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The views expressed in this journal are the authors' own and do not necessarily reflect those of the Special EU Programmes Body or the European Commission.
A WORD FROM THE CHAIRMAN

Chris Gibson OBE

This will be my sixth and last foreword to an edition of the *Journal of Cross Border Studies in Ireland*, since I intend to stand down as chairman in the next few months. It has been my pleasure to be chairman of the Centre for Cross Border Studies for the past 11 and a half years and see the Centre grow from very small beginnings into an organisation with an unrivalled reputation for the kind of practical cross-border cooperation research and development work that leads to better understanding between the peoples of the two parts of Ireland. Under Andy Pollak’s leadership it has led the way in research, information, training, networking and management support projects in the North-South and cross-border cooperation field, with a well-recognised ability to bring to fruition high-class research projects, run major conferences and organise cross-border exchanges, thus promoting what we have in common on this small island on the edge of Europe.

There are many single issue organisations also contributing to greater mutual understanding on this island. But I believe the Centre for Cross Border Studies has made and will continue to make a unique contribution to the difficult task of blending as many of them as possible into the complex social, economic and cultural mix which reflects the realities of life in Ireland today. A clear feature of this work is the Centre’s philosophy of building partnerships to enable future progress across the Irish border in a wide range of areas. We now have an impressive range of skills in the staff in the Centre’s offices in Armagh, greatly enhanced by the wide range of academic and other contributors who are associated with our work. Long may it continue under the new chair, Helen Johnston of the National Economic and Social Council in Dublin, who is originally from County Antrim.

2010-2011 was another extremely busy year for the Centre. In summary, we carried out and supported research, information, training, networking, management and scholarship projects in the following areas: the border region economy, cross-border spatial planning,
cross-border hospital services, cross-border mobility information, cross-border impact assessment, cross-border postgraduate and teacher education, cross-border rail services, cross-border training in Europe and Irish universities’ cooperation with Africa.

All five research, training and information projects funded by EU INTERREG IVA (managed by the Special EU Programmes Body) under the omnibus title INICCO (Ireland/Northern Ireland Cross-border Cooperation Observatory) were up and going during this period. The first of these is a study of the economy of the Irish border region by a high-powered team led by Professor Michael Best of the University of Massachusetts – an international authority on business strategies in many regions of the world – and Dr John Bradley, formerly a research professor at the Economic and Social Research Institute in Dublin. There is an article by Professor Best and Dr Bradley detailing their emerging findings in this journal.

The Centre’s ‘sister’ organisation, the International Centre for Local and Regional Development (ICLRD), heads the second project, the Cross-border Spatial Planning and Training Network (CroSPlaN), which has brought together local councillors, officials, business and community leaders in the border region to learn about planning in the two jurisdictions and how they might use their planning powers (or future planning powers) to work more closely together. Executive training courses were completed in the Newry-Dundalk and Derry-Letterkenny regions. The first of these, following on from a 2009 ICLRD report on this ‘twin city’ region, has led to an unprecedented Memorandum of Understanding between Newry and Mourne District Council and Louth Local Authorities to work together on selected environmental, energy, tourism and regeneration projects, which will be signed in Brussels at the beginning of March 2011.

The third EU-funded project is a two-part study of the potential of cross-border hospital services. Deputy director Ruth Taillon completed a study of the role of community participation in hospital planning in the border region. The consultancy firm Horwath Bastow Charleton has continued to work on a
prototype modelling tool for hospital planning in selected specialties on a cross-border and all-island basis.

The Border People cross-border mobility information website went from strength to strength. A user survey conducted with Indecon Economic Consultants in the summer of 2010 found that 92% of respondents ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that Border People is an ‘important and valuable resource’ for people living in the border region. At a seminar in Dublin in November, international lawyer and EU labour mobility expert John Handoll called the website an ‘essential tool’ and ‘a first port of call for those seeking to understand their rights.’

The fifth EU-funded project is the development of a Pilot Impact Assessment Toolkit for cross-border cooperation in Ireland. This highly innovative project – in European as well as Irish terms – began in early summer 2010 in collaboration with Dr Joachim Beck, Director of the Euro-Institute at Kehl, near Strasbourg, and an advisor to the European Commission on cross-border cooperation and impact assessment.

Dr Beck sent the Centre its first intern. 24-year-old Sebastian Rihm, who is taking a Masters in European Public Administration degree at the Universities of Ludwigshurg and Kehl in Germany. Sebastian worked in Armagh for six months on the Pilot Impact Assessment Toolkit and during that time made a very valuable contribution to the evolving work of that project. We wish him well in his future career.

During the year the Centre also organised two successful meetings of its North/South Research Forum, which brings together researchers, policy-makers and funders interested in North-South and cross-border cooperation. The first of these, in Dundalk, was on ‘Cross-Border Innovation and Creativity’ with speakers on health technologies, economic development and energy efficiency. The second, in Belfast, was on ‘The Future of Public Sector Cross-Border Cooperation in a Difficult Financial Climate’ with two of the island’s leading economists, Pat McArdle and Victor Hewitt.
Busy all-island networks

The three all-island higher education networks managed by the Centre were equally busy in 2010-2011. Universities Ireland continued its work through three principal projects: the Irish-African Partnership for Research Capacity Building (IAP); the North/South Postgraduate Scholarship scheme; and the Irish Section of the Scholars at Risk programme.

The final two Irish-African Partnership events were held in Zomba (Malawi) and Belfast. The first of these, in March 2010, was in the form of a ‘summer school’ at which senior Irish and African researchers and research staff worked together on research management, research funding, ICT and human resource issues – evaluation feedback from participants showed that it was the most successful IAP event to date. The culminating project conference at Queen’s University at the end of September 2010, was addressed by leading figures in the world of international development such as the former Irish president Dr Mary Robinson, the Chief Executive of Concern Worldwide, Tom Arnold, and the former head of Tony Blair’s Commission for Africa, Myles Wickstead. It was attended by 110 academics from Ireland, North and South, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, Uganda, Ethiopia, South Africa, England, Canada and Belgium.

Five more students crossed the border to do postgraduate degrees in universities in the other Irish jurisdiction assisted by scholarships provided jointly by Universities Ireland and two firms, ESB and Dublin Port. Four academics facing threats to their liberty and life in Iran, Iraq and Burma were hosted at Irish universities for a year under the international Scholars at Risk network (for which Universities Ireland is the Irish Section).

The Standing Conference on Teacher Education North and South (SCoTENS) continues to be probably the Centre’s most vibrant and transformative all-island network, with 61 cross-border research projects funded in the past eight years (15 more applications were received in January 2011) and 14 published reports. An eighth annual international conference in Belfast in October 2010 on the subject ‘Teacher Education for Inclusion’ was addressed by one of Britain’s outstanding educationalists, Sir Tim Brighouse, the former Schools Commissioner for London, and Renato Opertti from UNESCO. The Centre also runs its longest running educational exchange, the North/South Student Teacher Exchange (started in 2002) under SCoTENS auspices (with 167 participating student teachers to date).

Professor Malcolm Skilbeck, a noted international authority on higher education (and formerly Deputy Director for Education of the OECD), wrote an article in the Irish Independent in December 2010 in which he paid tribute to the pioneering work of both Universities Ireland and SCoTENS – both driven by the ‘energetic Armagh-based Centre for Cross Border Studies’ – and stressed the continuing
The importance of the educational dimension in the process of peace and cross-border cooperation in Ireland.

The third network the Centre manages is the International Centre for Local and Regional Development (ICLRD), which brings together university-based spatial planners from the International Institute for Urban Development in Cambridge, Massachusetts (and formerly from Harvard University), University of Ulster, National University of Ireland Maynooth and CCBS. In the past year it has published reports on planning reform, ‘functional territories’ and sustainable communities across Ireland, and international comparative studies of cross-jurisdictional planning in Switzerland and the USA; held a highly successful sixth annual international conference in Sligo in January 2011, and launched the first edition of a new journal: *Borderlands: The Journal of Spatial Planning in Ireland*.

**New departures**

A new departure last year was a series of seminars on the present circumstances and future prospects for the Belfast-Dublin rail service, attended by regular users, interested business leaders and the two operating companies, Irish Rail and Translink. This led to a paper to the Minister for Transport in the South and the Minister for Regional Development in the North, which was discussed at a North South Ministerial Council transport sectoral meeting in October 2010, and to which the operating companies will formally respond at the next transport sectoral meeting in spring 2011. This is a good example of the Centre identifying a cross-border public policy problem (in this case the inadequacies of the ‘Enterprise’ service); holding stakeholder seminars to discuss it; compiling a cogent and accessible report; and making sure key senior policy-makers receive and read it – all of this leading to the issue being raised and seriously discussed at high policy level through the North South Ministerial Council structures.

Another new initiative was the first meeting of a new network Transfrontier Euro-Institute Network (TEIN) in Kehl on the German-French border in October 2010. This new network, funded by the EU Leonardo programme, brings together institutes and centres of cross-border or transfrontier studies from 10 countries (or 11, depending on the definition of a country!): Germany, France, Denmark, Poland, Czech Republic, Austria, Italy, Slovenia, the French Caribbean and Ireland, North and South. The partners will work for the next two years to initiate the development of a training and certification system for cross-border training in Europe, particularly for people working in public administration.

As in previous years, director Andy Pollak, has continued his outreach activities at home and abroad. Highlights of the past year included addressing a Sinn Fein conference on Irish unity in London (at which he urged greater cross-community and cross-border cooperation rather than moves towards unity); chairing a session of an all-island...
conference on young people and politics at University College Dublin; addressing a conference on cooperation across the Austrian-Italian-Slovene border; addressing the annual conference of the Association of European Border Regions; and chairing a session at a high-level conference on European cross-border cooperation in Strasbourg.

Andy also continued his own research work in the educational field, with a report for the Irish Department of Education and Skills and the NI Department of Education on cross-border cooperation in education between 2005 and 2010, with special attention being paid to teacher qualifications and exchanges; educational under-achievement; education for children with special needs; and school, youth and teacher exchanges. This was well received by senior officials both departments who are carrying out a review of their cooperation and funding in this area.

There were a number of high profile journals and reports published by the Centre and its ‘sister’ bodies during the past 12 months. The 2010 Journal of Cross Border Studies in Ireland was launched by the then Minister for Foreign Affairs (now leader of Fianna Fail), Micheál Martin, in April, and there was widespread press coverage of the interview it carried with the then Taoiseach, Brian Cowen, on North-South cooperation. In October SCoTENS published a report on Valuing Education Technology in Schools, North and South, by leading ICT in education experts John Anderson and Roger Austin (along with the SCoTENS 2009 annual report, Reflective Practice: Challenges for Teacher Education North and South). In January 2011 a new International Centre for Local and Regional Development research journal, Borderlands: The Journal of Spatial Planning in Ireland, was launched at the ICLRD’s annual conference in Sligo.

Overall it was a good year, and one in which the Centre was not too adversely affected by the clouds of financial crisis looming on both sides of the Irish border. The effects of the economic maelstrom which has hit the developed world in recent years – and which Ireland has suffered from more than most – will be with us for some time to come. It is essential that we weather this storm and use the opportunity it presents fundamentally to change some of the ways in which we live and work as Irish people, making them more fit for the 21st century and for the younger people who will follow us in this work for the good of the island we love. I know that Andy will thank many other people in this journal. I would like to express my admiration both to him and his colleagues in Armagh, and my gratitude for the great support that the board of the Centre for Cross Border Studies – and in particular vice-chairman Pauric Travers – have given me since we started on this adventure together in September 1999. I wish them all continued success in the future.

Once again, the Centre has to thank a long list of financial supporters, partners and advertisers. First and foremost is the Special EU Programmes Body. Without the generous support from
the EU INTERREG IVA programme, managed through the SEUPB, the Centre would simply not be able to do its work. The SEUPB is living testimony to the European Union’s huge solidarity with Ireland and Northern Ireland as the island continues to work to find ways of sustaining its remarkable rise out of the ashes of 30 years of conflict. The Irish Department of Education and Skills continues to fund the Centre despite severe financial constraints, a tribute to its continuing commitment to the vital role education plays in building cooperation and mutual understanding across this island.

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 nine universities, the 34 teacher education providers, the Northern Ireland Department for Employment and Learning, the NI Department of Education, the Irish Department of Education and Skills, the Higher Education Authority, InterTradeIreland, the NI Department for Regional Development, the Irish Department of Education and Skills, the Higher Education Authority, InterTradeIreland, the NI Department for Regional Development, the Irish
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Department of the Environment, Heritage 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 our sponsoring institutions, Queen’s University Belfast, Dublin City University and the Workers Educational Association (NI); the North South Ministerial Council Joint Secretariat, with special thanks to Mary Bunting and the South’s new Joint Secretary Anne Barrington (until last summer Ireland’s ambassador to Tanzania); the Department of the Taoiseach; the nine universities, with particular thanks to the current Universities Ireland chairman, Professor John Hegarty, Provost of Trinity College Dublin; the nine colleges of education and 25 other institutional subscribers to SCoTENS, with particular gratitude to the 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 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’ to our friend and colleague, John Driscoll, the gentle and indefatigable American who is director of the ICLRD, and his assistant directors, Caroline Creamer of NUI Maynooth and Dr Neale Blair of University of Ulster.

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. They are Safefood, Tourism Ireland, InterTradeIreland, Weber Shandwick, Cooperation Ireland, Armagh City Hotel (Mooney Hotel Group), the Loughs Agency, the Institute of Public Health in Ireland, FPM Chartered Accountants, Michael Campbell Photography and Leslie Stannage Design (who design all the Centre’s publications and reports). New advertisers this year are Armagh City and District Council, the Grand Hotel, Malahide, the EURES Cross-Border Partnership, John McMahon and Co, and McCusker Pro-Audio.
WE NEED TO BE BIG AND GENEROUS TOWARDS EACH OTHER: INTERVIEW ON NORTH-SOUTH COOPERATION WITH THE NI DEPUTY FIRST MINISTER, MARTIN McGUINNESS MP MLA

Martin McGuinness MP MLA

Would you agree that North-South cooperation has been one of the success stories of the Northern Ireland peace process? What do you think are its major achievements since the Good Friday Agreement?

I do absolutely agree that North-South cooperation has made a major contribution to peace. The North South Ministerial Council, the power-sharing government in the North and the East/West institutions are obviously the foundation stones of the Good Friday Agreement, and it’s vitally important that all of those relationships are developed. These institutions, first established in December 1999, struggled through a very difficult period until October 2002 when they collapsed. Then we effectively had a desert from 2002 until 2007. But I think the fact that they were restored in 2007 and they have been worked without interruption in the course of nearly four years is a major success story.

There’s no doubt that the big success story of the North-South relationship has been the the comfortable position that all Ministers now find themselves in at North South Ministerial Council meetings, and the important relationships that are being built on an ongoing basis. I always refer to the first meeting of the NSMC in December 1999, when Ian Paisley and I led our Ministers from the North to meet the then Taoiseach, Bertie Ahern and his Ministers. At the press conference afterwards Ian Paisley talked – I thought very powerfully – about the need to end the old divisions, to bring down barriers, and the need for all of us to work together. That was a huge encouragement to me and to anybody listening to his remarks at that time. I worked with him for a period of a year in the office of First Minister and Deputy...
First Minister and participated with him in further meetings of North South Ministerial Council. That clearly showed everybody on this island, no matter what their political persuasion, that where there was mutual benefit to be brought to the people of the island that it was our bounden duty as Ministers to work together.

As I’ve said to my own people in Sinn Fein, at the very outset of this relationship with the DUP I forecast that the first term would be difficult and rocky, and that the true value of the institutions – the power-sharing Executive, the North South Ministerial Council and the East-West relationships – would only really be properly assessed in the second term of the Assembly, which will come after the elections due to be held in a couple of months time.

So I think North-South cooperation has been very important. Some of the North/South institutions have been resounding successes: Tourism Ireland, for example, and InterTradeIreland. We’ve seen more trade than ever before in the history of the Northern and Southern states, with people from all over the island collaborating on plans and projects to bring employment to the people. That, of course, has been impacted by the recession of the past two years. But you still have IBEC and CBI working very closely and comfortably together and regularly inviting Ministers from North and South to address them. And you have economists North and South arguing – as the Taoiseach did at the North South Ministerial Council today [21 January 2011] – that all of us should consistently look at how we can do things together in terms of shared cross-border services and how we can use them to deliver for the people we represent. So overall I think it’s been huge success.

What have been the main challenges to cooperation between North and South in recent years?

The main obstacle to be overcome for me was the building of relationships between Ministers and officials North and South so that they can work together on a consistent basis. Because a lot of the good things that can flow from human contact between Ministers comes from an acceptance that if there is mutual benefit to be gained then we have a responsibility to work together. The big difficulty obviously is that the Ministers who represent Sinn Fein and the SDLP are quite comfortable with that type of working, but they are also very conscious of the concerns within those departments that have DUP and Ulster Unionist Ministers – although the concern is more in the minds of the unionist Ministers than in their departments.

Their concern is that to further develop North-South cooperation is something that undermines the Union. However a very strong case can be made that working across the border for mutual benefit will allow us to make huge savings in terms of other monies that can be put to proper use helping our citizens, North and South, and that can be done without undermining the allegiance that unionists would have to what they call the United Kingdom. But I’m conscious that we could be
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making much more progress if we had a situation where unionist Ministers recognised that there could be considerable gains for their departments and the people they represent if they were to seriously examine how further benefits might be achieved by working on a cross-border basis with departments in the South without any way damaging their constitutional position. Obviously, it’s not a view I share but it’s one that I recognise as presenting a problem for them.

Are there particular areas of North-South cooperation you think you might be able to persuade unionists to move into in the future?

There are a range of issues where the border damages the building of social relationships and economic prospects. For example much more could be done in education. We have this phenomenon where families have moved from Derry City to County Donegal and then a furore happens in some Derry schools because children wanting to attend them are born and reared in Donegal even though their families originally come from Derry and their grannies live in Derry and are part of a childminding process after school. Then a row can develop because those children aren’t being educated in the North. I think that’s crazy.

Then there’s the issue of health. We’ve had this debate about the establishment of a radiotherapy unit in Altnagelvin hospital in Derry. We have a ridiculous situation where people with cancer from Donegal and Derry have to travel to Belfast, and people from Donegal have to travel to Galway or Dublin for treatment. Now we have an agreement that that a radiotherapy unit will be built at Altnagelvin.

These are two examples of essential cross-border services that should make sense to everybody. Then there is economic development and spatial planning – all of these things could be tackled in a way that removes the border as an obstacle to social, economic and political development.

How do you work in this area with DUP Ministers who obviously might prefer that there is as little North-South cooperation as possible?

The downside to all of this is that every now and again you will hear a Unionist politician talk about the absolute need to do away with the North/South institutions. I think you can show citizens – and it doesn’t matter what political persuasion they are – that gains can be made through North-South cooperation that can really improve their lives, and that people will go along with that. What it requires is leadership; what it requires is facing down those people who would like to turn us back to the bad old days.

In a recent Irish News column Breidge Gadd expressed frustration that North-South cooperation was being forgotten about by the politicians in Northern Ireland. Do you share her frustration?

I think it’s wrong to say that it’s forgotten about because it’s a major priority for my party and has been for a very long
time. And to be fair that’s also true for the SDLP, while they may not be as forward as we are in terms of where we need to go in North-South cooperation. I’m an Irish republican, and I would love to be living in a united Ireland tomorrow morning. And I’m determined as an Irish republican to bring about a free and independent republic. That said, we do have a situation where there is a difficulty because of consistent fears unionist Ministers have looking over their shoulders because of the negative elements in Unionism.

Some Ministers on the unionist side are not prepared to go as far as they need to go in being willing to show real savings by working together across the border and then ensuring that the savings accrued as a result are put into other worthwhile projects that improve the lives of people. This is going to be a process: while the North South Ministerial Council and all the workstreams and structures that happen under the NSMC might have had a rocky beginning, we can all go from strength to strength if we encourage people to think in new ways which will improve their performance as Ministers and bring about an engagement with their counterparts in Dublin to deliver shared services that can be shown to citizens to be of enormous value to everyone without compromising anyone’s political allegiances.

It was relatively easy to argue for greater cooperation with a dynamic Republic of Ireland during the good years of the Celtic Tiger. How can you persuade unionists that it makes sense now, with the South so deeply mired in financial crisis?

I actually think it’s all the more imperative that we do it now. It’s like people saying to Peter Robinson and I two years ago: ‘What are you going to America for?’
America’s not going to invest in the North.’ We went to America and we saw companies like Universal and HBO, and a result of us convincing them to come to the North, for the past year or so 6-700 people have been employed at the Paint Hall in Belfast’s Titanic Quarter making firstly a feature-length movie and then a TV series for HBO with every prospect of further series to come. You also have 400 people working for the New York Stock Exchange in the North.

Similarly on the North-South strand, what we need to do is make the argument that even at a time of recession what people think is not doable is eminently doable, and there are opportunities to be gained from North-South cooperation. So even though the South is facing a huge economic crisis, and we face our own economic crisis insofar as we have a Tory-led administration in London which has reneged on commitments made by the previous administration and withdrawn £4 billion from our budget over the next number of years, we have to see those as challenges that we have to rise to. So there is an argument for people to intensify the working together across the border rather than accepting the argument that because there are economic difficulties that’s something that should not be contemplated. I don’t buy that at all.

How can North-South cooperation help the two parts of Ireland come out of recession?

I’ll give you an example. I am conscious that Michael McGimpsey is presently holding a report that was done by very qualified people to look at the benefits that would accrue to all the people of Ireland, North and South, through shared health services. Disappointingly he has refused to publish that over recent times. I think a very compelling case can be made that if we work together for the provision of those services on a shared, cross-border basis we will actually provide a far better health service for our citizens. I don’t think our citizens, when they go into hospital – whether they’re Protestants or Catholics or non-believers, whether they’re unionists or loyalists, nationalists or republicans – worry one jot about political allegiance.

Any there any other public services which can be delivered more effectively – and even more cost-effectively – on a cross-border basis?

Tourism is one area. Tourism Ireland, a North/South body, is charged with the responsibility of marketing Ireland on an international basis. However I think the tourist organisations here in Ireland, North and South, need to work much more closely together than they do at the moment.

I also believe that local councils along the border need to be working much more closely together. It’s a bit like the development of the North South Ministerial Council – where people can see actual benefits for citizens from such cross-border work, then the argument for continuing it can be won. The same is true at local council level. Having said that, we could do it an awful lot more quickly.
In terms of growing the economy, I think that is the next big thing to be taken on board, because the potential for economic development, and particularly export-led development to help us grow out of recession, is huge. It is ludicrous having the IDA and Invest Northern Ireland competing against one another. But that brings you into a whole new debate around corporation tax and the fact that we don’t have a level playing pitch, North and South. We have majored on that in the course of this term of the Assembly, and we are now in consultation with the British Treasury.

If the power to fix our own corporation tax were to be given to the Executive, that would make a very dramatic change to our FDI prospects. And the DUP and Sinn Fein are agreed on that.

There are also some sporting and cultural services which could be better provided on a cross-border basis. There are two separate Sports Councils which contain many individual sporting bodies that are organised on an all-island basis, so there are savings to be made there.
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Is there a danger of both politicians and people in the South turning in on themselves during this period of financial crisis and forgetting about the peace that was so hard won in the North, and more specifically the importance of the North-South strand of that process?

I think there is always a danger of people being complacent as we have seen in the course of recent times. There are still people out there who believe that the best way to go forward is to plunge us all back into conflict again. And of course there are people out there in the more extreme unionist political parties, for example the party led by Jim Allister, who believe that the power sharing executive in the North and the North/South institutions should be destroyed, and effectively argue for a return to unionist and majority rule. We also faced new challenges in the course of recent times, not least the killing of two soldiers in Antrim, and the killing of policeman Stephen Carroll last year. I think the fact that Peter Robinson and I stood together in a very united way against that sent a very powerful message to our own people on the island of Ireland and to the international community, that we were politicians who were absolutely determined to move forward and not to go back.

If people in the South do turn in on themselves, is there anything that Sinn Fein, as an all-island party and one that will probably have a bigger representation in the Dail after the coming election, can do to prevent that happening?

I give the Irish people much more credit than those who would suggest that they would turn in on themselves. Because whilst a percentage of the people might be tempted to do that, I think that people all over this island have a huge appreciation of the changes that have taken place over the course of the last 10-12 years since these institutions were established, and people don’t ever again want to see the situation slip back to where there is an isolationist approach in the North and this psychological barrier between North and South.

I believe that the vast majority of people, North and South, want to see politicians working together, building civilised relationships with one another, and cooperating in a positive, constructive way.

What do you hope to see coming out of the current review of the work of North/South Bodies? Is it not time that this was published?

People who watch what is happening know that the obstacles to that review being published do not reside with Sinn Fein. We are very much in favour of further developing and strengthening relationships on a North-South basis. The fact is that we are part of institutions that require the assent of everyone, and the search for solutions, not the exercise of vetoes, is the secret ingredient for moving forward. And on a lot of occasions we have done that.

There are some issues that still have to be overcome. For example a major case in point was the whole issue of
the transfer of powers over policing and justice, where some people said it would never happen, and some people clearly didn’t want it to happen, and some people made predictions that it would be many years before it could even be contemplated. But because we knuckled down on that issue in the course of the discussions that took place at Hillsborough Castle in the early part of last year, we found a solution, as we have found solutions to so many other issues.

Those issues include agreeing two budgets. We agreed the first budget with Ian Paisley, during his time in the Office of First and Deputy First Minister, and we have now agreed a draft budget. We were told the first budget would never happen, and then, when it did happen, that it would never last – well, it did last. The SDLP said this time ‘they might agree a budget, but it will only be for a year’. Well, we agreed a budget and it’s for four years. So we have confounded all of them, and I think it is quite clear that if we continue to build relationships and continue to work together in a very cordial and civilised way, there are no boundaries to what we can achieve.

Would you like to see the North South Ministerial Council’s remit being extended in the future to include other areas of North South cooperation other than those agreed in the Good Friday and the Saint Andrews Agreements?

I would like to see that. I think a major case in point is the issue of energy and renewables. There are major challenges facing the administrations, North and South, against the backdrop of the huge difficulties the planet is facing around the need to discover, exploit and store renewable energy. I would make this argument not only in the context of our need to work on a North-South basis, but also in the context of needing to work with other regions as well, like Scotland and Wales, and others within our ambit of responsibility. So it’s not just that we want to do this on an all island basis – in the future we could be exporting energy to Europe, for example.

Other areas where the NSMC remit could be expanded are promoting innovation, research and development; spatial planning; dealing with emergency issues like the recent water shortages during which Louth supplied water to Newry and Mourne; the technical management of flood plains (very relevant in counties like Fermanagh and Cavan); joint public procurement; waste disposal; an all-island sex offenders register; and national centres of excellence in research areas like health and engineering, so that instead of experts being spread across the Irish universities they can be concentrated in one university on the island so that you could actually grow industries out of that university on a cluster basis. The key is to develop a flexible approach to cross-border and all-Ireland working, to ensure that we make the most of opportunities that arise, opportunities that will deliver real change in people’s lives.

What is your vision of the ‘island of Ireland’ economy in the next 10 – 15 years?
Obviously getting through the recession is going to be a huge challenge for all of us. Some of the predictions from economists in terms of our ability to do that in the next short while fluctuate from being mildly optimistic to being hugely pessimistic, so I think that developing an all-island economy is eminently in the interests of the citizens who live on the island of Ireland. I think the biggest break on what we are trying to do is the political psychology of those who see the development of an all-island economy as something to be feared. We have to consistently challenge ourselves to see how we can develop an all-island economy in ways that can benefit the people that we represent.

Now I am an Irish republican, and very labour-oriented. I do believe that there is a huge responsibility on governments to protect the most vulnerable and disadvantaged in our society, and that essentially means us recognising that we live on an island where there is a very small proportion of people who control the vast bulk of wealth. There are some people who are rich beyond anybody’s wildest dreams, and that is to the disadvantage of the vast majority of citizens, particularly in working class areas. I am conscious that there are many political tendencies on the island: ourselves and the Unionist parties in the North, and Fianna Fail, Fine Gael, the Labour Party and Sinn Fein in the South. The forthcoming election in the South could be a watershed election. I think it is fair to predict that there will be a change of government, but there is a very real prospect that coming out of this election there could be a government in the South that doesn’t include Fianna Fail or Fine Gael.

How will that fit in to what is happening in the North? To be fair, in our recent discussions on the budget with the Democratic Unionist Party, what has again been under-estimated by the media is that at the end of those deliberations there is going to be an agreed budget, and it’s going to go through the Assembly. And what I take heart from is that during the course of those discussions, we agreed with the DUP that the development of our economy is still a major priority. But that priority must be set against a backdrop of recognising our responsibilities to protect front line services and to protect the most vulnerable and the most disadvantaged within our society. So it is clear that there is common ground between us and the DUP in terms of the need to ensure that as we go forward we develop an economy that is delivering for everyone and not just for the rich.

What do you make of Martin Mansergh’s statement that barriers to North-South cooperation have never been lower, and that the Irish government should concentrate on continuing to lower these rather than to press any claims for Irish unity at a time when its overriding priority is to get the Irish economy out of its present crisis?

I do agree with the first part of that. Huge progress has been made and the peace process has changed everything. This was an island that had been in conflict for something like 800 years, and I think that the agreements that we have forged with the assistance of the American Government, the British Government and the Irish Government,
and most important of all the agreement of political leaders like Gerry Adams and myself, Ian Paisley and Peter Robinson, John Hume and Mark Durkin, David Trimble and Reg Empey, have totally transformed the political situation. I can now say with a good degree of confidence that we are never again going to slip back into conflict in the North. This is a very big statement to make, a very bold statement, but a very confident statement, and I say it as an Irish republican whose raison d’etre is to bring about the reunification of Ireland by peaceful and democratic means that threaten nobody.

We have agreed through the Good Friday Agreement that if the people of the North decide that they want to end the link with Britain, then the British Government is duty bound to legislate for Irish unity.

However equally important is the work we do in the intervening period: the personal relationships we build, the ability of the politicians to work together North and South, to be civilised and cordial with each other. Yes, to fight our corner at election time, but whenever the people have spoken to roll up our sleeves, and to do the
business on their behalf. And I am hugely optimistic about the future – even in the face of the very severe economic situation that we face in the intervening period.

**So you don’t agree that the Irish government should concentrate on solving its own crisis rather than pressing any claims for Irish unity?**

Whoever is elected in the South is going to have to deal with the very grave economic circumstances that exist there. There is no running away from political realities and I respect the fact that whoever takes up those reigns has a huge amount of work to do. But I think that we need to get away from people trying to criminalise the political aspiration for Irish unity.

And we need people to be big about all of this. I mean I am big enough to accept Peter Robinson as a unionist: his allegiance is to Westminster and to what he calls the United Kingdom. I don’t have any allegiance to that: my allegiance is to the people of Ireland – North and South – whether they be loyalist, unionist, nationalist or republican, and you know I represent all of them in my Mid-Ulster constituency. Up until 10 or 12 years ago, you would hardly ever have seen somebody from a GAA club walk through a street in Magherafelt or Cookstown wearing their club jersey. We see it now all the time, and there are people who walk past them now wearing Rangers jerseys. Let’s be big enough to accept it – it’s an Irishman wearing a Rangers jersey. That’s what he is, and why should I feel annoyed or angry about that, or why should he or she feel similarly annoyed about someone wearing a GAA jersey.

We need to move beyond old positions and kneejerk reactions. We need to accept, respect and embrace diversity – to see the person behind the jersey.

We all need to be big and generous towards each other. The example for all of that is Peter Robinson and I, Ian Paisley and I, being able to go into an office together and work together.

*The interviewer was Andy Pollak and the interview took place in Armagh on 21 January 2011 following the eleventh plenary meeting of the North South Ministerial Council.*
BYPASSED PLACES? THE POST-BELFAST AGREEMENT BORDER REGION ECONOMY

John Bradley and Michael Best

Few Irish economists were interested in cross border issues in the decade preceding the 1998 Belfast/Good Friday Agreement. For those who were, their investigations tended to focus on the aggregate behaviour of the two regional economies of the island. Of course there was some understanding that inside the two separate island jurisdictions there was a considerable degree of economic and social heterogeneity. But to the extent that island issues came on political and economic agendas, they prioritised the desirability of normalising relations at a ‘national’ (i.e. Dublin-Belfast-London) level. Anything of relevance that went on inside each component economy, and particularly in the cross-border region, was left to a future, more settled period. Internal, sub-regional issues were not considered to be germane to the overriding focus on normalising North-South relations. Indeed, they may even have been thought to be unhelpful and distracting barriers to the encouragement of island re-normalisation.

The success of the Belfast/Good Friday Agreement in bringing an end to widespread violence is widely acknowledged and praised. Nobody questions that success and its crucial importance as a necessary precondition for everything that followed in the wake of the Agreement. However, we can see now with the aid of hindsight that the decade following the Agreement was characterised by excessive optimism on the part of Northern policy makers, when facing into the challenge of repairing the human, social and economic ravages of three decades of violence which had caused the degrading of much of the Northern productive sector, with damaging spillovers for the Southern border counties.

After the Agreement was signed, the confident assertion was made that Northern Ireland plc was now ‘open for business’. There was much talk of a ‘peace dividend’. Generous
reconstruction finance would be forthcoming from the UK Treasury, from Europe and from America. Foreign direct investment would flow in again, just as it had in the decade that preceded the 1968 outbreak of violence. The underlying historical entrepreneurial culture of Northern Ireland would bounce back. Prosperity would trickle down automatically from the major urban centre of Belfast to more peripheral Northern border regions. In many ways the optimism in the air was similar to that of the newly liberalised states of Central and Eastern Europe when they were released from the constraining shackles of Communism and central planning in 1989. And the disillusion that followed in its wake was also similar, as the difficult challenges of renewal became manifest.

As in the past, so today: the real boundaries in Europe are not between countries but between prosperous urban centres and a neglected and impoverished rural hinterland” Tony Judt, 2005, Post War: A History of Europe Since 1945, pp. 687-688

The unfortunate reality was that as a result of three decades of violence, the Northern Ireland economy had become, and still remains, very directly dependent on the public sector, while much of its business sector had become indirectly dependent on public expenditure to sustain demand, as well as being heavily reliant on subsidies and grants to keep it going. Some inward investment did come in the decade after the Agreement, seeking to benefit from Northern Ireland’s relatively low cost base, well educated labour force and good infrastructure. But it became clear that, in spite of their well intentioned and supportive rhetoric, foreign investors often took a more jaundiced view of conditions in Northern Ireland, where the newly devolved power-sharing administration was very slow to get working and even slower to produce innovative programmes of social cohesion and regional economic development and reconstruction.

There was peace, but the enduring and even increasing polarisation of communities into separate areas continued to cause complications for the evolution of sub-regional strategies and for the smooth operation of the labour market. Northern Ireland plc may have been ‘open for business’, but the quest for renewed, private sector-led prosperity was not without its problems and difficult challenges.

New meanings after the crash

It was in this context in the autumn of 2009 that the opportunity arose to carry out a research project that was specifically aimed at examining the economy of the border region, both North and South. The project was commissioned by the Centre for Cross Border Studies and funded under the INTERREG IVA programme by the Special EU Programmes Body, and had been conceptualised in an slightly earlier, more prosperous era.

Its title (Normal Business Restored: reviving the border region economy in a new era of devolved government) took on new, challenging meanings when the true horror of the post-2007 economic
crash, North and South, became clear. After a decade of apparently strong growth, GDP in Ireland fell by over 7 per cent in 2009 and investment (GFCF) collapsed by over 30 per cent (see Table 1), contractions that were off the scale of previous experience. The knock-on consequences of the IMF/European Central Bank (ECB) bail-out, with its imposed contractionary budgets for the next four years, are not yet fully understood. But in the absence of a dramatic recovery of the world economy, growth in Ireland is likely to continue to be very low. The impacts of the recession on the UK were less severe, but still forced the new Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition into adopting a very restrictive fiscal stance. The ‘island of Ireland’ economy, together with wider external developments, formed the encompassing framework for the border economy, and hence needed to be carefully examined and understood. Nevertheless, the focus of the new project was on the specific economy of the border region. In particular, we wished to examine the productive aspects of that region, i.e. the characteristics and performance of the set of businesses that operated in the border counties; whether they behaved differently to other, non-border counties that otherwise shared many similar characteristics; and to what extent was the presence of the now-peaceful border a help or hindrance to their activities?

The project continues and is scheduled for completion in the autumn of 2011. The research team includes Professor Michael Best, an expert on business strategy in many regions of the world and author of two books on how businesses and production processes...
have evolved over the past century. In an effort to try to identify specific factors that influence economic development and renewal in border regions, we also collaborated with experts from WARR, a regional development agency based in Wroclaw, located near the southern Polish-German border. Dr John Bradley’s area of expertise derived from two decades of international research into the role of EU regional development policy (Structural Funds), and previous experience with national-level research on Irish and North-South issues.

In this short article we take the opportunity to discuss some of the preliminary insights obtained from work in progress. First, we say something about the ‘island’ context of the research, and then move on to describing our attempts to understand the structure and characteristics of the border region economy from an outside perspective, i.e. using official, published data sources. We then move to what has turned out to be the most interesting and surprising element of the project, namely our efforts to communicate with

---

### Table 1: Irish and UK growth rates of GDP and Investment (GFCF), post-Belfast Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>GDP-IE</th>
<th>GDP-UK</th>
<th>GFCF-IE</th>
<th>GFCF-UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>13.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>13.55</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>7.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-3.55</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-14.26</td>
<td>-5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>-21.12</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>-10.05</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>6.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Eurostat; 2010-2012 are projections
and learn from local policy makers and actors in the border region, and to try to see the border economy from an inside perspective. We conclude with some remarks on how our research has driven us to conclude that new and more relevant frameworks of analysis are urgently needed if the border region and its struggling economy is to be reincorporated into the mainstream of island business life.

The island context

We touched on the characteristics of the post Agreement Northern economy above. In some curious ways, the situation in the South has now become a kind of mirror image of the situation in the North. The prosperity of the Southern economy is utterly dependent on foreign direct investment, to an extent that is unique within the EU, and almost unique in the global economy. Prosperity only came to the South in the 1990s, driven by a massive increase in inward investment, mainly from the USA. Unfortunately, like all quickly acquired wealth, most of it was dissipated during the following decade. The catastrophic private and public sector policy failures of the past decade – in the areas of unsustainable property development, lax fiscal policy and failure of bank regulation – do not need to be replayed here. Suffice it to say that the underlying Southern development model has largely survived the recession and the exports generated by the mainly foreign-owned firms serve to underpin whatever hope the South has of emerging eventually from dependency on IMF and European Central Bank (ECB) financial support. Northern Ireland, on the other hand, is utterly dependent on continued support from the UK Exchequer, since its export-generating private sector is simply too small to pull it out of recession as the global economy improves.

Given the fraught political context of the Belfast Agreement and the radically different structure of the two economies, North and South, it was understandable that the institutions put in place by the Belfast Agreement were symbolic, weak and minimalist. There was never going to be any Irish equivalent of the European Coal and Steel Community that formed the first step on the path to bringing Germany into ever closer and co-operative relations with France and other former enemies from the Second World War. Clearly, there was no willingness to bring about a meeting of minds between
the main state Development Agencies on the island: the IDA and Enterprise Ireland in the South and the Industrial Development Board and LEDU in the North (subsequently both replaced by Invest Northern Ireland).

Planning the renewal of the border region was left by central government mainly to local authorities, many of whom were ill equipped to undertake the task because of their small size and their limited human and other resources. Consequently, there was never going to be any fully integrated planning of island infrastructure, although some piecemeal co-operation did take place. Indeed, the complex nature of the power-sharing Executive in Northern Ireland made it more difficult, not less difficult, to promote any radical rethinking of how the North fitted into the island economy at a time when the other regions of the UK were beginning to carve out new strategic postures relative to, but remaining within, the United Kingdom.

In the South, the true horror of the economic catastrophe that was mainly self-inflicted gets worse, day by day. It is lucky that the modern, foreign-owned sector of manufacturing and high-technology services, together with agriculture, is still performing reasonably well, because recovery is now dependent on buoyant external demand for exports at a time when domestic demand will be depressed by fiscal cutbacks and higher taxes. In the North, the high expectations of the ‘peace dividend’ have been dashed and future growth is likely to be restricted as the UK Treasury is forced to cut back public expenditure for the next few years. Either way, the two economies are now in much the same strategic situation since both are externally constrained: Northern Ireland, as a region of the UK, was never sovereign; the Republic of Ireland has been forced to surrender key elements of its already modest economic sovereignty to the IMF and the ECB. For the next decade growth initiatives must come from within rather than without. This is the challenging context of the revival and renewal of the border region economy.

A problem of data

Our first task was to define the region that constituted the ‘border’ region economy. An obvious initial choice was to include only those counties that included the border as part of their boundary. This was made up of five Southern counties (Donegal, Leitrim, Cavan, Monaghan and Louth) and five Northern counties (Londonderry, Tyrone, Fermanagh, Armagh and Down). However Sligo shares no border with the North, but is always included in the official Border planning region by the Central Statistics Office (CSO), Forfás, Enterprise Ireland and other agencies because of its close proximity to the border. In the North, the unit of local governance is not the county (as in the South). Rather it is at the level of district councils, of which there are 26 in Northern Ireland as a whole, and seven which share the border as part of their boundary (Derry, Strabane, Omagh, Fermanagh, Dungannon, Armagh, and Newry and Mourne).

If one wishes to get an overall idea of how the border counties are structured, one needs data that describe a wide
range of social and economic variables. Demographic, social, educational and historical data can be used to understand many aspects of a region. But in this project we were specifically interested in gaining an understanding of the productive structure of the border region: what goods and services were produced there, and how? Were the businesses modern or traditional, expanding or contracting, high or low productivity, locally or foreign owned? Were there clusters of similar activities? Was the employed labour force high skilled or low skilled? In adopting this focus, we were not ignoring the importance of the broader, socio-demographic picture. But we were asserting that the dynamism of the existing regional productive base was the crucial driving force in any successful and prosperous region. If regions such as the Irish border region are to prosper, other than by depending on transfers from other more developed regions, then they must build on and strengthen their productive base. And the existing productive base – good, bad, or indifferent – is where you must start.

The Loughs Agency aims to provide sustainable social, economic and environmental benefits through the effective conservation, management, promotion and development of the fisheries and marine resources of the Foyle and Carlingford Areas.
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It was at this stage that we came to realise something very surprising. For the Southern economy the Central Statistics Office (CSO) gathers and publishes detailed sub-regional Irish business data for the 26 counties. Using that data, we know in some detail how, say, the economy of County Donegal suffers from under development, compared, say, to the more advanced economy of County Louth.

What we found in the case of Northern Ireland shocked us. There was absolutely no effective effort made to gather and publish these kinds of business data at a sub-regional level. Results from the UK-wide Annual Business Inquiry (ABI) were published for Northern Ireland as a whole, but not for any of its sub-regions. And when we interviewed the relevant government department, the Department of Enterprise Trade and Investment in Belfast, we were told by their analysts and statisticians that nothing was being, nor would be done, to address this Northern gap in regional knowledge. Of course the availability of good sub-regional business data does not imply that national governments will necessarily act on the information to address regional disparities. But the absence of such data makes it very difficult, if not impossible, for policy makers to understand what the sub-regional challenges are.

Using officially published data, one can examine producer characteristics in the Southern border counties in terms of broad sectors: agriculture, building and construction, manufacturing, market services and the public sector. But it is impossible to do this for the Northern sub-regions. Nevertheless, making use of all available official data, our analysis suggested that the border region is internally very heterogeneous and that there are at least three broad sub-divisions of the border economy, with rather different production characteristics.

**North-East sub-region (Down and Louth)**

Here one finds many examples of advanced manufacturing, in specialities such as engineering, pharmaceuticals and food processing, as well as evidence of specialised producer services in finance, accounting and other areas. Our interpretation of these findings was that this segment of the border economy benefited from spillovers from the Dublin and Belfast metropolitan ‘poles’ at either end of the so called east coast ‘corridor’.

This was an issue that had been explored during the 1990s, and what we see today is the realisation of the benefits of a massively improved transport and communication infrastructure in a region of the island that contains about one third of the whole population. Here the border seems to be a very minor inconvenience, dominated by the benefits of easy access to large markets in the adjoining jurisdictions.

**Mid-border sub-region (Monaghan, Cavan, Leitrim, Fermanagh, Armagh and South Tyrone)**

This is a heterogeneous sub-region,
containing many examples of more traditional manufacturing, but also retaining traces of pre-partition specialities from an era when the Belfast growth pole of the late 19th and early 20th centuries was the main (indeed, the only) industrial driving force on the island. The situation here was complex, and it was only when we moved to a more detailed ‘insider’ perspective that we began to understand the history and likely future potential of the region.

**North-West sub-region (Donegal, Sligo, Derry and North Tyrone)**

In the case of Donegal, where we had the official CSO county data, what we saw was a county whose manufacturing sector was very underdeveloped. Indeed, looking at earlier CSO data from the 1950s to the 1990s, it was clear that Donegal manufacturing specialities either reflected those of the adjoining Derry City region (e.g. clothing and textiles) or were specific to resources available in the county itself (e.g. seafood processing). The decline of the clothing and textiles sector in Derry since the 1960s probably dragged down these sectors in Donegal as they became progressively uncompetitive. An added negative factor was that the city of Derry has never played the role in its Donegal hinterland that it might have played in the absence of any border. Take away Derry City and Donegal becomes an ‘island’ completely peripheral to any large or even medium sized urban centre.

Looking at the border region from the outside, some key insights emerged that were obvious, but worth restating. First, the weakness of Irish regional development policy in both Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland has left the border area ‘stranded’. Major infrastructural improvements have eased Belfast-Dublin communication on the east coast corridor, but not changed much else in the border region. The
outward orientation of foreign-owned manufacturing at the national level to global markets has resulted in a skewed north-south trade pattern consisting of a high proportion of traditional goods such as food products. The border policy fault line has placed constraints on the evolution of Northern manufacturing that has resulted in a continuing British orientation of Northern manufactured exports. Consequently, the incentive to locate plants in or near the border region is much diminished, other than in the part of the border contained within the east coast corridor. Elsewhere in the border region, the structural characteristics of the less advanced border counties derive mainly from their peripherality and low level of urbanisation.

**With assistance from FAME**

Official CSO data are useful for providing a ‘bird’s eye’ view of the Southern border counties. They permit one to talk of the economy of, say, Donegal, compared to the characteristics of the economy of Louth. Although the CSO gathers data at the level of individual firms, for confidentiality reasons it only publishes very aggregate data at the level of counties (e.g. the aggregate manufacturing sector). We were fortunate in obtaining access to an enterprise database called FAME, which contained financial information and business intelligence covering all companies in the UK and Ireland.5 A detailed classification system is used in FAME to allocate enterprises to different sectors.6 It contains precise geographical location information, thereby permitting one to study the population of all business enterprises by county, to detect sectoral clusters in the border region, and even to study a ‘control’ non-border region to compare it to a border region equivalent.

Our first step was to download details of all enterprises for each border county, North and South. Within the collection of all enterprises, which range from small retail outlets to large factories employing hundreds of workers, we selected the sub-set of manufacturing enterprises (which include SIC codes 15-37). Finally, we downloaded Galway and Mayo as control regions. We selected Galway as an example of a peripheral county with large urban centre and significant third-level educational establishments. We selected Mayo as an example of a peripheral county with no large urban centres and no third-level educational establishments.

Once we began to examine the county-level FAME database, some interesting insights emerged. For example, it was fairly easy to search for county or region-specific ‘clusters’ of similar manufacturing activities using the SIC codes. In the case of the mid-border region, significant clusters of wood processing and furniture as well as food processing emerged. Many of these had deep historical roots in earlier eras. In the case of Down and Louth, manufacturing activity in high technology areas dominated, and many of these were either foreign-owned branch plants, or indigenous plants serving the foreign sector. In the case of the North-West region, there was a significant difference between the pattern of manufacturing in the Derry...
City agglomeration and the pattern in the adjoining mainly rural region of north Donegal.

Knowing what enterprises were present in the sub-regions of the border economy was only the start. The fact that clusters of similar manufacturing activities exist in a region does not tell you if the constituent firms are focusing on core capabilities and partnering for complementary capabilities in a way that creates an organic and highly competitive entity usually referred to as an ‘entrepreneurial industrial district’.

A more fully entrepreneurial industrial district is one in which associations of firms along the production chain can collectively and simultaneously redesign products. This requires close consultation along the production chain. A fully developed industrial district would behave like a collective entrepreneur: it would possess the capacity to redesign process and organisation as well as product (Best, 1990, p. 206).

Best was writing about the Italian region of Emilia-Romagna, a highly successful region of northern Italy consisting of many small firms producing traditional goods such as furniture, ceramics and clothing, which demonstrated that networked groups of firms, with the appropriate strategy, can prosper and be competitive even in the global market place. In isolation from each other, such firms cannot survive in modern, high wage economies, and tend to migrate to the low wage Asian countries. Of course we did not expect to find such advanced Emilia-Romagna-like behaviour in the Irish border region. But it was useful to have a best case example of regional clustering in order to calibrate how far removed business activity in the Irish region was from this standard. In the event, it proved to be very far removed.

Inside the factory door

The current phase of our project involves the difficult task of setting up visits to selected individual enterprises in the border region to obtain deeper insights into current trading conditions, business strategy, production facilities, networking behaviour and technology management. With limited time and resources, structuring the field work was not obvious a priori. Our final choice was a regional manufacturing overview; a study of apparent clusters; and an in-depth study of specific small towns. First, we targeted a representative selection of enterprises within each of the three sub-regions of the border economy in order to understand the manufacturing and business ‘culture’ of that sub-region. Next, we selected some ‘clusters’ of related activities for systematic study, such as furniture and food processing in the mid-border region; clothing and seafood processing in the North-West region; and technology-based firms in the North-East region. In each case we looked for cluster dynamic processes which can only be discovered by primary research ‘in the field’. Finally, we selected a limited number of small towns where the size would enable us to study the complete set of enterprises, rather than just selections, for comprehensive study of the production base.
The most difficult task that we faced in setting up these enterprise visits was literally getting in the door! Business people are always busy and not only did we wish to interview senior management and owners at considerable length, but we had a very intrusive list of questions that penetrated into the deepest areas of the firm’s operation and strategy. Field work was complicated by the nature of the research questions and time was needed to bring groups on board.

We quickly realised that postal surveys or ‘cold calling’ would not work, and were very fortunate in obtaining the initial assistance of InterTradeIreland in breaking the ice with firms in the NE sub-region. Generous assistance also came from chambers of commerce, and in particular the Monaghan Chamber, through the good offices of Dermot McNally of Rossmore Furniture, who enthusiastically assisted us in accessing the fascinating economy of Monaghan, an area whose manufacturing history goes back to the pre-partition era, and which still retains a specialised and distinctive character.

It is premature to present any detail emerging from our visits to enterprises, both because the visits are still being conducted and because any such accounts would have to be first cleared with the firms themselves. But we can sketch out some of the interesting findings.

Perhaps the most surprising conclusion was that the ‘border’ itself featured far less as a barrier or a problem to firms located in the border region than we had anticipated. This was put to us in a pithy way when we were told by one Monaghan businessman that ‘green had always traded with orange’, and that the border seemed more of a barrier to people remote from it than for people in its immediate vicinity, who crossed back and forth with ease. Once a firm had identified the island as its target market, and made determined and sustained efforts to build that market, then the benefits of serving a potential of six million consumers became available. Making use of the improved motorway systems on the island, one firm – Crossgar Food Services – told us that their delivery vans left their factory in Crossgar, north of Downpatrick, late at night and could make deliveries as far south as Cork by five o’clock the following morning.

Given the limited time and resources, we targeted indigenous firms rather than multinational branch plants. We accepted that foreign branch plants play a vital role in directly generating jobs and indirectly sustaining activity in the region. Indeed, for many small Irish towns the multinational enterprise is the largest, or sometimes the only,
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significant manufacturing employer. But such plants can resemble what Jane Jacobs referred to as ‘castles in the desert’, having no organic links with other businesses other than through their direct and indirect spillover impacts. However, when we visited locally owned firms it was usually very clear that success was always traceable to gifted individuals who, against all odds, founded and developed dynamic business ventures and leveraged local resources. In some cases the state development agencies played a crucial supportive role. But in others the firms seemed to value their independence and did not wish to bend their plans to the rigid, bureaucratic rules and regulations of the agencies. The diversity of experience with the state agencies was surprising.

Perhaps the most surprising aspect of our early enterprise visits was that successful, dynamic, internationally trading firms employing over a hundred people were often to be found in deeply rural border areas. As we approached the two plants of Walter Watson near Castlewellan, Co Down, on our very first trip, we could hardly believe our eyes when the factory buildings hove into view amid green fields. We were greeted by Mr. Watson himself, who took pride in recounting a story of how his business originated from the work of his father, who was a blacksmith with a shop next door to the small family home near Castlewellan, located about 30 kilometres north-east of the border city of Newry. Over the years he gradually extended his product range to agricultural trailers (eventually with hydraulic hoists), transport boxes, gates and silos. The firm then expanded into overhead cranes, and then into structural and reinforcing steel, and now employs about 180 people. In this firm, as in others in the border region, great importance was assigned to local attachments and to fostering and sustaining their mainly local labour force.

Many of the firms visited had a similar governance structure: privately held, family firms run by entrepreneurially-minded, independently-inclined men. The companies did not use debt finance but grew ‘organically’ via reinvested profits. They are entrepreneurial firms in that they see markets as subject to change to which the company must adapt, but that the adaptation must be anchored in deepening the company’s distinctive capability. They are also organised as entrepreneurial firms in the sense that the purpose of the company is not to generate profits for the purpose of personal aggrandisement. Rather it is to grow and develop a successful business organisation in which profits are the source of investment funds.

Further, and perhaps most importantly, the men who run these companies have a long time horizon. Most have lived through hard times in the past and see growth as an opportunity to build capabilities to enhance the company’s resilience in the future. While we were visiting these companies more than two years after the onset of the current economic recession, none mentioned the consequences for their companies.

How do they address the issue of succession? Once each of the companies had achieved a certain
size, they recruited first a finance/legal manager from outside the family and second either a marketing/sales professional or a production manager. The two management professionals were likely to be given small shares in the company and always sat on the board. The next challenge was the succession to the company founder. The founder’s sons and daughters were always likely candidates for leadership of the family business, but did not automatically take over.

In one case, a son came back with the unexpected death of a highly valued manager. In another, three sons did not join the business, but a nephew, an engineering graduate with more than a decade of experience in a large managerial enterprise in a closely-related industry, was being groomed to take over. In another, two sons had taken degrees in medical science and engineering and will likely take over the reins of the company in due course. In yet another, a son established an independent business unit with a distinctive product but within the same umbrella business organisation. In another, the company was being run by a third generation manufacturing engineering graduate who was taking the company in new directions.

In search of sustainable development

The border region has examples of locally owned, dynamic entrepreneurial firms. But the official statistics tell us that only in the North-East region, within the Belfast-Dublin corridor, is the level of GDP generated by the enterprise sector near the level attained in the regions of the island that have large urban agglomerations and institutions of higher education. When run by exceptional people, firms in the border region can excel. But there are too few of them. How can their numbers be increased?

One of the by-products of the publication of the National Spatial Strategy in the South in 2002 was that individual counties have produced county development plans. These are usually drawn up with the assistance of specialised firms of consultants rather than produced by actors within the county itself. After reviewing many examples, including those from the border counties, some patterns become clear. Although such plans contain SWOT analysis, the intention is often to portray the county as a highly desirable location and an attractive base for inward investment.11 Understandably, county development plans tend to be seen more as marketing opportunities than as vehicles for self-critical analysis. Perhaps the most surprising aspect of county development plans is the brevity with which they usually treat the study of the existing county production base. For example, the Monaghan County Development Plan, published in 2002 and regularly reviewed and updated since then, has no separate section covering the important county manufacturing base, or, indeed, of its base of market service enterprises, but does have detailed treatment of the environment, social inclusion, a healthy and safe community, arts and culture, and sports and leisure.12
Given the extreme difficulty that we, as researchers, experienced in obtaining, processing and understanding data on the enterprise sector at a county level, this limitation of county level planning is perhaps understandable. Such plans are heavily influenced by local government and state development agencies, that are often tasked with implementing a plan which, however admirable, is complex and often lacks local budgets or policy instruments to attain designated targets. Public policy affecting individual business enterprises is made at the national level. At a regional level very little can be done in terms of formal policy initiatives. The hope is that private sector firms will take care of themselves, attain their own private business goals, and in so doing, help realise local social and economic development goals. But, of course, local initiatives can have significant positive impacts on enterprises through many other, often informal channels.

In our research we range from ‘top-down’ treatment of the border region using official data, to a ‘bottom-up’ view based on private data sources and extended interviews with business people who are actually running successful businesses in the region. We place a lot of stress on the bottom-up view, not because we believe that it is the only valid approach. Rather, we have found that it has seldom been used in previous research or motivated existing county development plans, which tend to take for granted the role played by individual business enterprises or geographical clusters of similar enterprises.

Institutional and broad policy aspects are also important, and ideally should work in harmony with an enterprise-based approach. For example, we suggest that there needs to be a radical rethink about why we need cross-border institutions. As the Belfast Agreement was being negotiated, perhaps there was a necessary focus on an islandwide role for these bodies. Our initial findings suggested that the concept of an ‘island’ market place is now well established, driven in large part by the activities of bodies such as InterTradeIreland. But perhaps these initiatives need to be refocused on the specific needs of the border region, which have tended to be hidden in the shadow of the greater potential of the rapidly integrating island economy.

More specifically, attention is needed to address the peripheral nature of the economy of the cross-border region, which is particularly disadvantaged by the historical legacy of the border. Far from being a minor issue, this is at the very core of the goal to renew the island economy in a mutually beneficial way. It is depressing that when one tries to make a case for a cross-border development strategy, one is usually greeted by old, tired jokes about smuggling. The reality is that both sides of the immediate border region suffered after partition, while the rest of the island – centred on Belfast and Dublin - went its separate ways. Until we bring ourselves to address this historical legacy of distortion and disadvantage openly, honestly and effectively, the border economy will continue to be isolated from mainstream island life and
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its development potential will remain unrealised.
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3. The inability to provide detailed production-related data for Northern sub-regions hinges on the small data sample used by DETI in Northern Ireland to derive their part of the UK-wide Annual Business Inquiry (ABI). The size of the sample is barely enough to derive results for Northern Ireland as a whole, but completely
inadequate for use in sub-regions. In Scotland, the government has greatly increased the sample size used by the UK Office of National Statistics (ONS), and detailed data for Scottish regions are published freely on the official government web site.


5. FAME is a commercial database of UK and Irish company information and business intelligence. It combines comprehensive company information with flexible software. Using it one can create searches and analyse results. It currently contains over seven million companies.

6. The sectoral classification system used in FAME is the 2003 version of the UK Standardised Classification System (SIC 2003). Each enterprise is allocated at least one classification code. For example, one can extract, say, all firms in the furniture sector by searching on SIC 2003 code 36.1, and by further restricting the geographical location, one can identify all furniture plants in, say, Monaghan (refer to SIC 2003 for full details of the classification system).

7. A branch of Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology (GMIT) is located in Mayo, in Castlebar. But it has a very restricted set of courses and cannot be classified as an independent third-level establishment along the lines of GMIT in Galway and National University of Ireland Galway.

8. The set of questions in which we were interested did not include financial details. Nevertheless, a high degree of trust was required if the detailed and deep issues were to be discussed with outside researchers like us! So far we can report that the degree of cooperation and the comprehensiveness of information given to us by enterprises that we have visited were remarkable, and had a profound impact on the way that we thought about businesses in the border region and businesses in general.


10. The companies that we have visited to date have all been run by men. We know that this is not always the case and will discover more about the gender composition of both management and workforces as we proceed.
11. SWOT stands for Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats. It is a useful way of classifying and distinguishing factors that are internal to the region (SW) from factors that are mainly external (OT), and exploring ways in which the internal-external interaction is likely to affect the process of regional development. Many SWOT applications are poorly organised and disconnected from analysis. SWOT is merely an organising technique, and is only as good as the underlying research and analysis upon which it is based.

12. For complete information of county development planning in Monaghan, see http://www.monaghamcdb.ie/. Information on the consultancy firm that drew up the plan, Mentor Economic Development Limited, is available on http://www.mentorconsultants.com/.
I was very pleased and honoured to be asked to give last year’s Stephen Livingstone Lecture on 5 October 2010. Stephen was one of the brightest stars of the very remarkable group of human rights lawyers and activists that came together around the Committee on the Administration of Justice (CAJ) over the last 30 years. It was a real honour to be asked to pay a tribute to him. I first met Stephen in the mid to late 1980s at a small meeting in Dublin about the campaign to get the Irish Government to ratify the European Convention on the Transfer of Sentenced Prisoners. It was evidence of his deep concern for one of the less popular human rights causes – the rights of prisoners and their families.

I then got to know him better as part of the close cooperation, led by CAJ, between the Irish Council for Civil Liberties, of which I was co-chairperson at the time, Liberty, British-Irish Rights Watch, Amnesty and the US Lawyers Committee for Human Rights, who worked very hard and with some success to try to ensure that human rights protections formed a key part of the Northern Ireland peace negotiations and the eventual Belfast/Good Friday Agreement.

The last time I met Stephen was in connection with a fascinating conference organised by himself and Kieran McEvoy on the Judiciary and Human Rights, held at the Stormont Hotel. I think it was in connection with it that I rang Stephen on his mobile phone at one stage only to find that he was answering from a hotel in Addis Ababa, which brought home to me just how far-reaching, in the literal sense, was his concern for human rights.

It was quite some time after I first met Stephen when I learned that he had been, as he put it, the ‘fifth Beatle’ member of the very funny comedy group, the Hole in the Wall Gang. It helped to explain his wry wit and quirky sense of humour. And it was later still that I realised that I had worked in the old Belfast Tech in College Square with
his father Max, a quiet and courteous man in very troubled times.

In retrospect it has become clearer that Stephen was a very important figure in the creation of a vibrant and determined human rights community in Northern Ireland, committed to developing a culture of human rights and equality in this jurisdiction, in the island of Ireland and in these islands. His loss was a great blow not just to his partner Karen and his immediate family, but to the whole human rights community here – but he had helped to dig the foundations well and the house still stands.

**Equivalence of rights?**

I should say at the outset that although I am the senior solicitor with Free Legal Advice Centres in Dublin and I am also a member of the Irish Human Rights Commission, I am speaking in my personal capacity. I would not want my respected and respectable colleagues to get blamed for what I say.

It seemed fitting that a lecture to honour Stephen’s memory should deal with the human rights provisions of the Belfast/Good Friday Agreement, which embodied much of what he had worked for. And since I have lived and worked in the Republic for many years, I thought I should talk about an aspect of the Agreement that is less commonly discussed: namely the requirement in its ‘Rights, Safeguards and Equality of Opportunity’ section that the Republic should introduce measures to ‘ensure at least an equivalent level of protection of human rights as will pertain in Northern Ireland’. That requirement clearly envisaged an all-island dimension to the rights protections in the Agreement.

To the human rights community and, I hope, to many others who welcomed the Agreement as an opportunity for a new beginning, 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 and protect those rights.

And even at the most mundane and pragmatic level, 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. It may even have implied that the Republic might sometimes set an example by implementing ‘equivalent’ reforms with an energy and enthusiasm that would highlight any foot-dragging north of the border. Either way, the requirement for equivalence held out the prospect of an island committed to a common platform of human rights, available and enforceable from Ballyferriter to Belfast and from Coleraine to Cork.

I want to look at the extent to which the Government in the Republic has delivered on this commitment, but given the all-island character of the vision of a new era of human rights, and in light of some recent developments here in Northern Ireland, I want to say a little about the situation in the North as well.
The position in the Republic

The section of the Agreement on ‘Rights, Safeguards and Equality of Opportunity’ was clear, specific and quite far-reaching in relation to the Republic. It stated that:

*The Irish Government will also take steps to further strengthen the protection of human rights in its jurisdiction. The Government will ... bring forward measures to strengthen and underpin the constitutional protection of human rights.*

The Irish Government agreed to consider incorporation of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) into its domestic law; to establish a Human Rights Commission ‘with a mandate and remit equivalent to that within Northern Ireland’; to ratify the European Framework Convention on National Minorities; to bring in enhanced employment equality and equal status legislation; to take steps to demonstrate respect for the different traditions in the island; and to initiate ‘a wide-ranging review of the Offences Against the State Acts, 1939-85’.

This was all in the context of the commitment to ensuring at least (my emphasis) an equivalent level of protection of human rights to that in Northern Ireland.

A Joint Committee of the two Human Rights Commissions was also to be set up ‘as a forum for consideration of human rights issues in the island of Ireland’. And the Joint Committee was tasked to consider establishing ‘a charter... reflecting and endorsing agreed measures for the protection of the fundamental rights of everyone living in the island of Ireland’.
This was clearly a vision, an ideal of a new dispensation, with the whole island sharing a commitment to an enhanced protection of human rights. It was very much what the coalition of human rights bodies I mentioned earlier had worked for. And of course such a vision had also been advocated by a number of the parties involved in the negotiations for the Agreement, notably the Women’s Coalition, sadly no longer with us, but whose strong support for human rights has been carried on by Monica McWilliams as Chief Commissioner of the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission.

The Irish Government had, we understood, supported this vision, and had, of course, signed up for it in the Inter-Governmental Agreement, which is part of the overall Belfast/Good Friday Agreement, and which included a commitment by both British and Irish Governments to implement the provisions of the Multi-Party Agreement and to protect ‘civil, political, social, economic and cultural rights in their respective jurisdictions’.

How has the Dublin Government delivered on its commitments? Sadly, when the euphoria over the signing of the Agreement subsided, successive Irish governments showed little enough enthusiasm about delivering what they had pledged. While the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission was established promptly, the Irish Human Rights Commission was not set up until 2001, three years after the Agreement. And even then there was a major controversy when the Government rejected most of the recommendations of its own selection committee for members of the Commission. It had to subsequently back down and appoint the rejected nominees as well. And it never allocated a budget that was sufficient to allow the Commission to carry out all its functions.

Regrettably, the Joint Committee, the proposed ‘forum for the consideration of human rights issues in the island of Ireland’, has never really taken off. With both Commissions regularly underfunded, they could not spare the money or the staff to make the Joint Committee a serious body with its own, even seconded, staff and resources, without which it could not be effective. And the Charter of Rights for the whole island, which could have provided a blueprint for realising the vision of 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 and the chronic lack of funding of the two Commissions.

**European Convention finally incorporated**

The European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) was not incorporated into domestic law in the Republic until the beginning of 2004, nearly six years after the Agreement, and even then it was only after an active lobbying campaign by NGOs and some pressure from the Irish Human Rights Commission. By then Ireland was the only Council of Europe member state not to have incorporated the Convention. And the Irish legislation, which was closely modelled on the UK Human Rights
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Act, specifically excluded the courts from the definition of bodies required to act compatibly with the European Convention and contained no provision similar to the UK one which requires Ministers to certify to Parliament whether proposed legislation is compatible with the ECHR.

New and quite wide-ranging equality legislation was brought in promptly and a new and more powerful Equality Authority set up, but it is arguable that this owed more to EU obligations than to the Agreement. The new legislation did not prohibit discrimination on the basis of political opinion, however, and in a major weakness compared with the Northern Ireland legislation, there was – and still is – no equivalent of the Section 75 positive duty to promote equality, that is so important in the North.

A committee was set up to review the Offences Against the State Acts, as pledged in the Agreement, but when it reported in 2002, it was deeply divided. A majority supported the retention of the power to intern suspects without trial, continued use of the non-jury Special Criminal Court even for some non-paramilitary offences, and use of the opinion of a Garda officer as evidence of membership of an illegal organisation. No action was taken by Irish Government even on some minor reforms suggested by the committee and new legislation brought in last year has extended the use of the Special Criminal Court to try non-paramilitary gangland offences.

Little attention seems to have been paid by either the committee or the Government to the commitment by the UK Government in the ‘Security’ section of the Agreement to ‘as early a return as possible to normal security arrangements… and…the removal of emergency powers in Northern Ireland’. And it does not seem to have occurred to anyone that, in the context of developing an all-island zone of enhanced human rights protections, this might have been an area where it would have been easier for the Irish Government to take the initiative in dismantling emergency legislation, faced as it was with a lower level of paramilitary activity.

Those were the areas where formal and specific commitments had been given by the Irish Government. In other areas where the general requirement of equivalence applied, the record was no better. One of the flagship changes in Northern Ireland has clearly been the establishment of the Police Ombudsman’s Office, which has become a model for many countries seeking to reform their police forces. There were calls for a similar body to be set up in the Republic, but it took a series of domestic scandals, culminating in the extraordinary behaviour of a number of gardai in Donegal, recorded in the devastating reports of the Morris Tribunal, to finally push the authorities in Dublin into setting up the Garda Síochána Ombudsman Commission.

And, returning to a theme close to Stephen Livingstone’s heart, accountability and transparency have not made much impact on the prison system in the Republic, where gross overcrowding, some of it in crumbling
Victorian buildings with no in-cell sanitation, has turned many of the prisons into penal slums. Despite the appointment of a Prisoner Ombudsman in Northern Ireland in 2005, there has been no response by Dublin to calls for the establishment of a similar institution in the Republic.

In other areas unconnected with the legacy of the Troubles or other security issues, progressive changes in Northern Ireland, generally as a result of developments in the UK as a whole, have not been the trigger for changes in the Republic to provide equivalent rights. Instead, such changes have generally resulted from domestic demands and/or developments in the European Court of Human Rights or EU law. Examples are the recent passage of the Civil Partnership Bill and the Irish Government’s even more recent move to introduce legal recognition for transgendered persons – both developments which have been in effect in Northern Ireland for some time.

In summary, not long after the Agreement was concluded, the Irish Government seems to have taken its eye off the bigger picture and the exciting and inspiring concept of an all-island area of human rights. While elements in the administration remained committed to the ideal, inertia seems to have set in, coupled with resistance to change by parts of the permanent government.

The specific commitments in the Agreement – apart, arguably, from the dismantling of the Offences Against the State Acts – were delivered on, somewhat grudgingly, but there was no enthusiasm for change, no brave initiatives to generate a momentum that would be infectious across the border as well.

And then came the economic crisis. In 2008-2009 when we were seeing only the tip of the iceberg that was to come, the Irish Government had already decided to pay off the enormous debts generated by profligate banks and developers from the pockets of the ordinary people. There was a drive to cut public spending with a general reduction of 10% in the budget of public bodies, but the Government slashed the budget of the Equality Authority by 43%, forcing the resignation of its widely respected chief executive, Niall Crowley, and seriously undermining its effectiveness.

The budget of the Irish Human Rights Commission – a specific commitment in the Agreement – was cut by 32% and a ban on filling vacancies in the public service is slowly strangling it. A National Action Plan Against Racism was not renewed and both the state-funded anti-racism body, the National Consultative Committee on Racism and Inter-culturalism (NCCRI) and the Combat Poverty Agency were disbanded – at a time when racism and poverty were likely to get substantially worse.

There is no doubt that there was a quite disproportionate cut in funding for the human rights and equality sector and there has been much speculation about the reasons for it. Was it revenge for the Equality Authority taking discrimination cases against public service bodies,
for the Human Rights Commission criticising the Government’s policy on US rendition planes landing at Shannon, or for both these bodies criticising the Government’s treatment of asylum seekers?

Or was it a bid to silence bodies that might speak out when Government austerity policies began to really hurt the most vulnerable in Irish society?

Whatever the answer to those questions, even the most charitable view would indicate that when things began to get tough and cuts had to be made, the Government saw human rights and equality as expendable as luxuries which were alright in times of plenty, but which should be among the first to go when belts had to be tightened.

And again it seems that no thought was given to the wider vision of an all-island culture of human rights, to the specific commitments in the Good Friday Agreement, or to the knock-on effect that undermining key human rights bodies in the Republic might have on the UK Government’s attitude to the equivalent bodies in Northern Ireland.

I am conscious that I am not painting a very encouraging picture, but I do not think that all is entirely lost in the Republic. I will come back to that point, but now I would like to say something about the situation in Northern Ireland. I say this with some diffidence since most people here will be more familiar with the details of these matters than me, but to get a rounded picture of the all-island position it is necessary to look at developments in both jurisdictions.

**Developments in Northern Ireland**

There has undoubtedly been substantial progress in human rights terms in Northern Ireland since the Agreement. The police have been radically reformed and 50/50 recruitment and active recruiting of women has made the PSNI much more acceptable across both main communities, while the establishment of the Ombudsman’s office has given confidence that where there are abuses, potential remedies are available.

The Human Rights Act has made the law a significant instrument of change, and human rights advocates can now look to the new Supreme Court as an ally in the protection of human rights in a way they would not have done to the House of Lords in the pre-Human Rights Act days. And the judiciary in Northern Ireland has become much more representative of the main political/religious communities as well – though it remains singularly unrepresentative of half the population – women.

The equality legislation, the Equality Commission and Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act have done a lot to end the discrimination that played such a role in the origins of the Northern conflict. There are, however, still significant imbalances in unemployment and deprivation, and areas of persistent poverty and neglect that need to be addressed, and this may well require more emphasis on positive action and targeting investment and resources than on the limited remedy of decisions on individual complaints.
The report of the Bloody Sunday Inquiry during the summer of 2010 also represents a major step forward, despite its unconscionable cost, which was not the fault of the victims or their families. The fact that Lord Saville asserted clearly the innocence of all those killed or wounded on that day and the responsibility of the British army, and the forthright apology by David Cameron, have gone a long way to undoing the insult of the Widgery Tribunal and bringing some closure to the families and very many people in the city of Derry.

I hope the results of the remaining inquiries will be as frank and forthright and that the Government will finally agree to hold a proper public inquiry into the murder of Pat Finucane as well.

The establishment of the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission has been a major building block in the human rights infrastructure in the North. It has had its problems and divisions, which perhaps in retrospect was not surprising given the difficulty of some of the issues it has had to grapple with and the less than supportive attitude of the UK Government and some of the local parties. But the Commission has survived and has earned a well-deserved reputation for the excellence of its work in trying to protect the rights of the most vulnerable in all communities in Northern Ireland.

It has become a crucial driver of the whole human rights dimension of the Agreement. However, warning lights have begun to flash in connection with...
the attitude of the UK Government to the Commission and by implication to the whole Agreement.

**Bill of Rights**

A key responsibility of the Commission under the Agreement was to advise the UK Government on a Bill of Rights, which was envisaged as becoming, together with the European Convention on Human Rights, a basic constitutional document for Northern Ireland. The Commission and its staff put nine years of dedication, commitment, enthusiasm and sheer hard work into drawing up its Bill of Rights proposals. It held consultations across Northern Ireland and with every sector of society, raising hopes and expectations. The Bill of Rights Forum put another two years of hard work into the process under the patient direction of Chris Sidoti, former head of the Australian Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission. NGOs and civil society generally made countless submissions to the process.

The draft Bill was inevitably a compromise and may not have satisfied everybody, but it was and is an impressive document that genuinely tries to deal with the particular concerns of Northern Ireland, and it contains innovative proposals on social and economic rights that are particularly relevant to a society that has consistently higher levels of poverty and deprivation than other regions of the UK.

For the Northern Ireland Office to sit on these proposals for almost a year and then issue a Consultation Paper that refuses to consider nine of the key recommendations, and dismisses a number of the others as well, seems to me to show contempt for the whole process and for a key part of the architecture of the Agreement. And when the new Coalition Government apparently adopts and repeats more firmly its predecessor’s argument that the Bill of Rights process should be effectively subsumed in its plans for a Bill of Rights and Responsibilities for the UK as a whole, it appears to show a lack of understanding of the basic concepts of the Agreement, with its recognition of the particularity and special circumstances of Northern Ireland.

The proposal for a ‘Bill of Rights and Responsibilities’ contains its own difficulties. The rhetoric around this proposal about substituting a more ‘British’ set of rights for the ‘European’ model of the European Convention on Human Rights, and the suspicion by many in the human rights community that this is really intended to dilute the Human Rights Act, is liable to undermine some of the confidence in the Agreement.

After all, the ‘incorporation into Northern Ireland of the European Convention on Human Rights [ECHR], with direct access to the courts, and remedies for breach of the Convention, including power for the courts to overrule Assembly legislation on grounds of inconsistency’ was a key component of the Rights, Safeguards and Equality of Opportunity section of the Agreement.

And the role of the ECHR is also written into Strand One of the Agreement under
‘Democratic Institutions in Northern Ireland’. It is hard to see how, if the Human Rights Act, which incorporates the ECHR into law for the whole of the UK, was diluted, the European Convention could continue to play the crucial role in Northern Ireland that was envisaged for it in the Agreement.

Then there is the proposed 25% cut in the budget of the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission, following the example set by the Irish Government, and the arbitrary refusal to allow the Commission to accept philanthropic support for specific projects, something which has proved a lifeline for the IHRC and has not compromised its independence in any way. In a situation where the Northern Ireland Commission has been inadequately funded from the beginning, a 25% cut could seriously impair its capacity to do its job, thus undermining another key element of the Agreement.

This seems to me a dangerous course. It threatens the vision behind the Agreement, the concept of a new society where the rights of everyone in all communities will be comprehensively protected and enshrined in law and can be enforced through the courts.

I would prefer to concentrate on the vision and the ideals behind the Agreement. But there is a down to earth and practical danger here as well. The UK Government has been warning of a serious danger from dissident Republican violence. While there is very little political support at the moment for the activities of Republican ‘dissidents’, there is a close correlation between support for dissident organisations and areas of serious deprivation, which are marked by hopelessness and lack of
faith in the political system. Even from a realpolitik point of view, this is not a time to begin dismantling or undermining parts of the Agreement – or to cut public spending and investment in the most deprived areas of Northern Ireland.

This is more than ever a time to reach out and try to demonstrate to deprived and marginalised people, who have experienced no peace dividend so far, that the Agreement and the political settlement based on it can offer them hope and the prospect of a fair deal in a new society based on respect, equality and human rights principles. This is a time, North and South in the island of Ireland, to defend and develop the Belfast/Good Friday Agreement, not to dismantle it.

It is also a time, in both jurisdictions, to place more focus on social and economic rights as well as the civil and political rights which have up to now been the main focus of discussion. It is worth repeating that the Inter-Governmental Agreement commits both British and Irish governments to protect ‘civil, political, social, economic [my emphasis] and cultural rights in their respective jurisdictions’.

The Human Rights Commission Act in the Republic defines human rights as the rights conferred by the Constitution and the international treaties to which the State is a party, which, of course, includes the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the European Social Charter. And although the Belfast/Good Friday Agreement refers only to the European Convention on Human Rights, the House of Lords and the Supreme Court have indicated in some recent judgments that the ECHR requires at least a minimum level of social protection in the states that are parties to the Convention (cf. R (Limbuela) v. Secretary of State for the Home Department [2005] UKHL 66).

As the economic crisis deepens in both jurisdictions and impacts more severely on those already on the margins, such as the sick, the disabled, the elderly, single parents and their families, the homeless, migrants and asylum seekers, we face a challenge to make human rights more relevant to these groups. Indeed a lack of pressure to implement the Agreement from those working with the most deprived and marginalised in the Republic because they saw it as largely connected with the North rather than with the vulnerable throughout the island, may have contributed to the Irish Government’s lack of energy and enthusiasm in carrying out its commitments.

Fortunately, the NI Human Rights Commission has prepared the ground for such an initiative by naming and explaining key social and economic rights in its Advice on the Bill of Rights.

**Conclusion**

So far I have presented a fairly gloomy picture: the inspiring vision in the Belfast/Good Friday Agreement of a new dawn and a new dispensation – an island based on a culture of human rights – but slow, grudging and half-hearted delivery of some of the specific commitments in
the Agreement and downright refusal to implement others.

But this was never going to be easy and a great deal has already been achieved – in both jurisdictions. And it is a lot better in a cold climate to be defending and seeking to build upon gains that have already been made, than having to start off afresh.

While I can only speak with confidence about the situation in the Republic, there are some hopeful signs as well. The crude attack on the human rights and equality sector has provoked resistance among NGOs and community organisations which have formed a broad-based Equality and Rights Alliance that has already had some success in preventing further cuts. And the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Council of Europe Commissioner, Thomas Hammarberg, have intervened as well and put significant pressure on the Irish Government not to undermine these bodies any further.
The revelations of the appalling greed and hubris of the Irish banking sector and the complicity and mismanagement by the Irish Government have made an early election inevitable. The electorate is deeply disillusioned with the existing political system and open to new ideas on how to build a better society. The Labour Party, which will be pivotal to any new Government in the Republic, has called for the drafting of a new Constitution to replace the existing one which is based on the values of a different age.

There is a real opportunity in the Republic now to put the case, not just for the restoration of the human rights infrastructure as it was, but for a renewal of that vision in 1998 of an island built on a culture of human rights and for stronger, more effective, more committed human rights structures to help bring it about.

The dynamics may be different in Northern Ireland, just as the recession that has devastated the Republic’s economy is only beginning to hit the UK with full force now. But this is no time to give up hope, to abandon the huge gains that have been made, or to lose sight of the vision behind the Agreement. Instead it is a time in the words of one of the inspirational songs of the US Civil Rights movement, to ‘Keep your eyes on the prize, hold on’.

Michael Farrell is the senior solicitor with Free Legal Advice Centres in Dublin and a member of the Irish Human Rights Commission. He is a former co-chairperson of the Irish Council of Civil Liberties. In the late 1960s he was a leading member of the Civil Rights Movement in Northern Ireland and a founding member of People’s Democracy. He is the author of a number of books, including Northern Ireland: The Orange State (1976 and 1980). This is the text of the annual Stephen Livingstone Lecture delivered in Belfast on 5th October 2010.
THE DUBLIN-BELFAST RAIL LINE: THE NEED FOR A BETTER SERVICE TO LOWER NORTH-SOUTH ECONOMIC BARRIERS

Edgar Morgenroth

The Dublin-Belfast ‘corridor’ is the most significant economic region on the island of Ireland, with approximately 50% of the output of the island produced here. More than 2 million people – out of six million on the island – live in the corridor.1 Given the relatively small scale of the island and its two constituent parts, it is not surprising that the area between its two largest cities has been identified as a key driver for growth due to its critical mass.

However, while the corridor can be identified as a spatial concept, the degree to which it currently represents a ‘functional region’ can be questioned. For example van Egeraat and Sokol (2006) show that the linkages among advanced producer service providers on the island outside Dublin are very limited2. Research by Morgenroth (2009) shows that trade between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland is lower than expected for a number of sectors. These findings suggest that there are still significant barriers to economic integration between the two parts of the island, including along the Dublin-Belfast corridor. Given the relatively low critical economic mass of Ireland, a lower level of integration is likely to result in lower growth. Consequently it is not surprising that there have been calls for the further development of the corridor, ranging from the man who originated the concept, Sir George Quigley, nearly 20 years ago, to the Engineers Ireland report, *Infrastructure for an island population of 8 million*, in 2010.

The degree to which the development of the corridor is supported within the spatial planning frameworks North and South differs. The 2002 Irish National Spatial Strategy aims to consolidate Dublin, but allows for the further development of Dundalk as a gateway. In contrast, the 2001 Regional Development Strategy for Northern Ireland does envisage the clustering of certain business activities in the corridor. Both strategies have identified the Dublin-Belfast corridor as a major transport route, and indeed the Northern Ireland regional development strategy envisages the introduction of high speed rail services between the two cities.
Transport links provide a critical facilitator for increased integration within this strategic east coast region between the island’s two major cities. Significant investment has gone into the improvement of the road connection, with the completion of the M1 motorway and investment in the A1 and in particular the completion of the Newry by-pass. This investment has cut the travel time for the car journey between Dublin and Belfast to about two hours, which is slightly shorter than the rail connection, which takes two hours and seven minutes (at its fastest) from Connolly Station in Dublin to Central Station in Belfast.

While the two modes of traffic differ considerably – e.g. road transport is more flexible and allows multiple access points, while rail travel is usually considered to be less stressful, safer and allows the traveller to work while travelling – the investment in the road infrastructure has eliminated the speed advantage that rail used to have. One might therefore expect the modal share of rail to reduce, holding everything else fixed. However, this runs contrary to the policy aim of both governments to increase the use of more sustainable forms of transport, and in that context it is important to consider whether the existing ‘express’ inter-city rail connection provides an adequate standard of service.

This paper outlines some basic facts about the Dublin-Belfast rail link, reviews some of the relevant literature on factors driving demand for rail, and conducts a benchmarking analysis comparing the Dublin-Belfast rail service with similar services across Europe.

Some basic facts

The Dublin-Belfast rail service runs over a length of approximately 190 kilometres. The fastest connection takes 127 minutes, which equates to an average speed of 90 km/h. There are eight trains per day in each direction serving Dublin, Belfast and four intermediate stations, Drogheda, Dundalk, Newry and Portadown.

During the summer of 2010 the Dublin-Belfast Enterprise service had the worst punctuality record across all mainline services on the island, with just 83% arriving within 10 minutes of the scheduled arrival time.

In a European context the Dublin – Belfast rail link appears to be providing a poor service, as is exemplified in table 1. In particular the frequency of the service, with just eight trains per day, is very low compared to the other city pairs.

It is difficult to obtain accurate up-to-date passenger journey figures for the Dublin-Belfast service. However, the 2010 Engineers Ireland publication reported that in 2007 the total number of journeys on the Dublin-Belfast line was slightly less than 10 million for passengers travelling between at least two stations on the line, including commuter traffic. That publication also showed that a very substantial proportion of these journeys are accounted for by commuting journeys, primarily between Dublin and Drogheda,
which has a commuter rail service in addition to the Dublin-Belfast service. The number of commuting journeys between Portadown and Belfast was just over half that of the Drogheda-Dublin flow. The higher frequency of services between Drogheda and Dublin has resulted in significantly higher market share for commuting journeys, as is shown in Map 1. In contrast the share on the commuter line into Belfast is considerably lower than for the Drogheda-Dublin route.

During 2010 traffic on the M1 motorway near Dundalk was around 20,000 vehicles per day, which implies that about seven million vehicles travel that section of road annually. Closer to Dublin that traffic increases, with almost 30 million vehicles travelling on the M1 section at the airport. Likewise traffic on the M1 near Belfast is also well in excess of 20,000 vehicles per day. Thus the total level of traffic on the Dublin-Belfast road connection is a multiple of the inter-city rail traffic.

Map 1 clearly shows that rail has a relatively low share as a commuting mode except in very few locations close to the two major cities. Furthermore, there is clear evidence that a more frequent commuter service results in increased mode share for rail. Most importantly, the map shows that usage of rail is almost non-existent for persons resident outside a very narrow corridor close to rail stations that is no more than 15 kilometres wide.

This tight containment of the rail catchment area is likely to be related to constraints on multi-modal travel. There has been little focus on multi-modal travel in Ireland; yet most people do not live in the vicinity of a railway station and thus have to use other modes to get to the station if they are to use rail. In major cities like Dublin and Belfast this can be addressed relatively easily, but this is not the case for stations in smaller towns where access to other public transport modes is limited.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Travel Time (Minutes)</th>
<th>Average Speed</th>
<th>Frequency (daily)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dublin-Belfast</td>
<td>190km</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>90 km/h</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh-Glasgow</td>
<td>74km</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>89 km/h</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester-Birmingham</td>
<td>140km</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95 km/h</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich-Nuremberg</td>
<td>170km</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>136 km/h</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels-Liege</td>
<td>97km</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>114 km/h</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Basic Service Quality Indicators for selected city pair rail connections
Map 1 Rail commuters as a percentage of total commuters on the Dublin-Belfast line

Note: The data for the Republic of Ireland is drawn from the 2006 Census of Population while the data for Northern Ireland is drawn from the 2001 Census of Population. Commuting in Northern Ireland refers only to commuting to work, while commuting in the Republic of Ireland also includes travel to school and college. The line between Lisburn and Antrim shown on this map has since closed.
Train v. car

A substantial academic literature exists on choice in mode of travel and the impact of different quality attributes, although there is only a limited literature on Ireland.

There is evidence that at least to some extent a train service provides a substitute to car ownership and travel. For example, recent analysis by Cummins and Nolan (2010) using Irish data showed that rail availability and the availability of park-and-ride facilities reduces car ownership and the likelihood of using a car for commuting purposes.

A key element in choosing one mode over another is the level of service (LOS) provided, which encompasses a range of quality issues such as availability (number of stations along a line and density of network), speed, frequency, reliability and price/value for money. Couto and Graham (2008) showed that overall service quality impacts significantly on rail demand, but their measure of quality is a general index so their results do not yield any insight into the importance of individual LOS variables.

Ben-Akiva and Morikawa (2002) showed that reliability is an important determinant in mode choice in an analysis of the choice between bus and rail travel. This is likely to be particularly important for commuting and business travel.

Mandel et al (1994) found that rail travel is more price and speed sensitive than car travel. Specifically they found that a one percent reduction in travel time would increase rail demand by at least one percent, while a one percent reduction in car travel time would increase demand by only 0.14%. They
also estimated the impact of a one percent increase in frequency of trains, which they said would raise demand by approximately 0.1%. However, in a study of the determinants of rail passenger demand across Europe, FitzRoy and Smith (1995) found that a 1% increase in frequency resulted in a much larger 0.5% increase in rail passengers. The differences in the impact of frequency changes might be explained by the possibility that this sensitivity varies between different service levels. For instance, Wardman (1994) found the demand responsiveness to a change in train frequency to be lower for longer distances but to be higher for routes with fewer intervals between stations.

Benchmarking analysis

In order to assess what level of service for two key indicators, namely speed and frequency, one would expect on the Dublin-Belfast line, a regression analysis using 35 European city pairs with direct rail connections was conducted by this researcher. The city pairs for the analysis were chosen on the basis that they were comparable in size and function to Dublin and Belfast with similar distances between them. They were drawn from 18 countries: Ireland, UK, Finland, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Netherlands, Belgium, France, Spain, Italy, Switzerland, Austria, Czech Republic, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland and Estonia. The average length per inter-city journey was 177 kilometres and the combined population of the two linked cities 1.64 million. The average speed of the rail services provided between the 35 city pairs was 117 km/h and the average number of daily services (one direction) was 28. The data was taken from published timetables for spring 2010, considering only midweek service levels.

Two regression models have been utilised: one modelling the speed and one modelling the number of trains per day (one-way). Specifically, speed was modelled as a function of distance, frequency and the minimum number of intermediate stops. Frequency was modelled as a function of speed and distance. These models are relatively crude, reflecting the difficulty in collecting data on additional variables such as electrification and track layout. Nevertheless the models were found to provide a reasonable fit in that the speed model explains 50% of the variation in the data and the connections model explains 40% of the variation. Some sensitivity analysis using additional variables and specifications showed that the chosen models are appropriate.

The results (see Table 2) show that services that run over a longer distance tend to be faster. An extra kilometre, holding all other variables constant, increases the speed by 0.34 km/h. More frequent services also provide a faster service, as indicated by the positive coefficient (1.14). Additional stops significantly reduce the average speed, as a stop results not only in time lost while stopped in a station, but also because time is lost while breaking and accelerating. The results suggest that one additional stop would reduce the speed by 9.8 km/h. This is an important consideration as there is a clear trade-off between speed and the number of stops – thus while it might be possible
On 21 August 2009 the Broadmeadow Viaduct at Malahide collapsed, causing a three month closure of the Dublin-Drogheda section of the Dublin-Belfast line. A Railway Safety Commission investigation found four serious cases of non-compliance with rail safety regulations.

to increase passenger journeys by introducing more stops, this could prove counter-productive in that the average speed might then drop to the point where other modes of transport become considerably more attractive.

A longer distance tends to result in fewer trains per day, but shorter-haul services, which are more likely to attract larger numbers of commuters, tend to have a higher frequency. A faster service is positively related to a more frequent service.

Using the regression results, it is possible to predict the expected speed and number of trains by calculating the predicted values using the parameter estimates from the regression and the observed variables for each city pair. For the Dublin-Belfast line the distance is 190km, the frequency is eight trains per day and the train currently stops at least at three intermediate stations (except the 8 am from Belfast to Dublin, which stops twice). Multiplying these values by the respective parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td>-0.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1.14***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of stops (minimum)</td>
<td>-9.8***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.22***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted value for the Dublin-Belfast line</td>
<td>92.76</td>
<td>19.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *** denotes significance at the 99% level.
and adding the products yields the predicted values. Similarly, the predicted value for the frequency is calculated by multiplying the parameters by the values for distance and speed for the service.

The predicted values from the analysis show that the expected speed for the Dublin-Belfast service is 90 km/h, corresponding to the actual current speed, which might be surprising given the fact that the service is being benchmarked against other nominally higher speed inter-city services elsewhere in Europe. However, given that the rail service now offers no speed advantage over a car, one could argue that speed improvements are necessary to make the service more attractive. An average speed improvement of 24 km/h would reduce the travel time to 1 hour 40 minutes.

The expected number of daily services, when benchmarked against standards elsewhere in Europe, is 20. Thus to achieve the expected frequency, 12 trains would need to be added in each direction, which would require a significant investment.

Large investment needed

The analysis conducted above suggests that the service needs to be improved by increasing the frequency and, in order to compete with the reduced travel time by car brought about by improvements on the Dublin-Belfast M1/A1 road, it would also need to be improved through an increase in speed. Both would require significant capital expenditure.

An increase in the frequency would require investment in additional rolling stock. In this respect it should be noted that the poor reliability record of the line is likely to be related to the need to replace some of the existing stock, so the total cost could be very substantial.

Achieving a significant speed improvement would require very significant investment in both rolling stock and track. The UK government is currently pursuing plans to construct a high-speed rail line from London to the Midlands. The cost of this high-speed line is estimated to exceed £80 million per kilometre. On this basis, a similar investment in high speed rail for the Dublin-Belfast line would exceed £15 billion. Given the considerably smaller population catchment area, it is therefore difficult to imagine a positive business case being made for such a proposal.

There are currently no published plans for the improvement of the Dublin-Belfast service as part of Transport 21 in the Republic of Ireland. It has been reported in the media that the two operating companies – Irish Rail and Translink – are hoping to introduce an hourly service, but that given the financial constraints it would not be possible to purchase the new rolling stock necessary for this and that instead the companies might have to resort to old rolling stock. However, Irish Rail will receive additional rolling stock for mainline services (51 railcars at a cost of €140 million funded through the National Development Plan) and it might be possible to use some of these on the Dublin-Belfast line.
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Furthermore, the current signalling technology would not allow for an increase in the number of trains as there is a constraint on the approaches to Dublin Connolly, where there is significant traffic by mainline, commuter and DART services (so that the incoming ‘Enterprise’ service from Belfast is often delayed by having to slot in behind local DART services). A re-signalling project is currently underway and will be finished in the middle of 2012. This would allow for a higher service frequency provided the rolling stock is available to do so. A separate dedicated track for the Dublin-Belfast service would also improve reliability and speed, although the very significant cost of this makes it extremely unlikely in the foreseeable future.

It also needs to be recognised that the operation of mainline rail services is already significantly subsidised. The implicit operating subvention rate on mainline services for Irish Rail is €6.86 per journey (although it is only €0.61 for commuter and DART). Precise estimates of the profitability or otherwise of the Dublin-Belfast line are not published, but media reports have quoted Translink, the Northern Ireland transport company, saying that the Dublin-Belfast service is not profitable.

**Conclusion**

Closer integration between the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland, especially within the Dublin-Belfast corridor, is likely to result in significant economic benefits for both jurisdictions. An important facilitator for such integration are transport links. While there has been significant investment in road infrastructure in the Dublin-Belfast corridor, this investment is likely to reduce the attractiveness of the environmentally more sustainable rail link.

A robust analysis has showed that the Dublin-Belfast rail service does not match the expected level of service one would expect between two cities of the size of Dublin and Belfast when benchmarked against equivalent European inter-city services, accounting for factors such as distance and the number of stops.

In order to increase the market share of the rail service, significant investment is needed. Such investment should only be carried out after careful independent analysis. However, it is highly unlikely that the sizeable resources required to increase the speed of the service significantly will be available in the short- to medium-term. There is scope to increase the frequency after the signalling has been upgraded, but that will require additional rolling stock. In the meantime one low cost way to improve the service would be to increase its reliability, which could be facilitated by increasing the priority of the Dublin-Belfast ‘express’ train from third priority (after DART and commuter trains on the approaches to Dublin) to highest priority.

**Dr Edgar Morgenroth** is an Associate Research Professor and programme co-ordinator for research on transport and infrastructure at the Economic and Social Research Institute in Dublin.
His research interests include transport economics, international trade, economic geography and public economics. He is particularly interested in commuting patterns, economic returns to infrastructure, determinants of the volume of trade, the determinants of firm location, regional disparities, regional policy and the efficiency of public investment. He has published articles in the Journal of International Economics, Canadian Journal of Economics, Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics, Applied Economics and Regional Studies. In 2010 he worked on secondment to the Strategic Investment Board in Northern Ireland.

ENDNOTES

1. The population is calculated by adding the populations of Dublin, Louth and east Meath from the CSO Census 2006 along with the population of Belfast, Lisburn, Craigavon, Armagh and Newry and Mourne from the NISRA 2009 mid-year population estimates, which corresponds more closely to the potential market for the rail service than that of the wider region including counties Kildare, Wicklow and Antrim.

2. A functional region is characterised by strong interactions across a range of variables such as commuting and business interactions and a high degree of self-containment.
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FOOD SECURITY AND HEALTH ON THE ISLAND OF IRELAND: ARE WE SLEEPWALKING INTO A CRISIS?

Jane Wilde

Food security is back on the global agenda. The drivers are complex and interconnected and include increasing energy prices, climate change, demography, urbanisation, changes in dietary habits, loss and degradation of natural resources such as soil and water, and difficulties in maintaining agricultural viability. As food prices in major world markets continue to rise, there is increasing concern about food security: the ability of the world to provide healthy and environmentally sustainable food for all its people. This is of course a critical problem for low income countries, but is it relevant for the island of Ireland?

This article highlights the need for new ways of thinking and acting which recognise that population health, food systems and agricultural production are intimately linked at global, national and local levels. Critical thinking is urgently needed to bring together different perspectives, but the debate in Ireland is low-key and disconnected and ignores the key issue of health. Yet evidence shows that health is and must be central to food and agricultural policy.

A new surge in food prices is likely to cause food riots, geo-political tension, global inflation and increasing hunger among the world’s poorest people. The UN index of food prices, based on an international basket comprising wheat, corn, dairy produce, meat and sugar, stands at its highest level since the index started in 1990. We are entering dangerous territory, says the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO)’s Chief Economist, Abdolreza Abbassian’. The impact of this is already being seen in rising food prices in Ireland and the UK. Whereas the biggest impact will obviously be felt in low income countries where staple items demand a much larger share of household incomes, low income families in wealthier countries will also be affected. This is likely to be of increasing importance as there is little sign of food prices stabilising and cereal and sugar prices are expected to continue rising.

In 2009 the number of undernourished people in the world reached one
billion, in part due to soaring food prices and the financial crisis. The FAO Director General, Jacques Diouf, has called this a ‘tragic achievement’. In 2009 world leaders convened at the FAO headquarters in Rome for the World Summit on Food Security and unanimously adopted a declaration pledging renewed commitment to eradicate hunger from the face of the earth.

But government policies such as the ban on food exports introduced by the Indian and Russian governments exacerbate the problems in world markets. The burgeoning economies of East and South Asia and demands to turn over agricultural land to biofuels (especially in the US) are adding to pressure on world food supplies. And there is increasing concern about speculation as investors climb onto the food price bandwagon.

**A perfect storm?**

In a recent lecture in Belfast on food security and sustainability, the UK Chief Scientist Sir John Beddington outlined a 21st century agenda for food security. He highlighted the importance of long term trends in demography and urbanisation. Approximately six million people a month are being added to the world’s population, and there is a dramatic move to urban centres, with a resultant impact on farm production. As well as the issue of peak oil, he stressed that freshwater security is one of the looming challenges across the world. Alongside the warnings of climate change and unpredictable weather activity, he described the situation as a ‘perfect storm’.

In 1985 2 billion of the population of the world lived in urban centres compared to 3 billion living in rural areas.

By 2015 it is estimated that 6.5 billion of the population of the world will be living in urban centres compared to 2.5 billion in rural areas.

The UK food policy expert Professor Tim Lang has been calling for a 21st century food policy to address this new set of fundamentals. In a recent paper he urged action to radically alter the policy mix we have inherited, a mix that is largely based on the idea of addressing supply by increasing output and reducing prices. He describes today’s challenge as even more complex – the need to address the coexistence of under-, over- and malnutrition.

In the emerging economies of the developing world more people are choosing to consume more meat and poultry, just as people in the Western world did when their economies grew dramatically in the 19th and 20th centuries. The combination of urbanisation and the globalisation of the food systems is leading to a rapid transition to a high-fat and high-sugar diet which is having a marked and disturbing effect on disease patterns, with a dramatic rise in chronic diseases, including heart disease and diabetes, in the developing world.
The World Health Organisation predicts that non-communicable diseases such as heart disease and diabetes will increase by 17% in the next 10 years. The greatest increase will be in Africa.7

From a health perspective, the challenges have been spelled out in several international reports which point to the harm done by the global shift in our diets. They also point to the impact food has on social inequality6,9. This shift in diet also has considerable environmental impact. Meat and poultry consume at least three times the level of resources of grain, and urbanisation means not only large concentrations of populations to be fed but less yield on the farms producing the food.

The impact of this shift has been summarised by the 2009 UN Environment Programme (UNEP) in its report on food’s impact on the biosphere10. In addition, the influential 2006 Stern Report on climate change11 highlights the fact that that agriculture and food production are considerable sources of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

World food production must rise by 50% by 2030 to meet increasing demand.12 World energy demands are predicted to rise by 40% by 2030.13

Beside GHG emissions, diet has other significant environmental effects on water, waste and energy. The food and drink industries are high users of water and some foods are extremely high in embedded water. For example 1 kg of beef requires 10-20,000 litres of water and a cup of black coffee represents 140 litres of embedded water. Waste is another important issue: approximately one third of UK purchased food is thrown away by consumers.

**UK: Moving away from complacency**

The issue of food security is clearly a matter of life and death for low income countries, but no country, including those in the advanced world, can avoid the issues it raises. In both the UK and Ireland our current approach to food policy emerged in the aftermath of World War Two, where the combination of privation and rationing at home, malnutrition in countries such as India and the impact of the pre-war American economic depression meant there was agreement on the need to increase food
production and build a science base to support this.

But the picture today is very different. For the first time there is a concurrence of under-, mal- and over-nutrition, and an urgent need to address serious and emerging environmental and structural challenges. In the UK, discussions about what food security means and how it can be delivered have increased in the last five years, leading to major government statements including *Ensuring the UK's Food Security in a Changing World (2008)*, *Food Matters: Towards a Strategy for the 21st Century (2008)* and most recently *The Future of Food and Farming.*

Such reports aim to review the main trends in food production and consumption, analyse them for their economic, environmental and social impacts, assess the robustness of the current policy framework and determine objectives for future food policy. *Food Matters* identifies challenges such as rises in global commodity prices; impacts on health, including an estimated 70,000 premature deaths per year that could be avoided if UK diets matched nutritional guidelines; the need for continued vigilance in food safety; and the huge environmental impacts of the food chain. A clear vision is set out with the objectives of securing fair prices, choice, access to food and food security through open markets, continuous improvements in food safety, a transition to healthier diets, and a more environmentally sustainable food chain.

The most recent UK Foresight report aims to explore pressures on the global system between now and 2050, and identify decisions policy-makers need to take to ensure the global population can be fed sustainably and equitably.

These policy frameworks represent a considerable shift in thinking from the rather complacent tone of earlier years. For example, a 2006 Department of Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) document sounded confident about the state of food security in the UK, claiming that the country was relatively fortunate in that ‘we are food secure and have the ability to access a wealth of nutritious food from abroad as well as enjoying domestically produced food…National food security is hugely more relevant for developing countries than the rich countries of Western Europe.’

**Policy direction in Ireland**

As the UK food security debate has moved away from complacency, it is timely to try to get a sense of policy direction on the island of Ireland. Here it is probably fair to say that the term ‘food security’ is still seen as largely relevant to low income countries, and the debate is almost entirely about Ireland’s contribution to international efforts to feed the poorer countries of the developing world. The memory of the impact of the Irish famine is emphasised in Ireland’s approach and there is pride in the work of organisations dedicated to responding to world hunger.

*Food Harvest* is the Irish government’s most recent vision for the food sector. Launched in July 2010, it calls for the
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agricultural sector to lead the way in Ireland’s economic recovery. As Ireland’s largest indigenous industry, employing over 150,000 people and responsible for generating 24 billion euro very year for the economy, the issue is clearly of the utmost importance. The report’s emphasis is on strengthening and safeguarding the export sector and within this the key focus is on meat, dairy, infant formula, soft drinks, fortified foods and alcoholic beverages. There is a strong emphasis on ‘becoming green’ and the importance of this as a ‘branding issue’ as well as a commitment to a more sustainable world.

Food Harvest is outward looking and perhaps this is why there is so little consideration of the wider needs of Irish people in terms of resilience to food shocks such as supply chain problems or oil and water shortages. There is no mention of population health or the importance of dietary change and the emphasis is almost entirely on potential economic benefits. No one with any public health background or expertise appears to have been involved. There is no formal policy statement outlining Ireland’s assessment of its food security, and no reference to the impact of the recession, which is almost certain to drive down food quality as people on low incomes purchase cheaper, lower quality food.

Similarly, there appears to be no clear statement of a distinct policy on food security for Northern Ireland from the NI Executive or any of its departments, although the four devolved administrations have recognised the need for UK-wide collaboration in food matters and have agreed a range of issues where this would be beneficial, such as sustainable food production and cost-sharing in research and development. They have also agreed to regular ‘food summits’ to discuss the health and well-being of UK citizens and international food security.

Overall, the absence of policy direction that considers all aspects of food security in Ireland, North and South, lends weight to those who question whether countries like the UK and Ireland are sleepwalking into a crisis. We are vulnerable to unexpected factors such as supply chain collapses and need to put in place actions to increase our resilience.

Major drivers affecting the global food system have been well summarised in a recent series of papers. They include the demand for food (including changing consumption patterns, what can people afford, and the effects of urbanisation on food production); trends in future food supply (what sort of crops are being grown, and future plans for livestock and fisheries); external factors affecting the food system such as climate change, competition for water, energy and land; and cross-cutting themes such as health, food wastage, and the economics of food demand and supply.

In both parts of the island we are turning a blind eye to many of these issues. Many of them are controversial and will require some very radical thinking to tackle. Among the difficult issues we as Irish people will have to face in the future are: Is food security relevant in
62% of the Irish population are overweight or obese: contestants in RTE’s ‘Operation Transformation’ weight loss competition.

These represent deeply political questions that governments, North and South, need to face and respond to. Each question needs to be thought through, and all require important changes in government policy and individual behaviour globally, nationally and locally. But a policy response which views the issues as completely separate makes no sense. The knock-on effects of such interconnected issues are clear: climate change will reconfigure what is grown – how, where and by whom; urbanisation and demography will place heavy demands on food production; changes in the state of soil will determine what can be grown; changing agricultural policy will affect health, and so on.

Changing our diet

The 20th century change from largely plant-based diets to energy-dense diets which are high in fat and animal foods has played a key role in the upsurge of diet-related preventable health problems such as heart disease, diabetes, some cancers and obesity. In 2007 an extensive UK Foresight Report pointed out that nearly 60% of the UK population could be obese by 2050, with substantial health and economic implications. A similar picture exists in Ireland, with over 62% of the population already overweight or obese and significant resulting costs to individuals and society.

The dramatic rise in obesity matters because it is an important risk factor
for a wide range of serious conditions such as heart disease, stroke, high blood pressure and diabetes. Recent reports from the all-island Institute of Public Health in Ireland (IPH) forecast, for example, that over the period 2007 to 2020 there will be a 55% increase – from 211,000 to 327,000 – in the levels of diabetes. Further examples of increases forecast in non-communicable diseases are listed in table 1.

The case for action has been spelled out in several recent government reports including Fit Futures in Northern Ireland and the Taskforce on Obesity Report.

### Table 1 Chronic Diseases: number of cases and prevalence rates in 2007 and (forecast in) 2020 in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypertension</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>395529</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Ireland</td>
<td>851658</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Angina and heart attack (CHD)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>75158</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Ireland</td>
<td>130703</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stroke</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>32941</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Ireland</td>
<td>58778</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diabetes (Type 1 and Type 2 combined)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>67262</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Ireland</td>
<td>143618</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** The higher prevalence in Northern Ireland than the Republic of Ireland is due to differences in their demographic, lifestyle and socio-economic profiles. In particular, Northern Ireland has an older population than the Republic of Ireland.
in Ireland. But implementation is limited and patchy. The Northern Ireland Assembly Health Committee, in its October 2009 report on obesity, called it ‘a problem with enormous impact that threatens to engulf the entire health service and will have a serious impact on society and the economy’.

As well as the strong evidence on food’s impact on health, it is closely linked to the issue of social inequalities. Availability of healthy food is often worse in deprived areas due to the mix of shops in these areas. Low income groups are most likely to eat fat spreads, non-diet soft drinks, processed meats, whole milk and table sugar than people who are better off. Ensuring that people have sufficient income to access an affordable, sustainable and healthy diet is a key step in food security.

In Ireland, two key reports dealing with food poverty have been produced recently by community and public health interest groups. They show that across the island low income households are most affected by the relatively high cost of food. Low income households spend a relatively higher proportion of their income on food and despite this have a poor diet in terms of food and nutritional intake. People in low income households tend to shop at convenience stores where prices are high and variety is poor. Both financial and physical barriers limit the opportunity of many low income household to purchase healthy food.

In 2009 Healthy Food for All (HFfA)*, an all island initiative which seeks to ensure that everyone on the island has enough of the right foods necessary for health, published a policy briefing on the cost of a healthy diet which highlights the huge challenges posed for households, and particularly for those with children. Low income households are twice as likely as the whole population to experience food poverty, and almost 50% of lone parent households and 36% of unemployed people experience some sort of food deprivation.

Almost 1 in 5 schoolchildren in Ireland report going to bed hungry.

Almost 10% of the population were unable to afford to have family or friends around for a meal or a drink once a month.

Around 20% of people in Northern Ireland live in low income households with around 25% of children living in poverty.

A strong all-island network has been developed by HFfA, with key partner and funding organisations, to support practical local food initiatives. Examples include Dundalk’s Garden Project, supporting marginalised and vulnerable people to prepare and cook fruit and vegetables; Limerick’s ‘Seed to Plate’ Project, which encourages organic home gardening; the East Belfast Eating Education Programme; Footprints Womens Centre’s ‘Building a Transition Community’; and ‘Food for Life’ in Derry. The initiatives are managed by HFfA, and funded by the North/South body safefood with the aim of creating successful and sustainable models to make healthy and affordable food available to all. The work of HFfA
and other local initiatives are an important part of any efforts to improve food security.

Current policy in Ireland and Northern Ireland is not delivering sustainability for food security and health. A food security policy is needed in both parts of the island to shift food production and eating behaviour. Single issue approaches waste time, resources and energy. We need to make sense of the complexities of food security, sustainability and health, and this can only be done by open discussion and debate.

Can we eat what we like?

There seems to be a view that we can eat what we like, and that this choice is a purely personal one. Yet surely all the evidence suggests that there are huge public issues associated with our choices: ranging from global hunger and starvation (the world cannot eat as we in the rich countries do) to the social, economic and health care costs of illness associated with under- and over-nutrition. Leaving this all to the market and individual choice seems to absolve governments of responsibility to manage and reorient the market, gain public support for healthy and sustainable eating, and promote constraint over choice in consumer food advice.

There is a clear need for government to set in place processes which bring together different interests, and to think about who is ‘at the table’. For example, the recent plans of the UK government to bring food companies into the frame by giving them responsibility for programmes to tackle obesity need to ensure that public health does not get lost in the economic interests of these companies’ shareholders. While no one would deny the importance of business in creating conditions for health, we need to recognise that food systems are dominated by very powerful vested interests that do not necessarily act in the interests of good health or sustainability.

The evidence for better integration of food production, agricultural policy and health is irrefutable. A clearer picture of the links between population health and the agriculture and food production systems will ensure that health becomes a driver of agricultural change. There is a recognition that dietary change can also play a key role in mitigating climate change and adaptation strategies, by promoting health through reducing the consumption of saturated fats from meat and dairy foods.

Food systems clearly need to be more sustainable, but we need clarification about what makes for a sustainable diet and what would this mean in Ireland. A recent report from the UK Sustainable Development Commission highlighted the changes likely to have the most significant and immediate impact on making diets more sustainable, and in which health, environmental, social

---

* Healthy Food for All (HFfA). The core work of Healthy Food for All is funded by the Department of Community, Equality and Gaeltacht Affairs, the Food Safety Authority of Ireland, the Health Service Executive and safefood. This all-island multi-agency initiative seeks to address food poverty by promoting access, availability and affordability of healthy food for low income groups.
and economic impacts complemented each other. These were reducing consumption of meat and dairy foods, reducing consumption of food and drinks of low nutritional value (i.e. fatty and sugary foods), and reducing waste. Clearer direction is also needed from government and public agencies to let people know how to meet their nutrition needs and how these fit with requirements for environmental sustainability.

What is needed in Ireland, North and South, is a clear set of policy priorities and wide agreement on action. New ideas are needed and a clear framework on food security (non-existent at the moment) which cuts across party and jurisdictional lines. This represents an opportunity for cooperation between North and South in thinking, science, research and creativity and in the sharing of limited resources.

**Food is the link**

Food provides a link between the population health, food security and environmental sustainability agendas. A broader view of food security is needed in the 21st century: one that
judges the food system for its social value, nutritional quality and impact on the environment. The reduction in consumption of animal source foods can improve food security and reduce the levels of chronic disease, including cardiovascular disease and some cancers. There is a major opportunity here to improve both our population health and our environment.

A recent example of the opportunity to learn from northern and southern approaches on the island, and to share information on what works, is Health Well34, an all-island interactive web-based information tool and its obesity hub. Health Well is an initiative of the Institute of Public Health in Ireland which builds on its work with the Health Research Board’s Centre for Health and Diet Research at University College Cork and the UK Clinical Research Collaboration Centre of Excellence for Public Health (NI) at Queen’s University Belfast. In recognition of its importance to an all-island research infrastructure, this work has been supported by a grant from the NI Department for Employment and Learning (DEL). It is now being extended to the development of food poverty indicators for the island.

As well as food poverty indicators, it is important to have clear and coherent indicators of a sustainable food system and food security. These would set out various dimensions of how we understand food security and would help demonstrate how the food system should be judged.

Before the highlighting of global food security warnings in 2008, the concerns in Europe were mainly about excess food production and waste. International food reserves are now low and many are wondering if this situation is here to stay. We need to be aware of the possible impact of shocks to the international system in interrelated food, health and environmental areas such as climate change, supply chain management, health threats (like avian flu), fuel price rises, power supplies and storage problems.

Specifc sectoral assessments are needed on the island of Ireland for grain, meat, dairy, fruit, vegetables and fibre, assessing them for their contribution to home consumption, the environment, employment, economy and health, with indications of how to deliver optimum production sustainably.

We have the opportunity to build on the thinking and lead being shown elsewhere, including in the UK in general and Scotland in particular, and to create a common vision for food security on the island. It is vital that our politicians now argue for moves to make the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) into a common EU sustainable food policy, and to explore with fellow member states ways in which the CAP can be shifted in this direction.

The governments in Ireland, North and South, need to make clear statements of policy intent in the vital food security area. Their emphasis needs to be on policy coherence and increased awareness, and understanding of the fit between sustainable development, food security and population health. What is good for sustainability is good for health.
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No food policy will deliver what is needed in the 21st century unless it reshapes food systems in line with sustainable development. Food security is in danger of being submerged in demands for single issue solutions. Secure, safe and sustainable food systems that meet the needs of people globally and across the island of Ireland require informed discussions about food security and the wide participation of people from all areas of society in these discussions. We need to get out of the sectoral silos we have built and find ways of connecting and communicating. No one sector holds the key to unlock the problems we are facing now and which will clearly increase in the future.

We need a coherent, cross-border approach which enables and encourages people to eat a healthy and sustainable diet; ensures a resilient and competitive food system; and increases food sustainability. A sustainable food system that supports the well-being and health of people is worth working for. With courage and persistence more food can be produced sustainably and used to feed those who need it most, at home and abroad.
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The former Duchy of Schleswig has been a historic borderland between Denmark and Germany ever since human settlement began in the forests, marshes and swamps along the Eider River in the 12th century. Today, the region is considered a model of ethnic accommodation, border appeasement and cross-border region building within the greater European framework. In this article, I will give a comprehensive overview on the processes of conflict, accommodation and cooperation in this region.

In 1997 the Danish county of Sønderjylland and the three German counties of Nordfriesland, Schleswig-Flensburg and Flensburg city within the German land (federal state) of Schleswig-Holstein concluded an agreement to establish Region Sønderjylland-Schleswig. Although the region does not formally consider itself as a ‘Euroregion’, it says on its website: ‘Region Sønderjylland-Schleswig is a so-called Euroregion, an organisational cooperation between two or more European border regions.’

Sønderjylland-Schleswig’s territory goes back to a historic entity, the former duchy of Sønderjylland or Schleswig, which was separated from the Danish kingdom in the 12th century. Already around 1100 Danish princes were vice-regents of this duchy, and were later linked by marriage to the Schauenburg family, Counts of Holstein (which, unlike Schleswig, was a part of the Holy Roman Empire).

Their heirs ruled in Southern Jutland for five generations, with recurrent conflicts with the Danish crown and violent feuds between rival noble families in the territory itself. After the last Schauenburg duke Adolf IV died childless in 1459, the conflict was resolved by the Ribe Treaty.

* Schleswig and Southern Jutland are synonymous terms originally used for the region between the Eider river in the South and the Kongeå river in the north. The area was divided by the border drawn after the referendum in 1920 into North Schleswig and South Schleswig, but today Danes refer to North Schleswig as Southern Jutland, whereas Germans refer to the city of Schleswig and the federal state of Schleswig-Holstein (see map on page 89).
which saw the nobility of Schleswig and Holstein electing Danish king Christian I, a nephew of Adolf IV, as Duke of Schleswig and Count of Holstein. This construction proved very stable, until an expansionist Sweden threatened to encircle Denmark in the 17th century by using the duchy of Schleswig-Holstein as a ‘sovereign’ Swedish satellite state.

After this conflict in was settled in Denmark’s favour, the territories of Schleswig were incorporated into the Danish monarchy in 1721. By 1800 Schleswig had become one of the wealthier, more advanced parts of the Danish conglomerate state, then comprising Denmark, Norway, Schleswig, Holstein, the Faroe Islands, Iceland and Greenland. The elite in the Duchy of Schleswig was loyal to the Danish king. The duchy’s largest city, Flensburg, was an important trading port in the Baltic Sea trade, with a merchant fleet third only to Copenhagen and Altona. The region’s leading families had excellent relations with the capital city, with marriage patterns linking it to the whole conglomerate state. The region’s population shared a clear feeling of supremacy over Northern Jutland, which was regarded as backward and ‘in the sticks’.

19th century national awakening

During the national awakenings of the 19th century, Danish and a German national movements claimed Schleswig for their respective national projects, using essentially legalistic arguments to support their claims. The 1848–51 war between Denmark and Germany was primarily fought on the Schleswig question. It ended with the recreation of the status before 1848, so that Denmark was forbidden to have closer ties with Schleswig than the latter had with Holstein, which continued to belong to the German Federation.

Schleswig’s constitutional position within the Danish kingdom was the pretext for Prussia and Austria’s war against Denmark in 1864, which led to the entire duchy’s incorporation into Prussia and the German empire. The status quo ante bellum of 1864 was not restored after German defeat in World War I. After a plebiscite in 1920 – coincidentally the same year the statelet of Northern Ireland was established – Schleswig was divided along a frontier roughly corresponding to the line separating the usage of Danish and German in Lutheran church services established at the time of the Reformation. North of the line 75% voted for Denmark. There were local German majorities, though, in the towns of Høyer, Tønder, Aabenraa and Sønderborg, as well as in some villages near the border. South of the line (stretching 30-50 kilometres south of today’s border), 80% voted for Germany.

During the 1920s and 1930s, regional German politicians and the German minority in Denmark demanded a revision of the border drawn in 1920. These demands became especially explicit after the Nazi takeover in 1933. On the other hand, there were still considerable factions on the Danish side of the border who believed in the possibility of recovering all of Schleswig for Denmark eventually. At the same time the Danish and German governments’ policies emphasised
the separating character of the new border by economically and culturally integrating ‘their’ share of Schleswig into their respective nation states.

The German occupation of Denmark on 9 April 1940, in spite of a non-aggression treaty concluded less than a year earlier, severely harmed psychological Danish-German relations, especially as the German minority saw a new chance for their wish of a border revision to come true. This did not happen: the German authorities postponed a decision on the future Danish-German border until after the war. In the event, after the Second World War ended with a German defeat, the Danish minority in South Schleswig, together with a large share of the hitherto German-oriented population of the region, along with national organisations and politicians in Denmark, asked for a new referendum to move the Danish-German border back to the southern border of
Schleswig on the Eider river. However both the Danish government and the British military government in Germany refused to alter the border. This historical background shows how ‘nationalism’ in this region divided a largely united cultural landscape with close economic and social ties and a rather homogeneous population, which could not have been divided clearly by any objective ethnic, cultural, linguistic or religious criteria.

**Post-war alienation**

Prospects for successful future cross-border cooperation were not promising in 1945. Danish-German relations were at a low point. Five years of German occupation had caused some physical and severe psychological harm in Denmark, while Germany suffered from total defeat, destruction, refugees, famine and an uncertain future. At the same time, a large popular movement in hitherto German South Schleswig demanded that the region should be unified with Denmark. The movement had support from Danish politicians as well as in influential parts of Denmark’s population.

Thus after World War II the status quo of the Danish-German border region can be characterised by the following elements:

- Separateness instead of integration;
- Alienation instead of cooperation;
- Border struggle instead of bridge-building;
- Cross-border activities exclusively in the form of material and cultural support of the respective national minorities from their kin-states;
- This kin-state support to a national minority across the border was regarded suspiciously by the majority population, who feared separatism or a border revision.

The onset of the East-West conflict, the establishment of a democratic West German state in 1949 and West Germany’s membership of NATO in 1955, as well as the start of the economic and political integration of Western Europe, stabilised the situation at the Danish-German border. This situation during the 1950s represented a return to normality, but no more. Denmark set the agenda here. Danish politicians were well aware of the necessity to integrate West Germany into NATO and a West European economic and political system. They were also interested in finding a solution to the question of the Danish minority in South Schleswig. Cross-border cooperation or integration were not on the political agenda, though. Denmark wanted to preserve the border’s protective function, and felt that there should be no treaties giving Germany the possibility of interfering in Danish domestic affairs. Thus the national minority rights on both sides of the border were guaranteed through two similar, non-binding government declarations in 1955: the so-called Bonn-Copenhagen Declarations.

By the mid 1950s the situation at the Danish-German border can be characterised as normalised. Visa-free travel had been established, treaties regulating border issues had been re-established, and local cross-border
shopping expanded. In addition, the minority situation had calmed since the Bonn-Copenhagen Declarations, which, together with generous material support from the respective kin-states, accommodated the national minorities and assured the individual right to national self-determination (within the existing Danish and German nation-states) in both North and South Schleswig. The border and minority issue was effectively settled, opening the region up for cooperation across the border eventually.

The Schleswig region’s common history began to enter a new political era when Denmark made plans to join the European Economic Community in the 1960s. The German minority in North Schleswig had already started to think of itself in new terms in the 1950s as it began to define itself as a bridge-builder between Germany and Denmark (or even between Europe and Scandinavia) based on their common German-Danish heritage. Zweistromigkeit became the leading characteristic of the minority’s self-identification, meaning their bicultural identity encompassing both nations.

Even though Denmark could not accede to the European Community immediately, cross-border contacts at governmental and non-governmental level became more common. For some years, the Schleswig-Holstein land (federal state or regional) government in Germany was enthusiastically involved in promoting German-Danish friendship, hoping for a bilateral agreement based on the model of the German-French agreement of the period, which provided for generous support, especially for youth exchange activities. However here the Danish side was much more sceptical and reserved. There was no special interest in Copenhagen in concluding a formal, bilateral friendship treaty with Germany at that time. It was clear that Danish popular interest in people-to-people meetings with Germans was much lower than vice versa.

**German pressure to create a Euroregion**

In 1973 Denmark, along with the UK and Ireland, joined the European Community. The land government of Schleswig-Holstein, the region’s political parties and other social groups, and the German minority in North Schleswig, immediately pressed their Danish
counterparts to increase cross-border cooperation and establish cross-border institutions, sometimes not very diplomatically. The Schleswig-Holstein regional government’s action plan on cross-border cooperation at the start of the 1970s aimed to create an integrated, cross-border region comprising the three German border counties and the Danish county of Southern Jutland. The land government used the argument of the region’s assumed historical and cultural unity as a main reason to plan a re-integration of the border region.

However the German approaches on formal cross-border cooperation aiming at an integrated cross-border region met considerable reservations at all political levels in Denmark. The Danes declined all propositions moving in the direction of abolishing the border and had difficulties in seeing practical results from what they saw as an ideological German approach to cross-border cooperation; they refused institutionalisation as an empty principle. A main reason for their reservations was that the Danish Foreign Ministry still considered the national balance in the border region far too sensitive to engage in institutionalised cooperation with Germany or Schleswig-Holstein at that time. In consequence, cross-border cooperation evolved very slowly in the 1970s, concentrating on loose informal contacts and a few cross-border issues that required cooperation.

This changed only when the European Community included support to cross-border cooperation in its cohesion policy in the late 1980s. The prospect of obtaining financial support from Brussels led to a common action programme for cross-border cooperation between Schleswig-Holstein and Southern Jutland County being presented in February 1988. Only four projects from this programme, with a total volume of 3 million ECUs - that is 10% of the original amount envisaged - were accepted and funded by the European Regional Development Fund. Nonetheless, Schleswig-Holstein and Southern Jutland continued to cooperate in the three EU INTERREG programmes which followed in the 1990s and 2000s, with a restructuring leading to a larger programme area including the whole South Denmark region and most of northern Schleswig-Holstein.

In spite of the Danish reluctance to move to more institutionalised cross-border cooperation, the German side continued to propose more fixed frames for cross-border cooperation in the border region. In the 1980s the four administrative units of the border region (three in Germany and one in Denmark) joined the Association of European Border Regions, although not as a single member, which would have been the German side’s preference. Inspired by the INTERREG cooperation, Schleswig-Holstein’s Minister for European affairs, Gerd Walter, introduced plans to establish a Euroregion Schleswig at the first German-Danish borderland conference in Aabenraa in 1995. Flensburg mayor Olaf Cord Dielewicz became a strong supporter of the plan, stressing the historical dimension of the reunification of Schleswig. A joint Danish-German working group prepared an outline framework acceptable to politicians on both sides of the border,
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following the typical Euroregion model with a staffed regional office and a political council.

When the plans were made public in early 1997, there was considerable opposition in Denmark, led by nationalist Southern Jutes in alliance with both the right-wing and the left-wing Danish EU opposition movements. Coincidentally, Denmark joined the Schengen Agreement at the same time, giving opponents the opportunity to link both projects. Arguments centred around Danish loss of sovereignty over Southern Jutland and the threat of continuous German interference in internal Danish matters. German politicians’ reference to the ‘good old days’ in the Duchy of Schleswig made matters worse. Expressing concern about the possibility of a new border between Denmark and the Euroregion, the plan’s opponents made clear that they considered a clearly defined and visible border between Denmark and Germany as a necessity for successful cooperation. Nonetheless, the new Euroregion was created with almost unanimous political support in the local councils.

Integration or networking?

Region Sønderjylland-Schleswig has now existed for 13 years. There has, without doubt, been a tremendous increase in cross-border activities across a wide field during this time. There are now regular cross-border sporting events (especially for young people), cross-border youth conferences, cross-border children’s theatre and a cross-border cycle route. There is cooperation between the border region's two universities in three cross-border study programmes. The local employment agencies have used a lot of resources to develop a cross-border labour market. A huge demand for labour in Denmark, combined with high unemployment in Germany, and higher wages and tax incentives on the Danish side, multiplied the number of German workers commuting to Denmark up to 2008. After a dip caused by the economic recession, such commuting is on the way back again, especially as the German labour market recovered faster from the crisis than the Danish. The abolition of Danish tax privileges for married commuters in January 2011, as well as the prospect of considerable wage increases in Germany, have made the net wage differential smaller and will probably continue to reduce the number of cross-border commuters. These developments have not resulted in a larger number in the other direction as yet.

Additionally, there is cooperation between the health systems. This is not actually cooperation in the strict sense, as what has happened is that the Danish health authorities have bought treatment capacities south of the border for their own citizens (cancer post-surgery radiation treatment, maternity and ambulance services). There have also been common initiatives to improve cross-border public transport which have been partially successful. The frequency of passenger train services across both cross-border rail lines was increased to every two hours; the Flensburg city bus system was extended into Denmark, and an express bus...
service was introduced between Husum, Flensburg and Sønderborg.

Additionally, there have been projects on the common, regional marketing of tourism. Region Sønderjylland-Schleswig has a fund to support cross-border cultural activities, with priority given to projects bringing people together across the border. Professional cooperation between the region’s symphony orchestras has functioned well for many years, but there is little cooperation between organisers of pop music concerts. The national minorities also provide an excellent programme of cultural activities from the neighbouring country, with regular visiting performances of theatres and orchestras of the highest calibre.

It is difficult to judge whether economic cooperation has improved. The southern part of the border region was attractive to Danish companies before Denmark joined the EEC. Many Danish companies then opened branches in South Schleswig to have a foothold in the German and European markets. This practice has continued to a certain extent. Danish retail chains, in particular, use South Schleswig or Flensburg as a test market, before expanding further into Germany. Thus the German headquarters of the well-known Danish furniture chain ‘Jysk’ is located near Flensburg. North of the border, Danish, Swedish and Norwegian companies have established themselves because of the location close to the European market, and there is a considerable, border-related logistics cluster in Padborg just at the border. It is not apparent yet whether German companies have followed the same practice. In general, German companies regard Scandinavia as one market and prefer to locate their activities in or near one of the capital cities. Many attempts have been made to increase cooperation between local businesses, and some successes are visible in vocational training. In general, though, cross-border business cooperation is not a specific strength of the region.

A regional coordinator

Region Sønderjylland-Schleswig functions as a coordinator and partial financial supporter of a range of cross-border activities. It is steered by a board, which represents the region externally. Since 2007 the partners, that is the two counties of Nordfriesland and Schleswig-Flensburg and the city of Flensburg on the German side and the newly constituted Region South Denmark and the four cities of Haderslev, Tønder, Sønderborg and Aabenraa on the Danish side, each appoint two members of the board. The region’s Regional Council, consisting of 22 members (11 from each side), is its supreme organ. The members are appointed by the partners’ elected assemblies and other stakeholders in the cooperation such as the universities, labour organisations and the national minorities. Additionally, there is one observer each representing the Danish and the Schleswig-Holstein governments, as well as two each representing the largest political groups in the Danish and the Schleswig-Holstein parliaments.
The Regional Council has established six committees on environmental protection; spatial planning, rural districts and transportation; health and social questions; youth and sports; business development, labour market and education; and culture, equal opportunities and language. The council has no legal political authority, but can pass resolutions on topics relevant to the region as a whole. It has a budget supplied by the partners and thus has the competency to fund a limited number of cross-border activities.

Even though cross-border cooperation in the Danish-German border region has multiplied since the establishment of Region Sønderjylland-Schleswig, and cross-border activities now take place across a wide field with a broad network of actors, there has also been a lot of criticism. The main focus of this criticism has been the weakness of the region’s cross-border institutions. The Regional Council is considered too large and ineffective, lacking concrete competencies. It is not evident that political actors in the cross-border region have shifted their loyalties and political activities toward Region Sønderjylland-Schleswig as a new centre, whose institutions take precedence over the pre-existing national states and their administrative units, which would be the precondition for the classic definition of regional integration. As a consequence, the council discussed its own dissolution in November 2010, as well as the dissolution of most of its committees (except the cultural committee). The alternative model of organisation being discussed now is a permanent, eight-member board to implement concrete action plans developed annually by a Euroregional conference.

New networks of cooperation have also evolved. Already in 2001 Southern Jutland County in Denmark had signed a cooperation agreement with the Schleswig-Holstein land (regional government). This was supplemented by a new agreement between Region South Denmark and Schleswig-Holstein in 2008, when administrative reform in Denmark abolished the counties and created regions instead. As well as this, the border cities of Flensburg (in Germany), Sønderborg and Aabenraa (in Denmark) have formed the ‘Border Triangle’, following the example of the triangular area of Kolding-Fredericia-Vejle, a strong economic development region about 100 kilometres north of the border.

The effects of cross-border integration are still difficult to measure. The regional population’s awareness of Region Sønderjylland-Schleswig is not very high; nor is its awareness of the cultural activities on the other side of the border. Cross-border media coverage is at present half a page to a page in the leading daily newspaper south of the border, but only irregular in the leading newspaper north of the border. A regional, cross-border TV magazine was discontinued after INTERREG funding ended, even though it had won a European prize.

There are no visible signs of a cross-border, regional identification in the population. People meet as Germans and Danes, with the exception of those inhabitants of the region who are tied
to the national minorities. Detectable regional identifications are connected to present-day Southern Jutland in Denmark and Schleswig-Holstein in Germany, not to the historic Southern Jutland down to the Eider river or a Schleswig-Holstein extending north to the Kongeå river.

A specific Schleswigian identity is historic. It was difficult to grasp already in the 1840s. Today, it can hardly be detected outside the Danish and German minorities. They are practically the only ones using Schleswig in their nomenclature. Otherwise, while ‘Slesvig’ has almost disappeared in Danish language usage, Schleswig is tied to Holstein in German language usage: Schleswig-Holsteinischer Zeitungsverlag (which until recently only published newspapers in German South Schleswig), Schleswig-Holsteinisches Landestheater (which only performs in South Schleswig), and Schleswig-Holstein Bahn (which only operates trains in Holstein and Dithmarschen), to name a few examples. Especially in South Schleswig, a Schleswigian identity is competing with several other local identities. A traveller through the region will notice plenty of red white and blue Schleswig-Holstein flags flying in private gardens south of the border, while the red and white Danish national flag is the exclusive banner north of the border.

It can thus be concluded that there is no evolving cross-border region of Sønderjylland-Scheswig. On the other hand, networks have multiplied, and cross-border cooperation reaches out to most local institutions and more and more civil society organisations in the region. Political taboos have been overcome, and nobody today questions the general usefulness of cross-border cooperation. The minorities’ role as bridge builders has been acknowledged by both sides, even though funding issues still can be controversial and lead to political upheavals, as was shown by the recently passed budget cuts that stopped equal funding of Danish minority schools in South Schleswig, compared to public schools. Meanwhile the regional politicians on the German side have not given up in their quest to promote a cross-border region: the most recent indication of this was the support of all three German border counties for the Danish city of Sønderborg’s application to become European Capital of Culture in 2017.

Martin Klatt is Associate Professor in the Department of Border Region Studies at the University of Southern Denmark. He has been researching the Danish-German border region since 1997, concentrating on the national minorities in the region, regional cross-border cooperation and cross-border institutions in this region and other European border regions. He holds Ph.D. in contemporary history from University of Southern Denmark and an MA in History, Political Science and Nordic Philology from University of Kiel, Germany.
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CO-OPERATION IRELAND: REMAINING RELEVANT IN A DIFFICULT RECESSIONARY AGE

Mary Minihan

The original cross-border peace-building charity, Co-operation Ireland – formerly Cooperation North – was founded 32 years ago. Like other voluntary organisations struggling with the legacy of the Northern Ireland ‘Troubles’ it faces the challenge of being either relevant or redundant in these difficult recessionary times.

When the organisation’s Chief Executive Peter Sheridan, a former Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI) Assistant Chief Constable, joined Co-operation Ireland in 2009, he said Northern Ireland had achieved ‘peace with bigotry’ and described subtly-embedded sectarianism as the last major frontier to be tackled. As politicians narrow their focus to concentrate on economic matters during the present crisis, they may long-finger important social issues, and there is a risk of citizens being left alone to muddle through the coming years with ‘an acceptable level of sectarianism’, to mangle Reginald Maulding’s infamous line.

Where governments are failing or have failed, for whatever reason, to bring the peace process to a recognisably complete conclusion, the voluntary sector has an obligation step up to the mark. At this critical juncture in our history, direct intervention at community level, in projects such as those carried out by Co-operation Ireland, has the potential to make agreement between the North’s politicians a reality at grassroots level. Perhaps only in this way can we complete the delicate process of banishing ingrained intolerance, discrimination and exclusion from our shared island for good.

Economic difficulties will probably be with us for the bulk of the next decade at least, but, as difficult as they appear to be and are for many, such pain will eventually pass. However, if the cold hand of so-called dissident republicanism is allowed to develop a firmer grip on the futures of disenfranchised and disengaged young people in estates across Northern Ireland, that legacy will haunt the island’s prospects and reputation for many years to come.

If such a depressing scenario were to come to pass, the negative implications for economic development are clear:
longed-for investment from abroad will simply never arrive. As First Minister Peter Robinson conceded in an interview with the Journal of Cross Border Studies in Ireland in 2009: ‘I’m not sure that people in the United States or India or the Far East will particularly distinguish which side of the border on the island they’re on. So the more stable and inviting the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland are, the better for both of us’.

The US economic envoy to Northern Ireland Declan Kelly insisted last May that dissident republican activity would not affect Derry’s bid to be UK City of Culture in 2013. He was right and it did not. But Derry’s competitors for the title in Norwich, Sheffield and Birmingham must have been nonplussed by the news the following October that the Real IRA had detonated a car bomb with more than 100kg of explosives outside a hotel in the city.

On the Kilwilkie Estate

One of the initiatives Peter Sheridan has overseen in his new role has been a pilot project undertaken in the deprived Kilwilkie estate in north Lurgan, where dissident republicans are said to have considerable support, and youths attacked police on several occasions last summer, and even tried to hijack the Belfast-Dublin train. This is a creative example of an evolved approach to peace-building by Co-operation Ireland, now in its 32nd year.

18 young people who might in wealthier areas be recognised for having obvious leadership potential, but in Kilwilkie were heading street gangs and were clearly at risk of embarking on a life devoted to anti-social behaviour, or perhaps worse, were selected to participate in the project. The aim – a tall order, some sceptics might have said – was to turn the teenagers into positive role models for their peers and to help them win the respect of the wider community.

They began a programme of personal development, digital media training and supervised recreational activities. With the help of a scriptwriter from BBC’s Eastenders soap opera and state-of-the-art equipment, the teenagers created and produced a short film, entitled Wasted, which was screened in Belfast’s Odeon Cinema. Some of the youngsters had never previously ventured further than the neighbouring town of Lisburn.

The response of a local shop owner to this pioneering initiative will be understood by anyone living in a community where youths have created an uneasy atmosphere on the streets: ‘Normally these kids torture me on a Friday night. Now I see a completely different side to them. It’s the best thing that has happened to them.’ Among the young people themselves, one said being involved in the project ‘makes you want to get up in the morning’ while another said ‘it’s getting me off the streets, and I’m learning new things’.

Co-operation Ireland’s intervention does not end there. Such projects also seek to improve the participants’ employment prospects. The next phase of the Kilwilkie project will see the young people participating in internship
programmes in well-known companies ranging from hairdressing chains to global banking institutions. Funding applications have also been submitted so that other similar communities in south Lurgan, Coleraine, the Shantallow and Fountain areas of Derry City and Limerick can reap the benefits of the Kilwilkie project.

Another major schools-based project, Civic-Link, aims to encourage young people in both Irish jurisdictions to engage positively in the development of their own communities and in understanding the perspectives of others. Schools are partnered on a cross-community and cross-border basis. They identify and research problems specific to their communities and attempt to develop solutions using tried and tested problem-solving strategies. Civic-Link has operated in more than 200 schools since the late 1990s, and more than 10,000 students have participated and have been taught new advocacy, civic participation and relationship-building skills.

Co-operation Ireland is the island’s largest cross-border peace and reconciliation organisation (and the second oldest, after the Irish Association). It was established in 1979 as Co-operation North by the late Dr Brendan O’Regan (the man behind the world’s first airport-based duty free industrial estate at Shannon) with the aim of building mutual respect and understanding between the peoples of the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland through practical co-operation.
With great foresight, O’Regan saw this as the greatest challenge then facing the island of Ireland.

Through the organisation’s early years in the difficult political climate of the 1980s, Co-operation North’s concentration was initially on research. Its first publications in that decade were on economic indicators, demographic and labour force statistics. Its most high profile event during this time was probably the Maracycle, which over a period of 15 years (1984-1998) saw a total of 45,000 cyclists taking part in an annual two-day, 200 mile mass cycle ride between Dublin and Belfast. In 1999 this was replaced by the Bordertrek cycle along the border. The original Dublin-Belfast Maracycle was reinstated in 2009 as part of the organisation’s 30th anniversary and will take place this year on 25-26 June.

In the mid-1990s, the Queen and President Mary Robinson became joint patrons of the organisation, with President Mary McAleese succeeding Mrs Robinson in 1997. In 1998, after the signing of the Good Friday Agreement, the organisation changed its name.
from Co-operation North to Co-operation Ireland.

1996 was an important year in the organisation’s development, as it became one of the ‘intermediary funding bodies’ administering large amounts of European money to deliver the cross-border dimension of the first EU PEACE programme for Northern Ireland and the Southern border counties. It was also an ‘intermediary funding body’ for the follow-up PEACE II and INTERREG IIIA (cross-border) programmes in 2000-2006. It currently has a similar role as ‘lead partner’ in the PEACE III programme (2007-2013). However despite this new role, with its welcome influx of EU funds, much of Co-operation Ireland’s money continues to come from business and other philanthropic supporters in Ireland, Britain and the US. Under the leadership of Head of Communications and Fundraising, Terry O’Neill, the organisation has built an enviable reputation as a successful fund-raiser.

Peter Sheridan, originally from Enniskillen, Co Fermanagh, had been tipped as a likely Chief Constable and there was some surprise when he left the PSNI to join Co-operation Ireland. He was the most senior Catholic officer in the force, having served 30 years in first the RUC and then the PSNI. In an interview conducted when he took up his new post, he described his main function as a police officer with characteristic frankness as having been to ‘stop people murdering each other’.

He graduated from the FBI Academy in 1999 and also holds an honours degree in applied sciences and a diploma in criminology from Cambridge University. He was first attracted to a police career when he was 16, taking the advice of a teacher at St Michael’s College in Enniskillen, Fr. Peadar Livingstone.

Progressing through painful phases

Sheridan sees Northern Ireland as being in the process of progressing through a number of often quite painful phases. He has given these phases a series of titles: peace-keeping, peace-making, peace-building (the current phase) and finally peace-sharing. In the peace-keeping phase, the police and the army played a pre-eminent role, while the peace-making phase during the 1990s saw the politicians take the lead. It could be said that this peace-making phase, during which the political parties thrashed out the 1998 Belfast/Good Friday Agreement and strategised about the idea of a shared future, really only came to a conclusion as recently as April of last year, with the devolution of policing and justice, and the appointment of the
Alliance Party’s leader, David Ford, as Northern Ireland Minister for Justice.

The first locally elected politician to have control of justice since 1972, Ford made headlines in the Republic when he revealed, at a recent session of the Oireachtas Committee on the Implementation of the Good Friday Agreement, that Catholic representation in the PSNI now stands at almost 30 per cent, while 25 per cent of its officers are women.

However despite this good news on the policing front, one continuing problem is that while governments tend to work in five-year electoral cycles, Sheridan believes that the current ‘peace-building’ phase of the Northern Ireland peace process could could take 15-20 years or longer. This is the kind of timescale Co-operation Ireland works to.

It is likely that there will be a new government – probably a Fine Gael-Labour coalition – in power in Dublin by the time this journal is published in the spring of 2011. A new administration in the Republic naturally means a fresh relationship with Northern Ireland. Essential and practical groundwork has already been done by Co-operation Ireland in this regard. Fine Gael leader Enda Kenny spent an afternoon with the organisation’s personnel in Belfast recently, and the former Fine Gael Taoiseach John Bruton recently joined its board. The hugely influential international lawyer, banker and businessman Peter Sutherland – himself a former Attorney General in a Fine Gael government - is also among the board members, as is former Fianna Fail Taoiseach Bertie Ahern, who has referred to sectarianism in Northern Ireland as ‘the dangerous bit that’s remaining’.

More contact may need to take place with the Irish Labour Party, Sheridan concedes, following the recent surprise suggestion by one of that party’s senior figures, Joe Costello, that the Republic might no longer be able to afford to honour road-upgrading commitments - linking Monaghan with Derry and Letterkenny and improving access to Larne harbour – to which the Irish government has committed some £400 million (€466 million).

Sheridan acknowledges that, through no fault of its own, Co-operation Ireland has sometimes found itself perceived as being located in a particular moment in time – the era of the Belfast/Good Friday Agreement. Nearly 13 years on from that epoch-changing agreement, it is worth looking back at some of the organisation’s key developments and placing them in their proper context.

At least two generations to succeed

When the organisation’s founder, Brendan O’Regan, died in 2008, Co-operation Ireland’s then Chief Executive Tony Kennedy said ‘his greatest memorial is the changed relationship between both parts of the island of Ireland’. A well-known early paper by O’Regan, ‘A Far, Far Better Way’, had outlined the new organisation’s aim as working together ‘to abolish violence and the fear and hatred on which it feeds by developing ways in which we can get to know and understand each other better’. Kennedy spoke of
conversations he had with O’Regan in his seventies in which the founder had insisted on the importance of ‘succeeding generations continuing with this work which would take at least two generations to succeed.’

The programmes established by the organisation in the 1980s and 1990s brought people from different religious and political traditions together to meet and make contact, with subsequent opportunities to take part in projects covering youth leadership, the arts and citizenship engagement. In 1981 Co-operation USA was founded to support the work, and a Belfast office was opened in 1982. The following year saw the launch of 15 experimental cross-border projects in different sectors including industry, trade, education and sport. In the mid-1980s, the organisation began developing what became known as ‘the Co-operation Ireland reciprocal exchange model’ with its cross-border schools and youth projects. Participating schools and youth groups began to be linked on a North-South basis and the young people encouraged to explore issues of cultural identity and reconciliation.

The organisation was also at that time providing a safe environment for business people from the Catholic nationalist tradition to talk in a meaningful way with people from the Protestant unionist tradition, as well as those from the Republic, often for the first time. It began hosting a series of North-South economic conferences in the late 1980s.

President McAleese with the choir of Presentation Secondary School, Ballyphehane, Cork, winners of the 2010 Co-operation Ireland All-Island School Choir Competition.
In the nineties, it moved into other areas. A conference tackling homelessness on both sides of the border was hosted in 1993 and the following year a hospitality programme began fostering links between the Irish Hotel and Catering Institute and the Hotel Catering and Institutional Management Association. In 2002 an all-island Local Authority Steering Forum was established to encourage sustainable approaches to cross-border relationships between local councils.

2006 saw the establishment of the ArtsLinks programme, which used the arts to challenge young people to explore and push the boundaries of their own thinking in order to examine attitudes to diversity within Irish society, North and South. This programme also trained and equipped teachers to develop their skills in using drama and film-making as community relations tools.

Recent years have seen an increased emphasis on the ‘nitty-gritty’ of peace-building at community level. In 2007, the CORE project evolved out of a pilot partnership between the people of two traditionally under-privileged areas: Short Strand and inner East Belfast in the North and Finglas and Cabra in Dublin. Among the events facilitated by the project were tours of the two communities, visits to Stormont, youth and sporting exchanges, and activities for parents.

Projects on the 'softer' side of the spectrum continue. These include the all-island Pride of Place competition, introduced in 2003. This recognises improvements and initiatives undertaken by local communities to provoke civic pride in their area and create long-lasting positive impacts on their society. Award-winning activities have included developing community centres, tackling social exclusion issues and providing childcare facilities. The second annual Co-operation Ireland All-Island School Choir Competition took place last year and was won by Presentation Secondary School in Ballyphehane, Cork. The final was broadcast live on RTÉ from the Waterfront Hall in Belfast in front of an audience which included President McAleese.

Tackling sectarianism

Sheridan has pushed hard for Co-operation Ireland's long-cherished concept of 'overcoming division for mutual benefit' to be treated as just as important as any other government policy area. While the impact of the organisation’s work can be difficult to quantify, and progress on the elimination of the deep cancer of sectarianism difficult to measure, government policy in this area should be given the same significance and attention to detail as economic policy, he argues. ‘The breeder of violence is sectarianism and it’s still out there. That issue must be tackled. If you look at government policies, they’re largely focused around the economy now. Social policy and community development are not on their radar.’

The organisation sees its current role as underpinning and consolidating the accommodation at political level, enshrined in the Belfast and St...
IRISH PEACE CENTRES
An Integrated Approach to Peace-Building.

Irish Peace Centres (IPC) is a consortium of legacy peace-building organisations which seeks to extend and embed reconciliation within and between communities by creating a strategic consortium to deliver a range of peace-building activities. Irish Peace Centres facilitates a number of interrelated activities that explore our experiences with conflict and look at ways to transform different perceptions in a post-conflict society. Through experiential learning exchanges, discussion, group challenges, storytelling and tailored activities, participants explore ways of embedding reconciliation into their everyday lives. Through these different activities, Irish Peace Centres has successfully engaged a wide range of stakeholders in society including faith groups, women’s groups, ex-combatants, young people, minority ethnic groups and other communities.

When first established in 2008, IPC was constituted of Co-operation Ireland, Corrymeela Community, Donegal Peace Centre and Glencree Peace and Reconciliation Centre. Unfortunately, in July 2010, The Donegal Peace Centre ceased trading and now, IPC is three.

While we have decreased in size in terms of organisations, our work parameters remain the same: to build the consortium and networks throughout the sector; to engage groups and individuals in interface reconciliation; to capture and share the learning through conferences, seminars, publications and training; and to foster sustainable positive relations through the in-depth core group process and faith in positive relations. Core themes run through this wide range of strands that hold them together and provide a supporting backbone to what we do: integrated approach and reflective practice.

The idea behind the consortium is that we can be more than the sum of our separate parts by working collaboratively across organisations and through the delivery of our projects with community groups and individuals who come from a range of different backgrounds. Over the last two years we have been developing this integrated approach to delivery and can now really see the added value of working as part of the consortium; it has allowed each organisation to develop and share their expertise to strengthen each partner’s own peace and reconciliation impacts.

IPC also focuses on being reflective in our practice; new and existing projects are delivered based on issue based action research, focused seminars and analysis of evaluation of the work we do by self-assessment of the impacts we see and through the evaluation provided by our participants. It is important to us that we capture the learning of our projects. This will further embed the impact of the peace and reconciliation interventions that we build and will influence how we design our projects and respond to the needs we are presented with on the ground.

Irish Peace Centres a project supported by the EU’s Peace III Programme, managed by the Special EU Programmes Body.

More information on our programmes, events and training is available on our website: www.irishpeacecentres.org.
Andrews Agreements, at community level – within Northern Ireland, between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland and between Northern Ireland and Britain. Sheridan believes strongly that sustainable peace requires agreement both at the level of the political and societal elite and through embedding it in the fabric of society, with the strengthening of relationships between and within communities on the ground. ‘Relationships are still not normal when you have segregated education and peace walls. We’ve got the political agreement. This is about seeking to normalise relationships at community level. It’s about people-to-people relationships. That’s the way you underpin political agreement,’ he stresses.

The organisation Sheridan fronts cites a series of simple values in its vision statement: ‘In carrying out its mission, Co-operation Ireland is guided by and gives expression to the following values: respect for people and their rights; inclusion, equality and fairness; accountability, integrity and transparency’.

Sheridan’s concern is that both Northern Ireland and the Republic are drifting aimlessly in what he calls the ‘peace-building’ phase. While the Republic struggles with its own serious economic problems, there is a danger that the distance between the two jurisdictions begins to appear greater than it is in reality.

The fact that many of the ‘big personalities’ in the peace process – Tony Blair, Bill Clinton, George Mitchell, Bertie Ahern – have departed the scene has also impacted hugely on the nature of coverage of political events in Northern Ireland, he says. These figures were replaced by what might be best described as a series of low-key managers. ‘We can’t leave it to the political elite. They’re about politics, and politics by its very nature is adversarial. Sometimes politicians have to play to that tune,’ says Sheridan.

**Transition to ‘peace-sharing’**

The ultimate goal of Co-operation Ireland is to assist with the transition to what Sheridan calls ‘peace-sharing’. However he believes that even before Northern Ireland has arrived at that point, it is more than entitled to offer itself as a symbol of hope to other regions currently experiencing the heat of conflict. He insists there is a duty to share the lessons of the current phase of peace-building, and all the learning and experience involved, with troubled communities outside Ireland. ‘There’s a responsibility to give something back. We got support and help from world leaders. We shouldn’t lose sight of the huge progress we’ve made. Probably about 1,000 people’s lives have been saved. Of course we have something to offer other countries, especially those who are further back in their conflict resolution,’ he says.

Sheridan adds that while things are far from perfect, the peace process is rightly lauded, and there are extensive opportunities for overseas groups to come and study Northern Ireland’s experience, and learn from its mistakes as well as what was done correctly.
Particularly worthy of examination, he believes, would be the things the media and churches did well and not so well during the years of the ‘Troubles’. ‘We are closer than ever before to achieving the dream of a peaceful and stable island, free of sectarianism, where cultural and political differences are not ignored but respected, and where people of all backgrounds not only can but are willing to live and work together for a better future,’ he says.

However, he points out that peace walls have multiplied, while social housing and education remain to a very large extent segregated, inevitably meaning that the dividends of peace come dropping more slowly than they otherwise might. ‘The almost terminal division between some communities has not been adequately addressed by politicians at a grassroots level, and is further evidence that governments have failed to prosecute the peace process to its end. Despite the obvious progress that has been made, people still feel insecure, anxious and unsafe – quite often with very good reason. Of course, it remains easier to perpetuate myths and stereotypes about those “on the other side of the wall”, or even physically attack them, so long as you do not get an opportunity to come to know them on a human level,’ he says.

Sheridan says the economic argument against segregation has always been very strong and is more applicable than ever in the current economic downturn. He estimates that the cost of maintaining separate health centres and separate leisure centres and separate youth clubs, all a short distance away from each other, in order to facilitate segregated communities, is somewhere in the region of €1.5 billion per year across Northern Ireland.

‘We have to recognise that it remains difficult for people to live together. Relationships have to be allowed to cement and mature. The ultimate aim would be to avoid duplication of schools, community centres and so on, but it’ll take 15 to 20 years. That’s why it requires the same passion and energy from governments as economic policy.’

As the largest North-South co-operation and reconciliation organisation, should Co-operation Ireland adopt a particular leadership role as the transition takes place from an abnormal, damaged society to a properly functioning pluralist democracy and community? Sheridan advocates increased co-operation with other peace-building organisations. ‘One thing I’ve tried to get the organisation to find out is what the model is for the future. It’s not just about sustaining the organisation for the sake of sustaining it. That can be uncomfortable for staff.”

He says Co-operation Ireland and other similar groups can serve not only as facilitators but also as catalysts of community development and integration. ‘Things have changed. What remains is the unfinished part of the peace process. Particularly in working class areas, it’s as if the peace process has excluded them. They’ve seen an absence of violence, but the peace dividend hasn’t arrived.’
An integrated future

Using their wide range of political, business and other contacts built up over years, Co-operation Ireland staff and board members can push the notion that the creation of an integrated future cannot solely be about economic cooperation and that social policy must increasingly be pushed to the forefront. Governments everywhere have traditionally been guilty of failing to value the community and voluntary sector, Sheridan says. On the other hand, he emphasises that voluntary agencies must also be held to account. They cannot be allowed to take the easy option of preaching to the converted and the middle-classes, but must opt for the more difficult task of reaching out to the underprivileged and delivering projects in places like Kilwilkie, where the young people involved had learned that ‘the only thing they were good at was being bad’. He notes that if such projects save a handful of youngsters from opting for the wrong path in life, they will have been more than worth the funding and time invested in them.

Sheridan hopes that Co-operation Ireland’s work can also help stimulate
the curiosity of young people in other parts of the island. ‘Why is it that, on such a small land mass, people in Coleraine, for example, have so little interest in what happens in Cork, and vice versa? I still think there’s an element of prejudice on both sides. Sometimes there’s a perception down south that there’s only sectarianism in the North, but it exists there too.’

Within Northern Ireland, looking forward does not mean forgetting the past. Sheridan says many people in Northern Ireland who have suffered grievously during the ‘Troubles’ have now been effectively asked to ‘live with their abusers’ and must be treated with sensitivity.

He says Co-operation Ireland – a relatively small organisation of some 40 energetic people - can only do so much. Co-operation Ireland staff work hard to secure a media profile at a time when Northern Ireland is something of a ‘switch off’ for both journalists and the public which reads, watches and listens to them. High profile names, such as the veteran BBC reporter Kate Adie, are persuaded to travel to Northern Ireland and share their experience with local young people. Adie spoke in an inspiring fashion at the Co-operation Ireland Student Journalism Conference in February 2010. The title of the conference, ‘The Transition from Conflict to Reconciliation’, acknowledged that peace had changed the dynamic of reporting in Northern Ireland. Adie said she did not think the media had a role to play in promoting reconciliation. But in a lighter moment she reminisced that she had loved coming to Belfast over the last 35 years, because ‘it’s the only place, and I’ve been in a lot of conflicts, where someone will tell you a joke in the middle of a riot’.

Sheridan emphasises that there is a role for the wider nationalist community in tackling the issue of Republican dissidents, as well as the ingrained sectarianism which continues to exist on both sides of the traditional divide. He argues that it must be addressed by a variety of organisations, including the Catholic Church, the Irish Government and the GAA, as well as Sinn Fein and the SDLP.

‘I’m not sure people have recognised quickly enough that this is a new phase. The focus has been more on politics and politicians and less on communities and relationships. We should be looking collectively at the future, as opposed to continuing to do what’s always been done.’

Mary Minihan reports on politics for the Irish Times in Dublin. Previously she worked as political correspondent for the Newstalk 106-108 radio station. She is from Derry and has a degree from Oxford University.
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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, and develops and manages cross-border information websites.

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 Science. 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 12 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 and development of such cooperation.

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;
- Commission and publish research on issues related to opportunities for and obstacles to cross-border cooperation in all fields of society and the economy;
- 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 wider 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 and others in North-South cooperation in Ireland;
- Provide sources of comprehensive and accurate information about North-South and cross-border cooperation in Ireland.

WEBSITES

CCBS HOUSE WEBSITE

www.crossborder.ie

The number of people accessing the Centre’s home website increased across all measurements in 2010 – visitors, number of visits, page views and hits – with a particularly dramatic rise in the number of page views, which increased by more than 10,000 per month and have now risen by more than six times since 2003.
In May 2010 a redesigned and upgraded www.crossborder.ie website was launched in Derry by the Chief Executives of the Derry and Letterkenny Chambers of Commerce, Sinead McLaughlin and Toni Forrester, at a seminar organised by Border People.

The figures for the Border Ireland website (www.borderireland.info) declined slightly over its 2009 high point (except for page views), with the Media Centre continuing to be the main page visited (see below).

### www.crossborder.ie

<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>2003</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>2161</td>
<td>4802</td>
<td>14373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>2084</td>
<td>9178</td>
<td>18981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2566</td>
<td>3603</td>
<td>8127</td>
<td>24747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3481</td>
<td>4915</td>
<td>10149</td>
<td>30534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3969</td>
<td>5432</td>
<td>12041</td>
<td>32207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4340</td>
<td>6060</td>
<td>15930</td>
<td>37045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3621</td>
<td>5156</td>
<td>19338</td>
<td>43007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4054</td>
<td>6490</td>
<td>29449</td>
<td>63317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### www.borderireland.ie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Visitors</th>
<th>Visits</th>
<th>Page views</th>
<th>Hits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3801</td>
<td>7043</td>
<td>24840</td>
<td>82984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2994</td>
<td>6544</td>
<td>25178</td>
<td>55486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BORDER IRELAND**

**www.borderireland.info**

Border Ireland is the first ever online searchable database to provide access to the full range of information on North-South and cross-border issues in Ireland, covering education, health, agriculture, transport, the environment, tourism, culture, mobility issues, business and community development.

Formally launching it in March 2006, the then Irish Minister for Finance, Brian Cowen TD, said:

*This website will be the keystone for information provision that will enable us all to meet future challenges, be they economic, social or educational. I would encourage everyone who wishes to benefit from a cross-border approach to their activities to make use of this invaluable website.*
With funding from the EU Peace II programme, the Centre developed Border Ireland to centralise the very large amount of uncoordinated and fragmented information about North-South cooperation and the Irish border region. This has involved the creation of an information capture strategy and strong working relationships with a network of over 200 information providers from all government departments, North and South; the managing authorities for all EU programmes; relevant charitable foundations on the island; research coordinators in all higher education institutions, and key community and voluntary, and business leaders.

By the end of January 2011 Border Ireland had documented (online) the details of 3,782 North-South and cross-border activities, 1,790 organisations, 2,048 publications, 2,276 newspaper articles and 2,345 individual contacts (people).

Border Ireland is available at www.borderireland.info where people can search through the information by year, sector and location, and view an organisation’s history of involvement in cross-border cooperation.

A second 2006-2008 phase of the project was implemented through support provided under the EU Peace II Extension Programme. The key objective for this second phase was to develop Border Ireland as the recognised portal for information on and communication about cross-border cooperation on the island of Ireland.

Following a facelift in 2008, the Border Ireland Media Centre was introduced to highlight media reports on North-South and cross-border issues. The Media Centre is now the most popular and visited page on the site with almost 6,000 page views during January 2011. This RSS* news feed is syndicated on three of the Centre’s other websites namely www.crossborder.ie, www.borderpeople.info and www.scotens.org.

Also during this phase, an interactive discussion forum was developed to disseminate Border Ireland Briefings, to provide responses to ‘A Note from the Next Door Neighbours’ (see below), and to communicate progress in collecting data for and maintaining this

* RSS (most commonly translated as Really Simple Syndication) is a family of web feed formats used to publish frequently updated items such as blog entries, news headlines, audio and video in a standardized format.
very large database. The Border Ireland Briefings now on the site are: a guide to cross-border cooperation in the health services; cooperation between public libraries; a guide to the geographical location of cross-border cooperation activities; an overview of North-South and cross-border cooperation in the Common Chapter of the two jurisdictions’ development plans; ‘Who’s Who’ in North-South and cross-border cooperation; and overviews of North-South and cross-border cooperation in agriculture, economic development, tourism and transport.

BORDER PEOPLE

www.borderpeople.info

The prototype website was officially launched (initially as www.crossbordermobility.info) in October 2007 at a meeting of the North South Ministerial Council in Ballymascanlon, Co. Louth by the First Minister of Northern Ireland, Dr Ian Paisley MP MLA, the Deputy First Minister, Mr Martin McGuinness MP MLA and the Irish Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr Dermot Ahern TD. Work continued on the site, and it was launched to the public as www.borderpeople.info in Dublin in April 2008 (by television and radio presenter Clare Byrne) and in Derry/Londonderry in May 2008 (by Northern Ireland Deputy First Minister Martin McGuinness MP MLA). It received widespread publicity throughout

Usage in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Visitors</th>
<th>Visits</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>8200</td>
<td>8695</td>
<td>16446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>6819</td>
<td>7256</td>
<td>14474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>7695</td>
<td>8175</td>
<td>16208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>5798</td>
<td>6205</td>
<td>12425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>5844</td>
<td>6287</td>
<td>14252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>5745</td>
<td>6168</td>
<td>13285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>6068</td>
<td>6517</td>
<td>13356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>5852</td>
<td>6329</td>
<td>13502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>6592</td>
<td>7186</td>
<td>16145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>7016</td>
<td>7610</td>
<td>18058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>7417</td>
<td>8053</td>
<td>17348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>4686</td>
<td>5083</td>
<td>12262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Average</td>
<td>6478</td>
<td>7043</td>
<td>14813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. In the past year the DID section of the NI Department of Finance and Personnel has installed a more sophisticated method of measuring web statistics. These statistics can therefore not be compared with previous years’ statistics.
Northern Ireland and the Southern border region, including a full page in the *Belfast Telegraph*.

The Border People public information website – the first of its kind on the island of Ireland – is structured around the four themes of Commute, Work, Live, Study. It includes in depth information on a range of subjects in both Irish jurisdictions, including taxation, social security, job seeking, qualifications, health, education, housing, banking and telecommunications. The website content has been continuously updated in consultation with other advice and information providers such as Citizens Advice Bureau Northern Ireland and the Citizens Information Board in the Republic of Ireland.

There is a continuing demand for information and advice on cross-border mobility issues. The number of page views on the Border People website during 2011 was on average 14,813 per month read by 6,478 visitors. The Border People team also receive an average of about 30 queries per month via the comment facility on the website, email or telephone.

This second phase of the Border People website (2009-2011) is currently being maintained and developed by the Centre in partnership with the North South Ministerial Council Joint Secretariat and funded by the EU’s INTERREG IVA programme as part of the INICCO group of projects.

An all-Ireland and international marketing company, Weber Shandwick, was retained to publicise the initiative. During 2010 there were poster campaigns on billboards, adshels and buses in Newry, Armagh, Enniskillen, Coleraine, Derry/Londonderry, Dundalk, Letterkenny, Bundoran and Monaghan to coincide with key events in the region’s tourism, business and cross-border shopping calendars, and leaflets and pens were distributed at targeted events.

A User Group of cross-border mobility information providers and users – including citizens advice bureaux, government agencies, health organisations, cross-border local authority networks, the EURES cross-border employment service, community groups, business groups and individual firms – met twice in 2010 in May (in Derry) and September (in Dundalk). Both of these User Group seminars were on the topic ‘The Cross-Border Worker’, with speakers from the EURES Cross-border Partnership and John McMahon and Co, a firm of accountants with offices in Newry and Dundalk who specialise in cross-border tax and finance.

The EURES (European Employment Services) Cross-border Partnership (www.eures-crossborder.org) was established to make things easier for those who wish to commute across the border to work by attempting to address the information gaps which workers and their employers face, such as how the taxation system works or how social security entitlements might be affected by taking a job on the other side of the border.

A wide range of topics were discussed at both these seminars including:

- The complexity of the Habitually
Sinead McLaughlin, CEO of Derry Chamber of Commerce and Toni Forrester, CEO of Letterkenny Chamber of Commerce launch the new Centre for Cross Border Studies website (www.crossborder.ie) at a Border People user group in Derry.

Resident Condition – which has to be met if people are to qualify for welfare payments in the Republic of Ireland – and the problems caused by its application;

• the delays associated with cross-border welfare queries, with calls being made for a dedicated unit to specialise in claims with a cross-border dimension;
• the desirability of a more uniform or all-island approach to tax and welfare issues;
• the unfamiliar requirements of having to complete self-assessment tax forms in the other Irish jurisdiction.

In August-September 2010 a user survey was carried out in collaboration with Indecon Economic Consultants which showed that 92% of respondents ‘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.

At a seminar in Dublin In November 2010, the international lawyer and expert on EU mobility issues (and the Irish representative on the European Network on Free Movement within the EU), John Handoll, said:

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.

The Border People website and its user groups are 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 jurisdictions more knowledgeable about and thus 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: nearly 7,000 at the last count. These Notes have provoked enthusiastic feedback and debate.

The 53 ‘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; and the poor state of the Southern health service.

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 RESEARCH, INFORMATION AND TRAINING PROJECTS

THE INICCO PROJECTS

Between 2009 and the end of 2011 the Centre is undertaking five major research projects funded by the EU cross-border programme INTERREG IVA and managed by the Special EU Programmes Body. These have been packaged under the collective title: the Ireland/Northern Ireland Cross-border Cooperation Observatory (INICCO). The five constituent projects are as follows:

1. BORDER PEOPLE CROSS-BORDER MOBILITY INFORMATION WEBSITE (PHASE TWO)

This is the second phase of the Border People (www.borderpeople.info) information website, being developed in a continuing partnership with the North South Ministerial Council. This project is led by the Centre for Cross Border Studies’ IT manager, Joe Shiels, assisted by information officer, Annmarie O’Kane. (For more information see the longer item on Border People on pages 119-122).
Phase Two allows 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 wide range of citizens advice, employment advice, local authority, business and community organisations. Performance is being reviewed against agreed targets for information content, along with regular statistical website reports to evaluate demand and usage. An annual survey tests whether the interests of users are being matched and how well the various website features are working.

The Steering Group for this project is drawn from the North South Ministerial Council Joint Secretariat, the Centre for Cross Border Studies, the Department of Finance and Personnel (NI), the Department of Social and Family Affairs (RoI), Citizens Advice Northern Ireland, Citizens Information Board (RoI), and the EURES Cross-border Partnership.

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

This network, organised by the Centre’s sister organisation, the International Centre for Local and Regional Development (ICLRD), brings together an alliance 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. (For more information on CroSPlaN and ICLRD see pages (146-155.)

CroSPlaN’s three year (2009-2011) programme consists of the following:

- **Two applied research projects** per year. The first two completed research projects in 2009-10 – both now on the ICLRD website (www.icld.org) – were on the implications of the NI Review of Public Administration’s proposals for local government on inter-jurisdictional planning; and on tri-national planning in the Basel Metropolitan Region in Switzerland, which incorporates neighbouring parts of France and Germany.
- **One executive training programme** per year for cross-border region local councillors, council officials and business leaders. The first course, in Dundalk and Newry, ran from November 2009 to May 2010, and the second, in Derry and Letterkenny, is running from October 2010 to March 2011. The third course, in the central border area, will take place in the autumn of 2011.
- **One technical workshop** per year
- **One annual conference**

The two 2010-2011 research projects are:

- **Cross-border river basin management.** Three of the eight River Basin Districts on the island of Ireland are cross-border. This research project will consist of two separate but inter-linked studies:
  a. International best practice in managing river basins that involve overlapping jurisdictions;
b. Mapping the policies necessary for the island of Ireland to achieve integrated decision-making in cross-border river basin management, with a particular focus on water quality and the role of spatial planning.

- **Local authority shared services.** Again this research will consist of separate but inter-linked studies:
  a. Comparative best practice in local authority shared services in Europe and North America;
  b. Shared services in Ireland, with a particular focus on the cross-border region, and on specialist services like ecological, flood risk, strategic environmental and habitats assessment.

The Steering Group for this project brings together planners, planning academics, cross-border cooperation specialists and cross-border local authority network representatives from the Planning Service (NI), the Border Region Authority (RoI), Leitrim County Council, the National Institute of Regional and Spatial Analysis (NIRSA) at NUI Maynooth, University of Ulster, the Irish Central Border Area Network (ICBAN), the Centre for Cross Border Studies and the ICLRD.

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

The overall aim of this project is to ‘identify how cross-border hospital services can provide mutual benefits for the people of the border region’. It is in two strands.
The report of the first strand, carried out by CCBS Deputy Director Ruth Taillon, was published on 14 October 2010 under the title *Exploring the Potential for Cross-Border Hospital Services in the Irish Border Region: The role of community involvement in planning hospital services*. It was launched by the chairman of the Northern Ireland Patient Client Council, Sean Brown, at the project’s emerging findings seminar in Ravensdale, Co Louth, on that date. The keynote speaker at the seminar was Dr Michael Wilks, immediate past president of the Comité Permanent des Medecins Européens, and a noted authority on cross-border health care in Europe.

The final report featured feedback from 11 focus groups in the border region and a range of patients and medical professionals. Case studies of service users and campaigning community groups in three areas were undertaken: cancer care in the North-West; cystic fibrosis in the two jurisdictions; and the campaign for a hospital in Omagh. Among the recommendations were that Patient and Public Involvement (PPI) concepts in hospital planning should be properly implemented; service users from both jurisdictions should be involved in the planning of new services at Altnagelvin (Derry/Londonderry) and Enniskillen hospitals; and service users should have full information about their entitlement to services in the other jurisdiction. Both the full report and an executive summary are available on the Centre’s website (www.crossborder.ie).

The second strand, a study to develop a prototype modelling tool for hospital planning on a cross-border (particularly in the border region) and all-island basis, is being carried out by the consultancy firm Horwath Bastow Charleton (with a team led by Shane McQuillan), and will be completed by summer 2011. An ‘emerging findings’ conference will be held in May 2011. The final report of this study will:

- Explore what six or seven selected specialist services would look like in the future if they were delivered in the border region on the basis of population needs rather than jurisdictional frontiers. Among the services being examined are general surgery; orthopaedic surgery; ENT; urology; some paediatric surgery; acute mental health; and treatment of cystic fibrosis. There will be a particular focus on building on the substantial work of Cooperation and Working Together (CAWT) in some of these areas.
- Develop in a prototype form a modelling tool for hospital planning on a border region and all-island basis, based on the analysis of these exemplar services, and taking into account factors like the geographical distribution of patients, supply and demand issues, and transport to and accessibility of hospital and other services.
- Recommendations on the future configuration of hospitals, North and South, that would be required if the planning of acute services in the border region was on the basis of population needs only – both on a short to medium term incremental scale (the CAWT model) and on a
longer term scale with a more radical vision for change.

The Steering Group for this project brings health and cross-border cooperation specialists together from the Institute of Public Health in Ireland, the Health Research Board (RoI), the Health Service Executive (RoI) (observer), Cooperation and Working Together (CAWT), the Irish Patients Association, the Patient Client Council (NI), the Pharmaceutical Society of Ireland, the Irish Department of Foreign Affairs (observer), the Centre for Cross Border Studies and the University of Warwick.

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

The aim of this package of four closely inter-related research projects is to find ways of understanding and increasing the accessibility, size, transparency, competitiveness and profitability of Irish border region markets in a context where peace and normality have finally arrived in Northern Ireland and the Southern Border Region, but have been followed by a deep economic recession. This overall project – in which the Centre is partnered by InterTradeIreland – is being carried out by a high-level team led by Dr John Bradley, formerly a research professor at the Economic and Social Research Institute in Dublin; Professor Michael Best of the Universities of Massachusetts and Cambridge, an international authority on regional business strategies; and two economists from the Wroclaw Regional Development Agency in Poland (the research is ‘twinned’ for comparative purposes with the Lower Silesia region of Poland and its common border with the German länder of Saxony and Brandenburg). This project was formally launched in April 2010. An ‘emerging findings’ conference will be held in autumn 2011.

The four constituent elements of this research project are:

a. The ‘generic’ challenges the region faces due to its peripheral location. This ‘framing’ study, which was presented at the first Steering Group meeting in April 2010, provides a stand-alone interpretive framework for understanding how a border region becomes peripheral, and how peripherality creates challenges to development. It also provides inputs in terms
of data sources (or lack of them) and specific applications to help understand the other three elements of the study.

b. **How border region consumer markets might be made more efficient drivers of regional growth.** This second study, which is currently being undertaken, is focusing on the border region viewed as an area where consumer behaviour has been, and continues to be, both isolated and distorted, and which must now seek ways of becoming a genuine single market. Cross-border shopping is the most dramatic aspect of this consumer behaviour, but the study is more interested in the disruption that the border causes to the evolution of local consumer market linkages on both sides of the border.

c. **How the region's small and micro-enterprises, which are the mainstay of so much economic activity in the region, might be enabled to develop.** The third study, which is being undertaken in tandem with the second topic, examines how small, medium and micro-enterprises, which are predominant in this border region, can draw inspiration and support from the region's special characteristics of a good labour force, a pristine environment and lack of congestion. This study involves factory visits and detailed interviews with owners and managers.

d. **How the region's tourism product might dovetail with strategic plans for tourism in Ireland.** This final study will explore tourism in terms of peripherality, consumer markets, micro-enterprise behaviour and tourism-related infrastructure, thus bringing together, in the form of an integrated case study, the insights which have emerged from the first three topics.

The Steering Group for this project brings together economists, industrial promotion practitioners and cross-border cooperation specialists from InterTradeIreland, the Department of Enterprise, Trade and Investment (NI), Invest Northern Ireland, Forfás (RoI), the Economic and Social Research Institute (RoI), the Centre for Cross Border Studies and University of Ulster.

### 5. PILOT IMPACT ASSESSMENT TOOLKIT FOR CROSS-BORDER COOPERATION IN IRELAND

As part of the integrative work of a cross-border observatory, the Centre is undertaking the development of a pilot Impact Assessment Toolkit (PIAT) for practical, mutually beneficial cross-border cooperation in Ireland. The pilot toolkit is intended to guide policy-makers and EU funders – and particularly the Special EU Programmes Body in Ireland – in thinking through the impact assessment process, assisting them in exploring the future consequences of cross-border programmes and projects. 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.
The proposed toolkit is breaking new ground in that it will offer an integrated process that takes into account social, economic and environmental impacts (the three ‘pillars’ of sustainable development), plus a fourth ‘administrative’ pillar that will identify impacts specific to cross-border cooperation in Ireland. It will have two unique characteristics: it will be developed with the specific conditions of the Irish ‘cross border territory’ in mind, and it will focus on identifying the ‘added value’ of cross-border cooperation in Irish circumstances.

The project’s methodology involves the active participation of public officials and NGOs who are currently working in cross-border cooperation in Ireland, who take part in a series of workshops and training programmes. An initial analysis of the ‘core problems’ of cross-border cooperation in Ireland was carried out at a workshop in Newry in November 2010, and a second workshop will take place in May 2011 to test a draft toolkit. One cross-border project will then be selected in order to carry out a detailed impact assessment to test the toolkit’s implementation. This will be followed by a three-day training course for cross-border practitioners in autumn 2011, and the toolkit will be published and launched in December 2011.

This project is being carried out by a team consisting of Centre for Cross Border Studies Deputy Director Ruth Taillon; the Director of the Euro-Institute in Kehl, Germany, Dr Joachim Beck, an advisor to the European Commission on
cross-border cooperation and impact assessment; and, as research assistant, Sebastian Rihm, a postgraduate student of the Universities of Kehl and Ludwigsburg working as an intern.

The project Steering Group is drawn from the Special EU Programmes Body, the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency (NISRA), Cooperation Ireland, INCORE International Conflict Research Institute (University of Ulster), Pobal, Institute of Public Health in Ireland, Northern Ireland Commission for Victims and Survivors, International Centre for Local and Regional Development (ICLRD) and the Centre for Cross Border Studies.

The INICCO projects are being evaluated by Indecon Economic Consultants of Dublin.

CURRENT EXCHANGE PROJECTS

North-South Student Teacher Exchange Project (Year Seven)

In March 2011 the North-South Student Teacher Exchange project will enter its seventh year with the latest exchange of 15 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 have not taken part in the 2010 and 2011 exchanges). 157 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 2009, 2010 and 2011 exchanges were funded by the Standing Conference on Teacher Education North and South (SCoTENS) (see also pages 142-146).

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.
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 run 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 2010-2011 with the Centre acting as its secretariat. UI operates mainly through three key projects: the Universities Ireland/IBEC-CBI Joint Business Council North/South Postgraduate Scholarship scheme; the Irish-African Partnership for Research Capacity Building (IAP for short); and the Irish Section of Scholars at Risk. New activities in the past year included the first in a new series of North-South student debates and co-sponsorship of a conference on young people and politics in Ireland, North and South.
Funding continued to be provided by an annual subscription from the nine participating universities; 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 very 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 £366,000 from individual business firms in Dublin and Belfast with the same amount of matching funding from UI. The chairman of Universities Ireland in 2010-2011 is the Provost of Trinity College Dublin, Professor John Hegarty. The members of its governing council are the nine university presidents and vice-chancellors plus representatives of its external funders.

**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 2010-2011 five scholarships were awarded, four to students doing business and science subjects (co-sponsored by Universities Ireland along with the Electricity Supply Board and Dublin Port) and one doing a humanities subject (sponsored by UI alone). The scholarships are worth €15,000 each.

Because over the past four years this scheme has been 50% sponsored by business firms, the emphasis is on subjects of interest to business, and the scheme aims in particular to build all-island innovation in STEM subjects (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) – along with business administration – which will be important in moving the island towards the knowledge economy that is vital to its future prosperity. It is thus a scheme which has been conceived both to support the continuing peace process in Northern Ireland and to train highly skilled postgraduates to contribute to a new phase of economic development for the island as a whole.

These North/South scholarships are open to all students currently registered at an Irish or a Northern Irish university.
or Dublin Institute of Technology (or who have graduated within the past five 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 five 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 2010 winners received their awards at a ceremony in Belfast on 7 December from the Permanent Secretary of the NI Department of Enterprise, Trade and Investment, David Sterling (standing in for the Minister, Arlene Foster MLA). The winners were:

- Cliona Harkin, a graduate of Trinity College Dublin doing a Masters in International Business at Queen’s University Belfast (sponsored by Dublin Port)
- Emma Ryan, a graduate of TCD doing an MSc in Sustainability and Corporate Social Responsibility at QUB (sponsored by ESB)
- Patrick Molloy, a graduate of University College Dublin doing an MSc in Business Economics at QUB (sponsored by ESB)
- Paul Davidson, a graduate of University of Ulster doing a Masters in International Management at Trinity College Dublin (sponsored by ESB)
- Laura McCabe, a graduate of NUI Galway, doing a cross-border Masters in Human Rights Law at QUB and NUIG (sponsored by Universities Ireland)
This brings to 26 the number of students who have been awarded these scholarships over the past six years.

**THE IRISH-AFRICAN PARTNERSHIP FOR RESEARCH CAPACITY BUILDING (IAP)**

This three and a half year project (2007-2011), funded by Irish Aid under the auspices of Universities Ireland, brings together all nine universities on the island of Ireland and four universities in Sub-Saharan Africa in a unique, high-level partnership to develop a coordinated approach to Research Capacity Building (RCB) in higher education institutions. The overall aim of the Irish-African Partnership (IAP for short) is to advance effective strategies for sustainable research capacity building for poverty reduction in the 13 partner universities in the areas of health and education, with gender and ICT as cross-cutting themes.

The IAP partner universities are Trinity College Dublin, Queen’s University Belfast, Dublin City University, University of Limerick/Mary Immaculate College, University College Dublin, University of Ulster, National University of...
IAP was financed by a €1.5 million grant from the Programme for Strategic Cooperation (PSC) between Irish Aid and Higher Education and Research Institutes (2007-2011), with €110,000 in matching funding from Universities Ireland. The first phase of the Irish-African Partnership is due to be completed by 31 March 2011.

The six objectives of the IAP are detailed below with progress towards their attainment:

**Objective 1: To assess existing capacity in development research within the 13 partner universities**

In May 2010 the report synthesising findings from an unprecedented stakeholder consultation in all the 13
partner universities in Ireland and Africa (involving over 300 academic and administrative staff) was finalised. Its findings were presented at IAP’s final conference and workshop at Queen’s University Belfast on 29 September-1 October 2010. The report documents the key opportunities and constraints to building research capacity in the partner institutions. They include:

- The need for a clear and coherent research policy framework;
- A nurturing and enabling environment for research at institutional level, including a career structure for research personnel, and a mentorship culture involving guidance and peer support arrangements;
- Overcoming obstacles to publishing, especially for the African partners;
- Funding support;
- Research infrastructure;
- Influences exerted by national research assessment exercises where these exist.

The final report providing a more in-depth analysis of the findings is available at [http://www.irishafricanpartnership.ie/stakeholder-consultation](http://www.irishafricanpartnership.ie/stakeholder-consultation).

A final metrics survey involving over 100 academics and research staff has also been completed, eliciting relevant information on research capacity in the 13 participating universities. The final metrics report, accessible at [http://www.irishafricanpartnership.ie/content/metrics](http://www.irishafricanpartnership.ie/content/metrics), was also presented at the final IAP conference and workshop in Belfast in September 2010.

**Objective 2: To identify opportunities and constraints to development research capacity within the 13 partner institutions**

This objective was attained through the Stakeholder Consultation exercise outlined above. Its final report noted the following key issues in the context of research capacity building for international development:

- North-South and South-South institutional partnerships are vital to capacity-building and knowledge-sharing, especially in terms of the opportunities they offer for collaborative PhD research supervision, and sandwich-type programmes.
- One recognised advantage of partnership is the ability to facilitate multi-disciplinary research engagement, especially between the sciences and the humanities.
- Development-related research is of value to the Irish universities and is part of a duty of civic engagement.
- Research in the service of development is a function that requires a specific locus of responsibility within the organisational structure of universities (including at faculty/school level).
- The ‘language of development’ should be encouraged to become more current in academic discourse, and collaboration between research academics and development practitioners should be promoted.
- In addition to long-term human capital development, short-term training and induction of researchers
needs to be more systematic, particularly at the foundation stage.

- Training and induction of research supervisors is essential.
- Clear and imaginative institutional policies are necessary to address gender related barriers to undertaking research and to attain gender equity in universities.

Objective 3: To enhance partner institution research capacity through developing and delivering a Summer School training programme

The Malawi ‘training for trainers’ Summer School held at Chancellor College, Zomba, on 22-25 March 2010 was demand-led (particularly from the African partners), and was a great success. The objective of the summer school was to enhance human capacity in research management in research offices and among research team leaders based in the African partner institutions.

The summer school, which was attended by more than 70 participants (including academic staff, librarians, human resources personnel, ICT and finance staff), consisted of a combination of plenary sessions and workshop sessions. The workshops focused on six topics, each facilitated by expert teams drawn from Irish and African partner institutions:

i. Research management
ii. Research bid writing
iii. Research finance
iv. Human resource management
v The role of Information and Communications Technologies

vi Graduate schools, graduate supervision and structured PhD programmes.

To effectively disseminate the ideas that underpinned the summer school, a resource book and CD based on the six modules was developed between April and August 2010. This was finalised and launched at Stormont on 29 September 2010 during the final conference and workshop in Belfast by Jim Wells MLA, Chair of the All Party Group on International Development in the Northern Ireland Assembly. Based on lessons from the Malawi Summer School, these resources aim to provide baseline principles and practical guidance to assist partner universities in their efforts to overcome the main barriers to building research capacity. The resource book can be accessed at http://www.irishafricanpartnership.ie/sites/irishafricanpartnership.ie/files/Final%20RCB%20Training%20Manual_3.pdf. It is also available as a ‘hard copy’ handbook from the Centre for Cross Border Studies.

Objective 4: To identify key themes in health and education research over the next 10 years

This objective was achieved through a ‘foresight’ process which was specifically designed for this purpose. The final foresight report – Looking to the Future: The Irish-African Partnership Foresight Report – is now available at http://www.irishafricanpartnership.ie/content/foresight. The report documents the entire foresight process which commenced at the first IAP workshop in Dublin City University in April 2008, culminating at the third workshop in Maputo, Mozambique in May 2009, at which key themes in health and education were agreed. In health, the key priorities were maternal and child health, infectious diseases including HIV/AIDS, and food security/malnutrition. Cross cutting themes identified were gender and climate change. In education, key priorities were teacher education and education for sustainable development, with gender and ICT as cross-cutting themes.

Research clusters in education and health were then formed around these themes. Between May and December 2009 the research clusters were activated via an online discussion forum on the IAP web portal. As a result, one of the education clusters successfully mounted a research bid with the DELPhE/British Council. This is a three-year IAP spin-off project (starting in October 2010) on developing more effective school/higher education institution (HEI) partnerships in initial teacher education, involving Eduardo Mondlane University, Makerere University, University of Malawi and University of Ulster.

A health cluster which brought together all four IAP African partner universities with Dublin City University, Queen’s University Belfast and 15 other European partners narrowly failed to be successful in an application to an EU Framework Seven Africa Call for Proposals with a project based around training African health researchers and strengthening African health research units; reinforcing
European-African research networks; and increasing awareness of the importance of research to drive policy in building effective health systems in Africa.

**Objective 5: To build an Irish-based development research network through agreed principles of partnership with African partners**

Strong inter-university relationships have been built through the six project workshops in Dublin (two), Entebbe (Uganda), Maputo (Mozambique), Zomba (Malawi) and Belfast. During the past year, two workshops have taken place: the international Summer School in Zomba, Malawi, on 22-25 March 2010 and the final IAP workshop and conference at Queen’s University Belfast on 29 September-1 October 2010.

The Queen’s workshop and conference was the IAP’s most successful networking event to date. Over 110 senior academics and researchers from Northern Ireland, Ireland, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, Uganda, Ethiopia, South Africa, England, Canada and Belgium came together to hear presentations from the founding President of the Ethical Globalization Initiative Dr Mary Robinson (on climate justice), Concern Worldwide Chief Executive Tom Arnold (on hunger and food security), University of the Western Cape Vice-Chancellor Prof. Brian O’Connell (on global North-South partnerships), Irish Aid Deputy Director General Michael Gaffey, International Network for Higher Education in Africa founder Dr Damtew Tefera, former Tánaiste Dick Spring, former head of the Commission for Africa Prof. Myles Wicksteed, TCD Provost Prof. John Hegarty and others. There were three days of intensive networking and discussion of proposals for a post-2011 second phase for the IAP.

The Irish Aid Third Level Project Promoters Group, convened in January 2008 under the auspices of Universities Ireland, and chaired by UI Secretary Andy Pollak, is an additional effort to widen and deepen the Irish end of a future Irish-African development research network. This group, which brought together all eight project leaders funded under Irish Aid’s 2007-2011 third level programme, helped Irish Aid to organise several showcase events, and to re-activated the Development Studies Association of Ireland (launched in September 2010), which is a network of academics and practitioners who aim to foster new knowledge and approaches to the study of development issues. It is affiliated with the Development Studies Association in the UK.

**Objective 6: To provide a platform to enable and support the development of specific partnerships arising from network interactions**
There has been significant progress towards providing an online development research platform through the IAP web portal (www.irishafricanpartnership.ie) developed by a team at Trinity College Dublin during this period. There are three main elements to this portal:

1. The website www.irishafricanpartnership.ie
2. The research register
3. The digital repository

All these elements were completed in time for the Queen’s University conference and workshop in September 2010. The functionality provided by the IAP web portal in terms of its integrated research register and digital repository is unique and the first of its kind globally, bringing together information from both developed and developing countries. There is still a need for comprehensive user testing for which volunteers from the participating IAP universities are required. The issue now is to continue to keep the website up to date and to add more content to both the register and the repository. International experience is that the provision of content for web portals such as this on a continuing basis represents a major challenge.

Organisation and future plans

The Irish-African Partnership is overseen by an executive committee representing all 14 participating institutions with four chairs, two from Ireland (Professor Ronnie Munck of Dublin City University and Professor Sean Farren of University of Ulster) and two from Africa (Professor Eli Katunguka-Rwakishaya of Makerere University, Uganda and Professor Joseph Tesha of University of Dar es Salaam). There is also an International Advisory Board to provide support from international experts in development research, which is chaired by the former Tánaiste and Minister for Foreign Affairs, Dick Spring. The IAP employs a project manager (Peter McEvoy) and part-time administrator (Caitriona Fitzgerald), both based at Dublin City University; two postdoctoral fellows in education and health (Dr Mary Goretti Nakabugo based at Mary Immaculate College, Limerick, and Dr Eimear Barrett, based at Queen’s University Belfast); and a part-time workshop organiser (Patricia McAllister, based at the Centre for Cross Border Studies in Armagh).

Universities Ireland has agreed to allow a small underspend in its contribution to the IAP to be ‘rolled over’ so that project manager Peter McEvoy can be employed on a part-time basis between March and August 2011 to make further funding applications and keep the project ‘ticking over’ so as not to lose momentum during this funding gap. It is expected that Irish Aid will issue a new call for funding applications later in 2011.

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 countries.

At its September 2009 Council meeting, UI decided to allocate €20,000 in 2009-10 to support two scholarships for persecuted scholars in Irish and Northern Irish universities. University of Limerick quickly applied and received funding to host a psychology professor from Iraq. The second 2009 scholarship went jointly to Trinity College Dublin and University College Dublin to co-host a political scientist from Iran.

On 22 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.

In 2010 two more SAR scholars were hosted at Irish universities with financial support from Universities Ireland. University College Cork hosted a public health specialist from Burma, while a human rights lawyer from Iran was jointly hosted by NUI Galway and Queen’s University Belfast.

THE AGREEMENT GENERATION CONFERENCE

Universities Ireland was co-sponsor (with the John Hume Institute for Global Irish Studies) of a conference organised in University College Dublin on 17 November 2010 entitled ‘The Agreement Generation: An Opportunity for Change?’ Its theme was the opportunity for changing Northern Ireland and all-island politics, and the role in this change of the younger generation who have come of age during the peace process period of the 1990s and the first years of the new century. Most of the speakers came from this younger generation of political activists, business people, academics, new media practitioners, artists and community workers.

Among the speakers were representatives of the youth wings of the DUP, Ulster Unionist Party, SDLP, Fianna Fail, Fine Gael and the Irish Labour Party; a Sinn Fein Belfast City Councillor; a North Belfast community worker; an artist and a digital project leader from Derry; a coordinator of the Spirit of Enniskillen Trust; young business leaders from Dublin and County Derry; and young academics from Queen’s University Belfast and UCD.

NORTH-SOUTH STUDENT DEBATES

The first of a series of Universities Ireland-sponsored North-South student debates on aspects of the future of the island of Ireland took place in ‘The Hist’ debating society in Trinity College Dublin on 13 October 2010. The topic of this first debate was ‘What should Ireland
look like in 20 years time?’ The speakers were:

• Eamon Ryan TD, Irish Minister for Communications, Energy and Natural Resources;
• Michelle Gildernew MP MLA, NI Minister for Agriculture and Rural Development;
• Basil McCrea, Unionist MLA for Lagan Valley;
• Dr Stephen Kinsella, Lecturer in Economics at University of Limerick;
• Four Trinity College Dublin student speakers: Ursula Quill, Fintan Mallory, Emer Duffy and Barra Roantree.

Officers of the debating societies from University College Cork, Queen’s University Belfast, Dublin City University, National University of Ireland Maynooth, National University of Ireland Galway and University of Limerick were also present. Universities Ireland has offered to sponsor other student debates in universities, North and South, on subjects relevant to the future of the island of Ireland on a ‘first come, first served’ basis.

DISTINGUISHED SPEAKER SERIES

At the suggestion of UCD President Dr Hugh Brady it was decided this year to invite distinguished international higher education specialists to address the six-monthly Council meetings of Universities Ireland and to invite other senior Irish academics to hear them. This seminar series began on 12 February 2010 with an address by Professor John Casteen, President of the University of Virginia, who spoke on his experience of leading this highly successful US university in a difficult financial climate.

It continued on 17 September with Professor Malcolm Skilbeck, former OECD Deputy Director for Education and Vice-Chancellor of Deakin University in Australia (and author of a seminal 2001 report on higher education in Ireland), who spoke on the role and responsibilities of universities in contributing to the ‘common good’.

Website: 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 (SCoTENS). 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 2010-2011 joint chairs of SCoTENS are Professor Teresa O’Doherty, Dean of Education at Mary Immaculate College, University of Limerick, and Dr Tom Hesketh, Director of the Regional Training Unit in Belfast.
SCoTENS’ eighth annual conference, on ‘Teacher Education for Inclusion’, was held in October 2010 in Belfast. It was opened by the Permanent Secretary at the NI Department of Education, Paul Sweeney, and the Irish Minister of State for Lifelong Learning, Sean Haughey TD. The keynote speakers were Professor Sir Tim Brighouse, former Chief Education Officer for Birmingham and Schools Commissioner for London, who is widely recognised as one of Britain’s most eminent educationalists; Renato Opertti from the UNESCO International Bureau of Education, and Dr Amanda Watkins from the European Agency for Development in Special Needs.

In his opening comments, Mr Haughey praised SCoTENS as ‘a North/South platform that has gone from strength to strength through building professional partnerships and personal networks through its wide-ranging activities and research initiatives.’ Mr Sweeney said SCoTENS had been ‘acknowledged by commentators as one of the best examples of North-South co-operation’ and he had been pleased to hear a presentation from co-chairs Professor O’Doherty and Dr Hesketh at the most recent North South Ministerial Council meeting.

The conference featured ‘teacher education for inclusion’ workshops on race, special education, access and travellers, disability, and the professional development of teachers in the inclusion field. There were also presentations from school principals and teachers in special schools in Derry and Limerick.
Two reports were launched at the conference: *Reflective Practice – Challenges for Teacher Education, North and South (SCoTENS 2009 conference and annual reports)* and *Valuing Education Technology in Schools in Ireland, North and South* by John Anderson and Conor Galvin. They were launched by Professor John Coolahan and Professor John Furlong of Oxford University’s Department of Education.

Previous SCoTENS annual conferences were on ‘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 and all-island 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 (three); autism; dyslexia, literacy and inclusion; and the competences approach to teacher professional development.

It has also provided seed funding for North-South research projects on the following subjects: 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; and teachers’ understanding of children exposed to domestic abuse.

A total of 61 North-South research, conference and exchange projects have received financial support from SCoTENS in the period 2003-2010, and 14 reports have been published. Another 14 applications were received in February 2011. These were in the following areas: promoting children’s emotional health and well-being; cyberbullying; online adult arts education; North-South assessment in teacher education; mathematical identity using narrative as a tool; science learning through teacher exchanges; North-South educational partnerships in development contexts; teachers’ views on the factors affecting their professional development; teaching controversial history (1916 and the Somme); new challenges and opportunities for spiritual
education; promoting a ‘restorative school’ learning community; primary teacher education ‘transformation’ North and South; and writing as a professional development activity in initial teacher education.

The SCoTENS website (http://scotens.org) has been updated in the past three years and highlights, in particular, resources on special education, citizenship education and teaching and learning with digital video. As can be seen from the table on the previous page, this has led to a sharp increase in the number of users. Assistance with inputting content on special needs education has been provided by Dr Noel Purdy (Stranmillis University College) and on citizenship education by Dr Rowan Oberman (St Patrick’s College Drumcondra).

SCoTENS also sponsors the ground-breaking North-South Student Teacher Exchange, now in its seventh year, which brings student teachers from the island’s seven colleges of primary education to do a key part of their assessed teaching practice in the other jurisdiction (also see pages 130-131).

SCoTENS is funded by annual grants from the Irish Department of Education and Skills, 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 34 members, who are universities, colleges of education, teaching councils, education trade unions, education centres, curriculum councils and other bodies involved with teacher education.

INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR LOCAL AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The International Centre for Local and Regional Development (ICLRD) is a North-South-US partnership established in 2006 to explore and expand the contribution that planning and the development of physical, social and economic infrastructures can make to improve 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 in Cambridge, Massachusetts; and the Centre for Cross Border Studies.

The ICLRD continues to expand its collaboration with other institutions and has built close working relationships with individual faculty and researchers from Harvard University, Queen’s University Belfast and Mary Immaculate College, University of Limerick. It is very open to involving other academic and research institutions in its activities.

The director of the ICLRD is John Driscoll, who is assisted by two part-time assistant directors, Caroline Creamer of the National Institute for...
Regional and Spatial Analysis at NUI Maynooth and Dr. Neale Blair of the School of the Built Environment at the University of Ulster.

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 pro-active 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 authorities and communities to translate policy into ‘on the ground’ action; and an outreach programme that includes conferences, workshops, advice to community organisations, and international cooperation and exchanges to identify best practices.

Stimulating economic growth and improving living conditions to prevent and alleviate social conflict are at the heart of the ICLRD’s mission. It 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. Its work 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

Sustainable Spatial Development: River Basin Management
Development Plans and their implications for future development
Following a joint consultation process in 2003, eight River Basin Districts were established by the Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government (DoEHLG) and the Department of Environment Northern Ireland. Four of these river basis are in the Republic of Ireland, one in Northern Ireland and three are cross-border. This study will document the challenges...
associated with achieving integrated decision-making in cross-border river basins, with a particular focus on water quality and the role of spatial planning. It will put forward recommendations as to how current policies – at the national, regional, local and cross-jurisdictional scale – can be improved.

Delineating Functional Territories across the Island of Ireland: a cross-border case study

This Higher Education Authority(HEA)-funded study continues an earlier ICLRD research project to identify natural catchment areas for services and travel-to-work patterns in cities and towns in the Republic of Ireland, Northern Ireland and the border region. This follow-up case study will focus on a number of priority sectors in Sligo and Enniskillen. It will identify the significant spatial linkages between these centres and surrounding areas, and search for opportunities for shared service delivery. It will also seek to resolve the problems identified in Phase I around the compatibility of data sources in the different jurisdictions.

Governance and Planning: an international perspective

ICLRD is writing a series of international case studies in inter-jurisdictional and cross-boundary governance and planning to complement the recently concluded study All Change But Any Alignment? (see below). This research presents examples of innovative practice in collaboration in the following areas:

• **Basel Metropolitan Area**: this case study area – spanning Switzerland, France and Germany – highlights emerging cross-border cooperation in spatial planning at the sub-regional level;

• **Mancomunidades in Spain**: this study focuses on the provision of
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services through inter-municipal collaboration at the level of the micro-region;

- **Boston Metropolitan Area**: this study provides examples from the USA 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 provide practical examples of how cooperation in local and regional development can be shaped by collaborative efforts. They highlight how territorial cooperation, particularly in the EU, is moving towards ‘place-based strategies’ (as promoted in the EU 2020 Strategy and the Barca Report). The three case studies are due to be published online in early 2011.

**Completed research projects (2009-2010)**

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

This report focuses on inter-jurisdictional planning and multi-level governance and was published on the ICLRD website in June 2010. 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 how inter-jurisdictional spatial planning policies and operations will be more closely aligned following the various reforms to governance and planning in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland;
- Whether, in the context of the current recession, there is greater political and community support for the alignment of spatial planning policies on the island.

**Delineating Functional Territories across the Island of Ireland: An Initial Scoping**

Published in October 2010, this HEA-funded report considers the various options for mapping functional territories across the island of Ireland. In undertaking a preliminary analysis of Functional Urban Areas (FUAs) in Ireland and Northern Ireland, the study features maps of natural catchments, travel-to-work catchments, origin-destination data, gravity models and urban functional specialisations. The report summarises the progress made by ICLRD during Phase I of this project (with Phase II now under way), with a focus on exploring the various possibilities of mapping functional territories to produce a set of outputs based on datasets that were available to the research team. It illustrates the contribution that spatial analysis can make to the potential of urban centres across the island. This
study was undertaken in collaboration with the All Island Research Observatory (AIRO) at NUI Maynooth.

**Living Together – An investigation of case studies and strategies for promoting Safe, Integrated and Sustainable Communities**

This research project investigated initiatives in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland to improve and build subsidised housing in mixed communities (religiously and socially) 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. The three Northern case studies have been published in association with the Northern Ireland Housing Executive.

**Rural Restructuring: Local Sustainable Solutions to the Rural Challenge**

This report was the culmination of a 12-month research project which 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 programme of research focused on three rural areas; Draperstown in County Derry/Londonderry; Emvylee-Truagh-Aughnacloy on the Monaghan-Tyrone border; and Duhallow, spanning the Cork-Kerry border. 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 Monaghan in May 2009.

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

ICLRD undertook this research initiative in cooperation with Louth County Council, Newry and Mourne District Council, Dundalk Town Council and InterTradeIreland. Its objective was to identify (a) potential projects that can bring long-term benefits to the ‘Twin City’ region of Newry-Dundalk; and (b) models of cooperation to assist in their implementation. 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.
Borderlands: The Journal of Spatial Planning in Ireland

The inaugural issue of Borderlands: The Journal of Spatial Planning in Ireland was launched at the sixth annual ICLRD conference in Sligo on 20 January 2011. This new journal will be published on an annual basis and will cover a range of topics of interest to academics, practitioners and policy makers involved in spatial planning and local and regional development. The first issue includes 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.

Professional education and training

Much of the ICLRD’s work in 2009-2011 has been undertaken as part of the Cross-Border Spatial Planning and Training Network (CroSPIaN), an EU INTERREG IVA-funded programme delivered through the Special EU Programmes Body. Operated in association with the Centre for Cross Border Studies as part of its Ireland-Northern Ireland Cross-border Cooperation Observatory (INICCO), CroSPIaN is a three-year programme of research, training and workshops in Northern Ireland and the Southern border counties. It is under this initiative that the ICLRD has developed and implemented its professional education and training programmes.

Executive Training Programme for the Newry-Dundalk Twin City Region

This first CroSPIaN executive training programme was developed specifically for the Newry-Dundalk Twin City Region and focused on the theme of ‘Shaping and Managing Cross-Border Development’. Held over five modules in venues in Newry and Ravensdale, Co Louth from November 2009 to May 2010, it was designed to promote good practice in spatial planning in Newry, Dundalk and the wider eastern border region. Participants included councillors, officials, and public and private sector representatives from County Louth, Dundalk, Newry and Mourne and Down District council areas. In addition to the 30 participants, expert speakers from government, academia and the private sector from both sides of the border, including representatives from the North South Ministerial Council (NSMC) Joint Secretariat, took part. Findings were recorded in post module reports and these, together with recommended reading material and website links, were made available on a dedicated training website.

Executive Training Programme for the North-West Region

The second CroSPIaN executive training programme is being rolled out in the North-West between October 2010 and March 2011 following a development period involving key stakeholders from
Donegal County Council and Derry City Council. It focuses on the theme ‘Fostering growth through cooperation in the North-West region’. The design and content of the programme builds in several regional cross-border initiatives already under way and the particular issues this cross-border region hopes to address: enterprise and skills development, the green economy, culture, access to services and leadership. As with the Newry-Dundalk training programme, the focus of the North-West programme is to promote good practice in spatial planning in this cross-border region, and to assist the participants to identify best practices in regional cooperation that might be adopted by the newly established North-West Partnership Board.

Conferences and conference presentations

The sixth annual ICLRD/CroSPiLaN conference – The Changing Business, Community and Spatial Planning Landscape: Doing More with Less took place in Sligo on 20-21 January 2011, with 115 people attending. Sessions included:

- Planning for Economic Recovery and Sustainable Growth
- Planning for Homes and People: new challenges, new agendas
- Planning for Shared Innovation: infrastructure to support innovation-led recovery
- A Changing Landscape: networking, collaborating and achieving greater efficiencies.

Among the speakers were Nicolas Retsinas, Senior Lecturer in Real Estate and Director emeritus at Harvard University’s Joint Center for Housing Studies, and former US Assistant Secretary for Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner; Frank McDonald, Environment Editor with the Irish Times; Professor Greg Lloyd, Head of the School of the Built Environment, University of Ulster; Brian Rowntree, Chairman, Northern Ireland Housing Executive; Jenny Pyper, Director, Regional Planning and Transportation Division, NI Department for Regional Development; David Walsh, Principal Officer, Irish Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government; Professor Rob Kitchin, Director, National Institute for Regional and Spatial Analysis (NIRSA), NUI Maynooth; Dermot Byrne, Chief Executive, Eirgrid; Dr Gary McDarby, Complex Adaptive Systems Laboratory, University College Dublin; and Dr Tim O’Connor, former Secretary General to the President of Ireland.

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

- 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)

- **Community Building through Growing Leadership: The Challenge of the Border**, Presentation to Eisenhower-Loeb Fellows, Dublin, 5 May 2010 (Caroline Creamer and Karen Keaveney)


- **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, 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 Colour 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, April 2009 (Brendan O’Keeffe)

### Seminars and workshops

ICLRD organises regular seminars and workshops. In the past two years these have included events on the following topics:

- **Land Banks, Surplus Housing and Unfinished Estates: Assets and Liabilities**. Speakers from the USA, and Ireland, North and South: Nicolas Retsinas, Senior Lecturer in Real Estate, Harvard Business School; Brian Rowntree, Chairman, Northern Ireland Housing Executive; Niall Cussen, Senior Planning Advisor, Irish Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government; and Grania Long, Director, Chartered Institute of Housing NI (Sligo, January 2011)

- **The Functionality of Place: Determining and Mapping Functional Territories**, with the All-Island Research Observatory (AIRO) (Armagh, June 2010)
Outreach

Newry and Mourne and County Louth Cooperation Agreement
As a follow-on to the Twin City region study and the executive training programme in Newry and Mourne and Louth, the ICLRD was commissioned by the two councils to assist them in developing a formal cooperation agreement that builds on their existing areas of cooperation, and opens up further opportunities for the sharing of services and joint management of key resources in areas such as emergency planning, green technology and tourism and recreation. This agreement was approved by the respective councils in November 2010 and will be signed in Brussels in early March 2011.

Truagh-Aughnacloy Community Planning
Since May 2010 the ICLRD has been providing technical assistance to seven local community development associations in both jurisdictions along the north Monaghan and south Tyrone border. The development associations, who have never worked together formally before, are collaborating on a community business and social economy plan. In addition, a significant amount of groundwork has taken place on the development of an inter-territorial / transnational project, involving Truagh-Aughnacloy, Draperstown (Co Derry/Londonderry), Duhallow (Co. Cork and Kerry) with EU partners. Both these initiatives evolved from previous ICLRD activities including the Rural Restructuring study and the applied research on small connected towns in the border region.

Briefing paper series
In November 2009 the ICLRD launched its Briefing Paper series. This involves the publication of timely online articles (on www.iclrd.org) 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. Articles available to date include:

- Good Planning Key to Future Success by Professor Rob Kitchin, NUI Maynooth and Professor Alastair Adair, University of Ulster (November 2009);
- Linking Spatial Planning with Public Investment: Perspectives from the island of Ireland by David Counsell, planner, and Professor Greg Lloyd, University of Ulster (December 2009);
- The Conditions necessary for Gateway Development and the Role of Smaller Gateways in Economic Development by Professor Jim Walsh, NUI Maynooth and Cormac Walsh, Urban Institute, University College Dublin (January 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 (February 2010);
- Evidence-Informed Spatial Planning:
A Metro Boston Perspective by Holly St Clair, Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC), Boston (May 2010);

• Recovery Scenarios for the Two Irish Economies by Professor John FitzGerald, Economic and Social Research Institute (July 2010).

Website

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

BELFAST-DUBLIN RAIL SEMINARS

The Centre organised two seminars in spring-early summer 2010 on the Belfast-Dublin rail service from the user’s perspective, following the perceived decline in the reliability and quality of the service, particularly since the Malahide embankment collapse the previous August. These seminars were organised as part of the outreach work of the Border People website.

The first seminar, on 11 March in Belfast, was addressed by Reg McCabe, Director of the IBEC-CBI Joint Business Council and a transport specialist from a business viewpoint. The second, on 27 May in Dublin, was addressed by Dr Edgar Morgenroth, an economist specialising in infrastructure and transport who was at that time seconded from the Economic and Social Research Institute in Dublin to the Northern Ireland Strategic Investment Board in Belfast (There is an article by Dr Morgenroth based on his address in this journal). Both rail companies, Irish Rail and Translink, were represented at these seminars by senior officials, and the participants included senior business, government, cross-border organisation and ‘third sector’ figures who are regular travellers on the line.

A short report out of these seminars was completed by early September and was submitted to the Irish Department of Transport and the NI Department for Regional Development for presentation to and discussion at the next transport sectoral meeting of the North South Ministerial Council (i.e. the Ministers in charge of transport in the two jurisdictions) on 20 October. This discussion led to a request to the two operating companies to respond to the paper and its recommendations at the following transport sectoral meeting in spring 2011.

The paper’s short-term recommendations included:

• Introduction of an hourly service within four years;
• Expansion of fleet by converting MRK 111 coaches;
• Expansion of capacity at Dublin Connolly by altering signalling;
• More appropriately timetabled service for business and regular users;
• Increased co-ordination and coherence between the two service operators;
• Improved cleanliness of train interiors and working fixtures;
• Improved quality and cost of catering services;
• Improved PA announcements and communications;
• Introduction of Wi-Fi.
This was an example of the Centre acting in response to a clearly perceived cross-border problem and undertaking a speedy and relevant piece of research; consulting with stakeholders; and bringing its findings to senior levels of government in both jurisdictions, leading to action through the North South Ministerial Council machinery to call the relevant state actors to account.

EDUCATION FOR RECONCILIATION

The Centre is a partner with the City of Dublin Vocational Education Committee’s Curriculum Development Unit in the 2009-2011 phase of the cross-border, cross-community Education for Reconciliation project, subtitled ‘Securing the Future through Active Citizenship.’ The aims of this EU PEACE III-funded project, which in its successive phases has been working with teachers in both jurisdictions since 1998, have remained consistent. They are:

- To contribute to peace and reconciliation, human rights and justice through citizenship education
- To enable young people to develop the understanding, attitudes and skills to be active citizens in relation to reconciliation, conflict and controversial issues within their communities and society
- To embed reconciliation as a key element within citizenship education.

The project aims to achieve this through a cross-border programme of professional development for citizenship education teachers in second-level schools, and through the development of teaching and learning resources on issues of local and global conflict, conflict resolution, human rights and peace building. The project particularly supports teachers to develop key skills such as critical thinking in relation to controversial issues like conflict, reconciliation and human rights. Over 80 schools have participated in Education for Reconciliation since its inception.

Reconciliation and peace building require us to look at the difficult issues which have often been ignored in schools because they are deemed too controversial. Education for Reconciliation is currently supporting in-service training on a new resource, From Prison to Peace, with the involvement of loyalist and republican former paramilitaries. It is also developing teaching resources on equality and diversity, and on international conflict resolution (a case study of the Palestine/Israel conflict in relation to human rights and international law). It is carrying out action research on developing young people’s voice in the classroom, and also offers initial support to participating schools in developing restorative practices and peer mediation within the school community.

42 teachers from 25 schools across Northern Ireland and the northern part of the Republic of Ireland are involved in the current phase of the project. They are drawn from a wide range of school types (grammar and secondary – Protestant and Catholic – and alternative education centres in the North; community, vocational and gaelscoileanna in the Republic) from Belfast; Newtownabbey and
Crumlin, Co Antrim; Ballynahinch and Dromore, Co Down; Keady, Co Armagh; Strabane and Dungannon, Co Tyrone; Enniskillen, Co Fermanagh; Belturbet, Co Cavan; Arranmore Island, Bundoran, Carndonagh, Dungloe and Falcaragh, Co Donegal; Dunleer and Dundalk, Co Louth; Sligo, and Drumshambo, Co Leitrim. For further information see www.reconciliation.ie.

PAST RESEARCH PROJECTS

The Centre has commissioned and published 17 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, public sector training, hospital services, mental health research and government services to minority ethnic groups.

These projects involved researchers drawn from 13 universities, colleges and independent research centres 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 and the Centre for Cross Border Studies itself. The research assignments under the North/South public sector training project (see above) 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...
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.

**Improving Government Service Delivery to Minority Ethnic Groups (2006).** 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.

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.

COMMISSIONED STUDIES AND EVALUATIONS

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

- 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 Irish Department of Education and Skills and the Department of Education Northern Ireland (January-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 (December 2009-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)
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 focussed 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

* For the Mapping Frontiers, Plotting Pathways project
NORTH/SOUTH RESEARCH FORUM

There have been three meetings of the North/South Research Forum (NSRF) to date. This initiative, which is funded by the EU INTERREG IVA programme (managed by the Special EU Programmes Body) through the Ireland/Northern Ireland Cross-border Cooperation Observatory (INICCO), aims to bring together researchers, policy-makers and funders interested in North-South and cross-border cooperation in Ireland every six months to discuss a research and/or policy issue of current interest.

The first meeting was in Dundalk in December 2009 under the title ‘What is the future for local and cross-border economic development in the context of the global economic crisis’. The keynote speakers were the economist Michael Smyth of University of Ulster and Celine McHugh, a senior policy advisor with Forfás, the Republic’s national policy advisory body for enterprise and science.

The second forum was also in Dundalk, on 24 June 2010, with the theme ‘Cross-Border Innovation and Creativity’. It was addressed by Padraic White, Chairman of Louth Economic Forum, Chairman of the West Belfast and Greater Shankill Enterprise Council and former IDA Chief Executive; Michael Curran, Louth Local Authorities’ Director of Economic Development and Future Planning, and head of the EU-funded HOLISTIC green energy project with towns in Austria and Switzerland; and Dr Maurice O’Kane, Chief Executive of the Clinical Translational Research and Innovation Centre (C-TRIC) at Altnagelvin Hospital in Derry and Head of Research and Development at the Western Health and Social Care Trust (C-TRIC’s work on innovative health technologies won the 2010 Irish Times/InterTradeIreland cross-border innovation award).

The third forum was held in Belfast under the title ‘The Future of Public Sector Cross-Border Cooperation in a Difficult Financial Climate’. It was addressed by two of the island’s leading economists – Irish Times commentator and former Ulster Bank chief economist Pat McArdle and the Director of the Economic Research Institute of Northern Ireland (ERINI), Victor Hewitt – and CCBS Director Andy Pollak. The chair was Shaun Henry, Director, Managing Authority, Special EU Programmes Body.

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 Cooperation: 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.

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 Opérationelle 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 the Centre, the Royal School Armagh, the Armagh Observatory and the Armagh Planetarium came together to organise a second ‘Discover the Stars in Armagh: the Second Cross-Border Schools Science Conference’. Again this brought together 260 students from 16 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. The keynote lecture on ‘The Science of Armageddon’ was given by the leading British astronomer, Jay Tate of Spaceguard UK in Wales, and there were structured educational activities around the Planetarium’s ‘Star Show’ and the Observatory’s work on meteorites and the Human Orrery. The conference celebrated 2009 as the United Nations International Year of Astronomy. A third Cross-Border Schools Science Conference will be held in Armagh in May 2011.

THE TRANSFRONTIER EURO-INSTITUTE NETWORK (TEIN)

In November 2011 the Centre will organise an international conference on cross-border training at a venue in the Irish border region. It will bring together lecturers and students from centres and institutes of cross-border cooperation all over Europe together with public service officials involved in its implementation in Ireland and Europe.

This is an outcome of the Centre’s involvement in the Transfrontier Euro-Institute Network. This is a new EU Leonardo programme-funded network consisting of the following partnered research and training institutes and
Participants at the first meeting of the Transfrontier Euro-Institute Network (TEIN) in Kehl, Germany, October 2010

centres, and university departments of cross-border studies and cross-border cooperation:

- Euro-Institut, Kehl (German-French-Swiss borders) (lead partner)
- Carinthian University of Applied Sciences, Villach; University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Administration; ForSer (Austrian-Slovene-Italian borders)
- Olza Association; Institut Euroschoala (Czech-Polish border)
- Euro-Institut Caribéen (Caribbean space)
- Catalan Euro-Institute for Cross-Border Cooperation (Catalonia);
- Université de Pau et des Pays de l’Adour (Basque Country)
- Université de Nice; Région Provence Alpes Côte d’Azur (French-Italian border)
- Institut Européen pour la Coopération Territoriale (French-Belgian border)
- University of Southern Denmark, Department of Border Region Studies (Danish-German border)
- Centre for Cross Border Studies (Northern Irish-Irish border)

TEIN’s inaugural meeting took place in Kehl in October 2010. It aims to identify and begin to develop tools, methods and skills for cross-border training in Europe; start the process of developing a certification system for such cross-border training; provide the EU with a
trans-European network of cross-border training centres, and develop locally relevant training networks in specific fields such as public administration.

**PUBLICATIONS**

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**

The Centre for Cross Border Studies continues to play an important role in researching, developing and promoting cross border co-operation.

We particularly welcome the work that the Centre is taking forward on the development of the website [www.borderpeople.info](http://www.borderpeople.info) which the Centre operates in partnership with the NSMC Joint Secretariat. Traffic to Border People remains strong, with a monthly average of 6,478 visitors viewing 14,813 pages. Reciprocal links have been successfully established with NI Direct and Citizens Information, the public service providers for both jurisdictions. The Centre has also provided very valuable assistance to the NSMC Joint Secretariat in its work on identifying new and emerging cross-border mobility issues. The Centre has organised focus group discussions with key stakeholders on consumer, transport and employment related issues.

We commend the Centre for its high quality research, particularly in the health and education sectors. We look forward to continuing our co-operation with the Centre in 2011 and wish Andy Pollak and his team every success with their work.

North/South Ministerial Council Joint Secretaries, Mary Bunting and Anne Barrington, February 2011

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.

Minister for Foreign Affairs, Micheál Martin, April 2010

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 MLA, June 2009

The Centre for Cross Border Studies and its researchers are to be congratulated on their terrific record of achievement over the past 10 years. They have been at the forefront of policy research and development on a cross-border basis at a time of very significant change on the island, providing leadership and energy and dynamism in this key area. They have added to the knowledge base and brought together policy-makers, academics and researchers to seek practical solutions to issues of real relevance to people in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. One example of this kind of relevant work, undertaken in close collaboration with the North South Ministerial Council, is the development of the Border People mobility information website. The cross-border mobility issues on which this website provides information are a key...
priority for Ministers on both sides of the border.

I warmly and openly pay tribute to the Centre’s work. Without their energy and enthusiasm, the kind of practical cross-border cooperation issues now considered part of the mainstream certainly wouldn’t be considered as self-evidently important as they now are. When the Centre set out on its journey 10 years ago they were not considered self-evident at all. I particularly commend the new series of INTERREG-funded research projects on the border region economy, cross-border spatial planning, health, impact assessment and mobility information which they are currently embarking on.

Head of the Northern Ireland Civil Service, Sir Bruce Robinson, March 2009

The Centre for Cross Border Studies is an important catalyst for bringing people to work together across a range of social and economic issues and thus find out what they have in common. The tragedy of the recent past on this island is that we turned our backs on each other and did everything separately. The value the Centre adds is to show how much more we can achieve by working together. The whole reconciliation project on the island of Ireland is about people learning that they have so many interests in common. The Centre’s research and development work is key to building that kind of practical, mutually beneficial cooperation and collaboration.

The Taoiseach, Brian Cowen TD, March 2009

---

Students and speakers at the Trinity College Dublin ‘Hist’ North-South student debate with Irish Minister for Communications, Energy and National Resources, Eamon Ryan TD, Basil McCrea MLA, and NI Minister for Agriculture and Rural Development, Michelle Gildernew MP MLA (see page 141)
I have so far only been able to skim the contents of your latest Journal of Cross Border Studies in Ireland. But it is clear that this publication – as indeed, the Centre for Cross Border Studies of which it is a product – goes from strength to strength, and that the new edition makes a superb contribution to the consolidation and elaboration of the North/South agenda.

Sir George Quigley, Chairman, Bombardier Aerospace, March 2009

I mean it quite genuinely when I say that we wouldn’t be able to work at the level that we are working at – at ministerial or departmental level – if the ‘on the ground’ cross-border work hadn’t been happening for the last few years. If the type of interactions, workshops, seminars, publications and visiting speakers hadn’t been going on in frameworks like that of SCoTENS, the barriers wouldn’t have been broken down to the same degree. The contribution that SCoTENS, the Centre for Cross Border Studies and Andy Pollak have made to the overall process of peace and cooperation in this country is probably not widely noticed, but it is certainly well-recognised and well appreciated as part of the overall process.

Irish Minister for Education and Science, Mary Hanafin TD, November 2007

What the Centre for Cross Border Studies is doing is really important. We hope that you will provide analytical and research support to what we’re trying to do in the British-Irish Intergovernmental Conference, pushing forward a significant North-South agenda on a purely practical basis, and looking at the concept of an all-island economy. We need to maximise the benefits of this cross-border work, identifying what will and will not succeed. This is not an academic exercise – its practical outcomes are almost limitless. In economic terms this is a pretty small island which should be looking outwards towards the global economy rather than inwards. We need to be encouraging cross-border cooperation to gain the maximum benefits for Northern Ireland in that global context. This is very rich and fruitful territory for the Centre to be working in.

Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, Rt Hon Peter Hain MP, February 2007

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

by Brian Harvey (Brian Harvey Social Research, Dublin)

‘Clients of the Centre appraised its work as more than competent, demonstrating the highest levels of professionalism, coupled with commitment and invariable courtesy. Expert opinion likewise gave a high assessment of the Centre’s performance, admiring its quality, output, impact, relevance, value for money,
working methods, expertise, vision, tact and diplomacy.

Comments were: “its projects are always very thorough”; “doing a great job in challenging circumstances”; “the director has an excellent grasp of what is necessary to move things along”; “nothing more important than north-south reconciliation”; “contributes a significant amount of information to the wider policy arena”; “does important work and deserves more exposure”.

The Centre was considered to be professional, reliable and worked hard. Its staff were “a pleasure to deal with”. They did a “tremendous job”, provided “good support and service”, “they do what they have to do – and more.” All the staff were good – “but that comes from the values set down from the director at the top”. They were “efficient, focussed, interested and believed in what they were doing”.

“Several commented that the Centre went beyond what was expected, “treating the project pro-actively, bringing fresh energy and commitment, finding imaginative ways to work around problems”.

The Centre was admired and respected for its commitment, energy, political even-handedness and ability to open doors to people who might not otherwise be in contact with each other. It has oiled the wheels of co-operation better than anyone else could, bringing an ever wider range of people into co-operation – “not just border people, but as far south as Cork”.

‘All had a sense that the Centre had performed well on minimal staffing and resources. “It is transparent, managing an extensive programme, working within tight timeframes and with a small number of staff”.

One organisation, whose work had been facilitated by the Centre, spoke enthusiastically of the Centre’s commitment to arranging cross-border contacts and promoting relationships between groups that had hitherto little contact, making the comment that: “Once the relationship was established and got going, the Centre walked quietly away. It didn’t try to hog the limelight or build an empire but let them get on with it”.

“Several commented that the Centre went beyond what was expected, “treating the project pro-actively, bringing fresh energy and commitment, finding imaginative ways to work around problems”.

The Centre was admired and respected for its commitment, energy, political even-handedness and ability to open doors to people who might not otherwise be in contact with each other. It has oiled the wheels of co-operation better than anyone else could, bringing an ever wider range of people into co-operation – “not just border people, but as far south as Cork”.

‘All had a sense that the Centre had performed well on minimal staffing and resources. “It is transparent, managing an extensive programme, working within tight timeframes and with a small number of staff”.

One organisation, whose work had been facilitated by the Centre, spoke enthusiastically of the Centre’s commitment to arranging cross-border contacts and promoting relationships between groups that had hitherto little contact, making the comment that: “Once the relationship was established and got going, the Centre walked quietly away. It didn’t try to hog the limelight or build an empire but let them get on with it”. 
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The director of the Centre is Andy Pollak, formerly religion and education correspondent and Belfast reporter with The Irish Times, and in the early 1990s coordinator of the Opsahl Commission.

The Centre’s deputy director (research) is Ruth Taillon, formerly research coordinator with Border Action (partnership of Combat Poverty Agency and Pobal). Its IT manager is Joseph Shiels, a former software developer with Fujitsu and consultant with PricewaterhouseCoopers.

The Centre’s finance and administration manager is Mairéad Hughes. The director’s PA and events manager is Patricia McAllister. The INICCO project administrator is Eimear Donnelly. The information officer is Annmarie O’Kane.
EXTRACTS FROM 2009-2010 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 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Total Funds 2010</th>
<th>Total Funds 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming resources/income</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for generating funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>818,321</td>
<td>818,321</td>
<td>755,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming resources from charitable activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other incoming resources</td>
<td>326,491</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>326,491</td>
<td>334,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total incoming resources</td>
<td>326,491</td>
<td>818,321</td>
<td>1,144,812</td>
<td>1,090,667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Resources expended/expenditure | | | | |
|Charitable activities | 334,002 | 651,958 | 985,960 | 999,762 |
|Costs of generating funds | 7,518 | 851 | 8,369 | 20,635 |
|Governance costs | 3,995 | - | 3,995 | 3,525 |
|Total resources expended | 345,515 | 652,809 | 998,324 | 1,023,992 |

| Net movement in funds/net income and expenditure | | | | |
|(19,024) | 165,512 | 146,488 | 66,745 |

| Total funds brought forward | | | | |
|202,132 | 339,770 | 541,902 | 475,157 |

| Total funds carried forward | | | | |
|183,108 | 505,282 | 688,390 | 541,902 |
The allocation of funds brought forward between restricted and unrestricted has been restated to reflect a review of the balances and future commitments. 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 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debtors</td>
<td>938,486</td>
<td>730,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash at bank and in hand</td>
<td>1,855</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>940,341</td>
<td>730,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creditors: amounts falling due within one year</strong></td>
<td>(251,951)</td>
<td>(188,621)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net current assets</strong></td>
<td>688,390</td>
<td>541,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>183,108</td>
<td>202,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>505,282</td>
<td>339,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total funds</strong></td>
<td>688,390</td>
<td>541,902</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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