THE JOURNAL OF CROSS BORDER STUDIES IN IRELAND

No. 7 Spring 2012

Cover illustration: The Falls, Belfast 2011 by Hannah Starkey, © the artist, courtesy Maureen Paley, London

The Centre for Cross Border Studies is part-financed by the European Union’s European Regional Development Fund through the EU INTERREG IVA Programme managed by the Special EU Programmes Body.
The artist Hannah Starkey explains the cover picture, The Falls, Belfast 2011.

This is a scene I photographed while visiting the area where I grew up. I used to help my mother in the Andy Town market and remember the terrible poverty and desperate circumstances people were living in. My mother would help where she could, allowing people to buy on credit and making sure they had their school uniforms and other essentials. She taught me life lessons in empathy and compassion which I now employ in my art. The mural wall references the romantic idealism and political reality of West Belfast. The 10-year-old girl is isolated on the rock, a symbol that represents the stifling political situation and lack of economic investment in these areas. Belfast may look great now, but the working class communities who suffered the most are still lacking good infrastructure and facilities for their children. I met wonderful kids with so much potential but nowhere to play. After the ‘Troubles’ I would have thought that it would be possible to find funding to help such a community to turn itself around. The will is definitely there, but not the money. The picture is asking: What is the legacy after 30 years of conflict?
The staff of the Centre for Cross Border Studies: From left to right (front row): Andy Pollak, Ruth Tailon, Annmarie O’Kane: (back row) Mairead Hughes, Patricia McAllister, John Driscoll (Director of International Centre for Local and Regional Development), Eimear Donnelly, Joe Shiels.
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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.
It gives me great pleasure to write my first foreword as chair of the Centre in this, the seventh *Journal of Cross Border Studies in Ireland*. Since its establishment 13 years ago the Centre has seen many changes in the political and economic climate on the island of Ireland. The Centre was established in the aftermath of the 1998 Good Friday/Belfast agreement. Optimism was in the air, the economy was booming and there was renewed vigour in forging North-South co-operation at political, administrative, business and community level. While, thankfully, we continue to have peace on the island of Ireland, the context within which the Centre is now operating is very different from its earlier years.

The focus in both parts of the island is now on addressing the economic crisis. The Republic of Ireland’s Programme for Government states its support for North-South co-operation and the Northern Ireland Executive’s draft Programme for Government refers to the importance of formal structures and day-to-day contact between the two administrations. However the reality in these economically straitened times is to look first to what can be done in our own jurisdictions before we look across the border. By lifting our heads up, nevertheless, we may see the economic, social and community opportunities and benefits of greater co-operation across the border, especially if we build this into our day-to-day work.

The Centre for Cross Border Studies can provide a valuable resource in this regard. Over the years the Centre has built up a wealth of evidence on cross border synergies in areas as diverse as telecoms technologies, health services, education, animal disease, local government, regional economics and sustainable development to name but a few. Government departments, public and private agencies, and NGOs can look to the Centre to assist in informing their work and in researching the potential of cross border linkages and partnerships.

**More Europe-facing**

Over the past 12 months the Centre has been positioning itself – through publishing new tools like the *Impact Assessment Toolkit for Cross Border...*
Cooperation, active membership of the Transfrontier Euro-Institut Network (TEIN) and in other ways – to do more work in the broader European field and to re-brand itself as a ‘Europe-facing’ institute. In this context, the highlight of the past year has been the publication and roll-out – in the form of training workshops – of its new Impact Assessment Toolkit for Cross Border Cooperation, which was widely and enthusiastically welcomed for its timeliness and usefulness in both parts of Ireland and by a range of EU agencies and departments such as the Special EU Programmes Body in Belfast, DG Regional Policy in Brussels and INTERACT in Bratislava. Deputy Director Ruth Taillon, who led this project along with colleagues Joachim Beck and Sebastian Rihm from the Euro-Institut in Germany, was in great demand as a trainer in Ireland, North and South, and Scotland, as well as travelling to speak about the toolkit in Brussels, Rome and Valencia.

At time of writing the other four so-called INICCO projects – funded under the 2009-2012 INTERREG IVA programme through the Special EU Programmes Body – have either been completed or are about to be completed. The second report of the cross-border hospitals study – entitled Exploring the Potential of Cross-Border Hospital Planning on the Island of Ireland: A Prototype Modelling Framework – was launched in Belfast in December 2011. It examined the potential of cross-border services in five areas: orthopaedic surgery, ENT, paediatric cardiac surgery, cystic fibrosis and acute mental health.

The Centre’s sister organisation, the International Centre for Local and Regional Development (ICLRD) continued its excellent work through the third project, the Cross-border Spatial Planning and Training Network (CroSPiAN). A particular success here has been its work in training local authority officials in the three cross-border regions – the eastern, north-western and central border regions – in planning for future cross-border development. The most outstanding output of these executive training courses was the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding between Newry and Mourne District Council and Louth Local Authorities in Brussels in March 2011 to allow them to work together formally on a
range of environmental, energy, tourism and regeneration projects. European Commission officials hailed this as the most advanced cross-border instrument of its type in the EU.

The fourth project was the Border Region Economy research study, led by two internationally eminent economists, Dr John Bradley, formerly of the Economic and Social Research Institute in Dublin, and Professor Michael Best of University of Massachusetts Lowell and Cambridge University. This saw a highly successful ‘emerging findings’ conference in November 2011 and a final report - Cross-Border Economic Renewal: Rethinking Regional Policy in Ireland - ready for publication in early March 2012. The conference concluded with a proposal for a special ‘Border Development Zone’ to address the particular economic weaknesses (and occasional strengths, including some very dynamic SMEs) of the Irish cross-border region.

The fifth EU-funded project was the Border People cross-border mobility information website, which continued to provide – for the fifth year – vital information on social security, tax, welfare, healthcare, pensions and other practical issues for people moving across the border to live, work, study and retire. In the autumn of 2011 its monthly usage was running at over 9,000 visits and nearly 20,000 page views, well up on previous years. It also ran several well-attended cross-border business information events with the IBEC-CBI Joint Business Council in Monaghan, Letterkenny and Manorhamilton.

The Centre’s ‘house’ website also went from strength to strength, with a particularly dramatic 20,000 rise in monthly page views, so that its usage has now risen tenfold since it started in 2003. The four other CCBS websites have also maintained or increased their usage levels:
- www.borderpeople.info (see above);
- www.borderireland.info (particularly its Media Centre’s monitoring of cross-border news coverage);
- http://scotens.org (Standing Conference on Teacher Education North and South) and
- www.universitiesireland.ie (Universities Ireland).
The fourth and fifth meetings of the North South Research Forum, which brings researchers, policy-makers and funders together to discuss cross-border matters of mutual interest, were held in Derry and Belfast in June and December 2011. They were on cross-border peacebuilding and health cooperation. The Centre has also become one of two Northern organisers (with W5 in Belfast) of the all-island Debating Science Issues schools debating competition.

Other research work completed and/or commissioned in the past year has included a study of North-South undergraduate flows for the IBEC-CBI Joint Business Council and the EURES Cross-Border Partnership; a review of North-South postgraduate flows for the Irish Department of Education and Skills; a scoping study on the potential of ‘value for money’ North-South public service cooperation for the Irish Department of Foreign Affairs (by Dublin consultant Michael D’Arcy); and a study for the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust on how the JRCT’s work in the Republic might complement, through cross-border cooperation, its work in Northern Ireland.

Three large and successful conferences were organised in the autumn of 2011, all of them in Cavan. In September the Standing Conference on Teacher Education North and South (SCoTENS) held its ninth annual international conference on promoting literacy and numeracy, with keynote speakers Professor Terezinha Nunes from Oxford University, Irish Chief Inspector Dr Harold Hislop and the leading British educationalist Sir Bob Salisbury. In October over 130 people came from 12 countries to an international conference entitled ‘Cross-Border Training and Impact Assessment in Ireland and Europe’ at which the CCBS’s new Impact Assessment Toolkit was launched by Dr José Antonio Ruiz de Casas, a senior official from DG REGIO in Brussels. In November another 120 people attended the ‘emerging findings’ conference of the Border Region Economy project under the title ‘Reviving the Border Region Economy in a time of Peace, Devolved Government and International Recession.’ This was addressed by luminaries such as former IDA head Padraic White and former Director of the Confederation of Irish Industry, Liam Connellan.

Irish and European networks

SCoTENS, and the Centre’s management of it, is widely recognised in the education field as an example of a real North-South cooperation success story. A September 2011 evaluation of eight years of SCoTENS work by a team from Oxford University’s Department of Education was glowing: ‘The findings of our evaluation are overwhelmingly positive. Despite limited and precarious funding, significant dependence on the goodwill of volunteers and the support of a paid secretariat with myriad other responsibilities, it has achieved an enormous amount...Many of those we spoke to believed that the majority of the initiatives SCoTENS has led – conferences, research projects, the student exchange programme – would simply not have happened without the organisation: its leadership and
administration were vital.’ The number of SCoTENS-funded research, conference and exchange projects rose to nearly 80 by March 2012.

Universities Ireland (UI), another CCBS-run higher education network, ended one major project – the Irish-African Partnership for Research Capacity Building (IAP) – in 2011, with a final workshop in Dar es Salaam in September. The following month it started a new and completely different project – a UI Historians Group to reflect on the 1912-1923 period – which has brought together outstanding scholars from the island’s nine universities to plan a programme of research scholarships, archival access, public conferences and other activities around that revolutionary era in modern Irish history. Five young people were awarded UI North/South postgraduate scholarships, which this year were co-sponsored by ESB Electric Ireland and focused on energy and engineering subjects.

The International Centre for Local and Regional Development (ICLRD) – for which the Centre provides office and administration support – held a very successful annual conference in Dundalk in January 2012 entitled ‘Planning for a New Future: Can planning and cross-border cooperation deliver change in Ireland and Europe?’ It ran highly regarded executive training programmes for local councillors and officials in the North West and central border region on spatial planning and cross-border cooperation, and saw similar work in the Newry and Mourne-Louth region rewarded with the signing of an unprecedented Memorandum of Understanding. ICLRD also published new research reports on cross-border river basin management and functional territories and (in collaboration with the All-Island Research Observatory – AIRO – at NUI Maynooth) highly innovative all-island research tools on housing monitoring and accessibility mapping, and an all-island deprivation index.

The Transfrontier Euro-Institut Network (TEIN), which brings together cross-border research and training institutes and university departments dealing with cross-border cooperation in 10 European border regions – and of which the Centre for Cross Border Studies is a leading member – held meetings over the past 12 months in Villach (Austria), Trinec (Czech Republic), Armagh and Banyuls (French Catalonia). TEIN has submitted an application for further EU Leonardo programme funding to adapt and develop a number of toolkits in intercultural cross-border project management and moderation of meetings which have been pioneered in the Upper Rhine Franco-German-Swiss region. TEIN is also involved in organising a major symposium on capacity-building and impact assessment in Brussels in July 2012 along with the French Government’s cross-border cooperation agency MOT and the Association of European Border Regions.

At time of writing, the Centre, in close collaboration with the ICLRD along with a range of other partners, is preparing a follow-up funding application to the INTERREG IVA programme (2013-2015). This package of proposals will build on the research findings and
training and impact assessment tools of INICCO Phase 1 and its five projects. Its proposed outputs will be a mixture of new research reports and publications; advocacy seminars (for example on the Europe 2020 strategy); budget, evaluation and mentoring tools, and the development and dissemination of new tools in spatial planning, shared services and other areas, including updating the ICLRD’s all-island digital atlas and deprivation index using the 2011 Census figures in both jurisdictions (with AIRO). There will be new research projects into the potential of a cross-border development zone in the Irish border region and shared services; a new training and capacity-building dimension to Border People; work with the Cooperation and Working Together (CAWT) cross-border health network on mapping acute specialities in Irish and Northern Irish hospitals; and more executive training programmes with border region local authorities, led again by ICLRD.

In addition, the Centre and the Euro-Institut are preparing a joint proposal, based on the methodology of the Impact Assessment Toolkit for Cross Border Cooperation, to the EU’s territorial cooperation training agency, INTERACT, to undertake a review of INTERREG programmes throughout Europe in the context of the new EU Cohesion Policy.

Overall, it has been a very busy year for the Centre, with new avenues opened, particularly at European level. The quality and quantity of the work achieved is a tribute to Andy and his very able staff team of Ruth, Mairéad, Joseph, Patricia, Eimear and Annmarie. The core partnership with the ICLRD – and particularly with John Driscoll and Caroline Creamer – has been strengthened and deepened in the past year.

The staff are purposefully supported by a very committed board. We bade farewell to outgoing Chair Chris Gibson this year and to Dermot Diamond who is on sabbatical. During his eleven and a half years as chair of the Centre Chris oversaw its development, steering it from very small beginnings to the reputable organisation it is today. We wish Chris all the best in his future endeavours. We welcome to the Board Ann McGeeney, former director of the Cross Border Centre for Community Development at Dundalk Institute of Technology, who brings a breadth and depth of expertise and practical experience in cross-border working, particularly at community level.

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

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

We would also like to express our gratitude to the various other organisations which have partnered the Centre over the past 12 months: notably the North South Ministerial Council Joint Secretariat, with special thanks to Northern Joint Secretary Mary Bunting and Acting Southern Joint Secretary Margaret Stanley; the Department of the Taoiseach and the Department of Foreign Affairs; the nine universities, with particular thanks to the current Universities Ireland chairman, Professor Michael Murphy, President of University College Cork; the nine colleges of education and 26 other institutional subscribers to SCoTENS, with particular gratitude to the SCoTENS co-chairs, Dr Tom Hesketh, Director of the Regional Training Unit in Belfast.
Again we have to thank our advertisers, many of them cross-border bodies or companies themselves, who have faithfully supported this Journal in recent years, and have advertised again this year despite often severe financial constraints. They are Safefood, Tourism Ireland, InterTradeIreland, Weber Shandwick, Cooperation Ireland, Armagh City Hotel (Mooney Hotel Group), FPM Chartered Accountants, Leslie Stannage Design (who design all the Centre's publications and reports), Armagh City and District Council, EURES Cross-Border Partnership, John McMahon and Co and the Radisson Blu Farnham Estate Hotel in Cavan (where we held three highly successful conferences in autumn 2011).

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 friends, colleagues and close partners in the ICLRD: Director John Driscoll (who is also Vice-President of the Institute for International Urban Development): Deputy Director, Caroline Creamer of NUI Maynooth, and Assistant Director Dr Neale Blair of University of Ulster.
‘AS AN ISLAND, LET US SHOW THE WORLD WHAT WE CAN REALLY DO’: INTERVIEW ON NORTH-SOUTH COOPERATION WITH THE TAOISEACH, ENDA KENNY TD

Enda Kenny TD

How are Fine Gael-Labour policies on North-South Cooperation different from those of the last government? Which North-South areas are you prioritising in these financially difficult times?

First of all, it’s not that you change direction completely in the context of Northern Ireland when there’s a change of government – obviously everybody stands on the same platform here in terms of the Good Friday Agreement and the St Andrews Agreement and the implementation of those agreements. I have to say that there is a very strong relationship between the Government here and the Executive and the Assembly in Northern Ireland. What we are all really aiming for is a prosperous Republic and a prosperous Northern Ireland, where people are working at job and career opportunities in their own location, and as a consequence you continue to build the peace between communities which is so important.

While you have got peace at a political level which has been so hard won, there is always the need for vigilance in communities, because unemployment or lack of facilities can aggravate tensions. That is why the strengthening of the economy is so important: for example, there has been talk of corporate tax changes in Northern Ireland, and we have joint problems with diesel smuggling and laundering. These are issues that both governments in Dublin and Belfast can deal with together from a business perspective. Tourism, education and health and cross-border activities in terms of business are always priorities and will continue to be so. Agriculture is another area: our agri-food exports are over €9 billion, which we hope to raise to €12 billion by 2014 – and clearly the Northern Ireland economy has much to gain from the
powerhouse that is the South in that regard.

Would you agree that North-South cooperation has been one of the quiet success stories of the Northern Ireland peace process? What do you think are its main achievements over the past decade and a half?

It has been one of the quiet successes. I was Minister for Trade in the nineties and before that a Junior Minister back in the eighties. And even in those times of trouble, you had continuous trade between North and South, with people from the North testing their products in the bigger market of the South, and people from the Republic testing their products in Northern Ireland before selling them to the bigger British market. With the peace process cooperation has become formalised, if you like, and the present normality of relations speaks for itself.

I have made this next point on many occasions: that the visit of the Queen here was the closing of the circle of history. It was begun by Mary Robinson, followed through by Mary McAleese, with her ‘building bridges’ theme. Both these influential women worked towards the visit by Her Majesty, the first in a hundred years, and this restored normality formally – and that is what you would expect the Heads of State of two neighbouring, friendly states to do, to visit each other and to be well received and generously applauded and to create the current sort of harmonious environment. This is perfectly normal. So like the Queen’s visit, North-South cooperation has been a quiet success story, but it is been very hard won and it has to be worked on all the time.

How have the economic recession and the government’s financial problems affected North-South cooperation?

We have had to limit the money to the A5. Back in the days of the Celtic Tiger, there was talk of committing €400-500 million for that road, but the expenditure ceilings that have been set by the Government here meant that we have had to reduce our spending with serious money on such major infrastructural projects – meaning that we have had to make an allocation of €50 million in 2015-2016. I went up to Belfast and explained that to First Minister Robinson and Deputy First Minister McGuinness, and they were able to re-configure the construction of the road into three sections to cater for that allocation in 2015-2016.

We were able to continue to fund the radiotherapy unit in Altnagelvin, which I think is an important signal about health in a cross-border sense. We are also looking at issues of tourism: the Irish Open is going North this year, and with the three Open champions you now have from Northern Ireland, that is a big signal on a global scale. I had the privilege of playing with young Rory Mcllroy last year during the Irish Open in Killarney.

I try to see things on a cross-border basis all the time. When this comes up in the North South Ministerial Council, I encourage the Ministers and Ministers
Co-operation Ireland’s mission is to underpin political agreement on the island of Ireland by building positive relationships at community level, both within Northern Ireland and between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland, through the promotion of mutual understanding and co-operation.

Co-operation Ireland works in the following areas...

- Youth Development
- Community Engagement
- Education and Civic Engagement
- Specific International Reconciliation Projects
- Fundraising and Special Events
of State here to be very engaged with the people in Northern Ireland. One of the things I stressed in London 10 days ago, when speaking to the British Prime Minister, David Cameron, was to say that we should keep encouraging people there in their work to build good relationships for the future, and we did agree on keeping our regular connections with the communities in the North. I was in the Short Strand in East Belfast some time ago, and you could see the evidence of that cross-community building: where people were originally very polarised, now there was really strong work from both communities going on, with people saying this is the path for the future. You have to raise young people with those objectives in mind: to keep working together for mutual understanding.

Is there a danger of both politicians and people in the South turning in on themselves during this period of recession and forgetting about the peace that was so hard won in Northern Ireland, and in particular the importance of the North-South ‘Strand Two’ of that peace?

Well, I think that normality often in politics leads to forgetfulness, so it is important that the structures that are now in place for some time continue to be managed. That is why I am happy to attend North South Ministerial Councils; that is why the bodies under the North South Ministerial Council continue to meet and Ministers pick up the telephone and talk to each other – all that is important.

But it is also important that in the House – the Oireachtas – we speak about these things when it is appropriate, at Question Time or whenever. I understand the tensions that can arise and it is absolutely critical that politicians don’t forget the importance of keeping connections very much alive – both between North and South and between the communities in Northern Ireland – and to encourage business and trading and leisure links and all of these links that help the peace process.

How do you work in this area with DUP ministers in the Executive, who obviously might prefer that were was as little North-South cooperation as possible?

I think that First Minister Robinson has become very much focused on his job as First Minister, and on his perspective on the island economy – not to mention the challenges that the Executive face in Northern Ireland. Clearly his ability to travel with Deputy First Minister McGuinness and to interact with the parties here in the Republic is important in an island context and we support that very strongly.

There are issues like Project Kelvin which puts Northern Ireland right at the top internationally in terms of capacity for broadband communication – we need to follow that in the South so that we can bring the island to a point where it can be a global hub for Cloud Computing and for data content storage. We need to link into Kelvin so that we can light up the west coast with fibre, and local authorities from Derry down to West Cork can have a real opportunity to say
that data content and Cloud Computing is the place to be.

My mantra is very simple: by 2016 to prove firstly that we are the best small country in the world to do business with; secondly be the best country in the world in which to raise a family, and thirdly be the best country in the world in which to grow old with a sense of dignity and respect. These are things that are not unachievable.

Do you think that the North-South dimensions of those aims are important?

Yes, I do because they send out a signal globally. If you want to go to a place where the people have a passion for work, a passion for productivity, for high standards and competency, be it in food or technology or innovation or whatever, this is the island to be on.

Do you think North-South economic cooperation has any role in helping to get the island out of recession? If so, how?

Of course it has, and the trading links that I have referred to and the cooperation that exist in health and education are areas where we can do so much. We are the only English speaking country in the Euro zone, and although Northern Ireland is obviously associated with Sterling, we are still an
island - and people like to look at this island from abroad and think that we have got stability, we have got a location in Western Europe that has no military designs on any place else, and we have got a young population that is flexible enough to cater for the demands of whatever might arise.

I had a multinational chief executive in here some time ago, and she said: ‘We have brought our primary products from Silicon Valley to Ireland’. I asked: ‘What is the reason for that? Is it the Corporation Tax rate, or the fact that we are English speaking?’; She said: ‘No, it is the passion displayed by the young people for what they are doing’. That is a big signal about the younger generation, and we are very proud of that, North and South.

**What is your vision of the ‘island of Ireland’ economy in 10-15 years?**

I would like to see it being run competently, with economies that are growing and prosperous, and where people have the choice to stay at home in their own place and have a job and a career if that is what they want to do. If that is not what they want to do - and I hate to see forced emigration – at least if they go, they go with confidence and with competence. And the thing I notice about the Republic and indeed Northern Ireland in the last 10 or 15 years is the confidence of young people. They can stand up on any stage and articulate their arguments very powerfully and cogently. When I was up at the Aisling Awards in the Europa Hotel in Belfast in November I saw this: they got up there and said their piece or gave their performance, and it was the sense of ‘heads up’, the confidence, that was so important.

**Could you envisage the North South Ministerial Council’s remit being extended in the future to include areas of North-South cooperation other than those agreed in the Belfast and St Andrews Agreements? Which areas would you like these to be?**

The all-island energy market was one that was developed outside the Good Friday Agreement, and I think it is obviously of significant importance. If you look at both Britain and Ireland’s requirements for energy for the next 20 years, obviously there is a real problem there that can be partly tackled by such a market. In the Republic of Ireland and in Northern Ireland there are also opportunities for renewables to be sold to Britain.

I also think the visit of the Queen had an enormous impact on tourism in both parts of the island. When you think that Rory McIlroy is No. 2 in the world – and Graeme McDowell and Darren Clarke and of course Padraig Harrington – these are all iconic figureheads for young people. They are people of global reach. So I say to all those who are ‘swingers of the stick after the white ball’: if you want to find out the secret, you have to come to play here in Ireland and Northern Ireland.

So I think there are areas of energy, tourism and business which can be looked at. While the Good Friday Agreement was put together under
very difficult circumstances, it has its structures, but life is changing and we may need to widen those areas of cooperation. I think the recognition of cooperation between North and South is very important – whoever is in charge in 20-25 years time will live in a very different world, but it is still going to require human connection and doing business with each other.

Is there a case for more ‘value for money’ North-South cooperation between public service deliverers, particularly in areas like health, higher education and environmental services?

Yes - The way Northern Ireland has downsized the extent of its public service, and the cost of delivery of those public services, speaks for itself. And the same applies here in the Republic – I can’t give you the figures now because until the end of February we do not know how many civil servants will leave, but the cost of the delivery of public services has been reduced and with new technology the capacity for more cost-effective North-South shared services is clearly there.

I think education is an area here, and innovation, technology, research and design – all of these things that are changing the world that we live in are all certainly a central part of that. There is lots of potential in health: cancer treatment, centres of clinical excellence, radiotherapy. When the issues of ‘the troubles’ and wars are just a distant memory, these are the kind of services that are going to affect the quality of the lives of people in their hundreds and thousands for the future.
Would you encourage your civil servants to investigate seriously the feasibility of doing such joint work in the delivery of services?

Absolutely. We have a very strong commitment to seeing that that actually happens. I know that some civil servants have been moved from the positions they were in. But new circumstances and new responsibilities and new levels of cooperation, working together and understanding each other – that is absolutely part of what we want to project here. We cannot go on the way we are, and we are never going back, so we are going to put the country into the bright new light that is shining for us in the future.

Do you agree with the former Fianna Fail Minister Martin Mansergh that barriers to North/South cooperation have never been lower, and that the Government should concentrate on continuing to lower those rather than press any claims for Irish unity at a time when its overriding priority is to get the Irish economy out of its present mess?

Yes, I do, I agree with that. Barriers have never been lower, cooperation has never been higher: be it between the PSNI and the Gardaí; be it issues of trade and business; be it issues of education, research, and health – there are exceptionally high levels of cooperation in all these areas. I would like to see another real impact for Northern Ireland and for the Republic in the stimulation of the indigenous economies, North and South – which means small and medium enterprises cooperating.

We have also made arrangements in respect of NAMA for Northern Ireland and the bank issues that are there, so that is another important area for cooperation. Given that people North and South all have the same challenges, and we all breathe the same air, and the uncertainty that is out there in the Euro zone affects everybody, we need to get our island economy in a strong shape. That means elimination of waste, paring down of duplication, and having a lean, competent, professional public service machine that respects the personality of the people of the North and the people of the Republic and allows them to get on with their daily business. What can be more normal than to have people go about their daily business and be able to plan – as far as you can in this mortal world – for their future and the future of their families. That is what good politics is about, so our brand would be to work with the elected representatives in Northern Ireland for the benefit of the communities and the peoples North and South. And as an island, let us show the world what we can really do.

The former head of the IDA Padraic White said recently that the cross border region, which has always been rather peripheral, should come up with a plan for a ‘border development zone’, based on the existing entrepreneurial firms in the region and driven by dynamic county managers and local authority chief executives. Would you be supportive of such an idea?

You have a Border Midland and Western regional council which is part of a European entity. You don’t need
a plethora of new bodies to deal with this. I think that county managers with imagination and creativity can have a real impact on the topography and infrastructure in their areas and they also have cross border connections with local authority chief executives on the other side. The border region has had PEACE and INTERREG monies over the years, and these programmes have played a very important part, but good governance can spread the benefits of a well run economy throughout the region. The same opportunity for the small and medium enterprises in Cavan or Monaghan or Fermanagh or Tyrone should be there, in the same way as they are in the affluent areas of major cities.

Can I ask you what you think of the work of the Centre for Cross Border Studies?

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

_The interviewer was Andy Pollak and the interview took place on 20 January 2012._
THE AGREEMENT GENERATION: YOUNG PEOPLE’S VIEWS ON THE CROSS-BORDER RELATIONSHIP

Aoibhín de Búrca and Katy Hayward

Martin McGuinness’s candidacy for Sinn Féin in the 2011 Irish Presidential election brought the complex reality of the North-South relationship to the fore in a Southern political context. One particular question posed directly to McGuinness by a young woman in a debate on the RTÉ Frontline programme encapsulated an underlying tension (emphases as verbally delivered):

As a young Irish person, I am curious as to why you have chosen to come down here to this country, with all your baggage, your history, your controversy? And how do you feel you can represent me, as a young Irish person, who knows nothing of the Troubles and who doesn’t want to know anything about it? 1

McGuinness responded with the assertion that Derry is as Irish as Cork or Kerry – a comment that generated loud applause from the audience. He went on to state that, although he had met a ‘tiny minority of people who are partitionist in their thinking … the people of Ireland are not partitionist’.

Even if more than a tiny minority agree with this young woman’s opinions, her willingness to express them publicly is unusual in the Republic – perhaps it reflects the fact that historical progress, as well as geography, has fortunately distanced her from the conflict. Thus, the reason her question proved so striking is that it indicates not only alienation between North and South, but a growing inter-generational gap in attitudes towards the border. The young questioner simply equated ‘Northern’ with ‘Troubles’ and, therefore, as something she did not want to know about, let alone engage with. In this paper, we seek to understand a little more about the views of young people on both sides of the border about their relationship to each other. In doing so, we suggest that, as hinted by the tenor of the Frontline question,
it is not necessarily the case that the benefits of peace will be translated by the ‘Agreement Generation’ into more amicable cross-border relations.

The Agreement Generation

Young adults of today are the first generation of people on the island of Ireland raised in a context of a negotiated – and democratically endorsed – agreement on the constitutional question, supported by institutions working on a power-sharing, cross-border and inter-governmental basis. The 1998 Good Friday/Belfast Agreement provided an opportunity to reframe the various relationships within and between the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland. But its lasting legacy will be determined by those who were young children at the time of its conception – a generation whose views on the subject of the border and the ‘other’ across it remain relatively unknown.

Using Mannheim’s work on the sociology of generations, we define a ‘generation’ as an age group located within a shared social and historical process. Those whose early childhoods coincided with the peace process can be said to be part of this ‘generation location’. More difficult to identify is whether this group exist as a ‘generational actuality’, North and South, whereby they share a common vision, ideas and conceptual reference points. We could theoretically discover this if there appears to be evidence of identity shifts and norm-creation in line with the principles of the 1998 Agreement. Our examination of the concept of the ‘Agreement Generation’ does not expect convergence of opinion among Northern and Southern respondents on all topics of debate, but it is premised on the belief that the social and historical process stimulated by the 1998 Agreement has created a new all-island context for conceiving the Irish border and relationships across it.

In order to assess the impact of this changed context on the North-South views of the young people who make up the Agreement Generation, we briefly examine here the legacy of the conflict on opinion in the Republic (as reflected in anti-partitionism) and in Northern Ireland (as reflected in community relations) with reference to public opinion survey data as well as academic research on shifts in national and communal identity on the island. We then report the initial findings of a small focus group study with undergraduates in the Republic of Ireland from University College Dublin (UCD) and in Northern Ireland from Queen’s University Belfast (QUB). The focus groups were conducted to examine in depth the views and opinions of the younger generation regarding the conflict, the 1998 Agreement, the North-South relationship and their vision of the future of this relationship.

Anti-partitionism in the South

There is a tendency (as McGuinness predictably exemplified) to presume that the majority of people in the Republic are in favour of unity and have remained anti-partitionist since the creation of the state. However, unsurprisingly, polling data shows the issue to be more
complex. Support for a united Ireland was highest in the late 1970s and early 1980s during the ‘Troubles’, but by the turn of the century the European Values Survey (1999-2000) found that only a slight majority favoured Irish unity (54 per cent), whilst one third wanted to see an independent Northern Ireland. This very slender pro-unification majority is in line with more recent polling on the topic by the *Sunday Independent* and *Sunday Business Post* newspapers.

Additional questioning finds that unification is not an immediate objective, and the commitment and support to it is not always wholehearted. Thus Mair describes the attitude of Irish voters as: ‘Unity would be nice. But if it’s going to cost money, or result in violence, or disrupt the moral and social equilibrium, then it’s not worth it’. As the official version of Irish nationalism has rescinded irredentist claims over Northern Ireland as part of the peace process and a broader process of Europeanisation, so popular Irish nationalism has slowly incorporated ‘the physical border created between the North and South’.

Relevant to this, and notably present in the 2011 Presidential election debates, is the argument (by Fahey et al.) that civic features (i.e. centred on common laws, values and institutions) are more prominent than ethnic features (e.g. language, ancestry) in how people in the Republic define Irish nationalism and national identity. That said, although ‘speaking Irish’ or ‘being Catholic’ may be seen as optional identity markers for those born to white Irish parents in the 26 counties, the results and debate around the 2004 referendum on Irish citizenship arguably returned ethnicity and ancestry right to the heart of the process of determining ‘legitimate’ Irish identity. It appears indisputable that changes to Irish nationalism in the contemporary Republic are social and cultural in nature, as much as they are due to modified interpretations of the ‘constitutional question’.
The constitutional question has not been definitively resolved, but it was removed as an obstacle to cooperation by the 1998 Agreement. This has helped facilitate significant advances in policy sharing and regional infrastructure, as well as material, symbolic and cultural exchange (as assiduously reported and aided by the Centre for Cross Border Studies). The Agreement Generation have grown up with these new North-South developments and are thus part of a ‘generation location’; yet to what extent has this shaped the creation of common values and opinions that would indicate even a tentative cross-border ‘generational actuality’?

What’s new for the new generation in the North?

Studies of young people in contemporary Northern Ireland consistently point to the enduring legacy of the conflict. Connolly et al. found that cultural dispositions and prejudice are formed among children from a young age, and Leonard has shown that these cultural habits soon translate into the use of sectarian markers – and divergent social worlds – of Catholic and Protestant teenagers. Indeed, Shirlow and Murtagh argue that these cultural barriers are such that young people are more likely to hold sectarian views than their parents or grandparents. Such findings pose the risk of allowing young people to be presented as ‘perpetrators’ of the conflict rather than as its ‘victims’.

The Agreement Generation is made vulnerable to conflict by this persistent sectarianism, together with (according to the young participants in our study) the institutionalised segregation of the education system. Opinion surveys among young people in Northern Ireland consistently show that they are generally favourable to enabling greater ‘mixing’ between communities; indeed, 20 per cent see themselves as belonging to neither the Protestant nor Catholic community. Morrow’s study of a series of these surveys leads him to the conclusion that ‘this is a generation expectant of change’. Yet this tells us little in itself about what kind of society these young people might contribute to creating in Northern Ireland. Indeed, our tendency to burden young people both with the hope that they might bring future change, as much as to blame them for opportunistic/occasional sectarian disorder, only serves to disempower them as active citizens. A better approach would be to prioritise redressing the serious deficit in the recognition of young people’s rights which currently inhibits their engagement and participation in wider society.

Research study outline

For the purposes of this small study, we used the method of convening focus groups among social science undergraduates who were in their early years of primary school at the time of the 1998 Agreement: that is to say, students who will have had all their political socialisation and education in a post-Agreement environment (shared ‘generation location’). The rationale for the use of focus groups was to enable discussion to be centred upon five core themes but still be open to development in response to opinions and issues raised among the student groups.
themselves. These core themes were:

- Generational difference
- Knowledge of/familiarity with the 1998 Agreement
- Interpretation of the Agreement and its significance
- Cross border relations and perceptions
- The future: suggestions for building cooperation, especially within own generation.

Three focus groups were conducted (two in Dublin, one in Belfast), each session lasting around an hour and a half and involving an average of four participants. This data was supplemented by self-completed questionnaires of open-ended questions on these same topics to an additional set of students in Belfast. Ethical approval was given for this research by the relevant research ethics boards in both UCD and QUB. Particular care was taken to ensure that, although focus groups were held on campus to ensure that participants felt as comfortable as possible, students were absolutely clear that the process was wholly disassociated from their college studies and performance. All responses were fully anonymised and the recordings of the focus groups were accessible only to the interviewer.

We were conscious that some participants could find some of the topics covered sensitive, so the purpose and remit of the session, together with ground rules for constructive discussion, were made clear in advance, with each participant understanding that (s)he was free to withdraw at any point. Although participation was secured on an opt-in basis from students within the same social science degree programmes, we found that ensuring a mix of 2nd and 3rd year students meant that students tended not to know each other beforehand and knew their paths were unlikely to cross again, and therefore did not appear constrained from discussing the issues in hand.

Helping to ensure that students felt free to express their views was an especially important consideration for participants in Belfast, where (perhaps ironically given the ever-present issue of conflict) opportunities to discuss the subject openly in a cross-community group are still rare. Although we had a mixture of gender, social and religious backgrounds in these focus groups, we make no claim that these groups are representative of wider opinion in their age group. Nevertheless, we used this method to bring to a wider audience the views of some in this generation who, being third level social science students, are among the most engaged and informed regarding the subject in question.

**Generational difference**

All the students participating in this study identified a clear generational difference between their views and those of their parents and grandparents regarding the conflict and the ‘other side’ of the border. This was not framed consistently as being a result of having grown up in a post-ceasefire context. Indeed, one participant in a Dublin focus group argued, in response to McGuinness’s Presidential election candidacy:
That is the problem with Martin McGuinness running: it’s too fresh. It’s not that ‘your father did this to my father’, or ‘your grandfather did this to my grandfather’. It’s: ‘you did this to my family’. It’s too soon.¹⁸

It is notable that this view of the ‘live’ conflict is expressed by a Southern respondent – but it is surely no coincidence that this comment arose when discussing the Presidential candidacy of McGuinness. Perhaps this suggests that the young woman’s question on the Frontline programme encapsulated a wider popular fear, and even resentment, that McGuinness’s presence in the Presidential race was dragging the very issue of the Northern conflict back into the South and into the twenty-first century. In contrast, Northern respondents readily acknowledged that the conflict is still very ‘real’ for them (one respondent to the questionnaire stated: ‘Sectarian violence, and fear of it, doesn’t seem to be decreasing’), but were confident in drawing a distinction between their experience of it and those of their parents.

For example, one of the participants in the Belfast focus group described the fear and bitterness that shaped the lives of her grandparents as having been ‘phased out’ by the time of her generation.¹⁹ Her fellow focus group participants generally echoed the belief that they are relatively free from the burden of past hurts, and therefore were able to articulate a general optimism about the potential of their generation to ‘rise above’ identity politics and engage with more urgent problems. Indeed, all focus groups expressed particular frustration at the failure of politicians to concentrate on working together on issues of concern to everyone, such as health and education. The solution proffered in frank terms by one Dublin-based student was:

Make the Northern Ireland Assembly themselves make decisions. This will finally make the politicians answerable to the voters, and voters will ask: ‘Why did I vote for this person, they’re an idiot!’ And let them see that the politicians, when given responsibility, are not representing them and doing their job.²⁰

The 1998 Agreement

It is this perception that those currently in power are ‘still bitter and stuck’ that directly informs students’ slight caution towards the 1998 Agreement. One respondent to the QUB questionnaire wondered: ‘Did our parents make a mistake in agreeing to the Agreement? We’re wary of doing the same’. Students on both sides of the border are keen to judge the success of the Agreement on the basis of the changes it has facilitated rather than on its symbolic significance, seeing it, quite realistically, as an ongoing process fraught with difficulties.

Even though the Good Friday Agreement was sensationalised in the media as a great turning point, really it took many years for any of the stuff to come into practice. You know there is still a lot of hostility in many communities to the other
side. I think it’s really only now you’re seeing – with the regeneration programmes and stuff – a bit of change happening. …So I wouldn’t say [the Agreement is] a huge success.  

No student participant appeared to be entirely familiar with the minutiae of the Agreement and the subsequent institutions, but all seemed aware of its key areas of impact and, interestingly, the issues of contention around it.

Related to this point, the respondents generally agreed that progress in Strand Two is stymied by suspicions over the motivations for this North-South dimension, but Northern and Southern students had differing interpretations as to what the motivation for cooperation was. Whereas those in Belfast saw engagement with the South as directly related to religious or political affiliation, Southern students said the objective of cross-border cooperation was to promote investment and trade for mutual benefit, and was thus driven by financial considerations rather than any nationalist ideology or solidarity. (This is perhaps reflected in the fact that, of the participants in the Dublin focus groups who had visited Northern Ireland, many had done so to go shopping!) Otherwise, they argued, there is no incentive to cross the border – indeed, it appeared to them in some ways more awkward to do so than to travel elsewhere in Europe.

The ‘other jurisdiction’

In comparing both jurisdictions, the Dublin-based students highlighted the changing nature of ‘Irishness’ and nationalism in the Republic in the past century, particularly the diminishing importance (in their eyes) of religion and traditional ethnic nationalism. Furthermore, the Southern students suggested that the British-Irish relationship is more positive, or at least less fraught, than the North-South relationship; some went so far as to indicate more affinity with London than Belfast, due not only to its cultural diversity and size but also to a sense of simply not understanding Belfast. Although respondents recounted largely positive experiences of crossing the border, some confessed that doing so made them consider the cultural differences between them to be greater than they had originally believed.

More broadly, the students readily acknowledge the complexity and ambiguity of the current arrangement. Southern respondents in particular expressed frustration at the difficulty of classifying the relationship of Northern Ireland to the Republic:

We don’t know what they are. It’s not clear. They aren’t just a neighbour or another country like Spain. They aren’t like England either. So they’re not a neighbour, but they are also not part of Ireland as things stand. Nobody has come up with a definition of what the relationship is between the 26 counties and the 6 counties.  

The use of language and ambiguity, its role in positioning and identification, and the difficulties that exist regarding certain terms, was mentioned repeatedly in the
focus group discussions. The reasons for this perhaps include the fact that, as they talked, the students themselves became aware of how cautious they are habitually prone to be when discussing the topic of the conflict and cross-border relations.

Related to this, one finding from the focus groups is that the Northern and Southern respondents view one another, and the ‘other jurisdiction’, in quite different terms. In this very small study, all the Dublin-based students explicitly recognised partition. One UCD student put it bluntly:

Neither of us want it [Northern Ireland]: neither us nor the UK government. I’d say if you asked the majority of Irish people – yes, nationalists, out of a sense of allegiance, might say they wanted Northern Ireland – but it’s really far more trouble than it’s worth. I mean to integrate Northern Ireland into this state – why would you be bothered? The status quo satisfies everyone.  

Nevertheless, some of his fellow respondents confirmed that they aspire for a united Ireland in the future, and reaffirmed the right to hold such aspirations. More of them expressed a curiosity about the North, and a desire to improve the relationship with it and to be actively inclusive in doing so. There was more divergence among the views of the Northern respondents about North-South relations, and this – not surprisingly – appeared to relate to traditional lines of political affiliation. All of them, however, expressed surprise at their Southern counterparts’ explicit recognition of two jurisdictions and their perception of ‘huge cultural difference’ between North and South.

The legacy of conflict

The cultural ‘otherness’ of the North was frequently and unambiguously claimed by our Southern respondents, including by those who expressly hoped for Irish unification. The example of ‘painted kerbstones’ was raised in each of the focus group discussions (North and South) by the participants as a convenient illustration of the division and confrontational identities still associated with Northern Ireland. One Dublin-based student used the language of bio-cultural determinism to explain his lack of identification with his Northern counterparts: ‘kids [in Northern Ireland] are brought up in such an environment that [it] means the conflict is embodied in them. ...I just don’t know how far they have come.’ Another, in a different group, similarly described the conflict in Northern Ireland as: ‘an inbred thing of “I must take the side of the Catholics or the Protestants”. He then went on to make a somewhat surprising local comparison: ‘You know, it’s like Fianna Fáil people just hate Fine Gael people and they don’t even know why!’ Such sweeping generalisations were not reciprocated by the Northern respondents towards the Republic and its population.

Somewhat ironically, given the ease with which some of the Dublin students stereotyped Northern Ireland and Northerners, the need for diplomacy and tact in North-South relations was acknowledged by all. Some frustration
was expressed at the fact that the North-South relationship (or, indeed, unification) is rarely discussed openly and honestly. Most explain this to be due to necessary consideration of opposing views and out of a concern to not do anything to damage the fragile peace. All expressed some exasperation with people, including parents as well as politicians, who still focus on and thus perpetuate the traditional divides and divisive constitutional question. They saw this very much as a problem of older generations rather than their own.

This reflects the fact that all our respondents appeared to draw a direct link between ‘traditional’ views, ‘bias/prejudice’ and the Northern conflict. Northern respondents were careful to constantly reiterate that their generation is determined that political goals are ‘not worth the cost’ of violence. As one (nationalist) participant said when talking about the aspiration of Irish unity: ‘a lot of people growing up now can’t be bothered with it. They are nearly fed up hearing about it. No one cares anymore’. Southern respondents were equally aware of the priority and fragility of peace and perceived strong Irish nationalism to pose a threat to this, as seen in one person’s description of the situation in Northern Ireland:

It’s a tinderbox and if you push it, it might just explode, and no one wants to go back to what it was. Nobody wants to go back to shootings. Even during the recent riots in Belfast everyone just thought: ‘What are you doing? Just get a grip of yourselves and calm down’.

The future

Such events as the summer 2011 riots in Belfast contributed to the sense of general pessimism regarding the current state of affairs in Northern Ireland (with concerns over the North-South relationship voiced by the Southern students in particular). Nevertheless all participants expressed the hope that the remaining problems can be addressed, not least because they see these as ‘bread and butter issues’ for which solutions can be found, given the political will (a factor viewed by our respondents as being all too often in short supply).

First, they expressed a wish to see the end of segregation in housing and education, and impatience with the lack of initiatives in these areas. They also had many suggestions of their own: such as to teach similar civic and history education to students on both sides of the border; to give more media coverage to North-South cooperation and cross-border bodies; to cooperate on upcoming commemorations in order to show respect for one another’s important historical events rather than allow them to be divisive; and to establish third level cross-border exchanges so that students can become familiar and engaged with their counterparts over a period of time in a safe environment.

If the Northern conflict endures because of fear, then our findings (as with the response to McGuinness’s presidential campaign) suggest that it will also continue to linger in the cross-border relationship within the young people who
make up the Agreement Generation. The young generation in the South still perceive the North with some degree of apprehension – something that is based on a simple association of the North, and Northerners, with conflict (as evident in the *Frontline* question directed to McGuinness). Even our young Dublin-based respondents have internalised a wariness of ‘huge cultural difference’ (expressed in their concerns about wearing the wrong colour shirt or having a noticeable accent) that reinforces in their own minds the ‘otherness’ of Northern Ireland and the implications of crossing the border.

It is notable, however, that such fears are not reciprocated with nearly as much broad intensity of feeling by Northern respondents towards the South (although community background and proximity to the border are significant variables). One Belfast-based student even attempted to empathise with her Southern counterparts’ fears by making the analogy of cross community relations:

*I suppose [for a Dublin student crossing the border] it’s how a Protestant feels going into a Catholic area: it makes you feel maybe a bit uneasy – and the same with a Catholic going into a Protestant area. I wouldn’t say it’s entirely different with North and South.*

This debate reveals something of the enduring attentiveness to cultural difference and borders/boundaries for the Agreement Generation, North and South. Yet their broad willingness to empathise and to be aware of the sensitivities of the subject and, furthermore, not to allow this uneasiness to transmogrify into prejudice or conflict, is something that characterised the discussion of the North-South relationship across our study.

This is connected to the overriding theme emerging from all our focus group discussions: the need to affirm the norm of consent and respect for difference, and not to force people into identity categories or constitutional positions. In so doing, our respondents, North and South, appear to have – to no insignificant degree – incorporated the key principles of the 1998 Agreement into their thinking on the North-South relationship (principles such as replacing absolutist goals with political accommodation, mutual consent, acceptance of differing national identities and principles, and pursuing political aims by peaceful means).

This may be seen to constitute the tentative elements of a ‘generational actuality’ that gives the very concept of an all-island Agreement Generation some validity. Sharing these values, this generation see themselves as being better placed than their parents to work on building North-South trust and respect. But they also readily acknowledge that the embedding of peace requires deep political and social reform that will not simply appear as a product of the passing of time. The Agreement Generation (and their cross-border relationships) remain indisputably affected by the legacy of conflict; yet their very awareness of this legacy, and of the long distance yet to
be travelled to realise the Agreement-based principles they share, constitutes a common foundation for their role in the consolidation of peace.
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RETHINKING REGIONAL RENEWAL: TOWARDS A CROSS-BORDER ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ZONE IN IRELAND

John Bradley and Michael Best

The task of getting national economic development strategy right is hard enough. But the challenge of regional development strategy is even harder. To paraphrase the famous opening lines of Tolstoy’s Anna Karenina: ‘All happy regional economies resemble one another, but each unhappy region is unhappy in its own way’. Since 1922 our perspectives on the development challenges of the macro economies of the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland have been reasonably well articulated and systematic, and have gradually became more effective as these two economies progressively integrated with the wider world economy.1 On the other hand, our perspectives on the development of the sub-regions of the island have tended to be partial, distorted, poorly organised and often ineffective.

Previous regional development perspectives have been partial because there is a natural tendency to focus almost exclusively on the role of public policy-makers and neglect other NGO and private sector actors and actions. They are distorted because from a mainly public policy perspective it is difficult to understand the true potential and structural characteristics of regional economies and how they evolve and grow in an organic way. They are poorly organised, not for lack of regional enthusiasm, but because it has proved extremely difficult to coordinate the many actors and layers of decision making that need to be involved. They are ineffective because there is a strong preference to rely on national strategic development frameworks with the hope that centralised policies will generate sufficient spillover and trickle-down effects from core, densely populated regions to peripheral, sparsely populated regions.

It is not much of an exaggeration to say that we have never really taken regional
policy very seriously on this island, which is something of a paradox in view of the extremely strong identification Irish people have with their own native counties and towns. In the post-World War Two era there was a vigorous debate on ‘growth poles’ as a new orientation of national development strategy, where growth poles are usually large urban locations that benefit from agglomeration economies. In the 1960s Buchanan’s proposal for Ireland was to select a small number of such ‘poles’ for special development with the expectation that they would interact with surrounding areas, spreading prosperity from the core to the periphery.

Regional dispersal policy

The outcome of the 1960s debate led to the rejection of ‘polar’ development strategies in favour of a policy that actively promoted regional dispersal of the benefits of (mainly) inward investment. Yet 50 years later we have an island that has a small number of developed urban regions with infrastructure that is fit for purpose and activity sustained by a largely foreign-owned manufacturing base, with expansion of internationally traded services taking up the slack in recent years. The less favoured rural hinterlands and more peripheral regions have had some injections of foreign direct investment, but this has created the phenomenon of the ‘one plant town’ that is uniquely vulnerable and never likely to become self-sustaining. In other words, the well intentioned polices of dispersal of economic development to the regions were frustrated by the impersonal, inexorable logic of spatial and market forces. We have ended up with a regional outcome that development planners never wanted!

In the Republic of Ireland, regional policy was revisited in the early years of the last decade with the eventual publication in 2002 of the National Spatial Strategy for Ireland: 2002-2020. However, it was ironic that this publication followed the major policy decisions taken during the three major EU Structural Fund programmes of 1989-1993, 1994-1999 and 2000-2006, when the economic infrastructure of the RoI was updated in order to accelerate the pace of convergence to a higher EU-type standard of living. Logically the formulation of the strategy should have come first! The timing of the National Spatial Strategy unintentionally revealed the lack of importance that policy makers attached to regional strategy.

Of course, in the Republic of Ireland a lot of policy attention is given to regional sensitivities. However, this often takes the form of politically expedient compensation in terms of fragmented ‘consolation prizes’ rather than as part of any systematic regional development framework. In Northern Ireland, on the other hand, there is a general dearth of strategic thinking about its own sub-regions. For example, the Northern Ireland economic strategy consultation paper that was published in November 2011 (Economic Strategy: Priorities for Sustainable Growth and Prosperity), makes no mention of sub-regional development challenges and, more surprisingly, very little mention of the economy of the Republic of Ireland.
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During our recent research for a 2009-2012 Centre for Cross Border Studies study on the Border Region Economy (on both sides of the border), we discovered that the officially published Northern Ireland economic statistics make it impossible to explore how, say, the economies of the Newry-Mourne region or of the region centred on Derry City are performing relative to other Northern Ireland sub-regions or relative to Northern Ireland as a whole. There is a range of socio-economic indicators of population, unemployment, poverty and so on. But there are none of the kind of data that would be needed if the economic strategy for Northern Ireland as a whole were to be augmented by treatment of sub-regional black spots.

Our verdict on the poverty of regional strategy might appear harsh and unreasonable. Indeed, during our research for the Centre for Cross Border Studies, we found isolated islands of excellence, dedication and enthusiasm within the cross-border region, some of which are described below. But there did not appear to be any overall guiding strategy through which successful initiatives could cumulate and generate positive spillovers to other parts of the region. In part, the explanation was the less ‘dense’ nature of the cross-border region compared, say, to the ‘denser’ urban agglomerations elsewhere on the island. In part, it is also due to the policy fault line introduced by the border itself. But this does not mean that such cumulative spillovers are impossible in other than urban agglomerations contained within a politically unified jurisdiction. Unfortunately, it does mean that they are more difficult to achieve in the cross-border region which lies largely outside major urban agglomerations. Spatial and market forces are weaker in peripheral regions, but not entirely absent. Increasing returns to effort in regional development are especially needed when resources are limited and windows of opportunity rare.

**Analysing regional strategy**

Systematic policy frameworks can help small nations and their regions to be smart with limited resources. They are essential in order to bring focus and synergy to the disparate policies that make up any modern national or regional development strategy. However, the experience in the Republic of Ireland has been that such frameworks usually emerge as ex-post explanations of outcomes of policies that were designed (or which emerged) in a less formal, more eclectic fashion. This is not an ideal situation, but is probably no less desirable than a slavish adherence to a rigid and prescriptive strategy that might turn out ex-post to be completely inappropriate. Nevertheless, strategic frameworks have an important role to play in identifying potential barriers to development or in distilling the lessons of development experience in nations and regions that may share some common characteristics. Formulating, documenting and testing such frameworks represent some of the very few ways that researchers can play a role in promoting regional development.

In general, there have been two broad economic approaches to regional analysis. The first might be termed the ‘descriptive’ approach, which is
based on the history of regions, their geographical features, the quality of their physical infrastructure, the characteristics and standards of their human resources (or human capital), the nature of their main economic activities and their socio-demographic features. This ‘soft’ approach is popular, but tends to end up as a confusing mix of praise for the great unrealised potential of the region and a call for something to be done about its serious problems. The second approach might be described as ‘analytical’, which is usually based on an explicit economic framework and makes use of systematic data to examine critically the underlying economic mechanisms of the regions.

Within the analytical approach to strategy formation, one possible way of looking at regional economies is to regard them as spatially scaled down versions of the encompassing national economy, but which have at least some local policy autonomy. At the other extreme, one might regard regional economies as isolated production units (or export bases) with little or no policy autonomy. However, if we regard the region as an isolated unit of production, with very little local policy autonomy or initiative, then structural development policy reverts to being the concern of the national authorities. In these circumstances the convergence prospects of any such lagging region are limited, and depend almost completely on how national policy towards the regions is designed and executed. A lagging region risks being trapped semi-permanently in dependency, a situation that is often referred to as the Mezzogiorno problem, after the region of Southern Italy whose name has become synonymous with persistent under-development and dependency.

A useful approach to developing an analytical economic framework for the Irish regions, North and South, starts off with the premise that regions have different initial internal structures and potential for some policy autonomy, even if that potential is not always realised. For reasons that are fairly obvious, no such framework has yet emerged for the cross-border region.

Turning to a narrower focus on the business sector, the work of Michael Porter on competitive advantage has been influential in the reformulations of Northern Ireland and Republic of Ireland ‘national’ industrial strategies, and has obvious – although as yet largely unanalysed – implications for Irish regions, including the cross-border region. Porter asked how a nation can achieve international success in any particular industry or in groups of industries. His answers identified four broad attributes (the competitiveness ‘diamond’) that shape the environment in which firms compete:

(a) **Factor conditions:** the availability and quality of the factors of production such as skilled labour, infrastructure etc.

(b) **Demand conditions:** the nature of local and external demand for the industry’s product or service, where local demand can play a vital role in encouraging product innovation and improvement.

(c) **Related and supporting industries:** the presence or absence
of supplier industries and related industries that are also internationally competitive.

(d) **Firm strategy, structure and rivalry:** the national conditions governing how companies are created, organised and managed.

Porter also suggested that there were different stages of competitive development during which different elements of the ‘diamond’ come into play. At the early stages, competitive development is driven by factor conditions, and draws on low cost labour and/or abundant natural resources. The next stage is investment driven, drawing from factor conditions and demand conditions as well as firm strategy, structure and rivalry (i.e. from three of the four diamond elements). In the final stage, competitiveness is driven by innovation and draws from the entire diamond.

Of particular interest in the context of small economies such as Ireland, including regional economies, is the fact that Porter assigns particular significance to indigenous firms and local markets. More ominously, he asserts that:

> A development strategy based solely on foreign multinationals may doom a nation to remaining a factor-driven economy. (Porter, 1990, p.679)

Debate on the wisdom and sustainability of the Irish national strategy has raged over this important issue, and has serious implications for regional policy. An extensive literature has grown up around the debate on the role Porter assigns to the home market and domestic firms (the home-country ‘diamond’), and has led to modifications and extensions. In a closely related issue, Porter’s views on the role of inward FDI in small nations have also been criticised. Porter only regards outward investment as a manifestation of competitive strength. Inward investment he regards as a manifestation of domestic weakness.

> Except when it is largely passive, widespread foreign investment usually indicates that the process of competitive upgrading in an economy is not entirely healthy because domestic firms in many industries lack the capabilities to defend their market positions against foreign firms. …Inbound foreign investment is never the solution to a nation’s competitive problems. (Porter, 1990, p. 671)

### The capability triad

Another framework to emerge from a business research perspective is the ‘capability triad’ of Michael Best. The capability triad contains probably the most synergistic combination of insights drawn from the economic theory of the firm and the detailed history of the structural evolution of business practices. It is based on the interaction of three elements: a business model, production capabilities and skill formation. The most crucial policy implication to emerge from Best’s framework is that any overall programme of change in the area of industrial policy requires the close integration of the change programme in each of the elements of the triad:
Rapid growth involves coordinated organizational changes in each of three domains: the business model, production capabilities, and skill formation. …The three domains are not separable and additive components of growth, but mutually interdependent sub-systems of a single developmental process. …No one of the three elements of the Capability Triad can contribute to growth independently of mutual adjustment processes involving all three elements. (Best, 2001, p.2).

The business model element of the triad describes how entrepreneurial firms can grow, based on the creation of new firms through technology diversification, inter-firm networks within open systems, and regional specialisation based on technological capabilities. The production capabilities element of the triad integrates ideas from operations management and strategy into a logical system of production models that drives home the lesson that competitive strategy and productive systems are bound together. The skill formation element of the triad provides a vital input to innovation and serves to facilitate the synergistic interaction and reinforcement of all three elements. Finally, an important implication to emerge from Best’s analysis is that overall programmes in the area of industrial strategy require the close integration over time and space of the change programmes that need to take place within each of the elements of the triad.

The above three policy analysis frameworks are analytical to varying degrees. The most analytical – the macro-regional framework – is normally incorporated into formal computer models that can be used to carry out forecasting and policy impact analysis. The Porter and Best frameworks are more like systematic taxonomies that provide ways of organising facts into sequences that are easier to link together in a policy-useful way.

A final framework, formulated by Jane Jacobs, is very different. Jacobs’s principal theme is the part played by cities in economic achievement. She sees cities as the engines of economic advance, providing markets, jobs, capital and technology for themselves, the regions around them, and other cities as well. Cities do this, she believes, only when business people in them engage in what she calls ‘import-substitution’: that is, ‘replacing goods that they once imported with goods that they make themselves’. Because, she argues, ‘an import-replacing city does not, upon replacing former imports, import less than it otherwise would, but shifts to other purchases in lieu of what it no longer needs from outside’, the import-replacing activity of the city is ‘at the root of all economic expansion’.

However, when the economic forces created by a city’s growth spread beyond a city’s region, they are often not in reasonable balance with one another: ‘The various strands—markets, jobs, technology, transplants and capital—separate from the mesh and take off by themselves and create stunted and bizarre economies in distant regions’. An example is what she refers to as a ‘supply region’, i.e., a region that supplies distant markets but lacks an import-replacing city of its own.
Lessons from regional winners

The most difficult part of our research was the task of gaining a deep understanding of how businesses operated in the cross-border region. Official statistics tended to be bland and uninformative, where they existed. Ultimately, knowledge lies with the people who run the businesses. However, 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 tried to penetrate into the deepest areas of the firm’s operation and strategy. The visits that we were able to carry out were extraordinarily interesting, informative and thought provoking, and the senior managers that met us gave generously of their time and their expertise in a very friendly and open way. Not only did we learn much about a range of individual firms, but we also came to interpret the role of public policy in a new and illuminating way.

Given limited time and resources, we mainly 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, 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 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 was surprising.

It is not our intention to describe this material in detail in this paper. A full account will be available in the project’s final report, to be published in spring 2012. Rather we want to focus on a few implications of the analysis of the performance of four sample firms: namely, what wider lessons can we learn from a detailed examination of a sample of specific firms that operate in the cross-border area?

Hunter Apparel Solutions, Derry/ Londonderry

The insights arising from our discussions with the head of Hunter Apparel Solutions, Simon Hunter, related mainly to the question of how a firm in a very traditional manufacturing sector (clothing) can transform itself and survive in a declining sector and a de-industrialising region. When we visited the Derry region and spoke to people in local government and NGOs, there was a tendency to regard this sector as a lost cause and to want to move on to high-tech sectors that appeared to offer more promise. Hunter Apparel Solutions showed us how short-sighted and flawed this view was.
Derry is known as the first city in the world to have shirt making factories, an industry that once had 64 shirt making companies, many of which were large. Hunter Apparel Solutions is the only surviving company in the city’s clothing industry, an industry that until recently dominated the regional economy. Hunter began in Belfast in 1936 as a retailer of police uniforms and relocated to Derry after buying a small shirt manufacturing company to control its supply chain. However, the shirt making industry contracted rapidly in the 1980s, and by the time Simon Hunter, the third generation owner, took over in 1995 the number of shirt making factories had been reduced to four from the 46 at the beginning of his father’s tenure.

When Simon Hunter became managing director, his first challenge was to develop a strategy. He feared the ups and downs of getting into the fashion end of the market and the power of retailers to shift the cost of unsold inventories to manufacturers. He sought to build on the company’s legacy in supplying groups within the emergency services as these sectors were well-known. But the marketplace was changing due to a move toward the idea of ‘consolidated purchasing’ in which suppliers were required to offer a whole uniform rather than a single item.

Starting with the idea of ‘holistic’ supply meant Hunter had to move toward supplying the whole uniform to its customers. Hunter Apparel, however, did not have the manufacturing capability to supply whole uniforms and such capability could not be found by networking with other firms to combine the skill base of the region. This led to the decision to not compete on the basis of low manufacturing costs for any single item or even to seek to drive down costs on manufacturing by importing alone.

Simon Hunter’s strategic vision for reinventing his company was based on an understanding of the opportunity created by information technology and the internet. By fortunate coincidence, he was developing a strategic vision precisely as the internet was starting to provide a sophisticated tool for communication between supplier and customer. He had studied accounting at university and realised that the great opportunity to reduce waste and economise in the delivery of service uniforms was not in production. Rather, it was in simplifying and reducing the long chain of activities in the ordering process.

**A new strategic vision**

The strategic vision became clear: Hunter Apparel Solutions would become a ‘managed service agent’ for public service agencies. The target was to re-engineer the chain of activities in the ordering and delivery process for uniforms to drive waste out of the system. The technological cornerstone of the new business model was a proprietary web portal that would eliminate much of the indirect labour previously required to order uniforms. The new technology made it possible for an individual member of a public service agency to interact directly with Hunter and thereby eliminate the many intermediary people and transactions.
that had previously been involved in the order delivery process.

On the production side it meant downsizing internal manufacturing activities and developing a flexible, rapid response, networked supply system. This greatly expanded the company’s global reach. The in-house production facilities were reorganised into four warehouse cells using visual, ‘lean production’ system principles to maximize throughput efficiency. It also meant investing in a high-tech embroidery capability for purposes of individualizing uniform insignia and retaining a small but highly flexible manufacturing capability to respond to emergencies as well as to deal with highly customised orders.

Hunter is now established as the managing agent of uniforms primarily for emergency services such as fire brigades, police, ambulance and health. The success of the new business model is indicated by the fact that Hunter Apparel Solutions has contracts to supply the uniforms for 21 of the 48 UK fire services. It also supplies An Post, Ireland’s postal service; Dublin’s new airport terminal staff; and the Northern Ireland health and social care system. At the same time, by focusing on apparel solutions, Hunter is now finding ways to partner with technology companies to dramatically improve the functionality of the uniforms. In the case of health care professionals, this means developing uniforms that reduce the spread of infection.

**Castlecool, Castleblayney, Co Monaghan**

The insights arising from our discussions with Paul Shortt of Castlecool related to the complex storage and supply logistic systems that are essential in supporting the growth of high added value food manufacturing, much of which is located in the cross-border area. They also illustrated how firms that take the island market seriously see the cross-border region as an important strategic location for supplying the large population centres, North and South.

Castlecool, a cold storage and logistics company founded and managed by Paul Shortt, operates from three sites in Castleblayney, Lough Egish and Dundalk. It won the prestigious Deloitte Best Managed Company award in both 2010 and 2011; recently won first prize at the Small Firms Association (SFA) National Business awards in the Services category, and was nominated in the SFA awards Environmental Sustainability category. Castlecool’s customer base comprises major food and beverage companies in the dairy and retail food sectors in both Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland.

What makes Castlecool particularly interesting is that this single company interfaces with so many other companies and sub-sectors of the food processing industry. It does so by providing a set of common production-related services that are required by nearly all firms in the industry. This enables all its customer companies to specialise in their core capabilities and partner for their requisite business
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services. Castlecool, in turn, is able to achieve economies of scale and scope in the provision of storage and logistics services to all of the firms in the industry independent of size.

The diverse but related range of services that Castlecool can provide customers includes temperature controlled warehousing, dry storage, blast freezing, tempering, packing, order picking, local and international distribution, sampling and food testing, logistics management and food brokerage. It has integrated a range of IT and internet-based telecommunication technologies with food processing logistics. These include web-based network management software and radio frequency functionality which has enhanced order picking accuracy, tracks movement of goods (receipt-order pick-delivery), interfaces with SAP and other systems, and provides product traceability processes.

To address the costs from the high energy intensity of cold storage, Castlecool has conducted R&D on wind turbines and combined heat and energy systems. In giving its 2010 award to Castlecool, the Small Firms Association noted that: ‘The company also works closely with Queen’s University Belfast to aid innovation and has recently taken in a graduate electrical engineer to look at wind-energy opportunities’. Funded in part by an InterTradeIreland Fusion award, Catherine Conaghan, an electronics engineering graduate of National University of Ireland Galway, and Cuan Boake, a research fellow at Queen’s University’s Environmental Engineering Research Centre, completed an exemplary wind turbine feasibility study for the Lough Eglish Food Park site. In refrigerated cold stores there is an opportunity to store energy passively within the building in the internal structures and product. Driving down the costs of energy with innovation is another illustration of how increasing specialisation within an open-system business model can foster innovation for networked groups of companies.

Walter Watson (WW) Ltd, Castlewellan, Co Down

Our discussions with Walter Watson gave valuable insights into how a sophisticated, modern firm engaged in the production of a range of complex metal products could evolve in a rural
area not far from the border and thrive in highly competitive domestic and export markets. It also illustrated how a firm can start by manufacturing simple products destined for local markets, but can grow to become a large and sophisticated exporter.

Walter Watson’s father 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. Walter, born in 1944, became a welder, but after being laid off by his employer in 1967 he set up a business to repair farm machinery and later to make farm machinery and farm buildings. He extended his product range to agricultural trailers (eventually with hydraulic hoists), transport boxes, gates and silos. His core capability was in steel fabrication and he fostered relationships in Scotland with steel mills at Ravenscraig and elsewhere. He built and sold hundreds of farm buildings in Scotland and the Republic of Ireland. All were pre-fabricated in Walter Watson's facilities before shipping and erection on the customer’s land. The firm had its own transport with access to roll on and roll off facilities.

Walter Watson expanded into the production of reinforcing steel and a new opportunity arose when a German company making overhead cranes closed its Bangor (Co Down) operation. WW bought all of the unsold cranes, refurbished them and added guarantees to create a market. Thus overhead cranes became a third main line of business along with structural steel and reinforcing steel. WW has continued to develop and grow up to the present with annual sales approaching £30 million and 180 employees, setting an extraordinarily high productivity level.

**Bose (Ireland), Carrickmacross, Co Monaghan**

Our discussions with Pat McAdam, Bose director in Ireland, gave us an example of an extraordinarily sophisticated, foreign-owned firm that located in the border region in the late 1970s, originally hoping to source some of its supply chain locally (i.e. production of wooden cabinets for the Bose top-of-the-range audio equipment), failed to find suitable suppliers and then put in place its own supply facility. It also illustrated how the valuable experience of a firm like Bose was largely ignored by the existing furniture sector in the area, which has suffered a catastrophic decline in recent years.

Bose Corporation, the global leader in loudspeakers and ancillary audio equipment, was founded in Massachusetts in 1964. Its turnover today is approximate $700 million and it has five facilities, including its headquarters in Framingham, Massachusetts. It opened its Carrickmacross manufacturing site in 1978, attracted in part by the furniture making tradition in the region. In Pat McAdam’s words, importing cabinets was not economical. The idea was to get local suppliers to make the high-specification cabinets, which for acoustical reasons are made of wood.

As it turned out, Bose was not successful in finding woodworkers who had experience in making wood
products at the tight tolerances demanded for audio systems. Subsequently, Bose developed a state of the art manufacturing plant which today employs just under 200 people. Much of the specific woodworking expertise was obtained from a Bose facility in Canada that had developed good woodworking practices over the years. The Carrickmacross plant has seven CNC woodworking machines for drilling, routing and milling operations. Much of the tooling is made in an in-house machine shop. Furthermore, the Bose plant recycles waste wood products into an environmentally clean boiler system to provide all of its heat energy requirements.

The cabinet-making and electronic assembly plant is a model ‘lean’ manufacturing facility, including a high-performance, self-directed work team organisational system. Mr McAdam stated that productivity has advanced by 50% since beginning the lean manufacturing journey in 2007. All of the features of the Toyota lean manufacturing production system are on display: JIT, SMED or single-minute exchange of die, Kanban or visual information and scheduling system, and 5-S Kaizen continuous innovation work organisation. Bose illustrates how world class manufacturing can work in a relatively small plant located in a rural area in the Irish border region.

As we left the plant we asked our host if local furniture firms came by to study the wood processing side of the Bose plant in order to evaluate possible ways in which the more traditional Irish sector could upgrade its technology and production systems to meet the stiff competition coming from China and elsewhere. The negative answer surprised us and obliged us to reflect on the policy, institutional and other problems that prevented this world class centre of excellence from becoming a force for transformation that might have assisted in the preservation of the once strong but now rapidly declining furniture sector in the mid-border region.

**Entrepreneurial firms and cluster dynamics**

To understand the industrial growth of a region our research focused on entrepreneurial firms as the engines of growth. We sought to address two inter-related questions: where did new entrepreneurial firms come from, and where did new groups, sectors or clusters of firms come from? These are inter-related questions, since entrepreneurial firms drive clusters and clusters create opportunities for existing entrepreneurial firms and new entrants. This simple proposition informed our research methodology and a very brief overview of our findings follows.

**Entrepreneurial Firms**

Firm strategy is important and a variety of strategies existed. We found examples of high volume production within single production units. Seagate (based in Derry City) produces on a scale that matches East Asian mass producers. Bose, while on a much smaller scale, has a one-piece flow, high-throughput, efficient plant in a niche market. Scale economies in segments of the dairy
and poultry industry are also important. Nevertheless, scale economies alone were rarely the sources of competitive advantage. Flexible specialisation is the most common generic strategy. The common denominator was focusing on a core capability but partnering for complementary capabilities – but we found creative applications depending upon context rather than a formulaic categorisation.

Most of the successful companies in the Irish cross-border region pursued a strategy of developing a distinctive product/service and constructed the production capability to deliver it. A number can be characterised as mid-size, indigenous, multinational companies. Here we drew an unexpected lesson: these companies have radically reinvented themselves at least once as if they became a new firm. In fact, we might say that new firms were created out of previous incarnations of the same firm. Other times we find succeeding generations of the same firm in the form of the establishment of new out of old production systems. Walter Watson, for example, moved from steel fabrication of agricultural implements, to structural steel fabrication, to fabric mesh and pile cages, to cranes – all the while deepening the company’s core capability in steel fabrication. The transition to a range of reinforced steel products involved erecting a new, state of the art production facility.

We found examples of ‘system integration’ strategies or a process of enterprise reinvention. In these cases the new management leveraged legacy skills and capabilities, but within the context of reengineering the core production system, in order to take full advantage of new technologies and market opportunities. Often this was precipitated by the transition to the second and third generation of family leadership. Simon Hunter, for example, established his ‘management service agent’ business model by seizing the opportunity of the internet and the web to redesign the system by which service uniforms are designed, manufactured, and delivered. This transition required an alliance with an IT company to develop a web portal system. But it also meant the construction of a new production process at Hunter Apparel and new service offerings that could become a resource for companies in other sectors. This process of increasing differentiation of capabilities and innovation has led to the creation of a new business system as envisioned by Simon Hunter. It also hints at how network alliances can be incipient clustering processes. The fact that Hunter Apparel is a successful company has created a new opportunity to form a R&D alliance to create a material with built-in functionality that could revolutionise medical services apparel.

The process of developing a distinctive capability is inter-locked with establishing ‘network alliances’. These alliances may be in other production units within a larger company (such as Feldhues, based in Clones, Co. Monaghan) or they may be part of incipient clustering processes. In any case, we have found that an ongoing process of focusing on core capability and partnering for complementary capabilities underlies or sparks increases
in capability differentiation and derived innovation activities in the participating companies. These are examples of the dynamic between internal organisation and inter-firm relations. In the case of Castlecool, we found the emergence of an open-system business model in which a series of service activities in logistics and warehousing are shared to the mutual advantage of a range of enterprises. Here the advantages are not merely cost economies of scale and scope: Castlecool is an innovative company that enables its partners to focus on what they do best and, at the same time, enjoy the benefits of improved complementary business services.

Cluster dynamics

We found that the important characteristics of clusters included the following:

a) Firms do not compete alone in the global marketplace but as members of networked groups of firms. For this reason we needed to examine network alliances and other forms of inter-firm relationships.

b) Firms compete in the global marketplace by leveraging the skills, capabilities and knowledge bases of the regions in which they are embedded.

c) Innovative firms make more than products: they advance the skills, capabilities and knowledge base of the region in which they conduct business. Moreover, the process by which innovative firms develop specific capabilities in pursuit of new market opportunities itself creates opportunities for other firms. In fact, even the failure to pursue emergent market opportunities by one firm may give rise to the establishment of a new firm. Paul Short, for example, who later established his own company, had previously been a finance manager for a company in the same sector.

d) The inter-firm processes by which skills, capabilities and knowledge are deepened within a region can trigger the emergence of new sub-sector growth opportunities. In this way, a region’s production base can be enhanced by transition from declining to growing sectors.

The detailed examples of cluster dynamics we studied in our research (mainly in food processing, aerospace, furniture and wood processing, timber frame housing and science-based clusters) are not meant to be exhaustive. Further research would certainly reveal many more. We have at least demonstrated that constructing and searching company and other datasets for regional concentrations of companies by sector can indicate ongoing or incipient cluster dynamic processes of new firm creation, techno-diversification and increasing capability differentiation. Industrial growth is not likely to happen without policies that foster these processes.

Towards a Cross-Border Economic Development Zone

There were some very positive findings from our research project, but also many negative findings. Positive findings
included the identification of some extremely successful and entrepreneurial manufacturing enterprises in the border region and the intelligent manner in which they made full use of the single island market (within the Single European Market), the more open post-Belfast Agreement environment and the dramatic improvements in some aspects of North-South physical infrastructure.

However, we also found many aspects of the border region economy that suffered from the peripheral nature of the region, the economic policy implications of the border, and the interaction of these two issues. The first aspect – peripherality – is shared by other regions of the island that are remote from large population agglomerations. The second aspect – the border-related policy fault line – is unique to the region. But it is the interaction of peripherality and the border that presents the unique challenge to policy makers if the border region is to be reintegrated into the island-wide economy, and is to seek out and implement policies that address these exceptional challenges.

It was clear at the time of negotiation of the 1998 Belfast Agreement that there was only limited willingness to create an island-wide industrial development strategy that would bring together the two separate development agencies in Dublin (the IDA plus Enterprise Ireland) and Belfast (Invest NI). What was put in place was InterTradeIreland, whose policy remit was to maximize the gains from North-South trade and business co-operation. In other words, its focus was on the whole island and not specifically on the narrower border region, and, from its Newry base, it...
operated in the margins of the ‘national’ development agencies and other institutions based in Belfast and Dublin.

For the foreseeable future the separate operation of the main Northern Ireland and Republic of Ireland development agencies is a fact of life, although a degree of cooperation does take place, mainly in the sphere of island marketing as distinct from island-wide industrial strategy. For regions located internally within NI and the RoI, ‘national’ development strategies operate fairly efficiently, and incorporate and encompass a wide range of other institutions and agencies that have a development remit (e.g. local government – county and district council – development activities, chambers of commerce, higher education institutions, training centres etc.). Our research highlighted the negative consequences of this situation for the economic revival of the economy of the specific border region. We now need to move to the next stage and develop ways in which the negative consequences of these policy fault lines might be mitigated.

The need for a new development strategy for the border region arises because its development is caught between two conflicting perspectives. On the one hand the ‘national’ development agencies have a remit that legally obliges them to focus on their own jurisdictions, and they have different policy instruments and institutional frameworks that make it difficult to deal with cross-border issues, even when there is political willingness to do so. On the other hand, the local government administrations and other regional institutions that operate in the border region do not have the resources (financial and institutional) to overcome the twin challenges of the peripherality and ‘border’ problems that are holding back development. The fragmentation of local government organisation in the border region, as well as the three-way division of existing local authority-based cross-border co-operation (East Border Region - EBR; Irish Central Border Area Network - ICBAN; and North West Region Cross Border Group – NWRCBG), compound the problem of fragmented cross-border development initiatives.

Any new approach to cross-border development will need to advance proposals for the more efficient and effective use of ‘national’ and ‘local’ development resources in a manner that is consistent with current legal and institutional constraints on the island. Specifically, it needs to address how local government on both sides of the border should reinterpret its role in encouraging and supporting cross-border development through a better understanding of how development can take place in a region that does not benefit from the advantages enjoyed by more central regions clustered near the larger population agglomerations on the island. Public services need to operate more efficiently in identifying activities that can take advantage of ‘good’ characteristics of the cross-border region, which include manufacturing and other strengths that were not always understood in past national and regional development planning. The central organising framework of such a strategy could be a cross-border Border Development Zone, the rationale for whose existence stems from the twin
disadvantages of peripherality and ‘border’ policy, and institutional fault lines that demand a uniquely targeted approach that is different from and more serious than challenges facing other peripheral regions of the island.

**Padraic White’s proposition**

In his closing address to the ‘emerging findings’ conference of our Border Region Economy study in Cavan in November 2011, the former Managing Director of IDA Ireland, Padraic White (now Chair of Louth Economic Forum), characterised the development dilemma of the border region in a way that complements and reinforces our own research findings:9

*My proposition is that the immediate border areas risk being further ‘stranded’ economically for a number of current reasons including the following:*

1. **Central governments in both jurisdictions are grappling with European economic stagnation, and while focusing on national economic revival, regional priorities, and especially peripheral border regions, fall down the pecking order of priority;**
2. **The public budget cutbacks will result in virtually no current discretionary spending in border regions and very little capital investment;**
3. **FDI is increasingly concentrating on the large cities and metropolitan areas where the companies are more confident of getting a mix of skilled personnel as their projects in Ireland become more research and skills based;**
4. **The national development agencies are not sufficiently geared to respond to the particular challenges of the border regions;**
5. **The current higher level of incentives permitted under EU regional state aids in the border regions in the Republic expire in 2013 and may not be renewed subsequently.**

Mr. White went ahead to advocate a recognition that the immediately adjoining border areas have common economic threats but also a strong common interest in maximising their joint strengths. He believed that the district councils and counties along this ‘Border Development Zone’ could drive economic development by cooperation and sharing successful ideas. He identified a number of current bilateral initiatives in border areas that could form the initial basis of a Strategic Development Plan along the entire border area from Derry/Donegal to Newry and Mourne/Louth and which could build on four key sources of indigenous enterprise and growth:

1. SME enterprise in goods and services with an export potential;
2. Tourism and recreation;
3. Agriculture, food and fish processing;
4. Low carbon initiatives, energy saving and renewable energy.

The goal of such a Border Development Zone would be to stimulate a form of development that is uniquely adapted to the region, making maximum use of current ‘national’ resources (where politically feasible) and stimulating the evolution of local resources and expertise of the kind that were identified.
during our Border Region Economy research project. The measure of success of such a policy initiative would be the rebalancing of the border region economy, and particularly the north-west and mid-border regions, so that it is less dependent on external financial subvention, and is able to generate resources for development internally from a revitalised small-scale manufacturing and service sector base that has the potential for higher external sales and ultimately a greater international export potential.

**Three key dimensions**

There are likely to be three key dimensions to the establishment of a Border Development Zone. The first dimension is **spatial**, to characterise the extent of the border region economy, defined as the cross-border region where the twin challenges of peripherality and ‘border’ policy fault lines need to be addressed. Earlier research has shown that such a region is unlikely to coincide with any simple collection of existing county or district council boundaries.

The second dimension is **sectoral**, to identify a range of sectors which are uniquely suitable and adaptable for promotion within the proposed Border Development Zone. Examples will include high technology and environmental manufacturing in the eastern cross-border region, which is a rapidly developing source of activity; advances in food processing, as exemplified by a range of important existing clusters in the mid-border region; and a search for new manufacturing and service specialities in the NW region, which has suffered greatly from the decline and virtual extinction of its previous specialisation in clothing and textiles.

The third dimension is **institutional**, to identify the kinds of co-operative policy frameworks and actions that will be needed in the Border Development Zone if it is to have a greater prospect of participating in island-wide prosperity. Our previous research has suggested that failures here tended to arise as a result of knowledge deficits (e.g. imperfect understanding of the structure of regional cross-border economies); institutional jurisdictional issues (e.g. legal constraints on the operation of ‘national’ development agencies); policy and administrative gaps (e.g. small and under-resourced local government development functions and capacities); a lack of regional development focus by the higher education establishments and an inability to achieve close cross-border synthesis between them; and weaknesses in non-governmental socio-economic agencies (e.g. chambers of commerce, the IBEC-CBI Joint Business Council etc.). The objective here will not be to design new institutions from scratch, since neither the resources nor the political will are likely to favour such a root and branch approach. Rather, it will be to propose ways that elements of the existing institutional policy framework can be improved and refocused in order to overcome the weaknesses caused by coordination failure, mainly by articulating a shared vision of the challenges faced within the proposed Border Development Zone.

The combination of these three objectives – spatial, sectoral and
institutional – will provide a better basis for dealing with the exceptional challenges of the Irish border region. For example, the identification of specific infrastructural deficits (such as the proposed bridge across Carlingford Lough to permit the integrated development of tourism in both Carlingford and Mourne, or the upgrading of the road network connecting the north-west region to other road networks on the island) is best carried out where the spatial dimension is explicit, the sectoral issues are a key justification, and the institutional dimensions are supportive and facilitating. The three objectives provide the natural context in which to generate specific development proposals, to do so in a way that facilitates the objective evaluation of likely achievable benefits, and to ensure that the appropriate institutional framework is in place to implement policy decisions.

Specific examples of areas of cooperation identified by Padraic White in his Cavan address included: campaigning for progression of the A5 route from Aughnacloy to Derry which is relevant to connectivity through and within the border zone; joint cooperation between Enterprise Ireland and Invest NI in promoting clusters of industry in the food sector, renewables and high-tech ‘start ups’ in the border zone; and capitalising in a more structured way on the know-how and graduates of the Institutes of Technology in Letterkenny, Sligo and Dundalk and the University of Ulster and further education colleges in the NI border area. He concluded with the vital observation that:

Local authorities in the border zone have the power to drive economic development more than they or others suspect if they pro-actively use the powers, funds and leadership role they have in their territories. With a coherent strategic border plan, capitalising on their existing cross-border networks and initiatives, they can make substantial progress themselves in identified growth areas. With such a plan they can be persuasive in winning support from their governments and from the EU and its funds.

ENDNOTES

1. We regard national policy failures as exceptions rather than the rule. Hence, the maintenance of inward-looking tariff protection in the RoI for long after it was wise represented a failure of nerve that was exacerbated by isolation from global thinking. The more recent catastrophic failure of the banking system imposed huge costs on citizens, but has left the successful strategy of outward-oriented, FDI-driven national development relatively unscathed.


Armagh: Centre for Cross Border Studies, forthcoming.


7. Jacobs’ concept of import substitution should not be confused with the policy driven, tariff-induced strategy of import substitution implemented in the RoI between 1932 and the early 1960s. In a Jacobs city, import substitution initially serves local markets, but rapidly generates strong local firms capable of exporting.


NORTH-SOUTH RESEARCH COLLABORATION: A DROP IN THE INTERNATIONAL OCEAN

Brian Trench

Academic researchers in the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland have recently collaborated or are currently collaborating in several hundred projects. Information on these collaborations was gathered in a survey in December 2011 undertaken by Patricia McAllister of the Centre for Cross Border Studies on behalf of the Department of Education and Skills in Dublin. The survey respondents were research offices in the Republic’s seven universities, in the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland and in nine institutes of technology in the northern half of the state.

The collaborations cover a wide range of types: from very large international biomedical projects with partners in Irish institutions on both sides of the border alongside dozens more in institutions in other countries; through graduate education programmes in natural sciences, engineering, humanities and social sciences in which Northern institutions are ‘devolved partners’, to bilateral relationships between individual Northern and Southern institutions focused on applied research in energy and the environment.

The level of involvement of the Republic’s higher education institutions in North-South collaborations is highly variable. On the basis of this survey, it appears that Trinity College Dublin and University College Dublin are the most active universities, and institutes of technology in Dundalk, Letterkenny and Sligo – all in border counties – are the most active in their sector (albeit at a much lower level than the universities). The research funding shared by Northern and Southern collaborators in these projects ranges from a couple of thousand euro or pounds to six-figure sums. The depth and strength of these cross-border collaborations are apparently of highly variable significance to those taking part. The survey data provided to the Department of Education and Skills will be subjected to further analysis in the department. However, without information enabling historical comparisons or comparisons with the pattern of collaborations
between researchers in the Republic and researchers in other states, it is likely to be difficult to draw any significant conclusions from the data.

A comparison across space can be made with information from the annual survey of approximately 3,000 researchers receiving support from Science Foundation Ireland (SFI), the principal source of research funding in the Republic. Figures derived from the latest complete (2010) ‘census’ show that SFI-funded researchers reported they had academic or industrial collaborations with 71 partners in Northern Ireland, compared with 67 in Scotland and 40 in the Netherlands.\(^1\) Taking account of the much larger number of research-active higher education institutions in Scotland and the Netherlands than in Northern Ireland, this finding indicates that contiguity on the same island is a factor – though perhaps not a major factor – in the selection of research partners.

**Changing nature of collaboration**

Assessing the strength and scope of cross-border research collaborations requires some consideration of the changing nature of research collaboration more broadly. Research in the natural sciences is remarkably internationalised: a researcher who has worked 20 years in a laboratory in Asia or Australia can join a lab in Europe or North America and quickly resume work at a similar level of responsibility. Not only can they do this, they actually do it: research scientists are highly mobile.

This internationalisation is being intensified by trends within science and supported by developments in communications and transport. Research activity over the past couple of generations has been marked by increasing specialisation, and micro-specialists may have to hunt further and further afield to find colleagues with the same interests. On the other hand, large-scale research projects on broadly defined topics – for example, in genomics or in particle physics – require collaboration across the boundaries not just of disciplines, including the newly emerging micro-disciplines, but also of countries, in order to multiply the potential sources of funding.

This trend towards specialisation is facilitated by the very dramatic improvements of the past two decades in international telecommunications and specifically in internet communication in academic research. Active collaborations, including sharing of data resources, co-authorship of papers and organisation of seminars, are possible across continents and time zones without face-to-face contact. As many academics observe from their own and from colleagues’ experience, research relations by email with colleagues in other countries are often more intense than those with colleagues in the same corridors.

The growing inter-disciplinarity of research is to some extent a product of specialisation, but has other roots too. Analysts of contemporary science have noted that it is more porous than was traditional ‘academic science’, being more oriented to social application and more open to social influence.
(e.g. Ziman 2000; Nowotny et al 1994). Addressing big issues arising in energy demand, environmental protection, food security, global health and other so-called ‘grand challenges’ necessitates multiple perspectives, and thus collaboration across departments, institutions and indeed countries and states. While these observations apply mainly to natural sciences and engineering, research in humanities and social sciences is beginning to look quite similar in its organisation.

In the several contexts outlined, researchers may choose collaborators on the grounds of shared or compatible interests, approaches, methods and facilities, as much as or more than on the basis of physical or cultural proximity. But personal connections and shared values and attitudes do count, and we can see their influence in the development of some of the more sustained cross-border collaborations. The convenience of common starting points or of being no more than a few hours’ journey time apart can be significant, even when it is balanced against the possible contribution to research quality of relations with well-established experts further afield and exposure to different customs and perspectives.

In sum, we can say that there are compelling reasons within the conduct of research itself why researchers in the two jurisdictions in Ireland might prefer to seek collaborations outside the island rather than inside it. When we add in consideration of research funding mechanisms, the forces driving researchers to look outside the island are increased.

The availability of research funding and the conditions attached to it are a central concern in the increasingly collaborative and international research of the early 21st century. Money may be the single strongest factor influencing the research questions that are asked, the approaches taken to answering them and the relations formed in addressing them. Money for research is made available in different ways, at different amounts and with different priorities in different jurisdictions.

Access to funding

Of course, researchers in the Republic of Ireland and in Northern Ireland both have access to funds from major international sources such as the Wellcome Trust, the US National Institutes of Health and the European Commission’s Framework Programmes. But here different strategies are followed. Southern researchers have had a strong orientation to European Commission programmes for 25 years, repeatedly winning more than their juste retour from that source. For academic researchers in the United Kingdom, including Northern Ireland, the main priority of recent years has been to conduct and publish research that counts well in UK-specific research assessment ratings (such as the inter-university Research Assessment Exercise/Research Excellence Framework). UK research has been under-represented in EU collaborative projects just as Irish research has been relatively over-represented. For UK biomedical researchers, the Wellcome Trust is likely to be a first port of call; in the Republic, its presence is very much weaker – and weaker than it once was – and the
Health Research Board and Science Foundation Ireland’s biotechnology programmes are the main targets of grant proposal writing in the life and health sciences.

In both jurisdictions there are major funding programmes that are very largely confined to their respective sides of the border. Funding from UK research councils does not cross borders and nor does funding from Science Foundation Ireland, with the exception of a small amount of funding for energy research and for projects linked with US institutions. During the bounteous ‘Celtic Tiger’ years a number of Southern institutions and programmes (see below) widened their criteria to include Northern researchers, but many of these opportunities have closed off in recent years.

In the larger context of research funding worth hundreds of millions of euro or pounds annually to researchers North and South, the amounts dedicated to promote bilateral collaborative research are very small. The governments in Dublin and Belfast have similar commitments to developing knowledge economies in which academic and industrial research has a central place as a driver of growth. The two governments share related concerns about declining student interest in scientific and technical (sometimes labelled STEM) subjects, as potentially threatening the availability of high-level skills required in a knowledge economy.

However despite these common – although also competitive – interests and a shared island space, there has been only one inter-governmental programme designed specifically to support collaborative academic research. The Cross-Border Programme for Research and Education contributing to Peace and Reconciliation started in 2004 and is now coming to an end, having supported seven projects and disbursed €6 million, equivalent to less than one per cent of annual research spending on the island. This was a joint initiative, and the first of its kind, between the Department of Education and Science in Dublin and the Department for Employment and Learning in Belfast. Funding was provided under the EU PEACE II Programme and was managed by the Higher Education Authority (HEA). In 2004-6 the programme funded five projects, engendering collaborations that might not otherwise have happened and involving four institutions in the Republic and three in Northern Ireland. The programme had a policy-oriented ambition to ‘help generate new policies for future peace programmes, to improve the effectiveness of existing ones, and to produce new models for collaboration’. Reflecting these origins and aims, the projects were the subject of a major political and promotional investment not usually attached to such research. But there is little, if any, evidence to be found of sustained collaboration arising from these projects.

In 2008 a further €3 million was awarded to two projects in transport research and cancer research, in both of which Queen’s University Belfast was the Northern partner. A project on sustainability in transport, involving Queen’s University, University of Limerick, Trinity College Dublin and
Dublin City University, had the stated objective to ‘build an internationally recognised all-island research centre with leading research capability and capacity in computational science for sustainable design, manufacture and materials, with the leadership to develop all-island collaborative research which will reinforce the Island’s advanced engineering and manufacturing capacity’. This all-island research centre does not yet exist.

Further research funding born of the Northern Ireland peace process comes through a US-Ireland scheme for projects involving partners in both parts of Ireland and in the United States. The US-Ireland R&D Partnership, initiated in the early 2000s, aims to foster collaborations between academic and industrial researchers in the three jurisdictions, focusing on questions in nanotechnology, diabetes, sensors, cystic fibrosis, telecommunications, and energy and sustainability. This scheme facilitates submissions to the major US research funders, National Science Foundation and National Institutes of Health, through some of their funding programmes. At time of writing, it is not clear how active this scheme still is.

Overall, the peace dividend for cross-border research collaboration has been small and has now all but dried up. One continuing programme is the relatively modestly funded programme for cross-border research in teacher education. This is run by SCoTENS (Standing Conference on Teacher Education, North and South), which was established in 2002 following a conference of teacher educators looking at their role in the peace process and is managed by the Centre for Cross Border Studies (CCBS).
To date, over 70 projects have been given ‘seed funding’ up to a maximum of £6,000 and all are based on direct collaboration between Northern and Southern partners. The next round of project grants will be announced in early 2012. A 2011 external evaluation of SCoTENS noted that a minority of completed research reports had high academic value but also that the funding programme contributed to the development of professional relationships and networks.\(^2\)

In another small-scale initiative, Universities Ireland, a CCBS-managed network which brings together the nine university presidents on the island, provides masters and PhD (first year) scholarships of €15,000 each for postgraduates who wish to do further study – including research – in the other Irish jurisdiction. It awards five-six of these scholarships annually.

More support for bilateral collaboration has come indirectly through the operation of broader research funding programmes. For example, the Programme for Third Level Institutions (PRTLI) operated by the Republic’s Higher Education Authority, has targeted some of the funding available under its fourth and fifth (2011-16) cycles to structured doctoral programmes. The two Northern universities have been partners in some of these programmes, which provide studentships and suites of shared taught courses for doctoral students in networks of institutions. The programmes cover a wide range of disciplines and topics in humanities and social sciences, as well as in natural sciences and engineering: nanosciences, earth sciences, computer simulations, telecommunications and the knowledge society have been among the fields of study. In the fifth cycle of PRTLI a total of €360 million is being spent on 36 collaborative projects, including these doctoral programmes, across the disciplines. Queen’s University and University of Ulster are ‘supporting’ or ‘devolved’ partners in several of these, but so too are universities and research institutes in Britain, United States and continental Europe.

**Discipline-specific schemes**

Among the discipline-specific research funding schemes, the Charles Parsons energy research awards initiated in 2006 by the Irish Department of Communications, Marine and Natural Resources have supported PhD studentships in Queen’s University as well as in Southern universities. The scheme is now administered by Science Foundation Ireland as one of the very few in which SFI channels money to Northern Ireland. Particular Northern strengths in wind and wave energy are reflected in the projects funded under this programme.

Also in 2006 the Irish Energy Research Council was established and specifically charged to ‘have regard to the all-island dimension’ of its responsibilities. The council had one member with a Northern affiliation, Professor Peter Crossley, then of Queen’s University, now returned to Manchester University. The council consulted institutions, companies and individuals in developing its Energy Research Strategy for Ireland (2008).\(^3\) The University of Ulster’s Centre for Sustainable Technologies, which
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has well-established collaborations with University College Dublin, was the only Northern group to make a submission in response to the strategy document. ‘As all-island cooperation is highly recommended to aid in the construction of a strong and dynamic energy research base in Ireland, strong representations need to be made to Northern counterparts to ensure cooperation and avoid duplication,’ wrote the Centre’s director, Professor Neil Hewitt.

This strategy document referred briefly to the all-island context, and to the ‘need for strong coordination, within Ireland, between north and south’ and to ‘existing R&D strengths on the island of Ireland’. However, the Energy Research Map of Ireland produced in 2011 by the Sustainable Energy Authority of Ireland showed a relatively weak representation of Northern Ireland in the ‘hotspots’ for various categories of energy research, in the number of groups engaged in such research and in the level of funding obtained for it. Clearly, the all-island dimension of energy research is under-developed, and the Irish Energy Research Council, now without Northern representation, has not been meeting recently.

The European Commission is the source of funding for collaborative research in ocean energy that is led by University College Cork(UCC) and includes Queen’s University Belfast as one of the 12 other partners. This CORES project (2008-11) has been testing systems in Galway Bay. UCC’s principal initiative in this sector is the Irish Maritime and Energy Resource Cluster (IMERC), which is being developed in co-operation with Cork Institute of Technology and the Irish Naval Service. Among its ambitions is to build ‘the largest and most significant marine energy research group in the world’. Given that Ireland’s island status is shared between two states, Northern partners – Queen’s University and University of Ulster – are an entirely expected presence, especially given Queen’s involvement in the world-leading Seagen tidal energy project in Strangford Lough. But they are among a longer list of partners that includes higher education and research institutions on the Atlantic seaboard in Canada, United States and Brazil.

Marine research involving cross-border partnerships has been supported by the Beaufort Marine Research Awards initiated in 2007 by the Marine Institute in Galway. These were explicitly open to ‘research groups located in Institutions on the Island of Ireland (32 counties)’ and Queen’s University researchers have received €4 million of the €20 million allocated.

Funding available from the European Union’s INTERREG programme within the area encompassing the border regions of Ireland and western Scotland is supporting BioMara, a €6 million joint UK-Irish project examining the feasibility of producing biofuels from seaweed. The project is based in Scotland and involves research teams in University of Ulster, Queen’s University, Dundalk Institute of Technology and Institute of Technology Sligo. The project has additional funding from regional and national government agencies bodies in Scotland, Northern Ireland and the Republic.
Also crossing the border, the Republic’s Griffith Research Awards for geosciences were given in 2007 to eight projects involving teams in University of Ulster and Queen’s University, as well as in several universities, a research institute and a museum in the Republic. The projects received funding totalling €9.2 million. Under this scheme, the geological surveys North and South are participating in the Irish Geoscience Graduate Programme, which makes taught modules available to PhD students in geosciences in institutions either side of the border. This programme was funded through a Griffith Research Award to the Dublin Institute of Advanced Studies.

In a related collaboration, the geological surveys in the two jurisdictions are also involved in joint survey work in the border counties under the €5 million Tellus Border mapping project. This is funded mainly by the EU INTERREG IVA Programme, and the current phase of the project is led by the Geological Survey Northern Ireland with partners Geological Survey Ireland, Queen’s University Belfast and Dundalk Institute of Technology. The collection of geological data is intended to support the management of soils, stream waters and ground waters across the border counties. Additional funding has come from the Departments of Environment, North and South.

INTERREG funding has also supported the All-Island Research Observatory (AIRO) at National University of Ireland Maynooth, which is compiling demographic and other data in maps as a resource for evidence-based planning. AIRO was initially established as a pilot project with INTERREG support and was broadened with funding from the Programme for Research in Third Level Institutions in 2008-11. The National Institute for Regional and Spatial Analysis (NIRSA) and the National Centre for Geocomputation at NUI Maynooth have led the project, with the Armagh-based International Centre for Local and Regional Development, Queen’s University and Dundalk Institute of Technology as academic partners.

One of the longer-term North-South research relationships is that between Queen’s University’s highly successful QUESTOR international environmental research centre and Dublin City University. In this case, the main flow of money is – unusually – from North to South. DCU became QUESTOR’s first academic partner outside Queen’s in 2005 and Professor Fiona Regan and colleagues at the School of Chemical Sciences in DCU currently have eight projects centred on PhD studentships funded through QUESTOR. The centre undertakes and supports research that is industry-led and funded from QUESTOR’s 50 industrial members’ annual fees and from state agencies in Northern Ireland and the Republic. In a small number of cases, funding from the Irish Environmental Protection Agency has supported research conducted in Northern Ireland.

DCU proposals have been notably successful in the annual competitions for funding allocated by decision of QUESTOR’s industrial members. A further six DCU projects will be funded in the 2012 round. Professor Regan
observes that DCU’s applied research approach represents a good fit with QUESTOR, but also that cultural compatibility and easy physical access facilitate the continuing relationship. Currency exchange issues, sometimes cited as a disincentive to cross-border collaboration, have been addressed in this relationship by fixing the exchange rate at the start of the three-year projects.

QUESTOR is also the co-ordinator of an EU-funded research training project with seven partners in Britain, Germany and Ireland. DCU academics helped write the proposal for the €3.4 million project and has funding through this project to support five doctoral researchers investigating aspects of water quality improvement.

Safefood, the North/South food safety promotion body, has funded over 90 research projects in the past decade. These have been spread around university departments, state laboratories and independent researchers across the island, though few have involved direct cross-border collaboration.

In research on public health and on ageing, the Institute of Public Health in Ireland and CARDI (Centre for Ageing Research and Development in Ireland) also engage academic and independent researchers from both jurisdictions, sometimes in direct collaboration. Both groups receive funding from agencies in both states, though CARDI receives its main support from the charitable foundation Atlantic Philanthropies.

It would take detailed and probably difficult investigation of the incentives and disincentives to cross-border research collaboration to undertake a more complete assessment of the present picture. As indicated earlier, the larger context of research administration and culture would need to be taken into account. International comparisons with, for example, research relations in European cross-border regions where there are established inter-university networks (such as the Oresund region of Denmark and Southern Sweden, the Upper Rhine region between France, Germany and Switzerland and the Dutch-NW German-Flanders region) could be instructive. But it does seem fair to observe that academic researchers in the Republic of Ireland do not give particular preference to their counterparts in the other Irish jurisdiction when seeking out partnerships.

On 11 -15 July 2012 Dublin will host the biennial Euroscience Open Forum (ESOF), to which 5,000 researchers from all over Europe will come to deliver and hear presentations and discussions on a wide range of subjects in the natural and social sciences. Of the 80 panel proposals approved for the programme, just one is coordinated from Northern Ireland, reflecting the very small proportion of proposals received from that source. The successful proposer works in ocean research and collaborates actively with Southern colleagues. In its planning of this event, the local organising committee, including myself, did not consider the possible implications for Northern participation of scheduling the conference during the height of the ‘Twelfth’ marching season!
Brian Trench is a former senior lecturer in the School of Communications, Dublin City University and a former member of the board of the Centre for Cross Border Studies. He is a researcher and educator in science communication and a participant in several EU-funded projects in science in society. He has lectured in 15 countries on science communication, and published widely, most recently on science blogs. He is co-editor (with M. Bucchi) of *Handbook of Public Communication of Science and Technology* (Routledge 2008). Before joining DCU in 1992, he was a journalist for 20 years.
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A PARADOX IN IRISH ATTITUDES: GARRET FITZGERALD AND THE NORTH-SOUTH RELATIONSHIP

Eoin Magennis

Dr Garret FitzGerald, twice former Taoiseach (1981-82 and 1983-87) and Minister for Foreign Affairs (1973-77), died on 19 May 2011. He is generally recognised, at home and abroad, to have been one of the outstanding Irish statesmen of the second half of the 20th century. When his name is mentioned in relation to North-South cooperation, it is usually with reference to his time in government and his involvement in various British-Irish initiatives. The most notable of these were the Sunningdale Agreement of December 1973 and the Anglo-Irish Agreement (AIA) of November 1985. In both initiatives the North-South elements (the Council of Ireland and the Anglo-Irish Intergovernmental Conference) were central. Indeed what was seen as Dublin interference in the shape of these new institutions became the focus of fierce and concerted unionist opposition.1

Given his recent passing, it seems timely to offer an exploration of Garret FitzGerald’s views on this border paradox and actions to deal with it. This article opens by looking at Sunningdale and the Anglo-Irish Agreement and the North-South institutions mentioned above. (Those wanting more detail on these should refer to their voluminous treatment in FitzGerald’s autobiography, All in a Life (1991)3. It then goes on to focus on the way in which he tried to resolve the paradox and looks at FitzGerald’s belief that ideas, relationships and conversations might

Garret FitzGerald’s interest in Northern Ireland and the related question of partition led him to identify a paradox in Irish attitudes. On the one hand partition was a bad thing to be opposed and done away with in order to reunite the island. On the other hand many, if not most, Irish politicians or public figures in FitzGerald’s lifetime had little interest in or knowledge of the North. Indeed, his frequent visits to Northern Ireland and his writings about the border and the North-South relationship arguably made FitzGerald atypical in the Republic of Ireland.2
change minds; his understanding that dealing with the border posed a strong challenge for the South; and his view that cooperation offered more in the way of opportunities and mutual benefits than threats to identity. It concludes with what can only be an initial and hopefully fair assessment of his contributions to the North-South relationship.

**Forming North-South institutions**

The Sunningdale communiqué of December 1973 announced agreement on a Council of Ireland comprising a Council of Ministers from the Irish Government and the power-sharing Executive in Northern Ireland, a secretariat to support this, and a consultative North/South Assembly. The Council was to have executive and ‘harmonising functions’ as well as having a consultative role on some policing functions within both states. It was to prove a key stumbling block to unionist acceptance of the Sunningdale Agreement, although FitzGerald suggested later that the collapse of the Executive had not been inevitable. At a distance of over 30 years FitzGerald’s belief was that a combination of a failure of Britain to back the Agreement, of the Irish Government to trust in public opinion over changing Articles 2 and 3, and political tactics within both North and South led to the collapse.

FitzGerald makes an interesting comment about the Council of Ireland in his reminiscence on the Sunningdale talks and communiqué. This is that he tended to push for stronger powers for the Council, sometimes against the reluctance not only of Unionists but also Paddy Devlin of the SDLP. Indeed, when FitzGerald showed Devlin the lengthy list of executive functions for the new Council of Ireland which he had agreed in negotiations, the latter deleted many of these, arguing that too long a list would endanger unionist agreement. FitzGerald was reflecting Irish government policy on the need for a strong Council which would begin the process of removing the border. However, perhaps paradoxically, he was also clear in his view that the Council had the potential to offer an opportunity for reconciliation between North and South.

In the 1985 Anglo-Irish Agreement the North-South element was to be found in the Anglo-Irish Intergovernmental Conference (AIIC). Article 2 established this institution, in which the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland and the Irish Minister for Foreign Affairs would meet regularly to discuss not only cross-border issues (such as security and the promotion of further cooperation), but also issues internal to Northern Ireland (including the administration of justice). Although it was envisaged that the AIIC might become less active if devolution took off in Northern Ireland, a permanent secretariat was established in Maryfield, outside Belfast, which became a focus for angry unionist protest demonstrations. The AIIC was less of an executive body than a formalisation of the regular inter-governmental discussions and summits since 1980. 20 meetings had taken place and studies had been commissioned in this period to see where cooperation could be promoted.
There has been much debate over the importance of the AIC, which the Irish Times said would give Ireland ‘a foothold in decisions governing Northern Ireland’. The experience of the civil servants involved was that it was largely concerned with political matters. What limited practical cross-border cooperation there was tended to be driven by the beginnings of EU funding and the work of the International Fund for Ireland.8

Not surprisingly then, Garret FitzGerald’s memoir records the achievements of the Anglo-Irish Agreement in terms of what became known as ‘confidence-building measures’ within Northern Ireland. These included the Flags and Emblems Act, criteria for rerouting contentious parades and updated Fair Employment legislation. Also, crucially, it marked a distinct shift in his approach to the North-South relationship. The Anglo-Irish Agreement, to the fury of most unionists, was signed without their input. FitzGerald dealt with this question in a characteristically direct fashion on the 25th anniversary of the agreement:

This decision represented a reversal of my own earlier preference for a solution agreed with our Northern unionist fellow Irishmen. That personal change of stance reflected concerns about the scale of increased support among the Northern minority for Sinn Fein/IRA, which, we feared, might tempt the IRA to raise its level of violence to a civil war scale. Also, the cumulative impact of unionist intransigence over the preceding 15 years had eroded confidence in the alternative approach that I had hitherto espoused.9

The current North/South institutions, in the shape of the North South Ministerial Council (NSMC) and the six implementation bodies, were established in December 1999, after more than a year and a half of intense negotiations following the April 1998 Belfast/Good Friday Agreement.10 There are significant differences from the Anglo-Irish Agreement structures, such as the executive functions of the implementation bodies, albeit within tight remits, and the meetings of the NSMC involving Irish Ministers and the Northern Ireland Executive, rather than Direct Rule Ministers. Garret FitzGerald (out of office for 11 years at this point) approved of the bodies, although he also had particular hopes that they would fulfil a key economic function. At the time of the Belfast Agreement he wrote that the bodies had ‘an important psychological role to fulfil’ for Northern nationalists. However, he went on:

If this new North/South relationship is to prosper, these bodies must become much more than psychological boosts…they must start to play a visibly positive role in the development of the Northern Ireland economy.11

Two ideas suggested themselves to FitzGerald: the creation of economies of scale in energy (involving a single regulatory agency) and joint inward investment promotion (involving the merging of the IDA and the then Industrial Development Board in Northern Ireland). The first of these has
been tackled on a North-South basis, although without a single regulator, while the second has been ignored in the argument about how to use lower corporation tax (as in the Republic) to attract FDI to Northern Ireland.12

**Conversations, ideas and relationships**

Moving from the creation of institutions to the development of arguments and/or the use of persuasion to further North-South cooperation and understanding, we come to the importance placed by Garret FitzGerald on conversations, writing and cultivating friendships. Many of the reminiscences about FitzGerald centre, mostly genially, on his loquaciousness and almost professorial style. Cabinet meetings were lengthy affairs and so too could be intergovernmental talks. In November 1982 Margaret Thatcher reported on one such meeting and James Molyneux, leader of the Ulster Unionists, ironically commended her ‘on her fortitude yesterday in listening to Dr. FitzGerald for some five hours. It may have seemed a little longer.’13

However, this very characteristic was part and parcel of Fitzgerald’s passionate belief that people could be persuaded, and that ideas and conversations were important in rethinking what had become known as the ‘Northern Ireland question’. This was a quite deliberate policy and one which he pursued even before his entry into politics in 1965. For example an article, written for the journal *Studies* in late 1964, was specifically aimed at making public his political ideas on the North at a time when Northern Ireland was very much off the Southern political agenda – something which seems strange to a contemporary reader more used to the cynical (and often untruthful) art of spin. The article openly targetted many of the ‘sacred cows’ underpinning demands for Irish unity and argued that in future any North-South relations ‘ would be based on wholehearted acceptance of the principle that political unity must be preceded by a unity of hearts... the government of Northern Ireland as a provincial administration meanwhile would receive the unequivocal recognition that is its due.’14

One reason that Garret FitzGerald gave for his interest in the North was his personal connections. His mother, Mabel McConnell, was from a prominent Belfast Presbyterian business family and he was unusual among his peers in spending a lot of time in Northern Ireland, visiting relatives as well as political figures. Family holidays were spent there during his childhood with the McConnell relatives being those closest to him. FitzGerald knew he was different, and in a 1956 *Studies* article comparing the economies of North and South he castigated his fellow Southerners for never visiting the North and the media for ignoring news beyond sectarian disturbances.15

In later life FitzGerald endeavoured to continue and develop his connections with the North. This extended beyond family as his career took off. For example, as a lecturer in political economy in UCD he organised first a joint visit by Irish and Northern Irish economists to Brussels in 1962,
and then annual meetings in the Ballymascanlon Hotel outside Dundalk of ‘dismal scientists’ from both sides of the border. He also accepted invitations to lecture, especially in Belfast. Two cases of this are a talk given to a predecessor of the SDLP, National Unity, in 1959, and another in Queen’s University in February 1975 on the Irish presidency of the EEC.¹⁶

One example of a by-product of this relationship-building, intellectual and political, was the presentations by two leading economists, Sir Charles Carter (from the North) and Professor Louden Ryan (from the South), to the New Ireland Forum in 1983. Carter and Ryan were both well-known to FitzGerald. He knew Carter – Vice-Chancellor of University of Lancaster and former Professor of Economics at Queen’s University Belfast – through a paper he gave to the Statistical and Social Inquiry Society in 1954, which prompted FitzGerald to write his own comparison of the two Irish economies. Ryan, Professor of Industrial Economics at Trinity College Dublin, was also a longstanding colleague in academia and on public bodies. Both speakers noted the poor state of the Northern Ireland economy and its bleak prospects while it continued under UK regional policies. However, they did not pander to nationalist sympathies either, as they pointed out that the South was not in a position to make reunification economically attractive.¹⁷
Carter and Ryan’s submissions to the Forum were central to another sometimes sceptical study of the consequences of North-South economic integration.18 This was part-written by a Northerner well-known to FitzGerald and a key figure in the rethinking of anti-partitionism in the 1950s. Professor Norman Gibson had written a pamphlet in 1958 which provided a Northern perspective on partition and North-South relations which was neither unionist nor nationalist. Gibson concluded that partition was unlikely to end any time soon, if at all. Despite, or perhaps because of this, ‘every opportunity for mutual cooperation [with Ireland] must be taken and welcomed.’ The pamphlet was part of the ‘rethinking of the irredentist Irish approach to Northern Ireland’ to which FitzGerald contributed.19 Again, one is left with the impression that such personal networks mattered to FitzGerald even when the ideas they produced were not exactly to his liking.

Throughout his life FitzGerald made sure that his ideas were widely disseminated through journalism, lectures and books. For example, he described in 2004 how he wrote the first of 1,700 articles for the Irish Times in December 1954, beginning first with university statistics and then moving into economics and political commentary. Again, the North featured regularly: a web search of these articles shows almost 7% dealing with Northern Ireland. His many lectures were also intended to shape debate and discussion. In one, given to the Oxford University Students Union on the eve of the 1973 Sunningdale talks, FitzGerald spoke of the ‘spirit of reconciliation’ in the South, surveyed at some length the origins of the conflict, and proposed solutions including the Council of Ireland.20

A challenge to the South

Garret FitzGerald was not unaware that his ideas on the North-South relationship would challenge opinion in Ireland. The clearest statement of these ideas came in the book Towards a New Ireland, published in 1972 when Stormont had been abolished and the conflict in Northern Ireland threatened to spill over into the South.21 Again the Northern input is made clear in the preface, with thanks to Canon Eric Elliott of the Church of Ireland, the civil servant Terry Stewart and the economist John Simpson for their help. Reconciliation, he stressed, was the priority, not only within the North, but also between North and South.

The idea of how to become ‘good neighbours’ was then explored in the rest of the book. Partition is presented by FitzGerald as having had many negative effects, from accelerating economic differences between the two states to preventing a secular system of education and the development of left/right politics within both. Indeed, in one section, he bemoans how a perceived need for Ireland to follow Northern Ireland (or rather UK) policy had led to differences with European decimalisation and the continued economic dependence of both on British rather than new EEC markets. Given the debates in 1972 about the future of Northern Ireland, Garret FitzGerald offered a full chapter on the need for
reforms there. He then followed that with a chapter on the changes needed in the South to create a more ‘liberal and pluralist society’. Here were the beginnings of the divisive ‘constitutional crusade’ he headed while in government in the early 1980s, itself an effort to persuade unionists that unity did not pose a threat.

Later, in a 1997 article, in a completely changed context, FitzGerald again laid down a challenge, this time for a much-needed debate in Ireland about the North/South institutions. In the Framework Documents agreed between the British and Irish Governments in February 1995, it was proposed that significant functions of the Irish state could be transferred to joint cross-border control, including export marketing and promotional activities, culture and heritage, environmental management of landscape and nature, and EU programmes and policies. This debate would also prepare opinion in the South for the potentially radical changes coming and show unionists that they might have more to gain from cooperation. In addition, discussion could both reassure Northern nationalists that Ireland was serious about the North/South institutions and put pressure on the public service in the South to respond positively to the change. In summary, in FitzGerald’s view, the North/South institutions:

might well involve...a serious challenge to the unconscious assumption by most people in this State that we can rely on Northern unionists to minimise North/South institutional links so as to leave us undisturbed in our comfortable, partitioned – and in many ways partitionist – State.

FitzGerald’s view was that partition posed a severe challenge to the Irish State and populace, one which it had repeatedly failed to meet. He believed that successive Irish Governments for the first 50 years of the State had refused to take the issue seriously. A large part of the problem was the uninformed and lazy belief that the border was a temporary thing which would disappear either through a Boundary Commission reducing the size of the new Northern State or through Irish pressure on Britain through international channels. In summary, anti-partitionism was a policy that everyone paid lip service to but noone expected to work.

Even the anti-traditionalist FitzGerald may have succumbed to this at times. Despite its novelty, Towards a New Ireland not only presented an argument for Irish unity, but also examined various scenarios in which this could happen. In articles in May 1998 arguing for the amendment of Articles 2 and 3 in a referendum, Fitzgerald wrote that noone would now take his 1972 arguments seriously. And in his memoirs he mused on a possible lost opportunity in 1973-4 to hold a similar referendum. This might have helped the Sunningdale Agreement, though FitzGerald was also aware that a failed campaign to amend Articles 2 and 3 would have been very damaging.

A centerpiece of FitzGerald’s intellectual contributions to undermining traditional
anti-partitionist arguments was the New Ireland Forum report of 1984. One account of this takes the view that it was ‘a monument to the evasions and ambiguities’ in Irish policy on partition.\(^{25}\) FitzGerald himself seemed well aware in later reflections of its weaknesses, especially the ‘ritual obeisance’ to the ‘unitary state’ over the joint authority or confederation options. However, the report clearly stated that consent in both states would be needed for any final agreement; put other options on the table based on North-South cooperation rather than just a demand for unity, and did not evade the economic implications of reunification.\(^{26}\)

These economic implications posed another challenge to the South, which had been explored by FitzGerald from the 1950s onwards. In this early period the economic output per head and standards of living were very much in favour of Northern Ireland (perhaps by 20-30%) and the gap seemed to be widening. The North’s major advantages lay in higher productivity in agriculture and industries such as engineering and textiles. However, even then, before the expansion of the Lemass years, there was a future pointer in the finding that in other industries the South was ‘more highly developed’. FitzGerald’s impish humour can be found in comparisons of consumption which showed that the North spent more on amusements, perhaps showing that ‘the inhabitants of that area are less dour than is commonly assumed!’\(^{27}\)

Although FitzGerald was always clear about the havoc wreaked on the North’s economy by the violence after 1969, there were signs that the differences between the two states were diminishing even before then. In a comparison written in 1967, he noted that industrial output was then broadly similar, although the necessity of a more focused policy to attract FDI to Northern Ireland was stressed. By this time, however, the main reason for the gap between North and South was the lower level of agricultural output in the latter. As he forecast, better industrial policy, membership of the EEC and changing farm practices saw the South outstrip the North over the next three decades. So much so that just as the Celtic Tiger was taking off in 1997 FitzGerald pointed out that personal disposable income in the South had overtaken the North.\(^{28}\) This point was made in an argument not for political unity but for economic cooperation.

**Mutual benefits and opportunities**

Garret FitzGerald often posed the question of whether North-South cooperation could aid the two economies and his answer was consistently ‘Yes’. In an article after the Lemass-O’Neill talks in January 1965, he argued strongly that such cooperation could have mutual benefits. He focused on a then favourite topic of his, tourism, and argued that whatever benefits might come to the North from promotion of travel to the UK, these would be outstripped by cooperation with the Irish Tourist Board in overseas promotion.\(^{29}\)

This was an argument he pursued consistently though the Sunningdale talks, the Anglo-Irish Agreement
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and later. By the time of the Belfast Agreement it was becoming clear that the major benefits of peace and agreement would accrue to a lagging Northern economy. Cross-border trade was seen as bringing advantages to small firms in the North, although it would not transform that economy. What was needed instead, FitzGerald argued, was lower corporation tax for the North at the same level as the South’s, plus a joint inward investment promotion body. He hoped that the economic benefits that might accrue would outweigh any ‘ideological hang-up about North/South joint action in significant areas of economic policy.’

It is useful to note that Garret FitzGerald could see the challenges (and sacrifices) inherent in such cooperation. Back in the 1960s it posed a threat to vested agricultural and political interests in the Republic, as well as to energy policies based on turf production. In the 1990s and 2000s the price to be paid by joint inward investment promotion might be in those towns and counties across Ireland which would lose out in a more competitive all-island FDI market. However FitzGerald generally chose instead to focus on the mutual benefits that might emerge, including from a better knowledge and understanding of policies in the other jurisdiction.

As befits his early intellectual interests, he found the 2001 joint statistical compilation *North and South: A Statistical Profile* a joy to read and in particular, with his love of statistics, the differences in marriage rates, deaths from various causes and the relative shares of the island’s economic output in 1997 (75% from the South, 25% the North). Just as importantly he made the point that the statistics could alert people ‘to weaknesses and deficiencies that could usefully be tackled by drawing on the experience of the neighbouring area.’ This is almost a direct copy of a metaphor in a 1956 article in which he noted that the South should learn from the North, as anyone would take an interest in a neighbour’s garden ‘especially if his crops of fruit and vegetables are notably more successful’.

### The North-South relationship and its barriers

In reflecting on his ideas and actions – and in the interests of balance – an argument can be made that there were barriers to Garret FitzGerald’s cultivation of the North-South relationship. The first of these resulted from his frustration with what he saw as unionist intransigence. This probably began with the collapse of the Sunningdale deal in 1974 and continued into the 1980s. Although this did not break his links with the North, there is no doubt that the relationship-building on which he placed much emphasis would have been sorely tested, particularly after the Anglo-Irish Agreement. A second not unconnected barrier was identified by FitzGerald in later years. His view was that unionist politicians and their economic advisers at the time of the Belfast Agreement had chosen stagnation over potential cooperation and joint development, particularly in the economic sphere.

Both these arguments led to suspicions...
at the time that he really did not ‘get’ unionists and the depth of their suspicion about or antipathy to closer relations with the South.

The third barrier seems to have come from FitzGerald’s annoyance at British insistence on a snail’s pace development in cross-border cooperation in the 1970s. This he blamed on the failure of the British authorities, be they based in London or the Northern Ireland Office in Belfast, to progress the very practical joint studies on the impact of the border, some of which had been proposed as early as 1963. Indeed, he did not contradict Jack Lynch’s claim in 1978 that the latter was ‘surprised and disappointed’ at how little progress had been made in the area of practical North-South cooperation over the previous four years. A final barrier, which FitzGerald himself pointed to, was his own failure (along with most Irish politicians of his generation) to push harder to challenge anti-partitionist views in the South. This centred on what might be called ‘missed opportunities’ to amend Articles 2 and 3 of the Irish Constitution much earlier than in 1998.

It is the belief of this writer that these barriers or limits to pursuing the North-South relationship should not be allowed to hide the extent of Garret FitzGerald’s contribution to highlighting the issue in both Ireland and Northern Ireland. He succeeded in tackling the ‘border paradox’ and challenging people, particularly in the South, to take partition more seriously rather than seeking comfort in well-established and largely outdated rhetoric. His political initiatives of the 1970s and 1980s also laid the framework for the 1998 Belfast Agreement and the institutions which have emerged out of that accord. Above all, Garret FitzGerald’s political and intellectual actions and arguments undermined many key preconceptions about North-South relationships and laid the foundations for their unprecedented normality and ordinariness today.

Dr Eoin Magennis is a leading local historian of the Armagh-Down area, and an author of previous articles in this journal and elsewhere on the development of cross-border economic, business and political cooperation. He is a former information and research officer with the Centre for Cross Border Studies. The author wishes to acknowledge the advice, information and encouragement provided by Professor John Coakley, Dr Michael Kennedy, Jani Lopez and Dr Lesa Ní Mhunghaile.
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CROSS-BORDER HOSPITAL PLANNING IN IRELAND: LEARNING FROM LOCAL SUCCESS STORIES

Shane McQuillan and Vanya Sargent

“Our hospitals are too many, too small, and too independent of each other. The available resources are too thinly spread.” This quote was taken from the FitzGerald Report into hospital services in the Republic of Ireland, published in 1968, 44 years ago. It remains true, if not quite so dramatically true, of hospitals in both Northern Ireland and Republic of Ireland today.

The provision of acute hospital services in Ireland has, for many years, been a matter of significant debate, with much of the focus on the location of hospitals and the public and political concerns surrounding services being removed from smaller hospitals and centralised within larger, regional units. So what has changed since 1968, we may ask, given the number of academic papers, consultancy reports, government reviews and the like which have been published in the intervening years? Perhaps the main difference is the sheer reduction in scale: in 1968, the FitzGerald report found that there were ‘169 separate hospitals providing acute medical, surgical and maternity services’ in the Republic of Ireland, as opposed to the 51 public hospitals now operating, along with 18 private hospitals.

In recent times, we have seen the greater centralisation of clinical services within larger, regional hospitals, reflecting the fact that more complex work requiring multidisciplinary clinical input can only be delivered safely and efficiently within such institutions. This does not necessarily mean that the days of smaller hospitals are numbered: instead it recognises that the role which these hospitals play is more appropriately focused on those services which do not require complex clinical interventions or lengthy inpatient stays, enabling them to concentrate on providing diagnostic services, day procedures, outpatient appointments,
reviews over the years has adequately addressed is the question of cross-border acute care provision: services being specifically developed and delivered in an acute hospital in one jurisdiction to serve the identified needs of client and patient populations on both sides of the border, rather than simply in their own territory. For the most part, experience up to very recently shows that the efforts of the two health systems, North and South, have been directed very specifically to meeting the needs of their own populations, with little reference being made to those requiring similar services on the other side of the border.

Of course, there are many occasions in which people living in one jurisdiction are either forced to use hospital services on the other side of the border (for example, people suddenly taken ill or involved in accidents), or choose to access services across the border for various reasons (for instance, maternity deliveries at Daisy Hill Hospital in Newry to mothers resident in County Louth because they are unhappy with such services in hospitals in Louth).

In Northern Ireland a similar situation prevails. Over the last decade the configuration of acute hospitals has been reviewed and analysed on several occasions, culminating in recommendations contained within a major report arising from a wide-ranging review of health and social care services in Northern Ireland, published in December 2011. The Compton Report identified that 10 acute hospitals in NI currently serve a population of 1.8 million, and suggested that a reduction is necessary in order to bring Northern Ireland into line with other areas of the UK with similar-sized populations. The review team concluded that it is only likely to be possible to provide resilient, sustainable major acute services on five to seven sites in future, and that significant change will have occurred by 2016-17.

What none of these various studies and
are not geared exclusively to the service requirements and funding of one or other health system.

**Cross-border health research**

Although the two health systems have been slow to come together for joint service planning initiatives, some useful research studies have been published in recent years and have explored options for developing cross-border hospital care in a more structured and integrated fashion. The Centre for Cross Border Studies (CCBS) has been particularly active in this field, and has commissioned a series of reports examining the potential for achieving significant change. As long ago as 2001 the Centre published a wide-ranging report, *Cross-Border Co-operation in Health Services in Ireland*, by a team led by Dr Jim Jamison of Queen’s University Belfast and Professor Martin McKee of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine.

A 2007 report, *Removing the Barriers: an Initial Report on the Potential for Cross-Border Co-operation in Hospital Services in Ireland*, concluded that there was a clear case for joint hospital planning and rationalisation in the border region. The report documented differences in strategic policy between the two jurisdictions: for example, there appeared to be a greater premium on accessibility in Northern Ireland than in the Republic. There were also questions raised in respect of future acute hospital provision in the North-East region, suggesting that account needed to be taken of services available across the border. Similarly, in April 2008, an OECD report highlighted the latter issue.

In March 2008 the Centre for Cross Border Studies published a further paper – ‘Surveying the Sickbeds: initial steps towards modelling all-island hospital accessibility’ – in which it examined the possibilities of spatially exploring the accessibility of present and future hospital provision, with particular attention paid to the cross-border region.

In light of the above research, the Centre for Cross Border Studies, with funding from the EU INTERREG IVA programme through the Special EU Programmes Body, commissioned further research on the planning of hospital services in the border region. The 2009-2011 project, *Exploring the Potential for Cross-Border Hospital Services in the Border Region*, comprised two strands. The first strand examined the issue of public participation in the planning of acute hospital services. This was undertaken by Ruth Taillon, CCBS Deputy Director, and a substantial report, *The Role of Community Involvement in Planning Hospital Services*, outlining the importance of such participation, was published in October 2010.

The second strand, related to the development of a modelling framework for cross-border acute hospital services, culminated in a report published in December 2011, *Unlocking the Potential of Cross-Border Hospital Planning on the Island of Ireland*, written by the authors of this article, Shane McQuillan and Vanya Sargent of Horwath Bastow Charleton. This report examined the potential for the development of acute cross-border services by exploring a number of clinical areas, including ENT.
(discussed in this article in more detail); orthopaedic surgery; acute mental health services; paediatric cardiac surgery; and cystic fibrosis services.

**Cooperation and Working Together (CAWT)**

One cross-border health partnership which has been making a difference is Cooperation and Working Together (CAWT), which celebrates the 20th anniversary of its inauguration in 2012. CAWT is a partnership between health and social care providers in Northern Ireland and the Republic, and facilitates cross-border collaborative working between those providers. CAWT’s region includes counties Donegal, Sligo, Leitrim, Cavan, Monaghan and Louth in the Republic, and counties Armagh, Fermanagh, mid- and west Tyrone, much of Derry, and south Down in the North.

In its early years, much of CAWT’s activity was focused on research projects and on analysing the future potential for introducing more collaborative approaches on a cross-border basis. At present, on behalf of the two Departments of Health, CAWT is managing the implementation of 12 EU INTERREG IVA funded large-scale cross-border health and social care projects. The title of this overarching programme is *Putting Patients, Clients and Families First*, and it has a strong focus on improving access to services, promoting health and well-being, reducing health inequalities, and promoting social inclusion across five strategic themes: acute hospital services; primary, community and continuing care; mental health; population health and disability.

CAWT’s work now has a very practical focus, and is benefiting patients in a direct manner by making available treatment in border hospitals which previously was not available locally, or where capacity problems existed. The partnership works to a series of defined criteria which candidate projects must meet, including the requirements that they must:

- contribute to cross-border core health services, in line with the CAWT partners’ strategic and service plans;
- demonstrate health and/or social gain, impacting directly on patient / client care, and bring added value;
- be based on common and identified cross-border needs;
- reduce inequalities and disadvantage, facilitate access and equity and ensure social inclusion;
- show true partnership with evidence of community and voluntary sector engagement and input into the planning and delivery process;
- improve patient/client access to primary and secondary care;
- have a clear exit strategy with the potential for future mainstreaming;
- be capable of delivering focused, achievable, specified outcomes within a given timescale, which can be clearly evaluated;
- ensure consumer involvement and person-centredness.

At present, the benefits of this approach can be seen clearly in CAWT’s Acute Hospital Services project, a €9 million initiative which has three streams of
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work: Ear, Nose and Throat (ENT) services; Vascular surgery; and Urology.

The Vascular project is located in the Erne Hospital in Enniskillen and performs vascular surgery for patients throughout the CAWT region, including procedures for dialysis patients who previously had to wait long periods for such interventions in Dublin. There is a multidisciplinary team between the Erne Hospital (Enniskillen) and Sligo General Hospital, as some screening is provided to patients from the Erne in Sligo. Both clinicians and patients travel between the locations to deliver and access the related services.

The Urology project has involved the appointment of a consultant urologist in Letterkenny General Hospital, which along with the existing consultants creates a team of five, treating patients on both sides of the border, in the HSE West, Western Health and Social Care Trust (NI), and HSE Dublin North East regions.

**Ear Nose and Throat services**

A cross-border pilot Ear, Nose and Throat (ENT) service, supported by funding from the INTERREG III-A Programme, was delivered between April 2006 and March 2007, aimed at reducing waiting times and lists at Altnagelvin Area and Letterkenny General Hospitals. The pilot project was managed with direct input from clinicians and managers from Altnagelvin and Letterkenny hospitals, and from the then Sperrin Lakeland HSS Trust (now part of the Western HSC Trust).

An extra ENT consultant was recruited to the staff of Altnagelvin Area Hospital, adding to the six consultants based there. The consultant team was detailed to work on a rotational basis, with inpatient surgical procedures at Altnagelvin, and outpatient and day-case services delivered at Letterkenny Hospital.

The pilot project was evaluated as having had a beneficial impact. As a direct result of the additional resources provided, almost 1,000 extra outpatient appointments were delivered for patients on the Letterkenny waiting list at Altnagelvin and Tyrone County Hospitals. The project significantly reduced waiting lists: the total reduction was 2,881 cases, reducing the numbers waiting more than six months from 74.7% to 8.5% in Letterkenny and from 39.6% to none in Altnagelvin.

CAWT are currently managing a project providing ENT services between Monaghan and Craigavon hospitals, principally serving the Cavan/Monaghan region in the Republic and the South Tyrone/Armagh region in NI. The service provides outpatient consultations and day-case surgery for adults in Monaghan Hospital, with paediatric cases referred to Daisy Hill Hospital in Newry and inpatient cases treated in Craigavon. Two ENT consultants were recruited under this programme: one is based full-time in Craigavon, and sees outpatients and performs some surgery in Craigavon, Newry, and Monaghan; the other consultant is part-time and is based in Monaghan, where he does outpatients and day-case surgery.

The initiative is funded through the INTERREG IV-A funding mechanism,
and is supported by ‘in kind’ provision of resources such as, for example, nursing time in Monaghan. The consultant surgeons have trained the clinical team in Monaghan to facilitate high-quality care for day-case ENT patients. CAWT have funded the necessary equipment and pay for the consultants.

This project also works to identify theatre capacity in the relevant hospitals, so that patients can be slotted in to utilise the available resources, and the waiting lists reduced accordingly. The project is not without its limitations and issues. Among these are:

- clinical guidelines recommend a six-hour post-op observation period, necessitating much of the Monaghan day-case surgery to be completed by 12 noon as the patients ordinarily require to be discharged by 6 pm from Monaghan, reducing the number of operations that can be performed on a given day;
- Monaghan can only take adult patients, meaning that paediatric patients must be referred to Newry;
- Monaghan is not a full-service acute hospital: protocols are in place for emergency transfer to Craigavon should the need arise. To date, this has never been needed;
- procurement can be problematic with NHS supply chain restrictions;
- there is a perception in relation to patients accessing the service provided under the CAWT programme that it has a somewhat different status than ‘ordinary’ hospital attendees;
- difficulties in attracting staff to hospitals outside the main urban centres in both NI and RoI.

However the project is well-established and has successfully treated over 4,800 patients in a little over two years. Given the demonstrated success of this cross-border clinical network approach, funding and support have been secured from the HSE and the Southern HSC Trust to maintain the ENT cross-border service between Monaghan and Craigavon. The project will therefore continue beyond the external EU funding and be mainstreamed as part of the health services in both jurisdictions.

The significant waiting lists in areas such as Louth for ENT outpatient consultations (in excess of 2,000) have led to the expansion of the Monaghan/Craigavon project to treat patients from Louth. It is intended that patients on the Louth waiting list can be seen in Louth County Hospital outpatient clinics and may avail of treatment in Monaghan on a day-case basis.

There is an intention to develop a permanent cross-border ENT clinical network in the north-west, providing services in Letterkenny and the Erne Hospital in Enniskillen on a day-case basis (the Erne has no ENT surgery service at present), and Sligo and Altnagelvin on an inpatient basis. This will build on both the success of the pilot project in the north-west and the current Monaghan/Craigavon project.

Ultimately, it is intended that there will be a border region ENT service operating on a cross-border clinical network basis. There are 17 ENT consultants practicing in the border corridor and all have expressed interest in developing such an approach.
Replicating the ENT approach

It is clear that the ENT projects led by CAWT have had, and continue to have, a very positive impact on patients and their families in the border region, by making available and accessible treatments which were previously not available locally, or where there were long waiting lists. The challenge for the two health systems is whether and how the ENT approach can be replicated in other clinical areas where the same needs exist. This question has been examined in the new report, *Unlocking the Potential of Cross-Border Hospital Planning on the Island of Ireland*. In the report, we examine a series of clinical services – including ENT – in which more cohesive cross-border approaches have been developed, and we present a modelling tool which aims to take account of the benefits realised in those service areas and to provide the opportunity for similar approaches to be taken elsewhere.

Looking specifically at ENT, we found that a number of important factors enabled services to be developed on a cross-border basis and could be harnessed to facilitate such developments in other clinical areas, such as:

- the identified potential for better utilisation of capacity in both non-acute hospital settings and theatre space to slot in day-cases and inpatient treatment, so as to tackle waiting lists and treat patients in a timely manner;
- the recognition that there are no insurmountable obstacles to prevent the development of further cross-border ENT services – while some potential barriers exist (for example, dual registration and indemnity of clinicians), there are precedents for working around and overcoming them;
- the existence of champions (clinicians and managers) with the commitment, mandate and authority to develop further cross-border ENT services.

Not all services will lend themselves to being delivered on a cross-border basis, and there is no ‘one size fits all’ solution to the question of whether a given clinical service is suited to such an approach – every service is different in terms of a range of factors, including clinical complexity, interdependence between related specialties, the need for multidisciplinary and cross-professional skills, and sustainability in terms of clinical safety and efficiency. On that basis, our recent report includes a comprehensive framework to consider the key factors requiring assessment, and an online modelling tool designed to take account of the quantitative elements, to provide planners and policymakers with an opportunity to test the model and see what a more integrated cross-border approach might mean for their service.

The report examined ENT as one of five exemplar services in developing the framework for the planning and modelling of cross-border acute hospital services. The other services examined in detail were orthopaedic surgery, cystic fibrosis, acute mental health services, and paediatric cardiac surgery. A framework was developed that brings the user through a series of key decision points, and includes an Excel-based
modelling tool for quantitative analysis. Each exemplar service was examined by means of the framework methodology.

Following on from an initial assessment of any proposed cross-border acute service, and having considered key decisions in relation to the anticipated benefits, potential barriers, and presence of ‘champions’ (key people who will drive an initiative), some of the detailed decision factors that would need to be considered include the following:

**Quantitative Factors**
- **resources** – the number of consultants currently providing the service, and the number of locations in which they operate, e.g. the 17 consultants across three sites performing orthopaedic surgery in the North-West;
- **critical mass** – the number of consultants required to run a service effectively and safely (in the case of ENT, best practice showed that this equated to 1 ENT consultant surgeon per 70,000 population, and 3 consultant surgeons per ENT centre);
- **infrastructure** – e.g. the requirement for paediatric cardiac surgery to be supported by paediatric ICU services (among others) on-site;
- **supporting services** – such as specialised physiotherapy and dieticians for cystic fibrosis patients;
- **catchment population and current patient numbers** (elective and emergency);
- **incidence of need** within the population (e.g. 1% typically require ENT services);
- **waiting lists** – the orthopaedic surgery waiting lists in the NW region exceeded 1,600 at the end of 2010.

**Qualitative Factors**
- **appropriateness for local provision** – for example, paediatric surgery is unsuitable for local provision as it must be performed in tertiary centres with a high throughput of cases and significant specialised support services;
- **ability to access similar services**, e.g. the length of waiting lists and expected waiting time;
- **transport infrastructure** and the available connections between locations where services are provided and where the catchment population resides – a consideration for mental health services, for
example, is that those with mental health problems may have less capability to travel (may not have access to a car, for instance);

- **willingness to travel** – in ENT we found that patients were willing to travel for procedures, including across the border, rather than endure waiting lists, indicating that the service should be provided within the region;
- **patient experience** and satisfaction;
- **outcomes** – evidence is strong for an improvement in outcomes for cystic fibrosis patients treated in specialist centres, for example;
- **service quality** and the need to maintain quality and develop clinical teams in all locations proposed.

**Political commitment or obstruction?**

It is clear that the model for cross-border ENT as established by CAWT is working well to develop an effective service, reducing waiting lists and enabling patients to access a service both locally and in a timely manner. Similarly, as examined in our report, it would appear that other services could benefit from such an approach.

We referred earlier to the studies into prospects for more integrated cross-border care which had been conducted in recent years, and the consolidation of hospital services taking place separately on both sides of the border. However, this debate and analysis has lacked any real sense that growing funding and resourcing challenges could be better met by having a more integrated approach, and looking to a future planning scenario in which both jurisdictions agree to invest in a single new hospital to serve patients in a broad geographical area straddling the border, with satellite facilities providing less complex services, diagnostic facilities and the like, rather than having two or more medium- to large-sized hospitals providing similar services on each side of the border.

Our study for the Centre for Cross Border Studies showed that there is a commonly held belief among stakeholders at every level that in the absence of a policy imperative supporting and prioritising cross-border care initiatives, it is and will continue to be extremely difficult to obtain funding approval for the development of hospital or other healthcare services on a cross-border basis. This was exemplified by the reluctance of the two Departments of Health to publish a feasibility study, which they had jointly commissioned in 2007, to develop a strategic framework for taking forward on a North-South basis future collaborative work in planning and delivering some health and social care services. Although the study was concluded in February 2009, it was not published until December 2011, even though its recommendations were fairly non-contentious, dealing for the most part with closer collaborative working in future between the two Departments and the relevant health agencies in some limited and defined areas.

Many senior officials within the Northern Ireland health and social care system indicated to us a belief that the report’s suppression illustrated that major collaborative efforts in health service planning would be
unlikely to take place between the two jurisdictions, other than specific initiatives which are already under way. This was bolstered by a decision in March 2011 by the then Northern Health Minister, Michael McGimpsey (a member of the Ulster Unionist Party), to postpone development of the planned radiotherapy service centre in Altnagelvin, designed to provide services to patients from Donegal as well as those in the west of NI. This was in many ways the most significant cross-border development in acute services, and its delay was a worrying signal for some that the NI authorities, at least, were not committed to developing cross-border services on a larger scale. Its rapid reversal in May 2011 by the new NI Health Minister, Edwin Poots (a DUP member), has gone some way towards allaying such fears. However, the saga is a reminder of how such projects are vulnerable to political whims and tactics.

Overcoming high-level opposition or simply lack of interest is a difficult prospect. If key authority figures do not see a value in developing a co-ordinated approach at a strategic level, it undermines all attempts to establish cross-border initiatives further down the chain. However, as the various successes at a micro level have demonstrated, a lack of political support does not automatically spell failure for such projects. Indeed, the successful development and implementation of projects at local level, and the gradual roll-out of such initiatives across more sites and specialties, can inform later political and strategy-making decisions. They serve as an advertisement for the potential of cross-border services to deliver healthcare in a joined-up way to serve the needs of the population, and can act as a lever to drive a more strategic policy of collaboration in the future.

The current political environment in both jurisdictions is characterised by increasing cutbacks and pressure for reforms in the face of opposition. Deeply unpopular decisions are being taken, such as the closure of the A&E Department in Roscommon County Hospital, despite pre-election promises by government representatives to maintain services at the hospital (seemingly despite the evidence which tends to suggest that small A&E units cannot be operated safely on a 24/7 basis). The prospect for cross-border services to deliver ‘good news’ stories without significant additional investment could be exploited to sell the concept to those in authority.

Opportunities in Enniskillen?

The ongoing development of the new South West Acute Hospital in Enniskillen presents a significant opportunity for fresh thinking in respect of service provision on a cross-border basis. Replacing the existing Erne Hospital, the new hospital will provide up to 312 inpatient and day-case beds (compared with the present bed complement of 232 inpatient beds plus 16 day-case beds at the Erne).

The Western Health and Social Care Trust, which will operate the new hospital, places great emphasis on the fact that the model of care will promote the delivery of safe, accessible, sustainable, equitable, affordable, high
quality services, working in a network with other hospitals. At the core of the Trust’s new model is a focus on providing a better patient experience and improved patient outcomes, the capacity for which is to be delivered through better clinical facilities within a new, high-quality building offering 100% single-room accommodation (the first in NI).

The opening of the new South West Acute Hospital in mid-2012, and to a lesser extent the probable coming onstream of a new Enhanced Local Hospital in Omagh two or three years later, will present clear opportunities for the development and strengthening of acute hospital services for the benefit of patients on both sides of border. Given that current economic circumstances in both jurisdictions dictate that it is unlikely that any major new acute hospital construction projects will be approved in the foreseeable future, it is timely to consider whether developments of the type seen in Enniskillen will offer the prospect of improving access to services for those living in adjoining counties in the Republic of Ireland.

In this context, it is noteworthy that the new South West Acute Hospital will be within reasonable proximity of a number of major population centres in the Republic (by ‘reasonable proximity’, we mean a typical car journey of under 90 minutes). Included within this general potential catchment area are the towns of Monaghan, Clones, Bundoran, Killybegs, Manorhamilton, Leitrim Town, Carrick-on-Shannon, Belturbet, and Cootehill. It is not unreasonable to expect that a possible catchment population of between 200,000 and 250,000 persons in the adjoining five counties in the Republic (south Donegal, north and east Leitrim, north and mid-Cavan, north and west Monaghan, and north Sligo) might be able to benefit from the services planned for the new hospital in Enniskillen.

Particular opportunities may arise in areas such as day-case surgical procedures in orthopaedics, where there are lengthy waiting lists, serving patients not just in Fermanagh and Tyrone but also in the surrounding cross-border areas.

The new South West Acute Hospital can therefore have a valid and significant role to play as part of a managed clinical network which also involves the acute hospitals in Altnagelvin, Letterkenny and Sligo, and can help to increase the percentage of surgical procedures carried out on a day-case basis (currently significantly less in Ireland than in England and Wales) and a corresponding reduction in the need for costly acute surgical in-patient beds.

**Conclusion**

As we have found, there is an absence of any agreed strategic framework covering the health and social care systems in the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland which might facilitate cross-border co-operation, a situation exacerbated by the apparent lack of political will to commit to cross-border co-operation on a mutually agreed agenda of work.

Despite these restrictions and limitations at strategic and policy levels, significant work has been done to enhance...
cross-border collaboration in health service delivery in recent years, much of it facilitated through CAWT and local health agencies on both sides of the border. Clear benefits have been achieved, particularly in providing access to services for communities within the border region, much of it on a South-to-North basis. In most instances where such initiatives have been pursued, funding has been time-limited and services have not been mainstreamed, although it would appear that the provision of radiotherapy services at Altnagelvin Hospital for patients within Donegal and adjoining areas of the Republic will shortly commence on a permanent basis.

Against this backdrop, our preliminary conclusion is that there is likely to be reasonably significant scope for further development of acute hospital and other healthcare services on a cross-border basis. Given recent progress and the cohesion achieved across the various agencies in Northern Ireland and Republic of Ireland, we would expect such development work to be taken forward by CAWT, an approach which we would strongly endorse.
There is also significant potential in the development of cross-border services based in the soon to be completed new hospital in Enniskillen in terms of serving the population on both sides of the border. We recommend the commissioning of further research into the potential for the new South West Acute Hospital to provide services to a wider cross-border catchment population.

Shane McQuillan is partner in charge of consulting services at Horwath Bastow Charleton. He has 24 years of health consulting experience, working with the Department of Health and Children, the Health Service Executive – and its predecessors, the regional health boards – in the Republic of Ireland, and the Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety and the Health and Social Care Trusts in Northern Ireland.

Vanya Sargent is a consultant at Horwath Bastow Charleton, with 9 years experience in public sector consulting, and a particular specialisation in health and social care. She has worked for the Health Service Executive (RoI); the Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety (NI); National Drugs Strategy Team (RoI); the Pharmaceutical Society of Ireland; the Office of the Minister for Integration (RoI), and the BIG Lottery (NI).

ENDNOTES


CROSS-BORDER UNDERGRADUATE MOBILITY: AN OBSTACLE RACE THAT THE STUDENTS ARE LOSING?

Andy Pollak

The Irish and Northern Irish higher education systems are very different and very complicated: some might say unnecessarily complicated for two small systems on an English-speaking island springing only 90 years ago from the same British roots. A high value is traditionally placed on education in general and higher education in particular in both jurisdictions, although in Northern Ireland this is probably more true of the Catholic than the Protestant community, with its traditional reliance on trades in now outdated heavy industries. In this context this article looks at the history of and barriers to cross-border student – and in particular undergraduate – mobility on the island.

A high proportion of young people on the island of Ireland have higher education qualifications. A recent EU survey showed that 49% of 30-34 year olds in the Republic of Ireland had a higher education qualification, the highest in Europe and already well exceeding the target of 40% for the EU as a whole by 2020.¹ In Northern Ireland, although the numbers going to university from high-achieving grammar schools are the highest in the UK, there is a ‘long tail of underachievement’² in the province’s less advantaged schools.

The Northern Irish higher education system

In 2009-10 there were nearly 38,500 full-time and part-time undergraduates attending Northern Ireland’s four higher education institutions: University of Ulster and Queens University Belfast, with its two associated colleges of education, Stranmillis and St Mary’s University Colleges. Another 12,000 were doing higher education courses – including degrees, certificates and diplomas – at NI’s five regional education...
colleges, the merged former further and higher education colleges.

The situation of university students in Northern Ireland is unique among the regions of the United Kingdom in at least three distinctive ways:

- It has the highest participation rate in the UK regions for students from lower socio-economic groups (in 2008-09 nearly 41.7% of NI’s full-time degree entrants were from socio-economic groups 4-7, compared to 32.4% in England and 28.2% in Scotland)
- A very high proportion of NI-domiciled students (31%) study in England, Scotland and Wales. More Protestant than Catholic students go to universities in Britain, and many of these remain to live and work there.
- A very low proportion of students at NI universities (2%) are from the rest of the UK.

The Northern Ireland university system faces a number of challenges in the coming years. Among these are demographic changes, with the number of 18 year olds forecast to fall by around 15% over the next 10 years, with a consequent impact on undergraduate numbers and finance. This, in itself, could provide opportunities for all-Ireland cooperation in the future, as the Republic of Ireland returns to a situation comparable to the 1980s, with high undergraduate demand and not enough higher education places at a time when there is spare capacity in the Northern system (see reference to the Williams Report on page 104).

Following the UK Government’s decision to raise undergraduate fees (currently £3,290 per annum for full-time UK and EU undergraduates) in the academic year 2012-2013 to £6,000-9,000 p.a. (most English and Welsh universities have opted for the upper limit of £9,000, much to the UK Government’s discomfiture), there was considerable pressure on the Northern Ireland Executive to follow suit. An update to the Stuart Report on student fees in Northern Ireland in January 2011 recommended an increase in the undergraduate fee cap from the present rate to between £5,000 and £5,750.

However in September 2011 the new Minister for Employment and Learning, Dr Stephen Farry, announced that fees for Northern Ireland undergraduates would be ‘capped’ at £3,465 per year, with students from England, Scotland and Wales having to pay fees of up to £9,000. Undergraduates from the Republic of Ireland, on the other hand – as EU citizens – will pay only the same as their NI counterparts. Dr Farry said this anomaly was the ‘inevitable consequence of a decision to have different fee levels for different parts of the UK.’ He said that charging students from other parts of the UK at the local rate would see Northern Ireland’s universities flooded with applicants from Britain who would ‘crowd out’ local students.

The UK Government’s decision to change the balance of financing the British higher education system from largely public funding to mainly private funding through increasing student fees is a radical one, and could have far-reaching implications for student flows between Britain and both parts of
Ireland (see page 114: Impact of Rising UK fees). It will also be interesting to see if the new high fees in British universities lessen the flow of Northern students out of Northern Ireland.

The Northern Ireland student fees, grants and loans system is complex. NI undergraduates currently have to pay a maximum of £3,290 in annual tuition fees and are entitled to a non means-tested loan to cover this which they will pay back when they start earning £15,000 per annum. For lower income households there is an annual maintenance grant. Students with household incomes of under £18,360 p.a. receive a full, non-repayable government grant of £3,255 p.a. Partial grants are paid to students whose household income is between £18,360 and £38,360 p.a.\footnote{\textsuperscript{5}}

The Stuart Report pointed to an unfair anomaly in that NI students from households with an income of £11,805 or less are eligible for separate ‘higher education bursaries’ of £2,000 p.a. to study in higher education institutions in the Republic of Ireland (with a similar sliding scale for household incomes of between £11,805 and £23,605). Thus both the threshold and the amount for NI students studying in RoI are significantly lower than for NI students studying at UK higher education institutions. Northern Ireland students in a focus group at TCD commented to this researcher on the difficulties facing NI students wanting to study in the South if they do not have parental financial support: this anomaly only exacerbates those difficulties.

On the other hand, Northern students at Southern higher education institutions have their €2,000 registration fee paid for them by the NI Department for Employment and Learning. The Stuart Report recommended that ‘policies regarding maintenance grant and fee payment for NI students studying in the
Republic of Ireland should be reviewed, as they are currently out of step with those which apply to NI students studying at HEIs in the UK.6

**The Irish higher education system**

There were nearly 77,000 full-time undergraduates in the Republic of Ireland’s seven universities and four smaller higher education institutions in 2009-2010, plus another nearly 70,000 – including those taking sub-degree certificates and diplomas – at its 14 institutes of technology. From a low base and a late start, the rate of expansion in higher education places in Ireland has consistently been among the highest of all OECD countries in recent decades.7

In 1960 5% of 18 years olds went on to higher education; in 2010 the proportion was 65%.

The great majority of entrants to higher education (third level education, as it is called in Ireland) are traditional school-leavers. Irish higher education students have the narrowest age range across all OECD countries.8 At the same time, only 3% of undergraduate degree students were part-time in 2007-08, very low by international standards; in the two Northern Irish universities the comparable figure is currently over 20%. This inflexibility in higher education and Ireland’s poor performance in lifelong learning were among the strongest concerns voiced in the 2011 National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030 (the Hunt Report).

The Irish student fees system is unusual by international standards. Since 1997 there has been a system of so-called ‘free fees’ for all Irish and EU undergraduates in Irish higher education institutions, with the Irish exchequer paying all such fees. Successive governments since then have deemed it politically impossible to re-introduce tuition fees, despite the demands of university presidents and the international consensus that university students should contribute to the cost of their own higher education, given that it will significantly increase their earning capacity once they take up employment.

There is an annual registration fee of €2,000 in the current academic year, which is due to be increased to €2,250 in 2012-2013. The Hunt Report recommended ‘a new form of direct student contribution based on an upfront fee with a deferred payment facility,’ which would be effectively the UK model. The Fine Gael-Labour coalition government has set its face against this, largely because of promises made during the February 2011 election.

Around one-third of undergraduates in the Republic of Ireland are currently eligible for maintenance grants, with a maximum annual grant of €3,250 for students with a family income of over €22,700, and a maximum of €6,355 for students with a family income under that level. These maintenance grants are ‘portable’ for undergraduates studying in Northern Ireland. The current maintenance grants system has been widely criticised, both for its inequity in not taking into account capital assets or other wealth but only income (which has prevented it being targeted at those students most in need), and for the inefficiency of the grant.
distribution system through County Councils and county Vocational Education Committees.

In sharp contrast to Northern Ireland, it is estimated that demand for higher education places in Ireland will rise from 42,500 new entrants in 2009 to 68,000 in 2027\(^9\). This follows from an unprecedented increase in the number of births in Ireland in recent years, which will lead to an expected rise of 12% in primary school enrolments and 7% in secondary school enrolments during the decade 2009-2019\(^{10}\), with consequent impacts on higher education enrolments (which will also be swollen by larger numbers of mature students). This demographic growth will put huge pressure on a government which is faced with the need to impose very large public expenditure cuts over the next three-five years.

**Levels of undergraduate mobility**

Observers have noted that until the 1990s the movement of higher education students between the two jurisdictions on this island was considerably lower than one might expect on a small English-speaking island with similar university cultures and systems.\(^{11}\)

In the 1960s there were two major investigations into higher education provision in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland, neither of which even mentioned the other jurisdiction [Nearly 50 years on this has not changed much: the Hunt Report in the Republic and the Consultation Document on the Development of a Higher Education Strategy for Northern Ireland, both published in January 2011, barely referred to the higher education system of the other Irish jurisdiction]. In Northern Ireland the 1965 Lockwood Report\(^{12}\) was the echo of the UK Robbins Report of 1963, whose recommendations led to the establishment of a number of new universities.

The Lockwood Report took the statistical evidence of Robbins as also applying to Northern Ireland and argued for considerable expansion of participation, to be effected through a second university to complement Queen’s University Belfast. Three characteristics of Lockwood stand out. Firstly, there was the surprising recommendation to locate the second university in the unionist town of Coleraine rather than Northern Ireland’s largely nationalist second city, Derry, despite the fact that Derry already had a third level institution – Magee College – historically linked with Trinity College Dublin.

Secondly there was a total absence of any analysis or even reference to the issue of Protestant/Catholic higher education participation in the province. Thirdly, there was no reference to the cross-border movement of students or indeed, to any other interaction on a North-South basis. In this, the Lockwood Report had much in common with the Irish Government’s Commission on Higher Education Report of 1967\(^{13}\), which while recommending new planning machinery and the setting up of the Regional Technical Colleges, was silent on any cross-border dimension to higher education provision.
In the early and mid-1980s, a series of joint National Economic and Social Council-Northern Ireland Economic Council reports explored different aspects of possible cross-border collaboration. As part of this process, Professor Gareth Williams, a noted British analyst of higher education policy, was invited to review the prospects for North-South collaboration in higher education. After reviewing the relevant statistical evidence on the demand for higher education in both jurisdictions, Williams suggested that as demand for higher education provision was set to fall in Northern Ireland (based on demographic evidence) and demographic pressures were set to increase in the Republic, it would make economic sense for the Irish Government to pay for its surplus students to fill the spare capacity in Northern institutions rather than funding additional places in the Republic.

Williams suggested, in particular, that there was considerable scope for cross-border collaboration in the Derry-Donegal border area, and for the extension of the British Open University, already operating in Northern Ireland, to the South. He also proposed a North-South higher education liaison committee which would advise the two governments on ‘those aspects of their higher education policies which have, or might have, cross-border implications’.

The Williams Report was discussed at a high profile conference in Dublin in November 1985 but the institutions were notably cautious in endorsing its recommendations without clear political cover from the two governments. Hanging over the report and the conference were the forthcoming new arrangements for the governance of Northern Ireland under the Anglo-Irish Agreement, which was launched later in the same month. In the stormy aftermath of that major policy change any proposals for North-South higher education collaboration disappeared.

Increase in undergraduate flows to North

In the early 1990s a combination of new developments sparked a new flow of Southern students to Britain and Northern Ireland. At a time of increasing demand and restrictions on the provision of undergraduate places in the South, there was a significant excess of demand over supply. Furthermore, a European ruling that all EU nationals were to be treated on the same basis as ‘home’ students in terms of fees led to a new market-led cross-border movement of Irish students from the South (mainly undergraduates) to Northern Ireland and Britain. This resulted in a situation where 17% of full-time undergraduate entrants to University of Ulster in the mid-nineties came from the South (the figure in Queen’s University Belfast was 7.2%).

The Northern Ireland authorities control the total number of full-time undergraduate places through the so-called ‘MaSN cap’. This means that each institution is only funded for a set number of full-time undergraduate places. Hence when the figures for each institution appeared they fed the perception that the flow of Southern students to the North was displacing local students who were therefore ‘forced’ to go to Britain to study. A
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number of unionist politicians took up this cry and it became something of a political football as the institutions were forced to defend their admissions processes as being fair and without prejudice to any sector, and to emphasise that Southern students were achieving entry on merit.

It needs to be stressed that the MaSN cap – which is still in existence – only applies to full-time undergraduates and that the institutions are free to recruit as many part-time undergraduates (and full and part-time postgraduates) as they wish.

**Current flows: South to North**

With the abolition of undergraduate fees in the Republic in 1997, the numbers of full-time undergraduate entrants going from the Republic to Northern Ireland higher education institutions fell sharply so that by 1998/99 they were at less than half (555) the highest point (1,205) they had reached three years earlier. UK Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) figures show that fall continuing into the new century so that RoI undergraduate entrant numbers reached a low point of 310 full-time students in 2008/09. They rose slightly in 2009/2010 but the overall trend over the past 15 years is one of slow decline, offset to a certain extent by a rise in part-time undergraduate entrants.

The total number of Republic of Ireland full-time undergraduates at Northern Ireland higher education institutions saw a similar sharp decline from 1996/97, when they constituted over 10% of the full-time undergraduate population, so that by 2008/09 they were only 4.2% of full-time undergraduates (see Table 1).

At the same time, there has been a steady increase from a low base of part-time Southern undergraduates at Northern universities, particularly at University of Ulster. This can be explained largely by the broad range of courses (both full-time and part-time, many of them delivered largely online) offered by University of Ulster, which is known for being particularly entrepreneurial in putting on specialised undergraduate courses where there is a market for them. For example the significant increase in part-time undergraduates in 2009/10 can be explained largely by a once-off University of Ulster certificate course in business methods for staff in credit unions.

There has also been an increase in the number of Southern postgraduate students at Northern universities, although many of these, particularly at University of Ulster, are part-time or doing courses online. The proportion of Southern postgraduates as a percentage of the NI postgraduate population as a whole has risen slowly but steadily in recent years: from 9.8% in 2000/01, to 13.8% in 2005/06, to 16.65% in 2009/10.

**Current flows: North to South**

As can be seen from Table 2 there was also a slow decline from an already much lower base in the number of Northern Ireland-domiciled full-time undergraduates at Republic of Ireland universities from 2004/05 (the earliest year the HEA keeps computerised
Table 1 Number of Republic of Ireland-domiciled undergraduates at Northern Ireland higher education institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total undergraduates at NI institutions</th>
<th>RoI undergrads as % of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994/95</td>
<td>2465</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2615</td>
<td>26,790</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/96</td>
<td>2690</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>2885</td>
<td>29,240</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>2670</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>3110</td>
<td>29,750</td>
<td>10.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997/98</td>
<td>2770</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>3140</td>
<td>32,395</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td>2460</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>2970</td>
<td>33,525</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/00</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>2485</td>
<td>33,260</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>2230</td>
<td>34,220</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>35,810</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>2045</td>
<td>37,230</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>2125</td>
<td>39,020</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>2285</td>
<td>40,960</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>2220</td>
<td>40,765</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>38,405</td>
<td>4.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>37,265</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>36,925</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>38,430</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA)

To check these trends before 2004/05 (in the absence of HEA figures for undergraduates before that date), HEA figures for all Northern Irish students – undergraduate and postgraduate – at Republic of Ireland universities were calculated (See Table 3): it is estimated that over 90% of Northern Ireland students counted in this period were undergraduates. These figures confirm the previous picture of a steady decline, with a fall of nearly 27% in the decade between 1998 and 2008.
Obstacles to undergraduate mobility

For this section, the researcher has relied on the views of four focus groups conducted among sixth-formers in four schools (two in County Armagh, one in County Louth and one in Dublin); interviews with their careers teachers; two focus groups conducted with Northern undergraduates at Trinity College Dublin and Southern undergraduates at University of Ulster, and his own experience as a researcher of North-South higher education exchanges and cooperation. A number of main obstacles to (and factors limiting) cross-border undergraduate mobility in each direction can be identified:

### Table 2 Attendance of Northern Ireland-domiciled full-time undergraduates at HEA funded universities 2005-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004/05</th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dublin City University</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National University of Ireland, Galway</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National University of Ireland, Maynooth</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity College Dublin</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College Cork</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College Dublin</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Limerick</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Northern Ireland undergraduates</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total full-time undergraduates (at the seven RoI universities only)</td>
<td>60775</td>
<td>60172</td>
<td>61241</td>
<td>63079</td>
<td>65880</td>
<td>66536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI undergraduates as % of total undergraduates</td>
<td>1.27%</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Higher Education Authority (HEA)
**From North to South**

a) Lack of information about universities in the other jurisdiction. This was highlighted by all the Northern groups consulted for this research: a focus group of undergraduates at Trinity College Dublin, and a group of students and careers teachers from two high achieving schools (one mainly Protestant and one Catholic) in the Northern border region. Unlike British universities keen to attract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3 Attendance of all Northern Ireland-domiciled full-time students (undergraduate and postgraduate) at HEA funded institutions in Ireland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>University College Dublin</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University College Cork</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUI Galway</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trinity College Dublin</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUI Maynooth</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dublin City University</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Limerick</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other HEIs (mainly National College of Art and Design)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Northern Ireland students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There appears to have been a glitch in the HEA statistics for 2005/06 – e.g. in one set of HEA statistics seen by this researcher 32 NCAD students were counted; in another set, no students were counted. This table uses the higher of the two recorded statistics.

Source: Higher Education Authority
highlighted by careers teachers and current undergraduates alike. With the high inflation rate of the ‘Celtic Tiger’ years, Dublin became as expensive as – or in student accommodation, more expensive than – London, for which Northern Ireland students get a ‘weighted’ increase in their maintenance loans to cover the extra cost of living in the UK capital. Northern British university cities such as Glasgow, Newcastle, Manchester and Liverpool – which are popular with NI students – remain considerably cheaper than Dublin. In addition, these cities – unlike Dublin – have ‘student quarters’ where the accommodation is geared to university students’ pockets. This high cost of living appears to have more than cancelled out the attraction of the ‘free fees’ regime in the Republic of Ireland.

d) The change in the ‘equivalences’ between A Level and Leaving Certificate grades, brought about by Southern universities deciding to increase the requirement for high demand courses like medicine and law from three A Levels at the highest A (later A*) grade to four A levels at the highest grade. This is seen by Northern school students studying for A levels as extremely onerous, and taking four A levels to get into a Republic of Ireland university, when comparable UK universities are seeking only three A levels, is sometimes discouraged by careers and other teachers. This is dealt with in further detail on page 113.

b) Lack of information about Institutes of Technology. This is almost total among Northern Ireland school students and their teachers. The Northern Ireland school students consulted by this researcher assumed – if they had had heard about them at all – that the Institutes of Technology in the Republic were the equivalent of the Regional Education Colleges (formerly Further and Higher Education Colleges) in the North, which do far less degree work than the IoTs (although more now than in the past). The result is that the three border region Institutes of Technology (Dundalk, Letterkenny and Sligo) have respectively 50, 28 and fewer than 25 Northern Ireland-domiciled undergraduates enrolled – despite their geographical location and ease of access for Northern students living close to the border.

c) The high cost of living (in Dublin in particular). This was a major reason
e) **Unfamiliarity with the Central Admissions Office (CAO) application process in the Republic of Ireland.** Whereas students in all schools – and particularly the high-achieving voluntary grammar schools – are intensively prepared for the UK’s UCAS process, there is little or no guidance by teachers in how to complete the Irish CAO application form – school students are usually left on their own to tackle this task. Northern applicants also find it unnerving that there is no CAO phone ‘helpline’; they are required to have their schools certify photocopies of missing exam results, often during the school holidays; and they must depend on an often unreliable cross-border postal service in the fraught few days every August when results are being communicated and offers of university places are being made.

**From South to North**

a) **The introduction of ‘free fees’ in the Republic in 1997.** This removed one of the main incentives for prospective undergraduates to look North for their university education. Students are shrewd and intelligent young people: the sample surveys of both schools and undergraduates for this research indicated strongly that they will go to university where they can firstly find the course that suits them, and secondly where the cost of higher education is most advantageous. Thus the move by significant numbers to go to Northern Ireland universities in the mid-1990s was driven by a shortage of undergraduate places in the South and an EU ruling reducing fees for Irish students in the North. With the ending of fees and the expansion of undergraduate provision in the Republic, this incentive was greatly reduced. With the introduction of high tuition fees in Northern Ireland and Britain in 2012, the likelihood is that the traffic will be in the other direction.

b) **Unfamiliarity with the Universities and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS) application process in the UK.** In particular, Southern students find the ‘personal statement’, containing personal and extra-curricular activities, which is so central to the UCAS process, unfamiliar and daunting, especially since the guidance counsellors in Irish schools are often equally unfamiliar with it. The concentration by guidance counsellors on helping their students to successfully navigate the CAO system in the South is as total as the concentration of careers teachers in the North on helping theirs through the UCAS system. There is relatively little time or capacity by either group to think about the university application process in the neighbouring jurisdiction.

c) **Continuing concerns about the effects of Northern Ireland emerging from conflict and the still sectarian nature of society in the North.** This is reflected in the comments and experience of the Southern students interviewed at
University of Ulster (including one ugly story about a Donegal woman student being assaulted and having her jaw broken in a pub for speaking Irish). All these students emphasised that they had gained greatly from and largely enjoyed their time in Coleraine. But as one student put it: ‘The university authorities and/or the students union should help us adapt to coming to live in a society still divided along sectarian lines which is unfamiliar to us.’

e) No financial assistance available in UK. Apart from having the right to defer tuition fees until they are earning £15,000 p.a., students from Republic of Ireland have no eligibility for any grants, loans or bursaries provided by the NI Department for Employment and Learning and implemented through the two universities.

Southern universities information gap

As indicated above, lack of information about universities in the Republic of Ireland is a bigger issue for Northern students than the other way around. This issue is therefore explored here in more detail from a Northern standpoint.

Few if any Republic of Ireland universities are currently pro-active in seeking Northern Ireland undergraduates. The belief among Northern careers teachers consulted is that this is because there are now more than enough highly qualified Southern school-leavers and they do not need to attract Northerners. Southern university admissions officers, particularly at UCD and TCD, deny this, pointing to the continuing flow of Northern applicants to a limited number of high-demand courses; the financial cutbacks which limit resources for school outreach and recruitment work generally, and the poor returns in terms of additional applicants from Northern Ireland as a result of these exercises.

However few Northern schools currently receive visits from Southern university schools liaison officers. TCD, which used to have a dedicated NI schools
liaison person, now goes only once per year to the North: to Methodist College in Belfast, where other Northern schools are also invited to attend.

The UCD Admissions Office admits that school visits in the North have been 'limited, not prolonged or systematic.' The National University of Ireland Maynooth Admissions Officer, a Monaghan man, has a personal commitment to this cross-border recruitment work – in which NUIM have targetted Catholic schools in the North’s border region in recent years – but they have seen poor returns from it.

NUI Maynooth is one of the few Southern higher education institutions (the others last year were Dublin City University, and Dundalk and Sligo Institutes of Technology) which continues to take a stand at the annual UCAS Convention in Belfast (cost £2,400), but again sees few returns from this investment. In contrast, 108 universities and colleges from England, Scotland and Wales exhibited in Belfast in March 2011.

**Leaving Certificate-A Levels equivalences**

Since this appeared to be one disincentive which could be addressed – and one which was raised by several Northern school students and careers teachers – the researcher explored this issue in more detail.

A senior admissions officer at Trinity College Dublin explained that the change in Advanced Level/Leaving Certificate equivalences in 2005 came about in the following way. In 2003 an Oxford University-led Expert Group reported to UCAS on these equivalences and concluded that whereas previously UCAS had deemed results in each Leaving Certificate subject to be half the value of an equivalent A-Level subject, this should now be adjusted to two-thirds of the value.

On foot of this finding – effectively downgrading the value of A-Levels compared to the Leaving Certificate – TCD decided to start requiring four A-Levels (with A, later A*, grades) for Northern Ireland applicants to high demand, high points courses like medicine, dentistry and law. They felt that to do otherwise would give Northern students with top grade A-Level results an unfair advantage over their Southern counterparts with top grade Leaving Certificate results. This practice was eventually adopted by all the Southern universities’ Admissions Offices.

The TCD Admissions Office had noticed that 22% of A-Level applicants were already presenting with four A-Levels, presumably because this improved their chances of entering high prestige British universities like Oxford and Cambridge (there is a long tradition, particularly in UK public schools, of thinking of Trinity as a third choice after the ‘Oxbridge’ universities).

The TCD admissions officer pointed out that only 33% of Northern students accept their TCD offers – evidence that they are using their application to TCD as insurance in case they are not accepted by a UK university – and when the UK university offers arrive in August, many accept a UK place and
discard their Trinity offer. This is common practice in both jurisdictions: a senior Queen’s University Belfast admissions officer said that of the 368 Southern applicants holding either unconditional or conditional ‘firm offers’ for QUB in June 2010, only 79 took up those places the following autumn.

The TCD admissions officer stressed that the British UCAS and Irish CAO admission schemes looked for different things, and it might be difficult for Northern students to navigate both of them. The CAO points system is based solely on performance in one exam, the Leaving Certificate. In this way it is utterly transparent – particularly important in a small society – but also excludes evidence of independent learning and personal development. The UCAS system, on the other hand, with its stress on a ‘personal statement’ from the applicant, also takes into account wider student achievements, including extra-curricular activities.

Another issue is that at the two big Dublin universities which receive the overwhelming majority of Northern applications, a large proportion of these are for a small number of high demand courses: medicine, dentistry, law, history and English in Trinity College Dublin; medicine, veterinary, law, history, politics and English in UCD. A senior UCD admissions officer said that before the Southern universities had changed to requiring four A-Levels for such high demand courses, there were very large numbers of Northern applicants with three top-grade A-Levels applying for them. ‘We could have filled medicine and law with Northern Ireland applicants!’ What they did was to resort to the unsatisfactory medium of random selection.

The TCD admission officer said Trinity continues to use the principle of ‘proportionality’ based on exam results from each jurisdiction – which Northern Ireland students may perceive to be ‘quotas’. Thus if the proportion of applicants from the UK (including Northern Ireland) with eligible A-Level results for a particular high demand course is 25%, they will be allocated 25% of the places on that course.

However the UCD admissions officer emphasised that Southern admissions officers were very concerned that there should be no inequity in the allocation of places to Northern students. To this end, there is currently a working group drawn from the Irish universities’ representative body, the Irish Universities Association, and the Northern Ireland examinations body, the NI Council for the Curriculum, Examinations and Assessment (CCEA) meeting to examine this issue.

Impact of rising UK fees

The large rise in UK tuition fees due to be introduced by the great majority of British universities in autumn 2012 is likely to have a very significant impact on undergraduate flows between Britain and both parts of Ireland. A 2011 paper prepared by Dublin business consultant Michael D’Arcy for Institute of Technology Sligo warned that policy makers in the Republic of Ireland ‘have yet to substantively engage with the potential impacts of the decreases and increases in cross-border flows of
students in and out of this jurisdiction that will result from this rise in fees. He said that if they wait until the 2012-13 academic year they will have little time to respond to a development which will have a major impact on the nearly 9,000 Republic of Ireland domiciled undergraduates who go to university in Britain and Northern Ireland every year.15

The situation in autumn 2012 will be as follows. The great majority of universities in England and Wales will charge annual tuition fees of up to £9,000. Scottish universities will not charge fees for Scottish-domiciled students (or students from Republic of Ireland and other EU countries), but will be able to charge up to £9,000 for students from elsewhere in the UK. In Northern Ireland the fees will rise only slightly, although students from elsewhere in the UK will be required to pay up to £9,000.

In its otherwise harsh December 2011 budget, the Irish Government decided to limit the increase in the university registration fee to €250 (bringing it to €2,250 per annum from 2012-1013). If the Republic of Ireland continues to have such a low fees system alongside a much higher fees system in Britain, the consequences will be significant. Not only will a growing proportion of the nearly 9,000 undergraduates who currently go to universities in Britain and Northern Ireland probably decide to stay at home, but also a rising number of British undergraduates will choose to study in the low-fees regime in the Republic of Ireland. Already in 2011 the number of Irish undergraduate applications to UK universities fell by nearly 20% (from 2,352 to 1,899)16, while the number of UK applicants to Irish universities rose by 9.5%.

This would have obvious implications for an Irish university system which is already over-extended in its efforts to cater for the rising demand for undergraduate places at a time of severe government funding cuts. That won’t prevent UK students trying to come here: in particular, Trinity College Dublin – as the top ranked Irish university internationally – expects more applications from Britain in 2012.

Andy Pollak is Director of the Centre for Cross Border Studies and Secretary of the all-island university network Universities Ireland. He is a former education correspondent of the Irish Times. This article is based on research that was carried out in spring-summer 2011 for the IBEC-CBI Joint Business Council and the EURES Cross Border Partnership.
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THE CENTRE FOR CROSS BORDER STUDIES

March 2012

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

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

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

**PURPOSE**

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

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

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

**WEBSITES**

**CCBS HOUSE WEBSITE**
The number of people accessing the Centre’s home website (www.crossborder.ie) once again increased across all measurements in 2011 – unique visitors, number of visits, page views and hits – with a particularly dramatic rise in the number of page views, which increased by 20,000 per month and have now risen by more than ten times since 2003.

Border Ireland was 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.

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

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 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.

EU Peace funding for the Border Ireland website finished at the end of 2008. Despite this, Border Ireland has documented (online) the details of 3,782 North-South and cross-border activities, 1,790 organisations, 2,048 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.

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 8,200 views during December 2011. This RSS¹ news feed is syndicated on the Centre’s and International Centre for Local and Regional Development’s other websites: www.crossborder.ie,

¹ RSS (most commonly expanded as Really Simple Syndication) is a family of web feed formats used to publish frequently updated works such as blog entries, news headlines, audio, and video in a standardised format.

<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>2009</td>
<td>3801</td>
<td>7043</td>
<td>24840</td>
<td>82984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2994</td>
<td>6547</td>
<td>25178</td>
<td>55486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3416</td>
<td>7569</td>
<td>29591</td>
<td>54971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The website also features an interactive discussion forum to disseminate Border Ireland Briefings and to provide responses to ‘A Note from the Next Door Neighbours’ (see page 128). 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

The Border People online information portal, providing citizens’ information for people crossing the border to live, work, study or retire, is now five years old. The website continues to be the only cross-border source of citizens information that covers both jurisdictions. It provides information on cross-border taxation, social security, job seeking, qualifications, health, education, housing, banking and telecommunications.

It was developed in response to a commission from the North South Ministerial Council Joint Secretariat in early 2007 with technical assistance from DID (Delivery and Innovation Division), the web and design team of the Northern Ireland Department of Finance and Personnel installed a more sophisticated method of measuring web statistics. These statistics can therefore not be compared with previous years’ statistics.

N.B. In 2010 the DID section of the NI Department of Finance and Personnel installed a more sophisticated method of measuring web statistics. These statistics can therefore not be compared with previous years’ statistics.
of Finance and Personnel, and was initially funded by the EU Peace Two programme.

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 then 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 Northern Ireland and the Southern border region, including a full page article in the *Belfast Telegraph*.

This second phase of the Border People website (2009-2012) 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 2011 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.

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 15,836 per month read by 6,880 visitors.

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

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

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

*It’s a service like this that people need in this current climate, and especially cross border workers who feel that they are falling between two stools.*

During 2011 two User Groups meetings were organised in collaboration with the IBEC-CBI Joint Business Council: in Monaghan in June and in Letterkenny...
in September. These events were entitled ‘Developing your Cross-Border Business’ and were well attended by representatives from government agencies, cross-border local authority networks, the EURES Cross Border Partnership, community groups, business development organisations and private businesses. Speakers from FPM Accountants, Morgan McManus Solicitors, InterTradeIreland, the Credit Review Office, Tierney Tax Consultancy, Grow Sales Online and Bid Management Services presented a wide range of topics including:

- Cross-border employment law
- Challenges facing SMEs and support mechanisms
- Sourcing bank finance for a cross-border business
- Debt collection: top 10 tips
- Cross-border business taxes
- Accessing business grants in each jurisdiction
- Public tendering and procurement procedures
- Cross-border business succession and related tax issues
- Digital social media for the SME – the basics

Presentations and case studies provided at the User Group meetings are available on www.borderpeople.info

Through the year Border People participated in a number of cross border events including:

- EURES Cross Border Partnership jobs fairs
• Tradelinks inter-regional Meet the Buyer and Networking Event
• Cross Border Business Support Expo, Dundalk Chamber of Commerce/ InterTradeIreland
• Eures Cross Border Partnership advisors training
• Tress Conference on Coordination of Social Security in Europe

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.*

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

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

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

CURRENT RESEARCH, INFORMATION AND TRAINING PROJECTS

THE INICCO PROJECTS

Between 2009 and March 2012 the Centre has undertaken five major research, training and information 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). At time of writing an INICCO Phase 2 funding application is being prepared for submission to the follow-up INTERREG IVA programme for 2013-1015. The five constituent projects in INICCO Phase 1 were 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 Joint Secretariat. This project is led by the Centre for Cross Border Studies’ IT manager, Joe Shiels, and information officer, Annmarie O’Kane. *(For more information see the longer item on Border People on pages 125-128).*

Phase Two has allowed for a much more systematic dissemination and marketing of information and public feedback on cross-border mobility issues, assisted by an active and enlarged User Group drawn from a range of citizens advice, employment advice, local authority, business and community organisations. 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. 92% of users in a 2010 survey said that they ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ with the statement that Border People is ‘an important and valuable resource’ for people living and working in the Irish border region.

At time of writing Phase 3 of Border People is being put together as part of the INICCO Phase 2 INTERREG funding application. It will include a programme of training and capacity building to prepare the existing citizens advice bodies, Citizens Advice (NI) and the Citizens Information Board (RoI), to integrate the Border People service into their mainstream provision after 2015; and research into patterns and issues of mobility across the Border.

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 (NI), Citizens Information Board (RoI), and the EURES Cross-border Partnership. User group meetings on specific topics of concern to cross-border workers and other interested people are organised every six months at a location in the border region.

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

This network, organised by the Centre’s sister organisation, the International Centre for Local and Regional Development (ICLRD),
brings together 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 150-167)

CroSPlaN’s three year (2009-2012) programme consists of the following:

- **Six applied research projects.** These have been on the inter-jurisdictional planning implications of the NI Review of Public Administration and on tri-national planning in the Basel region of Switzerland, Germany and France (Year 1); river basin management and spatial planning in Connecticut (USA) and the Elbe basin (Germany), and in Ireland’s cross-border region (Year 2); and shared services in Scotland, Spain, Canada and New York State, and examples drawing mainly on the Irish cross-border region (Year 3).

- One **executive training programme** per year for cross-border region local councillors, council officials and business leaders. The first course, in the Louth-Newry and Mourne region, ran from November 2009 to May 2010; the second, in the North West, ran from October 2010 to March 2011; the third, in the central border area, ran from October to December 2011.
One technical workshop per year
• One annual conference

The ICLRD during this time have also used the CroSPlaN programme to produce – with partners such as the National Institute for Regional and Spatial Analysis (NIRSA) and the All-Island Research Observatory (AIRO) at NUI Maynooth – a significant number of other innovative outputs, including an all-island Accessibility Mapping Tool; an all-island Housing Monitoring Tool; an all-island Deprivation Index; and a scoping study pointing the way towards an island of Ireland Spatial Monitoring Framework.

The Steering Group for CroSPlaN 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

This project has led to the publication of two reports on how cross-border hospital services might help to provide mutual benefits for the people of the Irish order region.

The first of these, carried out by CCBS Deputy Director Ruth Taillon, was published in 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.

This 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.

The second report was Unlocking the Potential of Cross-border Hospital Planning on the Island of Ireland: A Prototype Modelling Framework, by Shane McQuillan and Vanya Sargent of the Dublin consultancy firm Horwath Bastow Charleton. This report was launched in Belfast on 15 December 2011 (at a North South Research Forum meeting) by Tom Daly, Director General of Cooperation and Working Together (CAWT) and Dean Sullivan, Director of Planning and Performance at the Northern Ireland Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety.
The report concluded that while there are significant barriers to the development of cross-border acute healthcare, these can be ‘worked around’ where it makes sense for improved patient services to do so. The study analysed five sample clinical service areas where there is potential for cross-border collaboration: orthopaedic surgery, ENT surgery, paediatric cardiac surgery, cystic fibrosis and acute mental health services. It also produced a prototype modelling framework for cross-border acute healthcare services, incorporating both qualitative and quantitative factors, to help plan the development of such services. The report also noted that the new South West Acute hospital in Enniskillen offered a ‘significant opportunity’ for cross-border service provision.

The report was published in the same week as the Compton Review into health and social care in Northern Ireland, which suggested a number of cross-border initiatives, including specialist paediatric services to be provided to Northern patients by Southern hospitals, and patients from the South, particularly along the border, being treated for some cancers in Northern hospitals.

Both these reports are available on the Centre’s website (www.crossborder.ie).

The Steering Group for this project brought together 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 DEVOLVED GOVERNMENT

The final report of this research project - Cross-Border Economic
Renewal: Rethinking Regional Policy in Ireland - will be launched in spring 2012. The aim of its package of four closely inter-related studies 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 Irish Border Region, but have been followed by a deep economic recession. This project – in which the Centre is partnered by InterTradeIreland – was carried out by Dr John Bradley, formerly a research professor at the Economic and Research Institute in Dublin and Professor Michael Best of the Universities of Massachusetts (Lowell) and Cambridge University, an international authority on industrial development strategies and regional innovation systems. They also collaborated – for comparative purposes – with experts from the Polish (Lower Silesia) and German (Saxony and Brandenburg) border regions.

The focus of this project was on the specific economy of the peripheral and disadvantaged region straddling the Irish border. In particular, it examined the productive aspects of that region, i.e. the characteristics and performance of the set of businesses that operate 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 was carried out in three stages:

1. The researchers first examined the ‘island’ context of the border region economy, since this determines much of what happens in the region. They looked at its peripherality within the British Isles and on the island of Ireland and its uniqueness as a peripheral region with the added burden of a ‘border-related policy fault line.’

2. They then moved on to identifying and describing the structure and characteristics of the border region economy from an ‘outside’ perspective, using official, published data sources. They examined the nature of its consumer markets, its production activities and its tourism product.

3. The final and most innovative stage was an attempt to communicate with and learn from local policy makers and actors (including local manufacturers) in the border region and try to see the border economy from an ‘inside’ perspective. This included a series of detailed investigations of a range of specific enterprises in the region, in manufacturing and services. There was a concluding examination of the positive and/or negative roles played by the border as a policy barrier with the aim of understanding how this region might be reincorporated into the mainstream of island economic and business life (and how its political, administrative and business leaders might implement policies that address its exceptional challenges).

At an ‘emerging findings’ conference in Cavan on 17-18 November, a number of...
prominent economists and industrialists from Ireland, Scotland and Germany addressed these issues (see pages 182-183). The closing address was given by Padraic White, Chair of the Louth Economic Forum and formerly Managing Director of IDA Ireland, who proposed the formation of a ‘Strategic Development Plan for the Border Zone’ with support from mayors and council chairs and county managers and district council chief executives on both sides of the border.

The Centre is hoping to interest a publisher to bring out the Bradley-Best report as a book. It is also preparing a proposal for a follow-up research project into the potential of a Strategic Development Plan for the Border Zone, as outlined by Padraic White, as part of the INICCO Phase 2 application package to the 2013-2015 INTERREG IVA programme.

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. IMPACT ASSESSMENT TOOLKIT FOR CROSS-BORDER COOPERATION

As part of the integrative work of a cross-border observatory, the Centre has devised and developed an Impact Assessment Toolkit (IAT), to support
mutually beneficial cross-border cooperation in Ireland. This collaborative project with the Euro-Institut in Kehl, Germany was led by the Centre’s Deputy Director, Ruth Taillon. The highly innovative toolkit it has produced – the first of its kind in the European Union - is designed to guide policymakers and EU funders (and to be of particular assistance to the Special EU Programmes Body in Ireland/Northern Ireland) in thinking through the impact assessment process, and thus assisting them in designing better quality 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.

While the toolkit has been developed specifically for use in Northern Ireland and the Irish border counties, it is intended that the methodology it uses can be adapted to other cross-border regions in Europe. The toolkit breaks new ground in that it offers an integrated process that takes into account social, economic and environmental impacts (the three EU ‘pillars’ of sustainable development), plus a fourth ‘cooperation’ pillar that will identify and capture impacts specific to cross-border cooperation.

In the past EU-funded cross-border programme and project promoters have often found it difficult to demonstrate impact: i.e. the changes that have taken place as a result of the activities undertaken. The Impact Assessment Toolkit for Cross-Border Cooperation can help to define and clarify the extent to which a programme or project is likely to contribute to the desired changes. Many problems of Northern Ireland and the Irish border region do not respect jurisdictional boundaries. The toolkit will help to determine whether a cross-border approach is the appropriate level of intervention and, if so, to identify the ‘added value’ of such cooperation.

Will a cross-border approach be more efficient and/or effective than a single jurisdiction approach? Are the proposed activities expected to have a greater overall impact – socially, economically or environmentally – if undertaken on a cross-border basis than separately within each jurisdiction? Or, by addressing problems of the cross-border territory through a collaborative approach, will additional impacts result specifically from the cooperation process? For example, will new relationships be built between people or organisations that would not have developed otherwise? Will the cross-border activities lead to new ways of working or more intensive collaboration that would not have been the case if they had been carried out separately?

The toolkit was launched at a conference in Cavan on 27-28 October (see pages 181-182) by Dr José Antonio Ruiz de Casas of DG Regional Policy (DG REGIO) in Brussels. There has been a very positive reaction to the toolkit, and Ruth Taillon has made presentations on it to a wide range of EU, public and community organisations. Among these have been the EU’s territorial cooperation programmes training agency.
INTERACT (separate presentations in Valencia, Brussels and Rome); the Northern Ireland ESF Programme ‘Innovation and Mainstreaming Working Group’; the NI Regional European Forum (staff of key organisations involved in EU programmes); the Community Relations Council NI Evaluation Advisory Panel and the Community Workers Coop. The Toolkit is now available on the SEUPB, INTERACT and CCBS websites.

Most significantly, the SEUPB completely redesigned its INTERREG IVA application form for the January 2012 ‘call’ for applications to incorporate the toolkit’s methodology (using the same questions as those outlined in the toolkit). Ruth addressed SEUPB workshops in Northern Ireland, Ireland and Scotland for applicants to this final round of the INTERREG IVA programme. The new Victims and Survivors Service for Northern Ireland has also been planned using the toolkit’s methodology.

A first pilot training course in IAT took place on 17-18 January with six projects (ConneXions, Cavan County Council, Proteus, Blackwater Partnership, Community Workers Coop and Women into Public Life). A second training course was held in March specifically for EU programme implementation bodies. The Scottish National Contact Point for INTERREG, Cooperation and Working Together/HSE and Proteus have all expressed interest in the training course.

Further training and mentoring, using the toolkit, along with complementary evaluation and budget toolkits, are key elements in the INICCO Phase 2 funding application being prepared by the Centre and ICLRD at time of writing, along with a proposal to INTERACT (with the Euro-Institut); and probably...
work with the Transfronter Euro-Institut Network (TEIN) (see pages 184-185) on an adaptation of the toolkit for other European border regions.

This project was implemented by a team comprising Centre for Cross Border Studies Deputy Director Ruth Taillon; 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, formerly a postgraduate student at the Universities of Kehl and Ludwigsburg, who came to Armagh for six months in 2010-11 to work on the project as an intern, and now works for the Euro-Institut.

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.

CURRENT EXCHANGE PROJECTS

North-South Student Teacher Exchange Project (Year Eight)

In March 2012 the North-South Student Teacher Exchange project will enter its eighth year with the latest exchange of 13 students to do a key part of their assessed teaching practice in schools in the other Irish jurisdiction. The partners with the Centre in this project are six of the seven colleges of primary education on the island: Stranmillis University College and St Mary’s University College in Belfast; St Patrick’s College Drumcondra, Marino Institute of Education, Froebel College of Education and Church of Ireland College of Education in Dublin (Mary Immaculate College in Limerick took part in the exchanges up to 2009). 170 student teachers have taken part in this exchange project since it was initiated in 2003 (making it the longest-running of all the North-South exchanges that CCBS have organised). The first four exchanges were funded by the EU Peace Programme, while the exchanges since 2009 have been funded by the Standing Conference on Teacher Education North and South (SCoTENS) (see also pages 145-150).

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*
Students and Directors of Teaching Practice at the orientation day for the 8th Student Teacher Exchange project in the Skylon Hotel, Dublin, on 26 January 2012.

a greatly increased sense of personal worth and confidence gained through participation in the exchange.

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

In an evaluation of SCoTENS between 2003 and 2011 (see also pages 148-150), Dr John Furlong, Professor of Educational Studies at Oxford University, wrote of the North-South Student Teacher Exchange:

There was strong agreement among a number of our respondents that the Student Teacher Exchange scheme was one of SCoTENS’ most significant contributions to the peace process.

By giving the next generation of teachers the opportunity at first hand to experience a very different educational, social and political setting, the scheme was actively promoting the objectives of peace and reconciliation.

CURRENT ADMINISTRATION PROJECTS

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

UNIVERSITIES IRELAND

Universities Ireland (UI) continued in 2011-2012 with the Centre acting as its secretariat. During the year UI ran a number of key projects: the Universities Ireland/ESB North/South Postgraduate Scholarship scheme; the Irish-African Partnership for Research Capacity Building (whose support from UI ended this year); and the Irish Section of Scholars at Risk. New activities in the coming year will include an all-island programme of activities to reflect on the 1912-1923 period in Irish history and work on a new partnership with Scottish universities.

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

Universities Ireland has been able to overcome the disadvantage of being a very small networked organisation with no full-time staff and a small annual income of around £150,000 by leveraging sizeable amounts of extra money to support its activities. In 2007-2011 the Irish-African Partnership for Research Capacity Building (IAP) raised €1.5 million from Irish Aid with €110,000 in matching funds from UI. In 2006-2010 the Universities Ireland/IEBC-CBI Joint Business Council North/South postgraduate scholarships raised £366,000 from individual business firms in Dublin and Belfast with the same amount of matching funding from UI. In 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 the North/South scholarships scheme has been co-sponsored by ESB (contributing €45,000).

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

NORTH/SOUTH POSTGRADUATE SCHOLARSHIPS

The aim of this scheme is to encourage outstanding students from the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland to cross the border to undertake postgraduate
study and experience life in the other Irish jurisdiction. In 2011-2012 five scholarships were awarded, three to students doing energy and engineering subjects (co-sponsored by the Electricity Supply Board) and two doing law and philosophy (sponsored by Ul alone). The scholarships are worth €15,000 each. The ESB will again jointly sponsor the 2012-2013 scholarships.

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

These North/South scholarships are open to all students current registered at an Irish or a Northern Irish university or the Open University in Ireland or Dublin Institute of Technology (or who have graduated within the past 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 2011 winners were:

- Joyce Acheson, a graduate of Trinity College Dublin, doing a Masters in Advanced Mechanical Engineering at Queen’s University Belfast (co-sponsored by ESB)
- Jonathan Mitchell, a graduate of Queen's University Belfast, doing an MA in Contemporary European Philosophy at University College Dublin (sponsored by UI)
- Marian McGrath, a graduate of University College Cork, doing a PhD in Sedimentary Processes and Offshore Renewable Energy Development at University College Cork and Queen’s University Belfast (co-sponsored by ESB)
- Teresa McGrath, a graduate of University College Dublin, doing a PhD in the Long-term Performance of Materials and Technologies in Retrofitting Practices at Queen’s University Belfast (co-sponsored by ESB)
- Clayton O’Neill, a graduate of University of Ulster, doing a Masters in Law at Trinity College Dublin (sponsored by UI)

This brings to 30 the number of students who have been awarded these scholarships over the past seven years.

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

This four year project (2007-2011), funded by Irish Aid under the auspices of Universities Ireland, brought 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) was 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. Universities Ireland financial support for this network ended in August 2011, and it is now led by Dublin City University.

The IAP partner universities in the 2007-2011 period were Dublin City University, Trinity College Dublin, Queen’s University Belfast, University of Limerick/Mary Immaculate College, University College Dublin, University of Ulster, National University of Ireland Galway, National University of Ireland Maynooth, University College Cork, Makerere University (Uganda), University of Dar es Salaam (Tanzania), Universidade
Eduardo Mondlane (Mozambique) and University of Malawi. Finance, workshop organisation and liaison with the funders (Irish Aid/Higher Education Authority) were undertaken on behalf of the partnership by Universities Ireland through the Centre for Cross Border Studies (which was also represented on the IAP’s Executive Committee along with the 13 partner universities).

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. Irish Aid funding for the partnership ended in March 2011. The six objectives of the IAP (2007-2011) were:

1. To assess existing capacity in development research within the 13 partner universities
2. To identify opportunities and constraints to development research capacity within the 13 partner institutions
3. To enhance partner institution research capacity through developing and delivering a summer school training programme
4. To identify key themes in health and education research over the next 10 years
5. To build an Irish-based development research network through agreed principles of partnership with African partners.
6. To provide a platform to enable and support the development of specific partnerships arising from network interactions.

A final event in this phase – a research capacity building summer school – was held in Dar es Salaam on 22-24 September 2011. It was a joint venture between IAP, EARIMA (East African Research and Innovation Management Association) and the Association of Commonwealth Universities’ project, Research and Innovation Management Improvement for Africa and the Caribbean. Those attending came from 13 universities in Tanzania, Uganda, Mozambique, Kenya and Rwanda.

The three-day event revolved around three strands: research management, graduate research and supervision, and agenda-setting for the priorities of the new EARIMA network. The summer school was deemed a success by participants, notably because not only did it contribute to developing the knowledge and skills of participants, but it also consolidated an institutional structure at regional level, EARIMA, which is now in a position to carry forward and take ownership of the research capacity building agenda in East African universities.

**SCHOLARS AT RISK: IRISH SECTION**

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

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

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

**NEW INITIATIVES**

In January 2012 the council of Universities Ireland approved a new project following an application from a group of leading historians from the nine universities, including Professor Eunan O Halpin of TCD, Professor Diarmaid Ferriter of UCD, Professor Paul Bew of QUB and Professor Gearoid O Tuathaigh of NUI Galway. This will see the Universities Ireland initiating and supporting a multi-year **programme of activities to reflect on the 1912-1923 period in Irish history**. The intention is that this will be a high-level, scholarly and sustained initiative, and thus a unique contribution to reflection on a decade of history-changing events by the island’s intellectual leaders, the nine universities (and more specifically, their nine Departments of History). Universities Ireland will provide seed-funding to initiate this programme (plus some administrative support and funding to maintain it), and this will be used to seek extra financial support from interested Departments in the Irish and Northern Irish governments. The outline programme of activities will include lobbying to improve archival access; research scholarships for young historians; collaborative history teaching initiatives; and joint conferences and seminars.

On 26 January 2012 a delegation of university heads from Universities Ireland travelled to Aberdeen to meet Scottish university principals at Robert Gordon University, now headed by Professor Ferdinand von Prondzynski (formerly president of Dublin City University). They also met the Scottish Cabinet Secretary (Minister) for Education, Michael Russell MSP. They discussed a number of areas where **Irish-Northern Irish-Scottish inter-university collaboration** might be enhanced, including inter-university ‘research pooling’ (which the Scottish universities have developed to a high
degree). A return visit to Dublin by Mr Russell and the Scottish university heads is planned for early autumn of 2012.

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. 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 2011-2012 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.

Conferences

SCoTENS’ ninth annual conference, on ‘Promoting Literacy and Numeracy through Teacher Education’, was held in September 2011 in the Radisson Blu Farnham Estate Hotel in Cavan. It was opened by the Minister of State for Training and Skills in the Irish Department of Education
and Skills, Ciaran Cannon TD. The keynote speakers were Professor Terenzinha Nunes, Professor of Educational Studies at Oxford University, who spoke on ‘Why teachers must know about more than phonics to teach English literacy’; and Sir Bob Salisbury and Dr Harold Hislop, respectively chair of the Northern Ireland Literacy and Numeracy Task Force, and Chief Inspector at the Department of Education and Skills, who spoke on the implementation of the respective literacy and numeracy strategies in the two Irish jurisdictions.

The conference featured a series of workshops on literacy and numeracy with a number of themes: classroom literacy practice; the Leonardo Effect inter-disciplinary methodology for developing young children’s literacy skills; research into teachers’ mathematical knowledge; North-South perspectives on numeracy issues; the DEIS Project; Achieving Belfast and Bright Futures Derry.

Three reports were launched at the conference. The SCoTENS 2010 conference and annual report Teacher Education for Inclusion, was launched by Mary Bunting, Northern Joint Secretary of the North South Ministerial Council and Margaret Stanley, Southern Acting Joint Secretary. The other two reports launched were Primary School Teachers’ experiences of teaching Healthy Eating within the curriculum, by Elaine Mooney, Eileen Kelly-Blakeney, Amanda McCloat (all of St Angela’s College, Sligo) and Dorothy Black (University of Ulster); and Disablist Bullying: an investigation of student teachers’ knowledge and confidence, by Dr Noel Purdy (Stranmillis University College) and Dr Conor McGuckian (Trinity College Dublin).

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; the competences approach to teacher professional development; and teaching controversial history (1916 and the Battle of the Somme).

Research

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

A total of 71 North-South research, conference and exchange projects have received financial support from SCoTENS in the period 2003-2011, and 17 reports have been published. Another 10 applications were received in February 2012. These were in the following areas: mentor pedagogies to support pre-service teachers on teaching practice; early number concepts; managing early years transition practices; sharing outcomes in primary physical teacher education; leadership development in Irish Medium schools; nuns in education, North and South; a cross-border doctoral research in education conference; cyber-bullying and the law; threshold concepts in language teacher education; and the creative education infrastructure of Ireland.

The SCoTENS website

This 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. This has led to a sharp increase in the number of users. Its interactive special needs section, developed by Dr Noel Purdy of Stranmillis University College, is a particularly popular element.

SCoTENS also sponsors the ground-breaking North-South Student Teacher Exchange, now in its eighth year, which brings student teachers from the island’s seven colleges of primary education to do a key part of their assessed teacher practice in the other jurisdiction (also see pages 138-139).

SCoTENS is funded by annual grants from the Department of Education and Science, and the Department for Employment and Learning and the Department of Education (Northern Ireland). A significant proportion of its funding comes from institutional subscriptions from its 35 members, who are universities, colleges of education, teaching councils, education trade unions, education centres, curriculum councils and other bodies involved with teacher education.

Evaluation

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

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

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

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

Perhaps SCoTENS’ greatest achievement has been a more direct alignment between the interest and actions of the teacher education community and the education reform priorities of government departments, North and South. One indicator of departmental acknowledgement of such has been the continuation of central funding despite a vast change in the economic circumstances. Another has been the generous and pointed endorsement of the work of SCoTENS by Ministers and their officials, including a consideration of our work as part of a North South Ministerial Council meeting in 2010.
On its leadership and organisation, the evaluators noted: ‘Since its inception, SCoTENS has had the benefit of three very significant figures working for it - Professor John Coolahan, as one of the two initial academics who helped to establish the organisation, Andy Pollak, Director of the Centre for Cross Border Studies and secretary of SCoTENS, and Patricia McAllister, SCoTENS administrator. Professor Coolahan, although now formally retired, continues to play a key role in the organisation, particularly in terms of its links with political leaders and senior officials especially in the Republic. Of the senior academics we met, it was clear that Professor Coolahan was the most sensitive and skilful in understanding and negotiating the complex political terrain that an organisation, such as SCoTENS, has to face. The fact that the organisation has thrived so successfully for eight years, we felt, was in no small part due to his expert leadership’.

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

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

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

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

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

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 improving the lives of people on the island of Ireland and elsewhere. The partner institutions are the National Institute for Regional and Spatial Analysis (NIRSA) at the National University of Ireland, Maynooth; the
School of the Built Environment at the University of Ulster; the Institute for International Urban Development in Cambridge, Massachusetts; and the Centre for Cross Border Studies in Armagh. Each partner brings together complementary expertise and networks on both a North-South and East-West basis, creating a unique all-island and international centre.

The ICLRD continues to expand its collaboration with other institutions and has built up close working relationships with individual faculty and researchers from Harvard University, Queens 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, vice-president of the Institute for International Urban Development; the Deputy Director is Caroline Creamer of NIRSA, NUI Maynooth, and the Assistant Director is Dr. Neale Blair of the School of the Built Environment, University of Ulster.

The ICLRD operates out of the Centre for Cross Border Studies’ offices in Armagh and receives administrative and management support from the Centre.

In 2011, the ICLRD was supported by the EU’s INTERREG IVA Programme through the Special EU Programmes Body (through the CroSPIaN Project) and by the Irish Government through the Higher Education Authority. Both governments on the island of Ireland have been – and remain – very supportive of the ICLRD, with the Department of Environment, Community and Local Government (DoECLG) in Dublin supporting research and the
Department for Regional Development (DRD) in Belfast seconding a senior planner (Jim Hetherington) to the ICLRD management team. The ICLRD has over the years received funding from the International Fund for Ireland as well as commissioned research from InterTradeIreland, the Strategic Investment Board (NI) and the Irish Central Border Area Network (ICBAN).

The ICLRD provides independent, joined-up research and policy advice on cross-border and all-island spatial planning and local and regional development. It plays a proactive role in peace and reconciliation on the island by bringing together policy-makers, practitioners and academics, North and South, to work on common goals in the areas of coordinated spatial planning and social and economic development at local, regional and national levels. It does this through research, policy advice and publications; professional education and capacity building programmes that assist local governments and communities to translate policy into ‘on the ground’ action; and active outreach and networking that includes conferences, workshops and international cooperation and exchanges to identify best practices.

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

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

Current research projects

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

**Sustainable Spatial Development: Integrating River Basin Management with Spatial Planning Policy and Practice**

In association with the report, *Responding to the Environmental*
Challenge? Spatial Planning, Cross-Border Cooperation and Spatial Planning, two international case studies are being produced as ‘stand alone’ reports:

- The Elbe River Basin District: Integrated Cross-Border Management in Practice, and

The case studies illustrate that good river basin management practices have moved towards engagement and negotiation, rather than relying solely on compliance measures or regulatory enforcement. The cases also illustrate that while directives and regulations are set centrally, it is the sub-regional management of the river basin itself that is key to bringing together civic, business and environmental leadership in a meaningful way. This is especially the case when spatial planning decisions are made at the local level.

Shared Services

This research focuses on the timely issue of shared services and discusses the emerging shared services agenda for both jurisdictions on the island of Ireland. The study describes creative ways in which local governments can work together to more effectively use available resources when delivering services around citizen needs. It draws on international good practices in the adoption of shared service agendas. The four case studies are:

- Scotland: Glasgow and the Clyde Valley
- Spain: Mancomunidad Valle del Nalón in Asturias
- Canada: Ontario and its Local Services Realignment Programme
- New York State: Local Government Efficiency Programme and Lancaster County.

These case studies offer insights into the rethinking of public services within geographical areas that may include more than one local authority, and how both structured and voluntary associations can be used to provide infrastructure, broadband, waste management, training and local supports. The cases also highlight the associated challenges of multi-level governance in the provision of services and the importance of leadership and trust in paving the way for future cooperation. This research will be of interest to senior management in local government and regional authorities, regional development agencies, cross-border networks and agencies, and national policy-makers.

Applying the Functional Territories Concept: Planning Beyond Boundaries

This study suggests that flexible development strategies are needed when developing policies and plans that can respond to the ‘functional territories’ that often cut cross administrative boundaries. These functional territories are defined by where residents commute to work, shop, engage in recreation and access different services.

This report demonstrates the application of an evidence-based approach to
determining access to retail services by drawing on mapping modules and spatial analysis tools developed by the All-Island Research Observatory at NUI Maynooth (AIRO – see www.airo.ie). Using retail development in the Sligo-Enniskillen area as an example, the research team illustrates how retail functions in Enniskillen and Sligo do not overlap and that the average distance to the nearest grocery retail store in the study area is just under ten minutes. The study shows, for example, the gap in access to retail markets for the elderly living alone and in rural areas. Using retail as a prototype, this research has broader implications by demonstrating how planners in regional and local authorities can use existing web-based tools to analyse access to different types of services.

Evidence-based planning

Much of the ICLRD’s work over the past year has been undertaken as part of the Cross-Border Spatial Planning and Training Network (CroSPiLaN), an EU INTERREG IVA-funded programme administered by the Special EU Programmes Body. Operated in association with the Centre for Cross Border Studies as part of the Ireland/Northern Ireland Cross-border Cooperation Observatory (INICCO), CroSPiLaN is a three-year programme of research, training and workshops in Northern Ireland and the Southern border counties.

The ICLRD, together with its sister organisation AIRO, is currently involved in four applied research activities to support evidence-based planning as part of CroSPiLaN.

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

- The All-Island Accessibility Mapping Tool will map levels of access to key services across the island in areas such as education, health, transport and emergency services.

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

- Towards a Spatial Monitoring Framework for the Island of Ireland: A Scoping Study will provide recommendations regarding the development of common indicators and monitoring frameworks set out in the Spatial
Strategies on the Island of Ireland: Framework for Collaboration report. It draws on international experience at European level and elsewhere in the UK. The emergence of multiple spatial planning initiatives from the Irish cross-border region further reinforces the need for a coordinated approach, informed by good practice internationally. The study will provide a valuable source of expert advice for policy-makers and practitioners at national and regional government levels.

**Borderlands: The Journal of Spatial Planning in Ireland**

*Borderlands: The Journal of Spatial Planning in Ireland* is published annually and covers a range of topics of interest to academics, practitioners and policy-makers involved in spatial planning and local and regional development. The January 2012 edition of the Journal, launched by Frank McDonald, Environment Editor of *The Irish Times*, at the seventh annual ICLRD conference, includes articles on cross-border river basins; pathways to managing regional growth; modelling infrastructure investments; the development of a cross-border deprivation index; marine spatial planning; reinstating ‘kids’ into planning policy and practice; and the key links between spatial planning, data and housing policies.

The inaugural issue of *Borderlands: The Journal of Spatial Planning in Ireland* was launched at the sixth annual ICLRD conference in January 2011. The first issue included articles on the challenges of planning and governance reform on both sides of the Irish border; planning for sustainable communities; balancing private sector interests with the ‘common good’ in planning; cross-border planning in the greater Basel region between Switzerland, France and Germany; and how NGOs and academics in the Boston region have pioneered new methods of evidence-informed planning.

**Professional education**

Under the CroSPiAaN initiative, the ICLRD has been rolling out a professional education programme that has, to date, included three executive training programmes for council officials, elected representatives and the private sector in three areas in the Irish border region:

- Irish Central Border Area Network region (ICBAN)
- The North West region
- Newry/Dundalk ‘twin city’ region

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

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

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

**North West Training Programme: October 2010 – June 2011**

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

The materials introduced through the modules and the ideas generated through working group discussions were incorporated into the cross-border activities of the Donegal County Development Plan, the North West Partnership Board, and the ‘One Plan for Derry-Londonderry’. Having won the designation as the UK’s Capital of Culture for 2013, potential thematic areas for cross-border cooperation for Derry/L’Derry include tourism, creative industries and cultural programming. Other priority cross-border themes include enterprise development; vocational training and job creation; and the green economy and sustainable energy. There are also important cross-cutting themes such as greater accessibility to the North West region, transportation and spatial planning.
Newry/Dundalk Twin City Region Training Programme: November 2009 – May 2010

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

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

Completed research projects


This study examines the key role that spatial planning should play in the implementation of River Basin Management Plans (RBMP) under the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD). The study takes an all-island and cross-border perspective and draws on key insights through ‘good practice’ case studies from Germany and the United States.

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

**Governance and Planning: An International Perspective (2010)**

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

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

Together, the three case studies 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 ‘placed-based strategies’ as promoted in the EU 2020 Strategy.

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

Completed in June 2010, this report focuses on inter-jurisdictional planning and multi-level governance and was published on the ICLRD website. The study considers:

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

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

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

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

Following the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding in Brussels in March 2011, a new Louth/Newry and Mourne Joint Council Committee was established to progress joint initiatives and the two councils are now sharing council officers and staff in a common office to implement the MoU.

Delineating Functional Territories Across the Island of Ireland: An Initial Scoping (2010)
Published in October 2010, this report considered the various options for mapping functional territories across the island of Ireland. In undertaking a preliminary analysis of Functional Urban Areas (FUAs) in Ireland and Northern Ireland, this study included maps of natural catchments, travel-to-work catchments, origin-destination data, gravity models and urban functional specialisations. The focus of Phase I of this study was to explore the various possibilities of mapping functional territories to produce a set of outputs based on datasets that were available to the research team. The resulting report illustrated the contribution that dynamic spatial analysis of urban functions can make in the profiling of the relational status, performance and potential of urban centres across the island. The research was carried out by a multi-disciplinary team in ICLRD and funded by the Higher Education Authority (HEA).

Living Together – An Investigation of Case Studies and Strategies for Promoting Safe, Integrated and Sustainable Communities (2009)
This research project investigated initiatives and policies in both Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland to improve and build subsidised housing in mixed communities through the lens
of six case studies: Springfarm (Antrim), the Irish Street and Gobnascale interface (Londonderry/Derry) and Carran Crescent (Enniskillen) in Northern Ireland, and Cranmore (Sligo), Mahon (Cork) and Adamstown (Dublin) in the Republic of Ireland. Together, they provide a cross-section of the challenges faced by communities working to promote or provide mixed housing; the strategies that have helped address these challenges, and opportunities to create and maintain housing that is safe, prosperous and open to all. The six case studies were published in association with the Northern Ireland Housing Executive (NIHE) in Belfast and the Housing Agency in Dublin.

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

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

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

ICLRD undertook this research initiative in cooperation with Louth County Council, 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, at the Carrickdale Hotel, Ravensdale, County Louth. The report brought together recent and current research on how to realise the benefits of cross-border collaboration in the Newry-Dundalk sub-region through integrated planning and development strategies.

Fostering Mutual Benefits in Cross-Border Areas: The Challenges and Opportunities in Connecting Irish Border Towns and Villages (2008)
This 18-month research programme focused on the relationships between cross-border towns and villages in the mid-border region. The final report was launched in Blacklion, County Cavan in November 2008 by the author, Colm Toibin. The research considered the relationship and connectivity that exist between five cross-border settlement groupings and identified and examined the challenges facing and opportunities within these micro-regions. The border towns and villages included in the study were:
- Lifford-Strabane
- Kiltyclogher-Cashel/Scribbagh-Garrison-Rossinver
- Blacklion-Belcoo-Glenfarne
- Clones-Rosslea-Newtownbutler-Lisnaskea
- Castleblayney-Crossmaglen

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

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

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

Conferences

Seventh Annual Conference: Planning for a New Future: Can Planning and Cross-Border Cooperation deliver change in Ireland and Europe?
19-20 January 2012, Crowne Plaza Hotel, Dundalk

Attended by 135 people, the seventh ICLRD conference (part of the CroSPlaN programme) considered models of collaboration across borders and between local authorities and other key agencies. It was organised around three main sessions:

2. Leadership through Planning: debating the role of communities, the private sector and planners in learning from the past and planning a new future.
3. Planning the Future: bringing together people to consider the future role of planning and local and regional development and the implications of emerging EU territorial agendas.

The conference explored the many challenges faced by Ireland due to the severe downturn in the world economy and the legacy of over a decade of sometimes ill-planned development. Delegates discussed the knock-on implications for cross-border cooperation, sustainable development and engaging local authorities, businesses and residents in reshaping their communities.

Speakers and session chairs included Professor Allan Wallis, University of Colorado; Professor Karina Pallagst, Kaiserslautern University of Technology, Germany; Maria-Jose Doval-Tedin, DG Regional Policy, European Commission; Jenny Pyper, NI Department of Social Development; Anne Garvey, Head of Planning Service, NI Department of Environment; Colin Stutt, Colin Stutt Consulting, Belfast; Professor Deborah Peel, University of Ulster; Alice Charles, Alice Charles Planning, Dublin; Professor Mary Corcoran, NUI Maynooth; Justin Gleeson, All-Ireland Research Observatory; Vincent Goodstadt, University of Manchester; and Kelly O’Brien, Chicagoland Tri-State Metropolitan OECD Review.
Sixth Annual Conference:
The Changing Business, Community and Spatial Planning Landscape: Doing More with Less
20-21 January 2011, Radisson Blu Hotel, Sligo

Attended by 110 people representing central, regional and local government, elected representatives, policy makers, community activists, academics and business representatives, this two-day conference was sponsored by the Special EU Programmes Body under CroSPlaN. The conference was organised around four sessions:
1. Planning for Economic Recovery and Sustainable Growth
2. Planning for Homes and People: New Challenges, New Agendas
3. Planning for Shared Innovation: Infrastructure to support Innovation-Led Recovery

Speakers and session chairs included: Nicholas Retsinas, Harvard Business School; Shaun Henry, Special EU Programmes Body; Professor Greg Lloyd, University of Ulster; David Walsh, Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government; Jenny Pyper, NI Department for Regional Development; Brian Rowntree, Northern Ireland Housing Executive; Professor Rob Kitchin, National Institute for Regional and Spatial Analysis; Grainia Long, Chartered Institute of Housing Northern Ireland; Dermot Byrne, Eirgrid; Frank McDonald, The Irish Times; Gary McDarby, University College Dublin; Tracy Meharg, Invest Northern Ireland; Feargal McCormack, FPM Accountants; Dr Patricia O’Hara, National Statistics Board; and Dr James Cunningham, Centre for Innovation and Structural Change, NUI Galway.

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

Over 130 people attended this conference, which was organised around four sessions:
1. Health Check on Economic Development: Planning and Infrastructure
2. Planning and Economic Recovery: the Social and Community Dimension
4. Recovery through Collaborative Spatial Planning.

Among the speakers were Declan Kelly, US Economic Envoy to Northern Ireland; Professor John Fitzgerald, Economic and Social Research Institute, Dublin; Pat Colgan, Chief Executive, Special EU Programmes Body; Charlotte Kahn, Director of the Boston Indicators Project at the Boston Foundation, and Holly St.Clair, Director of Data Services at the Boston region Metropolitan Area Planning Council; Pat McArdle, former Ulster Bank Chief Economist.
and Irish Times columnist; Conor Skehan, Head of the Environment and Planning Department, Dublin Institute of Technology; Wesley Shannon, Director, Local Government Policy Division, NI Department of the Environment; Hubert Kearns, Manager, Sligo County Council; Patricia Potter, Director of the Dublin Regional Authority; Dr Celine McHugh, Senior Policy Adviser with Forfas, and Brian Murray, Chief Executive of the Workspace Group.

Rural Restructuring: Local Sustainable Solutions to the Rural Challenge
8 May 2009, Blackwater Learning Centre, Knockconan, Emyvale, Co. Monaghan

Fourth Annual Conference: Achieving Balanced Regional Development: Dynamic Regions, Spatial Strategies and Collaboration
22-23 January 2009, Radisson Hotel, Letterkenny, Co. Donegal

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Data Capture: Information Rich, Insight Poor?, ICBAN Spatial Planning conference, Cavan, 1 December 2011 (Prof. Rob Kitchin and Justin Gleeson)
- The ICLRD: Purpose, Principles and Process, Presentation on the ICLRD to a South African delegation from Cacadu Municipality, Armagh, 22 November 2011 (Caroline Creamer and Neale Blair)
- Cross-Border Local Authority Training Across the Island of Ireland, Centre for Cross Border Studies international conference on Cross-Border Training and Impact Assessment, Cavan, 27 October 2011 (Caroline Creamer)
• Indicator Development and Monitoring for the National Spatial Strategy and Regional Planning Guidelines, ESPON Ireland Dublin, 28th September 2011 (Jim Hetherington)

• What is Spatial Planning? Irish Central Border Area Network conference on Spatial Planning, Killadeas, Co Fermanagh, 15 September 2011 (Neale Blair)

• Fixing ‘Broken’ Government: Functional Territories as an Impetus for Reform, Regional Studies Association Conference, University of Manchester, 2 November 2010 (Caroline Creamer, Neale Blair and Justin Gleeson)

• Combating Rural Poverty and Social Exclusion, Pobal Conference, Drogheda, 21 October 2010 (Karen Keaveney)

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

• Inter-municipal collaboration across borders: Overcoming Legal and Institutional Differences in the Irish Border Region, American Association of Geographers (AAG) Annual Conference, Washington, 14 April 2010 (John Driscoll)

• Challenges and Opportunities for Rural Regeneration on the Island of Ireland, UK-Ireland Planning Research Conference, Anglia Ruskin University, Chelmsford, 7-9 April 2010 (Karen Keaveney)

• Rural Interfaces: Reconciling Perception with Reality, Sharing Our Space Event, Enniskillen, 4 March 2010 (Caroline Creamer)

Seminars and workshops

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

Organised in association with Cooperation Ireland and Queen’s University Belfast, the emphasis of this seminar was threefold: looking at the growing EU territorial agenda and the opportunities this creates for enhanced cross-border cooperation across the island of Ireland as demonstrated by the experiences of others in Europe; focusing on the potential role of elected representatives in the planning and governance processes of each Irish jurisdiction; and considering the role of planners and councillors in decision-making and the extent to which evidence should lie at the heart of that process.

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

Speakers and contributors at this joint NIRSA-ICLRD-Border Regional Authority event considered the state of housing development and the potential of land banking across the island of Ireland with respect to housing need, unfinished estates, the property market, the planning system and emerging programmes of both the Housing and Sustainable Communities Agency (HSCA) and the National Asset Management Agency (NAMA). It examined international experiences of asset disposal and public land development, and explored possibilities
and opportunities in the island of Ireland context.

Developing Core Strategies: Adopting a Bottom-up Approach 9 March 2011, Athlone

This joint NIRSA-ICLRD-Border Regional Authority seminar brought together over 120 local authority planners, elected representatives, private sector delegates and policy makers to exchange experiences in adopting core strategies as required by new planning legislation in Ireland. The case of how Aberdeen City and Shire produced the Aberdeen strategic plan with the support of elected representatives highlighted the key role that elected councillors have in adopting longer-term planning policies.

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

Evidence-Informed Planning: Making Information Accessible to build Inter-Jurisdictional Cooperation 21 January 2010, Enniskillen, Co. Fermanagh

An Introduction to Smart Growth 22 January 2009, Letterkenny, Co. Donegal

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

Outreach

Irish Central Border Region Network (ICBAN) and North West Region Cross Border Group

The ICLRD has been closely involved in providing guidance to ICBAN’s cross-border spatial planning activities. The Central Border Region Spatial Planning Initiative, which has been partly financed by the EU’s INTERREG IVA Programme, is a drive by ICBAN to give the region distinctiveness, translating key national plans into local and regional actions. The ICLRD provided technical assistance during the set-up period on how the work programme should be shaped and managed to achieve the aims of the Initiative, while also promoting collaborative activity and skill transfer amongst council and community groupings. The ICLRD continues to sit on the Initiative’s steering group.

The ICLRD’s sister organisation, AIRO, also provides advice on evidence-based planning and sits on the steering committee for the Northwest Region Cross-Border Group’s SPACEial data capture project.

Truagh/Aughnacloy Community Planning

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

The next phase of the groups’ work will examine the feasibility of:

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

Briefing Paper series

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

- Reflections on the Boom: A Time for Reform by Dr. Patricia O’Hara, Chairperson of the National Statistics Board and Adjunct Professor at the National Institute for Regional Spatial Analysis (NIRSA), NUI Maynooth (August 2011);
- Innovation: The Challenge of Building an Adaptive and Innovative Society by Dr. James Cunningham, Director of the Centre for Innovation and Structural Change (CISC) and Senior Lecturer at the J.E. Cairnes School of Business & Economics, NUI Galway (May 2011);
- Doing More with Less: A Business Perspective by Feargal McCormack, FPM Chartered Accountants (January 2011);
- Recovery Scenarios for the Two Irish Economies by Professor John FitzGerald, Economic and Social Research Institute (July 2010);
- Evidence-Informed Spatial Planning: A Metro Boston Perspective by Holly St Clair, Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC), Boston (May 2010);
- ESPON: A New Practical European Research Agenda for Territorial Development by Cliff Hague, ESPON Contact Point UK and Brendan Bartley, ESPON Contact Point Republic of Ireland (Feb. 2010);
- The Conditions Necessary for Gateway Development and the Role of Smaller Gateways in Economic Development by Professor Jim Walsh, NUI Maynooth and Cormac Walsh, Urban Institute, University College Dublin (Jan. 2010).

Website

The International Centre for Local and Regional Development’s website is at www.iclrd.org.
In 2012 the Centre (along with the W5 interactive discovery centre in Belfast) became the Ulster regional organisers of the Debating Science Issues all-island schools debating competition, led by the Regenerative Medicine Institute (REMEDi) at National University of Ireland Galway and funded by the Wellcome Trust.

The Debating Science Issues is a competition which invites young people to engage in debate on the cultural, societal and ethical implications of advances in biological and other sciences. It is open to students in the senior cycle of secondary school in the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland. It is coordinated by nine research, medical and science centres all over Ireland: REMEDI; the Alimentary Pharmabiotic Centre at University College Cork; the Biomedical Diagnostics Institute at Dublin City University; the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland in Dublin; W5 in Belfast; CLARITY, a joint University College Dublin-DCU Centre for Science, Engineering and Technology; CRANN, a nanoscience research centre at Trinity College Dublin; Cork Institute of Technology and the Centre for Cross Border Studies (debates organiser: Patricia McAllister).

The 2012 topics for debate are stem cell research; health and self-testing; genetically modified food; nanotechnology; rare diseases; and vaccination against seasonal and pandemic flu. The four Ulster schools in the 2012 regional eliminators are Banbridge Academy, Belfast High School, Castleblayney College, and St Colmcille’s High School, Crossgar.

EDUCATION FOR RECONCILIATION

The Centre is a partner with the City of Dublin Vocational Education Committee’s Curriculum Development Unit in the 2009-2012 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 secondary 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 classroom 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 Falcarragh, Co Donegal; Dunleer and Dundalk, Co Louth; Sligo, and Drumshambo, Co Leitrim. For further information see www.reconciliation.ie or contact mary.gannon@cdu.cdvec.ie

**PAST RESEARCH PROJECTS**

The Centre has commissioned and published 20 cross-border research projects in the fields of telecommunications developments, health services, disadvantage in education, EU funding programmes, local government links, mental health promotion, waste management policies, local history societies, animal health, the euro, local sustainable development, diversity in early years education, science and citizenship education, environmental studies in primary schools, public sector training, hospital services, mental health research,
government services to minority ethnic groups, and impact assessment.

These projects involved researchers drawn from 14 universities, colleges, independent research centres and consultancy firms in Ireland and Britain: Queen’s University Belfast, University of Ulster, Dublin City University, University College Dublin, National University of Ireland Galway, National University of Ireland Maynooth, St Patrick’s College Drumcondra, Stranmillis University College, the Institute of Public Administration, Belfast City Hospital, Dundalk Institute of Technology, the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Horwath Bastow Charleton, and the Centre for Cross Border Studies itself. The research assignments under the 2005-2008 North/South public sector training project also involved civil and public servants from both jurisdictions.

The Centre has published the following research projects:

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

**Cross-Border Co-operation in Health Services in Ireland (2001)**
A study of the past, present and potential for future co-operation in health services across the Irish border by a research team led by Dr Jim Jamison, formerly director of the Health and Social Care Research Unit at Queen’s University Belfast, and including Professor Martin McKee of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Dr Ciaran O’Neill of the University of Ulster, and Ms Michelle Butler of the Institute of Public Administration in Dublin.

**Ireland’s Learning Poor: Adult Educational Disadvantage and Cross-Border Co-operation (2001)**
A study of the needs of the more than a million people on the island who left school with few or no qualifications by Dr Mark Morgan of St Patrick’s College, Drumcondra, and Mr Paul McGill, formerly education correspondent of the Belfast Telegraph. They concluded that current policies in both jurisdictions were far removed from a vision of lifelong learning which allows people of all ages and social classes equal access to education and training.
Creating Living Institutions: EU Cross-Border Co-operation after the Good Friday Agreement (2001)
A study by Professor Brigid Laffan and Dr Diane Payne of the Institute for British-Irish Studies at University College Dublin, which analysed the interaction between the North-South Institutions set up under the Good Friday Agreement – notably the North/South Ministerial Council and the Special EU Programmes Body - and the EU’s funding programme for cross-border co-operation, INTERREG.

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

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

This is a two-part study by a team from National University of Ireland Galway led by Dr Margaret Barry and Ms Sharon Friel. It examined a number of cross-border projects in the areas of postnatal depression, public awareness of suicide, cancer support services, the mental health of young men and mental health in rural communities. The study also looked at the comparability and compatibility of mental health data sources in the two jurisdictions.

The Local History Project: Co-operating North and South (2003)
This study, by Dr Jacinta Prunty, Dr Raymond Gillespie and Maeve Mulryan-Moloney of National University of Ireland Maynooth, provided the basis for the first all-Ireland register of local
history societies. They identified 330 societies, but estimated that a complete list would exceed 500 societies, North and South, involving an active membership of perhaps 28,000 persons.

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

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

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 MacEoin 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.

Removing the Barriers: An Initial Report on the Potential for Cross-Border Cooperation in Hospital Services (2007) This short report compared the planning of hospital service reorganisation, North and South. It noted that there are different strategies in the two jurisdictions, with Northern Ireland placing greater emphasis on travel time and the Republic on the size of the catchment population. The authors, independent Belfast researcher Dr Jim Jamison and Dr Michelle Butler, Senior Lecturer in UCD’s School of Nursing Midwifery and Health Systems, point to the clear scope for joint hospital planning and rationalisation in the border region to benefit the health of the population.

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

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

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

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

This toolkit - the first of its kind in Europe - is particularly timely in light of the European Commission’s increasing focus on Territorial Cooperation and Territorial Cohesion. Cross-border impact assessment is intended to be a practical method to assist people planning cross-border programmes and projects. This first version is based on the Irish cross-border experience, but can be adapted to other European border regions. The toolkit will help to determine whether a cross-border approach is the appropriate level of intervention and, if so, to identify the ‘added value’ of cross-border cooperation. It will also identify the added value that has come about as a result of the cooperation process itself: e.g. the building of new cross-border services.
Unlocking the Potential of Cross-Border Hospital Planning on the Island of Ireland: a prototype modelling framework (2011) This study, carried out by Shane McQuillan and Vanya Sargent of the Dublin consultancy firm Horwath Bastow Charleton, explored the feasibility of developing cross-border acute healthcare services in a number of sectors, and outlined a prototype modelling framework for planning such services. The five sample clinical service areas examined were orthopaedic surgery, ENT surgery, paediatric cardiac surgery, cystic fibrosis and acute mental health care services. The researchers concluded that there were significant barriers to providing such services on a cross-border basis, but these could be worked around (particularly at local level, and following the example set by the Cooperation and Working Together network), and there were particular opportunities presented by the new South West Acute Hospital in Enniskillen.

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 study to explore current governmental and civil society connections between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland in areas of concern to the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust (December 2011 - May 2012)
- A scoping study on the potential for ‘value for money’ North-South public service cooperation for the Department of Foreign Affairs (by Michael D’Arcy) (November 2011 - April 2012)
- A third review of the 2008 study of postgraduate flows from the Republic of Ireland to Northern Ireland for the Irish Department of Education and Skills (December 2011)
- A study of Obstacles to Cross-Border Undergraduate Education (for the IBEC-CBI Joint Business Council and the EURES Cross Border Partnership) (August 2011)
- A study of North-South cooperation in the education sector (pre-school, primary, secondary) for the Department of Education and Skills and the Department of Education Northern Ireland (June 2010)
- A review of cross-border consumer issues, employment issues and railway links, as reflected in Border People queries and user group meetings, for the North/South Ministerial Council Joint Secretariat (April 2010)
- A study of the numbers of people crossing the border on a daily/weekly basis and what they are crossing the border to do (to
work, study, retire, access medical services etc), for the EURES Cross Border Partnership (February 2010).


- 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).


- 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).


- An Evaluation of the Education for Reconciliation Project (Year One and Two), for the City of Dublin Vocational Education Committee (2003-2005).


- ‘Towards a Strategic Economic and Business Research Agenda for the island of Ireland’, for InterTradeIreland (2002).

- A report on public feedback to the PriceWaterhouseCoopers/Indecon Obstacles to Mobility study, for the North/South Ministerial Council (2002).
A study into the feasibility of extending University for Industry/learndirect to the Republic of Ireland, for University for Industry (2001)

An evaluation of the Co-operation and Working Together (CAWT) cross-border network of health boards and trusts, for CAWT (2001)

A ‘scoping study’ of North-South School, Youth and Teacher Exchanges, for the Department of Education Northern Ireland and the Department of Education and Science (2001)

SEMINARS AND STUDY DAYS

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

- Agriculture
- Education
- Tourism
- Information and Communication
- Technologies
- Health Services
- Mental Health Promotion
- Developments in Telecom Technologies
- Local government links
- Foot and Mouth disease
- School, Youth and Teacher Exchanges
- European citizenship education

Pictured at the launch of the IBEC-CBI Joint Business Council/EURES Cross Border Partnership report, A study of Obstacles to Cross-Border Undergraduate Education, August 2011: (from left to right) Hugh Crossey, Chair of the IBEC-CBI Joint Business Council, Paula O’Dwyer (IBEC), Andy Pollak (author), Joe Lavery (EURES Cross Border Partnership).
NORTH/SOUTH RESEARCH FORUM

There have been five 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 second forum was also in Dundalk, in June 2010, with the theme ‘Cross-Border Innovation and Creativity’. The third forum was held in Belfast in December 2010 under the title ‘The Future of Public Sector Cross-Border Cooperation in a Difficult Financial Climate’.

The fourth forum was in Derry on 23 June 2011 under the title ‘Peacebuilding across Borders’. It was addressed by Dr Kenneth Bushe, INCORE, University of Ulster; Amanda Leighton, Communities and Policing in Transition (CAPT) project; Paddy Logue, Irish Peace Centres; and Ruth Taillon, Centre for Cross Border Studies.

A fifth forum was held in Belfast on 15 December 2011 on the subject of ‘Cross-Border Health Cooperation at a time of Austerity’ (to coincide with the launch of the report Unlocking the Potential of Cross-Border Hospital Planning on the Island of Ireland). It was addressed by Tom Daly, Director General of the Cooperation and Working Together (CAWT) cross-border health network; Dean Sullivan, Director of Planning and Performance in the NI Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety; and Dr Jan Rigby, Centre for Health Geoinformatics, NUI Maynooth.

For the Mapping Frontiers, Plotting Pathways project

*For the Mapping Frontiers, Plotting Pathways project
CONFERENCES

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

The Centre has also organised six North-South conferences on aspects of higher education on behalf of the Department for Employment and Learning (Belfast) and the Department of Education and Science (Dublin). The first of these, in October 2002 in Armagh, was on ‘Ireland as a Centre of Excellence in Third Level Education.’ This conference, which was attended by the presidents of seven of the nine universities on the island of Ireland, was addressed by several world authorities on higher education. These included Professor Malcolm Skilbeck, the OECD’s former Deputy Director for Education; former US Secretary of Education, Richard Riley; the Director-General for Education and Culture in the European Commission, Niko 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 Opérationnelle Transfrontalière (MOT) in Paris; Linda Blom from the Euregio Gronau-Enschede (Germany-Netherlands); and Gorka Espiau Idoiaga, Senior Advisor for Peacebuilding to the Basque Government. This conference was funded by the EU Peace Two programme.

In April 2009 and May 2011 the Centre, the Royal School Armagh, the Armagh Observatory and the Armagh Planetarium came together to organise a second and third ‘Discover the Stars in Armagh: Cross-Border Schools Science Conference’. These brought together over 500 students from 20 secondary schools on both sides of the border to learn about astronomy and related sciences and mathematics, using the unique joint facilities of the Observatory and the Planetarium. In 2009 the keynote lecture on ‘The Science of Armageddon’ was given by the leading British astronomer, Jay Tate of Spaceguard UK in Wales. In 2011 the keynote speaker was Dr Robert Walsh of the University of Central Lancashire on ‘Basking in the Sunshine: a new encounter with our closest star.’

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

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

THE TRANSFRONTIER EURO-INSTITUTE NETWORK (TEIN)

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

- Euro-Institute, Kehl (Upper Rhine region: German-French-Swiss borders) (lead partner)
The TEIN network has organised five meetings since October 2010 – in Kehl, Germany; Villach, Austria; Trinec, Czech Republic; Armagh, Northern Ireland, and Banyuls, French Catalonia – to explore ways of developing tools, methods and skills for cross-border training in Europe; to provide the EU with a trans-European network of cross-border training centres, and to develop locally relevant training networks in specific fields such as public administration.

TEIN speakers have addressed conferences in Ireland, France, Germany, Belgium and Austria, and the network has compiled a pilot database of 3,000 scholarly articles on cross-border cooperation in Europe. Along with the Association of European Border Regions and Mission Opérationelle Transfrontalière (MOT – the French Government’s cross-border
cooperation agency), it is planning a major symposium in Brussels on 10 July 2012 on capacity-building and impact assessment in cross-border cooperation in Europe, to be addressed by EU Regional Policy Commissioner Johannes Hahn.

A funding application was submitted to the EU Leonardo (Transfer of Innovation) programme in February 2012 to transfer and adapt a training tool for intercultural cross-border project management and the moderation of cross-border meetings – first developed in the Upper Rhine region – to other European border regions.

BOOKS

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

- *Multi-Culturalism: the View from the Two Irelands* by Edna Longley and Declan Kiberd, with a foreword by President Mary McAleese
- *Can the Celtic Tiger cross the Irish Border?* by John Bradley and Esmond Birnie, with a foreword by Peter Sutherland

WHAT THEY SAY

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

_The Taoiseach, Enda Kenny TD, January 2012_
I really enjoyed my visit to Armagh and meeting with you and your colleagues in the Centre for Cross Border Studies. Please keep in touch. I would be happy to visit again and get a detailed briefing on other aspects of the Centre’s work.

*Ruairi Quinn TD, Minister for Education and Skills, January 2012*

We welcome the Centre for Cross Border Studies’ ongoing role in researching, developing and promoting cross-border cooperation. The continuing development of the website [www.borderpeople.info](http://www.borderpeople.info), which the Centre operates in partnership with the NSMC Joint Secretariat, is particularly pleasing. Border People has proven to be an invaluable resource for people who wish to move across the border in either direction to work, study and live.

The Centre has also continued to provide valuable assistance to the NSMC Joint Secretariat in its work on identifying new and emerging cross-border mobility issues. It organised two well attended focus group discussions with key stakeholders on cross-border business development, including problems encountered by businesses operating across the border. In 2012 the focus will shift to examining how the provision of advice on cross-border matters might be mainstreamed into relevant front line services. We look forward to continuing our cooperation with the Centre in 2012 and wish Andy Pollak and his team every success with their work.

*North South Ministerial Council Joint Secretaries, Mary Bunting and Margaret Stanley (Acting), January 2012*

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

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

The Centre for Cross Border Studies’ team deserve our thanks and congratulations for the tremendous work they have been doing. It is work that has also paid dividends in terms of research projects done and people brought together from North and South in conferences, seminars and training courses. People have to be inter-connected, whether it is within the North, between North and South, or between East and West. That is how we will all learn from each other. The Centre is leading that North-South inter-connection process. It is therefore an honour and a pleasure to be here with you this morning to launch the
I applaud the Director, Andy Pollak, and his team on a tremendous record of achievement over well nigh 12 years. Pages 112-173 of this year’s Journal, on the Centre’s work, show just how far-reaching and significant is its range and how it touches on areas so relevant to the quality of our future on the island. I saw this at first hand through my involvement for several years in a highly innovative programme it ran for the training of personnel engaged in cross-border policy or operations. The Centre’s Journal typifies the quality of excellence which the Centre brings to all that it does. Beautifully produced, a pleasure just to handle but, most important of all, a treasure chest of highly readable articles written to the highest professional standards. Start any of these articles and you will become hooked. And not just hooked, but challenged, because these articles irresistibly prompt the response: What must be done about this?

Sir George Quigley, Chairman, Bombardier Aerospace, Belfast, March 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.

Fianna Fail leader (then Minister for Foreign Affairs), Micheál Martin TD, 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 always takes a very fresh and innovative approach, bringing together sources of energy on both sides of the border that used to be back to back but are now in an extraordinary dialogue.

President Mary McAleese, February 2005

EVALUATION QUOTES

An evaluation of the work of the INICCO ‘basket’ of EU INTERREG funded projects was carried out in 2009-2012 by Indecon Economic Consultants of Dublin. As part of this evaluation they sought the views of ‘high-level stakeholders’ with an interest in cross-border cooperation in Ireland. Indecon said these views were ‘consistent with our own evaluation of the programmes and the quantified evidence on activities.’

Their perceptions of the Centre’s achievements through the INICCO projects were as follows:

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

2. The Centre cannot, however, be expected to be expert in all fields; it exists on a modest budget and expectations of its applied research output must take account of the fact that it does not have the research resources which exist in university faculties or in larger research institutes. Nevertheless, through its networks on the island and internationally, it has been able
3. The importance of the Centre’s work on training and the development of individuals to help upskill them and disseminate good practices in a cross-border context was highlighted by various stakeholders. In particular, a number of people consulted referred to the impact of the Centre’s research and practical support for cooperation. An example of senior policy makers views on the Centre was indicated in the speech by Mary Bunting, NI Joint Secretary of the NSMC, to the Transfrontier Euro-Institut Network (TEIN) delegates on 27 October 2011, where she noted that:

The Centre makes an excellent contribution to research and cooperation on the island of Ireland in areas such as education, training, health, ICT, the economy, citizens’ information and a range of other practical areas.

4. The contribution of the Centre and INICCO to areas such as regional development was also raised by senior stakeholders. For example, in our consultations Martin Fraser, Secretary General of the Department of the Taoiseach, indicated his belief that the Centre for Cross Border Studies is engaged in valuable work in a challenging context. Mr Fraser gave the example of the opportunities identified in their work on health and on regional development and indicated that these initiatives were very well conceived.
5. There were a range of other positive views from senior stakeholders consulted. Sir George Quigley, Chairman of Bombardier Aerospace, said:

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

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

6. The Centre’s work programme through INICCO was seen as having relevance for the private sector as well as the public sector. However, some views were expressed suggesting placing greater emphasis on supporting the private sector in any future programmes.’

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

1. ‘There is a perception by some stakeholders that the Centre is primarily focused on the public sector, and this raises the issue of whether more could be done to enhance collaboration with private sector organisations and/or provide research that could meet identified needs of the private sector. It is accepted, however, that the Border People project has taken a business-oriented approach to its user group meetings in 2011, which have been positively received by the attendees. Indecon also believes that the provision of research and insights such as provided by INICCO may inevitably be of greater benefit to policy-makers and we believe this is consistent with its original rationale. It should also be noted that INICCO is funded under the public sector collaboration theme of the INTERREG IVA programme.

2. One issue noted by a number of stakeholders is that the Centre and INICCO are not implementation agencies and that implementation of various initiatives, in practice, is often a difficult challenge. One of the positives of INICCO is that it entails work by the Centre in collaboration with other cross-border/island of Ireland organisations, with steering/advisory groups who can help to implement cross-border initiatives. However, ultimately, implementation is a matter for policy makers. This suggests there is a continual challenge for the Centre to maintain its advocacy of cross-border collaboration with central and local government and with implementation agencies.

3. During the consultations one stakeholder raised the issue of the level of engagement by the universities who were the founder members of the Centre. While the Centre and its island of Ireland partner organisations have formed useful relationships with universities during the course of INICCO, the challenge remains of developing
significant cross-border research programmes within universities. An effective way forward may be to intensify these links (between universities North and South and between universities and the Centre) on a project-by-project basis. The Centre manages the all-island university network Universities Ireland and its North/South scholarships scheme, and other initiatives such as cooperation with African universities. None of these are funded by INTERREG. However the Centre’s close association, through ICLRD, with NUI Maynooth and University of Ulster, has served to strengthen INICCO’s university connections.

4. A small number of stakeholders raised the possibility that the Centre might be more active in the provision of quantitative analysis. However, we believe this is not a specialist area of the Centre and, given the challenging funding outlook for the Centre, we believe that the best way of accommodating more quantitative-based research by the Centre might be through its links with other organisations.

5. Important for future policy is the fact that in the course of developing its projects, the Centre has assembled extensive relevant data about the differing situations in both jurisdictions across a number of sectors. It was suggested that
a worthwhile exercise might be to assemble and further develop this data so it is easily accessible and provides a useful resource for planners and policy makers, including on the patterns of deprivation in border areas. ICLRD has developed an innovative all-island Deprivation Index with the All-Island Research Observatory. Indecon believes that maintaining and developing the important data and evidence assembled by the Centre and ICLRD is key to maximising the legacy benefits of INICCO.
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EXTRACTS FROM 2010-2011 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 2011 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 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unrestricted Funds</th>
<th>Restricted Funds</th>
<th>Total Funds 2011</th>
<th>Total Funds 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incoming resources</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for generating funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>862,764</td>
<td>862,764</td>
<td>818,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income</td>
<td>438,043</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>438,043</td>
<td>326,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total incoming resources</strong></td>
<td>438,043</td>
<td>862,764</td>
<td>1,300,807</td>
<td>1,144,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources expended</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct charitable expenditure</td>
<td>331,535</td>
<td>786,655</td>
<td>1,118,190</td>
<td>985,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of generating funds</td>
<td>7,664</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>7,969</td>
<td>8,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance Costs</strong></td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>3,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total resources expended</strong></td>
<td>342,849</td>
<td>786,960</td>
<td>1,129,809</td>
<td>998,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net movement in funds</strong></td>
<td>85,194</td>
<td>75,804</td>
<td>170,998</td>
<td>146,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund balance carried forward at August 2010</strong></td>
<td>183,108</td>
<td>505,282</td>
<td>688,390</td>
<td>541,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund balance carried forward at 31 July 2011</strong></td>
<td>278,302</td>
<td>581,086</td>
<td>859,388</td>
<td>688,390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All amounts above relate to continuing operations of the company.

The company 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 difference between the net movement in funds for the period stated above and its historical cost equivalent.

**BALANCE SHEET AS AT 31 JULY 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debtors</td>
<td>1,237,058</td>
<td>938,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash at bank</td>
<td>4,001</td>
<td>1,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,241,059</td>
<td>940,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creditors: amounts falling due within one year</strong></td>
<td>(381,671)</td>
<td>(251,951)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net current assets</strong></td>
<td>859,388</td>
<td>688,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>278,302</td>
<td>183,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>581,086</td>
<td>505,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total funds</strong></td>
<td>859,388</td>
<td>688,390</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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