and confident and to see the potential for using IT as a mechanism of communication to enable rural life to become more fruitful both economically and socially.

Nearly all the projects had participants who attended from outlying rural areas even where the projects themselves were located in a nearby town (**Doorway Computer & Arts Project (010262)**, **Integrated Services Project (002062)**, **Monaghan Town Educational Disadvantage Consortium (002099)**). The focus of many projects on self-employment was also a way of promoting a lifestyle that could be economically viable within a rural locality (**Farney Community Resource and Information Centre (950017)**).

III. Measure 1.4 Economic Renewal / Promoting Entrepreneurship

1. Programme Objectives

***Aim** – To raise awareness of enterprise within local communities and to equip them with the capacity and capability to identify business opportunities, establish and grow business and promote cross community relations through the business development process.*

There are two overarching Peace II programme objectives; 1) addressing the legacy of the conflict and 2) taking opportunities from peace. The legacy of the conflict, for many projects under this measure, appeared at two levels – acknowledging the lack of national and private investment and the subsequent lack of job opportunities within the region. The second aspect acknowledged that for many marginalized and disadvantaged groups arising from the conflict e.g. ex-combatants/ ex-prisoners / displaced people / people isolated in border closure areas, additional levels of support were needed to encourage what limited economic prospects there were.

1.1 Addressing the Legacy of the Conflict / Taking Opportunities from Peace

As with projects funded under the other economic measure i.e. 1.3 many projects were using opportunities arising from peace in order to address economic and social legacies of the conflict and therefore merged together these two distinctiveness criteria.

One of the key issues addressed through this measure was the acknowledgement of additional levels and types of support that specific targeted groups required in order to participate in

developing the social capital of the economy. Other issues addressed under the legacy included; supports to existing and newly established businesses especially those that were self-employed; community services and development within the community and voluntary sector and tackling issues of graduate migration.

1.2 Actions – Areas, Sectors and Groups

Projects addressed the legacy through a combination of one or more of the following areas.

Supporting Regional Capacity through Social Capital

One of the key actions undertaken by several projects (**Social Economy Agency (NI) (007062)**, **Bailieborough Development Strategy (006115)**, and the **CEIM Programme (015058)**) was to offer support to different components of the local social economy. **Social Economy Agency (NI) (007062)** supported social inclusion groups in business development by offering a range of support services including training / legal and business / research and promotion. Groups that received support included projects working with older people especially in rural and isolated locations, groups working with ex-prisoners and rural transport initiatives.

Support to established businesses

Many of the groups focused on offering support directly to businesses or entrepreneurs already existing in the locality. This was done in a variety of ways from the **Business Information Service (013654)** through the Donegal County Enterprise Board, where businesses were supported through a one stop shop for business information, to other projects such as **CEIM Programme (015058)**, **Manorhamilton Community Economic Development (018796)** and the Sligo graduate work placements in to local community businesses.

All of these projects had identified the need to retain and support indigenous enterprise development and that in order for businesses to expand and develop they needed to be kept abreast of the latest technology and support services. Sligo IT in the **3rd Level Enterprise for Micro-business Programme (017279)** project worked alongside Leitrim and Sligo Enterprise Boards to facilitate the placing of students who had modern business IT and marketing skills. Graduates were placed in local businesses and information was

effectively transferred from the IT to local businesses. The outcome for this project was twofold with businesses receiving support and local graduates often staying on as employees once their course at the Institute had finished.

The **Business Information Service (013654)** programme aimed at providing information to new and start up businesses. The emphasis was on easy access to information to reduce time and facilitate more enterprises being established locally. One outcome of the project saw a lot of entrepreneurs accessing the service mainly for information on finance and start-up business ideas.

The **Manorhamilton Community Economic Development (018796)** project had adopted a strategic enterprise development plan. This plan focused on developing the region as a whole rather than just focusing on development of individual entrepreneurs. Although businesses accessed support through the project the focus appeared to have been as much on encouraging businesses to give as well as receive support.

Support to community and voluntary sector

The **Manorhamilton Community Economic Development (018796)**, during their evaluation, cite several times the need to develop the social and community infrastructure in parallel to the enterprise development. This group names what several others allude to, namely that without incentives for people to live and enjoy a certain lifestyle then there is little chance in encouraging them to stay and invest in the area.

Fostering an Enterprise Culture in Swanlinbar (020525) engaged in producing a development a plan for their area. One of the outcomes for this project was to name several of the perceived barriers to participation in the workforce by certain sectors of the community, especially women. Such barriers included childcare, transport and the local environment for maximising tourism potential. Both projects highlighted the links between developing the community infrastructure and associated supports in order to attract and retain investment in the region.

1.3 Degree problem addressed (Outcomes – project level)

Funding through the peace programme appeared to enable a more strategic and in-depth level of support to be provided to the most

disadvantaged groups in the region. The higher level of support provided would not be viable for other organisations to offer, in a conventional business support programme, which is itself trying to operate at a profit in order to sustain its own operation.

Several projects (**Business Information Service (013654)**, **CEIM Programme (015058)** and **Manorhamilton Community Economic Development (018796)**) also indirectly highlighted the need to acknowledge the time constraints that many self-employed people were under. Time out for training was not always an option, **3rd Level Enterprise for Micro-business Programme (017279)** were able to pass on information through the student placements to counteract this fact although it was not explicitly cited in the evaluation report. The **Business Information Service (013654)** project had as a key focus to pass information on effectively and timely to start up businesses and acknowledged that if these people had to go to different places to access each piece of information then business start up would be slower if it happened at all.

Projects addressing issues of social capital depreciation within marginalized communities were addressing the legacy at two levels – Firstly in addressing the need to diversify and promote entrepreneurial skills in the region to redress the lack of economic investment. Secondly these groups were redressing additional barriers to competing and participating in local economic initiatives. These barriers included a lack of educational support to people who missed opportunities from both their initial schooling and second chance opportunities. This in turn could be due to a range of reasons including relocation or isolation due to lack of transport and/or outreach education opportunities in border closure areas.

Outcomes for these projects were targeted at addressing issues such as a lack of confidence in gaining skills or being eligible for employment as well as acquiring training skills. Two projects named in their evaluation reports how people who had suffered from long term unemployment (**CEIM Programme (015058)**) or lived in areas of long time neglect (**Fostering an Enterprise Culture in Swanlinbar (020525)**) needed additional support in order to develop self belief that things could get better.

1.4 Making a more normal, peaceful and stable society

The main focus of projects funded under measure 1.4 was to support the development of entrepreneurial activity within targeted disadvantaged areas that were primarily affected by the conflict.

The additional targeting, under this measure, of disadvantaged groups was another way of addressing the potential instability that areas of unemployment can generate. Issues such as depopulation, migration and the subsequent reduction of social capital, were all covered under this measure.

Social Economy Agency (NI) (007062) supported projects aiming to redress specific issues such as transport or support to older people in rural areas. The **Bailieborough Development Strategy (006115)** also addressed specific barriers to participation in entrepreneurial activities such as childcare, access to IT equipment and the development of specific enterprise units. **Fostering an Enterprise Culture in Swanlinbar (020525)** was at a slightly earlier stage than Bailieborough and was in the process of developing an economic development plan which also highlighted barriers to investment in the region including social supports such as childcare.

The **CEIM Programme (015058)** targeted a slightly different group and aimed to retain graduate skills and prevent the migration of the skilled population from the North West region. Whilst the **3rd Level Enterprise for Micro-business Programme (017279)** also aimed to encourage graduates to consider the benefits and opportunities in investing within the locality

Many of the projects funded under this measure were developing an environment that was conducive to entrepreneurial activity. Most acknowledged by their activities that this went beyond just providing access to finance and enterprise units. The wider social implication of what is needed in order for economic confidence to grow was more than just growth in the number of private businesses. The potential market for many businesses required confidence that people would stay in the area and this was being assessed through recreational and leisure facilities available, community development supports, transport links to rural areas, access to childcare as well as banking and retail supports.

2 Paving the Way to Reconciliation

Under measure 1.4 projects were addressing economic regeneration and renewal through promoting entrepreneurship.

2.1 Building Positive Relationships –(in order to impact positively on reconciliation)

Under measure 1.4 the focus for building positive relationships was in order to further develop and promote entrepreneurial activity within the region. However unlike measure 1.3 this often had wider social implications than just immediate economic need. On the whole measure 1.4 seemed to facilitate a broader range of relationships as identified in more detail below;

The **CEIM Programme (015058)** was developed in order to foster better relationships between the knowledge sector and the business community and to support graduates from the region, whilst **3rd Level Enterprise for Micro-business Programme (017279)** supported graduates through placements in local businesses to transfer the latest thinking from the knowledge sector into the micro business community.

Manorhamilton Community Economic Development (018796) had established an interagency / business / enterprise management structure. This structure supported the project to consider a range of strategic developments for the community that enabled development to happen at both a community and entrepreneurial level. According to the evaluation report business skills were used to purchase a site and develop this as a commercial enterprise in order to raise funds to purchase a community building and restore it. The project also operated to a limited extent on a cross border basis, however it appeared realistic about the need to establish relationships at this level at a slower pace and through the gradual build up of trust.

Many projects (**Social Economy Agency (NI) (007062)**, **Bailieborough Development Strategy (006115)**) had worked in partnership with local community projects who had expertise with specific target groups/ sectors of the population. This approach meant that sectors of the population who needed additional support e.g. literacy; confidence, self-development skills could participate in mainstream programmes. However this approach was unlikely to succeed unless the projects funded under this

measure had also made efforts to acquaint themselves with the needs of their proposed target groups and potential partner organisations.

2.2 Developing a Shared Vision of an Interdependent and Shared Society

One of the key visions developed by many groups under this measure was the possibility for all people to engage in successful entrepreneurial activity within their own locality.

Groups targeted under this measure ranged from marginalized groups in disadvantaged areas through to graduates and skilled business people. The focus was on generating enough economic activity within the region to become a sustainable economic sector. (**CEIM Programme (015058)**, **Social Economy Agency (NI) (007062)** and **Bailieborough Development Strategy (006115)**).

Many projects realised that environmental and social development was also needed in order to enhance the economic development potential for their region. This type of vision required a variety of potential stakeholders to become involved through project advisory groups, or in links with other organisations. For some projects this vision was fairly localised (**Fostering an Enterprise Culture in Swanlinbar (020525)**, **Bailieborough Development Strategy (006115)**) however other groups (**3rd Level Enterprise for Micro-business Programme (017279)**, **CEIM Programme (015058)** and **Business Information Service (013654)**) supported the dissemination of information and knowledge across a far broader geographical region with the vision of developing the entire North West region.

2.3 Acknowledging and Dealing with the Past

Projects under 1.4 looked at two key aspects of the past – firstly the lack of investment in the region and the subsequent lack of employment opportunities. Secondly the measure acknowledged the increased level of support that members of marginalized groups needed in addition to regular support and development in establishing their own business or enterprise.

Groups addressing the first aspect ranged from **CEIM Programme (015058)** supporting potential graduate entrepreneurs and linking the local further and higher education institutions to work in partnership with the business community. Other projects

(**Bailieborough Development Strategy (006115)**, **Manorhamilton Community Economic Development (018796)**, **Fostering an Enterprise Culture in Swanlinbar (020525)**) recognised the need to invest in structural support and were developing an enterprise centre with additional components such as childcare or a community website.

Most projects acknowledged that the lack of investment had not just been in economic initiatives and access to employment opportunities. There had been a substantial decline in social and recreational support, community development work as well as indirect employment supports such as transport and childcare. The result of this had also seen a decrease in the active economic population and a corresponding increase in the numbers of dependent members of the population. Projects under this measure specifically targeted graduates as the next generation of potential investment and employment into the region. However some projects (**3rd Level Enterprise for Micro-business Programme (017279)**) acknowledged that the most likely group to stay would be those graduates indigenous to the area, these students had additional reasons to stay along with their own social support network.

2.4 Significant Cultural and Attitudinal Change

One of the issues addressed through the legacy was the disadvantaged rural areas, due to border closures and the subsequent lack of investment and confidence in these regions. Many projects aimed at challenging the perception that rural areas were non-viable economically, and that obstacles of transport and childcare were further compounded in rurally isolated areas. The **Social Economy Agency (NI) (007062)** project challenged the notion that all viable businesses had to be product focused and based in urban areas. Many of their groups were working on developing social capital through training and development and also developing active citizenship skills e.g. Community Workers Co-op to influence policy in relation to future investment and spending in the region.

Most of the attitudinal change was focused at an individual level where individual enterprise leaders were encouraged to expand and reach greater potential through a series of relevant and supported interventions. (**CEIM Programme (015058)**, **Social Economy Agency (NI) (007062)**, **Fostering an Enterprise Culture in**

Swanlinbar (020525)). Projects such as Swanlinbar highlighted additional factors in their evaluation report such as the community not really feeling that change was possible because it had been in decline for so long.

3rd Level Enterprise for Micro-business Programme (017279) and its project partners in the County Enterprise Boards of Sligo and Leitrim were attempting to challenge perceptions amongst graduates. These perceptions included seeing the border region as not viable or an option for their future investment. The placing of students in existing and established micro and small businesses in the region provided practical and realistic examples of how these issues could be addressed.

2.5 Social, Economic and Political Change

Projects worked on all three of these levels although much of the work was addressing social and economic change in the various and immediate localities.

Social Change

According to many of the evaluation reports projects that targeted marginalized groups, e.g ex-prisoners, older people and women were directly addressing social issues in relation to integration and challenging stereotypes of enterprise development in the region. However what was often not mentioned was that indirectly projects were also reconstructing social inequalities and in turn producing a more stable economic environment in which to support entrepreneurial activity.

Other projects (**CEIM Programme (015058)**) challenged specific sectors of society such as graduates in order to encourage a shift in mindset from moving away from rural and peripheral urban areas to more centralised urban areas e.g. Dublin, Galway. However what projects such as **3rd Level Enterprise for Micro-business Programme (017279)** and **CEIM Programme (015058)** also recognised was that although attitudinal shift could occur with this target group and there was an openness to doing business in the region, unless there was a corresponding development of social supports, access to schools, childcare, recreational activities etc. then it was unlikely that new businesses would stay very long.

Issues such as childcare and transport were central to some projects (**Bailieborough Development Strategy (006115)**, **Social Economy Agency (NI) (007062)**) and highlighted the need to acknowledge and support the different sectors of the workforce in different ways. This measure (1.4) in particular supported many projects to work on both the broader economic and social environment as well as supporting individuals in micro enterprise ideas.

Economic Change

Most projects funded under this measure were directly affecting economic change in their locality. For some groups this was localised (**Bailieborough Development Strategy (006115)**) whilst other projects addressed this on a regional basis (**CEIM Programme (015058)**) or at an inter-county level (**3rd Level Enterprise for Micro-business Programme (017279)**). The measure worked not just with formal economy projects but also supported social economy projects and acknowledged the need to develop both social capital and infrastructural development in addition to entrepreneurial activity.

Investment in future start up businesses was a key theme of the measure with projects, and resources were not just seen as developing an individual but potentially developing a future employer in the region. In addition to supporting business start up a key feature of this measure was to focus on the longer-term issues of retaining businesses and entrepreneurs through the development of social and employment support structures.

Political Change

Overall projects worked less effectively at this level since most of the energies of projects and beneficiaries were on developing individual businesses. Some projects such as the **Social Economy Agency (NI) (007062)** also supported policy instruments such as the Community Worker Co-op, who were able to focus on wider political influence in relation to investment in the region, although this was primarily in relation to developing future social capital.

Despite this many projects had a strong interagency approach to their work, with recognition given to bringing together the different social, economic and political conduits within the region. This work was more affective with social, community and voluntary organisations and direct business supports, although organisations

such as the County Enterprise Boards would have some local political influence.

2.6 Use of an integrated approach to the 5 strands of reconciliation;

(Building Positive Relationships; Developing a Shared Vision of an Interdependent and Shared Society; Acknowledging and Dealing with the Past; Significant Cultural and Attitudinal Change; Social, Economic and Political Change.)

Individual level

Most projects appeared to target their key outcomes at an individual level. Entrepreneurial skills were focused on key individuals who it was hoped would invest and stay in the locality in order to redress the legacy of a lack of investment. (**CEIM Programme (015058)**, **3rd Level Enterprise for Micro-business Programme (017279)**, **Business Information Service (013654)**). Relationships were built in response to developing individual entrepreneurial skills, and focused on key contacts relevant to the work. Exchanges tended to be very focused on enterprise development without progressing into looking at attitudes and cultural beliefs. These beliefs would also impact on how enterprise development could realistically progress, especially given the historical relationships and divides that exist amongst communities on either side of the border.

Group level

Projects such as the **Social Economy Agency (NI) (007062)** worked with a variety of groups throughout the region to provide support to the social support sector of the economy. Projects included rural transport, support to the elderly and childcare support services. Several projects engaged with different groups as part of their vision for the area, including **Fostering an Enterprise Culture in Swanlinbar (020525)** and **Manorhamilton Community Economic Development (018796)**

The vision developed by some projects working at a group level involved establishing relationships with relevant stakeholders and looking at a shared vision for the future. Relationships also seemed to be on a practical basis (**Fostering an Enterprise Culture in Swanlinbar (020525)**, **Bailieborough Development Strategy (006115)**) and it was not reported through any of the evaluation

reports whether conversations or discussions occurred at any deeper level than this. In terms of reconciliation this again could be self-limiting in terms of cross border work but in communities that were not divided i.e. predominantly Catholic and in the South this approach could and did produce the intended outcomes.

Inter-community level

Some projects such as **Manorhamilton Community Economic Development (018796)** were looking beyond the immediate issues affecting start up businesses in the community. They actively sought to develop both the social and cultural climate in which these businesses would operate. The management structure was an attempt to represent all interests within the community from both Catholic and Protestant members but also from the community, economic and social services groups as well as the enterprise and business sectors. This project had also initiated development on a cross border basis, although this was still in the early stages.

Political level

Although this was the weakest area in terms of links many projects had engaged with institutions that also represented politicians or were implementing local authority or county development plans. Projects such as Sligo IT linked into two County Enterprise Boards and the **Business Information Service (013654)** project also worked with Donegal County Enterprise Board whilst **Fostering an Enterprise Culture in Swanlinbar (020525)** was supported through Cavan County Enterprise Board.

Evaluation reports didn't specify whether these partnerships went beyond immediate fiscal and information support or whether there was the opportunity to feedback into the Boards issues relevant to enterprise development in the region.

2.7 Overall comments on reconciliation

Projects funded under measure 1.4 focused primarily on promoting and developing micro enterprise and individual entrepreneurial activity. However inherent in this work was the need to acknowledge the wider community supports required in order to ensure the long-term sustainability of this sector.

Unlike measure 1.3 this measure had a more social focus and took a more holistic view to entrepreneurial development. The focus on attitudinal change was clearly identified although most of the measure still focused on practical issues and did not engage at any personal or emotional level, especially when addressing the legacy or acknowledging the past. The focus according to most of the evaluation reports was on a vision of the future with a practical, rather than an emotional, emphasis.

3 Horizontal Principles

In addition to the Peace and reconciliation impacts many of the projects also impacted on one of more areas of the horizontal principles.

3.1 Impact on Poverty

Projects working on issues addressing the social economy and/or supporting participants from marginalized communities to engage in entrepreneurial activities were directly impacting on poverty. The additional level of support needed for many of these target groups would not have been available without the intervention of these peace funded projects, since it would not have been commercially viable to offer this level of assistance through conventional business support programmes.

Projects such as the **Social Economy Agency (NI) (007062)** focused specifically on maximising the supports available to potential entrepreneurs in disadvantaged areas. In addition to the Social Economy Solutions supports there were other indirect supports made available through the actual businesses assisted and these were made available to individuals living in the region including transport options and childcare provision. Projects such as this therefore impacted on poverty on two levels both directly through their own enterprises supported and indirectly through the subsequent impact that the socially orientated projects had on their targeted beneficiaries.

The placement of students under the **3rd Level Enterprise for Micro-business Programme (017279)** project specifically targeted students who were from the locality and were classed, using unstated criteria, as disadvantaged. Similarly the businesses that

received the placements were targeted from the more disadvantaged areas in both Leitrim and Sligo.

3.2 Equal Opportunities

Some projects had targeted specific target groups such as rurally isolated groups, women who had childcare needs, people with disabilities and older people. (**Social Economy Agency (NI) (007062)**, **Bailieborough Development Strategy (006115)**). **Social Economy Agency (NI) (007062)** also offered workshops aimed at challenging racism and equality issues.

Although some projects stated very clearly that its intention was to target as wide a range of participants as possible there was no specific targeting of groups (e.g. targeting women through using local women's projects as a recruiting body). – (**CEIM Programme (015058)**, **BIS**). Other projects (**Fostering an Enterprise Culture in Swanlinbar (020525)**) had started to highlight the need to target women or to provide supports to attract women into the workforce (**Bailieborough Development Strategy (006115)**).

Some of the nine equality areas were addressed especially age, gender and family status. However the key area addressed by most projects in this section was rural isolation, especially in areas affected by border closures due to the conflict. This was the cross cutting theme and therefore some groups listed under the equality legislation did not have high visibility in these regions such as Travellers, Asylum seekers and members of the gay and lesbian community.

3.3 Environmental Sustainability

Many of the projects funded under this measure worked indirectly with groups supporting environmental issues. One of the projects supported through the **Social Economy Agency (NI) (007062)** project was the SEAL project that targeted older people and provided support on energy saving issues. Many of the business targeted under the **3rd Level Enterprise for Micro-business Programme (017279)** project were rural businesses developing local environmentally friendly products or supporting initiatives such as home cooking or eco tourism or local craft production.

Other projects supported through the **Social Economy Agency (NI) (007062)** included group transport schemes such as the NE transport initiative that indirectly supported reduced fuel and carbon emission. Home based supports also encouraged home-based enterprises, which are environmentally more efficient in terms of additional heating, transport and travelling to work.

Fostering an Enterprise Culture in Swanlinbar (020525) had instigated an economic development plan that focused on tourism as a major potential attraction to the economy. However they also acknowledged that work needed to be done to develop an appropriate environment to attract this investment, such work included flower displays, recycling units and litter bins in the locality.

Projects that used a broader networking strategy such as **Manorhamilton Community Economic Development (018796)** were also linking into projects such as the organic centre and the Green Box tourism project. Many rural projects and businesses had named tourism, through the evaluation reports, as a potential support in some way. The key tourist attraction for many of these areas was the local environment and the interest of eco-tourists in maintaining a rural and environmentally friendly lifestyle.

3.4 Rural Development

Most of the projects were based in rural areas or had rural catchment areas. The focus for most of the projects funded under measure 1.4 was to both retain and support indigenous enterprises and encourage new entrepreneurial activity. Projects targeted a range of potential entrepreneurs from both specific Peace programme targets such as women and ex-prisoners, through to indigenous businesses and graduate beneficiaries. In addition to the range of targeted beneficiaries a wide geographical region was also covered under this measure with rural areas in Leitrim, Sligo, Donegal and Cavan covered in the sample but with other areas also identified in other projects. The key focus for nearly all the projects under 1.4 was to redress issues such as migration from rural communities and the subsequent loss of a broad range of skills from the region. (**3rd Level Enterprise for Micro-business Programme (017279)**, **Manorhamilton Community Economic Development (018796)**, **Fostering an Enterprise Culture in Swanlinbar (020525)** and **Bailieborough Development Strategy (006115)**)

There was also a concerted effort amongst all the projects funded to promote self-employment as a viable option and to support the notion that it was possible to operate within the predominantly rural communities of the North West (**CEIM Programme (015058)**, **BIS, Manorhamilton Community Economic Development (018796)** and **3rd Level Enterprise for Micro-business Programme (017279)**) and the Central Border region (**Fostering an Enterprise Culture in Swanlinbar (020525)**).

As part of this overall strategy project initiatives such as the Social Economy Solutions provided supports to many groups affected by the lack of rural infrastructure e.g. transport, access to IT, childcare provision. Other projects also highlighted the overall development need of rural areas and **Manorhamilton Community Economic Development (018796)** in particular, used their economic and business skills to expand development and investment potential directly.

IV. Measure 2.1 Social Integration, Inclusion and Reconciliation) Reconciliation for Sustainable Peace

1. Programme Objectives

***Aim** – To provide opportunities for civil society to promote reconciliation and peace building efforts and to encourage communities in areas that had previously experienced violence and polarisation to develop strategies and activities, which promote reconciliation as a means to sustaining peace.*

1.1 Addressing the Legacy of the Conflict / Taking Opportunities from Peace

As with many of the other measures projects combined the two Peace II Programme Objectives, 1) addressing the legacy of the conflict and 2) taking opportunities from peace, as an overarching principle to guide their work. One of the key issues from the legacy of the

conflict, which was addressed by many of the projects, was the lack of discussion on sensitive issues relating to how the conflict had impacted on people's lives.

Projects under this measure were seeking to engage in dialogue with different sectors of civil society such as youth and women (**Quare Hawks Theatre Company (008403)**), churches (**Raphoe Reconciliation Project (950060,006958,029661X)**) or cultural groups (**Cultures of Ulster (002275)**). For some of the projects the focus was on hearing other stories or giving people space to have their say whilst in other projects it was support at a broader level to enable groups to come together and engage in dialogue amongst themselves (**Reaching Across with Sligo Connections (002826)**).

1.2 Actions – Areas, Sectors and Groups

The core theme for measure 2.1 was to promote the involvement of civil society in reconciliation and peace making initiatives. Many of the projects used multiplier strategies such as education programmes, drama productions, church forums or networking programmes to reach out to a larger sector of civil society.

Support to the community and voluntary sector engaging in reconciliation work.

Projects such as NUI Galway's **Diploma in Peacebuilding (005584, 032196X)** and Sligo County Council (**Reaching Across with Sligo Connections (002826)**) were two projects that aimed to support the community and voluntary sector that were trying to engage with and support reconciliation work. NUIG developed a **Diploma in Peacebuilding (005584, 032196X)** that aimed to look at current and historical aspects of peacebuilding. The programme was delivered to a group of students on an outreach basis in locations in the border region.

The **Diploma in Peacebuilding (005584, 032196X)** project aimed to support individuals in the community who were already engaging in issues of peacebuilding and aimed to support and further enhance their current work. The programme readily acknowledged that there were many skilled community development workers who were implementing peace building programmes and yet who had no training or support in tackling this issue. Feedback from participants in the evaluation report confirmed this perception.

Sligo County Council was funded to establish a support network for groups who were specifically addressing or working on cross border reconciliation issues. The **Reaching Across with Sligo Connections (002826)** project aimed to offer support to groups who were or wished to engage in working with a cross border partners. The ultimate aim was to challenge a lack of mistrust and uncertainty in working cross border and to normalise this approach across the county.

Reconciliation and Dialogue work with specific sectors of civil society

Many of the projects under this measure had targeted specific sectors of civil society that they wished to engage and work with. The **Raphoe Reconciliation Project (950060,006958,029661X)** had specifically targeted two groups that it felt had contributed to the ongoing polarisation, within Raphoe, of the Protestant and Catholic communities. These were the churches and the schools. The project aimed to increase trust amongst members of these two communities at a variety of levels and to challenge the traditionalist view of working alongside but not integrating with each other.

The County Dublin VEC **Education for Reconciliation Programme (950129, 001965, 029389X)** had sought funding to work on the mainstreaming of reconciliation within the Social, Personal and Cultural Education programmes / active citizenship in both the Northern and Southern school curricula. The programme targeted teachers, who would be delivering these courses, and provided an in-depth teacher training support programme to facilitate the delivery of this course.

The **Quare Hawks Theatre Company (008403)** targeted several different targets of the Peace II programme, including young people, ex-prisoners and women. Their projects were multifaceted but focused on discussing pertinent issues for each group and exploring these issues further through the use of drama. The finished products were in some cases performed publicly and displayed the outcomes of many of these discussions.

Building allegiances / avoiding difference

The final group, looked at in the project sample, took a different approach to many of the other projects. The **Cultures of Ulster (002275)** project focused on bringing together musicians and artists

from both sides of the border. This group then undertook a training course looking at different aspects of Ulster heritage and tradition with a particular focus on musical traditions. The aim was to develop a common identity and redress many of the difficulties of a separatist approach to Ulster and its musical traditions, culture and heritage.

1.3 Degree problem addressed (Outcomes – project level)

Many of the projects funded under 2.1 were using this measure to engage in discussion with members of civil society and to support as well as challenge their thinking on reconciliation work.

Projects such as **Quare Hawks Theatre Company (008403)** was criticised for one of the productions it made which it was felt highlighted people's perceptions of the conflict but in a dark way that didn't really engender any feeling of hope for the future. However this level of feedback highlighted the level of thought and commitment that many people had already given to the work of civil society and this challenge would imply that the project initiated meaningful debate as part of its overall outcome. The media reviews in both the local and national press also supported how art and drama work was being scrutinised and criticised which indicates that many of the issues being discussed were pertinent and relevant to people's lives across the spectrum of civil society groups.

NUIG monitored its **Diploma in Peacebuilding (005584, 032196X)** to ensure that participant's feedback was used in the review of the next stage of the project. Comments from participants highlighted the effectiveness of the course but also illustrated how isolated many community workers feel when left to implement peace programmes without support from suitably qualified personnel. An additional outcome from the **Diploma in Peacebuilding (005584, 032196X)** project is that the Peace II Programme also has access to a pool of workers who have been trained and developed a more insightful approach to peace building within a community development context.

Many of the projects were engaging with activists or teachers that would take the learning back into their community and continue to integrate reconciliation into their own project work. The longer term outcomes would be manifested in the next stage of the project development as the experiences gained through courses / drama

productions or developing a shared sense of cultural heritage are carried on in other communities.

1.4 Making a more normal, peaceful and stable society

Many of the projects acknowledged and recognised the work of groups trying to implement reconciliation work in their own projects / workplaces. The work of much of measure 2.1 was aimed at supporting this reconciliation work either through training and learning programmes on topics or in developing methodologies that could be used to support the delivery of reconciliation work.

The **Diploma in Peacebuilding (005584, 032196X)**, **Reaching Across with Sligo Connections (002826)** and **Education for Reconciliation Programme (950129, 001965, 029389X)** projects all focused on skills transfer to support the knowledge also being given. **Raphoe Reconciliation Project (950060,006958,029661X)** received its own support from the Irish School of Ecumenics (also funded through the peace Programme 5.3/5.4?) but was in turn able to support local community initiatives through providing workshops, seminars and speakers.

The **Quare Hawks Theatre Company (008403)** and the **Cultures of Ulster (002275)** aimed at changing attitudes in relation to what the arts / culture and heritage of the region should look at and how issues should be dealt with.

All the projects under this measure seemed to work from the assumption that dialogue and interaction were important and that perceived attitudes towards reconciliation needed to be challenged. However the underlying message was, ultimately, that it was OK to talk about these issues and that these issues needed to have a space or a medium through which people could discuss them.

2. Paving the Way to Reconciliation

2.1 Building Positive Relationships –(in order to impact positively on reconciliation)

Projects funded measure 2.1 were involved in a range of relationship building approaches. For nearly all the projects there was the immediate relationship amongst the project beneficiaries and between beneficiaries and the project (**Diploma in Peacebuilding**

(005584, 032196X), **Reaching Across with Sligo Connections** (002826), **Cultures of Ulster** (002275), **Raphoe Reconciliation Project** (950060,006958,029661X)).

The intensity of some of the issues being discussed such as suicide (**Quare Hawks Theatre Company** (008403)), inter church dialogue (**Raphoe Reconciliation Project** (950060,006958,029661X)) or impact of cultural identity (**Education for Reconciliation Programme** (950129, 001965, 029389X)) meant that relationships were established quickly with a high level of trust gained quite quickly. For other projects that addressed more general issues such as **Cultures of Ulster** (002275) or **Diploma in Peacebuilding** (005584, 032196X) the nature of the relationship established was more professional support and networking although with a stronger bond due to the subject matter and the nature of personal involvement of participants in the course.

However many of the projects were seeking to multiply the effect of their work through other contacts and medium. The **Diploma in Peacebuilding** (005584, 032196X) project relied on each of the project participants to complete a piece of research located within their own community or project area. Relationships with NUIG through these additional components helped to embed the work into existing community development projects. Similarly **Education for Reconciliation Programme** (950129, 001965, 029389X) project worked with teachers who would be disseminating materials and learning into their own staff structures. One of the findings of the evaluation report for this project stated that the ongoing success and implementation of this work, throughout an individual school, would depend heavily on the quality of these teacher-teacher relationships.

The **Raphoe Reconciliation Project** (950060,006958,029661X)) targeted church leaders and members of local congregations and focused much of their project on developing relationships of trust between the different churches in the area. The whole project relied heavily on the nature of these relationships, both between the different churches and between the churches and the project. In order for the reconciliation to be successful relationships of trust and respect had to be sought and gained within the community.

On a different level altogether were projects that engaged with relationships through the use of media. The **Quare Hawks Theatre**

Company (008403) used existing media connections to connect into a broader audience that would have developed a relationship with the production but not necessarily with the project promoters. Similarly the **Cultures of Ulster (002275)** project developed and produced CDs with their music, which were consumed by an audience that had no connection with the project and its participants per se.

2.2 Developing a Shared Vision of an Interdependent and Shared Society

A key vision for many projects funded under measure 2.1 was that reconciliation and peacebuilding would become an integral part of local community development work / professional work.

Projects such as **Diploma in Peacebuilding (005584, 032196X)** and **Reaching Across with Sligo Connections (002826)** specifically aimed to support the sector to enable them to partake of this work more effectively. **Raphoe Reconciliation Project (950060,006958,029661X)** had also initiated this approach amongst religious and education providers in the local vicinity whilst **Education for Reconciliation Programme (950129, 001965, 029389X)** was instigating reconciliation within the education sector across a larger region.

Quare Hawks Theatre Company (008403) had focused primarily on engaging with different sectors of society such as women, youth and ex-prisoners in an attempt to encourage wider audiences of civil society to consider issues and engage in debate on topics that had been traditionally seen as taboo or too sensitive to support. **Cultures of Ulster (002275)** shared a similar vision but focused on uniting and defining a common identity and shared cultural heritage and avoiding issues of difference or division.

The fundamental aim of this measure was to engage civil society in issues of reconciliation and to promote discussion of these issues. Many of the projects did this through specific targeted interventions at certain sectors of the community. The vision for all the projects however was to engage and enable discussion of reconciliation and to normalise this approach into society as a whole.

2.3 Acknowledging and Dealing with the Past

Most of the projects identified the fact that sensitive issues relating to the conflict were not being addressed with certain, if any, sectors of

society. **Diploma in Peacebuilding (005584, 032196X)** directly addressed the community and voluntary sector that are often the instigators of reconciliation dialogue work at a local level. Their programme aimed to support and upskill workers so that they felt both confident and competent to engage in this level of work. This was also acknowledging that many community workers would never have discussed the conflict from different perspectives or heard other points of view regarding models of peacebuilding.

The **Education for Reconciliation Programme (950129, 001965, 029389X)** similarly aimed to support teachers to develop appropriate methodologies and materials to deal with issues relating to the conflict as well as broader issues such as racism and equality. There was also the acknowledgement that many teachers would not have had the opportunity to engage in this level of discussion before, since most sectors within society have avoided discussing the impact of the conflict.

The **Reaching Across with Sligo Connections (002826)** also aimed to support the community and voluntary sector although this was done at a more general level but reached a wider selection of projects. However the project co-coordinator was also one of the participants on the **Diploma in Peacebuilding (005584, 032196X)** course and the Reach Across project supported the delivery of the **Diploma in Peacebuilding (005584, 032196X)** in the outreach locations so there was also a level of mutual support between these two projects within the measure.

Other projects such as **Quare Hawks Theatre Company (008403)** and **Cultures of Ulster (002275)** both used the medium of art (drama and music) as a means of addressing the legacy of a lack of discussion on divisive issues. For the **Cultures of Ulster (002275)** the focus was on developing an understanding of the shared evolvement of all the traditions relating to music within Ulster and to develop a vision that encompassed all. This challenged the past view that the traditions of Ulster belonged to one group or another and there was no shared heritage.

Quare Hawks Theatre Company (008403) acknowledged that discussion and therefore drama, representing points of view of how the conflict impacted on groups, had not occurred. Their project aimed firstly to engage groups that had not traditionally had their voices heard (Border Protestant Minorities, Women, Ex-prisoners)

and secondly to represent these voices in a way that captured the lifestyle during the Troubles and its impact on life today.

2.4 Significant Cultural and Attitudinal Change

The main attitudinal change that projects were trying to influence was the belief that reconciliation work could and should become part of mainstream society. This was addressed at many levels including within the education system, youth groups, social inclusion projects and within the churches.

The emphasis was on affecting change at a wider societal level and for that reason many of the projects used a multiplier effect within their approach. For some projects the national and established media was seen as an affective lever for engaging with wider civil society. For other projects local media such as parish / community newsletters (**Raphoe Reconciliation Project (950060,006958,029661X))**) were used to reach a broader target audience.

The training of trainers approach within both **Diploma in Peacebuilding (005584, 032196X)** and the **Education for Reconciliation Programme (950129, 001965, 029389X)** was another mechanism used by projects to ensure that resources and learning were maximised. Unlike other measures that focused their outcomes on the target beneficiaries, many of these projects aimed their project outcomes at influencing wider society and using their project as an example or pilot. The ideas and projects generated through this measure are to be used and developed further by other members of society/ other projects.

For all the projects there was also a strong element of individual attitudinal change amongst the project beneficiaries. Many projects reported in the evaluation reports how participants increased their awareness of listening skills and developed the skill of hearing other sides of the story before making decisions or judgements. This was particularly noticeable amongst the youth projects, although all the groups noted an increased tolerance for issues that would traditionally have been held as different and judged immediately, because of who they were associated with.

2.5 Social, Economic and Political Change

Projects worked on all three of these levels although much of the work was addressing social change in the various and immediate localities.

Social Change

Most of the projects were addressing issues of social change and attitude. The key focus for this measure was to engage members of civil society into promoting reconciliation and peacebuilding. Many of the projects addressed issues of social or cultural concern.

The **Quare Hawks Theatre Company (008403)** programme focused its youth production on discussing the issue of suicide. This had been a predetermined issue although it also came up by the young people themselves as part of their input into the workshops. Their play highlighted the impact of the conflict as it impacted on young people today and has been used by many school groups as it travelled around the country to engage young people in looking and discussing the issue of suicide as a social issue that affects everyone.

The **Education for Reconciliation Programme (950129, 001965, 029389X)** also aimed at teenagers through their Social and Personal education programmes in both Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. As well as exploring issues relating directly to experiencing the conflict as young people, the aim was to bring in discussion on other issues inherent in reconciliation work. These issues included racism and equality but other issues such as suicide also came up as a sensitive issue.

The **Quare Hawks Theatre Company (008403)** also worked with women through a series of workshops and encouraged them to produce a play and perform to other women. The challenge for the project was to encourage women from both sides of the border to openly discuss issues that were again sensitive, although shared by women across the region. Specific issues included for e.g. changes in the past, the troubles, feeling of hatred, frigidity, love, stress, sad times, hilarious times.

The **Reaching Across with Sligo Connections (002826)** project aimed to network and support a variety of social inclusion and community development groups. Within each of these projects reconciliation

work was being promoted along with their own local project. Many social issues were covered through this programme although this was not really reported back through the evaluation report as part of the overall outcome for Reaching Across.

Economic Change

As stated earlier the primary focus for most of the projects was influencing social change within certain sectors of civil society. Many of the projects worked with people already engaged in working in the community / education sectors. The economic focus for this measure was therefore targeted on upskilling workers and enhancing professional development.

The **Education for Reconciliation Programme (950129, 001965, 029389X)** also had a research component that supported the project and enabled it to review how methodologies and teaching materials were being used and how suitable they would be for teachers generally. The aim was to enhance the confidence and skill repertoire of teachers and possibly support them for future promotion.

NUIG's **Diploma in Peacebuilding (005584, 032196X)** also enhanced the skills and knowledge of many existing community workers. The recognition of a Diploma at the end of the course was a key motivating factor for participants especially in maintaining the weekend and evening commitments needed to complete the course. The increased qualification would also support future employment opportunities for many of the participants especially given the short term and insecure nature of the sector of community development work.

The **Cultures of Ulster (002275)** and **Quare Hawks Theatre Company (008403)** both represented sectors of society where low pay and instability of employment are commonplace. In both projects the experiences would again be added benefit for future work and the media coverage gained through the work could also assist in aiding the sustainability of the musicians and the theatre company.

Political Change

Many of the projects funded under this measure and used in the sample were well-established projects that had the capacity to influence social change at a wider political level.

The **Education for Reconciliation Programme (950129, 001965, 029389X)** worked closely with representatives from both Departments of Education (NI and ROI) and also lobbied for representation from the Cross Border body for Education. The involvement of teachers, school reps and representatives from the curriculum development units in both NI and the South also indicated the potential influence that this project had to mainstream the approach into the two Education systems.

The local county council initiated the **Reaching Across with Sligo Connections (002826)** project, which was also indicative of the recognition given by local political leaders to develop the social as well as the economic environment within Sligo. The project also supported NUIG and the **Diploma in Peacebuilding (005584, 032196X)** course. This project had the backing of the University in Galway as well as local authorities in Sligo. Both of these projects illustrate a level of political support at least at a local level.

The **Quare Hawks Theatre Company (008403)** toured different areas of the country, opening up discussion on issues affecting young people especially the issue of suicide. As a result it received national media coverage, which automatically brought the project into the political realm. The ongoing work of schools and youth groups, who have used the play to promote further action and discussion, will add another dimension to the political influence of this project.

2.6 Use of an integrated approach to the 5 strands of reconciliation;

(Building Positive Relationships; Developing a Shared Vision of an Interdependent and Shared Society; Acknowledging and Dealing with the Past; Significant Cultural and Attitudinal Change; Social, Economic and Political Change.)

Individual level

Although the focus for many project was on wider social change all of the projects also operated at an individual level in the work that they did. In order to support community workers / groups / teachers or schools to engage meaningfully in reconciliation work many of the projects identified the need to engage with the participants at this level first.

The **Education for Reconciliation Programme (950129, 001965, 029389X)** ran residential weekends as part of their training and provided a space where teachers could discuss many of the issues themselves that they would be working with young people on. The **Diploma in Peacebuilding (005584, 032196X)** similarly challenged its participants to consider other viewpoints and perspectives in relation to the conflict, so that they would be more aware and confident at dealing with the various complexities of reconciliation work.

The drama work started by listening to individual stories and experiences before developing a collective representation of what had been experienced. During the course of gathering this information many of the participants engaged in discussions on issues they would not have done before. They also had their perspectives challenged or broadened in order to accommodate other understandings. The **Cultures of Ulster (002275)** also encouraged a broadening of the interpretation of Ulster traditional music and challenged individual musicians to hear and become involved in traditional music not familiar to their own.

Group level

Most of the projects used the 5 strands at two levels in their project work. The first was at the individual level, through the course participants and the second at a group level in terms of influencing wider social change.

By working at a group level projects achieved their maximum impact. The purpose for many of the projects (**Diploma in Peacebuilding (005584, 032196X)**, **Reaching Across with Sligo Connections (002826)**, **Education for Reconciliation Programme (950129, 001965, 029389X)**, **Quare Hawks Theatre Company (008403)**) was to work with a small group of individuals and to use the influence of these individuals to continue the work in wider society. Many participants were from established community groups or education providers. The learning from the courses was fed back into these structures, which would continue to develop the ideas and incorporate reconciliation work into the project. The selection criteria for some of the projects were quite strict (**Diploma in Peacebuilding (005584, 032196X)**) in order to prioritise the second phase of the project and to ensure the sustainability of the learning.

Inter-community level

Many of the projects funded under measure 2.1 focused either on specific target groups within the peace programme or worked on very general issues. Intercommunity dialogue was only a specific focus for a couple of the projects in the sample (**Raphoe Reconciliation Project (950060,006958,029661X)**), **Cultures of Ulster (002275)**) although it underpinned the work of much of the rest of the work of the measure.

The **Diploma in Peacebuilding (005584, 032196X)** recruited a mixture of participants from both sides of the border and across the communities. The programme challenged intercommunity perceptions through the use of visiting speakers.

Other projects such as the **Cultures of Ulster (002275)** ensured a 50:50 mix of participants from the Ulster Scots and Irish traditions. However this project specifically avoided addressing differences between the two communities and used an approach of emphasising sameness as its underlying principle.

The **Quare Hawks Theatre Company (008403)** focused on specific target groups within the programme such as the ex-prisoners. Part of their work aimed to bring together two different ex-prisoner organisations that did not share the same political allegiance although they were both republican ex-prisoners organisations. However mistrust at this level was too great to sustain working together as one group and subsequent feedback and research was conducted on a 1:1 basis or within each of the groups.

The **Education for Reconciliation Programme (950129, 001965, 029389X)** had specifically targeted the inclusion of Protestant schools in its programme but the uptake was low. There was still some involvement though and hopefully future work will see the development and trust within the Protestant sector to engage more in the project. **Raphoe Reconciliation Project (950060,006958,029661X)** also targeted Protestant schools as well as church leaders. The combination of these two institutions, especially as schools are so closely influenced by the church, helped to ensure that many of the key leaders within the community became involved in the project.

Political

Many of the projects had a political dimension to their work. The drama and **Cultures of Ulster (002275)** projects showed their

productions nationally. The intention was to generate discussion on the issues and bring greater all round awareness to some of the issues affecting the border areas.

The **Education for Reconciliation Programme (950129, 001965, 029389X)** used an interagency approach to mainstreaming a reconciliation approach into the existing education curricula. The project aimed to directly influence government departments on both sides of the border as well as linking into the cross Border body for Education.

Other projects had indirect political influence through members of individual project management groups, or as part of their wider remit of influencing policy on other issues of which reconciliation work was only part of their overall outcome. (**Diploma in Peacebuilding (005584, 032196X), Reaching Across with Sligo Connections (002826)), Raphoe Reconciliation Project (950060,006958,029661X))**)

2.7 Overall comments on reconciliation

Measure 2.1 focused on developing the capacity of civil society to engage with issues of reconciliation and peacebuilding. The measure primarily acted as a support to further develop this work through the outcomes of other projects. The vision for the measure was that reconciliation work could be done through individual projects / schools but that it needed support. The relationships that were developed were to further support this work and the key issue being addressed was the lack of space or time that had been given to support workers seeking to include reconciliation into their own work.

The measure challenged individual workers on their perceptions of reconciliation and peacebuilding, however this was being done within an overall framework of influencing wider social change. Individual attitudinal change was noted as necessary for the participants in order to better equip them to deliver this work in their own projects. The focus of reconciliation work under this measure was at a wider level however a key priority for the measure was the adoption of appropriate methodologies to ensure that this work was undertaken both professionally and correctly.

3.Horizontal Principles

In addition to the Peace and reconciliation impacts many of the projects also impacted on one of more areas of the horizontal principles.

3.1 Impact on Poverty

Many of the projects funded under this measure were supporting the community and voluntary sector (**Raphoe Reconciliation Project (950060,006958,029661X)**), **Diploma in Peacebuilding (005584, 032196X)**, **Reaching Across with Sligo Connections (002826)**) who in turn were working specifically with groups impacting on poverty.

Projects such as the **Reaching Across with Sligo Connections (002826)** project supported the networking of a range of groups across the county that were working on local social inclusion issues. The key focus for this project was to encourage and develop cross border partnerships amongst this sector of groups and to strengthen the sector in the region as a whole.

NUIG targeted its participants on the **Diploma in Peacebuilding (005584, 032196X)** from the Community Development Sector who were currently trying to engage in reconciliation and peacebuilding work. The course stipulation that a piece of research be submitted that would be located within a community project, helped to strengthen the link between the social inclusion focused projects and the support to the sector provided under this measure.

Quare Hawks Theatre Company (008403) worked with target group members of the peace programme especially minority Protestant groups, Ex-prisoners and Women as well as the Youth project. The aim of the workshops at the participant level outcome, was twofold; to equip members from these groups to discuss issues that many of them had never been able to articulate before. The second part was to develop their confidence at speaking out and engaging in civil society dialogue in a wider context.

3.2 Equal Opportunities

Many of the projects were working on issues relating to reconciliation. Underpinning this work was the need to discuss sensitive issues arising from the conflict and in society generally. Much of this work included challenging perceptions and engaging in

discussion on topics relating to the areas covered under the Equality legislations, especially racism, diversity and equality.

The **Quare Hawks Theatre Company (008403)** worked specifically with women to encourage them to voice issues relevant to them and to portray them as part of a drama workshop. The project recognised that the perceptions of women were distinct voices and needed to be brought to the fore in debates and discussion relating to the conflict.

Reaching Across with Sligo Connections (002826) did not specifically target areas of equality but instead worked closely with projects that were being supported to develop issues and discussion relating to reconciliation, tolerance and diversity. **NUIG Diploma in Peacebuilding (005584, 032196X)** also operated in a similar way accept that the research projects allowed a more indepth focus on specific issues relating to equality. Such issues included lesbians in peacebuilding and women and conflict resolution.

The **Education for Reconciliation Programme (950129, 001965, 029389X)** aimed to encourage young people, through the Social and Personal Education programmes, to engage in dialogue relating to issues such as identity, difference, conflict and peacebuilding. As part of this work issues such as racism and equality were also brought into the syllabus.

3.3 Environmental Sustainability

This measure did not appear, from the evaluation reports, to focus specifically on the environmental aspects of peacebuilding. However many of the local community development projects would be supporting environmental sustainability at some level either through community recycling, group transport, or other such localised activities.

There are however models of peace building that recognise the link between peace and environmental sustainability. Similarly many environmental projects are using reconciliation as a way of bringing together groups as a part of a cross community / cross border approach. The fact that projects in the sample did not actively engage in this level of work, does not preclude the fact that this measure could have had impact through other projects on generating a more environmentally focused reconciliation and peacebuilding measure. The limited reporting in the evaluation reports on this issue also limits the comments in this section.

3.4 Rural Development

Most of the projects funded under this measure were located in the rural border county regions. The focus was to support the community infrastructure through sections of civil society and to introduce reconciliation work as a key process as to how that work would be done.

The emphasis on supporting an existing sector of community workers / teachers / projects was to promote sustainability of the rural economy and rural development. The skills being taught across many of the projects would be retained through existing workers in the rural areas. The multiplier strategy to highlight issues and concerns of the border regions, especially in the drama productions, ensured an ongoing political interest in the border region.

This measure appeared, from the reports, to be less focused on new and innovative ideas but more directed at supporting the innovative work already happening across the programme. The innovation within this measure was in the combination of supports being made available and the future utilisation of these skills and methods.

V. Measure 2.4c Social Integration, Inclusion and Reconciliation) Pathways to Inclusion, Integration and Reconciliation of Target Groups of the Programme

1. Programme Objectives

***Aim** – To build the capacity of individuals and communities to deal with the transition to peace by identifying and providing for skills gaps which may impede the transition and to promote a labour market open to all by continuing the work started under the Peace I Programme, promoting the re-socialisation, integration and inclusion of target groups.*

Most projects under this measure combined the two overarching Peace II programme objectives; 1) addressing the legacy of the conflict and 2) taking opportunities from peace in order to address

a specific aspect of the legacy. There were a wide variety of groups funded under this measure including a number of projects working specifically with ex-prisoners. However since a cluster evaluation of ex-prisoner projects is already reviewing many of these project evaluations they are not used in this review.

1.1 Addressing the Legacy of the Conflict / Taking Opportunities from Peace

Many of the projects funded under measure 2.4C were working on specialised issues reflecting the needs of a particular target group. Most projects combined the two peace distinctiveness criteria to take opportunities from peace in order to address specific issues arising from the legacy.

Groups funded under this measure included women experiencing domestic violence, Travellers, Ex-prisoners, People experiencing mental health and post conflict mental trauma, Women and displaced families as well as general community projects working with the above groups and other minority groups affected by the conflict.

In addition to direct work with victims and minority groups there were also projects focusing on intercommunity and cross border economic issues. Projects located in areas that had been neglected or had experienced a direct negative impact due to the conflict were also funded under this measure to start to try and rebuild or redevelop their area.

Actions – Areas, Sectors and Groups

Projects funded measure 2.4C worked closely with a range of different target groups and as such the response of the measure was varied but project specific. However within the specific projects most groups were working either on local economic regeneration on a geographical basis or working with specific targeted marginalized communities.

Marginalized Communities

Within this category there was a mix of groups. The Drogheda Women's Refuge **Outreach, Aftercare and Support Services Project (950031, 002002)** worked exclusively with women who had experienced domestic violence, there were many ex-prisoner projects funded under this measure as well as a mental health

project **GROW (008580, 029604X)** that looked at issues of post conflict trauma and mental health issues arising from the conflict.

Drogheda Women's Refuge **Outreach, Aftercare and Support Services Project (950031, 002002)** were supported to run an outreach, aftercare and support programme which was an additional service to their main work of providing refuge accommodation to women experiencing domestic violence. This project was in response to an identified need that many women from the North were accessing the refuge service based in the South.

The women needed to flee the jurisdiction because in many cases the partner they were fleeing also had paramilitary connections. Women were therefore experiencing intimidation and threats within the home that had the potential to escalate into experiencing threats from within the community and their local environment. Although many women experiencing domestic violence would also experience negative responses from the community the added presence and involvement of paramilitary groups was a direct influence of the conflict and provided new risks for the women and also for the refuge seeking to support them.

The **Donegal Traveller's Project (950049, 001980)** received funding to work on developing a reconciliation approach to engaging in meaningful dialogue with the settled community. This project had incorporated learning from the Peace programme and had been challenged into looking at alternative ways of engaging in dialogue between members of the Traveller community and members of the settled community. This was in response to recognising that hostility and aggression were not necessarily a conducive mechanism in which to foster productive working relationships, in order to better advance the cause of many members of the Traveller community.

There were a range of ex-prisoner projects that including supporting ex-prisoners and their families, engaging in dialogue with other sectors of society and conducting needs analysis and training needs of the group.

The mental health support group, **GROW (008580, 029604X)** was also funded under this measure. They have developed an international model of working with people who wish to avail of support for personal mental health issues. One of the key issues

being addressed by the group was that the culture of silence of what happened during the conflict and how it impacted on communities, was itself often a barrier to many people being able to access support and enter recovery.

Oideas na mBan's **Positive Action for Women (017101)** project working with women in the Gaeltacht region, many of whom were outsiders and some of whom were displaced women whose partners would have left Northern Ireland due to the conflict. This project group was also experiencing isolation from their local communities with language barriers / silence around issues of the conflict and a lack of community structures to promote inclusion and participation.

Cross Border / Cross Community Economic regeneration

Several projects were located in hinterland regions that had been divided by partition. This had had a resultant negative impact on the Social, Cultural and Economic Development of the region.

Many of the groups such as the Clones Community Forum **Building Bridges (950132, 001966)**, Clones Development Society's **Connecting Communities (950131 001968)** and the Tir Hugh's **Wavelength (010978)** did not necessarily experience or express any negative feelings towards the other side of their original community. However a long period of time with little or no involvement had engendered a culture of non-integration.

The Ballyshannon / Belleek project **Wavelength (010978)** used a combination of arts and heritage to generate a cross community / cross border project that could appeal to all sectors and ages of society. In addition to the arts skills and enjoyment that was created the project focused on developing and using the arts as part of the overall cultural tourism strategy for the region.

Clones Community Forum **Building Bridges (950132, 001966)**, focused specifically on community regeneration as part of their project. The process was to develop strong cross community ties and endeavour to create a united community with one developmental vision for the region. The Clones Development Association **Connecting Communities (950131 001968)** received funding on its own to further develop one aspect of the overall regional plan which was to build the capacity of individuals in relation to IT skills.

1.2 Degree problem addressed (Outcomes – project level)

Many of the projects funded under measure 2.4C were using the funding to initiate a process of long-term change (**Building Bridges (950132, 001966)**, **Donegal Traveller's Project (950049, 001980)**, **GROW (008580, 029604X)**, **Wavelength (010978)**). At this point in the lifecycle of the project much of the groundwork has been established and initial project outcomes indicate that for many of the projects this work has begun to see results.

For projects such as **Outreach, Aftercare and Support Services Project (950031, 002002)** the focus and outcomes were much clearer since the problems and key players involved had already been identified. The project worked closely with members of other agencies and support services including the PSNI and was able to implement a model of cross border interagency co-operation.

Clones Community Forum through the **Building Bridges (950132, 001966)**, project was able to undertake a series of small community orientated projects. The overall outcome for this project was to develop community confidence and instil a sense of belief and positive identification with the developments of the community.

Other projects however were longer term such as the **Donegal Traveller's Project (950049, 001980)**. Training in developing a reconciliation model was only part of the overall strategy. The follow on work involved in the implementation and monitoring of this strategy was not picked up by the evaluation report in the timescale of this project.

1.3 Making a more normal, peaceful and stable society

Many of the projects funded under measure 2.4C were attempting to normalise a reconciliation approach into the area where they were working. The focus was on dealing with issues that often reached across both sides of the border and being able to bring together appropriate groups or services that could deal with the issue holistically. (**Outreach, Aftercare and Support Services Project (950031, 002002)**, **Building Bridges (950132, 001966)**, **Wavelength (010978)**)

Projects such as **Wavelength (010978)** administered through the Tir Hugh Resource Centre, had successfully implemented a series of art workshops and cultural activities to tie into the heritage tourism work of the locality. Again though this work was to initiate dialogue and normalise the idea that the two areas would work together to further develop the tourism potential for the region. In the short time allocated to this project certain sectors of the community participated more than others. The longer-term outcomes would be to see this approach being replicated in other activities or additional funding secured to continue this project further.

Projects such as **GROW (008580, 029604X)** are mainstream approaches to supporting people with mental health issues. The impact of the conflict was recognised through this particular project and incorporated into the standard programme. There were however challenges that GROW faced in trying to develop a one solution to all problems approach, but the key factor was that for one of the first times the impact of the conflict was being recognised as a separate factor within general mental health support.

2. Paving the Way to Reconciliation

2.1 Building Positive Relationships –(in order to impact positively on reconciliation)

Most of the projects reviewed under measure 2.4C had a very specific target group and focus for the work they were engaging in. As a result the relationships developed under this measure were also quite specific and established with the primary intent of developing the project further.

Outreach, Aftercare and Support Services Project (950031, 002002) aimed to establish an interagency cross border group that would pool resources and support one another in moving women across the border to seek shelter and protection from abusive partners. Many of these partners also had paramilitary connections and had used these connections to further intimidate and threaten the women and children accessing this project.

The **Building Bridges (950132, 001966)** project ran a series of inter community projects ranging from Tidy Towns, to linking with other communities to refurbishing and renovating the old Protestant Hall. Through the establishment and successful

completion of these activities new members of the community began to become involved in the work of the project and many new relationships across the community subsequently developed. The project promoters viewed the activities as a means to an end of developing and enhancing community relations rather than as an end in themselves.

2.2 Developing a Shared Vision of an Interdependent and Shared Society

Many of the projects funded under this measure were seeking to develop a fairly complex vision for the future, which involved bringing together different players who had had little if any involvement in working together in the past.

The complexity of many of these visions is illustrated through the number of interagency/ inter community groups established as part of the projects work (**Wavelength (010978)**, **Building Bridges (950132, 001966)**, **Outreach, Aftercare and Support Services Project (950031, 002002)**) and by the projects that were seeking to link into and begin dialogue on an interagency basis (**GROW (008580, 029604X)**, **Donegal Traveller's Project (950049, 001980)**, **Connecting Communities (950131 001968)**).

2.3 Acknowledging and Dealing with the Past

Many of the projects were acknowledging a breakdown in relationships due to the conflict. **Connecting Communities (950131 001968)** and **Building Bridges (950132, 001966)**, projects and the **Wavelength (010978)** project were all trying to re-establish relationships with communities divided by the border. A history of non co-operation and isolation had effectively destroyed the hinterland region and reduced its economic and social potential.

Donegal Traveller's Project (950049, 001980) acknowledged the need to reassess how they approached interagency and inter Traveller/settled community dialogue. The conflict has focused reconciliation dialogue on the main communities (Protestant / Catholic) however on both sides of the border the Traveller community have been excluded from dialogue at the expense of incorporating these mainstream groups. In the South there has been little, if any, focus on reconciliation work within agencies and

therefore dialogue work incorporating inclusion and tolerance hasn't been developed at an interagency level.

The **Outreach, Aftercare and Support Services Project (950031, 002002)** were dealing with the legacy and difficulties of working cross border to operate a support service for women. This service needed to support women who wanted to move far enough away from their immediate danger zone and yet remain relatively close to family supports and other support services. For women in the Newry / Drogheda area this often meant crossing the border to the next local refuge. This also meant engaging with another jurisdiction and another set of regional health and accommodation supports.

For **GROW (008580, 029604X)** the issue being acknowledged was that in the past little or no encouragement had been given to discussing the impact of the conflict on the mental health and well being of people in the region.

2.4 Significant Cultural and Attitudinal Change

The main priority for many projects funded under measure 2.4C was to support specific target sectors of the population and to focus on their reintegration and acceptance by the mainstream society. Many projects were therefore addressing attitudinal change at two levels – firstly in the attitude of their target group towards the rest of society and secondly trying to affect attitudinal change within sectors of mainstream society especially in areas of service provision. (**Donegal Traveller's Project (950049, 001980)**, **Outreach, Aftercare and Support Services Project (950031, 002002)**, **GROW (008580, 029604X)**).

The timescale of the projects (mainly 2 years) and the process being used to develop attitudinal change – long-term community development, meant that during the life of the project this level of change was difficult to assess. However many of the projects had made significant inroads into embarking on this process of change and indicators of progress rather than indicators of impact were used by many of the evaluation reports.

The establishment of an interagency group in **Outreach, Aftercare and Support Services Project (950031, 002002)** was not in itself evidence of attitudinal change by individual members, however the concept of working together as agencies cross border in developing

a shared response was a significant shift in attitude. Similarly the establishment of several **GROW (008580, 029604X)** groups in the area was of itself a new project however the shift in attitude was evident when sufficient groups were established to create a presence and become accepted as a way of working with mental health issues.

2.5 Social, Economic and Political Change

Groups funded under measure 2.4C were seeking to achieve change at all 3 levels social, economic and political. However many of the changes started at social development and it was only as projects progressed that the other two areas became more affected by the project outcomes.

Social Change

Many of the projects were working with specific target groups. The immediate sphere of change that projects were seeking to influence was social acceptance and an increase in rights for their target group (**Donegal Traveller's Project (950049, 001980)** Refuge and accommodation, **GROW (008580, 029604X)** Mental health support, Ex-prisoners and training / employment options).

As representatives of minority groups many of the projects raised issues not only with the appropriate service providers but also with members of the general or majority community. This two pronged approach was to affect policy change through challenging service providers but also by creating a critical mass of people to support any lobbying for particular changes required.

Some of the traditional community development projects had recognised the need to shift away from purely antagonistic attitudes and approaches to developing a more sophisticated strategy of negotiation (**Donegal Traveller's Project (950049, 001980)**, **Outreach, Aftercare and Support Services Project (950031, 002002)**). Projects such as **Building Bridges (950132, 001966)**, and Wavelength used small-scale social projects to prove their value and workability and to encourage others to buy into the project or at least not to provide resistance. The cumulative affect of these small projects was to create social change within the locality.

Economic Change

Projects such as **Building Bridges (950132, 001966)**, **Connecting Communities (950131 001968)** and Tir Hugh Resource Centre – **Wavelength (010978)** were all projects that were seeking to influence social change through the micro projects they were engaging their respective communities in. However the ultimate aim was to affect change in the wider economic environment, primarily through developing tourism through heritage, environmental and cultural attractions.

Other projects working with specific target groups e.g. ex-prisoners, refuge and Travellers were all working on smaller scale economic capacity building. The focus for these projects was to provide an environment where the basic quality of life supports were provided (e.g. accommodation, safety, access to health services) so that the focus for many of these groups could shift to securing, or training for, employment in the wider society.

Political Change

For many of the projects working with marginalized groups the issues they were dealing with had wider political implications. The acceptance of Travellers and training in Traveller culture **Donegal Traveller's Project (950049, 001980)** was an issue that did not just affect Donegal but other agencies and services both North and South of the Border. The inter agency approach to dealing with refuge accommodation on a cross border basis was used in Drogheda **Outreach, Aftercare and Support Services Project (950031, 002002)**, however the same approach could equally be applied to Donegal / Derry and many of the lessons learnt could be passed on.

The evaluation reports did not really highlight the potential for political change and instead tended to focus strictly on the project outputs at a local level. Since much of the work that will influence political change is slower and often requires linking into other organisations to develop policy positions, the potential of an individual project to impact on this process was often missed.

2.6 Use of an integrated approach to the 5 strands of reconciliation;

(Building Positive Relationships; Developing a Shared Vision of an Interdependent and Shared Society; Acknowledging and Dealing with the

Past; Significant Cultural and Attitudinal Change; Social, Economic and Political Change.)

Individual level

Most of the projects targeted their primary outcomes at the individual level. Groups working with marginalized communities focused much of their attention on empowerment work and developing skills at an individual level.

Many of the groups focused on individual needs even when working through collective action (**Donegal Traveller's Project (950049, 001980)** and right to accommodation, **GROW (008580, 029604X)** and mental health rights and **Outreach, Aftercare and Support Services Project (950031, 002002)** and right to access safe and secure accommodation), this was mainly because a rights based approach works at a level of individual cases to influence and change both micro and macro level policy.

Economic projects worked through individual micro projects that were aimed at developing skills or providing training in making products or taking part in local events.

For many of the groups funded under measure 2.4c change had to occur at the individual level first in order for the wider social, economic and political change to occur.

Group level

Although many of the projects worked primarily at the individual level there was also reconciliation work being carried out at a group level. Projects seeking to bring about economic change often brought together local groups in order to promote the work of the project and / or encourage networking at a regional or intercommunity level.

Groups addressing issues of marginalized groups were supported through national organisations (**Donegal Traveller's Project (950049, 001980)**, **Outreach, Aftercare and Support Services Project (950031, 002002)**) or were part of a national model of working (**GROW (008580, 029604X)**). Within projects (**Donegal Traveller's Project (950049, 001980)**, **GROW (008580, 029604X)**) there were sometimes a range of organisations or groups that developed or

were developing at the same time and pace and benefited from the group dynamic of sharing practice and supporting one another.

The **Outreach, Aftercare and Support Services Project (950031, 002002)** developed its interagency group in partnership with the refuge in Newry. Both groups were able to benefit from the collaboration in order to provide a seamless support to women living either side of the border.

Inter-community level

Several of the projects (**Wavelength (010978)**, **Building Bridges (950132, 001966)**, and **Connecting Communities (950131 001968)**.) had consciously targeted their work at an intercommunity level. These projects were mainly focused on developing a broad geographical area in order to expand the tourism potential for the region.

Other projects such as the **Outreach, Aftercare and Support Services Project (950031, 002002)** were not specifically addressing intercommunity tensions, however their project impacted on both communities and could have indirect project outcomes that addressed issues relating to intercommunity relations.

Projects such as the **Donegal Traveller's Project (950049, 001980)** were addressing issues of the legacy that meant that they had received acceptance from neither of the main communities. They viewed and perceived hostility from both Catholic and Protestant communities and labelled them both as the settled community.

Political Level

Many of the projects had targeted the political level as part of their reconciliation approach. Projects that were working on economic issues could hope to secure only limited impact without some level of political support, whether this was in the form of investment opportunities, FAS schemes or additional community supports.

Similarly projects working with marginalized groups were often addressing wider political issues such as political ex-prisoners being excluded from certain types of employment, Travellers seeking housing from local authorities or the provision of Refuge accommodation for women experiencing domestic violence. These

were all issues that require local or national policy decisions in order to safe guard the future for other members of a group rather than individuals gaining at the expense of the rest.

The wider policy work was, as mentioned earlier, not always reported on in the evaluation reports, especially if information was fed into working groups or meetings of other projects.

2.7 Overall comments on reconciliation

There were two main approaches to reconciliation under this measure, the first was work that many projects were involved in with individual members of various target groups, these included Travellers, ex-prisoners, women, women experiencing violence and people with mental health issues. Most of these groups were working at two different levels trying to support participants from the target group and trying to engage in dialogue with members of service providers / or from the key organisations in the area.

The second approach focused on intercommunity reconciliation across traditional hinterland regions with the aim of reuniting regions for economic, cultural and social development.

3. Horizontal Principles

In addition to the Peace and reconciliation impacts many of the projects also impacted on one of more areas of the horizontal principles.

3.1 Impact on Poverty

Many of the projects funded were working with marginalized groups, who were in turn, addressing issues relating to poverty. **Outreach, Aftercare and Support Services Project (950031, 002002)** and the **Donegal Traveller's Project (950049, 001980)** were working on issues of accommodation and supporting their own target groups as well as developing interagency forums to tackle the issue locally. Many other groups (ex-prisoners, women) were supporting specific groups to reintegrate and find employment or avail of local training opportunities within their locality.

GROW (008580, 029604X) was working with people with mental health issues arising from their experiences of the conflict. This project recognised that many people had been unable to access support to overcome mental health problems and this was excluding them from progressing socially and economically within their community.

Groups working with economic development were trying to support and protect the economic viability of a region. Projects funded under this category, under measure 2.4C, aimed to prevent poverty taking hold of the area and to halt the progression of the region into further economic decline.

3.2 Equal Opportunities

Although many of the projects were working with marginalized or Peace II programme target groups, within these groups there was little analysis or breakdown of participants supplied through the evaluation reports. The **Outreach, Aftercare and Support Services Project (950031, 002002)** worked with women and young people, however there was no acknowledgement whether Traveller women availed of the service, what the age profile of women attending the service was, or whether access for women with a disability was catered for.

Similarly the **Donegal Traveller's Project (950049, 001980)** works with both male and female Travellers. However many of the sub projects within the overall Traveller project are segregated into men's and women's projects and it was unclear from the evaluation report how the various viewpoints were taken into account and if any gender analysis had been introduced into the project, especially in relation to how management decisions were made or consultations carried out.

There was no mention in **GROW (008580, 029604X)** whether men and women experienced the same type of issues arising from the conflict in their group discussions. Many projects did not describe a breakdown of the participants in detail and one of the comments in the evaluation report for GROW highlighted the conflict between collecting participant's details for reporting to Border Action and the need to retain client confidentiality amongst the group.

Many of the projects mentioned the overall community benefit but few of the groups such as **Building Bridges (950132, 001966)** or

Wavelength (010978) mentioned the impact to specific sectors of the community as mentioned in the Equality legislation. In particular there was often little if any discussion on the participation of groups such as the Disability lobby, Asylum seekers or members of the Gay and Lesbian community.

3.3 Environmental Sustainability

Part of the work of the **Donegal Traveller's Project (950049, 001980)** was to support the Traveller culture and way of life, which has many environmental connections especially in recycling. Some of the work of the overall Travellers Project had developed art and business projects based on recycling materials and these products were used as a way of promoting Traveller culture in a more positive light with some of the agencies.

Other projects such as Oideas na mBan's **Positive Action for Women (017101)** offered training in rural crafts such as stonewalling as part of their programme of activities. Whilst the Building Bridges project established a Tidy Towns group and supported local environmental and heritage development in the region.

3.4 Rural Development

Most of the projects funded under measure 2.4c were located in rural areas or had a rural catchment area as part of their project. The **Outreach, Aftercare and Support Services Project (950031, 002002)** was specifically funded to provide an outreach component to their work and to reach more women located in rural areas on both sides of the border.

The **Building Bridges (950132, 001966)** project was based in a rural area with the aim of economic regeneration and developing social capital in the region. The Tir Hugh **Wavelength (010978)** project was similarly located in the rural hinterland region between Ballyshannon and Belleek. Both groups used local community activities to develop relationships and re-establish community connections in order to develop the region as a whole.

Many of the ex-prisoner groups and organisations dealing with displaced people due to the conflict were working in rural and often isolated areas along the border. The Oideas na mBan **Positive Action for Women (017101)** project was located in the rural Gaeltacht region of Fintown and was seeking to develop

community participation and involvement in the area whilst also maintaining and developing the use of Irish in the town.

VI. Measure 2.6 Social Integration, Inclusion and Reconciliation) Promoting Active Citizenship

1 Programme Objectives

***Aims** – To generate the greatest possible involvement of citizens in the governance of their communities based on values of equality, inclusion and respect for human rights.*

To build closer links between policy makers, politicians, wider civic society and disadvantaged communities affected by the conflict.

1.1 Addressing the Legacy of the Conflict / Taking Opportunities from Peace

As with most of the other measures the two overarching Peace II programme objectives; 1) addressing the legacy of the conflict and 2) taking opportunities from peace were combined. Most projects under this measure were funded a small grant to pilot initiatives that would support the participation of sectors of civil society in democratic dialogue.

There were also a few larger projects under this measure that were funded on to promote active citizenship, these projects were mainly funded through the county councils (Sligo, Monaghan and Donegal as well as Leitrim Community Forum)

1.2 Actions – Areas, Sectors and Groups

Most of the projects funded under this measure received small grants of between 10,000 and 15,000 Euro. The issues that they were addressing tended to be very localised and specific such as training for management groups **Second Chance Ed Project for Women (023161)** or working with a specific housing estate, **Togra Trasnu Glunta Phobal Eascarrach (016367)**. Both of these projects acknowledged the lack of support that had been provided to the groups to enable them to engage in dialogue with outside groups and agencies.

The **Donegal Rural Protestants Peacebuilding Project (010985)** worked with a wider geographical spread of groups but within the border minority Protestant community. This project was addressing the lack of support and isolation that many felt living along the border area as well as the lack of engagement that many of the groups had with wider civic society groups.

Many of the larger projects focused on either harnessing youth participation and developing youth councils / forums or supporting existing community forums which were linked to County Councils / County Development Boards.

The Donegal Local Development Company **Blowing Your Own Trumpet (016363)** had received funding to hold a conference designed to promote and recognise the role and input of the community and voluntary sector. Recognition was given to those projects, funded through the partnership company that had provided models of good practice.

Other projects under this measure received funding to support their work such as promoting community consultation good practice (**Adopting Innovation in Community Consultation (013247)**), targeting specific members of society (**Voice of Older People (019663)**) or promoting the use of technology to support the community sector especially in areas of tourism and enterprise (**Donegal E-Forum (011337)**, www.castleblaney.ie (023362) and www.carrickmacross.ie (023357)).

Most of the projects were addressing a lack of meaningful participation, by the community and voluntary sector, within existing democratic mechanisms. The conflict had impeded nearly all of the democratic and purposeful dialogue structures including cross border structures. However many of the groups targeted through this measure had been further disenfranchised through the lack of recognition of the role of the community and voluntary sector and the ongoing marginalisation of many sectors of society, especially of groups that they represented.

1.3 Degree problem addressed (Outcomes – project level)

Many of the grants awarded under this measure were for small-scale projects. The projects were quite specific and many of the

deliverables were easily achieved. These ranged from completing training, designing web sites, hosting a conference and carrying out audits.

Some projects such as the **Donegal Rural protestant Peacebuilding Project (010985)** supported small Protestant groups that had never engaged with wider society groups or had experience in accessing external funding. The level of mistrust and high level of support needed to work with these groups proved very difficult in some cases, although in others project outputs were achieved such as drawing up plans for the refurbishment of Orange Halls.

Many of the projects received support to work with organisations already established such as community forums. However many of the forums' member groups are small community-based organisations and their representatives are involved in other voluntary organisations. There was an acknowledgement that many of these groups had not developed the skills required in order to participate effectively in many of the new and emerging forums designed to capture the views and opinions of wider civic society. Local county councils promoted several of the initiatives funded under this measure, which would indicate that there is a widespread recognition throughout the sector, that training and support is needed.

The longer-term aim of developing active citizenship has been only partially achieved, and although projects funded under this measure often provided an additional tool to support this process, additional levels of support would be required to sustain this process in the medium to long term.

1.4 Making a more normal, peaceful and stable society

The key focus for most of the projects funded under this measure was to promote active citizenship through projects that were currently up and running. Many of the groups were already involved in civil dialogue work however the structures that they were operating in were weak and had received little technical support.

The aim of this measure was to support and empower communities to engage in a more meaningful way within the existing structures. The structures themselves did not appear to be challenged at all

and there were no programmes of political education / women's studies being used to explain why groups might find it difficult to engage or participate within these structures.

Instead there was recognition on behalf of many of the authorities, responsible for ensuring active participation that the participation of civil society was missing. The focus was therefore purely on the lack of skill within the community and voluntary sector at negotiating and participating in dialogue with these organisations.

2 Paving the Way to Reconciliation

2.1 Building Positive Relationships –(in order to impact positively on reconciliation)

Many of the projects were using the funding to further develop the capacity of management groups or existing structures. The relationships that were developed were not necessarily new relationships but consisted of strengthening and deepening existing affiliations and connections.

The **Second Chance of Education for Women (023161)** targeted the management committee of its own organisation in order to develop skills within the group. One of the management representatives progressed onto a national organisation board (AONTAS) and expanded relationships between the two organisations on a professional basis.

The **Blowing Your Own Trumpet (016363)** hosted a conference to bring together a range of community and voluntary organisations. The formal theme of the conference was to acknowledge the work of the voluntary sector, however it provided an ideal forum in which the community organisations could network and strengthen ties.

Many of the applications from county councils, community forums and local partnerships were also made in recognition of the declining relationships, although this was not stated in the evaluation reports, between the statutory sector and the community and voluntary sector. A high level of frustration existed at community level towards many of the statutory organisations and strong feelings of not being heard or acknowledged. Many of these projects were funded with an underlying aim of trying to re-engage with groups that may have left out of this frustration, and to re-

establish a more meaningful working relationship in the future between local authorities and the community sector.

2.2 Developing a Shared Vision of an Interdependent and Shared Society.

Most of the projects worked from an unnamed vision of encouraging members of marginalized sectors to engage in active citizenship processes. However it was unclear from many of the project evaluation reports whether this vision was a shared vision between statutory and community / voluntary groups or whether it was a vision operating from two different and separate perspectives.

Many of the projects were funded for small amounts of money to engage in limited training and support programmes. In order to develop a genuine shared vision of the future and in order for the projects to engage in meaningful reconciliation work between the two sectors, more emphasis needed to go into this strand.

Most projects operated from the premise that the current structures were there and what was needed was more upskilling of the community and voluntary sector in order to engage with them. There appeared to be no invitation to the community sector to engage with the statutory organisations to critically analyse what was missing from the structures or which groups were repeatedly excluded even from the general community consultations / forums.

2.3 Acknowledging and Dealing with the Past

For many of the projects funded under measure 2.6 this section addressed negative histories. Groups that had a history of not being included in decision-making (women, community organisations, youth), or who had limited opportunity to acquire the skills and experience to engage in traditionally biased dialogue structures.

For many of the projects the promoters themselves were the limiting structures. They were applying to secure a short-term input to try and inject a level of support and engagement into what was currently happening.

However the real issue that had to be acknowledged was more long-term asking why groups had never engaged in decision

making in the past and needing to acknowledge the limitations of the current structures. These questions did not seem to be asked leaving the measure exposed to supplying short term fixes.

2.4 Significant Cultural and Attitudinal Change

Attitudinal and cultural change was being challenged from two different perspectives under this measure. The project promoters were seeking attitudinal change in the way that the community and voluntary sector engage in their decision-making and participation / consultation structures.

For many of the community and voluntary groups though the attitudinal change needed to occur within the decision-making structures. The **Blowing Your Own Trumpet (016363)** conference provided positive feedback from groups that recognised this was one of the first times they had been brought together for something positive and the evaluation report was clear that this type of event should occur more regularly.

Many of the projects targeted key groups such as women, youth and representatives of marginalized groups within the broader community forum. It was recognised through these projects that these target groups had been repeatedly excluded in activities or services that directly concerned them. The change in attitude was evident in a more responsive consultation process and support within a decision making process that would acknowledge and redress the constant bias away from these groups and to support other sectors of society.

2.5 Social, Economic and Political Change

The small amounts of money allocated to projects in this measure restricted the level of wider policy work that could be attempted. However across the measure several key factors arose under each of the headings.

Social Change

Most of the projects funded under this measure were supporting organisations / networks for individual projects working on issues of social justice and change. The purpose of most of the community forums being funded was to highlight issues of social change that

individual projects had identified, through their work within the community and voluntary sector.

Funding under this measure however was aimed at enhancing the participation of individuals within consultation forums and links to county council / county development board structures. This is however one step removed from highlighting issues or acknowledging the issues being raised by individuals.

The aim of all the projects would ultimately be to empower groups / individual members to articulate their needs and for the agencies to respond in a positive and appropriate manner. This is clearly a two way process of communication and understanding, measure 2.6 addressed one way in this process, it is unclear from the evaluation reports what support or work was done to develop the other side of the process.

Economic Change

Within many of the community fora there are representatives from the community enterprise sector. These are mainly small and micro enterprises often attached to and facilitated by other community based resources. As members of the fora they were also being supported to articulate the needs of the enterprise sector in the appropriate county and regional based structures.

Their specific role was not reported on in the evaluation reports however many community based enterprises have traditionally worked closely with local community projects and many would work from the same community based ethos e.g. co-operatives, credit unions, enterprise units within community centres and the running of community resource centres in some cases is managed by a community enterprise focused management group.

Many of the frustrations of the community sector can also be replicated in the community orientated enterprise sector i.e. as small organisations trying to keep their businesses viable whilst under pressure from multinational competition. Many of the smaller businesses find it increasingly more difficult to articulate their needs through county enterprise structures that do not easily facilitate diverse opinion. Local enterprise structures may struggle to take into consideration impacts on the environment, gender, poverty or take on board community development principles.

Political Change

Ironically many of the project promoters belonged to county structures who were supporting groups to become more vocal and critical of their own county structures and policies. There was a potential conflict of interest except that many of the grants were small and the overall outcomes were minimal compared to the work needed to support influencing regional or national policy change.

However for many of the individual beneficiaries (projects within the community forums) the ultimate aim was seeking political change. This is probably more likely to come from within their own individual project or through a specialised national representative body, than it is to come through community forums within a county development board structure. The lack of a developed shared vision with all key stakeholders involved, ultimately impacted on the ability of project promoters to affect change at this level.

2.6 Use of an integrated approach to the 5 strands of reconciliation;

(Building Positive Relationships; Developing a Shared Vision of an Interdependent and Shared Society; Acknowledging and Dealing with the Past; Significant Cultural and Attitudinal Change; Social, Economic and Political Change.)

Individual level

Much of the work was focused at an individual level even though individuals would be representing their group or a selection of groups. For many projects the issue being addressed was individual competency to engage in existing structures of representation. The aim was to develop a collection of individuals who could articulate the needs of the sector e.g. **Youth and Civic Society (013248)** and **Second Chance Ed Project for Women (023161)**. Many of the community forum projects were also aimed at developing individual skills within the forum, however the ultimate aim was a collective development of the forum.

Group level

Most of the work of this measure was geared towards group development. Either with projects targeting community forums and networks (DLDC), youth councils (Monaghan) or organisational development **Second Chance Ed Project for Women (023161)**

Donegal Rural protestant Peacebuilding Project (010985) targeted a range of small Protestant groups that had little or no prior engagement with the funding sector and provided support to their groups.

Youth and Civic Society (013248) supported different youth groups to come together and worked with some of them on developing cultural awareness and exploring issues of diversity and difference.

The **Togra Trasnu Glunta Phobal Eascarrach (016367)** project with Údúrá na Gaeltachta employed a resource worker to work with a housing estate to develop community capacity to engage with appropriate service providers and planners. Part of this work involved bringing together the different groups within the community and determining the needs of various target groups.

Inter-community level

Most of the work funded under measure 2.6 was focused on consultation structures located in the border county regions. Border Protestant communities would be one among many marginalized group either missing or poorly represented in the consultation process including rural groups, enterprise groups, women, Travellers and Asylum Seekers.

The **Donegal Rural protestant Peacebuilding Project (010985)** targeted its work on supporting the Protestant communities and enabling them to identify issues that they wanted to work on in their communities. There was little dialogue work occurring amongst projects or between different communities at any level under this measure, instead the focus was on small level supports to existing structures promoting general active citizenship within the county or region.

Political Level

Many of the project promoters funded under this measure were local authorities, and as such were engaged in local political structures. The support to community forums was a mainstreamed approach since these structures were part of the requirement of local authorities to engage with and support active citizenship within their locality.

The small size grants did not allow for any in-depth analysis of how the local political structures were engaging with the community sector and how this relationship could be improved. Traditionally there has been resistance by elected politicians to promoting community and voluntary groups to represent issues, since they feel that as the elected representatives they should have that role.

Many of the project promoters could have worked at two levels both supporting the community and voluntary level to engage in structures, but also supporting elected representatives to engage more meaningfully with marginalized sectors of their constituency and the county as a whole.

2.7 Overall comments on reconciliation

This measure had a lot of potential to tackle reconciliation issues especially between the different sectors within the county; community / enterprise / elected officials/ civil servants. However the nature of the grants and the applications generally were focused on the lack of skill within the community sector.

Unfortunately this only addressed elements of the problem and didn't really acknowledge the full past or develop a shared vision for the future. As a result attitudinal change was expected on one side only and not the other and subsequently political and social change was minimised.

This type of misuse of reconciliation would have huge implications for Peace III. In future evidence is needed for how projects have identified what the issue is they are addressing, how a shared vision is being developed and acknowledging the different viewpoints held by all the stakeholders and how this is going to be incorporated into their project in a meaningful way. – None of these issues were highlighted in the evaluation reports that were

reviewed and no analysis was given as to why this work was being carried out in the first place.

3 Horizontal Principles

In addition to the Peace and reconciliation impacts many of the projects also impacted on one of more areas of the horizontal principles.

3.1 Impact on Poverty

Measure 2.6 focused on supporting groups and projects that were working on issues of social injustice and poverty. Many of the project promoters were trying to facilitate and strengthen the voice of the community sector to articulate the needs of marginalized groups within society through local community fora.

The **Second Chance Ed Project for Women (023161)** received funding to develop its own internal organisational and management skills with the intention of being able to better represent women's issues in a variety of forums.

Several projects under this measure worked with youth structures in order to support young people addressing their issues.

The **Togra Trasnu Glunta Phobal Eascarrach (016367)** project worked closely with residents of a disadvantaged housing estate in rural Donegal. This estate had high levels of unemployment and a low level of esteem or engagement in community development. This project part employed a worker and worked in partnership with Údurás na Gaeltachta to support residents and promote active citizenship within the community. The primary focus of the project was on the youth population with the aim of combating antisocial behaviour and possible drug related behaviour.

3.2 Equal Opportunities

Measure 2.6 indirectly supported a range of community organisations through the support to community networks and fora. However what was not clear from the evaluation reports was

the exact composition of these groups and how many of the nine grounds of the equality legislation were covered, at present, through the current representative structures.

In most County Development Boards the community and voluntary sector have a limited number of places at the table. As a result community fora are used as a means of community groups raising issues and then elected / selected delegates are responsible for raising these concerns. However from an equality position there are a number of weaknesses to this approach;

- It depends on the minority groups being present at the community fora
- Many of the marginalized groups are quite specialised and other members of the forum may not feel confident taking their issues forward.
- Some of the marginalized groups may raise contentious issues e.g. Travellers and accommodation rights versus Residents Associations objections.
- Some groups may fundamentally disagree with other groups due to religion and refuse to progress issues e.g. Reproductive rights, Gay and Lesbian rights.
- The personal agenda of the elected representatives will often dictate which issues get prioritised and pushed and which are raised but not followed up on.

The representative structure can therefore further marginalize groups and silence their concerns. The evaluation reports did not progress into an analysis of what groups were absent from events and which issues repeatedly get left off agendas.

3.3 Environmental Sustainability

Most of the projects focused on the consultation mechanism in which groups were partaking, however many of the members of these groups would have been involved in developing local environmental projects. Groups working on eco tourism or heritage projects would have developed environmental policies for their work. Many local community development projects initiated recycling schemes, organised activities for Tidy Towns and did other local environmental cleanups.

3.4 Rural Development

Most of the projects funded under this measure were located in rural border county regions or supported groups that had a rural membership. The community for supported groups who had been addressing specific rural issues such as transport, working with older people and providing outreach services.

VII. Measure 2.7 Social Integration, Inclusion and Reconciliation / Developing Weak Community Infrastructure

1 Programme Objectives

Aim – To provide appropriate and sustained interventions to stimulate and support community involvement and building community confidence. To work sensitively to meet the needs of those areas including alleviation of the fragmentation that exists.

There are two overarching Peace II programme objectives; 1) addressing the legacy of the conflict and 2) taking opportunities from peace. Most projects under this measure were addressing a particular aspect of the legacy, which was the lack of community infrastructure and development within their own locality.

1.1 Addressing the Legacy of the Conflict / Taking Opportunities from Peace

As with other measures these two distinctiveness criteria were often merged together as opportunities from peace was seen to be facilitating the ability of projects to address the legacy. Most projects were addressing immediate issues such as the lack of social and community development infrastructure in their area along with the subsequent lack of social capital investment.

However what many groups also identified was that underlying legacy issues were also at the centre of why they wanted to develop the community infrastructure. These issues related to a lack of intercommunity relations where there were mixed Protestant and Catholic communities, there were also issues such as apathy and

attitudes of despondency that communities were exhibiting, as a result of long periods of lack of investment or revitalisation work in the area.

Many groups identified the need for a neutral community space as a means of addressing all these aspects of the legacy. However the process of consulting with the community, engaging individuals to support the building and construction work and planning future activities were also all outcomes of projects as well, that helped to redress some of the aspects of the legacy as outlined above.

1.2 Actions – Areas, Sectors and Groups

Projects under measure 2.7 focused primarily on developing local community infrastructure through using a process of cross-community engagement. The construction of a building or in some cases renovation of existing spaces was only part of the overall aim for each group. The subsequent management of the centre and the engagement of members of the community in using these premises was also a key priority. The ultimate aim was to rebuild not just the physical but also the social and intercommunity relationships that had suffered as a result of the conflict.

Supporting Community Infrastructure

Several projects under this measure were capital construction projects or renovations (**Culdaff Wee hall (010642)**, **Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (950114,001980,033899X)** and **Bunnoe Community Development Association (006266)**). The three projects listed are all in areas of a high Protestant / Catholic mix. The challenge for the projects was to develop a safe and neutral venue that would be acceptable and used by members of both sides of the community. The ultimate aim was to unite the community as one rather than reinforce the traditional separatist ideals that currently prevailed.

In **Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (950114,001980,033899X)** this was achieved by developing two separate spaces one from each side of the community with the proviso that both communities had to engage with each other and make the venues open to both. In other areas this was done through

joint committees that built a new building to facilitate the community as a whole.

An additional aim for most of the groups was that by developing a suitable community space there would be the possibility of attracting other community support services to come into the area e.g. The VEC, community facilitators, computer training programmes or additional funding from other programmes to further develop the community e.g. the Family Support Agency, Community Development Support Programme.

Supporting Social Capital Investment

Some projects also addressed the lack of social capital investment in their community. The Community Worker's Co-op **Towards Achieving Social Change (TASC) (001976)** was also funded under this section to offer support to a variety of groups throughout the county and support development at a broader level. The TASC project focused on supporting social policy change in the local county development programmes and social inclusion plans. The aim was to raise the interest and profile of work being done in this area as well as directly influencing the policy and commitment given to such issues through the range of current county based implementation strategies. Part of the work included the establishment and support to networking groups on issues such as racism and equality.

Other projects such as **Bunnoe Community Development Association (006266)**, and **Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (950114,001980,033899X)** saw the development of a community space as a mechanism for developing social capital and encouraging the community to engage more actively in this area.

Cavan Monaghan Rural Development Project (950124, 001962) was different to many of the others in that it tackled a specific interest area, Heritage, and sought to engage individuals in developing an interest in this issue. The underlying aim of this project was to develop and build relationships amongst the different sectors of the community and across different communities in the region. Much of the work was targeted at young people and communities interested in developing cultural awareness and respect for other cultures and traditions.

Although for some projects (**Cavan Monaghan Rural Development Project (950124, 001962)**, **Dunfanaghy Community Resource**

Association (950114,001980,033899X), Bunnoe Community Development Association (006266) there was an economic link to their project, either in terms of ensuring the future sustainability and ongoing funding or in focusing on developing rural tourism as a potential income generating option for some people (**Cavan Monaghan Rural Development Project (950124, 001962)**). The primary focus for most projects was to engage local community members and challenge issues of mistrust amongst sections of the community.

1.3 Degree problem addressed (Outcomes – project level)

The funding was used to secure either centres or neutral locations that would act as catalysts for community development or facilitate dialogue and co-operation at an intercommunity level.

Most of the evaluation reports focused on the types of groups or activities that proceeded to use the resource once it had been completed. In **Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (950114,001980,033899X)** there was evidence that traditional Protestant and Catholic activities were happening in each others centres with some groups using both centres. The two centres were providing different types of spaces so that the factor determining who would use what would link more into the type of activity rather than who the group was. However a deeper analysis of relationships established and positive interaction occurring across different sectors of the community was missing

Other centres however described a large range of activities and support that was given to a number of local groups and new groups that had emerged (**Bunnoe Community Development Association (006266, Association for the Development of Pettigo and Tullyhommon (ADoPT) (005579,029274X), Culdaff Wee hall (010642)**). However the composition of these groups and evidence that these people would not have mixed beforehand was not addressed through most of the reports. The funding provided a centre and the evaluation reports focused on this whereas the aim of many of the projects was to use the building in order to enhance community relationships and intercommunity activity. This appeared to possibly be happening at project level but was not always reflected clearly in the reports.

1.4 Making a more normal, peaceful and stable society

Most projects had highlighted how the lack of a community focal point had resulted in a steady decline in the community as a whole. The outlook of many people living in these areas was of despondency and a feeling of abandonment. The feedback once participants had seen the centres developed highlighted this fact clearly, with people saying that they never realised that their community had so much potential.

Many of the projects may not have realised the longer-term impact of their work in terms of developing both economic and social capital. However, there was nonetheless a realisation that improvement was needed at a community infrastructure level in order to support what limited community development activity there was already.

The key project outcome, apart from completion of the building or renovation work, was to support the existing networks of groups currently operating in the locality and to achieve this through a process of engaging all sectors of the community. This was done through cross-community management groups or in communities such as Pettigo (**Association for the Development of Pettigo and Tullyhommon (ADoPT) (005579,029274X)**), by expanding the committee to fully represent all sectors of the community.

2 Paving the Way to Reconciliation

2.1 Building Positive Relationships –(in order to impact positively on reconciliation)

Under measure 2.7 much of the focus for developing positive relationships was at an intercommunity level. Although funding was often sought to develop community spaces the process of how this was achieved was a primary factor in this measure.

Many of the groups (**Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (950114,001980,033899X)**, **Bunnoe Community Development Association (006266, Cavan Monaghan Rural Development Project (950124, 001962))**), had highlighted a high level of mistrust and fear amongst different sectors of the communities. The key aim for most of the projects was to try and redress these concerns and facilitate bringing groups together to develop a common community vision for development.

For groups such as the Co-op and the **Towards Achieving Social Change (TASC) (001976)** project the type of relationships built were slightly different. This project aimed at influencing policy on behalf of the community sector. There was a strong interagency focus with the co-op being represented on sub groups of the Donegal County Development Board or interagency and community groups such as the Gender Focus group. In addition their work involved supporting the development of a network on racism and also one on equality. The focus at this level was on developing and strengthening relationships amongst different sectors of the community that may not necessarily have worked together before.

The **Cavan Monaghan Rural Development Project (950124, 001962)** worked with several schools in the area and developed close links especially with a couple of integrated schools. The relationships were specifically targeted at organisations or schools that were interested in heritage work or in the case of the integrated schools had a previous history of tackling cultural projects on a cross community basis.

The nature of most of these relationships was tied into a practical project and task orientated. This ensured that the relationships were grounded and meaningful for the duration of the project, however once the project was completed it was less clear from the reports whether these relationships would continue.

2.2 Developing a Shared Vision of an Interdependent and Shared Society

The vision that underpinned many of the projects that were engaged in construction and/or renovation projects was to develop a cohesive community through the construction and utilisation of a common community space. This vision was primarily focused on community infrastructure and developing and supporting community involvement / activities.

There was also a wider vision although this was not necessarily named in the project application or evaluation reports, namely to develop a vibrant community atmosphere that would ensure the future retention of its younger population and attract and retain business and enterprise initiatives into the region. Projects such as **Cavan Monaghan Rural Development Project (950124, 001962)** used a heritage project to engage many members of local communities into developing a shared vision of the history and cultural traditions of

the area. However underpinning this was the acknowledgement that one of the few economic attractions this region had was its culture and heritage. The aim was therefore to encourage and develop the potential of this resource and support networking on a cross border basis to maximise this outcome.

2.3 Acknowledging and Dealing with the Past

Most of the projects working in local communities acknowledged the past at two different levels. The first was in the obvious lack of social and community development supports available to people living in the area. The second was to name the high levels of intercommunity tension in some of the areas, or the lack of engagement with members of other communities.

For other projects funded under this measure there were similar issues but with a slightly wider focus. The **Towards Achieving Social Change (TASC) (001976)** project aimed at supporting all community development groups in the county by updating them on current policy initiatives or ways in which they could influence community development in their area. The Cavan Monaghan heritage project looked at one issue but challenged groups across a wider geographical hinterland to work together and challenge issues of reconciliation on a cross border basis.

The common issue addressed by many of the project was a lack of cross border and intercommunity activity that had been sustained over a long period of time. All of the projects in the sample, except the **Towards Achieving Social Change (TASC) (001976)** group, were directly engaging in projects to redress this issue at a local level within specific communities.

2.4 Significant Cultural and Attitudinal Change

The main priority for many of the projects funded under this measure was to redress intercommunity tensions as well as to shift overall community attitudes in relation to the development potential of their local area. In many cases the development of a community space was used to facilitate this attitudinal change and act as catalysis for change.

For the **Towards Achieving Social Change (TASC) (001976)** project this attitude change was aimed at statutory organisations that had a responsibility to invest and develop such areas, for other projects the

aim was to instil a sense of community pride and a belief that change could happen. The **Cavan Monaghan Rural Development Project (950124, 001962)** was also seeking to redress intercommunity and cross border attitudes, this time with a focus on maximising the rural tourism potential for a cross border hinterland region.

For most of the projects the time scale of the measure only ensured the initial phase of the project, i.e. the construction or renovation of the building. The longer-term outcome would be more visible in the next stage of the project's development when more focus would be given to users of the resource. During this next stage one of the key priorities would be the role of the resource in developing and improving intercommunity relationships and thus challenging traditional ways of working and thinking.

2.5 Social, Economic and Political Change

Across the entire measure of 2.7 projects aimed to affect change at all three levels, however different projects placed different emphasis on each section.

Social Change

All of the projects funded under measure 2.7 were working on issues that at some level aimed to affect social change. The focus for most of the projects was to develop and enhance the social infrastructure of the locality. However the change wasn't restricted to physical spaces, the aim was to develop the networks and community organisations that operated in a disparate manner through various settings, and to bring them together in a more concerted attempt to strategically develop the community and maximise the impact of these activities.

Many of the projects aimed to channel the development of their community through a central focal point either using a committee (**Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (950114,001980,033899X)**) or in the development of a shared community space (**Culdaff Wee hall (010642), Bunnoe Community Development Association (006266)**). **Cavan Monaghan Rural Development Project (950124, 001962)** had chosen to use the common theme of heritage as an entry point into building relationships and developing both the social and economic potential of the region. All of this work as well as other community development supports was being supported at a wider level by the

policy work undertaken by the **Towards Achieving Social Change (TASC) (001976)** project.

Economic Change

This measure primarily focused on social change and promoting social integration and addressing issues of social inclusion. However as part of the wider vision of their work many of the projects (**Cavan Monaghan Rural Development Project (950124, 001962)**, **Bunnoe Community Development Association (006266)**, **Association for the Development of Pettigo and Tullyhommon (ADoPT) (005579,029274X),**) had acknowledged that future economic prosperity relied on being able to attract other funders, investors and support services into the region. The projects funded under this measure were seen as the start of a longer-term process of developing both the infrastructure and the social capital of the locality.

One of the impacts of the legacy that some of the projects were addressing (**Association for the Development of Pettigo and Tullyhommon (ADoPT) (005579,029274X),**, **Bunnoe Community Development Association (006266)**) was the mental impact and attitude of local people towards community development. In particular **Association for the Development of Pettigo and Tullyhommon (ADoPT) (005579,029274X)**, focused much of its project on engaging with sectors of the community that had never been included in developments before. Many of the targeted beneficiaries were marginalized people who had been living isolated lifestyles for long periods of time. The change in attitude towards believing in themselves and becoming more positive about their locality were noted as project outcomes in their evaluation report.

The change in mental attitude towards believing in the region would be a key component in reforming a potential workforce in an area. The social development and supports required had a direct outcome of revitalising the region and the people in it. This would benefit the community in several ways; by developing an enthusiasm to engage in local community initiatives; developing a willingness to take responsibility for developing the region and thirdly to develop a positive mental outlook on the future of the region. If local people believe that an area is or has potential to expand and grow and is willing to support this then future investors and employers are likely to see this as a positive sign for a potential investment area.

Political Change

Most projects were addressing local social change however the **Towards Achieving Social Change (TASC) (001976)** project was specifically funded to engage with and develop links between the statutory providers and the community and voluntary sector throughout the county of Donegal.

The Community Worker's Co-op in Donegal is part of the national Community Worker's Co-operative and as such had direct links to much of the current debate relating to the community and voluntary sector nationally. Most of the projects funded under measure 2.7 were localised in their focus of development. Although this was beneficial for individual communities it left a gap in passing on information of lessons learned, or of highlighting current gaps in service provision. Many of the communities funded were marginalized through isolation, lack of transport, low educational attainment, displaced people due to the conflict and women. The range of issues that many communities addressed, as part of developing their own community plan, was vast. However what was lacking was a forum for bringing these issues together to see what were national, regional or local issues, and what local authorities or national government strategies could address. The **Towards Achieving Social Change (TASC) (001976)** project aimed to fill that void and act as the conduit for passing on emerging issues as communities raised them.

As a result of their lobbying gender proofing and poverty proofing tools were introduced and training provided, for local statutory bodies in the region.

2.6 Use of an integrated approach to the 5 strands of reconciliation;

(Building Positive Relationships; Developing a Shared Vision of an Interdependent and Shared Society; Acknowledging and Dealing with the Past; Significant Cultural and Attitudinal Change; Social, Economic and Political Change.)

Individual level

Although most projects targeted their project outcomes on affecting change at a group or intercommunity level, this process would have had direct impacts on individual members within the groups. Consequently attitudinal change within many of these projects would

have occurred at an individual level even though most of the activities were performed at a group level.

Cavan Monaghan Rural Development Project (950124, 001962), in promoting heritage, were indirectly supporting local entrepreneurs to consider the tourism impact on their own businesses.

The **Towards Achieving Social Change (TASC) (001976)** project formed alliances between individual workers on other projects throughout the region, and would have depended on targeting individual members of County Boards etc. in order to gain support for their own work.

Association for the Development of Pettigo and Tullyhommon (ADoPT) (005579,029274X) supported individuals in the community to take part in the consultation and to become involved in the community management groups. **Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (950114,001980,033899X)** sought to influence individual community leaders especially amongst the Protestant and Catholic groups in order to ensure widespread community support for their project.

Group level

Most of the projects worked at the group level initially although it was an aim for many to influence intercommunity relations. Projects such as **Association for the Development of Pettigo and Tullyhommon (ADoPT) (005579,029274X)**, **Culdaff Wee hall (010642)**, **Bunnoe Community Development Association (006266)** and **Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (950114,001980,033899X)** were providing or making available a community space that would facilitate and expand the growth of groups in the locality.

Towards Achieving Social Change (TASC) (001976) project supported the establishment of the Donegal Action for Equality platform that sought to support the work of the Social Inclusion sector in Donegal. This work also supported the Donegal Alliance Against Racism and acted as a catalyst for bringing together a diverse range of groups to work together on overall policy issues and share learning.

Inter-community level

Measure 2.7 focused on developing and challenging existing cross community structures. Many of the projects were in areas of high ratios of Catholic / Protestant Communities. The impact of the conflict was to polarise many of these communities and in turn reduce what little opportunity there was for an overall strategy of community revitalisation.

In many cases projects identified the need to develop a safe space that would not threaten any particular culture but would in fact support the development of local traditions and cultures within an overall strategy of local development. Projects that developed physical community spaces also embarked on a process of consultation and engagement with both sides of the community. Although the building was seen as a catalyst for intercommunity engagement the long term impact would be seen as groups start to utilise the building in a non sectarian and non traditional way. Another indicator of genuine cross community engagement would be the establishment of new groups that are truly cross community and that feel supported in the community by both sides.

Political Level

The projects, as stated earlier in this report, were in many cases deemed as mechanisms for change. However the wider impact of change would also need to be supported by outside political and economic forces. Government commitment to fund centres and community development projects along with business investment and statutory training and education programmes are all components of developing the social infrastructure of a region.

It was not clear from many of the evaluation reports how projects had engaged with local political leaders or were lobbying to ensure a commitment either financially or socially in their project.

The **Towards Achieving Social Change (TASC) (001976)** project worked at a general policy level to influence change on wider social inclusion issues, however they were not a lobbying group to ensure funding was given to particular projects.

2.7 Overall comments on reconciliation

Many projects were engaging in localised and immediate issues of reconciliation. Communities that were trying to address a legacy of little if any investment at either an economic or social level, found their situation was compounded by divided communities. This meant that their only asset in terms of social capital was often not available in its most effective form.

The difficulty for many groups was trying to tackle a large construction project and work on in depth issues of reconciliation at the same time. Few of the evaluation reports commented on this difficulty and possibly projects were not forthcoming in naming the conflicts and difficulties they experienced in bringing together their divided community to work together on a single project. However learning from this process and how these projects succeeded in doing this would be useful information to be shared amongst projects and within the programme.

3 Horizontal Principles

In addition to the Peace and reconciliation impacts many of the projects also impacted on one of more areas of the horizontal principles.

3.1 Impact on Poverty

Measure 2.7 is under priority 2, which focuses specifically on addressing issues of social inclusion and integration. Most of the projects were seeking to develop local community infrastructure either in the form of physical capital developments, developing social capital or developing the capacity of the community and voluntary sector.

Many of the groups that would ultimately be supported through the community centres were working with lone parents, older people, young people as well as isolated groups due directly to the conflict such as divided communities and displaced people.

The policy work undertaken and supported through the **Towards Achieving Social Change (TASC) (001976)** project was specifically focusing on social inclusion work within the local county

development strategy and influencing the work of the sub groups of the county development board.

3.2 Equal Opportunities

Although many of the projects were developing local social infrastructure it was unclear from many of the evaluation reports how issues of equality were going to be addressed in the running of the centre and its ongoing sustainability. The focus on cross community prioritised key leaders from both sides of the Protestant / Catholic divide. The priority was to ensure that existing groups would use the newly established space and these groups tended to reflect traditional and local community groups such as Parents and Toddlers, short term basic skill courses e.g IT, Card nights and social events for older people.

One of the key issues facing many of the marginalized groups targeted under the various Equality Legislations is the need to challenge their current lack of involvement in community decision-making. Many of the community projects funded under this measure worked from the assumption that consultation would be targeted at the existing groups already established. There were no plans to challenge gaps in these groups, possibly due to time constraints in monitoring building progress and engaging in an intercommunity and cross community management structure.

However, at a programme level this measure is focusing on social inclusion, integration and reconciliation and what was not evident from the evaluation reports was how social inclusion would be addressed as part of the ongoing work of many of the projects outside of the traditional groups already able to access support. Key groups that were not mentioned at a decision making level include, members of the Traveller community, members of other ethnic minority groups, women in employment/ decision making / business or professions, members of the lesbian or gay community. There was also little evidence to show that at a decision making level older people were involved (although the age profile of local parish and church committees might cover some of that!)

One of the projects that did specifically address Equality was the **Towards Achieving Social Change (TASC) (001976)** project that supported the establishment of the Donegal Action for Equality (DAE). This was a network of groups that were working on different

aspects of equality. Groups such as the Travellers were supported as well as Women's Networks and projects and Asylum Seeker groups. The **Towards Achieving Social Change (TASC) (001976)** project also addressed equality at a policy level through some of the County Development Board groups such as the Gender Focus Group. An Alliance Against Racism group was also established in conjunction with TASC.

3.3 Environmental Sustainability

This measure had a huge potential to impact on environmental sustainability and yet this was not reported on in the evaluation reports. It would appear that opportunities to engage in environmental and green building practice were not taken. This could have occurred at a variety of levels;

- Appointing eco-architects to at least engage and discuss with groups as to what would be practical and affordable for the project. Issues such as placing of natural lighting in the building need not have incurred additional costs.
- Use of environmentally friendly materials and natural products over man made substances including wooden doors, windows rather than aluminium or plastic. The use of timber frame construction rather than traditional block and cement
- Considering the design of building to consider environmental impact, as well as most energy efficient design, including the use of insulation to reduce ongoing heating and lighting costs. Other aspects of environmentally friendly building that could have been considered include sewage systems, sustainable energy systems and eco-friendly decorating materials.

It is possible that some of these issues were mentioned during the project design phase but they were not implemented and were not reported on in the evaluation reports.

3.4 Rural Development

Most of the projects were located in rural areas and were addressing issues concerning a lack of local development and community infrastructure. Projects such as **Bunnoe Community Development Association (006266)**, **Culdaff Wee hall (010642)**, **Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (950114,001980,033899X)** and **Association for the Development of Pettigo and Tullyhommon**

(ADoPT) (005579,029274X), were all developing rural community infrastructure that included premises for groups to meet and establish themselves, as well as opening up opportunities for new courses and groups in the locality.

The long-term aim for many of the projects was to revitalise an area that had experienced severe social decline due to the conflict. For many groups this involved establishing a centre for the community, whilst others such as **Association for the Development of Pettigo and Tullyhommon (ADoPT) (005579,029274X)** the aim was to engage with sectors of the community that had not been involved in community activities before.

For all the projects funded under 2.7 there was a recognition that long term isolation and lack of investment both economically and socially had taken a negative toll on the community. Issues such as morale, mental health and a lack of belief in the possibility of things getting better were all cited, through the evaluation reports, as issues that had to be addressed as well as developing infrastructure.

For many of the projects measure 2.7 represented catalysis for future development and the ongoing revitalisation of the rural community and its surroundings.

VIII. Measure 2.8 Social Integration, Inclusion and Reconciliation Accompanying Infrastructure and Equipment Support

1 Programme Objectives

***Aim** – To ensure the successful implementation of some of the actions, assistance to provide infrastructure projects is required to support the objectives of other ESF measures in the priority. These could include the upgrading or adaptation of premises or the purchase of equipment to meet the specific needs of target groups.*

Most projects under this measure were addressing both of the two overarching Peace II programme objectives; 1) addressing the legacy of the conflict and 2) taking opportunities from peace. This measure (2.8) aimed to support the work being undertaken by projects funded under other measures of the programme.

1.1 Addressing the Legacy of the Conflict / Taking Opportunities from Peace

Most of the projects funded were also being supported to deliver outcomes under other measures in the Peace II programme. Projects funded under measure 2.8 included work with specific target groups of the programme such as women and minority Protestant groups. Other projects had a community or cross community focus and worked with rural community groups and groups operating cross border projects.

1.2 Actions – Areas, Sectors and Groups

Projects funded under this measure were all primarily infrastructure projects including renovation work, rebuilding or equipping and upgrading premises and facilities.

However these projects were funded as part of a broader project strategy.

The **North Leitrim Women's Centre (009529)** secured funding to equip their IT suite in the centre under measure 2.8. However this was to compliment project funding that they also received under measure 1.5, which was focusing on back to work training for women in the North Leitrim area. The enterprise and community centre that the women's centre is located in also received funding under other Peace II programme funding so that all these projects combined to develop an overall community and enterprise development strategy for the town of Manorhamilton.

An Teach Ban (011446) received funding for the renovation of some of its residential space, kitchen and the drainage system. This project through measure 5.4 had already been providing residential space to groups affected by the conflict from both Protestant and Catholic backgrounds. However the peaceful and scenic location with impressive views of the sea not only provided tranquillity but also drainage problems, which were addressed through this measure as

well as upgrading some of the accommodation units to provide ensuite facilities in some of the rooms.

Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (011545) received funding through different measures to tackle two renovation projects involving both Catholic and Protestant members of the community. Although the developments were on separate sites belonging to each community the overall aim was to develop a community resource that both sides of the community could use. Each centre had different facilities and it was envisaged that groups would choose locations according to the facilities and not the religious association of the building.

Scotstown Community Centre (011508) was a cross community resource centre that was being refurbished and renovated through measure 2.8. This was a project with similar project outcomes to 2.7 projects whereby the project aimed to reunite a divided community. However by completing this project the group could support the work of other projects funded through the programme such as the **Building Bridges (950132, 001966)** project.

1.3 Degree problem addressed (Outcomes – project level)

Many of the projects that received funding under this measure were established projects that had secured previous funding under other measures. (**North Leitrim Women's Centre (009529)**, **Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (011545)**, **An Teach Ban (011446)**).

The initial work applied for under the other measures tended to be the focus of the projects outcomes. This could include attracting women into further training and employment opportunities, and contributing to the overall employment regeneration strategy for the town (**North Leitrim Women's Centre (009529)**), or engaging cross community and single identity groups affected by the conflict in reconciliation and civil / political dialogue work (**An Teach Ban (011446)**). The success of these initial project outcomes had often been the determining factor in the projects undertaking the work under measure 2.8.

Most of the activities funded under 2.8 were supports to other pieces of work. However few of the evaluation reports made this link in their reporting, and the overall aim of the project with respect to the new structure was often not reported on.

1.4 Making a more normal, peaceful and stable society

Most of the projects funded under this measure were involved in reconciliation activities within a community. The use of a building in many instances was either to develop and support intercommunity work (**Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (011545)**, **Scotstown Community Centre (011508)**) or to work specifically with target groups of the peace II programme (**North Leitrim Women's Centre (009529)**, **An Teach Ban (011446)**).

The type of venue used and the process, by which the renovation or building work was undertaken, was deemed to be equally as important as the completion of the building itself. Many of the projects used the energy and enthusiasm generated in securing funding to elicit members of the community into the project that may not have been involved before, this was especially the case in areas where intercommunity work was the focus (**Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (011545)**, **Scotstown Community Centre (011508)**)

2 Paving the Way to Reconciliation

2.1 Building Positive Relationships –(in order to impact positively on reconciliation)

Many of the projects developed under measure 2.8 were involved in reconciliation work and relationship building in particular. Two of the projects (**Scotstown Community Centre (011508)**, **Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (011545)**) were working in communities that had been isolated by the conflict and had a high percentage mix of Catholic / Protestant members of the community. The purpose of developing and renovating the centres was primarily to address intercommunity tensions and the breakdown of many relationships over time as the two communities became increasingly segregated in their activities.

Other projects aimed to work with specific target groups such as **An Teach Ban (011446)**. Although the centre was hired out to small groups many of these groups were engaged in intensive and emotional dialogue work. Some of the groups accessing the centre were cross community and had never spent much time together other than at a night course. The residential part of this course was held in An Teach Ban and groups fed back on the incredible and positive

impact that being away with people had on their overall reconciliation process.

North Leitrim Women's Centre (009529), provided a range of supports and services to women ranging from health advice and a clinic to linking women into other specialised services such as domestic violence support. The IT centre would be another facility and resource they would offer to strengthen their work with women in the community. The idea would be to bring women into the women's centre, which was also located in the community resource centre. Relationships would be developed not just with people on the IT course but also through accessing other community resources / courses and facilities. There was a bigger strategy of involving women in the community and retaining their interest and support in all areas of the development of the town.

2.2 Developing a Shared Vision of an Interdependent and Shared Society

Projects funded under this measure tended to be involved in larger long-term visions. The experience needed to embark on projects of renovation required that there had been a long period of time developing and analysing the needs of communities and consulting over plans for the future.

Many of the projects had focused on developing closer intercommunity ties, some of which were cross community and some were with other sectors of the community (enterprise, local development, statutory). Projects such **North Leitrim Women's Centre (009529)**, were involved in the overall development of Manorbhamilton, but had retained the perspective and voice of women within the community.

The **Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (011545)** and **Scotstown Community Centre (011508)** were both addressing issues relating to a lack of economic investment in the area, which had impacted, on both sides of the community Protestant and Catholic. The vision was to develop one community that could respond more effectively to the declines of their region and which would ultimately benefit all members of society by working together.

2.3 Acknowledging and Dealing with the Past

Most of the projects funded under this measure were responding to a lack of investment in the region. In particular groups such as **Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (011545)** and,

Scotstown Community Centre (011508) and **North Leitrim Women's Centre (009529)**, were providing resources and venues in localities where there had been no such resource previously.

However the development of the building was one aspect of the past that was being acknowledged. For many of the groups there was a longer-term strategy of attracting other statutory players into the area (**North Leitrim Women's Centre (009529)**, **Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (011545)**) and addressing the fact that there had been little if any investment in social capital within the communities.

For **North Leitrim Women's Centre (009529)**, the acknowledgement was the lack of technical skill investment in women in the region that could be addressed through IT training in the locality.

An Teach Ban (011446) was developed as a peacebuilding centre, they acknowledged the lack of space or time given to indepth reconciliation work and dialogue amongst and between different sectors of the community, affected by the conflict. The project was primarily funded under measure 5.4 and was a cross community and cross border project.

2.4 Significant Cultural and Attitudinal Change

For projects engaged in cross community work the purpose of the project was to establish a different way of working and/or viewing members of the other community, or to encourage mixing amongst members of the community.

The process of refurbishing or renovating the project was the start of this process of challenging cultural and attitudinal change. Projects such as **Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (011545)** noticed that by engaging with all sectors of the community solutions were reached that were not as originally expected – the development of two centres had not been the original plan but through detailed discussion and listening to all views it was decided that the best use of resources was to work with the two buildings and develop an overall strategy of inclusion for the community.

An Teach Ban (011446) in their work had identified how Protestant members of the community and in some cases ex-service men had travelled across the border to access the venue. This had been a huge step in their thinking and had proven to be a challenging experience

but through this process significant barriers had been taken down and attitudes altered.

2.5 Social, Economic and Political Change

As part of their wider work many of the projects funded under measure 2.8 were aiming to influence change within all three sectors of economic, social and political change.

Social Change

Many of the projects were affecting social change through the development of the building or renovation work being funded under this measure. Projects such as **Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (011545)**, **Scotstown Community Centre (011508)** and **North Leitrim Women's Centre (009529)**, were providing resources that had not been in existence before or had not been operational for quite a long time. These projects were often used as triggers for reinvigorating the local community and encouraging active citizenship and participation in the overall local development.

Economic Change

North Leitrim Women's Centre (009529), was challenging the concept of women not being involved in the workplace especially in areas such as technology and IT. There was also a challenge that as a rural area in decline with many of the traditional occupations also declining, such as agriculture, then there was a need to reskill and change employment options.

Political Change

North Leitrim Women's Centre (009529), was part of the larger Manorhamilton development. This project was trying to affect political change and succeeded in lobbying the HSE to remain located in the region thus securing a large amount of employment for the region.

Other projects such as **Scotstown Community Centre (011508)** and **Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (011545)** were also using their resource funded under this measure as a means of lobbying local service providers to locate courses and other employment options within the locality.

2.6 Use of an integrated approach to the 5 strands of reconciliation;

(Building Positive Relationships; Developing a Shared Vision of an Interdependent and Shared Society; Acknowledging and Dealing with the Past; Significant Cultural and Attitudinal Change; Social, Economic and Political Change.)

Individual level

An Teach Ban (011446) worked at an individual level to address issues affecting people as a result of the conflict. Most of the work they did was supporting individuals and promoting leaders within the community to go back and engage in reconciliation work within their own local communities.

North Leitrim Women's Centre (009529), also worked with individual women often through personal development courses and 1:1 support before women felt ready to access and participate in other activities such as IT training or attending sessions within a groups of strangers.

Group level

Many of the projects were engaging in reconciliation work at a group level. Community resource centres were seeking to develop the social potential of communities by attracting groups to use the centre and securing their support in the development and design of the centre from an early stage.

Some of the groups supported were single identity and many Protestant groups (**North Cavan Church of Ireland Group(002095)**, **Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (011545)**) had clearly identified that they wanted developments that would support and retain their own cultural identity, before or as part of the process to engaging in cross community activities.

Inter-community level

Several of the projects were working directly on intercommunity projects. Within **Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (011545)** and **Scotstown Community Centre (011508)** these were with members of the local community where there was a high percentage mix of Protestant / Catholic. The projects that were

undertaken under other measures and the building / capital costs supported through measure 2.8 were all part of an ongoing strategy of inclusion and reconciliation within the community.

An Teach Ban (011446) worked with individual and single identity groups, but also supported projects once they returned to their own communities. Through this ongoing work it was possible to support intercommunity dialogue and if necessary provide time out spaces to support workers engaged in this type of work.

Political Level

Many of the groups funded under measure 2.8 were seeking to influence wider political change. For many of the groups this was in relation to ongoing investment and economic supports (**North Leitrim Women's Centre (009529), Scotstown Community Centre (011508), Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (011545)**). Many of the projects were working at different levels to develop social capital and community supports. These developments would make a more enticing environment for potential investors to consider the area, however without further government incentives and support this work could be undermined as people became disillusioned at a lack of progress and the obvious lack of political interest in their area.

2.7 Overall comments on reconciliation

Measure 2.8 was a supporting measure and therefore much of the reconciliation work was being carried on through other aspects of the project funded under other measures. However without the support of measure 2.8 much of this work would not have been possible and the work of this measure needs to be seen within the broader overall context of the project strategy. Unfortunately few of the evaluation reports picked this up although where the same evaluator was used for the other project measures and measure 2.8 this was more likely to occur.

3 Horizontal Principles

In addition to the Peace and reconciliation impacts many of the projects also impacted on one of more areas of the horizontal principles.

3.1 Impact on Poverty

Many of the community buildings were being used to support existing groups within the community that were engaging in work with marginalized and target groups.

The community development process that groups had started on had included many of the groups already in existence, however the challenge for many of the centres would be to ensure that all the groups remained involved in the management of the centres and that new groups were allowed to develop to represent other emerging marginalized groups.

3.2 Equal Opportunities

North Leitrim Women's Centre (009529), was working exclusively on supporting women to access IT skills and measure 2.8 supported the refurbishment of the IT suite within their centre.

Many of the community projects also listed a women's group and other groups such as older people as part of their target groups using the centre. However for many projects there was little reporting on how they planned to engage with newer groups or to reach out to sectors of the community that were not already catered for and were under the nine grounds of the equality legislation.

There was little mention made of the efforts to secure the access of the building and how groups within the disability sector could access the building with sight impairments / wheelchair users or for mothers with children and buggies, Travellers with larger families or non Irish national who may need access to translation services.

There was also no mention made in the evaluation reports as to how different sectors of the community would know they were welcome in the centre, e.g. posters and adverts depicting members of different communities / lone parents / lesbians and gay members / different cultures and traditions etc.

3.3 Environmental Sustainability

Several of the projects were refurbishing existing buildings and **Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (011545)** in particular made this option over developing a more expensive green site building that was trying to cater for all the communities needs

under one roof. The development of two different sites including the renovation of an existing building was a more positive environmental decision and improved the overall environmental impact of the resources within the community.

As with many of the projects funded under 2.7, that were building projects, there was little mention made in the evaluation reports to the use of renewable and alternative energy sources. As community projects many of the groups would have to locate ongoing running costs to maintain the premises. There was no mention as to whether consideration had been given to acquiring grants for a more expensive heating system such as geothermal, which would save the community in the long run.

3.4 Rural Development

Most of the projects were located in rural areas (**North Leitrim Women's Centre (009529)**, **Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (011545)**, **Scotstown Community Centre (011508)**, **An Teach Ban (011446)**). The development of a building within the community and the forthcoming attractions and investment that the building would generate all should impact positively on the rural region and its hinterland.

Projects such as **North Leitrim Women's Centre (009529)**, and **Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (011545)** had developed a longer-term development strategy, which included the resource building but also envisaged further economic investment and government involvement in the area.

IX. Conclusion and Recommendations

This section comprises a series of observations that have emerged during the course of the evaluation reviews. They are comments and recommendations specifically in relation to supporting the future collection of data, especially in relation to reporting on the Peace Distinctiveness criteria and the Hamber and Kelly's 5 strands of reconciliation.

Evaluation reports

Overall there appears to be a range of evaluation reports and styles of report writing for the evaluations commissioned by projects. Despite the range of projects most of the reports tend to follow a standard reporting format that includes the following;

- Project aims
- History / background to project
- Description of project activities
- Project outputs
- Overview of management / advisory structures inc. admin
- Recommendations / Conclusion

The overall evaluation is usually presented through a series of interim reports with a final report providing a cumulative analysis and evaluation of the entire project. The information is usually gathered throughout a specific funding lifecycle and includes many of the following sources;

- Project staff
- Project documentation - application form / internal evaluation / monitoring
- Advisory / management interview
- Beneficiaries' input (sometimes)
- IFB Development worker (occasionally)
- Other stakeholders (occasionally)

Report Content – Reconciliation and Peace Distinctiveness

Currently evaluation reports do not have to use the 5 strands of reconciliation in their reporting format. From this exercise it is clear

that programme and measure reporting on the 5 strands can be achieved retrospectively using general evaluation criteria. However the following key points would need to be included in the reports, in order for Border Action to gain sufficient general information on the project, in order to complete SEUPB reports on peace distinctiveness and reconciliation outcomes;

Evaluation Report Content

The following headings give a broad overview of the type of issues that all evaluation reports should endeavour to include;

- 1. Description of how the project feels it is addressing the legacy of the conflict**
 - including specific examples of local impact on economy / local impact of border closures, examples of how communities are isolated from each other / increase in unemployment and/or early school leavers compared to national figures.
- 2. History of project**
 - Previous funding / previous work with target groups / previous evaluation recommendations.
- 3. Detailed description of project activities**
 - who was targeted / why /what is being done
 - Breakdown of project participants in terms of gender/ age / other target groups as relevant to project aims and objectives.
 - how does the project feel this is addressing the impact of the conflict.
- 4. Link to Project Aims and Objectives**
 - This was a particular issue with projects undertaking building work, where the aim was to develop a centre for a particular use and the evaluation report focused solely on the development of the building and not the ultimate use of the project.
 - Some evaluation reports did not state the project's aims and objectives and therefore did not report on the overall success of the project in relation to the aims.
- 5. Details of sustainability and wider impact**
 - links to outside agencies / other support sources of funding / profile of project within community

6. Reconciliation Work

- A description of what the project is doing e.g. modules on peace building , training for management committees.
- Write ups and evaluations for any outside workshops on peace building / reconciliation themes.
- Interviews with staff as to how their attitudes to reconciliation have changed throughout the project lifecycle -

7. 5 Strands of Reconciliation

- Part of the focus of the 5 strands is a link into the wider political and social impact of projects, this requires some reporting on policy work that the projects are involved with either as part of their project or as part of a wider network of projects.
- It is useful if projects can clearly identify where they aim to impact their reconciliation work e.g. at individual / group / inter-community or political level
- Although it is possible to report on the 5 strands at an individual project level, the information given and the insular focus of the report may not be as useful in a measure or programme evaluation which focuses on the 5 strands.

8. Recommendations

1. These should relate to two aspects of the project;

1. The overall project progress and implementation / relevance / response from beneficiaries / progression / sustainability
2. The progress and contractual obligations to the Peace programme – agreed outputs / addressing the legacy / reconciliation work.

Many of the evaluation reports focused on outputs i.e. numbers attending, building work completed, number of hours etc. However in order to assess the reconciliation impact there needs to be a stronger focus on outcomes i.e. what the project beneficiaries did with the outputs and how is this contributing to change in the locality.

Development workers reports

As part of the process of compiling the Peace Distinctiveness reports the IFB has used development workers reports as well as evaluation reports. However, one of the difficulties with using the development workers reports is that these reports are designed to support the

development worker in their job and not necessarily assist Border Action in reporting back to SEUPB.

This can be seen in the following ways;

- The primary function of the development workers is financial and managerial accountability on behalf of the IFB /SEUPB. Development workers therefore tend to focus on this element of the work in their reporting, which has limited use in the Peace Distinctiveness reporting.
- The factors determining whether a development worker views an evaluation report as good or poor will tie into how well the report captures the development workers perspective of the project. This is therefore a highly subjective viewpoint and will probably tie into the financial and administrative accountability more than the peace distinctiveness / reconciliation impact of the project.
- Since it is not the development workers job per se to evaluate the project their analysis of the evaluation report should be linked to determining that the above desired list of descriptors (listed under evaluation reports) are included in the report. Thus ensuring that the person compiling the SEUPB reports has access to all the relevant information that they need.

Appendix One

A list of all the project evaluations used as apart of this review process;

Measure 1.3

Organic Centre Employment and Development Programme (950087)
Farney Community Resource and Information Centre (950017)
Tourism Development Project (001964)
ITC Training in the Home (005580)
Integrated Services Project (002062)
Sligo Northside IT Project (002258,033242X),
Doorway Computer & Arts Project (010262)
Monaghan Town Educational Disadvantage Consortium (002099)
E-Business for Donegal (013655)
GENERATE- Vision Track (017191)

Measure 1.4

Social Economy Agency (NI) (007062)
Business Information Service (013654)
CEIM Programme (015058)
Bailieborough Development Strategy (006115)
3rd Level Enterprise for Micro-business Programme (017279)
Fostering an Enterprise Culture in Swanlinbar (020525)
Manorhamilton Community Economic Development (018796)

Measure 2.1

Reaching Across with Sligo Connections (002826)
Quare Hawks Theatre Company (008403)
Raphoe Reconciliation Project (950060,006958,029661X)
Cultures of Ulster (002275)
Diploma in Peacebuilding (005584, 032196X)
Education for Reconciliation Programme (950129, 001965, 029389X)

Measure 2.4C

Outreach, Aftercare and Support Services Project (950031, 002002)

GROW (008580, 029604X)

Donegal Traveller's Project (950049, 001980)

Positive Action for Women (017101)

Building Bridges (950132, 001966)

Connecting Communities (950131 001968)

Wavelength (010978)

Measure 2.6

Second Chance Ed Project for Women (023161)

Togra Trasnu Glunta Phobal Eascarrach (016367)

Donegal Rural protestant Peacebuilding Project (010985)

Youth and Civic Society (013248)

Blowing Your Own Trumpet (016363)

Measure 2.7

Culdaff Wee hall (010642)

Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (950114,001980,033899X)

Bunnoe Community Development Association (006266)

Towards Achieving Social Change (TASC) (001976)

**Association for the Development of Pettigo and Tullyhommon (ADoPT)
(005579,029274X)**

Cavan Monaghan Rural Development Project (950124, 001962)

Measure 2.8

North Leitrim Women's Centre (009529)

Dunfanaghy Community Resource Association (011545)

North Cavan Church of Ireland Group(002095)

An Teach Ban (011446)

Scotstown Community Centre (011508)