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A WORD FROM THE CHAIR

Helen Johnston

It is my pleasure to write the foreword for the eighth Journal of Cross Border Studies in Ireland. The Centre for Cross Border Studies celebrated its 13th birthday in 2012, which was a year of transition. As documented in detail below, the Centre successfully completed five major projects in 2009-2012 with EU INTERREG funding. At a number of levels – local, national, and European – these projects have made an important contribution to cross-border working.

At national level in both Ireland and the United Kingdom, attention continues to be focused on addressing severe economic issues. A significant cross-border development was the signing of the Joint Statement on British Irish Relations – the Next Decade by Prime Minister David Cameron and Taoiseach Enda Kenny in March 2012. This notable statement built on the success of strengthened relationships between the two countries in recent years and set out a commitment to improved cooperation across a range of areas over the next decade.

The Centre for Cross Border Studies continues to support greater understanding and cooperation through its research, training, networking, impact assessment and information provision activities. As detailed below, the Centre has successfully applied for further EU INTERREG IVA funding for the period 2013-2015. The eight projects under this round of funding began in February 2013, building on existing partnerships and forging new ones. An exciting development is the increasing role of the Centre for Cross Border Studies in European cross-border working, signifying the high standing the Centre has gained in other parts of the EU.

Early 2013 also signals the impending retirement of the Centre’s founding Director, Andy Pollak. Andy’s name has been synonymous with the work of the Centre for more than 13 years, where his passion for and commitment to cross-border working as part of the peace process in Northern Ireland has raised the profile of the Centre to the important position it holds today.

In preparation for Andy’s retirement a recruitment process was initiated in late 2012. After a full public advertisement, shortlisting and interview process, I am pleased to announce that Deputy Director Ruth Taillon was appointed Director designate, to take up the...
Director’s post in July 2013 on Andy’s retirement. Ruth brings a wealth of cross-border working, research and management experience to the job and I am confident that the Centre will continue to thrive under her astute tutelage.

On the work programme front, 2012 was a year dominated by an application for renewed funding for 2013-2015 from the EU INTERREG IVA programme. This application was led and coordinated by Ruth Taillon, and was named INICCO-2 (as a follow up to the 2009-2012 ‘basket’ of projects which was called the Ireland/Northern Ireland Cross-border Cooperation Observatory, or INICCO-1). An initial application – with a revised application form based by the Special EU Programmes Body largely on a format adapted from the Centre’s Impact Assessment Toolkit for Cross Border Cooperation – was delivered in mid-February 2012. The Centre’s application was one of 14 shortlisted (out of over 90 submitted).

The Centre’s INTERREG funding for the 2009-2012 period (INICCO-1) expired on 31st March 2012. All five projects under this round of funding – the border region economy and cross-border hospital services research projects, the impact assessment toolkit, the second phase of Border People, and three spatial planning research, information and training projects led by the International Centre for Local and Regional Development (ICLRD) – were completed before this deadline.

An evaluation of INICCO-1 by Indecon Economic Consultants, completed in April 2012, concluded that the Centre had exceeded its target of 14 evidence-based solutions to problems of public sector cross-border cooperation by 100% (28 initiatives completed). It said its stakeholders had ‘a high regard for the Centre and its work’ and saw it as ‘a small and flexible organisation which “punches above its weight” in terms of its activities and reach, both nationally and internationally’. (see also page 204)

In the March-May period the Centre worked hard to prepare a 200 page business plan as phase two of the application. The Centre’s staff worked as a team on this with advice from former PricewaterhouseCoopers chief
economist Philip McDonagh. The business plan was delivered on 11th May. The amount of funding applied for was £901,000 for 24 months from February 2013.

The INICCO-2 application consisted of a package of nine sub-projects: a research project, ‘Towards a Border Development Zone’, building on one of the recommendations of the Centre’s 2009-2012 study Cross-border Economic Renewal: Rethinking Regional Policy in Ireland (with InterTradeIreland as a partner); a phase 3 for Border People, focusing on training existing citizens advice providers in the two jurisdictions in cross-border information provision (with the North South Ministerial Council Joint Secretariat, Citizens Advice Bureaux NI and the Citizens Information Board [Ireland] as partners); a project to map acute health specialities in Ireland, north and south (with Cooperation and Working Together - CAWT); further development of and training in the Impact Assessment Toolkit for Cross-border Cooperation; three projects led by the International Centre for Local and Regional Development (ICLRD) on researching local authority shared services in the border region; a follow-up training and animation programme for border region councillors and officials, and developing evidence-based planning through an updated all-island digital atlas and an all-island deprivation index; new toolkits for the evaluation and budgeting of cross-border projects; and a series of seminars on Europe 2020.

In September an economic appraisal of the business plan was carried out by a firm of Belfast management consultants who requested that a slimmed down, reduced cost package of proposals should be submitted to the SEUPB. This was costed at £810,000.

In the event, when the final decision was made by the SEUPB in late November, eight of the Centre’s nine proposals were approved for funding, worth a total of £878,400. Only the Europe 2020 seminars were excluded. At time of writing – in late February 2013 – partnership agreements are being finalised and INICCO-2 is beginning its work.

During the year from April 2012 the
Centre’s other non-INTERREG funded activities continued. In mid-June it published *Delivering a Prosperity Process: Opportunities in North/South Public Service Provision*, by Dublin business consultant Michael D’Arcy. This study, based on ‘off the record’ conversations with senior civil servants and business leaders in both jurisdictions, and funded by the Irish Department of Foreign Affairs, identified a number of North/South public service cooperation initiatives which could deliver positive results for the people of the island. These included a joint plan to support economic and employment opportunities targeted in particular at marginalised communities; moves towards an all-island Single Energy Market (to take advantage of renewable wind, wave and biomass energy); cooperation on the provision of ‘treated’ public water; an all-island tourism infrastructure project; and the provision of an ‘operational toolbox’ for civil and public service managers working on a North-South basis. Michael D’Arcy was asked to present his findings to both the Oireachtas Implementation of the Good Friday Agreement Committee and the NI Assembly’s Enterprise Trade and Investment committee.

The seventh edition of *The Journal of Cross Border Studies in Ireland* was launched in Dublin in late March 2012 by the Secretary General to the Irish Government, Martin Fraser. Mr Fraser said it was ‘an honour and privilege to be able to support the valuable work of the Centre for Cross Border Studies’. Quoting the Taoiseach, Enda Kenny, on North-South cooperation as a ‘quiet success story’, he stressed his belief that ‘the future will involve more, not less, such quiet work in an all-island context. So this North-South dimension remains really crucial: we have to strive to keep it going as much as we can.’

The final report of the 2009-2012 border region economy project, *Cross-Border Economic Renewal: Rethinking Regional Policy in Ireland* (by Dr John Bradley and Professor Michael Best) was launched on the same occasion.

Six Universities Ireland (UI) scholarships and bursaries were presented this year: four under the ESB-UI North/South
Postgraduate Scholarship scheme and two under a new scheme to encourage PhD students to undertake research into the 1912-1923 period in Irish history. The latter scheme was part of a new initiative by prominent historians from the history departments in the island’s 10 universities (including the Open University) entitled ‘Reflecting on a Decade of War and Revolution in Ireland 1912-1923’. The initiative was launched at a major conference in Dublin on 23 June (attended by over 320 people) on ‘Historians and Public History’, with a keynote address by Professor Jay Winter from Yale University, one of the United States’ most eminent historians and an international authority on the First World War and its impact on the 20th century.

The Standing Conference on Teacher Education North and South (SCoTENS) continued to have a high profile in the teacher education sector on the island. Its 10th annual conference in October was the best attended yet, with 140 people gathering in Cavan to hear speakers such as the internationally eminent expert on creativity, Sir Ken Robinson (on video from the US) and Sacha Hamilton, Duchess of Abercorn, founder of the Pushkin Prizes. An ‘away day’ in September heard Professor John Furlong of Oxford University, the lead author of SCoTENS’ 2003-2011 evaluation, call the network ‘an incredible achievement.’ Eight more North-South research and conference projects were seed-funded in 2012-2013 and another eight in 2013-2014, bringing the total number funded since 2003 to 86. Professor Linda Clarke, Head of the School of Education at University of Ulster and Tomás Ó Ruairc, Director of the Teaching Council in Ireland, were appointed the new co-chairs for a two-year term.
Andy Pollak and Ruth Taillon accepted numerous speaking engagements at home and abroad during this period, with a noticeable increase in the number of overseas invitations. Andy spoke at the Monaghan Bizcamp and Monaghan County Council; the North East Peace III Partnership (Coleraine); the Rural Development Network annual conference (Raphoe); the Brussels EU Open Days, speaking about labour mobility across the Irish border at the invitation of East Border Region; the Council of Europe's World Forum on Democracy in Strasbour; an EU-supported conference in Jerusalem entitled ‘Cross-border Cooperation - Lessons from Europe and a Strategic Recipe for Jerusalem?’; the University of Strasbourg, speaking about Irish-British relations 1998-2013; the Catholic Institute of the Mediterranean in Marseille and a British Academy ‘round table’ in London.

Ruth spoke at the ESF Learning Networks coordination meeting and an ageing conference in Belfast and the NE Peace Partnership launch in Ballymena. She addressed the Association of European Border Regions annual conference in Berlin and a Mission Opérationelle Territorial conference (‘Territorial Cooperation fostering European Integration’) in La Coruna in Spain. She also delivered three workshops in Belfast, Monaghan and Glasgow on the methodology of the Impact Assessment Toolkit for Cross-border Cooperation for applicants to the INTERREG IVA programme (2013-2015).

The Transfrontier Euro-Institut Network (TEIN), of which the Centre is a founding member, was awarded a second phase of funding from the EU Leonardo Programme to develop and adapt an innovative tool for intercultural cross-border project management (originally developed by the Euro-Institut in Kehl for the Franco-German border region) for use in five European cross-border regions during the 2012-2014 period. The Centre will adapt the tool to the Irish border region and provide technical support for the TEIN website.

The final event in Phase 1 of TEIN (2010-2012) took place Brussels in July 2012 when the Centre joined the Association of European Border Regions, Mission Opérationelle Transfrontalière (MOT - the French government’s cross-border cooperation agency) and other TEIN partners to run a symposium entitled 'The Future of European Territorial Cooperation: Capacity Building in Cross-border Territories,' which was addressed by senior European Commission officials and MEPs. TEIN Phase 1 received a glowing evaluation from the Leonardo UK national agency.

In July 2012 the Centre was honoured when former President of Ireland, Dr Mary Robinson, delivered the annual Centre for Cross Border Studies Talk at the 25th John Hewitt International Summer School in Armagh. She spoke on memory, truth and reconciliation in Northern Ireland and other post-conflict situations around the world.

On 1 February 2013 Andy Pollak and Ruth Taillon were involved in the launch of a new initiative led by activists
in peacebuilding, peace research, cross-community and cross-border organisations in Northern Ireland and Ireland. This group calls itself ‘15 Years On’ and is drawn from Cooperation Ireland, Community Foundation for Northern Ireland, INCORE at University of Ulster, the Corrymeela and Glencree Communities, Institute for British-Irish Studies at UCD, Institute for Conflict Research, ICLRD and CCBS. It has set up a blog page (http://15yearson.wordpress.com) to facilitate an online discussion on the successes and failures of the 15 year period since the 1998 Belfast/Good Friday Agreement and how we might learn from those experiences to do better in the future. It plans to hold events in Derry in May and in Dublin in October.

To return to the theme of transition, 2012 also saw a number of changes at board level. We said goodbye to the longstanding Vice-Chair Pauric Travers, who has been font of knowledge, good advice and support to both Board and staff. Also departing were Liam O’Dowd (a founding board member back in 1999), Jane Wilde and Ronaldo Munck
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who have judiciously and enthusiastically contributed to the governance and work of the Centre for many years.

We welcome to the Board the former head of the Northern Ireland Civil Service Sir Bruce Robinson; the President of St Patrick’s College Drumcondra, Daire Keogh; Queen’s University Belfast sociologist Katy Hayward, and Dublin City University External and Strategic Affairs Director Ciaran O’Cuinn. They join existing members Colin Stutt, Ann McGeeney, Tony Kennedy and Colin Neilands.

On behalf of the Board, I pay tribute to Andy and his hard-working staff for their unstinting work. In a year of transition and uncertainty, Andy, Ruth, Mairead Hughes, Patricia McAllister, Annemarie O’Kane, Ermear Donnelly and Joseph Shiels continued to produce a wide range of quality outputs on cross-border cooperation as outlined above, as well as securing funding for the Centre for the next two years. During the year we said good-bye to Joseph, the Centre’s IT manager, and wish him well in his new role, and in February 2013 we welcomed his successor, CarolAnne Murphy, as IT and administration officer.

We look forward to 2013 with considerable optimism, as the Centre takes on new projects and new challenges in its mission to inform cross-border working on the island of Ireland and further afield.

As usual we have to thank a long list of financial supporters, partners and advertisers. The INICCO-2 programme of work will once again be funded by INTERREG IVA and we particularly acknowledge the support, advice and encouragement of the officials of the Special EU Programmes Body. We must also single out for special thanks the Irish Department of Education and Skills for its continuing financial support in very difficult times.

Financial and other support for the Centre’s associated organisations – Universities Ireland, the Standing Conference on Teacher Education North and South (SCoTENS) and the International Centre for Local and Regional Development (ICLRD) – has again come from the Northern Ireland Department for Employment and Learning, the NI Department of Education, the Irish Department of Education and Skills, the Higher Education Authority, the NI Department for Regional Development, the Irish Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government, and the International Fund for Ireland.

We would also like to express our gratitude to the various other organisations which have partnered the Centre over the past 12 months: notably the North South Ministerial Council Joint Secretariat, with special thanks to Northern Joint Secretary Colm Shannon, Southern Joint Secretary Shane O’Neill and his deputy Margaret Stanley; outgoing Northern Joint Secretary Mary Bunting, who was a good friend to the Centre; the Department of the Taoiseach; the nine universities, with particular thanks to the current Universities Ireland chairman, Professor Michael Murphy, President of University College Cork;
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the nine colleges of education and 28 other institutional subscribers to SCoTENS, and both the outgoing SCoTENS co-chairs, Dr Tom Hesketh, Director of the Regional Training Unit in Belfast, and Professor Teresa O’Doherty of Mary Immaculate College, Limerick, and their autumn 2012 successors, Professor Linda Clarke of the University of Ulster and Tomás O’Ruairc, Director of the Teaching Council (Ireland); and the institutions which make up the International Centre for Local and Regional Development (ICLRD): the Institute for International Urban Development in Cambridge, Massachusetts; the National Institute for Regional and Spatial Analysis (NIRSA) at the National University of Ireland Maynooth; and the School of the Built Environment at the University of Ulster.

A specially warm ‘thank you’, as always, to our friends, colleagues and close partners in the ICLRD: Director John Driscoll (who is also Vice-President of the Institute for International Urban Development) and Deputy Director, Caroline Creamer of NUI Maynooth.

Again we have to thank our advertisers, many of them cross-border bodies or companies themselves, who have faithfully supported this Journal in recent years, and have advertised again this year despite often severe financial constraints. They are Safefood, Tourism Ireland, InterTradeIreland, the Loughs Agency, Weber Shandwick, Cooperation Ireland, EURES cross-border partnership, FPM Chartered Accountants, John McMahon and Co accountants, Leslie Stannage Design (and in particular Roisin McAuley and their brilliant senior designer, Ashley Bingham, who designs all the Centre’s publications and reports), Armagh City and District Council and the Radisson Blu Farnham Estate Hotel in Cavan.
What was your vision for North-South cooperation when you proposed the Belfast-Dublin ‘economic corridor’ and ‘island of Ireland’ economy in 1992?

I envisaged the island as a regional space – an economic zone – permeated by complex circuitry reflecting a network of market and non-market relationships. I was greatly taken with Kenichi Ohmae’s analysis of how, across the globe, economic zones were developing which transcended political borders without in any way jeopardising those borders.

Also published in the 1990s was a study undertaken for the Asian Development Bank which examined growth triangles in Asia. This showed how, by exploiting economies of scale and integrating the resource endowments of their members, adjoining areas in neighbouring countries could together be far more competitive in sectors such as manufacturing and services (including tourism). It was clear what could be achieved (as for example in the South China Triangle) by countries with very different political systems cooperating to address mutual needs. If it could happen in Asia, why not in Ireland?
In fact, when I first advanced the idea of the island economy and the Belfast-Dublin corridor at the annual conference of the Confederation of Irish Industry (now IBEC) over 20 years ago, I also argued that funding from Europe to the island of Ireland should be carefully aimed at promoting its development as precisely such an economic zone. This idea was not pursued, though as time went on steps were taken to coordinate flows of aid to North and South to mutual advantage.

Inherent in my vision was the encouragement of the far fuller exploitation of the South by the North as a market for goods and services, and vice versa. For that to happen, each part had to acquire much greater knowledge of the other. Impediments to trade, such as poor infrastructure, had to be removed.

I was in no doubt that it was a daunting agenda. So it was very encouraging when a number of champions emerged from within the business community and the effort was given structure through the establishment of the IBEC/CBI Joint Council, to which the recently deceased William Poole, as its Director, gave such sterling service for many years.

Were you involved in discussions with political and other leaders in Northern Ireland, Ireland, Britain and elsewhere during the 1990s as the NI peace process unfolded about this vision, and about the economic dimension of that process? Can you tell us a little about those discussions?

For five or six years after 1996 I chaired a group of business-oriented bodies (called the Group of 7, or G7) which came together in alarm at the violence around contentious parades and the very slow progress being made in filling the political vacuum. We emphasised strongly the damage being done to Northern Ireland’s economic prospects and the need for local politicians to bring the economic dimension closer to the top of the agenda. We returned to this topic again and again.

I do not recall the North-South economic issue featuring in those discussions. Unionists generally had reacted pretty negatively (to put it mildly) to what I had said (and continued throughout the nineties to say) about the island economy and, as the negotiations resulting in the Good Friday Agreement evolved, they were clearly having difficulties with the concept of North/South bodies.

I did, however, take the opportunity in informal discussion with nationalistic politicians to urge that the Good Friday Agreement should go for North/South bodies that could really deliver something tangible. The proposed North/South Trade and Business Development Body – to become known as InterTradeIreland – was obviously such a body. I argued – unsuccessfully – that a body capable of addressing energy issues was an equally compelling candidate. I got the impression, however, that the sensitivities were just too great to allow the boat to be pushed out very far.
What is your view of the North-South dimension of the 1998 Belfast/Good Friday Agreement, and of the North/South bodies that emerged from it?

As you may have gathered, I would have liked to see at least one additional body. Of those that were established, I am really only familiar with the work of InterTrade Ireland. It had the good fortune to be steered through the initial all-important formative years by one of Ireland’s most successful and enterprising business figures – Dr Martin Naughton – and it has been guided throughout by a very proactive Chief Executive, Liam Nellis (recently retired). To its credit, it has broadened its activities far beyond what its title might suggest its function would be – namely promoting trade links between North and South. I believe its remit should be formally enlarged to encompass much of what is involved from a business perspective in the creation of the island economy, with a new title indicative of such a role.

I would also have liked to see the North South Ministerial Council given the explicit role of identifying on an ongoing basis any other issues which should be addressed by means of a North/South body. Such machinery poses no threat to anyone. It can (and should be) fully accountable to the democratic institutions in both parts of the island. It should be seen not as a threat to be minimised but as an opportunity to be captured – provided always, of course, that each body passes (and continues to pass) the severely practical test of delivering results which would otherwise not be achievable for both parts of the island on their own.
How do you see the implementation of the North-South ‘Strand Two’ of the Belfast Agreement over the past 13 years? What are its successes and shortcomings?

I believe that Strand Two has been a resounding success – contrary, probably, to what many people expected. The North-South relationship has been transformed. Someone, indeed, has referred to its unprecedented ordinariness and normality today. We seem to have been able to resolve North-South tensions in a way which still too often escapes us so far as the traditional divisions within the Northern Ireland community itself are concerned. In a purely political context, the handling of the contentious matter of Articles 2 and 3 of the Irish Constitution appears to have been highly significant in removing tensions.

It is problematic what effect recent efforts to draw the South into issues around Northern Ireland’s so far unsuccessful attempt to ‘deal with’ the past will have on the tone and temper of the North-South relationship.

I suspect that, even without the structure given to it by Strand Two, the relationship would have steadily developed as each part of the island opened up to the other in an era where borders have become far more porous. After all, strong foundations for economic/business interaction were laid well before Strand Two of the Belfast Agreement.

Success can be measured in very practical ways. To mention but a few: the North’s sales to the South are now roughly the same as its sales to all the other European countries put together; there is close cooperation on infrastructure development; and a Single Electricity Market is being developed (notwithstanding the absence of a North/South body in this area).

But equally significant is how vastly enriched is the discourse these days about North-South possibilities. I take just four examples. There is the Irish Academy of Engineers’ 2010 study, *Infrastructure for an island population of 8 million*. There is the 2012 report by John Bradley and Michael Best on *Cross-Border Economic Renewal: Rethinking Regional Policy in Ireland* published by the Centre for Cross Border Studies. There is Michael D’Arcy’s 2012 survey of *Opportunities in North/South Public Service Provision* (also published by the Centre). And there is the *Journal of Cross Border Studies in Ireland* and the journal, *Borderlands*, and other research publications of the International Centre for Local and Regional Development (ICLRD). This ICLRD material deals with an impressive range of issues from river basin management to the mapping of functional territories throughout the island, with much else of significance in between. This last is a potentially exciting concept since, put at its simplest, it could hopefully be developed to provide guidance in an island context on what services should be put where, having regard to optimum catchment areas, thereby enhancing accessibility and ensuring that services are affordable, economically operated...
and effectively configured and managed to sustain high quality.

The richness of the discourse takes us into an entirely different world. What is now vital is to get it positioned within the mainstream of government thinking, North and South, and to have governments that are determined not to let a single idea that merits follow-up fall on stony ground.

Has the financial and economic crisis in both Ireland and Britain meant that North-South cooperation as part of the Northern Ireland peace process is now very low down the agenda of policy-makers in Dublin and London?

All countries – and the UK and Ireland are no exception – are undoubtedly preoccupied with the particular manifestation of the global financial and economic crisis in their own jurisdiction. And understandably so, since it would only be exaggerating slightly to describe the threat posed as existential. Doing whatever is needed to restore as quickly as possible a vigorously growing economy in the South is ultimately going to be what counts for the dynamism of North-South cooperation. It is, however, vital that the contribution which such cooperation can actually make to that restoration process should not be ignored. Reducing the burden of public expenditure North and South is an imperative, and it is therefore more important now than ever that all the opportunities to do so by rationalising public service provision in an island context without detriment to standards should be grasped.

Rebalancing the Northern Ireland economy by growing a far stronger private sector is also going to boost the prospects for North-South cooperation in the future. It is therefore disappointing that the UK Government has dragged its feet over the project to devolve to Northern Ireland the power to set its own rate of corporation tax. This is supported on all sides as being far and away the best strategy for growth in sight. The case for it is even more compelling in light of the impact locally of the UK’s “great recession”. This power should be urgently devolved as part of the UK’s national response to the recession.

Does the Irish Government now see the East-West relationship with Britain (and particularly its economic dimension) as more important than the relationship with Northern Ireland? What are the implications of this for the North-South dimension of the peace and reconciliation process on the Island?

The growing friendship between the UK and Ireland has been a vital feature of the architecture of peace. Keeping it in good repair and where possible enhancing it (as for instance was demonstrated by the Queen’s visit to Ireland in 2011) therefore makes good sense. It would, however, represent a signal failure on the part of both governments if they regarded the relationship as a Great Britain-Ireland relationship rather than a UK-Ireland one. I suspect that the health of the Northern Ireland Peace Process will indeed be very much on the agenda, and the demonstration around the turn
of the year in Belfast of the fragility of the peace process will have countered any tendency to the contrary.

But it goes wider than that. The survey by Michael D’Arcy which I mentioned earlier refers to what he describes as a ‘coordinated, comprehensive and proactive programme’ launched a year ago to develop the potential for mutual economic benefit between the UK and Ireland. He quoted a senior business person in Dublin to the effect that it would be most helpful to be able to explore pro-actively how and where Northern Ireland could benefit from this work and how the South could benefit from the North’s active participation in it. I very much agree.

What are the implications of the current low level of interest by the Republic’s politicians and public in Northern Ireland?

It was inevitable that the exceptionally high level of interest would diminish, particularly since the ‘problem’ was perceived to have been ‘fixed’. It would have been a reflection on the lack of maturity of Northern Ireland politicians if they had continued to be regarded as being at the nursery stage and still needing nannying by Dublin or London. I myself applaud the notion of our being deemed able to stand on our own feet, plot an ambitious course, address the tough issues and shape our own destiny. Hopefully this confidence will not in the event prove to be misplaced.

But the point about lack of interest can be exaggerated. I have, for example, listened to a couple of very well-informed and cogent speeches by Taoiseach Enda Kenny in the North and the new President has also made very thoughtful and insightful contributions on visits to the North. Moreover, the decision by the Taoiseach and Tánaiste to participate in the Remembrance Day ceremonies in Belfast and Enniskillen last November showed that the South remains no mean judge of when the situation can benefit from a well timed strategic intervention.

The 1990s and 2000s were a very benevolent period for Ireland, Europe and the Western world generally, with the end of the cold War and rapid economic growth everywhere. We are living in a very different and harsher climate now. How has this affected your vision for the island of Ireland and for North-South cooperation?

It was a tragedy that the South departed from its brilliantly successful model of export-led growth and that the collapse of the resultant property bubble in effect wrecked the banking system. Ireland was doubly unfortunate in that it had to seek a bail-out from Europe early on, before Europe had gone through the long tortuous process (still incomplete) of discovering how crises of this nature and magnitude should be handled. Ireland’s debt to GDP ratio pre-crisis had been remarkably low, but the routing of the rescue of the banks through the state turned a bank problem into an unnecessarily severe sovereign debt problem, which denied Ireland the ability to borrow in international markets at other than punitive interest rates.
The harsh consequences of the resultant austerity inevitably occupy centre stage, masking the fact that the solid benefits of the investment which surged into Ireland from overseas are still firmly in place and that the South continues to tap overseas markets very effectively. Remarkably, the value of exports exceeds the country’s GDP and, in the absence of domestic demand, it is this strong engine on which Ireland has been relying for the revival of growth. As we speak, Ireland is featured in the *Economist* as the poster boy of European recovery, with promising prospects but with a long haul still ahead of it.

A characteristic of the current recession has been the (very natural) reluctance to accept the research finding, published in the early stages of the crisis, that the combination of circumstances which it exhibits entail a very prolonged period of recovery. And that research related to periods when the inter-dependencies engendered by globalisation were far less marked, making for still greater complexities in today’s world.
Realistically, it is going to take at least the rest of this decade to repair balance sheets public and private, and perhaps even longer to absorb the labour surplus created by the debacle. Much of course will depend, particularly for an economy as open as Ireland’s, on the health of the wider global economy.

If it were a sovereign state, the North would be regarded as having a wholly unsustainable structural deficit requiring drastic surgery. As a devolved administration, however, it only has to deal with its proportionate share of the squeeze on UK public expenditure in a climate of austerity. But the economy cannot grow significantly unless the private sector expands a lot more than is needed to compensate for that contraction of the public sector. As things are now, the North’s private sector is far too small to do so. Hence the importance of the corporation tax flexibility to which I referred earlier, boosting investment at home and from overseas. Getting the process of rebalancing the North’s economy under way with far more urgency than the UK Government has hitherto displayed will determine how well the North weathers the present decade and how well equipped it is to make rapid strides thereafter.

It is vital that during this difficult decade the vision for the island remains intact and, as I said earlier, that none of the many ideas for action now spun out of the discourse that is now so strongly established is lost.

**How have recent developments in the UK (e.g. the economic recession/financial crisis; the referendum on Scottish independence) affected your vision of North-/South cooperation in Ireland?**

The short answer is ‘not at all’. I can’t add to what I’ve said already on the economic dimension, but I suspect that we are far too fearful of the implications of the referendum on Scottish independence. Even if (as I believe is unlikely) the Scots opt for independence, the common monarchy seems set to remain, thereby reverting to the position between the accession of the Scottish James VI to the English throne in 1603 and the act of Union in 1707. There also seems likely to be a shared currency, with the Bank of England’s writ continuing to run in Scotland, and with the Scottish Parliament’s fiscal freedom severely constrained by the controls which the eurozone experience has shown are necessary to prevent a common currency being jeopardised by irresponsibility on the part of individual members – as if the Scots would ever act irresponsibly!

In sum, a rather peculiar kind of independence could emerge (still preserving much of the architecture of economic union) which could be readily accommodated by England, Wales and Northern Ireland in a different configuration of the old relationships, particularly if Alex Salmond’s notion of a continuing strong ‘social union’ persists.

If independence is rejected, Scotland would probably demand more autonomy and, as we speak, there is speculation that this could lead to a
wider constitutional convention. If this happened, there could be any one of a range of outcomes: e.g. a fully fledged federal structure; or a more fully thought through system of devolution, with each jurisdiction, on the variable geometry principle, able to get the tools to do the job it has to do. Any of the outcomes must surely entail the abandonment of the obsession with centralisation and uniformity which presently bedevils UK governance arrangements.

Whatever happens, I foresee Northern Ireland securing greater autonomy and therefore having more space to pursue a meaningful North-South agenda.

**How have recent developments in the EU (and notably the long-running euro crisis) affected your vision of North-South cooperation in Ireland?**

The critical issue was clearly whether the South could box its way out of the crisis whilst remaining within the eurozone. Ireland’s competitiveness, which had deteriorated badly, had to be rebuilt and there were many voices arguing – not just in respect of Ireland but of other countries experiencing difficulty – that recovery would be hampered by the inability, within a regime of irrevocably fixed nominal exchange rates, to regain competitiveness by currency depreciation. Ireland, no doubt sensible of how problematic for all sorts of reasons the project to exit the eurozone would be, chose the difficult path of internal devaluation, which entails slower price and wage growth (or even outright decline) and faster productivity growth. As I said earlier, so far, so good. And, as I also made clear, the stronger the economies on both sides of the border, the better the prospects for dynamic interaction.

This does mean that, since the prospects for the UK entering the eurozone seem to have vanished, the island is stuck indefinitely with two currencies. This obviously adds to transaction costs, but business seems to have adjusted to it and it has not appeared on the North-South agenda as a significant issue. That could change if sterling and the euro ceased to be virtually parallel currencies and the relationship was characterised by extreme volatility.

**But what if the UK exited from the EU? Would that imperil the North-South project? Surely it would in effect reinforce the border?**

First of all, I don’t think it is likely that the UK will leave the EU. To decide to go it alone in what is likely to be increasingly a world of competing continents would be a huge leap in the dark. On its own, the UK’s bargaining power on trade issues, for example, would be slight. Moreover, more than 50% of its trade is with the EU and it is problematic what terms it could negotiate from outside the Single Market. The pressures to remain in from business and those fearful of job losses will be immense.

What seems more likely, if (and it is a big ‘if’) the eurozone succeeds in consolidating itself as a more integrated political, fiscal and monetary unit, is that the EU will resolve itself into a two-speed Europe held together by the Single Market. In that event, the UK
might well get some support from other members in the slower lane for changing the way the Single Market has been packaged over the years. Sufficient face could be saved all round to keep the UK inside the tent.

Even if the UK were to leave, I cannot see it ever being prepared to do so except on terms which did not disadvantage it in relation to its trade with the EU. The risk of serious damage to North-South trade therefore seems remote in any circumstances. And of course much of the rest of the agenda for cooperation which I have sketched out in this interview would be entirely unaffected.

What are the key domestic and international issues which will affect North-South cooperation and the ‘island of Ireland’ economy in the immediate future?

Since the correct strategy for both parts of the island is export-led growth, a key determinant of the prosperity of both will be the health of the world economy. On the domestic front both North and South, the trick will be to find the right balance between the discipline required to rebuild public and private balance sheets and the incentives needed to stimulate growth. And growth simply cannot occur without banks able and willing to lend responsibility to responsible borrowers.

Are there strategic ways in the foreseeable future for capturing more of the synergies inherent in the idea of the ‘island economy’? In which areas might these synergies be best captured?

Let me take first of all the provision of public services. For most, perhaps all, public sector programmes, effort is directed very specifically to meeting the needs of the population in each jurisdiction, with little reference being made to those requiring similar services on the other side of the border.

As to remedies, there is no need to rediscover the wheel. Michael D’Arcy’s scoping study has identified significant possibilities for North-South synergy in such areas as health, higher education and research, energy, tourism and water, and has made a series of recommendations. There are enough ideas here to fuel a North-South public sector agenda for at least a decade ahead and it would be a shame if the report were simply to gather dust somewhere. Surely it ought (if this has not already happened) to feature prominently in the deliberations of the North South Ministerial Council, with responsibility assigned for follow-up action. I believe that, where strong prima facie possibilities for North-South synergy are identified, there should be set up a small joint planning function within those areas, which looks at the present disposition of facilities and future needs throughout the island and explores, in effect, how you proceed within an island context. That notion links up with the concept of functional territories which I mentioned earlier. It can never make sense – but especially not when there is going to be such an ongoing tight constraint on resources – to duplicate capacity unnecessarily or to
meet needs in other than the most cost-effective, value for money way.

I would like to pick out for further brief comment just two areas from those I listed a moment ago. It is a cliché that a strong research base both within higher education and business (and by way of dynamic interaction between them both) is vital for economic growth. But I wonder whether the full potential of North-South synergy is presently being derived from the research base within the entire island. Is any attempt being made to scope the possibilities and proactively seek to have them developed?

The second area is energy, which is a key factor in the competitiveness equation. Some progress has been made towards realising the concept of a Single Electricity Market. But can we really develop the full potential of the island, conceived as a single all-purpose energy market, without the creation of an all-island Energy Authority and an all-island regulatory regime? We seem unlikely under present arrangements to advance towards the exciting vision, set out by Ulsterman and Harvard Professor Michael McElroy, of an all-island wind-generated electricity system as an alternative to fossil fuels and (to surely transformative effect) giving the island the capacity to be an energy exporter. Shale deposits are transforming the USA energy scene. We have few natural resources: if Fermanagh’s shale capacity turns out to be significant and safely exploitable, may it not prove to be a very valuable island asset?

Turning briefly to the private sector, I have already made clear that both parts of the island have to find their fortune in world markets – capturing the investment opportunities afforded by the global value chains which girdle the earth, and selling goods and services from the island into what will be a steadily widening spectrum of increasingly prosperous global markets.

Would it not make sense for North and South to undertake as a collaborative project the study and ongoing monitoring of the mega trends which will be determining the pattern of manufacturing and services worldwide during the next decade and beyond, since this holds the key to achieving the goals I have just outlined? In particular, should we not be working in partnership to develop the island’s interface with the formidable players – the BRIC countries and the others following closely on their heels – who are going to dominate the future of our new multipolar world? Should we not see how all-island clusters of companies might be formed which could join forces to gain greater clout in their chosen markets or which could share their experience of how barriers to penetration of new markets can best be removed?

There is so much that can be done.

How can Ireland, North and South, establish itself as ‘a globally competitive production platform for goods and services traded worldwide’? (a phrase which you used in your North South Ministerial Council 10th anniversary address in Armagh in December 2009).

North-South co-operation must not
be an inward-looking insular project. A primary object must be to come together in ways that perfect our ability to win the battles that count, i.e. outside Ireland. So what I had in mind was that we must give free rein to the competitive forces within the island in areas such as the provision of professional services, for example, so that the cost base in either part of the island does not become hostage to vested interests and the ability to compete globally is lost.

What I also had in mind was that, by world standards, both North and South are small and separately may lack the critical mass to operate on a scale which minimises unit costs. Energy is one – but merely one – example. Research centres of excellence are another. It would be foolish not to concentrate resources in order to achieve scaleability and hone the island’s competitive edge.

Do you think there is any scope for the two Irish jurisdictions to come together to learn from the commemorations of the 1912-1922 period?

Very much so. The commemorations can be a wonderful access point into the two grand narratives which define the strands of Britishness and Irishness on the island. Far from being an obstacle to focusing forward, history offers all of us an indispensable means of learning to understand each other and taking the monkey off our backs. But the history I speak about is the history which stretches back far beyond the Troubles and which shaped the context out of which those Troubles emerged. History did not begin in 1968.

Do you think that the protests and violence over the flags issue which erupted in December invalidate your vision?

No, I don’t. On the contrary, I think it makes all the stronger the case for developing a good, healthy, mutually beneficial partnership between the two parts of the island. This can demonstrate that all strands of identity can not only co-exist but can work together in the common interest. Until recently, the South was seen as the eminence grise behind a nationalist conspiracy to take over the North. That does not feature any longer in public debate.

I have already referred to the success of Strand Two. Its continuing success can
serve as a paradigm for inter-community relations in the North.

**How do you foresee the economic and social shape of Ireland in 2020?**

I foresee an island emerging somewhat battered and bruised from a decade more difficult than anyone could have begun to imagine as the new millennium dawned. Much still has to be done to prevent a recurrence. For example, the matter of how radical the restructuring of the financial sector needs to be has yet to be adequately addressed. Nor do we know how to ensure that the vast amounts of money which slosh around the globe find productive uses in the real world rather than in a parallel universe of speculative activity. How these issues play out will largely determine the scope and limits of ‘the new normal’.

However, once the economic legacy of the ‘noughties’ boom is liquidated, and both parts of the island are able to operate as open, well-balanced economies, drawing fully on the synergies they develop between them, I see no reason why sustainable growth levels which support a widespread high standard of living and good quality of life, and enable disadvantage to be decisively tackled, should not be achievable.

**Can you foresee any new constitutional configuration for the island of Ireland in the future?**

I shall resist the temptation to duck this question in order to make one observation and to venture a speculation.

The observation (whose validity is confirmed by so much that has happened in the North) is that major change has to obtain legitimacy if it is not to prove destabilising and even impermanent. Achieving legitimacy in this context must surely start with the recognition that there are in this situation two mutually opposed ‘principles of legitimacy’ which are strongly held - one nationalist and one unionist - and that some common ground would have to be found on which the divergent aspirations are transcended in a general consensus. The Good Friday Agreement recognises this in its espousal of the principle of consent for constitutional change. It would be a delusion to suppose that change could be achieved through some simple majoritarian process rather than by negotiation.

My speculative comment is this. If there is ever a new constitutional configuration for the island, my guess is that the model by far the likeliest to secure consent is the confederal model which featured as the most persuasively argued of a range of options in the Report of the New Ireland Forum in 1984. On this basis the final agreed Ireland would be a joint, equal venture between North and South, with each having its own governance structure, and with policies related to the powers to be specifically delegated to confederal level determined jointly by representatives from North and South. It is worth recalling the 1984 Report’s comment that ‘based on the existing identities, North and South, [a confederal solution] would reflect the political and administrative realities of the past 60 [now of course 90] years and
would entrench a measure of autonomy for both parts of Ireland within an all-island framework. While protecting and fostering the identities and ethos of the two traditions, it would enable them to work together in the common interest'. The Report envisages unionists having parallel British citizenship and, as it put it, being able to ‘maintain special links with Britain’.

Is there anything you would like to say in conclusion?

Just, first of all, to thank you for the opportunity to address these issues, daunting though the questions you have posed were!

But, second, to say that I do believe that North and South will develop an ever closer working partnership. The cumulative process of widely dispersed incremental change and the occasional breakthrough will reach a tipping point where North-South co-operation develops a momentum of its own. Indeed, increasingly, the interdependence of both parts of the island is forcing itself on public attention. A weaker economy in the South hits the North’s exports. The collapse of the South’s banks makes a public body in the South (NAMA) a major property owner in the North, with the ability to have a huge impact on the local property market. Differences in taxation between the two parts (e.g. corporation tax and VAT) can skew economic activity in significant ways.

It seems sensible to forge out of growing interdependence the positive outcomes for both North and South which the vision I described at the start of this interview embraces.

Until his sudden death on 3 March 2013, Sir George Quigley was Chairman of Bombardier Aerospace in Belfast. After a distinguished career in the Northern Ireland civil service – during which he was Permanent Secretary in a number of departments – he became Chairman of Ulster Bank in 1989. He was a former President of the Economic and Social Research Institute in Dublin and Chair of the board of the Institute of British-Irish Studies at UCD, and served on numerous public bodies in Northern Ireland, Ireland and Britain. In 2002 he carried out a review of the NI Parades Commission. He was part of the team which oversaw the 'putting beyond use' of loyalist paramilitary arms. He was mourned by all sections of the community in Northern Ireland.
15 years after it was signed, the Belfast Agreement operates today mainly as a mechanism for maintenance of peace and devolved government within Northern Ireland (Strand 1), with supportive but off-stage roles for North-South and East-West mechanisms (Strands 2 and 3). As the new devolved governance institutions were set up and started to function, it is understandable that attention in London and Dublin was focused on supporting the new Northern administration and not on wider issues within and between these islands. However, time moves on and circumstances change. Today, in the aftermath of the worst economic crisis since the 1930s, with further devolution of power within the UK, and with the UK government adopting a very negative stance to current and future EU developments, these wider relationships have become more complex and challenging.

Having opted out of joining the euro zone shortly after the Belfast Agreement was concluded, the UK government is now contemplating a more significant form of disengagement from deeper entanglement with the EU at a time when the Irish government appears willing, if not eager, to participate in and win benefits from an ever deepening union. Furthermore, within the UK there are now three devolved regional administrations. One of these, the Scottish government, will hold a referendum in 2014, where the question of Scottish independence will be posed. Another, the Northern Ireland government, is actively seeking greater fiscal autonomy in order to compete on a more level playing field with Ireland to attract inward investment. Perhaps the time is now right to bring Strand 2 and 3 thinking more to centre stage?

Small states, big world

In political and economic space, small states like Ireland define themselves in terms of their relationships with other
more powerful states. Their social and cultural life can be as self-organised and unique as they desire, but since they cannot impose their own political or economic will on their neighbours, they must seek to promote their welfare through establishing and maintaining close, friendly and stable relationships within an external world that largely determines their ability to grow and prosper. They must, in the words of Winston Churchill at Yalta in 1945, hope that ‘the Eagle should permit the small birds to sing, and care not wherefore they sang’.

In very broad strategic terms, Ireland’s external world today has three key defining elements that are individually common to many small states, but taken all together are exceptional. First, its close relationship with the United States has facilitated the spectacular rise of a modern, export-oriented manufacturing and services sector, both through mainly US foreign direct investment and through spillovers into locally owned business enterprises. Second, the destinations for the exported products of these enterprises are predominantly within the European Union’s single market. Third, within the EU, Ireland has particularly close trading and other links with one large EU state, the United Kingdom, an enduring legacy from the pre-1922 period when Ireland was a constituent part of the UK. Within this last defining element, the relationships between Ireland and Northern Ireland have aspects that are specific to this island and differ from wider relationships between the regions of Great Britain and Ireland.

All three of these external drivers of Irish economic development are under pressure today. The dominant role of the US economy is threatened both by internal impacts of the global recession and by the dramatic rise of Asian economies that challenge US hegemony. The performance of the EU economy has been battered by the same global recession, further exacerbated by internal problems and tensions within the euro zone that have yet to be resolved. The United Kingdom also struggles to emerge from recession and slow growth, while it has simultaneously chosen to distance itself from economic and political integration within the EU. Any one of these three problems would pose serious challenges for Ireland’s future prospects. For all three to occur simultaneously is unprecedented.

Our focus in this article is on the third element, Irish-UK relationships, embracing also the North-South relationships within this island. This is probably the most complex of the three main external driving forces. It is also the one most taken for granted, but least well understood. Familiarity breeds neglect. But two specific events have served to deflect attention away from any deep study of the importance of the evolving economic relations between and within these islands in recent decades. The first was the simultaneous entry of the UK and Ireland (together with Denmark) into the then EEC in January 1973, after which Brussels quickly supplanted London as the focus of Ireland’s economic policy concerns.2

The second was the civil unrest in Northern Ireland, initiated in 1968 and
brought to a kind of closure by the signing of the Belfast Agreement in 1998. The need to restore political, economic and business normality between North and South, rebuilding what Sir George Quigley identified in 1992 as the ‘island economy’, served to deflect attention away from the important strategic implications of the legacy of wider British-Irish economic interactions within a global economy. From Irish economic and business perspectives, subliminally, if not in reality, after 1st January 1973 Britain simply became just another EU economy, albeit a rather important one with respect to activity within and between these islands.

**The times they are a-changin’**

Irish businesses and policy makers today face new and unexpected challenges that call into question any complacency that led them to neglect what is happening within the UK and between Ireland and the UK. Given the large disparity in the relative sizes of the Irish and UK economies, and even between the ‘island’ economy (Ireland and Northern Ireland) and the ‘larger island’ British economy (England, Scotland and Wales), it is reasonable to look at this question mainly from the point of view of implications and consequences for Ireland. While Ireland’s economy exercises some degree of influence on the economy of the UK, as we will show below, it is Ireland that must prepare for the consequences of current and future changes within the UK over which it will have little or no control. In particular, Ireland is vulnerable to any policy shifts made within the UK that may clash with its own often different goals.
and development strategies. The UK will, of course, have to analyse the consequences for its own economy of any detachment from the EU and continual absence from the euro zone, as well as any deepening of internal regional autonomy. The point here is that UK-Irish relationships are unlikely to influence UK decisions in the slightest.

Whether or not the UK eventually dilutes its relationship with the EU to any significant degree, or whether or not Scotland achieves independence and Northern Ireland is given fiscal autonomy within the UK, Irish policy makers need to address the complex task of reconstructing a relationship with the UK and its regions in a way that remains consistent with, and does not damage, Ireland’s main strategic goal of seeking stability and prosperity through ever closer integration into EU policy and economic structures. As Northern Ireland makes its transition to normality and more autonomous regional policy-making, Irish policy makers must now regard future Irish-Northern Irish structures and relationships as harbingers of the kind of multi-layered relationships between these islands that we will have to foster if or when Scotland and Wales seek greater autonomy or even independence within the UK.

We saw that the Dublin-London focus of Irish economic policy-making effectively vanished after 1973. We must now prepare for the resurrection of a more complex form of that earlier relationship that will involve Dublin, Belfast, Edinburgh, Cardiff and London, and the requirement to make this completely consistent with Ireland’s equally close but far more important connections with Brussels and Washington. The ‘Boston or Berlin’ choice articulated in 2000 by the then Tánaiste, Mary Harney, with its now discredited, doctrinaire hubris, missed the important point that international economic policy is made in Washington, Brussels and, unfortunately for Ireland, London. In our present crisis, posturing is a luxury that we can ill afford.4

The Joint Statement: Reading between the lines

The above kinds of strategic issues were barely touched on in the Joint Statement issued by Prime Minister David Cameron and Taoiseach, Enda Kenny on 12th March 2012.5 This path-breaking statement was a rare, formal and public recognition of the fact that the economic well-being of the UK and Irish economies is more dependent on their mutual interactions than may be fully appreciated. Their joint prosperity is sensitively dependent on a complex of business, economic and social interactions which, because of their history, both states have found difficult to study impartially and at arm’s length.

For example, the series of four studies on Britain-Ireland: Lives Entwined, published since 2005 by the British Council, rightly celebrate the deep and harmonious cultural links between and within these islands, but contain no discussion of how the close business and economic links also ‘entwine’ our two nations.6 To an economist, the picture on the cover of the third study (Britain and Ireland: Lives Entwined – A new dawn? 2008), reproduced in Figure 1, reinforces strongly the thesis...
that any cosy UK-Irish relationship is only as effective as the strength of the branch upon which our common ‘nest’ rests. This image is not at all reassuring!

**Figure 1: Economies entwined?**

The complex and disputed historical roots of the UK-Irish relationship have tended to distract attention from its current closeness and mutual benefit. In particular, the task of repairing and rebuilding political and economic institutions between Ireland and Northern Ireland absorbed much time and resources of both governments, perhaps to the neglect of the wider British-Irish relationship. At the international level, both the UK and Ireland have vital national interests in their economic links with the wider EU and global economies. The narrower Irish-UK inter-dependency has tended to be taken for granted and has not been the subject of regular and focused economic and policy research in either jurisdiction.  

A series of overlapping developments have generated increased attention to the value of the UK-Irish economic relationship, as articulated in the Joint Statement. Most immediately, both Ireland and the UK are emerging out of recession at a time of very low and uncertain world growth prospects, and seek to maximise benefits from internal interactions between these islands. As we will see, Ireland is a major trading partner of the UK, to an extent far out of proportion to their relative sizes. Indeed, this has been the source of some negative internal comment in the UK. Elliot and Atkinson remarked last year that: ‘The United Kingdom exports as much to Ireland, one of the few countries in Western Europe in a more parlous state, as it does to China, India, Brazil and Russia put together’.  

In addition to obvious current business and economic reasons, the advent of a decade of centenary commemorations of political upheavals between these islands carries with it the need for reflection on our past, present and likely future economic relationships, learning from the consequences of earlier political changes. History casts a long shadow over today’s UK-Irish economic institutions and structures, even if it does not pre-determine or even dominate them.

**Patterns of UK and Irish trade**

From the period after independence in 1922 to the late 1950s, the UK was effectively the sole destination for Irish exports, which were all of a mainly agricultural nature (**Figure 2**). The absence of Irish participation, other than in the north-east corner centred on Belfast, in both phases of the 18th and 19th century industrial revolutions
taking place in the rest of the UK, meant that after 1922 the newly independent Irish Free State had only a miniscule manufacturing sector. The eventual construction of an Irish manufacturing sector between 1932 and the late 1950s took place behind high protective tariff barriers and created an industrial base that was weak, inefficient and difficult to orient towards export markets.

What might usefully be termed the ‘re-industrialisation’ or ‘modernisation’ of Ireland after 1960 was driven mainly by foreign direct investment, predominantly from the USA but with some UK participation, accompanied by tax incentives, education and training reforms and improvements in the quality of physical infrastructure. With a modern and efficient manufacturing base, Irish export trade steadily diversified away from the dominance of the UK and away from mainly agricultural products, but the UK long remained the largest single trading partner.

Over the same period, the UK economy also underwent massive structural change, with a decline in manufacturing and a rise in services. UK restructuring was driven by global considerations: the increasing hegemony of the US economy, the rapid post World War Two modernisation of Germany and Japan, and the recent rise of China and other Asian economies as industrial powers. In other words, both the UK and Ireland restructured in recent decades, but in radically different ways. Ireland developed a modern manufacturing base effectively from scratch, and more recently a base of export oriented services in software and finance-related areas. The UK, previously a global industrial powerhouse, de-industrialised, shed much of its traditional manufacturing specialities, shrank the share of manufacturing to one of the smallest in the EU, and massively expanded its service sector in the financial and retail areas.

**Figure 2: UK Share of Irish Imports and Exports**

These developments have profound implications for the future of the Irish-UK economic relationship. Ireland has an economic strategy, albeit one involving dependency, that is heavily based on the efficient hosting of inward investment, which requires maintaining close links with the EU and the US. The UK has struggled to find a robust post-industrial strategy and its actions are heavily influenced by the perceived need to protect its massive financial services sector from unwelcome EU regulation. In addition, as its traditional manufacturing sector contracted, it has not been able to put in place development strategies to revive its rust-belt regions in Scotland, Wales and northern England.

The Joint Statement took a more upbeat, positive approach and drew attention to the most obvious aspects
of the present UK-Irish economic relationship: trade, inward investment, migration/labour movements, tourism and a future of ever closer engagement and cooperation. Of course, these kinds of relationships are found in most countries that have common borders or that are geographically and/or culturally close. But the sense of the Joint Statement was that these relationships are stronger than the norm in the case of the UK and Ireland and that both countries benefit.

The most obvious inter-relationship is the high volume of trade between the two countries (Tables 1-3). Table 1 (Irish trade shares in goods) shows that today just under 17 per cent of total Irish exports of goods go to the UK, but the highest single country share is now the USA, at 19.8 per cent. The third largest trade share is Belgium at 14.7 per cent, with Germany at 8.4 per cent.

For Irish total import shares by country of origin, the picture is rather different. Here the UK is the dominant source of Irish imports of goods, with a share of 32.5%. The next largest share is the USA (14 per cent), followed by Germany, China and the Netherlands. As shown above in Figure 2, the share of total Irish imports originating in the UK has declined steadily since the 1920s, but still remains large.

Today Ireland is one of only two major trading partners with whom the UK has a trade surplus in goods (the other being the USA). The surpluses in 2010 were £10.5bn for the USA and £4.2bn for Ireland, but in many of the years of high growth prior to the 2008 crisis, the surplus on UK trade with Ireland exceeded that of its trade with the USA.

Table 1: Irish trade shares in goods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Export Shares</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Import Shares</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A dramatic feature of recent Irish growth is the rise of international trade in services, dominated by software and financial related activities. Table 2 shows the pattern of services export and import behaviour, complementing the data on trade in goods shown in Table 1. Unlike trade in goods, where Ireland runs a massive surplus, overall trade in services is more balanced. The dominant market for Irish services exports is the UK (18.5 per cent), almost twice as big as the next largest, Germany (9.4 per cent). However, Ireland imports its services mainly from the US (30 per cent), with the Netherlands (14 per cent) and the UK (12 per cent) in second and third place. Once again, these import shares are probably distorted by the presence of US multinationals and should be interpreted with care.
Table 2: Irish trade shares in services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Export Shares</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Import Shares</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turning to the United Kingdom, the trade shares for goods are shown in Table 3. The six biggest export destinations for UK trade in goods are the USA (13.3 per cent), followed by Germany, the Netherlands and France. Ireland, in spite of its small economic ‘size’, ranks fifth, at 6 per cent. Turning to import shares, Germany is by far the largest source of UK imports, with a share of 12.6 per cent of total UK imports. This is followed by China (7.9 per cent), and the USA and the Netherlands, both with 7.2 per cent shares. Ireland lies eighth, with a share of 3.3 per cent.

Table 3: UK trade shares in goods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Export Shares</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Import Shares</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (incl Lux)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Belgium (incl Lux)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A final piece of the Irish-UK jigsaw shows up when we examine the orientation of Irish firms to export markets, differentiated by local and foreign ownership. This is shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Export orientation of Irish manufacturing by ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All firms</th>
<th>Exporting firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>% Materials imported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>132666</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>85144</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>122978</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>97685</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>255644</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>182829</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census of Industrial Production, 2000 and 2010
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Some remarkable facts emerge from this table. First, although Irish-owned exporting firms only export about 50 per cent of their total output, against 95 per cent for foreign-owned firms, this is still a very high export orientation by EU standards. Second, the Irish-owned firms supply more to the UK market (40 per cent of total exports) than to the entire rest of the EU (34-38 per cent). Third, although Irish exporting firms only produced 17.6 per cent of the output of all firms who exported in the year 2010, they employed 44.5 per cent of workers.

On the narrow basis of production and trade, what can one conclude about the UK-Irish relationship? The fact that almost 20 per cent of total Irish exports go to the UK reflects both geography and history.13 Closer examination of the one third share of Ireland’s goods imports supplied by the UK suggests that these are predominantly consumer products, where Irish demand is more explicable in terms of culture (the English language), common standards (consumer electrical goods) and taste (long familiar food products) rather than any innate superiority in terms of design or price. Similar factors probably explain the capacity of Irish exporters to capture over 3 per cent of the UK market, a share comparable to that of much larger neighbouring EU states, and the appearance of Ireland as the fifth largest export market for UK producers.

The orientation of employment-intensive Irish-owned firms to the UK export market and the pattern of trade resembles nothing so much as that occurring between regions of a large state rather than between independent nation states. Elements of an earlier, pre-independence ‘web of dependency’ still endure.

Other East-West links

Another important UK-Irish inter-relationship concerns flows of labour within what remained a free travel area after 1922. The historical pattern of large-scale out-migration flows from Ireland to the UK goes back to the era of the Great Famine, but in more recent years net outflows have been both positive and negative, driven by economic push-pull factors such as the relative buoyancy of the UK and Irish labour markets.

If labour demand in Ireland is high (as it was over the period 1995-2007), previous emigrants tend to return to take up jobs. When labour demand is weak, as it is at present, net out-migration flows start up again. In many ways the magnitude and characteristics of UK-Irish migration flows also resemble the kinds of high inter-regional flows that one tends to get inside any large country where barriers to migration are very low, rather than international migration flows, which are usually smaller and where cultural, linguistic and other barriers tend to be much higher.

Both the UK and Ireland now interact within the EU Single Market, where all tariff and non-tariff barriers have been removed. The further strengthening of the Single Market is of vital interest to both states, but in different ways. Common interests include support for greater openness to the global economy, in particular greater opening of services markets (such as new
forms of e-trading) and the evolution of an internal market in energy. But the UK has stayed outside the Schengen area, thereby forcing Ireland also to remain outside because of the political and practical impossibility of having a Schengen border on this island.\textsuperscript{14} The UK also stayed outside the eurozone, facing Ireland with handling the consequences of disruptive and unpredictable fluctuations of the sterling/euro exchange rate, an instability that has particular impacts on the Irish and Northern Irish border region.\textsuperscript{15}

**Centripetal or centrifugal?**

It is probably asking too much to expect that Ireland and the UK will ever form as close an economic relationship as, say, the Benelux Union (previously, the Benelux Economic Union). The large disparity in size, for one thing, would make any Anglo-Irish Economic Union less relevant to the UK as a whole than to Ireland, but it could be very relevant to the devolved regions of the UK. Nevertheless, the serious differences between Irish and UK approaches to engagement with the EU does make such a coordinating framework necessary, if not essential. Were the UK a willing participant within the reformed and deepened eurozone and part of the Schengen Area, matters of mutual UK-Irish interest could be handled within EU institutions if there was no enthusiasm to move towards more formal bilateral co-operation along Benelux lines.

However, the kinds of moves away from closer EU integration and the desire for a narrower EU focused on the Single Market (i.e., a kind of neo-EEC) that were set out in the speech made by Prime Minister Cameron on 23 January 2013 are likely to have serious, if as yet unquantifiable impacts on the Irish economy.\textsuperscript{16} The *Joint Statement* focused primarily on the benefits of present UK-Irish links and the desirability of deepening them in the future. It was completely silent on the likely disruptive costs of any UK disengagement from EU institution building and ignored possible impacts of major policy misalignments. Nation states are entitled to make policy in the light of their own national interests, even within the EU. However, there are well established mechanisms in the EU for reconciling differences and mitigating any asymmetric costs. With the prospects of the UK ‘drifting towards the exit’, perhaps the time has come to take a new look at Strands 2 and 3 of the Belfast Agreement and adapt them to address the emerging challenges within these islands. Such an arrangement would surely be of assistance to the devolved regional governments of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, whose interests may not be served by any disengagement of the UK from the European Union.

In the narrower context of the provision of public services on this island, Michael D’Arcy has already scoped out what he terms a ‘prosperity process’, i.e., the task of identifying mutually beneficial opportunities for the governments in Dublin and Belfast to work together for the practical benefit of their citizens.\textsuperscript{17} The quest for any wider ‘prosperity process’ within and between these islands presents a much greater challenge, requiring the active engagement of public and
private sectors and the acceptance that constructive engagement with the EU is a necessary condition for deepening economic and other links between us.

Dr John Bradley is author, with Professor Michael Best, of *Cross-Border Economic Renewal: Rethinking Regional Policy in Ireland* (Centre for Cross Border Studies, 2012). He was formerly Research Professor at the Dublin-based Economic and Social Research Institute (ESRI), and is now an international consultant working in the area of development strategies, with an emphasis on EU Structural Fund design and evaluation. His current research and consultancy activities focus mainly on the new EU member states and candidate states. He specialises in the development barriers facing the post-Communist economies of Central and Eastern Europe, and in the study of the role of inward investment and the impact of pre-accession and post-accession Structural Funds on those economies. He regularly acts as a consultant to government ministries in many of these countries.

**ENDNOTES**

1. For a more detailed discussion of political aspects of the implementation of the East-West and North-South dimensions of the Belfast Agreement, see the paper by Andy Pollak on 'Irish-British Relations, 1998-2012: From Provincial Conflict to European Tensions' (presented at the University of Strasbourg, 6 December 2012).


3. In 2011, the ratio of total Irish GDP to UK GDP was approximately 1:10. The corresponding population ratio was 1:14.
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7. However, a study was commissioned by the UK Department of Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) and the Irish Government in December 2012 and is scheduled to report by the end of March 2013 (‘Evaluating the value of the economic relationship between the United Kingdom and Ireland’).


10. In Northern Ireland, where inward investment was more modest, Britain played a similar role to that of the USA in Ireland.

11. The trade share with Belgium is distorted by the large element of chemicals and pharmaceuticals. However, a considerable proportion of these are undoubtedly transhipped to other countries. In an economy whose manufacturing sector is dominated by multinational enterprises, trade data have to be interpreted with caution.

12. Unfortunately, UK trade in services by export destination and import source are not published, so it is not possible to examine these patterns, other from the perspective of Irish trade, using CSO data (Table 2 above).

13. For example, 26 per cent of Polish exports go to Germany, its close geographical neighbour.

14. In his January 23rd EU speech, Prime Minister Cameron commented that: ‘Two EU countries – Britain and Ireland – have retained their border controls’.


16. Christoph Scheurmann, the London correspondent for der Spiegel, commented: “How in heaven’s name does Cameron propose to persuade the German Chancellor, the French President and all the other European leaders that he should get to pick the raisins from the cake while everyone else gets the crumbs?”.
IMPACT ASSESSMENT: DEVELOPING AN INNOVATIVE METHODOLOGY TO SUPPORT CROSS-BORDER COOPERATION

Ruth Taillon

In October 2011, at an international conference in Cavan, the Centre for Cross Border Studies (CCBS) launched its Impact Assessment Toolkit for Cross-Border Cooperation, developed in partnership with the Euro Institut in Germany and funded by the EU INTERREG programme. At the heart of the impact assessment method is the idea of what change is needed (social, economic or environmental) in a particular cross-border region (or to use the EU term, cross-border territory).

Impact assessment is a method for project, programme or policy planning that starts with identification of the core problem; defines strategic and specific objectives that relate specifically to the causes and effects of that problem; and then moves on to decisions about what is to be done, what impacts the project is intended to achieve, and how these impacts (or changes) will be measured, demonstrated, reported and evaluated. While this Toolkit was developed by CCBS and the Euro Institut in Germany specifically for use in the Irish border region, the method is transferable to other transnational or cross-border contexts.

Since its publication, it has become increasingly clear that the Toolkit has filled a very real gap in the resources available to cross-border actors, particularly those working on projects funded by the EU’s European Territorial Cooperation (ETC) programmes – i.e. INTERREG and PEACE. In the past EU-funded cross-border programme and project promoters have often found it difficult to demonstrate impact: i.e. the changes that have taken place as a result of the activities undertaken. The Impact Assessment Toolkit for Cross-Border Cooperation can help to define and clarify the extent to which a project, programme or policy is likely to contribute to these desired changes. The Toolkit can help to determine whether a cross-border approach is the appropriate level of intervention and, if so, to identify the ‘added value’ of such cooperation.

It will identify whether the proposed activities could have a greater overall impact – socially, economically or environmentally – if undertaken on
a cross-border basis rather than separately within each jurisdiction. For example, will new relationships be built between people or organisations that would not have developed otherwise? Will the cross-border activities lead to new ways of working or more intensive collaboration that would not have been the case if they had been carried out separately? Will a cross-border approach be more efficient and/or effective than a single jurisdiction approach?

**Interest across Europe**

Since its launch, the *Impact Assessment Toolkit for Cross-Border Cooperation* has attracted considerable interest across Europe. It is being translated into French and Catalan and there are plans through the Transfrontier Euro Institut Network (TEIN) to adapt it for use in other EU border regions. In Ireland, the Special EU Programmes Body (SEUPB) has already integrated the Toolkit’s methodology into the application process for the final tranche of the INTERREG IVA programme (2013-2015), and it is anticipated that it will also be used in European Territorial Cooperation Programmes (ETCs) for the period 2014-2020 – i.e. INTERREG V and PEACE IV – that will be implemented by the SEUPB.

At European Commission level also, there has been considerable interest in the Toolkit. Senior officials in the Commission’s Directorate-General Regional and Urban Policy (DG Regio) with overall responsibility for implementation and evaluation of the ETCs have warmly welcomed its publication, and it has been made available on the website of INTERACT, the support programme for the implementation bodies of all ETCs. While some of the terminology being used by the Commission has changed in recent years, the Toolkit is very much in line with the Commission’s objectives of being able to demonstrate more clearly the changes that have been achieved as a result of the investment by EU funding programmes.

**Two policy initiatives**

Cross-border cooperation between Ireland and Northern Ireland has been evolving, deepening and widening over the past 15 years as a result of two main policy imperatives:

1) The commitment to cross-border cooperation that is integral to the Belfast/Good Friday Agreement; and

2) EU Territorial Cohesion Policy, which is aimed at reducing regional disparities in Europe; creating jobs by promoting competitiveness and making the regions concerned more attractive to businesses and investors; and encouraging cooperation across borders through joint programmes, projects and networks.

In the period 2007-2013 the European Territorial Cooperation objective covers three types of programmes: cross-border cooperation programmes along internal EU borders (INTERREG IVA); transnational cooperation programmes that cover larger areas of co-operation such as the Baltic Sea, the Alpine and
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Mediterranean regions (INTERREG IVB); and the inter-regional cooperation programme (INTERREG IVC); and three networking programmes (URBACT II, INTERACT II and ESPON) that cover all 27 Member States of the EU.

This cooperation is being implemented in Ireland through a range of cross-border structures and relationships and supported with resources from the EU, the UK and Irish Governments, the Northern Ireland Executive, local authorities on both sides of the border and a wide range of social partners.

“Cohesion policy is the EU’s main instrument for pursuing harmonious development across the Union. It is based on a broad vision, which encompasses not just the economic development of lagging regions and support for vulnerable social groups, but also environmental sustainability and respect for territorial and cultural features of different parts of the EU. This breadth of vision is reflected in the variety of programmes, projects and partners that are supported under the policy.”

Investing in Europe’s Future: Fifth report on economic, social and territorial cohesion, November 2010

Development of a cross-border Impact Assessment Toolkit for use in the context of the island of Ireland, must, in the first instance, take into account the imperatives set out in the 1998 Belfast/Good Friday Agreement. Under Strand Two of that Agreement, the North South Ministerial Council was established to bring together the Northern Ireland Executive and the Irish Government:

To develop consultation, cooperation and action within the island of Ireland – including through implementation on an all-island and cross-border basis – on matters of mutual interest within the competence of the Administrations, North and South. The two administrations are pledged to use their best endeavours to reach agreement on the adoption of common policies, in areas where there is a mutual cross-border and all-island benefit, and which are within the competence of both administrations.

Arising from the Agreement, work programmes for six ‘Areas for Cooperation’ were agreed and these are discussed at sectoral meetings of the North South Ministerial Council, but implemented separately in each jurisdiction. These are agriculture, education, environment, health, tourism and transport. In addition, six ‘implementation bodies’ span the border: Waterways Ireland; the Food Safety Promotion Board; InterTradeIreland; the North South Language Body; Foyle, Carlingford and Irish Lights Commission; and the Special European Union Programmes Body. Policies in these areas are agreed at North South Ministerial Council level and administered directly by these cross-border bodies.

European Cohesion Policy

Increasingly, however, European Cohesion Policy is shaping and
determining resource and policy decisions in the Irish cross-border region. The objective of European Cohesion Policy is to strengthen economic, social and territorial cohesion by reducing disparities between the development levels in countries and regions of the European Union. Economic, social and territorial disparities at both regional and national level have increased in the enlarged EU.

The increase in the number of the Community’s land and sea borders and the extension of its territory mean that the value added of cross-border, transnational and interregional cooperation in the community should be increased.³

To reduce these disparities, the current financial framework (2007-2013) has prioritised competitiveness and employment.

Since 2008, the economic disadvantages and social exclusion and marginalisation experienced by border communities in Ireland have, in common with border communities throughout the EU, been exacerbated by the global economic and fiscal crisis.

Europe faces a moment of transformation. The crisis has wiped out years of economic and social progress and exposed structural weaknesses in Europe’s economy. In the meantime, the world is moving fast and long-term challenges – globalisation, pressure on resources [climate change], ageing – intensify.⁴

Of course not every Member State and area of the European Union is affected in the same way, or experiences the same level of crisis. Ireland has been particularly badly affected, and along with Greece and Portugal, its financial and economic policies are now largely dictated by a ‘troika’ of the the European Central Bank (ECB), the European Commission and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The challenge is to create coherent policy approaches within the framework of the European Union that strengthen economic, social and territorial cohesion while respecting diversity: at the European Level, at the Member State level, and at the regional and local levels. The European Commission’s Directorate for Urban and Regional Policy has commented that:

An integrated place-based approach pursued by Cohesion Policy is ideally suited to respond to complex and strongly embedded issues, such as regional development, but in order to maximise synergies better coordination with sectoral policies is necessary. Territorial cohesion also stresses the added value of partnership with a strong local dimension, which ensures that policies are designed and implemented with local knowledge.⁵

An important feature of the Impact Assessment Toolkit is precisely that it offers this integrated, place-based approach to developing cross-border cooperation. An integrated place-based approach is multi-dimensional, tailored to features and outcomes that are specific to particular cross-border regions and localities. Thus the Toolkit was developed in the first instance as a
tool to support the planners of cross-border programmes and projects in Ireland and Northern Ireland.

The core problems of the ‘Irish cross-border territory’ (defined as the eligible area for the INTERREG IV and PEACE programmes, i.e. Northern Ireland and the border counties of Ireland) are summarised in an appendix to the Toolkit. Core social problems are categorised under the headings of labour force characteristics; inequalities, poverty and social exclusion; health inequalities and community relations. Core economic problems include both ‘national’ economic problems that impact on the territory, such as rising national debt and impacts of climate change, and territory-specific
economic problems such as structurally unbalanced regional economies and infrastructure deficits. Core environmental problems are also listed, as are core cross-border cooperation problems, including gaps and mismatches in statistical information and indicators, weak political institutions, and lack of coordination of public policies and services between the two jurisdictions.

While the methodology is transferable, a certain amount of adaptation would be required for its use in other political and geographical contexts. The first step of its six-step methodology is to identify the core problems to be addressed. However, a problem – not exclusive to the European Territorial Cooperation programmes in Ireland – has been that many of the projects seeking EU funding have not been able to make a strong logical connection between the region’s macro socio-economic analysis, the strategic objectives of the EU programme and the specific objectives of their project. At the operational level, there are a myriad of diverse cross-border projects. Because there is a logical gap between the different levels of action, the challenge is to bring the programme and project dimensions together: to ‘cascade’ down from the strategic programme aims to the operational project aims and to identify the added value of a cross-border approach.

The Impact Assessment Toolkit, in its integrated approach, is innovative in that it brings together the ‘three pillars’ of the EU’s Sustainable Development Strategy – social, economic and environmental – with a new ‘fourth pillar’ – cooperation.

In particular, a cross-border approach has the potential not only to enhance social, economic or environmental impacts that might be achieved by single jurisdictional responses, but also to have additional impacts that are specific to the process of cooperation.
In order to achieve the intended objectives of a programme or project, it might be necessary, for example, to make administrative, legislative or regulatory changes. New structures may be required. These might be temporary or permanent, formal or informal. There may be new monitoring and reporting arrangements, harmonised regulations or shared enforcement procedures. Shared data bases or agreement on harmonised legislation might be required. Existing policies might have to be coordinated or harmonised or shared policies developed in the framework of strategic objectives for the cross-border region. We have described these as the ‘fourth pillar’ (i.e. the ‘cooperation pillar’).

Social, economic or environmental impacts can be achieved that are additional to those that might be achieved by single jurisdiction approaches. For example, people or organisations might now have relationships with each other that would not have developed otherwise. The programme or project may involve new ways of working or more intensive collaboration than would otherwise be the case. There might be greater cross-border mobility of people for a wide variety of social, cultural or economic reasons.

Additional benefits through cooperation?

At each stage of the cross-border impact assessment process, consideration should be given to whether there are additional benefits to be gained through cross-border cooperation. Will a cross-border approach to addressing a particular problem or problems of the Irish Border Region bring ‘added value’ beyond what could be accomplished by responses that might be delivered independently by actors on one or both sides of the border? Can specific problems associated with the border or issues of a cross-border nature be addressed that could not or would not have been effectively addressed within one or both jurisdictions separately?
Will there be valuable synergies? Can the programme or project objectives be better achieved jointly than if the jurisdictions acted separately?

In summary, the proposed cooperative cross-border activities should have a greater effect than would be the case if the jurisdictions acted separately. These effects might be directly related to the specific objectives of the programme or project, or they could be additional benefits (expected or unexpected) arising specifically from the process of cooperation. Cooperation and partnerships based on mutual exchange of experiences should produce real interaction which promotes the achievement of shared objectives and leads to a final result that differs qualitatively from the sum of the several activities undertaken at the level of the two jurisdictions.

Cross-border impact assessment is a practical method to assist people planning cross-border programmes and projects. Many of the core problems of the border region do not respect jurisdictional boundaries. Just as many of these core problems are multi-faceted, actions taken to address them – whether social, economic or environmental – are likely to result in a combination of social, economic and environmental impacts. This Toolkit will assist in ensuring that the most significant of these impacts are captured and valued. Crucially, however, it will also identify the added value that has come about as a result of the cooperation process itself: for instance, the benefits derived from developing new cross-border relationships and new ways of working that contribute to the cohesion and sustainability of the region.

Cross-border impact assessment assists programme and project planners in thinking through the consequences of their proposals. The Toolkit offers a guide through this process, helping to
clarify and define the cross-border policy challenge under consideration and to analyse the case for intervention.

In the past, many people with responsibility for delivering cross-border programmes and projects have found it relatively easy to demonstrate what they have done. Success has been judged on the basis of activities measured through the use of output indicators. Demonstrating impact – the actual change that has taken place as an outcome of these activities – is more problematic. There is a growing consensus that the effective evaluation of the impacts of an intervention or group of interventions is not possible during the lifetime of the programme or project. It is increasingly accepted that it can be difficult to attribute changes to the actions of a particular project or programme in the context of a myriad of social, economic, environmental and other factors that may be acting to different degrees and in different ways. It is also increasingly recognised that not only is the attribution of impacts a problem, but that impacts are particularly hard to measure, and may not be identified until long after the project or programme has come to an end.

Conventional approaches to impact analysis using a logical framework (e.g. output leading to results leading to impacts) have also been
criticised because impacts of regional development projects and programmes are the product of internal as well as external factors – and their inter-relations. So, for example, a highly innovative and well-implemented training programme in a region (an internal factor) could be evaluated to have had limited success as an intervention designed to address high unemployment among a marginalised group because of external factors such as the effects of the national and international recession on overall employment opportunities. It is often difficult to identify clear, obvious relationships. Impact chains emerge as part of a dense set of actors which can exert influence on the various elements of a programme or project and be mutually influenced by them. It can also be difficult to isolate the effects of a project or programme.7

Besides, it is very tempting to claim observable impacts, regardless whether the project/programme under question has actually contributed to their achievement. This is particularly tempting in the case of higher-level objectives, where contributions of single factors are easy to claim but difficult to (dis)prove (i.e. the contribution of a training measure to increase employment in a given territory). Or in the case of long impact chains, where causes and effects are rather distant from each other, either in time or in functional relations.8

**Intervention logic**

For these reasons, the cross-border impact assessment process uses the ‘intervention logic’ of the proposed project or programme. If this intervention logic is coherent, the objectives will flow directly from the core problem that has been identified, with specific objectives directly addressing the effects of tackling the core problem to bring about the change needed. The type of intervention chosen (i.e. the policy approach) should directly address the causes of the core problem. For instance, if the core problem is high unemployment, it might be more appropriate for some cross-border actors to take different policy approaches – job creation schemes, benefits for the unemployed or training courses – to address the problem, depending on their remits and resources.

Consideration should be given as to whether a cross-border intervention is more appropriate or effective than intervention in a single jurisdiction or ‘back-to-back’ interventions, and how well the proposed actions will operationalise the chosen policy approach. The impacts that are expected to occur as a result of implementing the policy approach (including indirect, negative and unintended impacts) should be considered, including whether these impacts are proportionate to the scale of the proposed intervention. Finally, it is important that the indicators capture the most important social, economic, environmental and cooperation impacts and are consistent with the general and specific objectives. The relative strength and consistency of the intervention logic will determine to what extent the project or programme will be more or less likely
to contribute to the desired change. It will reflect the extent to which project or programme objectives are consistent with the desired change.

New evaluation guidelines from the EU Commission address precisely this issue and have revised their terminology accordingly. While continuing to define impact as ‘the change that can be credibly attributed to an intervention’, evaluation will focus on the contribution of the policy, programme or project to results, defined as ‘the specific dimension of the well-being of people that motivates policy action, i.e. that is expected to be modified by the interventions designed and implemented by a policy.’ The term ‘outcome’ captures the concept in English. In other EU languages the term ‘result’ is synonymous with outcome. The CCBS Toolkit is, despite some differences in terminology, consistent with this revised approach, as illustrated in the figure below:

The core elements of the Toolkit methodology are presented as six Key Analytical Steps for Cross-Border Impact Assessment (each of these sections is colour-coded):

1. Identifying the problems of the cross-border territory
2. Defining general and specific objectives
3. Identifying and choosing cross-border policy approaches and policy instruments/actions
4. Identifying expected impacts
5. Choosing and developing appropriate indicators
6. Designing an appropriate monitoring and evaluation framework
The six steps are illustrated in the above graphic. At the start of each step, there is a short overview to explain what that stage of the cross border impact assessment means, and directions about how to apply the methodology to the proposed programme or project. These instructions are supported by a number of ‘guiding questions’ to help clarify the project’s focus and rationale. Some of these questions are generic questions; others are specifically focused on identifying and measuring the added value of cross-border cooperation. At each step, there is an example based on a hypothetical project.
The Toolkit also sets out the policy contexts for cross-border cooperation in respect of both the European Union and the particular circumstances of the island of Ireland post the 1998 Agreement. It goes on to discuss the use of impact assessment in a cross-border context and to explain in detail what is meant by the added value of cross-border cooperation. Three case studies applying the cross-border impact assessment methodology to real life cross-border projects funded under the INTERREG IVA Programme and a summary of the core problems of the region are also included. The case studies are the ConneXions project for people with disabilities; the Innovation Factory project supporting micro-businesses; and the environmental project, Controlling Priority Invasive Non-Native Riparian Plants and Restoring Native Bio-Diversity.

The Toolkit is the first in a series of tools that are being developed by CCBS that are intended to support cross-border projects at each stage of the project ‘life cycle’: from project design, through management, implementation, monitoring to post-project evaluation. Recently the Centre has commenced work – along with the Euro Institut and other partners in the Transfrontier Euro-Institute Network (TEIN) – on a two-year project funded by the EU Leonardo
Programme. This will produce a new capacity-building tool in cross-border project management with a focus on the particular challenges of inter-cultural exchanges. Over the next two years, CCBS will itself be developing two new tools: a **Budget Toolkit for Cross-Border Projects** and an **Evaluation Toolkit for Cross-Border Projects**. Funded as part of a larger INTERREG IVA portfolio of projects, these tools will be developed in partnership with Pobal and the Euro Institut in 2013-2015.

Since the launch of the **Toolkit** in October 2011, its methodology has been presented at a number of meetings and seminars in different European cities organised by INTERACT, the body that supports Managing Authorities and Joint Technical Secretariats from all the European Territorial Cooperation programmes. It has also been presented at a European Social Fund (ESF) Learning Networks event, bringing together Managing Authorities and Joint Technical Secretariats for ESF programmes. As noted above, meetings have taken place with senior officials of the EU Commission’s DG Regio, and in January 2013 the Centre and the Euro Institut delivered training based on the Toolkit (funded by the British and German governments) to a group of cross-border actors working on the Tajikistan/Afghanistan border.

The success of the **Impact Assessment Toolkit for Cross Border Cooperation** was summed up by Indecon Economic Consultants, the evaluators of the Centre’s 2009-2012 EU-funded research programme, in the following words:

> This is the first time that the Impact Assessment approach of the European Commission has been applied in a cross-border context. By developing a fourth pillar, which directly tries to identify and capture the specific cross-border cooperation impacts (mostly not captured by the existing EU indicators), the Toolkit offers a new perspective on how to capture the added value of cross-border cooperation projects and programmes. As it was explained during the 2011 Cavan conference by the representative of DG Regio, this meets a concern of the Commission for the future: how to better demonstrate the value added and the durability of cross-border cooperation policy approaches. Thus the Toolkit is not only a pilot for the Irish context but for other cross-border territories in Europe.\(^\text{10}\)

**Ruth Taillon** is Director Designate of the Centre for Cross Border Studies and led the Irish-German team that developed the **Impact Assessment Toolkit for Cross-Border Cooperation**. The other two members were the Director of the Euro-Institut, Dr Joachim Beck, and its Assistant for Studies, Sebastian Rihm. The Centre is offering training and mentoring in applying the Toolkit methodology as well as support to cross-border projects through new budget and evaluation toolkits. Further information from Ruth at r.taillon@qub.ac.uk or +44-28-3751-1559/1550. The **Impact Assessment Toolkit for Cross-Border Cooperation** can be downloaded from the Centre’s website: www.crossborder.ie (under Publications).
ENDNOTES

1. The North South Ministerial Council (NSMC) was established under the Belfast/Good Friday Agreement (1998) and comprises Ministers of the Northern Ireland Executive and the Irish Government, working together to take forward cooperation between both parts of the island to mutual benefit.


8. Ibid.


CHARTING A FUTURE PATH FOR ARCHAEOLOGY IN IRELAND, NORTH AND SOUTH

Gabriel Cooney

At the end of November 2012 the Northern Ireland Archaeological Forum organised a seminar in Downpatrick, Co. Down on the theme: ‘Increasing the value of Northern Ireland’s archaeology to the public.’ The title of the seminar directly posed the challenge that at present archaeology (and those responsible for it) are not maximising the value it could have for wider society. This is unlikely to happen unless we consider the future of archaeology, and purposefully think and plan carefully about how we can achieve that objective. In turn this has implications for archaeological practice and the profession in Ireland (North and South), and indeed has been recognised as a challenge for archaeology internationally.

Historically there have been strong cross-border links in the practice of archaeology. Some of those links go back before the border was established (for example the initial 19th century monuments legislation). More particularly they reflect continued close professional cross-border ties that were formally recognised when the Irish Association of Professional Archaeologists (IAPA) was established in the 1970s and which continues to underpin the all-island ethos of the body that succeeded it, the Institute of Archaeologists of Ireland (IAI). The Archaeology Committee of the Royal Irish Academy has representation from both jurisdictions. Archaeological legislation in Northern Ireland has an interesting character, as the Historic Monuments and Archaeological Objects Order (NI) 1995 is both specific to Northern Ireland but also shares features with both the Republic of Ireland’s National Monuments Act and broader UK legislation.

My own position as an archaeologist based in University College Dublin’s School of Archaeology and current chair of the Historic Monuments Council of Northern Ireland provides both a personal perspective on these issues and also a context for raising important questions: Is a comparison and contrast of the current state of archaeology North and South useful? Would an all-Island
The island’s economic travails have had a major impact on the profession, particularly on archaeologists who worked in the planning-led sector. Contraction in public and private building and infrastructural projects has led to a dramatic reduction in the number of professional archaeologists, the closure of some private consultancies and a significant downsizing of others. A survey of the archaeological profession in 2007 estimated that there were about 1800 archaeologists employed (120 in the North, and an extraordinary 1700 in the South). Estimates vary but by 2012 this appears to have dropped drastically to around 300-400 on the island, with the great bulk of the decrease in the South.

That is the headline picture but it misses out a number of key factors. It was long-term government investment in both the Republic and Northern Ireland in compiling comprehensive records of sites and monuments, along with recognition of the social value of this resource and its linkage to the planning system, that was the basis for recognition of the need to mitigate the impact of development on the archaeological resource of the island. A profile of the profession carried out in 2001 on behalf of IAPA indicated that the growth evident even at that time was really not sustainable in the long-term. But, unfortunately, just as the rapid increase in archaeological activity was linked to the cresting economic wave, the decline has been similarly dramatic as the economy contracted.

What has been gained, however, is a unique record of human activity from perspective help in increasing public appreciation and awareness of the value of archaeology? The last question might be more carefully parsed in the following way: should archaeologists and historians recognise the need to consider the past, and the historic environment that is the result of it, in an all-island context?

Indeed at a European level little cross-border differentiation is recognised. What has been frequently highlighted as a distinctive feature of Ireland is the richness and diversity of the record of monuments, sites and historic landscapes across the island, in stark contrast to many other parts of northwest Europe. The key question then becomes how can we increase public awareness of and benefit from the value of this rich record of material remains of the past in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland today?

From boom to bust

Without going into too much detail, it is relevant to consider the recent past of archaeological practice in Ireland. The decade from the mid-1990s to mid-2000s was a time of extraordinary change. This was due to the increasing pace of economic and infrastructural development and investment (in the North helped by a peace dividend) and saw an explosion in archaeological excavation. This began earlier in the Republic but happened at a concomitant scale in Northern Ireland. It has been followed by a dramatic decrease in activity, especially in the Republic.
earliest times captured in the form of excavation archives, most of it excavated and recorded to a scientific quality far surpassing that of earlier excavations. This is the great resource and outcome from that decade of activity. Archaeological fieldwork is ongoing, albeit at a much slower pace, as planning-led investigation of the historic environment continues: for example at the Drumclay crannog site on the A32 Cherrymount link road near Enniskillen, Co. Fermanagh, which illustrates the potential of wetland sites, because of the extraordinary preservation of organic remains, to provide a window on life in the past.

It is easy to forget too that there was a concentrated effort in the middle of the first decade of the twenty first century to plan strategically for the future of Irish archaeology on an all-island basis which led to the publication of three reports; A Review of Research Needs in Irish Archaeology (The Heritage Council); Archaeology in Ireland: A Vision for the Future (Royal Irish Academy) and Archaeology 2020: Repositioning Ireland in the Knowledge Society (UCD/The Heritage Council). This planning was also evident in the formation of the Northern Ireland Archaeological Forum, a lobby group which aims to protect, study and promote the historic environment, and to raise political and public awareness of its importance.

Not surprisingly there was a degree of consensus across the three reports in terms of what was required in terms of key recommendations. In the Archaeology 2020 report focus was put on three enabling measures: firstly, partnership across the sector and profession (North and South); secondly, the need to address the publication and dissemination of archaeological
knowledge, and finally, research funding that would specifically build research value into excavation data and stimulate partnership, collaboration and the best use of resources. This was to be realised in the form of INSTAR, the Irish National Strategic Archaeological Research programme which, through projects such as *Cultivating Societies, The People of Prehistoric Ireland* and the *Early Medieval Archaeological Project* – all collaborative North-South projects (details can be found on the INSTAR project database on the Heritage Council website) – has transformed our understanding of key aspects of Ireland’s past.

One of the recommendations of the Royal Irish Academy report was a consolidation of the Republic’s National Monuments Acts. Following a review by an expert panel under the auspices of the then Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government, a National Monuments Bill is due for publication and consideration in 2013. However, in reality the driver for this review and new legislation was the view of John Gormley, the Minister of that Department from 2007-2011, that the site-based focus of the current legislation had failed in the protection of the archaeological resource, notably in cases such as the impact of the M3 on the wider Tara landscape in County Meath. This focus on a landscape-based approach can be further seen in the compilation and public consultation on a *Draft Landscape Strategy* (NLS) by the Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht in 2011. The development of a NLS is one of the commitments in the 2007 Fianna Fail/Green Party Programme for Government, in line with the implementation of the *European Landscape Convention* (ELC) which came into force in Ireland in 2004 (and in the UK in 2007).

**Wider contexts**

So where are we now? In spring 2011 the Heritage Council hosted a workshop on the archaeological profession in Ireland and this led to the drafting of an Archaeological Strategic Plan (September 2011). The Institute of Archaeologists of Ireland (IAI) has formulated a three-year strategic plan for the profession on the island. There has been cross-party political interest in solving the current unsatisfactory position about archaeological archives in Northern Ireland (where all the material from recent excavations is held by private archaeological consultancies), including discussion in the NI Assembly. There has been a recognition of the need for built heritage expertise in the newly established Marine Division of the Department of the Environment in Northern Ireland, in line with the UK implementation of the European Marine Directive.

Two recent reports published respectively by the Department of the Environment (NI) and the Heritage Council quantify the economic impacts that can be attributed to Northern Ireland’s and the Republic of Ireland’s historic environment. This value has been underplayed and under-appreciated. At a time of scarce public resources, establishing economic impacts is a critical step towards greater understanding of the need for regular investment, and to realise more fully the potential value.
of Ireland’s unique heritage assets. In recognising ‘sightseers and culture seekers’ as Ireland’s best opportunity for tourism growth, Tourism Ireland explicitly acknowledges that the culture and history of the island, the range of historical and cultural attractions and attractive cities and towns are cumulatively the most important factor that attracts visitors.

However, it would have to be said that the prevailing mood music is one of ‘keeping calm and hanging on’. For example much of the attention of the Heritage Council over the last year has been focused on making the case for its continued independent role and status under a critical review of state bodies undertaken by the Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht. This has only recently been confirmed. There is a disconnect between the perceived value of heritage, its role as a potential economic driver (a specific feature of Minister Alex Atwood’s philosophy and approach as the current Northern Minister of the Environment) and the apparent decreased investment in and political concern for it.

Part of the difficulty is that heritage is such a broad topic, encompassing both the natural and the built environment. At a time of severe economic constraint, built heritage often appears to be seen as a soft option. It can be perceived as static, unchanging and secure, when in reality it is constantly changing and in need of active conservation. In recent budgets the rate of decline in funding for the built heritage areas in both jurisdictions (through the then Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government, now Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, and the Built Heritage Directorate of NIEA) was arguably higher than the overall cut within the relevant departments. The INSTAR research fund – with grants allocated to research teams based both in the South and the North – dedicated to making the results of development-led archaeological excavations accessible to a wide audience (and described in a recent UK report as an ‘inspired initiative’) has been reduced to €50,000 per annum, in effect providing enough funding for just one project to continue. This contrasts to the initial allocation of €1 million to this programme in 2008.

In such ways we are decreasing both the ability to assess and manage the impact of changes on heritage, and to realise and transmit its public value through research and communication. In relation to government funding within the broad heritage/environment area, one key trend that needs to be identified and discussed is an effective shift in resources from the protection and management of the built heritage to the natural environment (although there has been significant investment in specific built heritage-related projects). The reality is that non-compliance with European directives has very serious financial implications for governments, while compliance with national cultural heritage laws does not. For example, this has resulted in the re-deployment of professional archaeologists from the National Monuments Service to the National Parks and Wildlife Service within the Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht.

Reading the publication Our Passion, Our Place: NIEA Strategic Priorities
2012-22, one has the impression that the key performance indicators for natural heritage are more stringent, clearly defined and require consistent input of resources compared to the commitments to the built heritage.

**Irish heritage 2016-2022**

Now while this may be painting a bleak picture (which might be contested), it is also worth thinking about how it may evolve in the short-term future. In its contribution to the *National Landscape Strategy*, the Heritage Council suggested that one could imagine the Ireland of 2016-2022 as having a number of features. The predictions for agriculture in the Food Harvest 2020 strategic plan suggest a 33% increase in the value of primary output. A more nuanced reading of this with reference to agriculture in both jurisdictions is that large, commercial-scale agricultural operations are likely to become increasingly profitable, with farm amalgamations, changing patterns of land ownership, marginalisation and extensification of smaller farm holdings.

Development pressure and construction will take place using green (and not so green) energy.

This is likely to lend support to the Futures Academy (Dublin Institute of Technology) vision of a two-zone Ireland: intensive economic enterprise and an increasingly urbanised society concentrated in an eastern zone, with the Dublin-Belfast corridor as an iconic economic driver, and a western zone with a greater focus on tourism and related activities. This latter zone we could call by a name that has been primarily used in the Republic, but that has equal relevance in an all-island context: the BMW – Border Midland West (as well as the South-West) region.

In relation to the spend on and perception of the built heritage and historic environment, it could be suggested that there will be declining funding for voluntary, community and non-governmental organisations and a growing contradiction within government funding and strategy which will focus on heritage tourism (including the ‘decade of commemorations’ of 1912-22) – to attract the ‘sightseers and culture seekers’ – but will see declining investment in management, protection and conservation. A particular challenge in the latter areas in Northern Ireland will be around the deployment and location of expertise in the built heritage following the enactment of the Reform of Public Administration (RPA) and an as yet undefined heritage role of a smaller number of enlarged local authorities.

One potential external driver of change that might have an impact on the policy landscape of the future is the current development at European level of a Joint Programme Initiative (JPI): ‘Cultural Heritage and Global Change: a New Challenge for Europe’. This is one of a number of JPIs that will have a major impact on the strategy and direction of the next round of European research funding, and it demonstrates the perceived importance of heritage for European society. It has key objectives including the building of greater value by creating greater linkages and interoperability between national databases and research, and aligning research
with other policies at European level. Whether it has the capacity to bring about a greater political investment in cultural heritage at national level remains to be seen.

Back to the future

Considering the future path of archaeology in Ireland, North and South, in terms of greater public value, there has been a useful recent discussion in the Southport Group Report in England (compiled by a think tank of archaeologists from across the profession) and its recommendations on developing the benefits of planning-led investigation of the historic environment in that country.

Reflecting on this from the perspective of practice in the Republic of Ireland, I have made the point that there are significant differences between the centralised legislative and operational system that obtains in the Republic (and Northern Ireland) and the situation in England. For example, licencing of excavation in Ireland means that there are contractual arrangements between the state, the developer and the archaeologist. In theory this should make easier the implementation of the key principle of the Southport report: namely the need to move from ideas of mitigation and preservation to the recognition of the requirement to ‘offset’ any losses of significance to monuments, sites and buildings by equivalent gains in terms of enhancing understanding of the past and to make these gains publicly available, through publications and engaging the public with the process of investigation.

The reality is that the state tends to focus on the facilitation of economic development rather than the imperative to create public value. Commenting on the Southport report from a Northern Ireland perspective, Dr Philip Macdonald has identified key issues that could be read as an agenda for the future in both parts of the island: the need to create opportunities for the public to engage with archaeological activity; the need to publish the spectacular discoveries from development-led excavation in formats that will be widely read and valued; and the provision for storage, long-term curation and access to archaeological archives.

Achievement of that agenda will require significant mindset and policy changes, and I think we sometimes forget that these human resources are the fundamentals that underlie the effective deployment and use of economic resources. In relation to Northern Ireland, Macdonald makes the point that a key change would be a revision of Planning Policy Statement 6: Planning Archaeology and the Built Heritage so that it has a focus on dissemination and publication, long-term curation of archives and public participation (on the other hand it could be argued that this aspiration could be achieved through a major revision of the archaeological excavation licensing arrangements). A similar ethos is proposed in the consolidated National Monuments Bill in the Republic, along with a greater focus on a landscape-based approach. The archive resource centre at Swords, close to Dublin, being jointly developed by the National Museum of Ireland and the National Monuments Service.
of the Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, has the potential to provide an integrated (records and material) archive, and to provide a useful model in the ongoing debate about archaeological archives in Northern Ireland and the lack of capacity in the museum sector for curating excavation archives.

This future will also require a responsive public service that is flexible and focused on creating public value and identifying trends in international best practice. However could I suggest that there are two mindsets that we also need to examine? Firstly, the licencing system both South and North has been a very important bulwark of the professional status of archaeologists, and indeed excavation has become the public face of archaeology. But it could be argued that the development of a vocabulary which is a critical and technical shorthand for professional practice has made it more more difficult to engage in a meaningful way with the public.

Even more fundamentally, as the Southport report reminds us, research and quality has to be at the heart of what planning-led archaeological work is about, or else it is simply an empty tick boxing enterprise. This is particularly important when there is so much pressure on 'value for money'. This has encouraged the ‘lowest price wins’ approach to planning-led investigation. If we are to plan a better future for archaeology, then the regulatory authorities need to regulate rather than simply licence. And their parent departments have to be willing to engage with the issue of the quality and research value of the work being undertaken. Why should the assessment...
of quality and reputation – the ability to do the job well, to involve the public and publish the results – not be a specific part of the contract process?

**The question of creating value**

There are many aspects of the island’s built heritage that demonstrate a shared history over the past 10,000 years. There are a number of areas which could provide a focus for cross-border cooperation and ‘easy wins’ on which to build. For a start, there currently appears to be little or no regular contact between the Built Heritage Directorate of the NI Environment Agency and the National Monuments Service/Architectural Protection and Heritage Policy sections of the Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht (or with the Heritage Service of the Office of Public Works). This is an area where immediate action could be taken to look at current programmes of work and to explore potential synergies and areas of co-operation: for example, a joint survey of the Carlingford Lough area could have a number of benefits, not least in the development of the Cooley Peninsula/Mourne Mountains as a major cross-border visitor destination (something that will be greatly facilitated by the construction of a new road bridge across the lough, largely funded by the EU, in 2013-2015).

At present, if local and international ‘sightseers and culture seekers’ are looking for details of particular aspects of Ireland’s built heritage, such as megalithic tombs, they have to consult the Monuments and Buildings Record (NI) or the Register of Recorded Monuments and Places (RoI). With the current availability and enormous potential of digital technology, minimal investment could create a link between these databases to increase their value as a data source, without impacting on the integrity of either database.

Indeed, returning to the question of archaeological archives, one way of maximising the value of public and private investment in excavations carried out during the economic boom would be to create a virtual repository of archaeological archives which would link the developing archive resource centre in Swords with whatever emerges from current discussions involving the Departments of Environment and Culture, Arts and Leisure about future provision for archaeological archives in Northern Ireland.

The Heritage Council in the Republic, through the network of heritage officers working in local authorities, has been exploring the development of a ‘Heritage Viewer’, linking data from over 200 datasets across the built and natural heritage. Some of these datasets already have an all-island basis. An extended programme could be developed on an island basis, providing users with a unique insight into Ireland’s built heritage and its wider context.

Perhaps the most powerful global heritage brand is World Heritage, and the inscription of sites with outstanding universal value on the *World Heritage List*. The Republic of Ireland has an active World Heritage programme. One of the sites on its new *Tentative List* (2010) for potential nomination for
inscription at some point is the multi-
locational or serial Royal Sites of Ireland. 
Reviewing submissions for inclusion on 
the UK’s new Tentative List (2010), the 
Department of Culture, Media and Sport in London indicated that the application of Navan (Emain Macha) in Armagh for 
inclusion should be driven forward by 
means of a transnational nomination in the context of the Republic’s Royal 
Sites. Armagh City and District Council 
have been actively promoting the 
development of Navan (Emain Macha) 
as its premier visitor attraction, with the 
attainment of World Heritage status as 
the ultimate goal. There is an excellent 
opportunity to build on existing official 
cross-border support for this important 
initiative.

The Royal Sites concept indicates 
the potential of an all-island thematic 
approach to heritage. Indeed many ‘sightseers’ and ‘home stayers’ plan 
with a particular theme or interest in 
mind such as Christian heritage or 
megalithic tombs. There is potential here to provide thematic ‘trails’ or ‘threads’ that lead the visitor across 
the island rather than stopping at the 
border. Examples of such trails could 
include megalithic tomb builders, St 
Patrick’s Trail or the walled towns of 
Ireland. Monuments in state ownership 
or guardianship (190 State Care 
Monuments in Northern Ireland and 
more than 700 National Monuments 
in the Republic of Ireland) are valuable 
heritage assets in terms of both their diversity and wide geographical 
spread, and as potential foci for such tourist trails. Currently access to and 
presentation of many of these sites are 
poor. For example, a focused approach 

to such monuments on either side of 
the jurisdictional boundary could act as 
a catalyst to help boost rural economies in the border region.

Engaging with the past

There is nothing very startling about 
what has been said above. What I am 
suggesting is that we work with what 
we have – an enormously rich and 
diverse material record documenting 
the human settlement of the island of 
Ireland over the last 10,000 years – to 
provide us with a better sense of the 
value of who we are. Archaeology and 
the built heritage provide us with both 
the challenge and opportunities to 
actively engage with our history through
surveys, excavations, community archaeology and exhibitions to understand and present the past from different perspectives. In relation to important periods or events – whether the Plantations of the 17th century or the multiple events that led to the establishment of the Free State (and ultimately the Republic of Ireland) and Northern Ireland in 1922 (around which so much has been written, analysed and mythologised) – engaging with the direct physical remains provides the chance to understand and commemorate how people created the pasts that we live with today.

Gabriel Cooney, originally from County Louth, is Professor of Celtic Archaeology in the School of Archaeology, University College Dublin. He is the Chairperson of the Historic Monuments Council of Northern Ireland and a member of the Heritage Council in the Republic of Ireland. In 2008 he was Academic Secretary for the 6th World Archaeological Congress held in Dublin with over 1800 participants.
THE NEWRY-DUNDALK ‘TWIN CITY’ REGION: 10 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER ACTION

Although the idea had been proposed earlier, the 2006 Buchanan Report1 was the first attempt to make the case for the creation of a ‘twin city’ region centred on Newry and Dundalk which would be of sufficient critical mass to attract investment, secure economic benefits and become a destination in its own right. While Buchanan had many successors, its recommendations still provide the basic template for the proposal.

The Buchanan Report

Buchanan’s main drawback was the lack of public sector involvement in its commissioning and oversight, something which still bedevils the region to the advantage of the North West (Derry-Donegal), where the need is perceived to be greater and which, accordingly, receives a more intense public policy focus.

Buchanan was conscious of the scale of the challenge and at the outset noted that:

The region suffers from a range of structural problems. It has arguably not benefited from the ‘success’ of the cities at either end of the corridor and is often negatively perceived in terms of its ‘frontier’ status. As transport infrastructure, for example, improves, bringing Belfast and Dublin closer together, the risk for the intervening settlements of Newry and Dundalk is that they will be physically and psychologically bypassed.

The main issues identified by Buchanan were:2

- A negative perception related to the historic ‘frontier status’ of the region;
- Two currencies with a floating exchange rate, the principal barrier to cross-border activity;
- Two VAT regimes and therefore extra administration costs;
- Differing excise duty regimes;
- Distortion effects of differences in corporate and personal taxation;
- Complexity in national insurance
and social security for cross-border employees;
- Problems around the recognition and comparability of qualifications;
- Cross-border variations in wages, taxation, transportation and housing costs;
- Polarised attitudes and mindsets;
- Lack of symmetry in environmental management policy between North and South;
- Mismatch in local authority functions, different areas of responsibility and ways of working;
- Above average overall and long-term unemployment;
- High proportions in dependent age groups;
- Lower proportions in services and corresponding greater dependency on agriculture and manufacturing;
- Over-reliance on the retail industry as a source of employment;
- Below-average graduate education levels.

These weaknesses are common to the whole Irish cross-border region, and some of the more fundamental ones, such as differential taxation and exchange rates, are unlikely to disappear. They stem from the existence of two separate policy regimes which meet at the border. For example, as long as the UK and the Republic have separate exchange rate regimes, the euro-sterling rate will continue to fluctuate, occasionally favouring one side, then the other.

The Buchanan Report concluded with an extensive analysis on ‘what needed to be done’. Its ambitious recommendations included:

- Promote all island policies for industrial development, skills, energy and planning, and maximise inter-agency cooperation and funding;
- A cross-border Economic Development Forum to plan initiatives, compile a common database, brand the ‘twin city’ initiative and focus on ‘quality of life’, telecommunications and waste;
- Get governments to address the currency fluctuation issue and facilitate the use of both currencies in the region;
- Develop a tourism sub-brand for the region;
- Progress the proposed Greencastle to Greenore ferry;
- Address skills deficits via Dundalk Institute of Technology (DKIT) and Newry Institute (NI) programmes and establish mutual recognition of teacher qualifications;
- Scope a cross-border ‘national ‘park’ covering the Mournes, Cooley and the Ring of Gullion;
- Promote administrative co-operation between Louth County Council, Newry and Mourne District Council and Dundalk Town Council.
- Integrate waste collection and disposal.

The ICLRD Report

Whereas the Buchanan Report was essentially a private sector undertaking, the 2009 report of the International Centre for Local and Regional Development (ICLRD) had significant public sector involvement. It was overseen by a steering committee.
chaired by InterTradeIreland and carried out by spatial planners from the ICLRD, University of Ulster and the National Institute for Regional and Spatial Analysis at NUI Maynooth. The steering committee included representatives from various cross-border bodies and government departments, North and South.

The ICLRD Report emphasised that a successful cross-border regional strategy requires the involvement of central government departments in both jurisdictions as well as that of local officials, civic leaders and the private sector, all working in a dynamic partnership to implement an agreed agenda.

The report noted that:

_Evidence clearly indicates that, for a sub-region to attract significant domestic and international investment, it must contain at least one city-region of sufficient size to appeal to the higher-value segments of the business chain. These require access to sizeable pools of suitably qualified workers, adequate_
supporting infrastructure, and good-quality public and commercial services.

Newry and Dundalk needed to think and act regionally if they were to compete in this market place. With urban populations of 28,000 and 35,000 respectively, neither had the critical mass to (separately) compete in the global economy.

The ICLRD proposed four equally ambitious projects:

- A Centre of Excellence to create a sustainable energy community;
- A Newry-Dundalk International Services Zone targeting high value-added internationally traded services including back office functions and HQs;
- Proposals to safeguard the geological assets and natural resources of the Mournes, Cooleys, Slieve Gullion, and Carlingford Lough, and to develop their tourism potential;
- A coordinated regeneration strategy for older areas in Newry and Dundalk.

Progress on these has been mixed. While Newry and Dundalk are each progressing sustainable energy projects – with Dundalk’s Sustainable Energy Zone and 2020 Initiative particular success stories – and some of the lessons learned in Dundalk are being rolled out in test format in Newry, there is little or no government funding in the latter area. Moreover, the proposed international services zone had to be deferred due to the economic crisis. On the ‘geo-park’ tourism initiative, an infrastructure has been established and a successful application for funds to the EU INTERREG programme made. As regards urban regeneration, a Newry Master Plan has been drafted, a Dundalk BIDS company established and the Dundalk Market Square refurbished.

Progress has been made in cross-border co-operation and the Dundalk-Newry region is now an examplar with the signing of the Joint Memorandum of Understanding between Newry and Mourne District Council and Louth Local Authorities in 2011. Louth is also one of the best examples of self-help on the island. It has a long history of innovative initiatives, notably the work of the Louth Economic Forum and the use of development levies to attract investment and create jobs. Over £17 million has been obtained from INTERREG to build a new bridge across Carlingford Lough at Narrow Water. However the more ambitious proposals by Buchanan and the ICLRD, which require major governmental assistance and funding, have taken a back seat.

Moreover, it has taken time to put private sector cooperation in place. Unlike in comparable regions in other parts of Europe – notably those along the German-French, German-Dutch and German-Danish borders – there is no historic tradition of cross-border cooperation in Ireland and each initiative has to be painstakingly assembled.

Though Newry and Dundalk have been divided by the border for less than a century, the folk memory of cross-border co-operation appears to have been lost and its restoration will take time.
A product of the balance of coercion between Britain and nationalist Ireland in 1920, the partition of Ireland installed an erratic and meandering international boundary of 450km, cross-cutting 1,400 agricultural holdings and 180 roads, and bisecting villages and even some individual houses. Ethno-national minorities were left stranded on either side. Over the next 50 years, this improbable boundary was to endure, and was consolidated by the Second World War and the different evolution of both national states.

The Louth Economic Forum dates from 2009 while the Joint Memorandum is even more recent. It is, thus, too early to assess their impact which, in any event, would not be evident in the 2006 census data analysed in the McArdle Report (see below). It will need the results of the 2011 censuses in both jurisdictions, currently being analysed, before a full objective assessment is possible.

Having said that, there are limits to what can be achieved in the absence of greater central government and public sector support. At official level, the results of the St Andrews Agreement review of the cross-border Implementation Bodies and Areas for Co-operation, which were due in 2008, are still awaited. There has also been criticism of the multiplicity and complexity of cross-border bodies, for example the following quote from businessman Tom Noonan, then President of IBEC, in 2010:

The effectiveness of these programmes is compromised by undue fragmentation and overlap, resulting in unnecessary duplication of effort.

If the public sector did not deliver in times of plenty, the prospects of it doing so in the current more austere fiscal circumstances are questionable.

The McArdle Report

Buchanan recommended an ‘economic forum’ to oversee the preparation and maintenance of a comprehensive database of robust, comparable indicators on the status and performance of the key sectors of the cross-border regional economy, while the ICLRD stated that ‘common data sets are needed for collaborative local-level decision-making’.

The difficulty in making cross-border comparisons is highlighted by the discrepancies in the trade statistics, which, on the face of it, should be at the more straightforward and reliable end of the scale. However, an investigation by InterTradeIreland, published in 2009, concluded:

In aggregate, the HMRC (Her Majesty’s Revenue & Customs), DETI (Department of Enterprise and Investment) and CSO (Central Statistics Office) series on cross-border trade bear little resemblance in either absolute level, time profile or growth. In terms of North to South trade, in particular, the series have little in common, suggesting either a stable picture (CSO), steady growth (DETI) or rapid growth (HMRC).”

Beyond the trade data, most of the statistics one would expect are simply
not available. In practice, there has been little or no progress on this basic requirement identified by both Buchanan and ICLRD, and without robust statistics, it has been hard to make a compelling case for a Newry-Dundalk economic zone.

On the ground, however, there was a growing feeling that Dundalk and Newry were not getting their fair share of the ‘fruits of the boom’ and that the fears expressed by Buchanan might be all too true.

Against this background, Louth County Council and Newry and Mourne District Council, in conjunction with their respective Chambers of Commerce, commissioned a further study7, to ‘evaluate and create a compelling report to frame the clear imperatives and policy recommendations necessary to establish a Cross Border Zone that will ensure the Zone enjoys accelerated growth and engineers economic catch-up in a sustainable manner across the border, all to our mutual advantage.’ This was carried out by the author of this article.

The emphasis on the need to accelerate growth and engineer economic catch-up pre-supposed the existence of an inequality or lack of development whose eradication was an objective to be achieved.

The lack of comprehensive traditional-style regional economic statistics forced us to seek other ways of demonstrating this lack of development and, hence, the imperative for ‘catch up’ for the Newry-Dundalk region.

Deprivation in Northern Ireland

Measures of deprivation attempt to capture and summarise the key elements which make life demonstrably better or worse relative to other communities. They have been used in Northern Ireland since the 1970s.

The NI deprivation measures have seven main elements or ‘domains’. These are income, employment, health, education, proximity to services, living environment and crime and disorder. The income score, for example, is the percentage of individuals living in households in receipt of income related benefits and tax credits. These domains are then weighted to arrive at an overall Multiple Deprivation Measure (MDM) for various sub-divisions within Northern Ireland. In practice, there is a very close correlation between the income score and the overall MDM and we relied primarily on the income statistics.

Newry

The income deprivation measure for each electoral ward was weighted by its population to derive a summary measure for deprivation in Newry. The results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 - Newry Income Deprivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>% deprived</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derryleckagh</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>4,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor Hill</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>3,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drumalane</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>3,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Patrick’s</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>3,702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deprivation in Newry was high, as encapsulated by the fact that one-third of the population lived in income-deprived households as compared with an average of 25% for Northern Ireland as a whole.

**Comparison with other NI border towns**

Deprivation was high in all the Northern border towns with the best off, Dungannon, having a score of 25%, just equal to the NI average. Derry and Strabane fared worse than the rest, with deprivation scores in excess of 40% - see Table 2. Newry was one of the most deprived border areas, with only Derry and Strabane recording higher scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Income Deprivation</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Mary's</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>2,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drumgullion</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>3,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derrymore</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>3,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy hill</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>3,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballybot</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>2,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>28,788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: NISRA*

The overall income deprivation score for Newry was 33, implying that 33% of people in Newry live in income-deprived households, as defined above. This average, however, masked a very wide range, from the more affluent Derryleckagh to the relatively deprived Ballybot, where more than half of the people were in receipt of income support from the State.
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Table 2 - Income Deprivation Scores for NI Border Towns and Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Town Deprivation</th>
<th>Region Deprivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dungannon</td>
<td>15,145</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enniskillen</td>
<td>13,615</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armagh</td>
<td>14,595</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omagh</td>
<td>18,985</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newry</td>
<td>28,788</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derry</td>
<td>60,595</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabane</td>
<td>13,965</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NISRA

Deprivation in the Republic of Ireland

Deprivation measures in the Republic of Ireland are based on data from the Censuses of Population (in this case the 2006 Census). Many of the same type of indicators feature except in a different mix. The focus is on three dimensions of affluence/disadvantage:

- Demographic profile
- Social class composition
- Labour market situation.

Dundalk

Table 3 (on page 80) shows that the Relative Index Score for the Dundalk region was minus 3.5. The national scores ranged from minus 60 (most disadvantaged) to plus 30 (most affluent), leaving Dundalk not far from the average, which was zero. However, there was a wide disparity of affluence and disadvantage in the Dundalk region. The RI score for Dundalk Urban No.1 was minus 23.3 while that for Haggardstown (part) was plus 10.5. The former ranked 98th worst while the latter was 3009th worst out of the total of 3409 Electoral Districts in the Republic in terms of their levels of deprivation, i.e. Dundalk includes some of the most advantaged as well as some of the most disadvantaged electoral districts in the Republic.

Table 4 on page 81 shows the same scores and rankings for the smaller Dundalk urban area, a subset of Table 3. As might be expected, the Relative Index Score at minus 6 shows that this was more disadvantaged than the larger Dundalk region. The scores of the urban Electoral Districts are, for the most part, significantly negative and, with one exception (Dundalk Urban No 2), all EDs recorded lower relative scores in 2006 than they did 15 years earlier.

Dundalk Urban also compared poorly with other towns on the Republic of Ireland side of the border – see Table 5. Its relative score in 2006 was minus 6 compared to minus 1.6 for Monaghan, which was the least deprived, and minus 12.7 for Cavan, which was the most deprived. (Interestingly, the deprivation measures in all five border towns had fallen in the 15 years to 2006, indicating that they had deteriorated relative to the national average – with the biggest falls occurring in the North West).

When the analysis was extended to incorporate the rural hinterland as well as the urban centres, Dundalk emerged as the most deprived of 20 'hub' and county towns in the Republic of Ireland. Despite having the sixth largest population, 52,000, it had one of the
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Comparisons with Table 2, which shows the ranking of border towns on the Northern side in terms of deprivation, suggested that both Newry and Dundalk were at or near the bottom of the rankings on their respective sides of the border.

Table 3: Dundalk Region Deprivation scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DUNDALK URBAN NO.1</td>
<td>-23.3</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>-193</td>
<td>-8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNDALK URBAN NO.2</td>
<td>-17.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASTLETOWN (PT.)</td>
<td>-10.4</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
<td>3,939</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNDALK RURAL (PT.)</td>
<td>-9.3</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>15,534</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNDALK URBAN NO.3</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>-126</td>
<td>-8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KILLANNY</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRUMMULLAGH</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNDALK URBAN NO.4</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>6,677</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREGGAN UPPER</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAUGHART</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRONSTOWN</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATHCOR</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUTH</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENORE</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARVER</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASTLERING</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANSFIELDSTOWN</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALLYMASCANLAN</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>2,016</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLINGFORD</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1,384</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JENKINSTOWN</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAVENSDALE</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAGGARDSTOWN (PT.)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>5,864</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNDALK REGION</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>51,758</td>
<td>7,156</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


lowest rates of population increase in the 15 years to 2006.
Gateway Development Index

Under the National Spatial Strategy (NSS) in the Republic of Ireland, the development of a network of nine “Gateways” was identified as key to stimulating growth in their respective regions, while strategically placed ‘Hubs’ were charged with driving development in their catchment areas and supporting the Gateways. A Gateway Development Index (GDI), which includes provision for both quantitative and qualitative indicators, is used to evaluate progress. The methodology used is similar to that of:

Table 4: Dundalk Urban Deprivation scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DUNDALK URBAN NO.1</td>
<td>-23.3</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>-193</td>
<td>-8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNDALK URBAN NO.2</td>
<td>-17.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASTLETOWN (PT.)</td>
<td>-10.4</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
<td>3,939</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNDALK RURAL (PT.)</td>
<td>-9.3</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>15,534</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNDALK URBAN NO.3</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>-126</td>
<td>-8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNDALK URBAN NO.4</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>6,677</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAGGARDSTOWN (PT.)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>5,864</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNDALK URBAN</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>36,762</td>
<td>5,181</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 5: Border Towns Relative Deprivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monaghan Urban</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>7,794</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sligo Urban</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
<td>17,892</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letterkenny Urban</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>-6.9</td>
<td>12,777</td>
<td>3,960</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundalk Urban</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>36,762</td>
<td>5,181</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavan Urban</td>
<td>-12.7</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>3,934</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Haase, T. & Pratsche, J (2008), Op cit, Dublin: Pobal Data by P McArdle
described above, albeit that the areas covered are bigger and their catchment zones are defined somewhat differently.

The results, however, are similar and they are summarised in Table 6. Dundalk emerged at the bottom of the GDI. Perhaps the most startling finding indicated by this table was the very limited changes in relative terms between the 1991 and 2006 censuses. There was little sign of the catch-up on the part of the less developed regions that might have been expected given the large sums of state aid that were expended and the rapid economic growth of the country during this period\textsuperscript{12}.

This experience with regional development in the period up to 2006 is encapsulated in the following quote:

Comparing the Electoral District maps ... shows the limited degree to which the relative position of local areas has changed over the past fifteen years. The worst-affected areas in 1991 were generally in the same position in 2006, despite the unprecedented economic growth experienced by practically all parts of the country. The rising tide seems to have lifted most boats, but this ‘lift’ has tended to conserve the relatively stable differentials that already existed between affluent and poorer areas\textsuperscript{13}.

The GDI score for the Dundalk core zone was 2.1, the lowest score of any Gateway and very significantly below the other two border Gateways, Sligo and Letterkenny. Of the three, only Sligo exceeded the national average GDI of 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gateways</th>
<th>Core (Zone 1)</th>
<th>Catchment (Zone 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core GDI 2006</td>
<td>Change 1991-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galway</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sligo</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letterkenny</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundalk</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fitzpatrick Associates and Trutz Haase, Economic Consultant

Table 6: Gateway Development Indices
This led Fitzpatrick & Associates to conclude that:

*Dundalk is one of the most challenging of the Gateways in terms of its structure and performance as revealed in this preliminary GDI analysis. It is not improving its relative position and is below average on most domains. Its status suggests that as yet it has not fully capitalized on its relatively advantageous location on the Dublin-Belfast corridor*\(^14\).

The greater detail in the GDIs enables us to focus on the factors underlying the experience in the border areas. The scores for the various component domains can be seen in the chart above. In Dundalk, only two domains scored above the national average - transport and health\(^15\) - compared with three in Letterkenny and five in Sligo.

The high Dundalk transport reading reflected short journeys to work, good public transport availability and a high proportion of retail outlets, but low PC/Internet access and limited non-car usage were negatives.

Dundalk scored well below average for environment, knowledge and affluence. The poor environment score reflected the low quality of drinking water and, to a somewhat lesser extent, river water quality. The knowledge score reflected the low proportion of the adult population with third-level qualifications and relatively low numbers of graduates returning to work in Dundalk, while the affluence indicator was based on the Income Deprivation scores outlined above.

Perhaps surprisingly, the weak Dundalk scores on Enterprise contrast with
those of the other two border region Gateways, which recorded above average scores for this domain. In Letterkenny this reflected strong new firm formation and good quality of enterprise as reflected by the share of services in total employment. Similar factors were evident in Sligo, which also benefited from low unemployment.

**Summary of deprivation results**

The deprivation measures indicated that Dundalk and Newry were surprisingly deprived given their location within the Belfast-Dublin Corridor and good transport infrastructure. Given the importance placed on the development of the Corridor for the future of the Island, it is anomalous that the two towns in the middle of it are at the poorest end of the scale. Relatively high levels of deprivation in the strictly urban areas appear to be leading to the more affluent living in the regions around these towns rather than within their urban perimeters.

However, even when comparison is made including their hinterlands, Dundalk remains at the bottom of the ranking of border towns in the Republic, and Newry third from lowest among Northern Ireland’s border towns.

This made a strong case for policies to enable the Dundalk-Newry area to catch up in terms of economic performance. In the Republic of Ireland the urban population is only 60 per cent of the whole compared with 80 per cent in the UK and the US, while a recent study placed Ireland 21st of 23 EU member states examined in terms of urbanisation. The trend towards urbanisation is clear and is likely to intensify over the next decade, which makes it likely that the border regions will lose rather than gain ground. Indeed, this trend is already apparent in the preliminary results of the 2011 Republic of Ireland census – see postscript.

However, the standard statistics used by the EU show a different picture, with significant catch-up reflected in the phasing out of assistance from the Structural Funds. There are a number of reasons for this:

- The EU statistics are generally measured at high aggregate levels and data for individual border towns are not available;
- The traditional measures used by the EU to assess eligibility – GDP and unemployment - are unsatisfactory in that they omit key indicators of deprivation;
- The bar has been raised as poorer countries from Eastern Europe have joined, dragging down the EU average;
- Use of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) instead of Gross National Product (GNP) boosts Republic of Ireland output at the expense of incomes, thereby creating a misleading impression as incomes are generally 20 per cent lower;
- Per capita income and unemployment statistics fail to capture the impact of emigration.

Rising average incomes and the enlargement of the EU has meant that State aid is being gradually phased out in both the Republic of Ireland and
Before the recent recession, it was likely that the next review of the guidelines would see significant further curtailment of EU assistance. This may well still happen, but recent declines in income – RoI national income has fallen by about 20 per cent relative to the EU since 2006 – should be a mitigating factor.

**Cross-border cooperation elsewhere**

A survey by McArdle found a limited number of significant cross-border initiatives around Europe while the Buchanan Report cited only one significant exemplar, the Öresund region linking Denmark and southern Sweden. However, the parallels and implications of this were of limited relevance given the vastly different scale and nature of the operations. The Öresund region has a population of more than 3.5 million and is centered around the longest road and rail bridge in Europe, with a focus on education as an enabler. It has, moreover, a history of interaction several centuries old. The significance of the project is reflected in the EU’s view of Öresund as a European flagship programme. Current traffic volumes and tolls are deemed sufficient to repay the debt raised to build the bridge, which was guaranteed by the two governments, in about 30 years.

Businesses in the region have set up a variety of cross-border associations to promote knowledge and networking activities. A project to integrate urban development and transport infrastructure called IBU (Infrastructure and Urban Development) is exploring how to create a sustainable transportation system. It will also work up a common Öresund regional development strategy. A joint initiative provides practical information on all aspects of moving and commuting, viz. taxes, housing, social security, living costs and education. In addition to an internet site, there is a call centre in Copenhagen and a one-stop information office in Malmö.

The Öresund region is more advanced than other cross-border initiatives in Europe in its management by a high-level steering committee, its fiscal agreements for the bridge project and the cooperation of the region’s higher education institutions.

The Regio TriRhena is located on the Upper Rhine in the heart of Europe, and covers parts of Southern Alsace (France), southern Baden (Germany) and north-west Switzerland. Strong economic interdependence, a pool of skilled labour, excellent transport infrastructure and cluster effects all integrate this overall area.

This region, too, has a long history of cross-border cooperation dating back to the Congress of Vienna in 1815. In 1975 an agreement between the French, German and Swiss governments to formalise cross-border activities came into force.

The regional associations formed a coordination committee that created the Council of the Regio TriRhena in 1995, a 60-member body bringing together representatives of cities, municipalities, economic organisations and universities that meets at least twice a year. Cross-border cooperation in the region is
extensive, involves diverse entities and has a shared vision.

Only Vienna-Bratislava, a relatively recent cross-border initiative, has experimented with jointly attracting multinational companies and investment to the entire Austrian-Slovak area.

Closer to home, the North West Gateway proposal began with an ambition to promote a cross-border industrial park but was subsequently transformed into a Virtual Cross Border Technology Park initiative. The initial intention was that IDA Ireland and Invest Northern Ireland would market, as one, their respective populations, graduates, educational and research institutions, business clusters and combined property solutions in the region. However, the idea of a unified cross-border park was dropped in favour of close cooperation to develop a Virtual Cross Border Technology Park that would link separate business parks in Letterkenny and Derry.

10 recommendations

**Recommendation 1:** Newry-Dundalk should push for a cross-border advisory service modelled on the Öresund example in the Southern Swedish-Danish region [This is already happening to a certain extent virtually through the Border People online cross-border information website www.borderpeople.info]

**Recommendation 2:** A greater focus on the ways in which the EU regional statistics are compiled and their relevance to the smaller less-developed regions is desirable.

**Recommendation 3:** Input to the St Andrews Review Body to seek to counteract the widespread view that the North West Region is the most deprived border area.

**Recommendation 4:** Assess the impact of the efforts to attract inward investment by the joint Vienna-Bratislava region (Austria-Slovakia).

**Recommendation 5:** Review the factors that led to the less ambitious North West Gateway objective of a Virtual Cross Border Technology Park and their significance for Newry-Dundalk.

**Recommendation 6:** Seek formal (cross-border) Gateway status and a public sector initiative similar to that of the North West.

**Recommendation 7:** Make a submission regarding the appropriate indicators to use in the 2013 review of the State Aid guidelines.

**Recommendation 8:** Examine the feasibility of having the joint Newry-Dundalk area recognised as a distinct region and the first cross-border zone for the 2013 State Aid guidelines.

**Recommendation 9:** Review the state of play regarding the recommendations in the ICLRD Report and critically assess the degree of progress achieved.

**Recommendation 10:** Pursuant to the 2011 Memorandum of Understanding
between Newry and Mourne and Louth Councils, prioritise the practical steps that can be undertaken to demonstrate progress on the ground.

Postscript

Since the McArdle report was written, the results of the 2011 Republic of Ireland Census have been published and preliminary updated deprivation data have also become available. They show that Dundalk’s position relative to Letterkenny deteriorated further between 2006 and 2011.

Pat McArdle is a former Chief Economist with Ulster Bank and also worked in the Department of Finance, the EU Commission and NCB Stockbrokers. He currently chairs the IIEA (International Institute of European Affairs) Economists Group, is a member of the Economic and Monetary Affairs Committee of the European Banking Federation and a commentator in the Irish Times and other publications on economic and financial matters. He is a member of the Joint Board of Appeal of the new European Banking Authority and is a director of the Corporate Governance Association of Ireland, RBS Asset Management Dublin and Coutts Multi-Asset Fund. He holds an MA in econometrics and is a Qualified Financial Advisor, a Fellow of the Institute of Bankers and a Member of the Institute of Directors. He holds a Diploma in Corporate Governance from the Smurfit Business School at University College Dublin.
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7. One can speculate as to the origins of the name, Baile Bocht being a likely possibility.
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GALICIA AND NORTH PORTUGAL: FROM CROSS-BORDER SUSPICION TO EUROPREGIODEAL COOPERATION

Celso Cancela Outeda

Galicia, the north-western region of Spain, and the region of North Portugal (see map on page 91) enjoy a common historical and cultural-linguistic heritage. They are neighbouring border territories divided by the River Minho, which in this region is the common frontier between the two states. Until the 1980s the relationship between these two most north-westerly parts of the Iberian peninsular was the traditional one of two peripheral regions divided by a jurisdictional frontier, with all the negative connotations caused by distance from capital cities and poor roads and communications facilities. Galicia is particularly known to Irish people for being the end point of the world-famous pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela.

The first formal contacts between the Galician and Portuguese authorities were aimed at correcting these negative effects. These contacts led to the formation of the Galicia-North of Portugal Working Community in 1991. Later cross-border agreements and entities such as the Eixo Atlantico Atlantic Axis and the Galicia-North of Portugal European Grouping for Territorial Cooperation (GNP-EGTC) emerged from EU programmes.

Despite their relative youthfulness (on the borders of Germany, France and Holland, for example, initiatives of this type began in the 1950s) and beyond the specific, tangible operations involved (e.g. building of bridges and improvement of roads), there is an outstanding intangible heritage associated with this initiative: the creation of a context which has encouraged cooperation amongst the diverse political-administrative and socio-economic actors, thus surpassing the purely cross-border, and acquiring an inter-regional (or euroregional) dimension. This evolution has involved making the most of opportunities (and overcoming challenges) for the development of the two regions, and improving the competitiveness created by European integration (the EU Single Market) and economic globalisation. In short, it is an attempt to create a more
socially and economically attractive territory, thus reducing its peripheral character and promoting its social cohesion.

The development of cross-border cooperation involved the overcoming of political, social and cultural dynamics established over centuries and marked by misunderstanding, distrust and mutual suspicion. The decades since the 1980s have seen a real change in the historical pattern of neighbours’ relations between Galicia and North Portugal. What caused this change? Several factors played a part in the initiation and consolidation of cross-border cooperation along the banks of the River Minho.

Political and legal factors related to the democratisation of the two Iberian states – both dictatorships up to the mid-1970s – were present at the beginning. Importantly, this brought about a reorientation of their respective foreign policies towards the common democratic space and opportunities for socio-economic development presented by the European Community. In terms of bilateral relationships between the two states, these entered a new stage in 1977 with the signing of the Spanish-Portuguese Treaty for Amity and Cooperation. This treaty established the foundations for greater inter-state cooperation, including cross-border initiatives in several sectors (including natural resources and communications). Since 1986 annual Iberian summit meetings have been held between the respective Heads of Government and other ministerial representatives (with the Presidents of the Spanish border region Autonomous Communities, including Galicia, also normally attending these summits).

In 1988 and 1990 respectively, Portugal and Spain ratified the European Outline Convention on Transfrontier Cooperation between Territorial Communities or Authorities (1980). Nevertheless, it was not until 2002 that Spain and Portugal signed the so-called Bilateral Treaty on Cross-border Cooperation between Territorial Entities and Authorities (which entered into force in 2004), which reaffirmed the two states’ political commitment to transfrontier cooperation between regional and local authorities, and helped to clarify the legal framework.

Another key political-administrative factor for starting transfrontier cooperation was, on the one hand, the political decentralisation of the Spanish state, which resulted in the establishment of Autonomous Communities in the various Spanish regions, and, on the other, a local and regional administrative restructuring undertaken in Portugal, which resulted in the strengthening of these administrative levels. As a consequence, new political and institutional players came to the fore who, despite the asymmetry of their powers, were capable of forging coordinated strategies and initiatives. Significant political leaders like Manuel Fraga Iribarne, President of the Galician Regional Government from 1989 to 2005, and Luis Braga da Cruz, President of the Coordination Commission for the Northern Region of Portugal from 1985 to 2001, backed and actively encouraged such cooperation initiatives.
Lastly, the process of European integration has had an influence – through the formation of the Single European Market and specific European Commission initiatives such as the INTERREG programme – on the commencement and evolution of cooperation between Galicia and North Portugal.

Towards a euroregional reality

Nowadays, this political-institutional cooperation is not limited to cross-border questions, but has acquired an inter-regional dimension, a wider ranging aspect that is developing within the framework of the so-called Galicia-North of Portugal Euroregion, with this region seen not as a legal entity but rather as a space for socio-economic inter-relations. Let us take a brief look at this space, examining it from a series of different standpoints.

From a European perspective, the Galicia-North of Portugal Euroregion is a peripheral territory located along the south-west of the continental Atlantic seaboard. It includes the region of Galicia (a NUTS 2 region, with A Coruña, Lugo, Ourense and Pontevedra as NUTS 3 counties within it), and the region of North Portugal (NUTS 2) (with Minho-Lima, Cávado, Alto-Trás-os-Montes, Grande Porto, Ave, Tâmega, Douro and Entre Douro e Vouga as NUTS 3).

The Euroregion covers an area of 50,700 square kilometres, and has 6.3 million inhabitants, with 2.7 million of these living in Galicia and 3.6 million in the North of Portugal. Galicia has an ageing population whilst the North of Portugal has a younger population.

The average population density is 125 inhabitants per square kilometre. There is a marked trend for the concentration of the population near the coast in detriment to inland areas. A factor common to both regions is population dispersion (i.e. the number of population centres is high in number and small in size), which makes it difficult and costly to provide certain public services (e.g. health, education and social services) and modern infrastructure, especially in areas close to the border. However it is worth noting that in comparison to the rest of the Spanish-Portuguese border region, which is practically uninhabited, the population density in Galicia and North Portugal is high.
This high population density leads, for example, to heavy daily cross-border traffic flows: this section of the border accounts for 49% of all heavy goods and car traffic along the entire Spanish-Portuguese frontier. Other factors here are the geographical proximity, easily navigated terrain and cultural affinity and linguistic proximity.

Among the socio-cultural affinities that continue to endure are: a common religiousness; the importance of agriculture and the division of the land into smallholdings; the persistence of subsistence economies in rural areas; the dispersion of the population; the parish as the basic centre of local life, and high emigration.

Pre-Roman roots

These affinities have their roots in the pre-Roman period. The Roman period saw, among other things, the construction of an urban (Braga, Lugo, and Astorga) and road network, plus the introduction of the Latin language, the Christian religion, and political-administrative divisions. During the Roman Empire the north-west of the Iberian peninsula was converted into an administrative entity called Gallaecia, with internal subdivisions (convents) called bracarense, lucense and asturiense: the first two of these approximate to what is currently Galicia and North Portugal.

In the Fifth Century invasions by the barbarian tribes destroyed the Roman organisation of the region. The Swabians settled in the north-west of the Iberian Peninsula, establishing a kingdom whose political-administrative, religious and intellectual centre was the current Portuguese city of Braga. In the year 585 this kingdom was overrun by the Visigoths. Nevertheless, the former Gallaecia maintained a certain degree of political autonomy and complete cultural and linguistic unity throughout the Middle Ages.

This unity was fractured at the end of the 11th Century with the creation of the state of Portugal to the south of the River Minho, effectively breaking with the territory to the north (the current Galicia). From the 12th-13th centuries onwards, today’s political border began to take shape, coinciding with the transfer of political and cultural life to Lisbon as a result of the ‘Reconquest’. Both territories were progressively separated due to their insertion into separate countries with different and rival political trajectories (Leon and Castille versus Portugal). In particular, this distancing occurred as a result of the construction of the rival Castilian and Portuguese monarchies, with their respective overseas empires and, ultimately, their development into nation states.

If we had to identify a date that definitively marked this distancing process, it would be 1640, when Portugal restored its monarchy and recovered its independence. This resulted in the creation of a negative image of Portugal in Galicia which led to much ignorance, distrust and mutual suspicion. In later centuries Portuguese nationalism, characterised by a fierce anti-Spanish sentiment (Spain had attempted to annex Portugal on numerous occasions), and Portugal
and Spain’s alliances with warring European powers, England and France respectively, further reinforced the existing physical, political and mental frontiers.

In 1864 the Spanish-Portuguese frontier was definitively delimited by the signing of the Treaty of Lisbon. It is now an old, pacific and consolidated border (it is Portugal’s only border). It is also worth noting the absence of irredentist political movements in either Galicia or Portugal, despite a common past and the linguistic and cultural links that exist between the two regions.

However in linguistic circles there are many advocates of bringing the Galician language closer into line with Portuguese.

From a European perspective this is a region that is far from the EU’s main economic and financial axes. Both Galicia and North Portugal are Objective 1 regions (with a per capita GDP less than 75% of the EU-25 average) and, as such, are recipients of significant European funds. They have a relatively low level of economic development. This can be seen, amongst other aspects, in the orientation of investment
in cross-border cooperation towards infrastructure, at least during the initial years.

The two regions’ respective economic structures are, generally speaking, complementary in nature. Their commercial exchanges have also led to a high level of regional interdependence: 40% of trade between Spain and Portugal is concentrated along the border between Galicia and North Portugal; an increased degree of economic integration (in 2004-2008 Galicia was the second Spanish Autonomous Community in terms of the amount of Portuguese investment it attracted); and a significant increase in cross-border journeys and social relations. These factors provided sufficient justification for bodies like the Working Community and the Eixo Atlántico to argue the need for certain strategic ‘euroregional’ initiatives before their respective national governments and the European Commission, such as the building of a high-speed rail link between Vigo and Oporto.

We need also to consider the political-organisational diversity of this Euroregion, since this has had a significant bearing on cross-border and inter-regional cooperation. Since 1981 Galicia has been an Autonomous Community with political powers defined by its Statute of Autonomy. It has its own political institutions: a Parliament with legislative powers, a Regional Government and a President with executive powers, and municipal authorities. Its territory is divided internally into provinces (A Coruña, Lugo, Ourense and Pontevedra, with the latter two provinces bordering Portugal) all with their governing bodies (provincial councils), and local municipal councils (315). These entities are all players in transfrontier cooperation.

The North Portugal Region is one of the five administrative regions into which the territory of mainland Portugal is divided. As an administrative region since 1979 it has had a Commission for Regional Coordination and Development – CCDR-N – with powers pertaining to questions of regional macroeconomic coordination and planning, the management of EU funds, and supervision and technical advice for local authorities. Nevertheless it is a decentralised body and is not a legal entity per se, lacking, above all, its own decision-making capacity. Within the region there are eight districts, the metropolitan areas, associations of councils, and 86 municipalities. Here the political-administrative players involved are central government, regional government, and supra-municipal and municipal authorities. The Portuguese municipalities are, in general, larger than their Galician counterparts. From the above we can see that there is an institutional and organisational asymmetry which at times hinders cooperation.

**Institutionalisation of cooperation**

The first meetings between the Galician and Portuguese authorities in the 1980s generated jointly-drafted documents and preparatory studies for specific cross-border initiatives that were presented to the respective governments in Madrid and Lisbon.
Later on it was decided that these initiatives would have to be institutionalised in order to provide continuity and coherence, and to increase their number so as to face the challenges presented by the Single European Market. In 1991 the President of the Galician Regional Government and the Chairman of the North Portuguese CCDR-N signed an agreement to set up the Galicia-North of Portugal Working Community (in the process overcoming resistance from the Madrid and Lisbon governments, who favoured the creation of a single working community for the entire Portuguese-Spanish border region). Unlike other Working Communities, the creation initiative came from the two regional entities, and not from local bodies. This both facilitated its functioning, with decisions taken by consensus by the two members alone, and added political weight with regard to higher level players such as central governments.

The Galicia-North of Portugal Working Community is a forum and not a legal entity, without its own staff and budget, and funding received in equal measure from both partners. It was created in order to help with the development of both regions in the framework of growing inter-regional interdependence and to help improve the situation of both border populations. What does it do? It deals with matters of common interest, promotes information exchange, coordinates initiatives and addresses common problems by means of agreed solutions. In which areas does the community act? It works in a wide range of sectors such as economic development, transport
and communications, agriculture, the environment, natural resources and land planning, fisheries, health and social affairs, local development, regional and local administration, education, training and employment, scientific research and universities, culture, and heritage and tourism.

The Working Community combines both political and technocratic dimensions. Its organic structure is based on a chairmanship held for alternating two year periods, a Board (with equal representation from both regions), a Coordination Committee (consisting of two general coordinators) and a Secretariat. There are also four sectoral committees: Sustainable Development and Planning, Economic Development and Tourism, Innovation and Energy Efficiency, and Civil Responsibility; a specific committee for the local authority-based Eixo Atlantico (see page 98); and Territorial Cooperation Communities, which have a local base and which allow local and provincial authorities to be involved in the management of initiatives and programmes. Lastly, there is a Crossborder Observatory and a Strategic Analysis and Reflection Group.

The Working Community is a milestone in recent history because, for the first time in centuries, both banks of the River Minho have a common forum for debating shared business and promoting coordination, and thus allowing common problems to be addressed, with the use of combined strategies and resources. For example, in 2007 the Working Community passed the 2007-2013 Galicia-North of Portugal Strategic Cooperation Plan, with five main operational objectives: 1. To drive competitiveness and encourage the creation of employment; 2. To protect the natural environment and heritage; 3. Land planning and accessibility; 4. Socio-economic and institutional integration; and 5. technical assistance.

Here is a list of some of the Community’s initiatives up to the present day: transfrontier infrastructures (four new bridges over the River Minho, cross-border roads, motorways and high speed rail links); economic and financial stimulation initiatives (Galicia-North of Portugal Capital Risk Fund, Development Centre, Transfrontier Business Services and Cooperation, Galicia-North of Portugal Statistical Yearbook, Business Atlas); technological research and development (MR innovation, CTAG/CellA, technical development platform for the car sector/new materials for use in cars); social services (renovation of villages for the social reintegration of children); the environment (Gêres-Xurés cross-border park, regeneration of border fluvial watercourses); culture, heritage and tourism (Fortrans, initiatives in border forts); and education, training and employment (cross-border EURES, FPRTRANS, Transfrontier Professional Training for the Unemployed, Euroregional Study Centre). The numerous different projects and programmes in these areas have mainly been funded by INTERREG.

A formal EGTC established

Besides the above initiatives, the Working Community has played a
driving role in the relationships between the Galician and Portuguese authorities, with the aim of promoting cooperation that was initially cross-border, but which is now inter-regional, in nature. In practice, it has established itself as a territorial based lobby which acts jointly in making representations to the authorities in Madrid, Lisbon and Brussels.

In 2008 in Santiago de Compostela a European Territorial Cooperation Agreement was signed between the Galician Government and the CCDR-N in Portugal which resulted in the establishment of the Galicia North of Portugal European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (GNP-EGTC). The objective of this body is to facilitate and encourage territorial cooperation (transfrontier, transnational and inter-regional) among members with the aim of strengthening economic and social cohesion. It is a legal entity with the legal power to act in the respective states. It has its own staff, a joint management team (with the first Chairperson being Portuguese and the first Secretary/Assistant Director Galician), and its own budget, provided in equal shares by the Galician Government and the CCDR-N.

The GNP-EGTC allows us to overcome a range of difficulties which have dogged transfrontier cooperation in our regions, including the lack of a legally established entity which can intervene in relationships with other players. It also provides a joint and flexible vision of daily joint management. In the past all cross-border projects had to be validated by the respective central governments and were carried out and managed in each territory in a separate manner. Now the programmes can be defined, presented to Brussels, and directly managed by the GNP-EGTC, since it is a legal entity with administrative authority, with the power to tender, contract and perform public works, to expropriate land, and to jointly manage facilities and run services. From the time of its creation its tasks have been orientated towards the execution of the 2007-2013 Galicia-North of Portugal Cooperation Plan.

The creation of the GNP-EGTC cooperative instrument marks a ‘before’ and ‘after’ in the history of the relationship between Galicia and North Portugal, which now – for the first time - have a common institution. Two entities coexist in the area of cross-border cooperation since the creation of the GNP-EGTC: the Working Community, which acts as a political body, and the GNP-EGCT, which functions as the effective executor of cooperative projects financed with its own funds or funds gained through applications to EU funding calls. In order to achieve coordination between the two entities, the structure of the GNP-EGTC features a Superior Council representing the Galician Regional Government and the CCDR-N. This acts as the organic link between the GNP-EGTC and the regional Heads of Government.

In addition there is an Assembly (formed by four representatives of the Galician Regional Government and four representatives of the Portuguese CCDR-N). Its powers consist of the annual approval of the programme of activities and budget; the approval of tariffs, levies, taxes and prices; the
imposition of disciplinary sanctions; prior authorisation for the signing of collaboration and cooperation agreements, and prior authorisation for loan and credit operations. Lastly, the organisation is completed with a Director, who is appointed by mutual agreement between the President of the Galician Regional Government and the Chairman of the CCDR-N for a two year period, with the condition that s/he must have a nationality different to that of the Secretary/Assistant Director and the current chairperson.

The taking of decisions and the composition of the bodies has to observe the principles of consensus and equity. Portuguese, Galician and Spanish are the working languages. All the documents generated by the GNP-EGTC have full legal validity in any of these languages, without the need for translation.

It is still somewhat difficult to evaluate the results of the GNP-EGTC. To the initial delay resulting from the slow, involved negotiations between the central governments in Madrid and Lisbon, and the later hold-up in the designation of the governing positions for the EGTC (Chairman, Director and Secretary/Assistant Director), we have to add the impact of the economic and financial crisis that is currently affecting both states.

The main drawback that affects cross-border cooperation in the Galicia-North Portugal region is political-institutional asymmetry. The lack of a proper devolved regional power to the south of the River Minho constitutes one of the most notable obstacles. The CCDR-N is a decentralised body of the central government, which hinders and slows down initiatives because consultations with and decisions from Lisbon are unavoidable. However despite this political asymmetry with respect to the autonomous Galician institutions, the CCDR-N has an excellent understanding of the regional reality, as well as the ability to act as a mobiliser of local and regional players in its territory.

Role of local authorities

The region’s local authorities also intervene in the area of territorial and cross-border cooperation. An example of this is offered by the North-western Peninsular Atlantic Axis or *Eixo Atlántico*. This began in 1992 as a private law association started by a dozen cities in Galicia and North Portugal, without any link to the Working Community. In 2000 a protocol was signed between both entities establishing an institutional link. In particular, a special committee was created in the Working Community to accommodate the association, granting it the status of full member.

This has allowed the two networks to pursue their respective objectives for the consolidation of the inter-regional space, which on many occasions were complementary, whilst avoiding duplication. This means that at present two political-institutional players are operating with a Euroregional vocation: the Working Community and the *Eixo Atlántico*. The latter has progressively increased its membership: the 12 founding cities have now become 34,
almost tripling the number of initial members.

The Eixo Atlántico maintains its own operations in a series of priority areas: infrastructure, transport, urban development, the environment, tourism, sport and culture. Its main objective consists of organising a common territory that allows advances to be made in terms of internal cohesion, favouring inter-regional and cross-border cooperation at a local level and, more generally, contributing to the development of the European urban element and European integration.

In practice, it acts as a transfrontier lobby in relation to public (European, state, regional) and private agents and as a promoter of diverse projects and initiatives. Its presence makes the cooperation in Galicia and North Portugal more than merely cross-border in nature, since it favours an inter-regional or Euroregional approach, while also involving municipal authorities and other urban public actors in a more intense manner, making them more dynamic and bringing them closer to citizens’ needs.
Other initiatives which are territorially limited and strictly cross-border in nature have arisen within the Galicia-North Portugal Euroregion, involving local authorities. The Unimiño Project has been underway since 2005. It is a result of a collaboration agreement between two supra-municipal entities: the Inter-municipal Community of Vale do Minho (integrating 5 Portuguese municipalities) and the Provincial Council of Pontevedra (involving 16 Galician municipalities). It covers a total of 21 Galician and Portuguese towns along the final stretch of the River Minho with a population of 190,000 inhabitants and extending over an area of 1900 square kilometres.

Its objectives are the promotion of cooperation and the establishment of initiatives among the municipalities in order to carry out public works, manage common services, and develop projects for submission to European and national calls for tenders. Although the potential areas of operation are numerous (farming and fishing, economic development, the environment, natural resources and land planning, public services, the joint use and protection of the River Minho), in practice efforts have centred on projects related to collective public transport and the provision of transfrontier public services.

Another example of cross-border cooperation is the Verín-Chaves Eurotown. This is a project sponsored by the Eixo Atlántico which began in 2007 and involves the Galician town of Verín (15,000 inhabitants) and the Portuguese town of Chaves (45,000 inhabitants). Geographically, it is located in an inland area of the Euroregion, on the so-called raia seca zone, typified by low economic activity and a reduced population density. It is an attempt to share services and carry out common projects in the areas of tourism, health, education, transport, the environment and culture.

More specifically, it aims to provide common resources through the joint management of services and facilities in both municipalities, thus avoiding unnecessary and expensive duplication. Its specific initiatives include the implementation of the ‘Eurocitizen Card’, which allows the use of social, sporting, recreational and cultural facilities and services under identical conditions for the residents of both municipalities. It tries to promote exchanges between the populations of both towns, while increasing the overall number and diversity of services on offer. This initiative inspired the creation in February 2012 of a second Eurotown in Tui-Valença, located on the banks of the River Minho and the most important crossing point along the whole length of the Spanish-Portuguese border.

Although in this article we have mainly focused on initiatives promoted by public entities, we could also mention other examples that involve civil society actors, such as business associations, trade unions and non-governmental organisations.

**Conclusion**

The cooperation that has been developed in the Galicia-North Portugal Euroregion has been the result of initiatives by public institutions, initially...
at a regional level. After this, local level players began to participate with diverse objectives and initiatives, thus helping further to promote that cooperation. Civil society actors are also now involved.

The development of cross-border and inter-regional cooperation involving this range of actors has undoubtedly helped generate a discourse that perceives such cooperation in a positive light, as an instrument for overcoming mutual disadvantage, presenting the Euroregion as a territorial space capable of generating opportunities in the context of a growing competitiveness resulting from globalisation and European integration. The feeling that there exist strategic, converging or shared interests that require coordination in sectors such as transport, the environment, natural resources, research and land planning has progressively taken hold. Specific joint operations exist and are, of course, of great importance, but we should not overlook what has been achieved in the terrain of perceptions, ideas and discourses: the intangible heritage of cooperation.

Nevertheless, at the present time, cooperation between Galicia and North Portugal faces a number of challenges. On the one hand it has to move on from initiatives related to physical infrastructures, in order to explore second generation cooperation such as in public services and Research, Development and Innovation in line with EU guidelines; on the other hand, cooperation has to adapt and survive in a harsher environment dictated by the current economic-financial crisis.

Celso Cancela Outeda is a Lecturer in Political Science and Public Administration at the University of Vigo. He holds a doctorate in law. He is the author of the Jean Monnet Module ‘The European Union towards the political union: A federal and constitutional perspective’ (2011). He has carried out research into the process of European integration and territorial cooperation in the Galicia-North Portugal Euroregion. He is the author of several publications on territorial cooperation in the Galicia-North Portugal Euroregion.
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NORTH-SOUTH COOPERATION BETWEEN CIVIL SOCIETY BODIES: STILL DISAPPOINTINGLY UNDER-DEVELOPED

Andy Pollak

In February 2012 two significant independent reports were published on the current state of the ‘peace process’ in Northern Ireland: the Northern Ireland Peace Monitoring Report by Paul Nolan and Progressing Good Relations and Reconciliation in Post-Agreement Northern Ireland by Grainne Kelly. These reports were published under the auspices of two highly reputable community and research-based organisations, the first by the NI Community Relations Council and the second by the University of Ulster’s conflict resolution research centre INCORE.

It is extraordinary how little mention there is of North-South1 or cross-border cooperation in either of these well-received reports. The Nolan report has a little over a page (out of 183) on ‘the workings of the North South Ministerial Council’, in which it mentions that the Centre for Cross Border Studies, one of a range of third sector bodies set up to develop ‘mutual understanding between the two jurisdictions’, had put together a database showing ‘5,000 organisations actively pursuing cross-border activities’. There is no further comment on this striking evidence of a rich network of connections between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland.2

The Kelly report has even less mention of North-South or cross-border cooperation. A word search found no matches for the phrases ‘cross-border’ or ‘Republic of Ireland’. The Irish government was cited only for its role as a funding source. In the lengthy literature review and bibliography there was no mention, for example, of the more than 100 research reports on all aspects of North-South and cross-border cooperation published by the Centre for Cross Border Studies and its associated bodies since 2001.

One of the sections in the Kelly report is on ‘successes to date’ in the implementation of the peace process in Northern Ireland. There was no mention of any North-South success stories here. In this foundational ‘strand’ of the 1998 Good Friday/Belfast Agreement
successes could have included the following: the regular meetings and harmonious cross-border relationships built up between politicians and civil servants through the North South Ministerial Council and the seven North/South bodies; frequent statements by the NI First Minister Peter Robinson that relations with the Republic of Ireland have never been better; the continuous growth of cross-border business and trade until the onset of the international financial crisis and its particularly heavy impact on the Republic of Ireland in 2008; the security threat from republican dissident groups largely held in check by excellent cooperation between the two police forces; and the accessing of hundreds of millions of euro in EU funding by thousands of cross-border community and voluntary groups, particularly in the border region, where such funding has seen a remarkable blossoming of that hitherto very underdeveloped sector (particularly on the Southern side of the border).

What does this striking absence of any significant mention of the very considerable work on the cross-border dimension of the peace process tell us about North-South relationships and connections 15 years after the signing of the Belfast Agreement? And what does it tell us about North-South connections between ‘civil society’ bodies in general and community and voluntary organisations in particular? Those are the questions this article, in a provisional way, will try to answer.

Since it is based on research carried out for the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust, the article will try to do it in the context of the five priorities of the Rowntree Trust’s 2011-2016 funding programme for Northern Ireland: strengthening ‘new politics’; fostering a culture of human rights, equality and civil liberties; encouraging and enabling marginalised groups to play a full part in the political process and in civil society; dealing with the past; and strengthening civil society. The Rowntree research was based largely on interviews with around 60 politicians, community and voluntary sector leaders, community activists, women, student and youth leaders, lawyers, social researchers, peace workers and young people in both jurisdictions between January and April 2012.

A quiet success story

Practical North-South cooperation in the decade from the Belfast/Good Friday Agreement in 1998 to the international financial crisis in 2008 between a wide range of social, educational, community, and economic development groups is generally seen as one of the quiet success stories of the Northern Irish peace process. The major factor in this success was the largesse of EU funding programmes like PEACE and INTERREG.

As the former editor of the *Irish Times*, Conor Brady, observed in 2005: ‘Right across public life – in public services, in business, in NGOs, in voluntary organisations – the deadly, deafening silences and the stopped-up channels of communication have been replaced by dialogue, cooperation and a realisation that everybody gains, and nobody loses, when people and organisations work
together...Now teachers from the two parts of Ireland can work in each others’ jurisdictions. Nurses and health workers have mutually-recognised credentials. Social workers can move from one jurisdiction to another. Business people are trading, investing and developing without regard to the lines on the map. From this year on, PSNI and Garda will be able to work on secondment in each other’s service.¹³

A more critical view came from the respected social commentator, Brian Harvey in 2010. He said that the governments in Dublin and Belfast had focused their efforts mainly on economic cooperation between the two jurisdictions, largely to the exclusion of the kind of ‘people to people’ cooperation that is the norm in many European cross-border regions (particularly between Germany, Belgium and the Netherlands). He paid tribute to the EU’s PEACE and INTERREG programmes for being ‘the crucial catalyst for the regeneration of the border region generally, and for community development and cross-border cooperation by voluntary and community organisations in particular.’⁴

However he said that the most recent PEACE III and INTERREG IV programmes (2007-2013) were ‘governmentalised, with a diminished role for voluntary and community organisations, the bulk of funding being channelled through government bodies and especially local government.’⁵ He believed the lack of government strategies to support cross-border cooperation by civil society organisations – with many in the sector believing
that so long as European funding was there, the two governments were happy without such a strategy – represented ‘an extraordinary example of a lost opportunity...The border region of the island provided an unusual example in Europe of an intense level of community development in a border region coming out of conflict, one where the Irish experience could be most useful to other countries.’

There are some real success stories of cross-border ‘people to people’ cooperation in the Irish border region in particular. Examples include the Diversity Challenges initiative (led by former Alliance politician and South Armagh farmer Will Glendinning), which brings together former security force members on both sides of the border; collects the ‘Troubles’ stories of loyalists, republicans and ex-security force members, and works to bring republican dissidents into the political process; the County Monaghan Community Network, a group which brings local people in that county together with republicans in south Armagh and members of the Orange Order in north Armagh for joint social, cultural and educational activities; a series of initiatives led by a parish priest in Truagh in north Monaghan and his local development association (see page 114), who have organised an astonishing range of cross-border and cross-community activities bringing people of every religious and political persuasion together for nearly 20 years in this largely forgotten rural area; remarkable groups of women in Newry and Dundalk and Derry and Letterkenny who have worked together against domestic violence; and ordinary small communities in practically every border county who have reached out into the unknown to link up with people from diametrically opposed political viewpoints and cultural and religious traditions for the sake of mutual understanding and reconciliation. The majority of such projects were largely sustained by EU PEACE programme funding which has now largely ended.

**Behind business, education and health**

Three of the sectors which have seen very significant levels of cross-border cooperation since 1998 are business, health and education, and this has been reflected in numerous articles in this journal since 2006. However it is striking that the community and voluntary sector largely failed to follow the North-South cooperation path laid down by these sectors. During the ‘good years’ of generous EU and Irish government ‘Celtic Tiger’ funding from 1998 to 2008, there was relatively little significant cross-border exchange and cooperation between larger nationwide or province-wide community and voluntary organisations in the two Irish jurisdictions.

The reasons given for this by spokespersons for the sector are various: the different structures North and South, with the former following the UK model of an overseeing ‘umbrella’ organisation representing the sector (NICVA) for its dealings with government, while in the Republic the various bodies worked with government through the community ‘pillar’ of institutionalised ‘social partnership’ arrangements;
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the fact that community and voluntary groups in the separate jurisdictions in the post Belfast Agreement period were generously funded by their own governments and therefore were not motivated to look across the border; and the failure to set up a North/South Consultative Forum to bring civil society organisations together on an all-island basis, as promised in both the 1998 Belfast Agreement and the follow-up 2006 St Andrews Agreement. This researcher does not find these reasons entirely convincing, believing that a fourth key factor is the continuing deep disconnect between the two societies which is one of the themes of this article.

BUILDING ‘NEW POLITICS’

This was one area which provoked enthusiastic answers from many interviewees, although it was striking how different the contexts – and therefore the opinions – were in the two jurisdictions. In Northern Ireland, the debate is largely about a ‘shared future’ between the two communities. In the words of Senator Martin McAleese, who has worked tirelessly ‘behind the scenes’ to persuade Northern Protestants and unionists (and particularly former loyalist paramilitary leaders) that the Republic is no longer a threat to their identity – the next and vital task of reconciliation in the North is to forge ‘One Community with two traditions.’

This is not a viewpoint shared by the DUP and Sinn Fein, who in 2010 rejected the British Government’s Shared Future policy proposals in favour of a deeply flawed Northern Ireland Executive policy paper called Cohesion, Sharing and Integration. This proposed to drop the Direct Rule goal of ‘reconciliation’ in favour of ‘mutual accommodation’ between ‘cultures and communities’, with the result is that there would be no agreed framework to address Northern Ireland’s enduring central problem of sectarianism. At time of writing this paper had been out for consultation for nearly three years! In July 2012 the Northern Ireland Secretary, Owen Paterson, said it was ‘profoundly disappointing’ that a concrete policy in this vital area was still not forthcoming from the Executive.

However the ‘shared future’ concept continues to strike a chord in working-class communities, both Catholic and Protestant. As John Loughran, an impressive younger North Belfast community worker from a republican background, put it: ‘At the heart of the Northern state is the duality of unionists and nationalists. We need to internalise that, and we need a new more affirmative and positive language to do it, one that is not reflected in the local media. Loyalism is demonised and vilified – how can you build peace with partners when you are constantly demonising them?’ He went on to cite the example of a prominent loyalist community leader who he described as ‘politically British and culturally Irish – republicans have to acknowledge that, and that he’s not some kind of misguided Irishman.’

Loughran is looking for a new dialogue that is ‘something transformative – we’re rather bereft of ideas here at the moment.’ He noted that although
the next 10-15 years would continue to see ‘a high level of collaboration between unionists and republicans, we’re not focused on a wider “change in Ireland” debate, a nation-building debate, and we need to create the space where civil society organisations can have this debate.’ He said ‘all-Ireland governance is romanticism in the current environment’; ‘the Good Friday Agreement is where it’s at’ and there was a need to ‘create a space for a new North-South-East-West debate’ on these fundamental issues.

Liam Maskey, Loughran’s boss at Intercomm, which works for reconciliation between the divided communities of North Belfast, is recognised as one of Northern Ireland’s outstanding cross-community leaders. He believes that NI’s nationalists and unionists have more in common with each other than with, respectively, nationalists in the Republic of Ireland or people in Britain. ‘We are realising that, regardless of our constitutional differences, we have no natural partners outside our Protestant and Catholic neighbours.’

Billy Hutchinson, a community leader in the loyalist Mount Vernon area, former UVF prisoner and leader of the small left-of-centre Progressive Unionist Party, originally formed by UVF ex-prisoners) is similarly advanced in his thinking. He believes people in Northern Ireland, including his own people, need ‘a broader perspective that brings in the Irish Republic too. We have to recognise that the Irish Republic has a very special relationship with Northern Ireland. It’s not just a foreign state. We were brothers in a previous time. Partition was like a split in a marriage: one brother went with the father and one brother went with the mother. We need to recognise that the Republic is not a priest-ridden or an IRA-ridden state. We have to get beyond that. There is a different political dispensation in the Republic now and it’s not to our disadvantage. It’s all about building a good working relationship with the Republic.’

Community, womens and youth views

Many leaders of the community sector also believe the time is right for a new public debate about the state of society in Northern Ireland. A leading Derry-based woman community leader felt that women’s voices – so strong in the 1990s, culminating in the contribution of the Women’s Coalition to the Belfast Agreement and the early years of the
Northern Ireland Assembly – had been stilled (and quoted Hillary Clinton saying the same thing). A North Belfast loyalist leader said it would be a good time to re-run the 1992-93 Opsahl Commission, the independent inquiry which canvassed the views of the people of Northern Ireland (and others) at a time of political deadlock and continuing violence.

However whether such diverse strands as national identity, sectarianism, poverty and unemployment, womens and young people's issues can be woven together into a meaningful all-Ireland debate is another matter. This researcher had a strong sense of two completely different political debates going on in the two Irish jurisdictions. Niall Crowley, former head of the Equality Authority in the Republic, and a long-time campaigner on issues to do with equality and poverty, was struck by this when he addressed a meeting of community activists in Derry in early 2012. The Northerners were completely focused on lobbying the power-sharing politicians at Stormont – a relatively new experience for them after over 30 years of Direct Rule from London. This contrasted with the radical post-austerity, post-lobbying thinking about ‘new politics’ developing (particularly through the group ‘Claiming our Future’ with which Crowley is associated) in the Republic of Ireland (see three points below). “They are going through what we went through in the 1980s. The problem is that such an emphasis on lobbying keeps the focus on influencing politicians rather than bringing along our own communities and people more generally, and persuading them of the core values of equality, justice, environmental sustainability and participative democracy”, he said.

Crowley would like to see what he calls a North-South ‘ferment of ideas’ event addressing the following three issues:

- What is the future role and function of the community and voluntary sectors, North and South;
- What kind of politics do we want to come out of this period of recession and austerity that will lead to a just, equal, participative and environmentally sustainable society;
- What kind of economic model will underpin such a society: we know that the current model has failed but we don’t yet know what the new model will look like.

He believes that there is a common conversation to be had in both Irish jurisdictions around these fundamental questions, although until Northern Ireland feels the full force of UK austerity measures, which it has largely been protected from to date, it is unlikely that Northern community and voluntary leaders will see the need for such a conversation. He also understands that the immediate reaction of a sector which has been hit by government funding cutbacks of more than 30% in the Republic is to ‘turn in on itself and go back to what it knows best’. Survival at such a time means being quiet and cautious: organisations are trapped into this agenda of survival by the predominance of their role as service providers.

Crowley warned that the community and voluntary sector in the Republic
of Ireland had failed the sell the value of equality to the public, and so they did not vote for it in the 2011 general election and did not protest in any real sense when it ‘went out of the window’ under successive Irish governments’ harsh austerity policies. As establishment politicians – including Labour politicians in the Republic – reached a consensus on the necessity for austerity, the sector had no alternative to offer. He wondered what would happen when a similar right-left (i.e. DUP-Sinn Fein) coalition in Northern Ireland had to face up to austerity and cutbacks, as inevitably it will.

HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

Having been an area of great promise after the Belfast Agreement, progress in human rights and equality in both parts of Ireland has been disappointing in recent years. It started so well. The 1998 Agreement laid down that the Republic of Ireland should introduce measures to ‘ensure at least an equivalent level of protection of human rights as will pertain in Northern Ireland.’ As Michael Farrell, senior solicitor at the Free Legal Aid Centre in Dublin and a former civil rights leader in Northern Ireland, wrote in 2011: ‘This amounted to a vision and an ideal of a society throughout the island that would be based on a culture of human rights, with laws and institutions to deliver those rights...the requirement for equivalence of rights was based on the idea of a symmetry of rights protections, North and South, to demonstrate that the Republic was fully committed to the ideals of equality, fairness, respect and due process that it
was advocating for Northern Ireland.’

Among other things, the Republic promised to consider incorporation of the European Convention on Human Rights into its domestic law; to establish a Human Rights Commission (alongside and similar to the NI Human Rights Commission); to bring in enhanced employment equality and equal status legislation; and to initiate a ‘wide-ranging review’ of draconian security legislation (the Offences Against the State Act) brought in during the Second World War and used for the previous 30 years largely to combat the Provisional IRA and other paramilitary groups.

A Joint Committee of the Irish and Northern Irish Human Rights Commissions would also be set up as ‘a forum for consideration of human rights issues in the island of Ireland.’ This Joint Committee was tasked with considering the establishment of ‘a charter...reflecting and endorsing agreed measures for the protection of the fundamental rights of everyone living on the island of Ireland.’

However Farrell said that ‘successive Irish governments showed little enough enthusiasm about delivering what they had pledged.’ While the NI Human Rights Commission was set up promptly, the Republic’s equivalent took three years to establish, and there was an immediate row when the government rejected the recommendations of its own selection committee on its membership. He said that the Joint Committee had ‘never really taken off’, largely because with both Commissions regularly underfunded, they could not spare the money or the staff to make the Joint Committee a serious undertaking. The proposed all-island Charter of Rights ‘which could have provided a blueprint for realising an all-island zone of human rights, has withered on the vine, a victim of the delays and obstacles put in the way of the Bill of Rights for Northern Ireland – mainly caused by successive British governments’ insistence on a Bill of Rights and Responsibilities for the UK as a whole – and the chronic lack of funding of the two Commissions.’

However, as Brian Gormally of the Committee for the Administration of Justice in Belfast points out, there would always be a fundamental problem, if such a charter was going to be more than just a declaration of principles, because it would not be ‘justiciable’ (i.e. capable of being determined by a court of law) under the different legal jurisdictions of the UK (with a system based on common law and parliamentary sovereignty) and the Republic of Ireland, with its written constitution.

The European Convention on Human Rights was not incorporated into Irish law until 2004, six years after the Belfast Agreement. By then Ireland was the only Council of Europe member state not to have incorporated the Convention.

In 2009, as the Irish and international financial crisis began to bite, the Irish Human Rights Commission’s budget was cut by 32%. In autumn 2012 the government advertised for a Chief Commissioner to oversee the merger of
the Human Rights Commission with the Equality Authority.

**Equality implementation**

Progress on the equality front in the Republic had been more substantial. New and wide-ranging equality legislation was brought in promptly and a new and powerful Equality Authority set up. However a major weakness compared with the Northern Ireland legislation was that there was – and still is – no equivalent of the Section 75 ‘positive duty’ on public authorities to promote equality of opportunity (and good relations) between people of different religious beliefs, political opinions, racial groups, sexual orientation, disability and four other characteristics.

Under an activist director, Niall Crowley, the North-South dimension of equality was taken very seriously in the early years of the century. The boards of the Equality Authority and the Equality Commission for Northern Ireland (which was under the leadership of an equally committed chief executive, Evelyn Collins) met every year to plan a programme of joint work. One of the rationales for their close relationship, quite apart from the implementation of the Belfast Agreement, was that they were the first two integrated equality bodies in Europe dealing with a wide range of equality grounds under the same roof.

Among the particular milestones in their joint work was a 2000 report on the benefits of such a multi-grounds equality agenda, which set the framework for much of the two agencies’ work in future years. A second report in 2005 – *Equivalence in Promoting Equality* – greatly annoyed the Irish government by pointing out that the implementation of equality measures was much stronger and more focused in the North than the South, and that there were failures of equivalence. Both organisations found such joint work and exchanges of practice a good learning experience. ‘When you create a space outside both jurisdictions, it frees people up so that they will do things they might not do within their own jurisdiction,’ says Crowley.

However in 2009, the crisis-hit Irish government slashed the Equality Authority’s budget by 43%. Crowley, also facing a new board which he feared would undermine the body’s independence from government, resigned.

Other human rights efforts also suffered. A National Action Plan against Racism was not renewed and both the Combat Poverty Agency and the National Consultative Committee on Racism and Inter-Culturalism were disbanded. Coincidentally both these bodies had been headed by Northerners who had overseen significant cross-border EU funding allocations and research work.

There is currently relatively little North-South joint work in the areas of human rights, equality and civil liberties. Most of what does happen is funded by the US charity, Atlantic Philanthropies, for whom human rights is a priority area. Thus AP provides generous funding to the Free Legal Advice Centres (75% of FLAC’s
total funding) and the Irish Council for Civil Liberties in Dublin (which has provided it with a bigger budget than the government’s Irish Human Rights Commission) and the Committee for the Administration of Justice in Belfast. Specific projects it has funded are cross-border conferences between the parallel Public Interest Law Alliance (RoI) and Public Interest Litigation Support project (NI), which encourage ‘pro bono’ work by lawyers (mainly in the South) and use of public interest litigation which has significance for more than the individual complainant (mainly in the North).

ENABLING MARGINALISED GROUPS TO PLAY A FULL PART IN THE POLITICAL PROCESS AND CIVIL SOCIETY

It was surprising to this researcher that he was able to uncover relatively little major North-South work aimed at encouraging and enabling marginalised groups to play a full part in the political process and civil society, outside the large number of mainly small projects funded by the EU PEACE programme, many of them in the immediate cross-border region.

It should be said first that there have been well over 23,000 cross-community and cross-border projects funded by the EU PEACE and INTERREG programmes (with over £2.2 billion), many of them aimed at bringing marginalised groups into mainstream society in Northern Ireland and the Southern border region (the ‘eligible area’ for this European funding). Hundreds of these have been cross-border. In a 2008 study – *Audit of Community Development in the Border Region* – the social researcher Brian Harvey found that the among the sample of these groups he talked to ‘most described themselves as working generically with local communities, disadvantaged and socially excluded people. Specifically the main target groups were, in descending order, young people, older people and unemployed people.

When he focussed on case studies of 20 of these projects, he found that they covered such diverse fields as ex-prisoners, generic community development, mental health, victims of the ‘Troubles’, peacebuilding and reconciliation, local development, the arts, second chance education, Travellers and the built environment. As can be seen from this list, EU funding went to many marginalised groups. Particularly in the early phases of the PEACE programme, the emphasis in project selection was on ‘bottom up’ initiatives and marginalised groups in the border region, although this emphasis moved more to larger organisations and local authorities in later years.

Work in marginalised and disadvantaged communities in the Irish border region continues, with or without EU funding, but it is at a much lower level than in previous years when generous funding was available from various sources. A good example of the kind of longstanding project that existed before EU funding and continues after it is the work of the Truagh Development Association, led by local parish priest Rev Sean Nolan, in a remote area of north Monaghan. This group began its contacts with the mainly unionist
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Aughnacloy Development Association, just across the border in south Tyrone, in the early 1990s; was funded for a range of ‘people to people’ projects in education, community development and peacebuilding by the EU PEACE programme from the mid-1990s until 2010; and is now back doing that work largely relying on its own very limited resources.

**Herculean efforts of individual community leaders**

Such work is often driven, in Brian Harvey’s words, by the herculean efforts of individual community leaders, modest people who have ‘a vision and a passion for cross-border work and cross-border development and who are prepared to commit considerable time and energy to such ventures, some a lifetime. These are not misty-eyed visionaries, but people with a hands-on appreciation of the practical difficulties of bridging gaps and differences.’

An example one of these individual community leaders in a Protestant area is George Newell, a youth worker in East Belfast. He has been bringing young working-class Protestants across the border for music, drama, sport and debates since the mid-1990s. He too received EU and Belfast City Council funding for a period but now continues to work part-time with young people on the Lower Newtownards Road-Short Strand interface with little or no regular funding, and no longer has the resources to bring them across the border. This interface area was the main flashpoint during the riots over the Union flag in December 2012 and January 2013.

As the EU and other money runs out, and the governments and established agencies lose interest in cross-border cooperation, it will increasingly be left to these often isolated people to continue this painstaking and unglamorous peacebuilding work.

Outside local projects, one of the few recent broader cross-border community-based projects discovered by this researcher was a 2010 all-island Traveller Health Study which was carried out for the Irish Department of Health by University College Dublin researchers. This well-received study took a ‘social determinants’ approach to the continuing poor health and life expectancy of the Irish Travelling community, which is probably the most deprived social group on the island (and one that tends to ignore borders in its movement between different places for life and work). The Pavee Point Travellers Centre in Dublin has also worked with the Romanian Roma community in both jurisdictions. Pavee Point director Ronnie Fay believes there is real scope for an all-island independent Traveller movement and support infrastructure.

Another significant North-South project is the all-island Gay Health Network, which brings together the Rainbow Project (the main gay and lesbian organisation in the North), GLEN (the Gay and Lesbian Equality Network, the main such organisation in the Republic), the HIV charities and the public health organisations in both jurisdictions. For the past seven years this network has run joint campaigns about HIV, sexually transmitted diseases and condom use.
Few examples of cooperation between larger organisations

It is striking that alongside the many examples of ‘grass roots’ cross-border projects led by local community leaders, there are disappointingly few examples of larger community and voluntary sector organisations (i.e. those based in Belfast and Dublin and covering the two jurisdictions with significant staff and resources) working together across the Irish border for the benefit of the people they represent.

In the South, leading commentators on the sector such as Brian Harvey, Niall Crowley and Mary Higgins point to the devastating impact of post-2008 government cutbacks on voluntary and community organisations. This, however, does not explain why there was so little significant exchange and joint work in the years of plentiful resources from 1998 to 2008 between key bodies like NICVA and the Community Foundation for NI in the North, and The Wheel and Social Justice Ireland in the South. In recent years there has been some joint work between between the Womens Resource and Development Agency (NI) and the National Women’s Council (mainly RoI) on implementing UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on the impact of armed conflict on women and women’s contribution to conflict resolution and peace-building; and on the Hannah’s House project, which has run a series of seminars throughout Ireland on a range of issues to do with women in conflict, gender-based violence and women’s role in peacebuilding.

One reason given for the relatively low level of North-South cooperation in the NGO sector is the absence of any kind of North-South consultative structure, such as the promised North South Consultative Forum (and the failure of its Northern Ireland equivalent, the Civic Forum). The almost exclusive focus on their respective government funders in Dublin and Belfast – so that North-South cooperation was always seen as an ‘added extra’, a kind of worthy but not essential luxury – is another.

Brian Gormally of the Committee on the Administration of Justice in Belfast says there are lots of obvious reasons for engaging in North-South cooperation: a small English-speaking island with high levels of cross-border movement; many
people in both jurisdictions regarding it as a single entity, and the belief that ‘it must be in everybody’s interests for there to be a common area of rights on the island.’ However, he goes on: ‘It doesn’t happen automatically. You’ve got to find out what’s going on in the other jurisdiction to know whether it would be valuable engaging with it through all-Ireland cooperation. It’s a ‘chicken and egg’ situation: you don’t know what the benefits are going to be until you start it, but you’ve got to have a reason to start it in the first place. It would be nice to do it, but that’s about all.’

It is this researcher’s conclusion that that there were no influential and forceful individual leaders in the community and voluntary pushing for more North-South cooperation, unlike in other sectors: there was nobody like Sir George Quigley of the CBI and Liam Connellan of IBEC in business; Martin McAleese working behind the scenes with the loyalist paramilitaries; Tom Daly of Cooperation and Working Together (CAWT) in health; and Professor John Coolahan of National University of Ireland Maynooth and the Standing Conference on Teacher Education North and South (SCoTENS) in education.

DEALING WITH THE PAST

A North-South dimension to dealing with the past of the Northern Ireland ‘Troubles’ was not something that came out strongly from this researcher’s interviews. In the South there is a weariness with the Northern situation at a time when the Republic has to deal with deep financial and economic problems, a relief that the conflict is over and a reluctance to revisit the difficult recent memories of those 30 years. These factors contribute to a wide gulf in perceptions, interest and understanding between the two jurisdictions.

The main cross-border initiative this researcher found in this area was some EU PEACE funded work by the Belfast-based group Healing through Remembering, notably in collaboration with ‘The Peace Process: Layers of Meaning’ oral history project (itself generously funded by the PEACE programme and led by Queen Mary College, London University with Trinity College Dublin and Dundalk Institute of Technology), which collects and archives a wide range of interviews with participants in the NI peace process.

The issue of dealing with the recent past which is still so live in Northern Ireland is rarely discussed in the Republic. A Southerner who has held senior public positions in both jurisdictions says that people in the Republic are ‘utterly happy with its 26 county shape: their mental map is the 26 counties...When there was active violence in the North, and people saw the Northern conflict on the television every night, their consciousness was more elevated. Now there is no longer a constituency of the concerned in the South.’

A decade of centenaries

Interestingly many people interviewed by this researcher (although fewer among young people) were happier to talk about dealing with the more distant past of what is known as the ‘decade of centenaries’: those mould-breaking events between 1912 and 1922 which
led to the formation of the two separate states on the island of Ireland.

For some people, commemorating this decade of highly sensitive centenaries – with its huge potential for reawakening ancient enmities and divisions – is the next challenge to the Northern Ireland peace process. In the words of one senior Dublin figure who is working in this area: 'The next 10 years are a test of the peace process and they are a test we could fail.'

The challenge here is to involve ordinary people – especially those from conflicted areas of Northern Ireland, the so-called ‘hard to reach’ communities (which is sometimes shorthand for deprived loyalist communities) – in these commemorations in some way so that they can make a real contribution to mutual understanding between unionist and nationalist, North and South. A Belfast group of ex-paramilitary leaders, local politicians and historians is examining how this might be done, emphasising that it can be another valuable step towards creating ‘one community with two traditions’ in Northern Ireland.

'We will be able to add value to the peace process in the second decade of the 21st century through consolidating it by discovering a shared history that we thought we didn’t have. We will jointly celebrate some events and learn generously to allow other people to celebrate their particular centenaries so that we can celebrate ours,' says a leading member of this group from a nationalist background. He gives as examples of joint commemorations:

- the sinking of the Belfast-built Titanic (commemorated widely throughout Ireland in 2012 but rarely in any joined-up way between North and South);
- the early years of the Irish labour movement;
- women’s suffrage, and, most importantly, the First World War.

He says that currently the only ‘shared memory’ between the working-class communities in Belfast is probably the footballer George Best, but ‘we have opportunities to create new shared memories over the next 10 years.’

Billy Hutchinson believes many people in his community are ready for such an all-island conversation about the past. He points to the success of a recent programme of events put on by the Belfast Centre for the Unemployed on the Ulster and Irish divisions in the British forces in the First World War; a ‘living history’ event involving former Official IRA men talking about the IRA’s 1950s campaign; and a visit to Dublin by former loyalist and official republican prisoners to an event to commemorate the 18th century Enlightenment philosopher – and Northern Presbyterian – Frances Hutcheson.

**STRENGTHENING CIVIL SOCIETY**

For this section, the researcher turned first to two highly regarded leadership figures within civil society in Northern Ireland: the first a leading figure in the community and voluntary sector in the North; the second Dr Duncan Morrow, the former director of the NI Community Relations Council, and an outspoken advocate of ‘shared future’ policies in Northern Ireland.
Leading community and voluntary sector figure

This woman would like to see a ‘public debate in Northern Ireland on participatory democracy, which could also be North-South.’ She recalls the intense debates that went on between groups in the Northern community and voluntary sector and other elements of civil society (notably the women’s movement and the churches) in the years running up to the 1998 Belfast Agreement.

She worries that too many people in the community and voluntary sector are now ‘technocratric’, more interested in structure, organisation and funding, than in civil society, human rights and social justice issues. She is also concerned that some important elements in the sector, such as community-based women’s groups have ‘lost out’, as Sinn Fein and the DUP increase their influence and patronage over local community groups. She gives the example of such groups having been increasingly excluded from the Neighbourhood Partnerships set up by the NI Department of Social Development in the most deprived urban areas to allow government departments to work with local communities to tackle all forms of disadvantage and deprivation. Many community development groups now employ paid workers, many of them ex-paramilitaries, and the usually unpaid work of women activists, often in making cross-community connections, is no longer seen as so important by the two big sectarian-based parties.

Duncan Morrow

Duncan Morrow says what is needed is a debate about creating a Northern Ireland that is not about ‘carving it up between the DUP and Sinn Fein.’ By focussing on both civil society and the North-South dimension, that debate can be made ‘less parochial and navel-gazing’, always a danger in a small, inward-looking society like Northern Ireland. It should include issues like community development, social partnership, health, education and wider issues of global justice and environmental sustainability.

He goes on: ‘We need to build functioning relationships on this island for the social, economic and cultural health of its people – whether it is in one state or two states. We have to talk to each other more and at this time there is no forum to do that. Politicians, particularly in Northern Ireland, don’t deal with the underlying questions. We need to have independent voices involved.’

He believes that politicians and civil society in the Republic must play a role here. ‘They can’t pretend that republicanism is a secular movement that can unite the two peoples. Unionists don’t see the white or orange in the Irish tricolour as sending a message of peace – they see it as a complete lie. There is a need for people in the Republic to examine their own pieties, their belief that Ireland is somehow a unifying culture reflected in Dublin.’
Young people's views

If civil society is to be strengthened in both parts of Ireland, much of the responsibility will lie with younger generations of political and community activists. At a certain point in his research, this researcher decided he was meeting too many people who had been working too long in community and voluntary and other civil society activities and as a result were perhaps running out of ideas. So he turned to organisations with younger members: the Spirit of Enniskillen youth organisation; the Washington Ireland Partnership, involving high-achieving university students from both sides of the border, and individual University College Dublin postgraduate students with a research interest in Northern Ireland.

The Spirit of Enniskillen (SoE) young people – four young men in their late teens and their youth leader – felt that there was often a ‘mismatch’ when young people from the two jurisdictions met and talked. The issues of sectarianism and coming out of conflict which are of interest to young Northerners are of little interest to young Southerners. On the other hand the four young SoE members said they had little or no knowledge of or interest in what went on politically in the Republic of Ireland.

The leader admitted that there was little contact between youth organisations
North and South. He felt the most valuable cross-border work is done when young people from a wide range of diverse backgrounds came together (diversity based on religion, ethnicity, urban-rural, class etc), and cited SoE’s work with a group in Oldham in Lancashire as an example of how this had worked well.

Despite their lack of interest in the South, the three young men from a nationalist background agreed that their Irish nationalist identity was very important to them, and it remained one issue which had real potential for conflict with their unionist contemporaries (they felt this was particularly so in working-class areas, where ‘kids wear their identity more on their sleeves.’). The one young man from a unionist background said unionists always felt ‘outnumbered’ in North-South encounters (as, indeed, he was in this interview).

**Washington Ireland Programme graduates**

The 12 ‘alumni’ of the 2011 Washington Ireland Programme, which brings undergraduates from both sides of the border to do internships in Washington DC every summer, were ‘only bursting to do something on a cross-border basis’ (in the words of one UCD student and Fine Gael party youth activist). They felt that one area where they might work together would be in trying to ‘reconnect’ alienated young people with politics on both sides of the border. They noted that the 18-25 group had seen the lowest voter turn-out of any age cohort in the 2011 Northern Ireland Assembly elections, and this had reached its lowest level in urban working-class Protestant areas, which they felt was a dangerous trend. They came up with the idea of a ‘North-South Young Minds’ project to bring young people together across the island to discuss issues of real importance to them, starting with youth unemployment. They also supported the idea of an under-40s opinion poll to be carried out by a professional polling firm to find out what the post Belfast Agreement generation felt about British, Irish and Northern Irish identity, young people’s alienation from politics, and other issues relevant to their generation.

They believed that the hundreds of undergraduates who had passed through the WIP programme since its foundation in 1995 formed a unique all-island group of younger, idealistic, high-achieving people to undertake North-South cooperation projects (they include one Irish cabinet minister, at least one MLA, several political advisers in both Belfast and Dublin, plus people who are now senior in professional and humanitarian organisations, ICT professionals and economists). It was noticeable that WIP was a programme young unionists felt able to engage in, and that the main proponent of the ‘Young Minds’ idea was an active member of the Ulster Unionist Party and the Orange Order.

**Marginalising dissident republicans**

The Chief Executive of the major North-South peacebuilding charity, Cooperation Ireland, Peter Sheridan, believes that marginalising dissident republicans and providing an alternative to their potential recruits is a key issue for civil society. He also argues that this
is a North-South issue, both because it is particularly in the Irish government’s interest to maintain political stability and normality on the island, and because there is significant dissident activity in places like Donegal, Louth and Dublin. One major atrocity, such as that in Omagh in 1998, could still do huge damage to the peace process.

Sheridan (himself a former senior police officer) thinks that continuing dissident activity leaves ordinary people in republican areas of Northern Ireland ‘nervous in their support for the new policing and justice arrangements in a way that they are not prepared or willing to openly demonstrate support for them.’ This ‘eats away’ at public confidence in policing. He believes strongly that ‘civil society’ bodies in both jurisdictions - notably the churches, youth organisations and reconciliation groups - have a role to play through a broad strategic alliance aimed at isolating the dissidents and persuading alienated young people not to join them.

CONCLUSIONS

This research found that current relationships and connections between civil society in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland are still disappointingly under-developed after years of significant political progress and generous outside funding following the Belfast Agreement. In Duncan Morrow’s words ‘the intellectual framework for thinking about the North-South relationship is very weak.’

Despite Conor Brady’s confident words in the introduction – written in 2005 when the Northern peace process was still a live issue in the Republic – the flow of teachers, health workers, civil servants, community workers, students and schoolchildren across the border is now far lower than in the early years of the century. At that time generous funding was flowing into North-South cooperation from the EU PEACE (a much smaller post-2013 PEACE IV fund is currently under discussion) and INTERREG programmes; the International Fund for Ireland (whose funds are due to expire in the next two-three years); Atlantic Philanthropies (funding due to expire in 2016) and the Irish government (whose grant-making resources are now minimal).

This writer wrote in the *Irish Times* in January 2012: ‘It is clear that Government, Civil Service, business and media [in the Republic] see the North as far lower down their agendas than in previous years’. He cited as evidence for this ‘turning away’ from the North and North-South cooperation the withdrawal of the Irish government’s largest financial commitment to Northern Ireland – more than £400 million promised for the new Monaghan-Derry road; the transfer of civil servants dealing with North-South cooperation to other areas; the effective ending of the joint council between the two business confederations, IBEC and CBI, with the winding up of its secretariat; and the halving of the Belfast staff of the country’s premier newspaper, the same *Irish Times*. Even Sinn Fein did ‘not seem that interested in the painstaking work of trying to bring the two jurisdictions closer together’, with observers noting that their Ministers did ‘little to speed up the snail’s pace agenda set by the DUP at North South Ministerial Council meetings.’
One Northern community leader brought up in the South said that most people from the Republic of Ireland ‘see Northern Ireland after the Good Friday Agreement as back as part of the UK. In the South only the older generation of community and voluntary sector leaders have any sense of the North-South dimension.’

Andy Pollak is Director of the Centre for Cross Border Studies. The research on which this article was based was carried out for the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust between January and May 2012.
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INFORMATION ON

THE CENTRE FOR CROSS BORDER STUDIES
The Centre for Cross Border Studies, founded in September 1999 and based in Armagh and Dublin, researches and develops cooperation across the Irish border in education, training, health, ICT, the economy, public administration, agriculture, planning, the environment and other practical areas. It also provides management, training and ICT support services to North-South and cross-border organisations and networks; develops and manages cross-border information websites, and offers cross-border impact assessment and evaluation tools and support. It also works with similar cross-border education and training centres and institutes elsewhere in Europe.

The Centre is an independent company limited by guarantee (UK charity no. XR 31047) and is owned jointly by Queen’s University Belfast, Dublin City University and the Workers’ Educational Association (Northern Ireland). Its principal financial contributors in the past year have been the EU INTERREG IVA programme and the Irish Department of Education and Skills. The Centre has also raised a significant proportion of its income through sponsorship and selling its research and consultancy services to government and other agencies.

Controversy about constitutional relations between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland now obscures less than ever before the broad consensus that exists in both jurisdictions about the value of cross-border cooperation on practical issues.
This holds that a low level of contact and communication across the Irish border damages the well-being of both parts of the island, and there is a clear need to identify and overcome the present barriers to cooperation and mutual understanding.

**PURPOSE**

The pragmatic view, that cooperation should take place where it brings real benefits to both parts of the island, is weakened by an additional factor: there has been too little research to date on how this practical cooperation is to be achieved, and how the outcomes of such research should be developed. For the past 13 years the Centre for Cross Border Studies – itself a unique expression of cross-border cooperation – has provided an objective, university-based setting for policy research into, training in and development of such cooperation. In recent years, in partnership with the Euro-Institut in Germany and other European partners, the Centre has also taken an increasingly EU-facing role, particularly in the area of developing tools for cross-border cooperation in Ireland and Europe.

The Centre is a policy research and development institute, whose purpose is to:

- Identify gaps in cross-border information, research and mutual learning in Ireland and Europe;
- Commission and publish research on issues related to opportunities for and obstacles to cross border cooperation in all fields of society and the economy in Ireland and Europe;
- Host events at which research findings can be discussed and disseminated, and at which policy formation in the area of cross border cooperation can be developed;
- Present the findings of such research and development projects to the European Commission, the two governments, the Northern Ireland Executive, employer, trade union and social partnership bodies, and the public;
- Provide management support for North-South and cross-border organisations and programmes which have a strong education, research, and development dimension;
- Provide training programmes for public officials, NGOs and others in cross-border cooperation and impact assessment in Ireland and Europe;
- Provide sources of comprehensive and accurate information about cross-border cooperation in Ireland and Europe, particularly information of use to citizens wishing to cross borders to live, work or study.

**WEBSITES**

**CCBS HOUSE WEBSITE**
The Centre for Cross Studies runs six websites: its ‘house’ website (www.crossborder.ie); its archive website, Border Ireland (www.borderireland.info); its cross-border citizens mobility information website (www.borderpeople.info); its SCoTENS teacher education website (http://scotens.org); its Universities Ireland website (www.universitiesireland.ie) and its European partnership website (www.transfrontier.eu).

The Centre’s home website (www.crossborder.ie) was the second most popular of its websites (after Border People) in 2012 with an average of 4,346 visitors per month. The website is continuously updated with details of future events, news, research, publications and the ‘A Note from the Next Door Neighbours’ column, as well as signposts to Border People and the Border Ireland news feed.

**Border Ireland**

Border Ireland was the first online searchable database to provide access to the full range of information on NorthSouth and cross-border issues covering education, health, agriculture, transport, the environment, tourism, culture, mobility issues, business and community development.
www.borderireland.info

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (monthly average)</th>
<th>Visitors</th>
<th>Visits</th>
<th>Page views</th>
<th>Hits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2,994</td>
<td>6,547</td>
<td>25,178</td>
<td>55,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3,416</td>
<td>7,569</td>
<td>29,591</td>
<td>54,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td>6,888</td>
<td>28,173</td>
<td>47,497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures for the Border Ireland website (www.borderireland.info) demonstrate a consistent user base (even though much of its archival material has not been updated since 2009). The Media Centre – which is updated on a weekly basis – continues to be the main page visited.

BORDER PEOPLE

www.borderpeople.info

In 2001 the North South Ministerial Council published *Study of Obstacles to Mobility*, a major report by PricewaterhouseCoopers and Indecon Economic Consultants which explored the wide range of obstacles which hindered people moving across the Irish border to live and work. Its second recommendation was:

With funding from the EU Peace II programme, it was developed by the Centre between 2006 and 2009 to centralise the very large amount of uncoordinated and fragmented information about North-South cooperation and the Irish border region.

EU PEACE funding for the Border Ireland website finished at the end of 2008. Despite this, Border Ireland has documented (online) the details of 3,782 North-South and cross-border activities, 1,790 organisations, 2,084 publications, 2,857 newspaper articles and 2,346 individual contacts (people).
A one-stop cross-border mobility information website should be established which would provide comprehensive and easily accessible information on key aspects of jobs, learning opportunities and living conditions on both sides of the border. This would be linked with European Commission proposals for development of such a site on a pan-European basis. This site should also provide linkages to websites for government departments as well as representative agencies and voluntary groups.¹

In response to this recommendation a partnership between the North South Ministerial Council Joint Secretariat and the Centre for Cross Border Studies launched a prototype Border People website in October 2007 which was initially funded by the EU PEACE Programme and and then developed as part of the Centre’s 2009-2012 INICCO-1 programme with EU INTERREG funding.

The Border People information service (www.borderpeople.info) is now six years old and is recognised as the only source of cross-jurisdictional citizens’ information and advice in Ireland. The website provides a wide range of online citizens’ information for people crossing the border to live, work, study or retire. It provides a signposting service to a wide range of (single jurisdiction) information sources, the most popular of which are in the areas of social security, taxation, welfare benefits, healthcare, pensions, and motoring.

In my practice and research into free movement issues, the Border People website has become an essential tool. More importantly, its clear and user friendly design allows citizens on both sides of the border to access up-to-date information on key topics. It has evolved over time in response to citizens’ needs and has become a first port of call for those seeking to understand their rights.

John Handoll, international lawyer and expert on EU mobility issues (and the Irish representative on the European Network on Free Movement within the EU)

As well as providing information to citizens the Border People project has actively engaged with policy and decision makers. Raymond McCartney MLA wrote in support:

As an elected representative I receive regular enquiries from constituents on cross-border issues. These issues can be as varied as cross-border banking, health and education services, cross-border travel, VRT, benefit enquiries and visa enquiries. We have used the Border People project on a number of occasions to access information and advice and we have also referred constituents directly to this service.

Border People website statistics confirm that there is clearly a demand for this service, as indicated by the consistent number of people using the website (see table on page 136).

¹ Recommendation 2: A B4Umove.com website should be established, Study of Obstacles to Mobility, PricewaterhouseCoopers/Indecon Economic Consultants 2001, p. 7.
A 2010 study by the Centre on behalf of EURES Cross-Border Partnership\textsuperscript{2} estimated that around 23,000 people were then crossing the Irish border to work. This is the group that finds Border People ‘an important and valuable resource’, in the words of a study carried out by the Centre’s 2009-2012 evaluators, Indecon Economic Consultants. People crossing the Irish border are required to understand two quite distinct public sector information systems and this causes significant confusion and misunderstanding.

The Border People team also receive an average of about 60 queries per month via the comment facility on the website, email or telephone. The enquiries are usually of a complex nature, e.g. involving cross-border claims for social welfare or taxation.

Due to the comprehensive information made available on the website and the assistance provided to people with individual queries, Border People has become recognised as the expert source of practical cross-border information. Typical testimonials from users are:

\textit{The help and support from the Border People project has been tremendous and I will definitely recommend the service to anyone in need of help and support.}

\textit{It's a service like this that people need in the current climate, and especially cross-border workers who feel that they are falling between two stools.}

There has always been a ‘knowledge gap’ between the two Irish public and citizens information systems, with public information providers in each jurisdiction having a very limited knowledge of the system on the other side of the border. Furthermore there is currently no formal training for information providers in any area of cross-border mobility information by any of the agencies involved.

As a consequence during 2012 the Centre directed its efforts into seeking further EU funding so that the Border

\textsuperscript{2} Joe Shiels and Annmarie O’Kane, \textit{Measuring Mobility in a Changing Island}
At a Border People seminar in Manorhamilton in March 2012 were (from left to right): David Mullins (Sligo Business Network), Joe Shiels (Centre for Cross Border Studies) Brian Morgan (Morgan McManus Solicitors), Paddy Savage (InterTradeIreland), Annmarie O’Kane (CCBS), John Trethrowan (Credit Review Office), Kevin Coghlan (Tier One Prudential), Ronan Haslette (Merenda), Rose Tierney (Tierney Tax Consultancy), Michael Farrell (FPM Accountants), Peter Murtagh (BDO), Desi Foley (FPM Accountants), Michael McElroy (InterTradeIreland Acumen programme) and Fergal McManus (Morgan McManus).

People project can embed, through training, the provision of cross-border information into the practices of mainstream information providers in citizens’ information and information agencies in Ireland and Northern Ireland. INTERREG funding has recently been secured for the period 2013-2015 along with project partners the North South Ministerial Council Joint Secretariat, Citizens Information Board (Ireland) and Citizens Advice Bureaux (Northern Ireland).

Border People has also gained a profile as an example of good cross-border practice in providing public information in the wider EU. As a result CCBS director Andy Pollak was invited to address an EU Open Days session (representing the East Border Region) in Brussels in October 2012 on ‘Cross-border Labour Mobility: a challenge that makes a difference’.

The Border People project is a clear example of cross-border cooperation at its most pragmatic and sensible: a means of making government departments, information and advice providers and the general public in both Irish jurisdictions more knowledgeable and thus more effective in dealing with practical obstacles to cross-border mobility.

A NOTE FROM THE NEXT DOOR NEIGHBOURS

Since September 2006 the Centre has been sending an opinionated monthly e-column, A Note from the Next Door
Neighbours, to a growing audience of subscribers: over 7,000 at the last count. These Notes have provoked enthusiastic feedback and debate.

The 77 ‘Notes’ so far have covered the following issues: whether North-South cooperation actually works to bring about reconciliation between people in the two jurisdictions; the inaccurate reporting of North-South cooperation in the media; the possible re-opening of the Ulster Canal; the importance of EU funding to cross-border cooperation in Ireland; the need for Northern Ireland to attract back its highly educated and skilled emigrants; how Ireland, North and South, could play a distinctive role in combating world hunger; hopes after the March 2007 Northern Ireland election; the cross-border role of teacher education; Rev Ian Paisley as a champion of North-South cooperation; the contribution of Norwegian human rights lawyer, Torkel Opsahl, to the peace process; the need for civil society groups in both Irish jurisdictions to talk to one another; a possible high-speed rail bridge between Northern Ireland and Scotland; the row over families in Donegal sending their children to Derry schools; why higher education students don’t cross the border to study any more; more about barriers to cross-border higher education; the resurrection of Clones; whether the Irish border region could become the best border region in Europe; how the Centre for Cross Border Studies is becoming involved in work in Africa; an upbeat message from the chairman of the Centre; reconciliation initiatives in Monaghan and Armagh; anti-racism and anti-sectarianism work in primary schools in County Antrim and the Southern border region; cross-border cooperators saying ‘Yes’ to the Lisbon Treaty; cross-community gaelic games; the value of having both a united Ireland and a United Kingdom at the same time; statistics which show the commonalities between North and South; North-South cooperation during the recession; why the concept of an ‘island of Ireland’ economy is still a valid one; the ‘patriotism’ of cross-border shopping; the work of a Monaghan priest in cross-border reconciliation; cross-border phone, insurance and banking services; the Belfast-Dublin Enterprise train (two ‘Notes’); the cross-border activities of an East Belfast Protestant community worker; an appeal for an idealistic person to become the Centre’s deputy director; the Centre’s work in knitting the island’s relationships back together; the Orange marching season; the need for less emphasis on Irish unity and more on cross-border cooperation; the Fermanagh man with the cross-border knowledge in his head; the role of civil servants and EU officials in cross-border peacebuilding; some unsung heroes of cross-border cooperation in 2009; the Armagh Rhymers group; Irish unity versus North-South cooperation; young people and politics; cross-border postal and train services; the welfare state, North and South; the role of the North
South Ministerial Council; North-South cooperation in energy; an unpublished cross-border health report; Dundalk as an exemplary green town; the impact of the Irish and UK financial crises on North-South cooperation (two ‘Notes’); ICT in Northern Schools; the poor state of the Southern health service; how to begin to revive the border region’s economy; good new ideas for cross-border cooperation; the South learning from the North during a time of recession; the Queen’s visit and impact assessment; bringing Irish schools together through ICT; a response to the Slugger O’Toole begrudgers; golf shows the way to ‘through-otherness’; making the island’s children our first priority; fracking in Fermanagh; the lack of interest in North-South cooperation by Irish researchers; the lack of interest in North-South cooperation by Sinn Fein; dynamic people in the Irish border region; the Monaghan writer Eugene McCabe; cross-border walking tourism; the Education for Reconciliation project; the interest of the community and voluntary sector in cross-border cooperation; the new closeness of the British-Irish relationship; the Marble Arch caves cross-border geopark; does the South really want the North as part of Ireland?; opportunities for the North-South joint provision of public services; the Standing Conference on Teacher Education North and South (SCoTENS); the Border People cross-border information service; the impact on the Irish border if the UK were to leave the EU; the Centre for Cross Border Studies embarks on a new EU-funded work programme.

These columns have been reported in the Irish Times, Irish News, Derry Journal, Northern Standard (Monaghan), Scotsman, Glasgow Herald, Sunday Post (Scotland) and on RTE, BBC Scotland, Border Television and local radio stations in Ireland, Northern Ireland, Scotland and northern England. They also appear on the celebrated website of British-Irish and Northern Irish issues Slugger O’Toole (http://sluggerotoole.com)

The columns can also be accessed at www.crossborder.ie/home/ndn/index.php

CURRENT AND RECENT RESEARCH, INFORMATION AND TRAINING PROJECTS

THE INICCO-1 PROJECTS

On 1 February 2013 the Centre started a new two-year programme of research, evaluation, training and information projects funded by the EU cross-border programme INTERREG IVA and managed by the Special EU Programmes Body. These were packaged under the collective title: the Ireland-Northern Ireland Cross-border Cooperation Observatory Phase 2 (INICCO-2). The eight constituent projects in INICCO Phase 2 are as follows:

1. TOWARDS A BORDER DEVELOPMENT ZONE

This research project, building on the proposals of the 2009-2012 action research project Cross-Border Economic Renewal: Rethinking Regional Policy in Ireland, will explore the potential
of a joint economic development approach across the whole Irish and Northern Irish cross-border region. Its three specific aims, to be carried out through five scoping studies and an action conference, are to:

- Stimulate a form of development that is uniquely adapted to the region, making maximum use of national and provincial resources in the two jurisdictions;
- Stimulate the evolution of local resources and expertise, as identified in *Cross-Border Economic Renewal*, particularly by building on the experiences of the successful border region firms identified in that study;
- By focusing on building the capacity of local authorities in both jurisdictions to promote this process, develop more effective public sector cross-border collaboration with the aim of having a major economic impact on the region.

The five studies will be: a) overall Border Development Zone strategy and structure; b) SME enterprise in goods and services with an export potential; c) tourism and recreation; d) agriculture, food and fish processing; e) low carbon initiatives, energy saving and renewable energy. CCBS’s main partner in this project will be InterTradeIreland. The action conference will be held in January 2014, and out of it will come working groups in the five areas to work on an implementation plan for incorporation into a funding application to the 2014-2020 INTERREG programme.

2. **CRoSPiaN-2 SHARED SERVICES**

This project will be led by the Centre’s ‘sister’ organisation, the International Centre for Local and Regional Development (ICLRD). The benefits of harmonising cross-border planning in specific regions along the Irish border is something that has already been recognised by both Irish administrations (e.g. in the North-West Gateway initiative) and in the outputs of CroSPiaN-1 (part of INICCO-1: see below) in the areas of inter-jurisdictional planning in Ireland and abroad, river basin management and shared services. This phase will expand on the research into shared services in Ireland, Scotland, Spain, Canada and the US. It will:

- Engage public bodies in the Irish cross-border region to identify areas for implementation of shared services;
- Develop two shared services pilot projects with cross-border region local councils in areas like tourism, environmental services, emergency services and spatial planning;
- Build on existing ICLRD research and facilitate collaboration between local councils and government in the two Irish jurisdictions to begin to implement these;
- Promote exchange of good practice with councils elsewhere in Ireland and Europe.

The project’s activities will include one cross-border action research project; one conference; three thematic seminars and one technical workshop; two local authority initiatives supported; a learning network established; new service
agreement prototypes developed; and online resources tailored to the needs of local authorities in the region.

3. CRoSPiN-2 EXECUTIVE TRAINING AND ANIMATION PROGRAMME

This project will also be led by the ICLRD. It will continue the training and animation programmes undertaken by the ICLRD for the three cross-border local authority groups – East Border Region, Irish Central Area Border Network (ICBAN) and North West Cross Border Group – in the 2009-2012 period. Its aims are to:

- Raise the awareness of the importance of operationalising spatial planning linkages between EU and central government territorial policies and territorial cooperation among cross-border region local councils;
- Provide best practices to develop solutions to common problems through joint actions;
- Address cross-border institutional fragmentation by developing collaborative frameworks to strengthen cooperation between cross-border region councils;
- Build the capacity of local councils to jointly articulate and present their initiatives to central government departments;
- Complement the work of the three local authority cross-border groups by supporting emerging initiatives in areas such as tourism and economic development.
The project’s activities will include 10 training events; one strategic cross-border local authority initiative supported; 90 local government officials, councillors and community leaders trained; one solution to a cross-border problem addressed through joint action.

4. CRoSPLaN-2: EVIDENCE-BASED PLANNING

This project will also be led by the ICLRD. Its aims are to:

- Provide compatible 2011 census data from Ireland and Northern Ireland in an online and user-friendly format to support collaboration between central government departments in both jurisdictions and between local authorities in the cross-border region, and to present the policy implications of such data;
- Update the all-island Pilot Deprivation Index developed in INICCO-1 using the 2011 census data;
- Provide analytical tools that will support evidence-based spatial planning on a cross-border basis;
- Train practitioners, officials and elected representatives in the cross-border region in the use and interpretation of data;
- Facilitate exchange of best practice in data capture among councils in the cross-border region.

The project’s activities will include the development of two new tools (an all-island Digital Atlas mapping the 2011 censuses and an updated all-island Deprivation Index); five seminars and four ‘data days’ to train 110 practitioners, policy makers and cross-border region officials and councillors in data use and interpretation.

5. BUDGET AND EVALUATION TOOLKITS FOR CROSS-BORDER COOPERATION

This project will contribute to a portfolio of tools to support cross-border cooperation in order to:

- Improve the capacity of people involved in the implementation of EU programmes and projects;
- Improve the efficiency and quality of funded projects;
- Improve the learning from funded projects.

Two new tools will be developed: an Evaluation Toolkit and a Budget Toolkit for Cross-Border Projects.

6. IMPACT ASSESSMENT TRAINING AND MONITORING

Following its highly-regarded Impact Assessment Toolkit for Cross-Border Cooperation (developed in INICCO-1), the Centre will assist EU-level efforts to streamline and simplify the application, monitoring and evaluation procedures of Structural Fund programmes (INTERREG and others) by delivering a package of capacity-building training and monitoring support to applicants and potential applicants. The project’s aims are to:

- Assist projects on the island of Ireland funded under EU cross-border, inter-regional and transnational programmes to better align their objectives and outcomes.
with the priorities of Cohesion Policy and Europe 2020;
• Contribute to improving the quality of applications to INTERREG and other European Territorial Cooperation (ETC) programmes, leading to higher quality projects;
• Strengthen the positive impacts of such programmes through improving the capacity of Irish and Northern Irish people to implement them through their projects;
• Contribute to improved monitoring and evaluation of such programmes and projects;
• Contribute to improved articulation and documentation of EU cross-border, inter-regional and transnational programmes so as to capture and share the learning from them and their projects.

The project’s activities will include 30 training events (both group and one-to-one sessions) with 100 beneficiaries trained in the use of the Impact Assessment Toolkit.

7. MAPPING ACUTE SPECIALITIES

The aims of this project are to address a gap in information about cross-border and all-island acute health specialities by:

• Developing a geodatabase that maps acute health specialities on the island;
• Training health professionals in the use of this mapping tool (two seminars to be held for 20 people).

The Centre’s partner in this project is the Cooperation and Working Together (CAWT) cross-border network of health authorities.

8. BORDER PEOPLE CROSS-BORDER INFORMATION SERVICE: PHASE 3

This will be the third phase of the Border People online information service, which provides citizens’ information for people crossing the border to live, work or study (the pilot website, which became www.borderpeople.info, was launched in 2007). It provides information on cross-border taxation, social security, job seeking, qualifications, health, education, housing, banking, telecoms and other practical areas. The website currently receives a monthly average of nearly 16,000 page views, and 60 direct inquiries (by phone or email) per month.

The aims of the 2013-2015 phase of the project are to:
• Through training, to embed the provision of cross-border mobility information into the practices of mainstream citizens information providers – notably Citizens Advice Bureaux (NI) and Citizens Information Board (Ireland);
• To provide cross-border mobility information as an essential component of a common travel zone and labour market in Ireland and Europe;
• To correct misinformation regarding the complex issues raised when somebody moves across the Irish border to live, work or study.

The project’s activities will include ‘training for trainers’ events and training days to train 40 advice workers in
existing organisations to become competent to advise on cross-border mobility issues. There will be ‘user group’ meetings, briefing papers on cross-border mobility issues and a plan developed to integrate the Border People service – with continued support from the Centre for Cross Border Studies – into existing citizens information services in the two jurisdictions by 2015. The partners in this project will be the North South Ministerial Council Joint Secretariat; Citizens Advice Bureaux (Northern Ireland) and Citizens Information Board (Ireland).

THE INICCO-1 PROJECTS

Between January 2009 and March 2012 the Centre undertook five research, training and information projects funded by the EU cross-border programme INTERREG IVA and managed by the Special EU Programmes Body under the collective title INICCO-1. The five constituent projects in INICCO Phase 1 (with their evaluation impacts) were as follows:

1. BORDER PEOPLE CROSS-BORDER MOBILITY INFORMATION WEBSITE: PHASE 2

This was the second phase of the Border People (www.borderpeople.info) cross-border mobility information website, with the North South Ministerial Council Joint Secretariat as partners. Phase Two allowed for a much more systematic dissemination and marketing of information and public feedback on cross-border mobility issues, assisted by an active and enlarged User Group drawn from a range of citizens advice, employment advice, local authority, business and community organisations. 92% of users in a 2010 survey said that they ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ with the statement that Border People is ‘an important and valuable resource’ for people living and working in the Irish border region.

The 2012 Indecon evaluation of INICCO-1 summarised the main impacts of Border People:

- Contributes to better-informed cross-border mobility on the island of Ireland;
- Gives practical information on a comprehensive range of cross-border issues that are easily accessible and relevant to a variety of audiences;
- Facilitates enhanced recognition of the Centre as a cross-border information agency by key policy-makers in both jurisdictions and the wider community in the border region;
- Contributes to networking among local authority officials, councillors, business people and members of the public in the border region;
- Awareness of the need for a cross-border information service is evidenced by the integration of Border People with NI Direct.

2. THE CROSS-BORDER SPATIAL PLANNING AND TRAINING NETWORK (CroSPlaN-1)

This network, organised by the Centre’s ‘sister’ organisation, the International
Centre for Local and Regional Development (ICLRD), brought together an alliance (CroSPLaN) of planners, economic development officers, local authority officials, councillors, and community and business interests on both sides of the border to promote more systematic learning and exchange in planning.

CroSPLaN-1’s 2009-2012 programme consisted of six applied research projects on the inter-jurisdictional implications of the NI Review of Public Administration; tri-national planning in the Basel region; river basin management and spatial planning in Connecticut, the Elbe basin (Germany) and Ireland’s cross-border region; and shared services in Scotland, Spain, Canada and New York State. It put on one executive training programme per year for cross-border region local councillors, council officials and business leaders; and one all-Ireland technical workshop and annual conference for planners and related professionals. With partners such as the National Institute for Regional and Spatial Analysis (NIRSA) and the All-Island Research Observatory (AIRO) at NUI Maynooth, it produced a range of tools such as an all-island Accessibility Mapping Tool; an all-island Housing Monitoring Tool; and all-island Deprivation Index; and an all-island Spatial Monitoring Framework.

Among the CroSPLaN-1 impacts summarised by the 2012 Indecon evaluation of INICCO-1 were:

• [through action research projects] Practical proposals on emerging issues such as local governance structures, aligning environmental/planning and shared services [in the two jurisdictions];
• Increased use of data and mapping in spatial planning initiatives in both jurisdictions and integration of cross-border data, facilitating linkages to data capture projects within border regions;
• [through executive training programmes] Strengthened cross-border operational linkages in spatial planning and development (e.g. Louth/Newry and Mourne MoU in March 2011 and Charter of Commitment to Cross-Border Collaboration in April 2011; North West Partnership Board; ICBAN Spatial Planning Initiative and Vision Plan);
• Facilitated dialogue between central and local government on issues of relevance to the border region;
• [through conferences and workshops] Facilitated access to international expertise for border officials and planners that otherwise would not happen.

3. EXPLORING THE POTENTIAL FOR CROSS-BORDER HOSPITAL SERVICES IN THE BORDER REGION

This project led to the publication of two reports on how cross-border hospital services might help to provide mutual benefits for the people of the Irish order region. The first of these, Exploring the Potential for Cross-Border Hospital Services in the Irish Border Region: The role of community involvement in planning hospital services, by CCBS
Deputy Director Ruth Taillon, was published in October 2010.

The second report was *Unlocking the Potential of Cross-border Hospital Planning on the Island of Ireland: A Prototype Modelling Framework*, by Shane McQuillan and Vanya Sargent of the Dublin consultancy firm Horwath Bastow Charleton. This analysed the potential for cross-border planning in five sample clinical service areas: orthopaedic surgery, ENT surgery, paediatric cardiac surgery, cystic fibrosis and acute mental health services.

The Indecon 2012 evaluation summarised the impacts of this project as follows:

- [Community Involvement] This research has the potential to be recognised by policy makers, planners, health professionals and the wider community as contributing to more effective participation in decision-making by local communities in planning hospital services in the border region, including in relation to cystic fibrosis and cancer care;
- [Hospital Planning] Provides a coherent framework for considering cross-border cooperation that can be applied across different areas of acute hospital services;
- Provides an indication of the ‘journey’ that needs to be taken in respect of the exemplar services;
- Emphasizes Cooperation and Working Together (CAWT) as the relevant body to take forward cross-border cooperation in hospital services.

### 4. REVIVING THE BORDER REGION ECONOMY IN A NEW ERA OF PEACE AND DEVOLVED GOVERNMENT

The final report of this major research project, by Dr John Bradley and Professor Michael Best, was launched in March 2012 under the title *Cross-Border Economic Renewal: Rethinking Regional Policy in Ireland*. It contained chapters on the origins of Ireland’s two economies (1750-1960), the economic consequences of the ‘Troubles’ (1968-1994); the Belfast Agreement and the island economy; development strategy frameworks – what do they tell us?; the Border – national and international context; the island economy context for the border region; the border region economy; the cross-border shopping phenomenon; producing in the border region economy; tourism and the border; and a new approach – the Border Development Zone.

The Indecon 2012 evaluation summarised the impacts of this project as follows:

- A better understanding of:
  - The three distinct border sub regions and their different producer characteristics;
  - The identification of clusters of activities within these sub-regions;
  - The behaviour of firms located in these areas and their views of the border;
  - Suggested policy implications
- Strong synergies with the CroSPIaN project, including helping to stimulate an ongoing discussion.
with local authority chief executives/county managers and other stakeholders in the border region on the possible creation of a Border Development Zone;

- Highlighting of data deficits required to study firms in the border region, in particular the paucity of sub-regional data in Northern Ireland (as a result of this study NISRA are consulting users on the possibility of boosting the sample of businesses in NI for survey purposes).

5. IMPACT ASSESSMENT TOOLKIT FOR CROSS-BORDER COOPERATION

As part of the integrative work of a cross-border observatory, the Centre has devised and developed an Impact Assessment Toolkit (IAT) for practical, mutually beneficial cross-border cooperation in Ireland. This collaborative project with the Euro-Institut in Kehl, Germany was led by the Centre’s Deputy Director, Ruth Taillon. The highly innovative toolkit it has produced – the first of its kind in the European Union - is designed to guide policy-makers and EU funders (and to be of particular assistance to the Special EU Programmes Body in Ireland) in thinking through the impact assessment process, assisting them in designing better quality cross-border programmes and projects. It is also designed to help project leaders both improve their funding applications to EU programmes and then improve those projects’ implementation. Impact assessment has been used particularly in the health and environmental sectors in Ireland, North and South, and widely in the European Union, but not until now in cross-border cooperation.
Among the impacts of this project highlighted by the 2012 Indecon evaluation were:

- The IA Toolkit has been mainstreamed into the largest INTERREG programme in Europe, with its adoption by SEUPB for use in the INTERREG IVA programme;
- It applies for the first time the European Commission’s own impact assessment approach in a cross-border context;
- There was significant interest in the impact assessment framework from INTERACT, the organisation that has responsibility for sharing expertise across European Territorial Cooperation (ETC) programmes;
- The Transfrontier Euro-Institut Network (TEIN) plans to develop a version of the impact assessment framework to be used in different border contexts across Europe;
- A number of public sector and other agencies are also interested in using the Toolkit.

**CURRENT EXCHANGE PROJECTS**

**North-South Student Teacher Exchange Project (Year Nine)**

In March 2013 the North-South Student Teacher Exchange project will enter its ninth year with the latest exchange of 11 students to do a key part of their assessed teaching practice in schools in the other Irish jurisdiction. The partners with the Centre in this project are six of the seven colleges of primary education on the island: Stranmillis University College and St Mary’s University College in Belfast; St Patrick’s College Drumcondra, Marino Institute of Education, Froebel College of Education and Church of Ireland College of Education in Dublin (Mary Immaculate College in Limerick took part in the exchanges up to 2009). 181 student teachers have taken part in this exchange project since it was initiated in 2003 (making it the longest-running of all the North-South exchanges that CCBS have organised). The first four exchanges were funded by the EU Peace Programme, while the exchanges since 2008 have been funded by the Standing Conference on Teacher Education North and South (SCoTENS) (see also pages 154-159).

In October 2008 a study by Dr Maeve Martin of NUI Maynooth on the impact of the exchange on the personal attitudes and professional practice of the student teachers who had taken part in it between 2003 and 2007 was completed. Dr Martin concluded:

> This project has been a great success in terms of the enduring positive dispositions it has helped to develop among the beneficiaries, the young teachers. These have included: greater interest in peace and reconciliation issues; greater consciousness of the demands of multicultural classrooms; greater knowledge of the other jurisdiction’s education system and curriculum; the invaluable experience gained from learning from skilled teachers in the other jurisdiction; and a greatly increased sense of personal worth and confidence gained through participation in the exchange.

She called the project ‘a courageous,
inclusive and groundbreaking exchange’ and ‘an experience that has been transformational’ for the student teachers involved.

In an evaluation of SCoTENS between 2003 and 2011 (see also pages 158-159), Dr John Furlong, Professor of Educational Studies at Oxford University, wrote of the North-South Student Teacher Exchange:

There was strong agreement among a number of our respondents that the Student Teacher Exchange scheme was one of SCoTENS’ most significant contributions to the peace process. By giving the next generation of teachers the opportunity at first hand to experience a very different educational, social and political setting, the scheme was actively promoting the objectives of peace and reconciliation.

CURRENT ADMINISTRATION PROJECTS

The Centre has filled an important niche by providing administrative support to North-South and cross-border initiatives, particularly in the field of education. Many cross-border projects are sustained largely through EU funding and the commitment of enthusiastic individuals, and when the money and enthusiasm runs out their absence of a proper administrative structure often dooms them to early closure. The Centre offers this cross-border administrative structure, and a detailed
knowledge of support mechanisms in both Irish jurisdictions, which can ensure such projects’ longer-term sustainability.

UNIVERSITIES IRELAND

The work of Universities Ireland (UI) continued in 2012-2013 with the Centre acting as its secretariat. During the year ran a number of key projects: the Universities Ireland/ESB North/South Postgraduate Scholarship scheme; the ‘Reflecting on a decade of War and Revolution in Ireland 1912-1923’ programme of activities and the Irish Section of Scholars at Risk.

Funding continued to be provided by an annual subscription from the 10 participating universities (the Open University in Ireland became the 10th member university in November 2011); and annual grants from the Irish Department of Education and Skills and the NI Department for Employment and Learning.

Universities Ireland has been able to overcome the disadvantage of being a very small networked organisation with no full-time staff and a small annual income of around £150,000 by leveraging sizeable amounts of extra money to support its activities. In 2007-2011 the Irish-African Partnership for Research Capacity Building (IAP) raised €1.5 million from Irish Aid with €110,000 in matching funds from UI. In 2006-2010 the Universities Ireland/IBEC-CBI Joint Business Council North/South scholarships raised £183,000 from individual business firms in Dublin and Belfast with the same amount of matching funding from UI. In the past three years the North/South scholarships scheme was co-sponsored by ESB (contributing €67,500).

The current chair of Universities Ireland is the President of University College Cork/National University of Ireland Cork, Professor Michael Murphy. The members of its governing council are the nine university presidents and vice-chancellors; the director of the Open University in Ireland, plus representatives of the Irish Department of Education and Skills and the NI Department for Employment and Learning.

North/South Postgraduate Scholarships

The aim of this scheme is to encourage outstanding students from the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland to cross the border to undertake postgraduate study and experience life in the other Irish jurisdiction. In 2012-2013 four scholarships were awarded, two to students doing energy and engineering subjects (co-sponsored by the Electricity Supply Board) and two doing Irish Studies and history (sponsored by UI alone). The scholarships are worth €15,000 each.
Speakers at the Universities Ireland ‘Reflecting on a decade of War and Revolution in Ireland 1912-1923: Historians and Public History’ conference in The Royal Hospital Kilmainham in June 2012: From left to right, Professor Diarmaid Ferriter, Professor Jay Winter, Ms Catriona Crowe, Lord Mayor of Dublin Andrew Montague, Professor Gearóid Ó Tuaithaigh, Professor John Horne.

This is a scheme which has been conceived both to support the continuing process of North-South reconciliation and to train highly-skilled postgraduates to contribute to a new phase of economic and environmental development for the island.

These North/South scholarships are open to all students currently registered at an Irish or a Northern Irish university or the Open University in Ireland or Dublin Institute of Technology (or who have graduated within the past 10 years) proposing to take up a place on a postgraduate course which would require them to locate to the other Irish jurisdiction. They are also open to Irish or Northern Irish-born students currently registered at (or who have graduated within the past 10 years from) a British university (i.e. a university in England, Scotland or Wales) who wish to relocate to the Irish jurisdiction they were not born in to undertake a postgraduate course.

The 2012-2013 winners were: Alison Meagher, a graduate of Trinity College Dublin, doing a Masters in Irish studies at Queen’s University Belfast (sponsored by Ul)
Hugh O’Reilly, a graduate of Dublin Institute of Technology, doing a Masters of Science in Advanced Mechanical Engineering at Queen’s University Belfast (co-sponsored by ESB)

Ryan McCourt, a graduate of Queen’s University Belfast, doing a Masters in History at University College Dublin (sponsored by UI)

Conor Henry, a graduate of Queen’s University Belfast, doing a Masters in Sustainable Energy and Green Technologies at University College Dublin (co-sponsored by ESB)

This brings to 34 the number of students who have been awarded these scholarships during the past eight years.

Scholars at Risk: Irish Section

Universities Ireland has been the Irish Section of the international inter-university network, Scholars at Risk (SAR), which is based in New York University, since 2008. In many countries around the world, scholars and academics are attacked because of their words, their ideas and their place in society. Those seeking power and control work to limit access to information and new ideas by persecuting scholars, restricting academic freedom and repressing research, publication, teaching and learning. Scholars at Risk (SAR) is an international network of universities and colleges responding to these attacks. SAR provides sanctuary in universities, particularly in Europe and North America, to professors, lecturers, researchers and other intellectuals who suffer threats in their home country.

In September 2009 the official launch of SAR Ireland Section took place at Trinity College Dublin, followed by a keynote address by Dr Shirin Ebadi, the Iranian human rights lawyer, university lecturer and author who became the first Muslim woman to win the Nobel Peace Prize in 2003.

Six SAR scholars have so far been hosted by Irish universities using Universities Ireland funding: a psychology professor from Iran at University of Limerick; a political scientist from Iran at Trinity College Dublin and University College Dublin; a public health specialist from Burma at University College Cork; a human rights lawyer from Iran at NUI Galway and Queen’s University Belfast; and two Iraqi human rights defenders and legal scholars at Queen’s University Belfast. The Universities Ireland scheme has inspired four more Irish universities to host scholars using other resources, and several speaker series have been organised.

In addition, faculty at Trinity College Dublin, University College Cork and NUI Galway have contributed to a new SAR initiative to monitor attacks on academic freedom around the world and to circulate monitoring reports to policy makers and the public.

Reflecting on a decade of War and Revolution in Ireland

In January 2012 the council of Universities Ireland approved a new
project following an application from a group of leading historians from the universities, including Professor Eunan O Halpin of TCD, Professor Diarmaid Ferriter of UCD, Professor Paul Bew of QUB and Professor Gearóid O Tuathaigh of NUI Galway. This saw Universities Ireland launching a 12-year programme of activities to reflect on the 1912-1923 period in Irish history.

This programme was launched at a major conference in the Royal Hospital Kilmainham in Dublin on 23rd June 2012 entitled ‘Reflecting on a decade of War and Revolution in Ireland 1912-1923: Historians and Public History’. The keynote speaker was Professor Jay Winter of University of Yale, one of the United States’ most eminent historians and a world authority on the First World War and its impact on the 20th century. Other speakers included Professor Ferriter and Professor Bew. The conference was attended by over 320 people.

Another element in this project’s first year was the award of two €20,000 bursaries to PhD students studying the 1912-1923 period. The first two winners of these bursaries were Stephen McQuillan, doing a study of international recognition of the emerging Irish state in 1919-1922 at Trinity College Dublin and Paul Lavery, studying urban warfare in Dublin in 1919-1923 at University of Ulster.

The intention is that this will be a high-level, scholarly and sustained initiative, and thus a unique contribution to reflection on a decade of history-changing events by the island’s intellectual leaders, the 10 universities (and more specifically, their Departments of History). Universities Ireland is providing funding for an annual conference on relevant themes throughout the decade, the PhD bursary scheme, lobbying to improve archival access and collaborative history teaching initiatives. It is intended that this UI funding should be used to seek extra financial support from interested Departments in the Irish and Northern Irish governments.

The second conference will take place in Liberty Hall in Dublin on 15 June 2013 under the title ‘Reflecting on a decade of War and Revolution in Ireland 1912-1923: the Cause of Labour’. The keynote speakers will be President Michael D. Higgins, Professor Ralph Darlington of Salford Business School, an international authority on early 20th century trade unionism, and Frances O’Grady, General Secretary of the British TUC.

**Other Initiatives**

In January 2012 a delegation of university heads from Universities Ireland travelled to Aberdeen to meet Scottish university principals at Robert Gordon University, now headed by Professor Ferdinand von Prondzynski (formerly president of Dublin City University). They also met the Scottish Cabinet Secretary (Minister) for Education, Michael Russell. They discussed a number of areas
where Irish-Northern Irish-Scottish inter-university collaboration might be enhanced, including inter-university ‘research pooling’ (which the Scottish universities have developed to a high degree).

A return visit to Dublin by Mr Russell and the Scottish university heads is planned for 2013, and at time of writing Universities Ireland is discussing dates with the offices of Mr Russell and Irish Minister for Education and Skills, Ruairí Quinn.

The Universities Ireland website is at www.universitiesireland.ie

STANDING CONFERENCE ON TEACHER EDUCATION, NORTH AND SOUTH (SCOTENS)

The Centre also acts as the secretariat for the Standing Conference on Teacher Education, North and South. This was set up in 2003 by a group of senior teacher education specialists from universities, colleges of education and other education agencies in both jurisdictions. The 2012-2013 joint chairs of SCoTENS are Professor Linda Clarke, Head of the School of Education at University of Ulster and Mr Tomás Ó Ruairc, Director of the Teaching Council (Ireland).

Conferences

SCoTENS’ 10th annual conference, on ‘Creative Teachers for Creative Learners: Implications for Teacher Education’, was held on 11-12 October 2012 in the Radisson Blu Farnham Estate Hotel in Cavan. It was opened by the Irish Minister for Education and Skills, Mr Ruairí Quinn TD and the NI Minister for Education, Mr John O’Dowd MLA. The keynote speaker was Sir Ken Robinson, the internationally renowned expert on creativity and innovation (who spoke via a video link from the USA); Sacha Abercorn, the Duchess of Abercorn, who spoke on the Pushkin Prizes creative writing competition for primary schoolchildren; Professor Teresa Cremin, Professor of Education (Literacy) at the Open University; and Professor Lisbeth Goodman, Chair of Creative Technology Innovation and Professor of Education at University College Dublin.

The conference featured workshops on critical reflection in science teaching and learning; primary teachers’ perspectives on creativity, imagination and innovation; primary children’s use of iPads; and ‘tensions between imagination and subversion in teacher education.’

Two reports were launched at the conference. The SCoTENS 2011 conference and annual report, Promoting Literacy and Numeracy through Teacher Education, was launched by Brigid McManus, former Secretary General of the
Department of Education and Skills. The 2011 compilation research report – *Exploring Japanese Lesson Study as a Model of Peer-to-Peer Professional Learning; Effective Mentoring in Physical Education Teacher Education, and Domestic Abuse: Using Arts-based Education to help Student Teachers learn about the Context and Impact on Children* – was launched by Professor Harry McMahon, former Professor of Education at University of Ulster and co-founder of SCoTENS.

Previous SCoTENS’ annual conferences were on ‘Promoting Literacy and Numeracy through Teacher Education’ in 2011; ‘Reflective Practice – Challenges for Teacher Education’ in 2009; ‘School Leadership Policy and Practice, North and South’ in 2008; ‘Teaching in the Knowledge Society’ in 2007; ‘Teacher Education and Schools: Together Towards Improvement’ in 2006; ‘Teacher Education for Citizenship in Diverse Societies’ in 2005; ‘The Changing Contexts of Teacher Education, North and South’ (with a particular emphasis on Teaching Councils) in 2004; and ‘Challenges to Teacher Education and Research, North and South’ in 2003.

SCoTENS has also provided seed funding for North-South conferences on social, scientific and environmental education (six); initial teacher education, citizenship and diversity education (two); educational research; special educational needs (two); social justice education in initial teacher education (two); language teacher education; post-primary religious education; doctoral research in education (five); autism; dyslexia, literacy and inclusion; the competences approach to teacher professional development; and teaching controversial history (1916 and the Battle of the Somme).

**Research**

It has also provided seed funding for North-South research projects on the social/national identity of young children in the border region; ICT in teacher education; children with profound and multiple learning difficulties; student teacher exchanges; student perceptions of history, geography and science; school-based work in colleges of education; the professional development of teachers working with students with special educational needs; examining assessment procedures for trainee teachers; universities’ role in continuing teacher professional development; work-placed learning models in post-compulsory teacher education; measuring the value of education technologies; primary student teachers’ mathematical identities; Realistic Mathematics Education; consulting pupils on remediation of their specific literacy difficulties; student teachers and the needs of pupils with autism spectrum disorder; English as an additional language in undergraduate teacher education; inclusion and diversity in post-primary education; the experiences of primary teachers...
in teaching healthy eating guidelines; building North-South links in global justice education; primary school physical education; arts-based educational research; the digitisation of Irish historical education documents; sixth year religion; peer mentoring in teacher education; spoken Irish in Irish-medium schools; the ‘lift off’ literacy programme for Irish medium schools; good practice in the teaching of pupils from ethnic minorities; continuous professional development for teaching practice supervisors; a framework for further education teaching qualifications; capacity-building in Initial Teacher Education; disablist bullying; art and design in teacher education; mentoring physical education teachers; Japanese research lessons in peer-to-peer professional learning; teachers understanding children exposed to domestic abuse; adult education practitioners exploring online and arts-based reflection; assessment in teacher education North and South; exploration of mathematical identity using narrative as a tool; science enhancement and learning through exchange/collaboration among teachers; North-South educational partnerships in development contexts; teachers’ views on the factors influencing their professional development; new challenges/new opportunities in spiritual education; promoting an active ‘restorative school’ learning community North and South; and writing as a professional development activity in initial teacher education.

A total of 86 North-South research, conference and exchange projects have received financial support from SCoTENS in the period 2003-2013 and 19 reports have been published. The 2012-2013 projects funded were: mentor pedagogies to support pre-service teachers on teaching practice; early number concepts; managing early years transition practices; nuns in education, North and South; a cross-border doctoral research in education conference; cyber-bullying and the law; threshold concepts in language teacher education; and the creative education infrastructure of Ireland.

Another 25 applications were received in February 2013. Eight projects were selected: ‘Navigating the continuum: from student teacher to professional practitioner’; teaching political history in primary schools; exploring the potential for transformative workplace learning by and for teachers; a cross-border doctoral research in education conference; ‘creative classrooms: insights from imaginative and innovative teaching in Ireland North and South’; addressing fundamental movement skill training; the Programming Studio (games-based mathematics education); and ‘Dyslexia in Ireland: the provision for pupils with dyslexia since the publication of the 2002 Task Force Reports, North and South.’
The significant increase in applications in 2013 can be partly explained by SCoTENS administrator Patricia McAllister setting up a ‘matching service’ to allow researchers – and particularly new researchers – to take advantage of the SCoTENS mailing list to find research partners in the other Irish jurisdiction. Under this service Patricia receives a request for a cross-border partner from a researcher in one jurisdiction and circulates it to the 1100 people on the SCoTENS mailing list. One University College Cork researcher received 34 replies to her query in January 2013.

The SCoTENS website (http://scotens.org) has been updated in recent years and highlights, in particular, resources on special education, citizenship education and teaching and learning with digital video. This has led to a sharp increase in the number of users. Its interactive special needs section, developed by Dr Noel Purday of Stranmillis University College, is a particularly popular element.

SCoTENS also sponsors the ground-breaking North-South Student Teacher Exchange, now in its eighth year, which brings student teachers from the island’s seven colleges of primary education to do a key part of their assessed teacher practice in the other jurisdiction (see also pages 148-149).

SCoTENS is funded by annual grants from the Department of Education.
and Science, and the Department for Employment and Learning and the Department of Education (Northern Ireland). A significant proportion of its funding comes from institutional subscriptions from its 37 members, who are universities, colleges of education, institutes of technology (RoI), further and higher education colleges (NI), teaching councils, education trade unions, education centres, curriculum councils and other bodies involved with teacher education.

**Evaluation**

In September 2011 SCoTENS received an extremely positive evaluation for its work between 2003 and 2011 from a team led by Professor John Furlong of Oxford University’s Department of Education.

The report’s conclusions were glowing: ‘Taken over all, the findings of our evaluation are overwhelmingly positive. Despite limited and precarious funding, significant dependence on the goodwill of volunteers and the support of a paid secretariat with myriad other responsibilities, it has achieved an enormous amount. For those aware of and involved in its work, there is substantial evidence that SCoTENS is highly valued across Ireland. Many of those we spoke to believed that the majority of the initiatives SCoTENS has led – conferences, research projects, the student exchange programme – would simply not have happened without the organisation; its leadership and administration were vital.’

‘Our evidence makes clear that SCoTENS has enabled the development of networks and encouraged communication and contacts between significant numbers of teacher educators in the North and South of Ireland. Many respondents felt that through SCoTENS they had developed a greater knowledge and understanding of the educational systems and practices across the island of Ireland. The forms of collaboration encouraged by SCoTENS have, we found, stimulated genuine professional and personal development; they have also, many of our respondents believed, contributed to the peace process by helping to normalise relationships within and between North and South. There was widespread belief that despite its achievements, without SCoTENS’ continued existence, those achievements would rapidly fade’.

A number of respondents commented how SCoTENS had strategically positioned itself to support the work of the Departments of Education, North and South, and as a result it was regarded very positively by those Departments. One senior academic said:

*Perhaps SCoTENS’ greatest achievement has been a more direct alignment between the interest and actions of the teacher education community and the education reform priorities of government departments, north and south. One indicator of departmental acknowledgement of such has been the continuation of central funding despite a vast change in the economic circumstances. Another has been the generous and pointed endorsement of the work of SCoTENS by Ministers and their officials, including a consideration of our work as part of a*
North South Ministerial Council meeting in 2010.

On its leadership and organisation, the evaluators noted: ‘Since its inception, SCoTENS has had the benefit of three very significant figures working for it - Professor John Coolahan, as one of the two initial academics who helped to establish the organisation, Andy Pollak, Director of the Centre for Cross Border Studies and Secretary of SCoTENS, and Patricia McAllister, SCoTENS administrator. Professor Coolahan, although now formally retired, continues to play a key role in the organisation, particularly in terms of its links with political leaders and senior officials especially in the Republic. Of the senior academics we met, it was clear that Professor Coolahan was the most sensitive and skilful in understanding and negotiating the complex political terrain that an organisation such as SCoTENS has to face. The fact that the organisation has thrived so successfully for eight years, we felt, was in no small part due to his expert leadership’.

The report also praised the quality of administrative support provided by Ms McAllister, which was ‘universally acknowledged’, and Mr Pollak’s ‘vision in relation to the broader politics of cross-border work and his ability to develop appropriate networks beyond the teacher education community’.

The evaluation said that all the completed research projects seed funded by SCoTENS (receiving £2000-£6000 each) were ‘generally judged to be very good value for money by, for example: developing sizeable teams involved in research projects; preparing extensive reports; organising highly topical conferences; building networks; developing toolkits or resources.’

Respondents argued that of particular value were the North-South processes and networks enabled by this seed funding.

The annual SCoTENS conferences were very highly regarded: ‘an overwhelming majority of respondents who had attended them thought that they offered them good opportunities for professional dialogue, helped them learn about education elsewhere in Ireland, helped them develop their informal contacts and networks across the island and their own professional practice’.

The SCoTENS website was also praised by the evaluators as ‘a rich resource’ containing ‘much helpful and highly informative material which is, in many cases, of a very high quality.’

At an ‘away day’ in September 2012 to discuss the findings of the evaluation, its team leader, Professor John Furlong, called SCoTENS ‘an incredible achievement’.

Website
The SCoTENS website is at http://scotens.org
The International Centre for Local and Regional Development (ICLRD) is a North-South-U.S. partnership established in 2006 to explore and expand the contribution that planning and the development of physical, social and economic infrastructures can make to improving the lives of people on the island of Ireland and elsewhere. The partner institutions are: the National Institute for Regional and Spatial Analysis (NIRSA) at the National University of Ireland, Maynooth; the School of the Built Environment at the University of Ulster; the Institute for International Urban Development (IIUD) in Cambridge, Massachusetts; and the Centre for Cross Border Studies in Armagh. Each partner brings together complementary expertise and networks on both a North-South and East-West basis – creating a unique, all-island and international centre.

The ICLRD continues to expand its collaboration with other institutions and has built up close working relationships with individual faculty and researchers from universities and research institutions including Queen’s University Belfast, Mary Immaculate College-University of Limerick, Harvard University, the National Center for Smart Growth Research and Education at the University of Maryland, and HafenCity University Hamburg. In 2012, we also expanded our joint initiatives with other organisations involved in cross-border research and activities including: Cooperation Ireland, the Institute for British-Irish Studies (IBIS) at University College Dublin (UCD) and the Border Regional Authority. The ICLRD is very open to involving other academics and research institutions in its activities.

The Director of the ICLRD is Mr. John Driscoll, Vice-President of the IIUD in Cambridge, Mass; the Deputy Director is Ms. Caroline Creamer of NIRSA, NUI Maynooth and the Assistant Director is Dr. Neale Blair of School of the Built Environment, University of Ulster.

In 2012, the ICLRD was supported by the EU’s INTERREG IVA Programme through the Special EU Programmes Body, the Irish Government through the Department of Environment, Community and Local Government (DoECLG) and the Northern Ireland Executive through the Department for Regional Development (DRD) and the Department for Social Development (DSD). The ICLRD has, over the years, also received funding from the International Fund for Ireland (IFI) as well as for commissioned research from InterTradeIreland, the Strategic Investment Board for Northern Ireland (SIB) and the Irish Central Border Area Network (ICBAN).
The ICLRD provides independent, joined-up research and policy advice on cross-border and all-island spatial planning and local and regional development. The Centre plays a role in peace and reconciliation on the island by bringing together policy-makers, practitioners and academics, North and South, to work on common goals in the areas of coordinated spatial planning and social and economic development at local, regional and national levels. It does this through research, policy advice and publications; professional education and capacity building programmes that assist local governments and communities to translate policy into ‘on the ground’ action; and active outreach and networking that includes conferences, workshops and international cooperation and exchanges to identify best practices.

Stimulating economic growth and improving living conditions to alleviate and prevent social conflict is at the heart of the Centre’s mission. The ICLRD is focused on building the capacity of regional and local authorities, development agencies, border networks and community and voluntary organisations to identify strategic areas of cooperation.

Through its research and professional education programmes, the ICLRD works with policy-makers and local leaders to improve the environments in which people in Ireland, North and South, live and work, with particular emphasis on the needs of marginalised and divided communities. It combines the promotion of regional planning and development as a tool for competitiveness with local planning and development as a way to remedy the continuing problems of social disadvantage.

**Current research projects**

Each year the ICLRD undertakes action research that contributes to a better understanding of the complex all-island and cross-border dynamics and drivers of change in Irish towns and rural areas, including cross-border communities. Since its inception, the ICLRD has organised its work around three spatial scales: EU and all-island; sub-regional, which includes cross-border; and local. Through its activities, the ICLRD is facilitating forums to foster the exchange of experience and best practices. It is also supporting North-South / East-West inter-regional cooperation, including on a cross-border basis, as encouraged by the European Union.

The emphasis of the ICLRD’s work programme in 2012 was the completion of its research programme under the Cross-Border Spatial Planning and Training Network, Phase 1 (CroSPlaN-1), an EU INTERREG IVA-funded programme administered by the Special EU Programmes Body. Concluded in March 2012, CroSPlaN was a programme of research, training and workshops in Northern Ireland and the Southern border counties which operated in association with the Centre for Cross Border Studies as part of the Ireland/Northern Ireland Cross-border Cooperation Observatory (INICCO).

Building on the success of CroSPlaN – and INICCO – the spring-early
summer of 2012 was given over to the development of a business plan to secure further funding under INTERREG IVA. In November 2012, we learnt our endeavours had been successful, and in February 2013 a second phase of INICCO and CroSPiLAn commenced.

There are three inter-linked components to CroSPiLAn-2, which will provide sustained support to territorial cooperation in the Irish border region. The three elements are:

- **Shared Services** – to identify opportunities, and operational frameworks, for joint initiatives that improve the delivery of public services; this will occur through action research and two pilot initiatives to demonstrate practical models for cooperation in delivering front-line or specialised services;

- **Executive Training** – building on the successful ICLRD model linking training and animation, to develop and deliver executive training for cross-border councils;

- **Evidence-Based Planning** – to map the compatible 2011 census data from the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland, and develop an updated deprivation index in an on-line, user-friendly format to support collaboration among central government departments across the island.

Evidence-based planning

In 2012, the ICLRD and its partners continued to provide support to different cross-border activities in local and regional development. These included: the Irish Central Border Area Network's (ICBAN) Spatial Planning Initiative and specifically its Data Capture Project and Regional Vision Plan; the North West Partnership Board and its potential role in progressing the North West Gateway Initiative; and the SPACEial data capture and indicators project implemented by the North West Region Cross-Border Group. As noted in the evaluation of the CroSPiLAn-1 programme by Indecon Economic Consultants, its activities "must be regarded as a ‘soft’ support to the sustainable development of the border region’ and ‘the synergies they produce should not be underestimated’. The Indecon evaluation further noted the key role of the ICLRD as an advocate / animator of change, and facilitator between the policy-praxis divide in the Irish border region.

Providing researchers, policy-makers and practitioners with timely access to data and information to better understand the implications of development trends and patterns has been an important part of ICLRD’s work since 2007. Under the CroSPiLAn-1 programme, the ICLRD, together with its sister organisation, the All-Island Research Observatory (AIRO), completed four applied research activities that provide both mapping tools and recommendations on how data and information can be used to monitor the implementation of spatial strategies. Three highly interactive mapping tools are available on the AIRO website (www.airo.ie):

- The **All-Island Accessibility Mapping Tool** (2012) maps levels of access to key services across the island in areas such as
education, health, transport and emergency services.

- The All-Island Deprivation Index (2012) facilitates, for the first time, a comparative analysis of deprivation at a regional level throughout the island. This Index can supplement the existing indices used within Ireland and Northern Ireland that are incompatible with each other and help researchers, communities and programmes to better understand the spatial distribution of deprivation. Both AIRO and ICLRD will further test this methodology with the 2011 Census data for Ireland and Northern Ireland.

- The Island of Ireland Housing Monitoring Tool (2011) provides an interactive mapping and querying tool for housing market indicators, combining for the first time data from both Ireland and Northern Ireland. The mapped outputs assist in understanding the spatial implications and outcomes of policy decisions and interventions over time.

The fourth element of this work programme, the research study Towards a Spatial Monitoring Framework for the Island of Ireland: A Scoping Study (see also page 167) is available to download from the ICLRD website.

ICLRD Journal: Borderlands

Borderlands: The Journal of Spatial Planning in Ireland is published on an annual basis and covers a range of topics of interest to academics, practitioners and policy-makers involved in spatial planning and local and regional development.

The January 2013 edition of the Journal was launched at the eighth annual ICLRD conference, and includes articles on cross-border health data; the work of the International Fund for Ireland from 1986-2011; the regeneration of Limerick; the planners’ toolkit and the importance of interdependence to overcome fragmentation of processes and actors; territorial cohesion and EU 2020; transport policy and the role of scenario modelling in determining economic development patterns; spatial planners as managers of change; a transatlantic exploration of planning frameworks and strategies; and local government in transition.

The second issue of Borderlands: The Journal of Spatial Planning in Ireland was launched by Frank McDonald, Environment Editor of The Irish Times, in January 2012 at the seventh annual ICLRD conference. Articles in this issue focused on cross-border river basin management; pathways to managing regional growth; modelling infrastructure investments; the development of a cross-border deprivation index; marine spatial planning and its role in the
management of ocean resources; reinstating ‘kids’ into planning policy and practice; and the key links between spatial planning, data and housing policies. Copies of the articles are now available to download off the ICLRD website, www.iclrd.org

The inaugural issue of *Borderlands: The Journal of Spatial Planning in Ireland* was launched at the sixth annual ICLRD conference in January 2011. This issue included articles on the challenges of planning and governance reform on both sides of the Irish border; planning for sustainable communities; balancing private sector interests with the ‘common good’ in planning; cross-border planning in the greater Basel region between Switzerland, France and Germany; and how NGOs and academics in the Boston region have pioneered new methods of evidence-informed planning. Contributors to the inaugural issue included Professor Peter Roberts (Homes and Communities Agency), Professor Greg Lloyd (University of Ulster), Charlotte Kahn (Boston Indicators Project), Holly St Clair (Boston Metropolitan Area Planning Council) and ICLRD partners. The journal was launched by Mary Bunting and Anne Barrington, Joint Secretaries of the North South Ministerial Council.

**Professional education**

Under the CroSpiaN-1 initiative, the ICLRD held professional education programmes for council officials, elected representatives and the private sector for three areas in the Irish border region:
- Irish Central Border Area Network Region (ICBAN)
- The Northwest Region
- Newry/Dundalk Twin City Region.

Each programme was tailored to help local governments and the business community to engage with the spatial planning agenda and build an awareness of the benefits of regional cooperation among local governments and other key stakeholders in the border region. Each programme introduced carefully selected case studies of international good practice and external speakers, and facilitated working groups to help participants to assess their current level of cross-border cooperation; develop suggestions for improvement; and propose institutional mechanisms to promote future collaboration.

**ICBAN Region Training Programme: October 2011 – December 2011**

This six-module training programme, *Harnessing diversity in a shared future*, was developed in association with the 10 councils that make up the Irish Central Border Area – five North and five South. As with the previous programmes, the modules were delivered through a mix of invited expert speakers, facilitated working group discussions and wider networking opportunities through additional seminars and workshops. Unlike the previous programmes, this training programme engaged with senior management only from the 10 councils.
This programme has helped local authorities in this cross-border region to identify opportunities for potential cooperation in the identified priority areas of shared services; tourism, culture, diaspora and creative industries; and energy and renewables. It provided an intense space (the modules were held at two-week intervals) in which the councils worked together to research and refine local and regional development issues for the area, as well as activities linked to the ongoing ICBAN-led, INTERREG-funded Spatial Planning Initiative. For example, over the coming months, the councils – with the support of both the ICLRD and ICBAN – will feed their conclusions and recommendations into the regional Spatial Vision Plan that has been recently commissioned by ICBAN.

**Northwest Training Programme: October 2010 – June 2011**

This programme focused on the theme of *Fostering Growth through Cooperation in the Northwest Region*. Donegal County Council, Derry City Council, the ILEX Regeneration Company and representatives of the Strabane and Limavady District Councils participated in the programme, which aimed to lead to a deeper understanding of the potential of the Northwest region and the role of a cross-border Strategic Partnership Board in furthering strategic cooperation in the linked gateway between Letterkenny and Derry/Londonderry.

The materials introduced through the modules and ideas generated through working group discussions were incorporated into the cross-border activities of the Donegal County Development Plan, the North West Partnership Board, and the ‘One Plan for Derry-Londonderry’. Having won the designation as UK Capital of Culture for 2013, potential thematic areas for cooperation for Derry/Londonderry include tourism, creative industries and cultural programming. Other priority cross-border themes include enterprise development, vocational training and job creation, and the green economy and sustainable energy. There are also important cross-cutting themes such as greater accessibility to the Northwest region, transportation and spatial planning.

**Newry/Dundalk Twin City Region Training Programme: November 2009 – May 2010**

Building on a previous ICLRD initiative, *The Newry-Dundalk Twin City Region: Supporting the Implementation of Cross-Border Collaborative Frameworks* (January 2009), the ICLRD organised a training programme, *Shaping and Managing Cross-Border Development*, for council officials, councillors and private sector representatives from Newry and Mourne District Council, Louth Local Authorities and Down District Council. The training raised awareness of the challenges and opportunities that the region faces, as well as the need for collaborative action, including the creation of stronger links between the communities in the wider...
Newry-Dundalk Twin-City region, such as Drogheda and Banbridge.

As a follow-up, Newry and Mourne and Louth councils requested ICLRD assistance to develop a cooperation agreement that built on their existing areas of cooperation, and opened up further opportunities for the sharing of services and joint management of key resources. The ICLRD outlined different types of instruments and institutional structures that could be used to facilitate cross-border cooperation and worked with the councils to draft a Memorandum of Understanding that identified the initial areas of cooperation. These included emergency planning; renewable energy and green technology; tourism and recreation; and sustainable economic growth and job creation. Cooperative structures included a joint Committee of Elected Members; a joint Senior Management Group; an Advisory Forum; and project teams for implementation. The MoU was approved by the respective councils in November 2010 and launched in Brussels in March 2011.

Completed research projects

*Briefing Report on Shared Services: Propositions for Local Government Collaboration (2012)*

This research focuses on the timely issue of shared services and discusses the emerging shared services agenda for both jurisdictions on the island of Ireland. The briefing paper, a companion paper to the international cases on shared services noted below, synthesises ICLRD’s research to date on this topic as well as presentations by experts on the topic delivered during the ICLRD executive training programmes – with a particular focus on the Irish border region. The paper reflects on potential directions and approaches that could be incorporated into current programmes for providing services in a financially constrained economic context.

*Shared Services across Local Government – Sharing International Experiences (2012)*

This report explores international experiences in shared services and local government reform in four locations: Glasgow and the Clyde Valley in Scotland; Mancomunidades in the Asturias Region of Spain; New York’s Shared Services Programme; and Local Government Restructuring and Realignment in Ontario, Canada. The cases illustrate the rethinking of cooperation in the delivery of public services in geographical areas that may include more than one local authority, and how both structured and voluntary associations can be used to provide a range of services. The cases also highlight the associated challenges of multi-level governance in the provision of services, and the importance of leadership and trust in paving the way for future cooperation. This research
will be of interest to senior management in local government and regional authorities, regional development agencies, cross-border networks and agencies, and national policy-makers.

**Towards a Spatial Monitoring Framework for the Island of Ireland: A Scoping Study (2012)**

This report focuses on the application of data for the purpose of informing policy decisions, in particular with respect to the policy objectives and strategic ambitions of the National Spatial Strategy for the Republic of Ireland (NSS) and the Regional Development Strategy for Northern Ireland (RDS). It draws on international experience at the European level and elsewhere in the UK. The report responds to the need for a joined-up approach to evidence-based planning given the emergence of multiple spatial planning initiatives in the Irish cross-border region. International studies and experience indicate the importance of evidence-informed approaches to decision making, but also the dangers of relying on statistical or quantitative information without taking due account of the underlying processes the data represents. This is often represented as ‘data rich but insight poor’. The study provides a valuable source of expert advice for policy-makers and practitioners at national and regional government levels.


This detailed case study focuses on the States of Berlin and Brandenburg in Germany and the Elbe International River Basin District (IRBD). It demonstrates how one catchment area applied both regulatory and non-regulatory measures to integrate water quality improvements with regional land-use plans. This document presents many insights of relevance to International River Basin Districts and the EU Water Framework Directive implementation on the island of Ireland more broadly.


This US case study demonstrates how one watershed applied both regulatory and non-regulatory measures to integrate water quality improvements with regional land-use plans. It describes how regional partnerships, and in particular collaboration with civic society, are instrumental in managing river basins that span multiple jurisdictions. It notes that while EU directives and legislation are important in setting the regulatory
parameters, individual river basins need champions to drive regional partnerships that bring together officials, politicians, civil society, recreational users, environmental organisations, landowners and the private sector to improve water quality and enhance opportunities for (re)connecting with the river through recreational uses.

Responding to the Environmental Challenge?
Spatial Planning, Cross-Border Cooperation and River Basin Management (2011)
This study examines the key role that spatial planning should play in the implementation of River Basin Management Plans (RBMP) under the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD). The study takes an all-island and cross-border perspective and draws key insights through ‘good practice’ case studies from Germany and the United States.

The study sets out strategic options regarding the governance of RBMP and WFD implementation in both Ireland and Northern Ireland. These options, drawing on research and interviews with key stakeholders, can inform discussions among government departments, environmental agencies and other public sector bodies on both sides of the Irish border. The case studies pay particular attention to the benefits of joint management of International River Basin Districts. The study raises important questions regarding the role of spatial planning in environmental management and sets out seven key requirements for effective coordination between river basin management and spatial planning. These requirements include recommendations in relation to communication, development of expertise, leadership capacity, allocation of resources and inter-jurisdictional cooperation.

Governance and Planning: An International Perspective (2010)
The ICLRD published a series of international case studies in inter-jurisdictional and cross-boundary governance and planning to complement the study All Change But Any Alignment? (see below). This research presents examples of innovative practice in collaboration in the following areas:

• Basel Metropolitan Area – spanning Germany, France and Switzerland, this case study highlights emerging cross-border cooperation in spatial planning at the sub-regional level;
• Mancomunidades in Spain – focuses on provision of services through inter-municipal collaboration at the level of the micro-region; and
• Boston Metropolitan Area – provides examples of how to promote regional development through cooperation among local governments, metropolitan planning organisations, the
business community and research organisations.

Together, the three case studies highlight how territorial cooperation, particularly in the EU, is moving towards ‘place-based strategies’ as promoted in the EU 2020 Strategy.

**All Change But Any Alignment? The Impact of the Proposed Governance and Planning Reforms Across the Island of Ireland on Inter-Jurisdictional Planning (2010)**

This report focuses on inter-jurisdictional planning and multi-level governance and was published on the ICLRD website. The study considers:

- The various iterations of and processes involved in the Northern Ireland Review of Public Administration, specifically as it relates to the reform of local government;
- If and/or how inter-jurisdictional spatial planning policies and operations will be more closely aligned following the various reforms to governance and planning on the island of Ireland; and
- Whether, in the context of the current economic downturn, there is greater political and community support for the alignment of spatial planning policies.

**Developing a Strategic Alliance between Newry and Mourne District Council and the Louth Local Authorities: Background Report (2010)**

Louth Local Authorities and Newry and Mourne District Council took a major step in the promotion of cross-border partnership in the border region with the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding in 2011 to cooperate in a number of thematic areas, including emergency planning, renewable energy and green technology, tourism and recreation, sustainable economic growth and job creation.

In support of this development, the ICLRD report considered a variety of legal instruments to facilitate cross-border cooperation, including Euroregions, European Groupings for Territorial Cooperation (EGTCs), European Economic Interest Groupings (EEIGs) and ad hoc agreements. It recommended that the cross-border local authorities adopt a legally non-binding Memorandum of Understanding as the basis for cooperation, with the agreement able to be expanded to include other regional stakeholders in the future.

Following the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding, a new Louth/Newry and Mourne Joint Council Committee was established to progress joint initiatives and the two Councils are
now sharing council officers and staff in a common office to implement the MoU.

**Delineating Functional Territories Across the Island of Ireland: An Initial Scoping (2010)**

This report considered the various options for mapping functional territories across the island of Ireland. In undertaking a preliminary analysis of Functional Urban Areas (FUAs) of the Irish / Northern Irish urban systems, the study included maps of natural catchments, travel-to-work catchments, origin-destination data, gravity models and urban functional specialisations. The focus of Phase I was to explore the various possibilities of mapping functional territories to produce a set of outputs based on datasets that were available to the research team. The resulting report illustrated the contribution that dynamic spatial analysis of urban functions can make in the profiling of the relational status, performance and potential of urban centres across the island. The research was carried out by a multi-disciplinary team within ICLRD and funded by the Higher Education Authority (HEA).

**Safe, Integrated and Sustainable Communities (2009)**

This research project investigated initiatives in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland to improve and build subsidised housing in mixed communities through the lens of six case studies: Springfarm (Antrim), the Irish Street and Gobnascale interface (Londonderry/Derry) and Carran Crescent (Enniskillen) in Northern Ireland; and Cranmore (Sligo), Mahon (Cork) and Adamstown (Dublin) in the Republic of Ireland. Together, they provided a cross-section of the challenges faced by communities working to promote or provide mixed housing; the strategies that have helped address these challenges, and opportunities to create and maintain housing that is safe, prosperous and open to all. The six case studies were published in association with the Northern Ireland Housing Executive (NIHE) in Belfast and the Housing Agency in Dublin.

**Rural Restructuring: Local Sustainable Solutions to the Rural Challenge (2009)**

This report was launched in June 2009 by the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD), Michelle Gildernew MLA. The culmination of a 12-month research project, the research considered the role of rural restructuring and economic diversification, together with the growing importance of the urban-rural interface, in the achievement of balanced spatial
development. The research focused on three rural areas: Draperstown in Magherafelt District, Emyvale-Truagh-Aughnaclay on the Monaghan-Tyrone border, and Duhallow on the Cork-Kerry border.

Both Draperstown and Duhallow have been engaged in a process of rural restructuring for the past 25 years and have built up a wealth of experience over this time. For Emyvale-Truagh-Aughnaclay, the challenges facing this rural community have been further exacerbated by its cross-border location and the impact of decades of back-to-back policy development across both administrations (North and South). Building on over 80 interviews, as well as a wealth of secondary data, the research team also developed a series of working papers on each area and held a one-day conference on the issue of rural restructuring in May 2009.

The resulting report was launched in February 2009 by Conor Murphy MP MLA, Minister for Regional Development in Northern Ireland, and John Gormley TD, Minister for the Environment, Heritage and Local Government of the Republic of Ireland, at the Carrickdale Hotel, Ravensdale, Dundalk, County Louth. The report brought together recent and current research on how to realise the benefits of cross-border collaboration in the Newry-Dundalk sub-region through integrated planning and development strategies.

**Newry-Dundalk Twin City Region: Supporting the Implementation of Cross-Border Collaborative Frameworks (2009)**

ICLRD undertook this research initiative in cooperation with Louth County Council, the Newry Mourne District Council, Dundalk Town Council and InterTradeIreland. Its objective was to identify (a) potential projects that could bring long-term benefits to the ‘twin city’ region of Newry-Dundalk and (b) models of cooperation to assist in their implementation.

Fostering Mutual Benefits in Cross-Border Areas: The Challenges and Opportunities in Connecting Irish Border Towns and Villages (2008)

This 18-month research project focused on the inter-relationships between cross-border towns and villages in the Irish Border region. The final report was launched in Blacklion, County Cavan in November 2008 by the author Colm Toibin. The research considered the relationship and connectivity that exist between five cross-border settlement groupings, and identified and examined the challenges facing and opportunities within these micro-regions. The Border towns and villages included in the study were:

- Lifford-Strabane
- Kiltyclogher-Cashel/Scribbagh-Garrison-Rossinver
The key objective of this study was to identify good practices in joined-up planning and regeneration for interconnected, cross-border areas, with a particular emphasis on collaborative efforts that have supported local economic development, social cohesion and mutual benefits. In addition, the study sought to identify factors associated with successful collaboration through reviewing projects with a history of successful interaction and outcomes including institutional frameworks for collaboration.


On the occasion of the ICLRD third annual conference in January 2008, ICLRD and AIRO launched *The Atlas of the Island of Ireland*, a set of detailed full colour maps and cartograms of varied socio-economic indicators across the island. The Atlas, co-authored by Justin Gleeson, Rob Kitchin, Brendan Bartley, John Driscoll, Ronan Foley, Stewart Fotheringham and Chris Lloyd, was launched by Tommie Gorman, Northern Editor of Radio Telefis Eireann (RTE).


This report was prepared by the ICLRD and commissioned by InterTradeIreland on behalf of the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government in the Republic of Ireland and the Department for Regional Development in Northern Ireland. The report outlined measures to better align spatial planning, infrastructure and cross-border projects to support long-term economic competitiveness, and was endorsed by the British-Irish Intergovernmental Conference. Both Governments committed themselves to developing a framework for collaborative action between the two existing spatial strategies on the Island.

**Conferences**

**Eighth Annual Conference: Cooperating across Boundaries: Resilience, Imagination, Vision...and Information**

7 February 2013, Canal Court Hotel, Newry

This one-day conference, attended by over 100 people, considered what type of cooperative models should be pursued in the context of ongoing local government reform, continued austerity, the increasing availability of data and
the unceasing need for strategic development.

The conference was organised around three themed sessions. The first explored the role of planning and regeneration in creating resilient places and connected communities. The second considered how to encourage and support shared opportunities in the provision of services and the promotion of strategic cooperation. The third gave participants a chance to debate the extent to which inter-municipal and cross-jurisdictional cooperation is an important factor in contributing to innovation and sustainable development – with specific consideration being given to models of collaborative working and service delivery, evidence-based planning, and building capacity for new responsibilities.

Among the speakers were Professor Frank Gaffikin, Professor of Spatial Planning at Queen’s University Belfast; John Fitzgerald, Chairman of An Post and the National Transport Authority, former Chairman of Limerick Regeneration Agencies and Dublin City Manager; Jenny Pyper, Deputy Secretary, NI Department of Social Development; Niall Cussen, Senior Adviser in the Planning and Housing Division of the Irish Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government; Siobhan Coughlan, Programme Manager at the UK ‘s Local Government Association; Dr Brendan O’Keefe, Mary Immaculate College, University of Limerick; Seamus Neely, Donegal City Manager; Ciaran Cuffe, Dublin Institute of Technology and formerly Irish Minister of State with responsibility for Planning and Climate Change; Professor Rob Kitchen, Director, National Institute of Regional and Spatial Analysis (NIRSA) at NUI Maynooth and Mary Bunting, former Northern Joint Secretary of the North South Ministerial Council.

19-20 January 2012, Crowne Plaza Hotel, Dundalk

Attended by 135 delegates and speakers, the conference was organised as part of the CroSPlaN-1 project funded by the Special EU Programmes Body under the INTERREG IVA Programme. The conference was organised around three main sessions:

- The Collaborative Framework: Cross-Border Regionalism in Action – the role of new regionalism in enhancing cooperation within functional regions
- Leadership through Planning: Demonstrating Leadership in Achieving the ‘Common Good’ – debating the role of communities, the private sector, and planners in learning from the past and planning a new future.
- Planning the Future: Rethinking the Role of Planning, Governance and Community – bringing people together to consider the role and
future of planning and local and regional development, and the opportunities and implications of emerging EU agendas on policy and practice.

The conference explored the common challenges faced by the island of Ireland and its European neighbours in terms of the global economic downturn, stagnant development and the legacy of over a decade of sometimes ill-planned development. These challenges have knock-on implications for cross-border cooperation, sustainable development and engaging local authorities, businesses and residents in shaping their communities.

Speakers and session chairs included Professor Alan Wallis, University of Colorado; Professor Karina Pallagst, Kaiserslautern University of Technology, Germany; Professor Mary Corcoran, NUI Maynooth; Professor Deborah Peel, University of Ulster; Jenny Pyper, NI Department for Social Development; Justin Gleeson, All-Island Research Observatory (AIRO); Maria-Jose Doval-Tedin, DG Regional Policy, European Commission; Anne Garvey, NI Department of Environment; Colin Stutt, Colin Stutt Consulting, Belfast; Alice Charles, Alice Charles Planning, Dublin; Vincent Goodstadt, independent consultant and University of Manchester; and Kelley O’Brien, Chicagoland Tri-State Metropolitan OECD Review.

**Sixth Annual Conference:**


20-21 January 2011, Radisson BLU Hotel, Ballincar, Co Sligo

Attended by 110 people representing central, regional and local government, elected representatives, policy-makers, cross-border networks, community activists, academics and representatives of the business community, this two-day conference was sponsored by the Special EU Programmes Body. The conference was organised around four sessions:

1. Planning for Economic Recovery and Sustainable Growth
2. Planning for Homes and People: New Challenges, New Agendas
3. Planning for Shared Innovation: Infrastructure to Support Innovation-led Recovery

Recognising that the past twelve months had represented a time of significant change for the island of Ireland, the conference focused on the changing budgetary, legislative and policy landscape, and the practical realities of reduced budgets.

Speakers and session chairs included: Nicholas Retsinas, Harvard Business
School; Shaun Henry, Special EU Programmes Body; Greg Lloyd, University of Ulster; David Walsh, Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government; Jenny Pyper, Department for Regional Development; Eddy Curtis, Newry and Mourne District Council; Pádraig Maguire, Border Regional Authority; Justin Gleeson, All-Island Research Observatory; Joe Frey, Northern Ireland Housing Executive; Rob Kitchin, National Institute for Regional and Spatial Analysis; Grainia Long, Chartered Institute of Housing Northern Ireland; Aidan Gough, InterTradeIreland; Dermot Byrne, Eirgrid; Frank McDonald, The Irish Times; Gary McDarby, University College Dublin; Tracy Meharg, Invest Northern Ireland; Feargal McCormack, FPM Accountants; Patricia O’Hara, National Statistics Board, and Tim O’Connor, former Secretary-General to President McAleese’s Office.

Fifth Annual Conference: Preparing for Economic Recovery: Planning Ireland, North and South, out of Recession 21-22 January 2010, Killyhevlin Hotel, Enniskillen, Co. Fermanagh

Over 130 people attended this two-day event, which was sponsored by the Special EU Programmes Body under CroSPlaN. Pat Colgan, the Chief Executive of the Special EU Programmes Body, opened the conference; Professor John FitzGerald of the Economic and Social Research Institute gave the opening keynote address; and Declan Kelly, the U.S. Economic Envoy to Northern Ireland gave the closing address. The conference was organised around four sessions:

- Health Check on Economic Development, Planning and Infrastructure
- Planning and Economic Recovery – The Social and Community Dimension
- Building the Platform for Economic Recovery
- Recovery through Collaborative Spatial Planning

The conference addressed questions on how spatial planning can contribute to the process of economic recovery across the island of Ireland in a balanced and sustainable manner.

Other speakers included Charlotte Kahn, Director of the Boston indicators Project at the Boston Foundation; Holly St. Clair, Director of Data Services at the Boston-region Metropolitan Area Planning Council; Pat McArdle, Economist and Irish Times correspondent; Conor Skehan, Head, Environment and Planning Department, Dublin Institute of Technology; Wesley Shannon, Director Local Government Policy Division, NI Department of Environment; Hubert Kearns, Manager, Sligo County Council; Patricia Potter, Director of the Dublin Regional Authority; Dr. Celine McHugh, Senior Policy Advisor with Forfás; and Brian Murray, Chief Executive of The Workspace Group.
Rural Restructuring: Local Sustainable Solutions to the Rural Challenge
8 May 2009, Blackwater Learning Centre, Knockconan, Emyvale, Co. Monaghan

22-23 January 2009, Radisson Hotel, Letterkenny, Co. Donegal

Keynote speakers from overseas included Steve Quartermain, Chief Planning Officer in the Department for Communities and Local Government in London; Jim MacKinnon, Director for the Built Environment in the Scottish Government, and Grant Duncan, Head of the Sustainable Futures Division in the Welsh Assembly Government.

Third Annual Conference: Fostering Cooperation for Local and Regional Development through Cross-Border Spatial Planning
17 January 2008, Armagh City Hotel

Supporting Evidence-Informed Spatial Planning and Analysis: Towards the Development of All-Island Spatial Databases
15 November 2007, Crowne Plaza Hotel, Dundalk

Second Annual Conference: Implementing a Framework for Collaborative Action: Spatial Strategies on the Island of Ireland
9 November 2006, The Canal Court Hotel, Newry

First Annual Conference: Regional and Local Development Strategies on the Island of Ireland – Addressing Key Issues and Building Capacity
27 May 2004, Radisson Hotel, Athlone, Co. Westmeath

As well as organising its own conferences, the ICLRD has been invited to present its work at a number of events hosted by other agencies. These have included:

- Cross-border Observation between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland: Building Mutual Understanding, MOT’s First European Seminar on Observation of Cross-Border Territories, Nancy, France, 10 December 2012 (Caroline Creamer)
- Data Capture: Information Rich, Insight Poor?, ICBAN Spatial Planning Conference, Hotel Kilmore, Cavan, 1 December 2011 (Prof. Rob Kitchin and Justin Gleeson)
- The International Centre for Local and Regional Development: Purpose, Principles and Process, Presentation on the ICLRD to a South African delegation from Cacadu Municipality, Armagh City Hotel, 22 November 2011 (Caroline Creamer and Neale Blair)
- Cross-Border Local Authority Training Across the Island of Ireland, INICCO-1 International Conference on Cross-Border Training and Impact Assessment, Radisson Blu Hotel, Cavan, 27 October 2011 (Caroline Creamer)
- Indicator Development and Monitoring for the National Spatial Strategy and Regional Planning


Guidelines, ESPON Ireland Dublin, 28th September 2011 (Jim Hetherington)

- What is Spatial Planning? Irish Central Border Area Network Conference on Spatial Planning, Manor House Hotel, Killadeas, 15 September 2011 (Neale Blair)
- Fixing ‘Broken’ Government: Functional Territories as an Impetus for Reform, Regional Studies Association Conference, University of Manchester, 2 November 2010 (Caroline Creamer, Neale Blair and Justin Gleeson)
- Combating Rural Poverty and Social Exclusion, Pobal Conference, Drogheda, 21 October 2010 (Karen Keaveney)
- Inter-Municipal collaboration across borders: Overcoming Legal and Institutional Differences in the Irish Border Region, American Association of Geographers Annual (AAG) Conference, 14 April 2010 (John Driscoll)
- Challenges and Opportunities for Rural Regeneration on the Island of Ireland, UK-Ireland Planning Research Conference, Anglia Ruskin University, Chelmsford, 7-9 April 2010 (Karen Keaveney)
- Rural Interfaces: Reconciling Perception with Reality, Sharing Our Space Event Killyhevlin Hotel, Enniskillen, 4 March 2010 (Caroline Creamer)

- Divergence in Policy and Practice: Government and Community Perspectives on Rural Development, National University of Ireland, Galway, 2 December 2009 (Brendan O’Keeffe and Caroline Creamer)
- Rural Restructuring: Local Sustainable Solutions to the Rural Challenge, NSMC Sectoral Meeting on Agriculture and Rural Development, Greenmount College of Agriculture and Horticulture, Antrim, 21 July 2009 (Caroline Creamer, Neale Blair, Karen Keaveney and Brendan O’Keeffe)
- The Color of Money: The (Changing) Role of Funding in Cross-Border Collaboration, MOPAN Conference, NUI Maynooth, 18 June 2009 (Caroline Creamer and Neale Blair)
- Rural Restructuring: an Opportunity within a Challenge, Conference of Irish Geographers, University College Cork, 16 May 2009 (Caroline Creamer and Brendan O’Keeffe)
- Understanding and Shaping Regions: Spatial, Social and Economic Futures Leuven, Belgium in April 2009 (Brendan O’Keeffe)
- Shaping our Future: Reviewing Northern Ireland’s Regional Development Strategy at the Stormont Hotel in Belfast, 5 November 2008 (Brendan Bartley)
- Stuck Behind a Tractor! The Celtic Tiger and its Slow Chug towards the Border, First Irish Social Sciences Platform (ISSP) Conference, Dublin City University, 11 September 2008 (Caroline Creamer and Brendan O’Keeffe)
- Border Effective: The Economic Competitiveness Challenge Facing Towns and Villages in the Irish...
Border Region, ERSA Congress 2008, University of Liverpool, 28 August 2008 (Caroline Creamer)

- Shared Future – Shaping the Fabric of our Communities, Cork, 24-25 April 2008 (John Driscoll)
- Drivers of Connectivity: Understanding the Nature, Challenges and Potentials, Presentation on ICLRD to Croatian Delegation, Armagh City Hotel, 2 April 2008 (Caroline Creamer)
- Northern Europe, Planning Together for a Sustainable Future in Inverness, Scotland, 11-15 November 2007 (Brendan Bartley)
- Cooperation in the Twin-City Region, Ballymascanlon House, Dundalk, 1 November 2007 Dundalk Chamber’s Annual Conference Border Vision Gateway, (John Driscoll)

Seminars and workshops

Local Governance in the UK and Ireland: So Far, So Near...
23-24 November 2012, Valenciennes, France

As part of the Europe-wide OLA (Observatory on Local Autonomy) Network, the ICLRD and the University of Valenciennes organised a two-day European symposium on local and regional governance. This event brought together high-level speakers and delegates from Britain, Ireland, Northern Ireland, France and other parts of Europe – including representatives from ICBAN (Irish Central Border Area Network), Border Regional Authority, Western Development Commission, Institute of Public Administration, and Seán O’Riordáin and Associates. The

ICLRD has been affiliated to OLA since 2009, with Caroline Creamer (NUI Maynooth) and Dr. Brendan O’Keeffe (Mary Immaculate College, University of Limerick) representing Ireland, and Professor Deborah Peel (University of Ulster) representing Northern Ireland.

River Basin Management Plans: Cross-Border Cooperation and the Role of Spatial Planning
17 October 2012, Monaghan

Building on a series of ICLRD reports, including documentation of good practices in cross-border river management, the Centre and the Border Regional Authority jointly hosted a half-day seminar on river basin management on the island of Ireland. Attendees included senior planners and representatives from local government in the Irish border region, the Northern Ireland Environmental Agency and the Irish Department of Environment, Community and Local Government. The importance of small-scale approaches to water resource management was one of the key issues highlighted.

Should Ambulances Stop at the Border? North-South Cooperation in Health
13 June 2012, Dublin

This evening seminar, held in association with the Institute for British-Irish Studies (IBIS), University College Dublin and the Centre for Cross Border Studies, was attended by over 60 healthcare policymakers, academics and professionals from across the island. Chaired by Dr Maurice Hayes, the seminar addressed questions around an all-island strategy.
on health, and the desirability of deepening cross-border healthcare co-operation to increase access to specialist services and facilities.

**Models of Cross-Border and Inter-Jurisdictional Cooperation: Learning from the Experiences of Others**
19 January 2012, Crowne Plaza Hotel, Dundalk

Organised as part of CroSPlaN-1, this half-day technical workshop was attended by over 30 delegates from central government, local authorities and academics interested in the application of models of cooperation to address common opportunities in cross-border cooperation. Three senior practitioners from local agencies and authorities in Massachusetts, Spain and the Irish Border Region presented examples of inter-jurisdictional cooperation agreements.

**Planning and Local Government on the Island of Ireland**
30 September 2011, Dundalk

Organised in association with Cooperation Ireland and Queen’s University Belfast, this seminar drew over 100 delegates from Ireland and Northern Ireland. The emphasis of the event was to look at the growing territorial agenda and the opportunities this creates for enhanced cross-border cooperation across the island as demonstrated by the experiences of others in Europe, and to focus on the potential role of elected members in the planning and governance processes of each jurisdiction in Ireland.

**Land Banking and Housing Development: The (New) Role of the Planning System**
28 April 2011, NUI Maynooth

**Developing Core Strategies: Adopting a Bottom-up Approach**
9 March 2011, Hodson Bay Hotel, Athlone

**The Functionality of Place: Determining and Mapping Functional Territories**
16 June 2010, Armagh City Hotel

**Evidence-Informed Planning: Making Information Accessible to build Inter-Jurisdictional Cooperation**
21 January 2010, Killyhevlin Hotel, Enniskillen, Co. Fermanagh
An Introduction to Smart Growth  
22 January 2009, Radisson Hotel, Letterkenny, Co. Donegal

Supporting Evidence-Based Spatial Planning and Analysis in Ireland: Towards the Development of All-Island Spatial Databases  
15 February 2007 in NUI Maynooth; and 20 June 2007 in University of Ulster

Exploring the Economic and Social Implications of the National Spatial Strategy  
15 April 2005, Athlone, Co. Westmeath

Outreach

Irish Central Border Region (2011-2012)

The ICLRD has been closely involved in providing guidance to the Irish Central Border Area Network’s (ICBAN’s) cross-border spatial planning activities. The Central Border Region Spatial Planning Initiative, which has been partly financed by the EU’s INTERREG IVA Programme, is a drive by ICBAN to give the region distinctiveness, translating key national plans into local and regional actions. The ICLRD provided technical assistance during the set-up period and will continue in its role as an external advisor post-2012.

North West Gateway Initiative (2011-2012)

Following the ICLRD 2011 training programme in the North West, the Centre has continued to provide assistance to local councils and the North West Partnership Board (NWPB) to consolidate initiatives supporting strategic cooperation in the NW Gateway region. Activities have included:
- Undertaking reviews of respective local policy documents such as the Donegal County Development Plan and the One Plan for Derry/Londonderry to identify common areas for future cooperation;
- Supporting the NWPB in their preparations for meeting with the NSMC and senior officials from those government departments involved in the NW Gateway Initiative;
- Engaging with key stakeholders in the North West and central government departments in Belfast and Dublin leading to a recommendation to develop a 2013 Action Plan to strengthen the linkages between the North West Gateway initiatives and the priorities for government (including the revised RDS and NSS, and the forthcoming Cooperative Framework for Spatial Planning).

Truagh-Aughnacloy Community Planning (2011-2012)

Since 2010 the ICLRD has been providing technical assistance to a number of community development associations along the North Monaghan / South Tyrone border. The development associations from Truagh, Aughnacloy, Aghaloo, the Bawn, Loughans, Clara and Carrickroe are working together on a community business and social economy plan. This is the first time that these neighbouring associations have formally worked together.
The next phase of the groups’ work will examine the feasibility of:

- A Blackwater Valley branded business development and marketing initiative;
- An Independent Living Project providing support services to lone dwellers and older people, in addition to community-based employment opportunities, especially for women; and
- The Implementation of a Youth Employment, Entrepreneurship and Leadership Programme.

In order to consult with residents on both sides of border and to gain insights into the types of social economy and community development activities that would be favoured locally, young people from Truagh and the surrounding communities came together in 2012 to undertake a household survey. The ICLRD provided technical support to enable them to formulate a survey questionnaire and to process the results. The response rate throughout the area was very positive and a wealth of suggestions were advanced. In the meantime, the youth have assumed leadership roles within their own communities, and are bringing a fresh vitality and energy to local development and cross-border collaboration.

**Briefing paper series**

In November 2009 the ICLRD launched its *Briefing Paper Series*. This involves the publication of short, timely articles that explore how various forms of planning, enacted at different spatial scales, can contribute to better collaboration on the pressing issues facing both the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland. By considering both jurisdictions on the island and the potential synergies and efficiencies that can be realised through cooperation, the series aims to provide a more rounded view than considering each jurisdiction in isolation. Articles available to date include:

- *Biomass Resource in the Island of Ireland* by Michael Doran, Executive Director of Action Renewables (September 2012);
- *Reflections on the Boom: A Time for Reform* by Dr. Patricia O’Hara, Chairperson of the National Statistics Board and Adjunct Professor at the National Institute for Regional Spatial Analysis (NIRSA), NUI Maynooth (August 2011);
- *Innovation: The Challenge of Building an Adaptive and Innovative Society* by Dr. James Cunningham, Director of the Centre for Innovation and Structural Change (CISC) and senior lecturer at the J.E. Cairnes School of Business & Economics at NUI Galway (May 2011);
- *Doing More with Less: A Business Perspective* by Feargal McCormack, FPM Chartered Accountants (January 2011);
- *Recovery Scenarios for the Two Irish Economies* by Prof. John FitzGerald, The Economic and Social Research Institute (July 2010);
Evidence-Informed Spatial Planning: A Metro Boston Perspective by Holly St Clair, Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC), Boston (May 2010);

ESPON – A New Practical European Research Agenda for Territorial Development by Cliff Hague, ESPON Contact Point UK and Brendan Bartley, ESPON Contact Point Republic of Ireland (Feb. 2010);

The Conditions Necessary for Gateway Development and The Role of Smaller Gateways in Economic Development by Prof. Jim Walsh, NUI Maynooth and Cormac Walsh, Urban Institute, University College Dublin (Jan, 2010);

Linking Spatial Planning with Public Investment: Perspectives from the island of Ireland by David Counsell, Planner & Prof. Greg Lloyd, University of Ulster (Dec. 2009);

Good Planning Key to Future Success by Prof. Rob Kitchin, NUI Maynooth & Prof. Alastair Adair, University of Ulster (Nov. 2009).

Website
The International Centre for Local and Regional Development’s website is at www.iclrd.org

DEBATING SCIENCE ISSUES

In 2013 – for the second year running – the Centre (along with the W5 interactive discovery centre in Belfast) organised the Ulster regional eliminators of the Debating Science Issues all-island schools debating competition, led by the Regenerative Medicine Institute (REMEDi) at National University of Ireland Galway and funded by the Wellcome Trust.

The Debating Science Issues is a competition which invites young people to engage in debate on the cultural, societal and ethical implications of advances in biological science. It is open to students in the senior cycle of secondary school in the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland. It is coordinated by nine research, medical and science centres all over Ireland: REMEDI; the Alimentary Pharmabiotic Centre at University College Cork; the Biomedical Diagnostics Institute at Dublin City University; the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland in Dublin; W5 in Belfast; CLARITY, a joint University College Dublin-DCU Centre for Science,
Ansley Patterson and Daniel Part from Banbridge Academy in County Down, winners of the 2013 all-Ireland Debating Science Issues schools debating competition. The final took place in the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland in Dublin.

The 2013 topics for debate were stem cell research; health and self-testing; genetically modified food; nanotechnology; serious rare diseases; vaccination against seasonal and pandemic flu, and organ transplants. The eight Ulster schools in the 2013 regional eliminators were Banbridge Academy, Down High School, Downpatrick; St Patrick’s College and St Catherine’s College, both Armagh; Our Lady and St Patrick’s, Knock, East Belfast; St Pius X College, Magherafelt, Co Derry; St Catherine’s College, Killybegs, Co Donegal; and Aquinas Diocesan Grammar School, Belfast.

Banbridge Academy went on to win the final of the all-Ireland competition in the Royal College of Surgeons in Dublin on 22 February 2013.

PAST RESEARCH PROJECTS

The Centre has commissioned and published 22 cross-border research projects in the fields of telecommunications developments, health services, disadvantage in education, EU funding programmes, local government links, mental health promotion, waste management policies, local history societies, animal health, the euro, local sustainable development, diversity in early years education, science and citizenship education, environmental studies in primary engineering and Technology; CRANN, a nanoscience research centre at Trinity College Dublin; Cork Institute of Technology and the Centre for Cross Border Studies.

The 2013 topics for debate were stem cell research; health and self-testing; genetically modified food; nanotechnology; serious rare diseases; vaccination against seasonal and pandemic flu, and organ transplants. The eight Ulster schools in the 2013 regional eliminators were Banbridge Academy, Down High School, Downpatrick; St Patrick’s College and St Catherine’s College, both Armagh; Our Lady and St Patrick’s, Knock, East Belfast; St Pius X College, Magherafelt, Co Derry; St Catherine’s College, Killybegs, Co Donegal; and Aquinas Diocesan Grammar School, Belfast.

Banbridge Academy went on to win the final of the all-Ireland competition in the Royal College of Surgeons in Dublin on 22 February 2013.

PAST RESEARCH PROJECTS

The Centre has commissioned and published 22 cross-border research projects in the fields of telecommunications developments, health services, disadvantage in education, EU funding programmes, local government links, mental health promotion, waste management policies, local history societies, animal health, the euro, local sustainable development, diversity in early years education, science and citizenship education, environmental studies in primary engineering and Technology; CRANN, a nanoscience research centre at Trinity College Dublin; Cork Institute of Technology and the Centre for Cross Border Studies.
schools, public sector training, hospital services, mental health research, government services to minority ethnic groups, impact assessment, the border region economy and North-South public service provision.

These projects involved researchers drawn from 14 universities, colleges, independent research centres and consultancy firms in Ireland and Britain: Queen’s University Belfast, University of Ulster, Dublin City University, University College Dublin, National University of Ireland Galway, National University of Ireland Maynooth, St Patrick’s College Drumcondra, Stranmillis University College, the Institute of Public Administration, Belfast City Hospital, Dundalk Institute of Technology, the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Horwath Bastow Charleton, and the Centre for Cross Border Studies itself. The research assignments under the North/South public sector training project (2004-2007) also involved civil and public servants from both jurisdictions.

The Centre has published the following research projects:


A number of case studies of developments in mobile and wireless telephony across the Irish border from a research team led by two of Ireland’s leading specialists in information retrieval, data analysis and image and signal processing: Professor Fionn Murtagh, then of Queen’s University Belfast, and Dr John Keating of National University of Ireland Maynooth. The project was sponsored by eircom.

**Cross-Border Co-operation in Health Services in Ireland (2001)**

A study of the past, present and potential for future co-operation in health services across the Irish border by a research team led by Dr Jim Jamison, formerly director of the Health and Social Care Research Unit at Queen’s University Belfast, and including Professor Martin McKee of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Dr Ciaran O’Neill of the University of Ulster, and Ms Michelle Butler of the Institute of Public Administration in Dublin.

**Ireland’s Learning Poor: Adult Educational Disadvantage and Cross-Border Co-operation (2001)**

A study of the needs of the more than a million people on the island who left school with few or no qualifications by Dr Mark Morgan of St Patrick’s College, Drumcondra, and Mr Paul McGill, formerly education correspondent of the Belfast Telegraph. They concluded that current policies in both jurisdictions were
far removed from a vision of lifelong learning which allows people of all ages and social classes equal access to education and training.

Creating Living Institutions: EU Cross-Border Co-operation after the Good Friday Agreement (2001)
A study by Professor Brigid Laffan and Dr Diane Payne of the Institute for British-Irish Studies at University College Dublin, which analysed the interaction between the North-South Institutions set up under the Good Friday Agreement – notably the North/South Ministerial Council and the Special EU Programmes Body - and the EU’s funding programme for cross-border co-operation, INTERREG.

A study by Professor Derek Birrell and Amanda Hayes of the University of Ulster of the different kinds of cross-border links between local authorities, including one-to-one linkages, local government cross-border networks, and cross-border partnerships involving other agencies. It also analysed the project management methods used, the views of the councillors involved and the involvement of the European Union.

A study of the cross-border dimension of the 2001 foot-and-mouth disease outbreak by the Centre’s research manager, Dr Patricia Clarke, with comments from the Departments of Agriculture in Belfast and Dublin. Issued exactly a year after the original outbreak in England, the report’s findings were praised by the two Ministers, Brid Rodgers and Joe Walsh, as “extremely valuable” in helping the Departments to formulate actions to deal with animal health emergencies.

This is a two-part study by a team from National University of Ireland Galway led by Dr Margaret Barry and Ms Sharon Friel. It examined a number of cross-border projects in the areas of postnatal depression, public awareness of suicide, cancer support services, the mental health of young men and mental health in rural communities. The study also looked at the comparability and compatibility of mental health data sources in the two jurisdictions.
The Local History Project: Co-operating North and South (2003)
This study, by Dr Jacinta Prunty, Dr Raymond Gillespie and Maeve Mulryan-Moloney of National University of Ireland Maynooth, provided the basis for the first all-Ireland register of local history societies. They identified 330 societies, but estimated that a complete list would exceed 500 societies, North and South, involving an active membership of perhaps 28,000 persons.

A study of local sustainable development as carried out (through the Local Agenda 21 process) by local authorities and social partners throughout Ireland, by a cross-border team comprising Geraint Ellis and Dr Bill Neill of the Queen’s University Belfast’s School of Environmental Planning, and Dublin-based researchers Una Hand and Brian Motherway. It found that 54% of local authorities on the island had begun a process of LA21, but stressed that the main challenge is to move from debate to action.

Diversity in Early Years Education North and South: Implications for Teacher Education (2004)
The aim of this EU-funded study was to identify the difficulties facing teachers and children in areas of inter-community conflict and tension on both sides of the Irish border with a view to developing a framework for preparing young teachers working with children in the early years. It was carried out by researchers at St Patrick’s College Drumcondra in Dublin and Stranmillis University College in Belfast, Mairin Kenny and Helen McLaughlin, under the direction of Philomena Donnelly and Louise Quinn.

Citizenship and Science: The Connecting Axes (2005)
The final report of the EU-funded Citizenship and Science Exchange (CaSE) Schools project looked at how a group of 12-14 year old students in 16 schools on both sides of the border deepened their understanding of the dynamic relationship between science and citizenship. The students explored subjects such as air and water pollution, waste management, GM and fair trade foods, renewable energy and energy efficiency. Much of the cross-border work centred on a shared Web resource. This project was led by Professor Peter McKenna and Dr Charlotte Holland of Dublin City University.
This study, funded by the Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister in Northern Ireland (with additional funding from the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust and the British Council), examined how public services such as health, education, policing and employment support are provided to minority ethnic groups in Northern Ireland, Republic of Ireland and Scotland. It had a particular focus on how Northern Ireland’s public authorities could learn from their nearest neighbours. The research work was carried out by a partnership led by the National Consultative Committee on Racism and Interculturalism (NCCRI), together with Piaras MacEinri from University College Cork, the Institute for Conflict Research in Belfast and Organisation and Social Development Consultants in Edinburgh.

The Wind Across the Border (2007)
This report brought together six award winning research assignments carried out by pairs and teams of officials as part of the North/South and Cross-Border Public Sector Training Programme. They were on the proposed reopening of the Ulster Canal; an all-island service for the recycling of waste fridges and freezers; expanding the CAWT-sponsored eMed renal information system to the whole island; an all-island visitor pass for heritage sites; setting up a cross-border training and accreditation system for installers of renewable energy technologies; and cross-border sharing of patient electronic records.

This short report compared the planning of hospital service reorganisation, North and South. It noted that there are different strategies in the two jurisdictions, with Northern Ireland placing greater emphasis on travel time and the Republic on the size of the catchment population. The authors, independent Belfast researcher Dr Jim Jamison and Dr Michelle Butler, Senior Lecturer in UCD’s School of Nursing Midwifery and Health Systems, point to the clear scope for joint hospital planning and rationalisation in the border region to benefit the health of the population.

Pride of our Place (2007)
The research report of this cross-border environmental project for primary schools was written by Mary Burke of St Patrick’s College Drumcondra. The project brought together 10-12 year olds from a group of primary schools in Louth, Monaghan,
Cavan, Tyrone, Armagh and Down to study key environmental features in their locality by looking at it historically and geographically, and then exploring it in the company of their cross-border partner schools. The Chief Inspector for Northern Ireland, Marion Matchett, called the project’s final event in Armagh ‘a wonderful event, made all the more so by the children’s enthusiasm, interest and expertise...you have every right to be proud of the project’s achievements.’

**Mental Health: The Case for a Cross-Jurisdictional Approach combining Policy and Research Efforts on the Island of Ireland (2009)**

This study by Dr Patricia Clarke of CCBS explored the context of and challenges to the reform of mental health services (and related research) in Northern Ireland and Republic of Ireland. It compared the two main mental health documents – the Bamford Review in the North and A Vision for Change in the South – in order to identify similarities and differences in policy approach in the two jurisdictions, highlighting areas of common concern, priorities for research and the gaps which exist. This work was carried in association with the Mental Health Commission (RoI), Cooperation and Working Together (CAWT) and other agencies in the mental health field.

**Exploring the Potential for Cross-Border Hospital Services in the Irish Border Region: the role of community involvement in planning hospital services (2010)**

This study by CCBS Deputy Director Ruth Taillon features feedback from 11 focus groups in the border region and case studies of service users and campaigning community groups in three areas: cancer care in the North-West; cystic fibrosis in the two jurisdictions; and the campaign for a hospital in Omagh. Among the recommendations are that Patient and Public Involvement (PPI) concepts in hospital planning should be properly implemented and that service users from both jurisdictions should be involved in the planning of new services at Altnagelvin (Derry/Londonderry) and Enniskillen hospitals. The full report and an executive summary are available on the CCBS website.

**Impact Assessment Toolkit for Cross Border Cooperation (2011)**

This toolkit – the first of its kind in Europe – is particularly timely in light of the European Commission’s increasing focus on ‘Territorial Cooperation’ and ‘Territorial Cohesion’. Cross-border impact assessment is intended to be a practical method to assist people planning cross-border programmes and projects. This first version is based on the Irish cross-border experience, but can be adapted to other European border regions. The toolkit will help to determine whether
a cross-border approach is the appropriate level of intervention and, if so, to identify the ‘added value’ of cross-border cooperation. It will also identify the added value that has come about as a result of the cooperation process itself: e.g. the building of new cross-border relationships. The toolkit was devised and developed by a team lead by CCBS Deputy Director Ruth Taillon along with Dr Joachim Beck and Sebastian Rihm from the Euro-Institut in Kehl, Germany.

Unlocking the Potential of Cross-Border Hospital Planning on the Island of Ireland: a prototype modelling framework (2011)
This study, carried out by Shane McQuillan and Vanya Sargent of the Dublin consultancy firm Horwath Bastow Charleton, explored the feasibility of developing cross-border acute healthcare services in a number of sectors, and outlined a prototype modelling framework for planning such services. The five sample clinical service areas examined were orthopaedic surgery, ENT surgery, paediatric cardiac surgery, cystic fibrosis and acute mental health care services. The researchers concluded that there were significant barriers to providing such services on a cross-border basis, but these could be worked around (particularly at local level, and following the example set by the Cooperation and Working Together network), and there were particular opportunities presented by the new South West Acute Hospital in Enniskillen.

This study by Dr John Bradley (formerly of the Economic and Social Research Institute) and Professor Michael Best of University of Massachusetts Lowell/Cambridge University examined the strengths and weaknesses of the economy of the Irish border region (with a particular focus on producing, and also on shopping and tourism). It put the regional economy in the context of the history of Ireland’s two economies, the economic consequences of the ‘Troubles’, the island economy and development strategy frameworks. It also proposed a new approach: a cross-border Border Development Zone, whose rationale would be based on the need for a uniquely targeted approach because of the region’s twin disadvantages of peripherality and the border policy ‘fault line’.

Delivering a Prosperity Process: Opportunities in North/South Public Service Provision (2012)
This study by Dublin business consultant Michael D’Arcy proposed 10 areas of public service provision where it makes sense for the Irish and Northern Irish public sectors to cooperate for improved service delivery and ‘value for money’. Its findings were based on private conversations
with senior civil servants and business leaders in both jurisdictions. Among the areas are a joint plan for economic and employment growth to target marginalised communities; an all-island Single Energy Market; North-South collaboration on public water supply; showcasing all-island business achievements, and an operational ‘tool box’ for public service managers working on a North-South basis.

COMMISSIONED STUDIES AND EVALUATIONS

The Centre has carried out studies and evaluations for government and other public agencies, charitable and social partner organisations. These have included:

- A fourth review of the 2008 study of postgraduate flows from the Republic of Ireland to Northern Ireland for the Irish Department of Education and Skills (December 2012);
- A study to identify and explore current political and civil society connections between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland in areas of concern to the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust (May 2012);
- A third review of the 2008 study of postgraduate flows from the Republic of Ireland to Northern Ireland for the Irish Department of Education and Skills (December 2011);
- A study of Obstacles to Cross-Border Undergraduate Education (for the IBEC-CBI Joint Business Council and the Eures Cross Border Partnership)(August 2011)
- A second review of the 2008 study of postgraduate flows from the Republic of Ireland to Northern Ireland for the Irish Department of Education and Skills (December 2010)
- A study of North-South cooperation in the education sector (pre-school, primary, secondary) for the Department of Education and Skills and the Department of Education Northern Ireland (June 2010)
- A review of cross-border consumer issues, employment issues and railway links, as reflected in Border People queries and user group meetings, for the North/South Ministerial Council Joint Secretariat (April 2010)
- A study of the numbers of people crossing the border on a daily/weekly basis and what they are crossing the border to do (to work, study, retire, access medical services etc), for the EURES Crossborder Partnership (February 2010)
- A review of the 2008 study of postgraduate flows from the Republic of Ireland to Northern Ireland for the Irish Department of Education and Science (December 2009)
- A study of mental health policy and research on the island of Ireland, for the Mental Health Commission (RoI) and other agencies, supported by the Cooperation and Working Together (CAWT) cross-border network of health authorities (December 2008)
- An evaluation of the cross-border GP out-of-hours service for
Cooperation and Working Together (July 2008)
• A study of postgraduate flows from the Republic of Ireland to Northern Ireland higher education institutions, for the Irish Department of Education and Science (January 2008)
• How the trade union movement can become more involved and influential in North-South cooperation, for the Northern Ireland office of the Irish Congress of Trade Unions (December 2007).
• A review of policy recommendations from the five research projects commissioned by the Higher Education Authority under the 2004-2006 Cross-Border Programme for Research contributing to Peace and Reconciliation: Intergenerational transmission and ethno-national identity in the border area; Equality and social inclusion; Mapping Frontiers, Plotting Pathways; E-consultation; and Virtual Research Centre for Point-of-Care Technology (February 2007).
• An overview of the activities of the Common Chapter of the Republic of Ireland’s National Development Plan and Northern Ireland’s Structural Funds Plan for the Special EU Programmes Body – in partnership with FPM Chartered Accountants (February 2007)
• A report on public attitudes to the development of cross-border health services, with particular reference to GP out-of-hours services, for CAWT (January 2007)
• A report on education and skills in the North West, for the Irish Department of Education and Science and the Northern Ireland Department for Employment and Learning (2006)
• An Evaluation of the Education for Reconciliation Project (Year One and Two), for the City of Dublin Vocational Education Committee (2003-2005)
• A Review of Cross-Border Mobility Information Provisions in the South of Ireland, for the North/South Mobility Information Group (2003)
• An Evaluation of the Upstate Theatre Company’s ‘Crossover’ cross-border community drama project (2002-2004)
• ‘Towards a Strategic Economic and Business Research Agenda for the island of Ireland’, for InterTradeIreland (2002)
• A report on public feedback to the PriceWaterhouseCoopers/Indecon Obstacles to Mobility study, for the North/South Ministerial Council (2002)
• A study into the feasibility of extending University for Industry/learndirect to the Republic of Ireland, for University for Industry (2001)
• An evaluation of the Co-operation and Working Together (CAWT) cross-border network of health boards and trusts, for CAWT(2001)
• A ‘scoping study’ of North-South School, Youth and Teacher Exchanges, for the Department of Education Northern Ireland and the Department of Education and Science (2001)

SEMINARS AND STUDY DAYS

The Centre holds regular seminars and study days in Armagh, Dublin and in the border region to examine strategic
areas of interest to North-South policy makers. These bring together groups of policy makers, senior practitioners and academics to discuss a research paper prepared by the Centre under the chairmanship of a distinguished authority in the field. As the Centre’s research programme has developed, these seminars have moved from studying broad policy fields to examining more focused areas which have been the subject of specific research projects and commissioned work. Cross-border seminars and study days have been organised in the following areas:

- Agriculture
- Education
- Tourism
- Information and Communication Technologies
- Health Services
- Mental Health Promotion
- Developments in Telecom Technologies
- Local government links
- Foot and Mouth disease
- School, Youth and Teacher Exchanges
- European citizenship education
- The euro
- Business research
- The North-South Consultative Forum
- Ageing
- Border region history*
- Border region regeneration*
- Waste Management
- Economic co-operation*
- Planning and mobility in the north-west*
- Science and Citizenship
- Information provision
- Housing and sustainable communities
- Education and Skills in the North West
- Mental Health Research
- Personal Banking
- Web 2.0 aspects of online cross-border information
- Cross-border statistics
- Cross-border consumer issues
- Cross-border hospital services
- Border Region Economy
- Developing your cross-border business (2)
- Cross-border impact assessment
- North/South Research Fora (5) (2009-2011)
  - Cross-border economic development at a time of crisis
  - Cross-border innovation and creativity
  - The future of cross-border public sector cooperation
  - Peacebuilding across borders
  - Cross-border health cooperation in times of austerity

* For the Mapping Frontiers, Plotting Pathways project

**TRAINING**

In February 2013 Deputy Director Ruth Taillon and Research and Training Officer Eimear Donnelly travelled to Kehl, Germany, where – in partnership with colleagues from the Euro Institut – they delivered training for a group of people from the Central Asian republic of Tajikistan working for the German international cooperation agency GIZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit) in that country. Members of the Tajikistan delegation are all working on the promotion of cross-border economic cooperation
between Tajikistan and its neighbouring countries, Afghanistan and Kyrgyzstan, cooperation that is jointly funded by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) and the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID).

Using as a ‘real life’ case study a GIZ pilot project to develop roadside services for cross-border traders and other small businesses and travellers in the two border corridors between Tajikistan and Afghanistan and Kyrgyzstan, a central component of the training programme was based on the Impact Assessment Toolkit for Cross-Border Cooperation, developed jointly by CCBS and the Euro Institut in 2010-2011. CCBS and the Euro Institut are also offering training to support cross-border projects in Ireland and elsewhere in Europe. For further details please contact Ruth Taillon (r.taillon@qub.ac.uk).

CONFERENCES

The first major conference organised by the Centre, jointly with the Centre for International Borders Research (CIBR), was held at Queen’s University Belfast in autumn 2000 under the title ‘European Cross Border Co-operation: Lessons for and from Ireland.’ This international conference was opened by the Irish President, Mary McAleese, and was addressed by a wide range of distinguished
speakers, including the First Minister of Northern Ireland, David Trimble; the Deputy First Minister, Seamus Mallon; the RUC Chief Constable, Sir Ronnie Flanagan; the head of the EU’s cross-border INTERREG programme, Esben Poulsen; the international emergency communications expert, Professor Edward Johnson; Ambassador Hermann von Richthofen of the German-Polish Governmental Commission; and the SDLP leader John Hume. Participants came from 13 countries to discuss cross-border co-operation in five areas: administrative institutions, security and policing, business and the economy, the environment, and culture and the arts.

The Centre has also organised six North-South conferences on aspects of higher education on behalf of the Department for Employment and Learning (Belfast) and the Department of Education and Science (Dublin). The first of these, in October 2002 in Armagh, was on ‘Ireland as a Centre of Excellence in Third Level Education.’ This conference, which was attended by the presidents of seven of the nine universities on the island of Ireland, was addressed by several world authorities on higher education. These included Professor Malcolm Skilbeck, the OECD’s former Deputy Director for Education; former US Secretary of Education, Richard Riley; the Director-General for Education and Culture in the European Commission, Nikolaus van der Pas, and the Chief Executive of the English Higher Education Funding Council, Sir Howard Newby.

In May 2003, the second conference was held in Cavan on ‘International Education: A Capacity Builder for the Island of Ireland?’ The keynote speakers were Lindy Hyam, Chief Executive of IDP Education Australia, a world leader in international education and development services, and Neil Kemp, director of the Education UK Division of the British Council. The conference was chaired by Sir George Quigley.

In November 2003, the third conference was held in Belfast on ‘Widening Access to Third Level Education on the Island of Ireland: Towards Better Policy and Practice’. The keynote speakers were Dr Arnold Mitchem, President of the Council for Opportunity in Education in Washington DC, a champion of access to higher education for low income and disabled Americans for 35 years, and Samuel Isaacs, Executive Officer of the South African Qualifications Authority.

The fourth conference – entitled ‘Cross-Border Higher Education Co-operation in Ireland and Europe’ – was held in Cavan in May 2004. This examined examples of good practice in cross-border higher
education elsewhere in Europe, notably in the Oresund region of Denmark and southern Sweden (with keynote speaker Professor Linda Nielsen, Rector of the University of Copenhagen), and the EUCOR network between French, German and Swiss universities in the Upper Rhine region. The conference was co-chaired by Sir Kenneth Bloomfield and Noel Dorr.

Higher Education and Business conference brochure cover

The fifth conference was held in Belfast in June 2005 under the title ‘Higher Education and Business: Beyond Mutual Incomprehension’. The keynote speaker was Richard Lambert, member of the Bank of England’s Monetary Policy Committee, former editor of the Financial Times and author of the seminal Lambert Review of University-Business Collaboration for the British Government. The conference was opened by the Irish Minister for Education and Science, Ms Mary Hanafin TD, and the Northern Ireland Minister for Employment and Learning and Education, Ms Angela Smyth MP. Other speakers included the Presidents of Queen’s University Belfast and NUI Maynooth, Professor Peter Gregson and Professor John Hughes, and leading Irish entrepreneurs Dr Chris Horn and Dr Hugh Cormican.

The sixth conference was held in Malahide in March 2006 with the title ‘What role for Higher Education in the Development of the 21st Century Workplace?’ The keynote speakers were the Board Chairman of the Intel Corporation, Dr Craig Barrett; the Directors General of the Confederation of British Industry and the Irish Business and Employers Confederation, Sir Digby Jones and Turlough O’Sullivan; the Education and Training Officer of the Irish Congress of Trade Unions, Peter Rigney; the Chief Executive of Forfás, Martin Cronin, and the President of Dublin City University, Professor Ferdinand von Prondzynski. The conference was opened by the Secretary General of the Irish Department for Education and Science, Brigid McManus, and the Permanent Secretary of the Northern Ireland Department for Employment and Learning, Dr Aideen McGinley. The event was organised in collaboration with the IBEC-CBI Joint Business Council.

In March 2007 the Centre joined with Armagh Observatory to organise ‘Discover the Stars at Armagh: a Cross-Border Schools Science Conference.’ This brought together 260 students from secondary schools in Belfast, Armagh, Dublin, Dundalk, Drogheda, Dungannon, Kilkeel, Cookstown, Fermanagh, Monaghan
and Westmeath to engage in two days of astronomical activities in Armagh. The event was funded by the Northern Ireland Department of Culture, Arts and Leisure and the Irish Department of Education and Science, and was designed to attract students aged 13-14 towards science and a scientific thinking at a critical stage of their academic careers. A 32 page booklet, edited by Dr Miruna Popescu, was produced for the participating schools by Observatory students and staff.

In June 2008 the Centre organised a major conference in Dundalk entitled 'Cross-Border Cooperation as part of the Northern Irish Peace Process: Some Lessons for Europe' which was attended by over 130 people from 13 countries: Ireland, England, Scotland, France, Spain, Germany, Belgium, Netherlands, Italy, Serbia, Kosovo, China and the USA. The conference was opened by the Irish Minister for Justice, Dermot Ahern TD, and among the speakers were Stephen Kingon, Chairman, Invest Northern Ireland; Martin Guillermo Ramirez, Secretary General of the Association of European Border Regions; Ronald Hall, Head of the European Commission’s Northern Ireland Task Force; Professor Elizabeth Meehan, former Director of the Institute of Governance at Queen’s University Belfast; Silvia Gobert-Keckeis of Mission Opérationnelle Transfrontalière (MOT) in Paris); Linda Blom from the Euregio Gronau-Enschede (Germany-Netherlands); and Gorka Espiau Idoiaga, Senior Advisor for Peacebuilding to the Basque Government. This conference was funded by the EU Peace Two programme.

In April 2009 and May 2011 the Centre, the Royal School Armagh, the Armagh Observatory and the Armagh Planetarium came together to organise a second and third ‘Discover the Stars in Armagh: Cross-Border Schools Science Conference’. These brought together over 500 students from 20 secondary schools on both sides of the border to learn about astronomy and related sciences and mathematics, using the unique joint facilities of the Observatory and the Planetarium.

In 2009 the keynote lecture on ‘The Science of Armageddon’ was given by the leading British astronomer, Jay Tate of Spaceguard UK in Wales. In 2011 the keynote speaker was Dr Robert Walsh of the University of Central Lancashire on ‘Basking in the Sunshine: a new encounter with our closest star.’

On 27-28 October 2011 the Centre organised an international conference in the Radisson Blu Farnham Estate Hotel in Cavan under the title Cross-Border Training and Impact Assessment in Ireland and Europe (funded by INTERREG IVA though the Special EU Programmes Body). It was was attended by 130 people from France, Germany, Poland, Czech Republic, Austria, Slovenia, Italy, Catalonia.
(Spain), USA, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland and Ireland. The highlight was the launch of the Impact Assessment Toolkit for Cross Border Cooperation – developed jointly by the Centre and the Euro-Institut in Kehl, Germany – by Dr José Antonio Ruiz de Casas of the European Commission’s Regional Policy directorate (DG REGIO). There were also presentations on health training, business monitoring and raising the public participation of women in the Irish border region and Scotland; training and evaluation for EU Territorial Cooperation programmes; cross-border local authority training in Ireland; higher education and research cooperation in the Upper Rhine; the Transfrontier Euro-Institut Network (TEIN); and cross-border training and impact assessment from the standpoints of the European Commission, the Association of European Border Regions, and France’s leading authority on cross-border cooperation, Professor Michel Casteigts.

On 17-18 November 2011 the Centre organised a conference in Cavan under the title Reviving the Border Region Economy in a time of Peace, Devolved Government and International Recession. This was the ‘emerging findings’ conference of the INTERREG-funded Border Region Economy research project led by Dr John Bradley and Professor Michael Best, and was attended by 125 people. Among the speakers and session chairs were Aidan Gough, Director of Policy and Strategy with InterTradeIreland; Dr Gerhard Untiedt from the German consultancy firm GEFRA; John Watt from the Highlands and Island Enterprise agency in Scotland; Dr Edgar Morgenroth from the Economic and Social Research Institute, Dublin; Liam Connellan, former Director General of the Confederation of Irish Industry; Padraic White, chair of Louth Economic Forum and former managing director of IDA Ireland; and three successful border region entrepreneurs, Walter Watson of Walter Watson Ltd, Paul Shortt of Castlecool and Pat McAdam of Bose. In his closing address Mr White called for setting up of a special development zone for the Irish border region.

TRANSFRONTIER EURO-INSTITUT NETWORK (TEIN)

Since 2010 the Centre has been a member of the Transfrontier Euro-Institut Network (TEIN). This is part-funded by the EU Leonardo programme, and is a network consisting of 12 cross-border research and training institutes and centres, and university departments of cross-border studies, in nine European border regions:

- Euro-Institute, Kehl (Upper Rhine region: German-French-Swiss borders)(lead partner)
- Centre for Cross Border Studies (Northern Irish-Irish border)
- Carinthia University of Applied Sciences (School of Management), Villach; University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Administration; ForSer (Austrian-Slovene-Italian borders)
- Institut Euroschola; Olza Association (Czech-Polish border)
The TEIN network has organised regular meetings since October 2010 – in Kehl, Germany; Villach, Austria; Trinec, Czech Republic; Banyuls, French Catalonia; Wisla, Poland, and Armagh – to explore ways of developing tools, methods and skills for cross-border training in Europe; to provide the EU with a trans-European network of cross-border training and research centres, and to develop locally relevant training networks in fields such as cross-border public administration.

On 10 July 2012 the Centre, along with the Euro-Institut and its other partners in the TEIN, was involved in organising a successful symposium in Brussels on the topic ‘The future of European Territorial Cooperation: Capacity Building in Cross-Border Territories’. Around 120 people attended the symposium, which was jointly organised by TEIN, the Association of European Border Regions (AEBR) and the French government’s cross-border cooperation agency.
Mission Opérationelle Transfrontalière (MOT), in the offices of the Baden-Wuerttemberg regional government. The keynote speakers were Dr Wolfgang Streitenberger, Advisor to the Director General for Regional Policy, and Dr Joachim Beck, Director of the Euro-Institut. There was also a distinguished speakers panel drawn from the European Commission, the European Parliament, the Committee of the Regions, the Special EU Programmes Body (Chief Executive Pat Colgan), the Euro-Institut, AEBR and MOT.

The second phase of TEIN (2012-2014) (sub-titled ‘Professionalising Actors of Transfrontier Cooperation’, with the acronym PAT-TEIN) is also part-funded by the Leonardo programme. It is developing and adapting an innovative tool for intercultural cross-border project management, originally developed by the Euro-Institut for the French-German border, for five other European border regions (including the Irish border region). Each partner will customise the tool for the needs of their own region, so that there are five new tools containing a common element, a border-specific element and relevant local case studies.

In November 2012, the UK National Agency for the Leonardo programme, ECORYS, described the first phase of TEIN as follows:

We found your project to be very worthwhile and interesting. The focus on cross-border cooperation clearly
demonstrates the added value of the EU dimension of the project. It was positive to see the structured nature of dialogue, evaluation and monitoring between the partners over the course of the project and the high quality of the products produced. The project’s core aims and objectives have been achieved and, in many cases, surpassed.

The TEIN website is at www.transfrontier.eu

**BOOKS**

In 2001 the Centre published, in association with Cork University Press, a series of short books containing essays by leading writers on key issues of interest to both Irish jurisdictions:

- *Multi-Culturalism: the View from the Two Irelands* by Edna Longley and Declan Kiberd, with a foreword by President Mary McAleese
- *Can the Celtic Tiger cross the Irish Border?* by John Bradley and Esmond Birnie, with a foreword by Peter Sutherland
- *Towards a Culture of Human Rights in Ireland* by Ivana Bacik and Stephen Livingstone, with a foreword by Mary Robinson
WHAT THEY SAY

I think the Centre plays an important role, in that it provides quality reports for people to study. Politicians as a rule don’t absorb reports like that on a regular basis, but I think it is important to have people who can tell them: ‘Here is a really valuable report, here are the essential items out of it - bear this in mind when you are talking to your counterparts from other locations about the mutual benefits for the communities on both sides of the border’. So it is an important entity, it does important work. I have read a number of its reports over the years and I value them greatly.

The Taoiseach, Enda Kenny TD, January 2012

I hold the work of the Centre for Cross Border Studies in very high regard.

The Tánaiste and Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade, Eamon Gilmore TD, January 2013

The Centre for Cross Border Studies continues to play an important role in researching, developing and promoting cross border co-operation. We welcome the success of the Centre in securing INTERREG IVA funding, particularly in relation to the third phase of Border People. The emphasis of this third phase will be on incorporating specialist training in cross-border information provision into the existing portfolios of a range of information providers in statutory and non-statutory agencies in both jurisdictions. We welcome this emphasis on the sustainability of the Border People project, whose existence is currently dependent on EU funding, and are pleased to partner the Centre for Cross Border Studies in this project. Border People has proven to be an invaluable resource for people who wish to move across the border in either direction to work, study or live, and this third phase will serve to enhance this resource further. We look forward to continuing our cooperation with the Centre in 2013 and wish Andy Pollak and his team every success with their work.

North South Ministerial Council Joint Secretaries, Colm Shannon and Shane O’Neill, February 2013
Jeffrey Donaldson: ‘I want to thank the Centre for all their work’

Martin McGuinness: ‘The Centre is leading the North-South inter-connection process’

Mary McAleese: ‘an extraordinary dialogue’

As both a cooperation partner and an expert on impact assessment I can only say that the Centre for Cross Border Studies meets very high professional and quality standards, both in terms of the content and the methodology of its work (as well as in its human relationships). The Centre’s concern to create something of real value for cross-border actors with its Impact Assessment Toolkit is reflected in the high acceptance of the toolkit by target groups. I would also say that within the TEIN network, the Centre contributes very pro-actively and is a most reliable and active partner. My final evaluation comment is that working with the Centre is a real partnership at the highest possible level: the Impact Assessment Toolkit for Cross-Border Cooperation was a top project with a top partner – it would be hard to find a better one in Europe.

Dr Joachim Beck, Director, Euro-Institute, Kehl, Germany, December 2011

I want to thank the Centre for Cross Border Studies and Andy Pollak for all their work in helping to bring about greater cross-border understanding in a number of key areas.

Rt Hon Jeffrey Donaldson MP, June 2009

The Centre for Cross Border Studies’ team deserve our thanks and congratulations for the tremendous work they have been doing. It is work that has also paid dividends in terms of research projects done and people brought together from North and South in conferences, seminars and training courses. People have to be inter-connected, whether it is within the North, between North and South, or between East and West. That is how we will all learn from each other. The Centre is leading that North-South inter-connection process. It is therefore an honour and a pleasure to be here with you this morning to launch the 2011 Journal of Cross Border Studies in Ireland.

Martin McGuinness MP MLA, NI Deputy First Minister, March 2011
It is an honour and privilege to be able to support the valuable work of the Centre for Cross Border Studies by launching the Journal of Cross Border Studies in Ireland today. One of the first things I did when I came to the Department of the Taoiseach in 2004-2005 was to attend an earlier launch of the journal, and I have always found the journal and the Centre’s other publications to be fundamental to understanding how cross-border cooperation works on the island of Ireland. The first generation of North/South co-operators was working away then: Tim O’Connor and Peter Smyth in the NSMC, Andy Pollak and his colleagues in the Centre, Cooperation and Working Together pioneering in health, and the International Centre for Local and Regional Development getting going in the important area of spatial planning…..The word ‘quiet’ in the phrase ‘quiet success story’ used by the Taoiseach in his interview was key then – this was quiet, slow, sensitive work. Real progress was a trade-off against PR: quiet success was better than noisy friction. I believe the future will involve more, not less, such quiet work in an all-island context. So this North-South dimension remains really crucial: we have to strive to keep it going as much as we can.’

*Martin Fraser, Secretary General, Department of the Taoiseach, and Secretary to the Irish Government, March 2012*

I was delighted to attend the opening of the Centre for Cross Border Studies in Armagh as Minister for Education in November 1999, and I have watched with admiration as the Centre has gone from strength to strength over more than a decade since. This has been a courageous and pioneering initiative begun and sustained at times of considerable political uncertainty. The extremely high quality of the Centre’s research and analysis is understood and respected now by decision-makers throughout the island, as well as by academics and practitioners further afield. The Journal we are launching today can only add, once again, to that fine reputation. This new edition is packed tight with informative opinion and insightful comment and will provide much food for thought for policy-makers and commentators North and South over the period ahead.
The Centre for Cross Border Studies always takes a very fresh and innovative approach, bringing together sources of energy on both sides of the border that used to be back to back but are now in an extraordinary dialogue.

President Mary McAleese, February 2005

EVALUATION QUOTES

An external evaluation of the work of the INICCO ‘basket’ of EU INTERREG funded projects was carried out in 2009-2012 by Indecon Economic Consultants of Dublin. They concluded that the Centre had exceeded its target of 14 evidence-based solutions to problems of public sector cross-border cooperation by 100% (28 initiatives completed).

As part of the evaluation they sought the views of ‘high-level stakeholders’ with an interest in cross-border cooperation in Ireland. Indecon said these views were ‘consistent with our own evaluation of the programmes and the quantified evidence on activities.’

These stakeholders’ perceptions of the Centre’s achievements through the INICCO (now called INICCO-1) projects included the following observations:

1. ‘Overall, the stakeholders consulted – which include senior public servants and private sector personnel from both sides of the border – have a high regard for the Centre and its work. The perceived strengths of the Centre are its knowledge and networks in respect of the Irish cross-border region. The Centre is seen as a small and flexible organisation, which “punches above its weight” in terms of its activities and reach, nationally and internationally.

2. The Centre cannot, however, be expected to be expert in all fields; it exists on a modest budget and expectations of its applied research output must take account of the fact that it does not have the research resources which exist in university faculties or in larger research institutes. Nevertheless, through its networks on the island and internationally, it has been able to take the lead on a number of projects addressing identified gaps in areas of the cross-border agenda.

3. The importance of the Centre’s work on training and the development of individuals to help upskill them and disseminate good practices in a cross-border context was highlighted by various stakeholders. In particular, a number of people consulted referred to the impact of the Centre’s research and practical support for cooperation. An example of senior policy makers views on the Centre was indicated in the speech by Mary Bunting, Northern Joint Secretary of the NSMC, to the Transfrontier Euro-Institut Network (TEIN) delegates on 27 October 2011, where she noted that:
The Centre makes an excellent contribution to research and cooperation on the island of Ireland in areas such as education, training, health, ICT, the economy, citizens’ information and a range of other practical areas.

4. The contribution of the Centre and INICCO to areas such as regional development was also raised by senior stakeholders. For example, in our consultations Martin Fraser, Secretary General of the Department of the Taoiseach, indicated his belief that the Centre for Cross Border Studies is engaged in valuable work in a challenging context. Mr Fraser gave the example of the opportunities identified in their work on health and on regional development and indicated that these initiatives were very well conceived.

5. The value of the Centre’s contribution to the assessment of the impact of cross-border projects is illustrated by remarks presented on behalf of the Irish Minister of State with responsibility for European Affairs, Lucinda Creighton TD, at the conference on ‘Cross-border Training and Impact Assessment in Ireland and Europe’ in Cavan on 27 October 2011:

I would like to commend the work of the Centre for Cross Border Studies and, in particular, its Director, Andy Pollak, and Director of Research, Ruth Taillon. They’ve put together a terrific line-up for this conference, with participants from 10 border regions across different parts of Europe...Tomorrow, on the second day of this conference, an Impact Assessment ‘Toolkit’ for Cross-border Cooperation will be launched. This toolkit promises to become an invaluable resource for practitioners right across Europe – not just in the border region of Ireland. There is one sentence in the toolkit which really stands out for me: ‘The proposed activities should have a greater effect at the level of the Cross-border Territory...than would be the case if the jurisdictions acted separately.’ This, very concisely, encapsulates the rationale of our whole approach to North-South cooperation.’

6. There were a range of other positive views from senior stakeholders consulted. Sir George Quigley, Chairman of Bombardier Aerospace, said:

I have seen them at close quarters in various contexts and have formed a very positive view of their relevance, competence and effectiveness.

I recall two instances in particular: 1) A major conference several years ago in the Slieve Russell Hotel involving all the Irish universities (with speakers from abroad, including Australia) to consider how the universities, north and south, could better tap the international student market for undergraduate and postgraduate students; 2) A programme over several
years for the training of staff in cross-border bodies or government departments dealing inter alia with cross-border issues. This was very imaginatively conceived and executed, with an impressive line-up of speakers.’

Positive views were also expressed by a private sector representative organisation. Reg McCabe, Chief Executive of the IBEC-CBI Joint Business Council, indicated “a very positive view of CCBS and its work and IBEC have developed a close relationship with the Centre over time’.

The Indecon evaluators also highlighted a number of future challenges and research opportunities for the Centre:

1. ‘There is a perception by some stakeholders that the Centre is primarily focused on the public sector, and this raises the issue of whether more could be done to enhance collaboration with private sector organisations and/ or provide research that could meet identified needs of the private sector. It is accepted, however, that the Border People project has taken a business-oriented approach to its user group meetings in 2011. A range of private sector organisations have been engaged (giving their time free of charge) with commitments for future involvement. Furthermore, the Border Economy project focuses on the importance of the private sector to the border region economy. However it is important to keep in mind that since 2009 the overwhelming majority of CCBS research funding has been for the INICCO project – funded under the INTERREG IVA Public Sector Collaboration call. Indecon also believes that the provision of research and insights such as provided by INICCO may inevitably be of greater benefit to policy-makers and we believe this is consistent with its original rationale.

2. One issue noted by a number of stakeholders is that the Centre and INICCO are not implementation agencies and that implementation of various initiatives, in practice, is often a difficult challenge.... One of the positives of INICCO is that it entails work by the Centre in collaboration with other cross-border/island of Ireland organisations, with steering/advisory groups who can help to implement cross-border initiatives. However, ultimately, implementation is a matter for policy makers. This suggests there is a continual challenge for the Centre to maintain its advocacy of cross-border collaboration with central and local government and with implementation agencies.

3. Important for future policy is the fact that in the course of developing its projects, the Centre has assembled extensive relevant data about the differing situations in both jurisdictions across a number of sectors. It was suggested that a worthwhile exercise might be to assemble and further develop this data so that it is easily accessible to policy-makers.
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EXTRACTS FROM 2011-2012 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

The opinion of the independent auditors, PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP:

- The financial statements give a true and fair view, in accordance with United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice, of the state of the charitable company's affairs at 31 July 2010 and of its net incoming resources, including its income and expenditure for the year then ended;
- and the financial statements have been properly prepared in accordance with the Companies (Northern Ireland) Order 1986, and
- the information given in the Directors’ Report is consistent with the financial statements.

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITIES FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 JULY 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unrestricted Funds</th>
<th>Restricted Funds</th>
<th>Total Funds 2012</th>
<th>Total Funds 2011</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incoming resources/income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming resources from generated funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for generating funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>352,938</td>
<td>352,938</td>
<td>862,764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming resources from charitable activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income resources</td>
<td>396,867</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>396,867</td>
<td>438,043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total incoming resources</td>
<td>396,867</td>
<td>352,938</td>
<td>749,805</td>
<td>1,300,807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources expended/expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable activities</td>
<td>355,991</td>
<td>283,439</td>
<td>639,430</td>
<td>1,118,190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of generating funds</td>
<td>7,667</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>8,215</td>
<td>7,969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance Costs</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total resources expended</td>
<td>367,408</td>
<td>283,987</td>
<td>651,395</td>
<td>1,129,809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net movement in funds/net income and expenditure</td>
<td>29,459</td>
<td>68,951</td>
<td>98,410</td>
<td>170,998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total funds brought forward at 1 August 2011</td>
<td>278,302</td>
<td>581,086</td>
<td>859,388</td>
<td>688,390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total funds carried forward at 31 July 2012</td>
<td>307,761</td>
<td>650,037</td>
<td>957,798</td>
<td>859,388</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All amounts above relate to continuing operations of the Centre.

The Centre has no recognised gains and losses other than those included in the results above and therefore no separate statement of total recognised gains and losses has been presented.

There is no material difference between the net movement in funds for the year and their historical cost equivalents.

**BALANCE SHEET AS AT 31 JULY 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debtors</td>
<td>1,107,936</td>
<td>1,237,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash at bank</td>
<td>3,955</td>
<td>4,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,111,891</td>
<td>1,241,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creditors: amounts falling due within one year</td>
<td>(154,093)</td>
<td>(381,671)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net current assets</td>
<td>957,798</td>
<td>859,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>307,761</td>
<td>278,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>650,037</td>
<td>581,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total funds</td>
<td>957,798</td>
<td>859,388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unrestricted funds are amounts which are expendable at the discretion of the Board in furtherance of the aims of the company.

Restricted funds are amounts which are expendable only in accordance with the specified wishes of the sponsor. The restricted funds consist of grants and awards for specific projects and awards for specific projects or administrative functions carried out by the company.
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