

Community Relations Council



COMMUNITY RELATIONS COUNCIL

Submission to the Committee of OFMDFM inquiry into Building a United Community

10 October 2014

6 Murray Street, Belfast, BT1 6DN, info@nicrc.org.uk , www.nicrc.org.uk, Tel: +44 (0) 28 9022 7500

Contents Page

Executive summary

Section 1 Introduction

Section 2 TBUC must be ambitious and fit for purpose.

Section 3 Uniting communities and community integration, including how communities are involved in decision making.

Section 4 Examine the theory and practice with regard to good relations, shared space and shared services in bringing divided communities together.

Section 5 Legislation and definitions.

Section 6 Good Relations Indicators in monitoring and measuring the progress of government interventions.

Appendix 1 CRC supported work

Executive summary

CRC welcomes this opportunity to respond to the Committee for the Office of the First Minister and deputy First Minister Inquiry into Building a United Community. It is especially poignant at this particular juncture in our peace process when there is a sense that Northern Irish society is at a crossroads, with an urgent need for agreed government commitments and actions to stabilise and reconfigure existing tensions.

It is critical that the Executive's strategy Together Building a United Community (TBUC) is developed as a new and progressive discourse, with innovative and ambitious actions that will continue to address the legacy of the past and assist in building a shared and reconciled society.

Key for CRC is the aim of the inquiry which is to *'inform the Executive's approach in the actions it takes to tackle sectarianism and racism and other forms of intolerance'*

CRC highlights the following key points as issues which should be given full attention by the Committee during its deliberations. These and other issues will be further elaborated upon within the body of our response:

- **Delays in implementation.** It is over a year and a half since the policy was first announced but there is little activity on the ground.
- **Financial implications.** There are serious financial implications with the loss/reduction of international funders and the constrictive domestic funding situation.
- **Local Government.** There is a need to ensure that the new 11 District Councils have equality and good relations at the forefront of everything they do.
- **Regional Co-ordination.** Regional co-ordination of community relations work is required, which should bring together and synchronize interventions at regional government level along with district councils and community initiatives.
- **Sectarianism and Racism.** Sectarianism and racism should be tackled in an effective and co-ordinated way. This is particularly important bearing in mind budget restraints imposed on Departments and their agencies which may impact negatively on tackling sectarianism and racism (for example, recent concerns expressed by PSNI around the negative impact of budget cuts in relation to policing interface areas).

CRC welcomes the September 2014 announcement by Northern Ireland Secretary of State Theresa Villiers, on the convening of a new round of cross-party negotiations to focus on the outstanding issues, including how to deal with flags, parades and the past and wishes it success in addressing these outstanding legacy issues which continue to impact on community relations and resources.

CRC also acknowledges the important role the Committee of OFMDFM has in relation to scrutiny, policy development and consultation with respect to OFMDFM and its key role in the consideration and development of legislation. In order to ensure a robust and transparent inquiry process, CRC recommends that the Committee:

CRC response to the Inquiry into Building a United Community

- Make inquiry submissions publicly available.
- Enlist the services of dedicated advisors to the inquiry.
- Call for evidence from all relevant departments regarding spend to date and future resourcing for the implementation of the United Community strategy priority areas, headline actions and community relations issues with no headline action attributed e.g. the regeneration of interface areas, flags/emblems, parades/protests and other legacy issues.
- Make recommendations to other Departments as part of the final inquiry report.
- Pro-actively engage with the sector on issues emerging from inquiry submissions through thematic and organisational events during the autumn and winter.
- Involve practitioners in the writing of the next version/update.
- Post-inquiry, make a commitment to engage with relevant cross-departmental officials on the Inquiry's Report i.e. recommendation for an ongoing examination on the impact of the Inquiry on policy/programme change. This would be invaluable to those interested in the implementation and delivery of TBUC.

CRC hopes that the learning and recommendations from the Inquiry submissions will be embedded in the ongoing TBUC planning and implementation processes and future plans so that peace building, countering sectarianism and racism and supporting reconciliation will be at TBUC's core.

One of CRC's areas of responsibility is the provision of practical and policy development and funding support to a broad network of statutory, private, and voluntary/community sector organisations. The Inquiry has provided an invaluable opportunity to revisit TBUC with these organisations. Hence during September CRC facilitated a wide ranging discussion with the sector in relation to the Inquiry and its terms of reference, as well as broader issues that are affecting the groups on the ground. CRC's response has captured some of this discourse and we would like to offer assistance to the Committee in the coordination of evidence gathering events with the sector – this direct engagement with those doing 'relationship building' on the ground would be significant as well as symbolic.

CRC, as the regional body would particularly welcome the opportunity to give evidence directly to the Committee over the coming months – it would be important to have this regional perspective.

Finally, CRC wish the Committee success in highlighting a clear vision for the development and delivery of TBUC to build cohesive, strong relationships across all levels of society, protect minorities and demonstrate fairness that inspires trust in the strategy.

SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

The Community Relations Council (CRC)¹ is the regional body for community relations in Northern Ireland, established as an independent charity and acting as an arm's length body through sponsorship by the Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister (OFMDFM). The board is appointed through a supervised public appointments process and the Memorandum and Articles provides for up to one third of the Board to be appointed by the Government.

CRC's vision is of a peaceful, inclusive, prosperous, stable and fair society founded on the achievement of reconciliation, equality, co-operation, respect, mutual trust and good relations, of an open society free from intimidation and threat, where peace and tolerance are considered normal.

To support the securing and attainment of this vision CRC's responsibilities as a regional body are:

- advocating and challenging progress towards a better, shared and prosperous inter-community partnership and inter-cultural co-operation;
- increasing awareness of community relations work and encouraging the flow of ideas and practice on North-South, East-West, European and international levels through commissioning and undertaking research;
- developing, supporting and disseminating best practice examples of peace-building and facilitating constructive debate on difficult, sensitive and controversial topics, whilst acknowledging and promoting good relations actions;
- providing support for local groups and organisations (finance, training, advice and information) to develop opportunities for cross-community understanding;
- providing practical opportunities for inter-community and inter-cultural partnership understanding and interventions; and
- assisting central and local Government in the development, implementation, and delivery of policies, programmes and actions by connecting community relations issues through learning from research and programmes at regional, sub-regional and local level.

Since its establishment in 1990 CRC has supported practical initiatives underpinning progress towards a society whose principles are fairness and justice, the peaceful celebration of variety and difference, and the importance of sharing, trust and inclusion. CRC supports cross-community partnerships and co-operation, inter and intra community dialogue, and sustained engagement; in addition to this CRC promotes better practice and aims to influence policy development processes. As the regional body for peace building, CRC acts as an independent voice championing change to achieve and maintain a shared and open society based on fairness, the celebration of diversity and variety, and genuine reconciliation and interdependence.

¹ CRC was formed in January 1990 with the purpose of supporting and promoting community relations work at all levels within the community, a role which it continues to carry out. It originated from a proposal of a research report commissioned by the NI Standing Advisory Committee on Human Rights titled 'Improving Community Relations' (Frazer & Fitzduff 1986).

Furthermore, CRC provides a challenge function that promotes a shared and better future throughout government and civic society. The consultation responses to *A Shared Future* clearly indicated that there was widespread support for such a regional body, independent of government and capable of commanding support to promote good relations throughout government and society, support organisations through funding, training and development of good practice and to provide a challenge function across the public sector and wider civic society through research, best practice and policy development

Context

Given CRC's central role in peace-building and relationship building in our post-conflict society we are particularly concerned with the formulation of strong, robust policy making that influences and supports best practice on the ground.

Before embarking on the specifics of OFMDFM's Inquiry into Building a United Community it is worth taking note of some of the key relevant commitments and reactions to our society's peace process.

In April 1998 the Belfast (Good Friday) Agreement states in its first paragraphs that *'we make a fresh start in which we firmly dedicate ourselves to the achievement of reconciliation, tolerance and mutual trust and to the protection and vindication of the human rights of all.'* It further states *'we are committed to partnership, equality and mutual respect as the basis of relationships within Northern Ireland, between North and South, and between these islands'*. Then in October 2006 the St Andrews Agreement states that *'the culture rights and aspirations of all are respected and valued, free from sectarianism, racism and intolerance'*.

External expectations. There is a sense that Northern Irish society is at a crossroads in our peace process which requires agreed government commitments and actions to stabilise and reconfigure existing tensions. The Haass/O'Sullivan process failed to produce consensus or an agreed blueprint for dealing with some of the most contentious issues facing our post-conflict society. More recently, Nancy Soderberg², accused Northern Ireland politicians of an *'abysmal abdication of leadership'* and unionists and nationalists of being *'far too stuck in the past, making progress vulnerable and even reversible'*. This was echoed by Minister Flanagan at the British Irish Association Conference (September 2014) when he referred to the Irish Government's concerns over the past year *'as politics in Northern Ireland has atrophied across a range of issues; not only the reconciliation agenda, which goes to the heart of the peace process itself, but other bread and butter issues have also fallen foul of disagreement within the Executive'*. At the same meeting Secretary of State Theresa Villiers, reiterated strongly to political parties reluctant to move forward to creating a fresh approach on the past that *'there are risks but the status quo is increasingly unsustainable and is putting ever greater pressure on our policing and criminal justice system'*.

Scale of the challenge. Recognising the problem is a recurring theme across a number of policy development areas, and it is therefore important that the Committee in taking forward its inquiry, reflect on the realities and the problems still facing our

² Senior aide to former US president Bill Clinton

society as it moves from peace-building to reconciliation. CRC would like to draw specific attention to the most recent findings from the third *Peace Monitoring Report* (<http://www.community-relations.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Peace-Monitoring-Report-2014.pdf>). Finally, CRC's core grant and community relations/cultural diversity grant schemes have suffered a decrease in budgets whilst witnessing an increase in applications. This is both symptomatic of the increased need to carry out the work, as well as the shrinking financial support for this work to take place i.e. exiting of Atlantic Philanthropies and International Fund for Ireland programmes as well as the gap between Peace III and Peace IV. The shrinking of the sector has the potential to impact negatively on peace-building activities.

Together Building a United Community strategy. It is critical that the Executive's strategy Together Building a United Community (TBUC) is developed as a new and progressive discourse, with innovative and ambitious actions that will continue to address the legacy of the past and assist in building a shared and reconciled society. CRC welcomed the launch of TBUC in May 2013 stating that, given that the details of implementation plans and budgets had still to be formulated it viewed the document as a statement of policy intent and would consider it further as these details unfolded.

It is well over a year since TBUC was issued and CRC welcomes this opportunity to respond to the Committee for the Office of the First Minister and deputy First Minister Inquiry into Building a United Community. Key for CRC is the purpose of the inquiry to '*inform the Executive's approach in the actions it takes to tackle sectarianism and racism and other forms of intolerance*'. .

CRC views this inquiry as hugely important at this particular juncture in our peace process.

SECTION 2 TBUC MUST BE AMBITIOUS AND FIT FOR PURPOSE

The TBUC strategy must match the ambition of wider civil society to live in a truly and fully reconciled region. It is a critical strategy within the NI peace process which must work in practice and not just in theory.

The successful development and implementation of TBUC depends on:

- **Having a clear framework** for departmental structures around the development and delivery of TBUC's four priorities and seven headline actions and how these will work, both individually and collectively.
- **Producing a meaningful assessment** of the scale of the challenge to help inform TBUC actions and programmes. This includes assessing inter and intra communal violence which continues to impact on people's lives, security budgets and the peace process. Some of this information can be found in CRC publications such as the *Northern Ireland Peace Monitoring Reports* which provide a dispassionate analysis of the dynamics within NI society. The reports have been welcomed as an important source of information that allow us to examine, on the basis of evidence, our journey towards or away from peace on issues including security, equality, political progress and cohesion and sharing. The reports use statistics in the public domain but which have not been previously assembled across the wide range of issues affecting life here. The reports are available on CRC's website along with many other valuable research reports that underpin our knowledge of issues affecting community relations including CRC's Shared Space research journal (<http://www.community-relations.org.uk/programmes/sub-page-1/shared-space/>) which publishes current academic research on the themes of peace, conflict and community relations journal.
- **Developing actions with clear and measurable outcomes**, as well as indicators and interventions using appropriate evaluation tools. This will enable the Executive, its departments and related agencies to properly demonstrate what these programmes have achieved, especially in relation to sustained cross-community sharing and reconciliation.
- **Being capable of addressing the complex mix of issues** that link poverty with long-term social disadvantage such as housing, education, regeneration and community safety, which are inextricably linked to the more fluid issues of identity, cultural expression and community division.
- **Ensuring TBUC will be funded.** This is one of the most critical questions to be addressed by the inquiry. Exact detail is required on what expenditure has been committed and what is being sought to properly resource TBUC's commitment to tackle sectarianism and racism and enhance policy in uniting communities and community integration.
- **Reconciliation.** The TBUC commitment to the '*desirability of good relations and reconciliation*' should be strengthened and reflected in subsequent actions. The PEACE III programme is based on a widely accepted definition of reconciliation developed by Hamber and Kelly for the PEACE II programme (<http://cain.ulst.ac.uk/dd/papers/dd04reconddef.pdf>) and agreed by the current Executive in 2007. This definition retains merit and credibility, and should be adopted and re-affirmed as TBUC moves forward.

CRC response to the Inquiry into Building a United Community

The Executive must ensure all Departments work together to embed TBUC and not just as a strategy for certain executive partners. TBUC must influence and guide the entire Executive, along with its Section 75 obligations, to make a positive contribution to reconciliation and peace- building. This should involve processes to review existing and new policies through a TBUC lens and civil servants engaged in writing and delivering TBUC should be given training to assist them in their understanding of the issues and engaging with the sector. Ministers should also ensure that TBUC is not only delivered but strongly advocated for across the entire Executive.

- **Joined up government.** The importance of inter-departmental co-operation can only be resolved through political commitment and Executive agreement. What is clear however, is that no serious issue in building a united community can be tackled by one Department alone working in a silo. For example:
 - significant change in the pattern of housing will require changes in safety, policing, transport, education and the location of public services;
 - shared space will require actions by the Departments of Social Development, Regional Development, Culture and Leisure, Education, and Justice, as well as local government;
 - there will be no change on the interfaces if there are not changes in planning, regeneration, transport, employment and education;
 - tackling the past will involve actions for justice, education, health, employment and community relations; and
 - tackling hate crime and racial inequalities is clearly a matter of serious inter-departmental action.
- **Practice shaping policy.** The TBUC strategy was issued in May 2013 with practically no results to show on the ground due to the fact that it is mainly focused on departmental programme development and delivery, largely ignoring the vast inter-community infrastructure in the most volatile areas which has been built up over many years through major international investment. The sector now reports a current financial crisis and is concerned that it will be unable to contribute fully to the implementation of TBUC. At a recent meeting with sectoral stakeholders 92% stated that their community had not yet benefitted from TBUC programmes. The strategy must work to link more effectively with good practice on the ground.

In addition to the general comments above CRC has the following observations to make on the current design and implementation of TBUC.

Participation. A number of design teams, subgroups, working groups have been established to take forward actions, but the involvement of the sector within this design process has been limited. The positive example of the Interagency Group established by the Department of Justice to drive forward its commitment to interface barrier removal is an example of good practice within and between key stakeholder government agencies and community groups. However, it is unclear as to whether or not this process will be able to find adequate resources to fund the TBUC commitment of barrier removal by 2023. The 'United Youth Programme' design team has engaged widely with the youth sector, young people, and training organisations but these examples do not seem to have been replicated across the other actions. There is no clear sense as to how the other programmatic areas are being designed.

CRC response to the Inquiry into Building a United Community

A commitment to engage strategically with the relevant knowledge base should be given and actioned across all headline action programmes during the remaining design period.

Implementation. Overall progress is slow. Aspects of programmes have emerged i.e. three shared campuses announced, two urban villages identified, the United Youth Programme is now moving to the selection of pilots. Other programmes still appear to be either in design mode or currently working up terms of reference to establish one. However, there is growing frustration at the delays.

Peace-building focus. Departments should also be more accountable in relation to the TBUC programmes for which they have responsibility in terms of their good relations content and impact. For example, the two urban villages programmes announced appear to have little or no good relations content and local minority communities appear to be excluded from the areas of benefit. TBUC also refers to a number of strategies relevant to Section 75 (1) categories e.g. Childcare and Gender Equality Strategy. It is important to clarify if these strategies will include peace-building as a core objective, CRC stresses the need to ensure that no government agency should be allowed to reinforce division.

Co-ordination. It is critical for the Executive to ensure Departments work together to deliver a joined up approach to TBUC. Each department should consider how it will:

- respond to community relations issues throughout its area of responsibility;
- work in partnership with other Departments and communities: and
- develop clear and transparent targets to assist in the delivery of TBUC priorities and measure progress.

Leadership. Strong Ministerial leadership is an important principle and Ministers should ensure that TBUC is not only delivered but also advocated for. To ensure a joined up inter-departmental approach to the strategy, leadership offered by the Executive should be efficient, effective and transparent. It should hold regular planned meetings and publish reports on progress which should be presented to OFMDFM Committee and circulated widely. To date there has only been one Ministerial Panel meeting.

Local Government reform. Councils should be supported in the development of strong reconciliation and funding programmes to strengthen and mainstream their significant contribution to peace which has been supported over many years by the European Peace Programmes and OFMDFM's Good Relations Funding.

Resources. TBUC will not be plausible without a serious resource review and the commitment of adequate resources. This includes urgent support for groups on the ground vital to implementing TBUC actions. A major rethink of how larger and significant budgets such as education, housing, community development, regeneration, justice and culture intersect and present opportunities for reconciliation and peace-building is also necessary. Without this review, commitment to reconciliation and peace building is likely to remain merely piecemeal.

Outstanding contentious issues. It is difficult to know how the Haass/O'Sullivan Panel of Parties and the issues it was set up to address currently sit/fit within the TBUC framework as discussions on these matters are currently stuck. Therefore, the Executive must:

- break the impasse and provide stability by returning to fully engaging on the key outstanding issues of flags, parades and protests, marking anniversaries and how to deal with the past;
- find agreement on the overarching principles and structures to address them;
- engage with other key organisations with responsibility for, and expertise in peace building activity to help support and sustain progress.

At the September 2014 Conservative party conference the NI Secretary of State, Theresa Villiers, announced a fresh round of all-party talks, involving the Irish Government commenting *"It's essential that the institutions crafted so painstakingly in 1998 function effectively and efficiently. There can be no doubt that both welfare and the legacy issues of flags, parading and the past are now impacting on the ability of the Executive to do that. A situation where decision-making becomes deadlocked is not something we could simply sit back and allow to happen"*.

In September 2013, the CRC submitted a briefing to the Panel of Parties established under TBUC (<http://www.community-relations.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/CRC-Haass-Submission.doc>). The briefing acknowledged that the Panel of Parties was taking place at an important time in our peace process and gave analysis and comment on the issues of flags and related matters; parades and protests; dealing with the past. The submission also gave examples of the CRC's practical engagement with these issues:

- 1. Agreement on overarching principles** – CRC believes that our society is reaching the limits of what can be achieved by pragmatic negotiation on a case by case basis. To move beyond the management of our difference to the acknowledgement of our diversity, CRC believes it is time to enshrine principles that form the basis of our collective rights and responsibilities to each other in relation to the remaining matters. These principles could form the foundation for the approach we take to these issues and could provide security for all identities without prejudice to the wider constitutional question.
- 2. Structures for sustaining peace** – It can be as difficult to live within a peace settlement as it is to negotiate it in the first place. CRC believes that our society has underestimated the implications of this important point and that the negotiating structures for sustaining peace should be revisited. Tensions and divisions will remain within Northern Ireland for the foreseeable future and sporadically lead to violence and disturbances in the street. Acknowledging this is not to be fatalistic, indifferent or undemanding of our peace process. It is simply the reality of the difficulties of transforming a deeply divided society. Therefore we suggest that negotiations on the three key issues should consider whether the ad-hoc approach taken to these inevitable issues is, in itself, creating instability and an erosion of trust.

SECTION 3 UNITING COMMUNITIES AND COMMUNITY INTEGRATION, INCLUDING HOW COMMUNITIES ARE INVOLVED IN DECISION MAKING.

Acknowledging the sector. The unparalleled scale of international support and community effort for peace-building over the years and the pace of progress and learning from practice on the ground must be strongly reflected within the strategy.

This acquired practice must be a key influence on current priorities and actions, yet it appears for the most part, that communities and practitioners have played a minimal role in the actual design and delivery of TBUC to date. The strategy should commit to the principle that the achievements on the ground throughout the conflict and peace process are the bedrock of future progress and commit to ensuring there is no regression from current levels of inter-community activity and partnership.

The void between TBUC and community need, has left much of the community relations sector vulnerable, frustrated and pessimistic. Enormous efforts have gone into the task of making peace and seeking real and meaningful reconciliation on the ground. Many people and organisations took big risks for change even when reconciliation was dismissed as naive. They hold the expertise in and commitment to the delivery of relationship and trust building work. TBUC should include a programme of actions and resources which are authentic, credible and rooted in the learning from this work.

CRC was established to support these efforts and to build from their insights and achievements (examples of CRC supported projects can be found in appendix 1). International partners have also made a huge contribution to this change including the EU Peace fund, Atlantic Philanthropies, the International Fund for Ireland, the Irish Government and others that have invested in economic regeneration and reconciliation for many years and enabled the direct participation of hundreds of thousands of people in building peace. This broadly based support for a genuine people's 'peace process' sustained hope through years of political disagreement and difficulty and was vital to the ultimate possibility of political agreement.

Wider inclusion. TBUC must be stronger in its acknowledgement of:

- the positive contribution by people from minority ethnic backgrounds, and minority faith backgrounds;
- how segregation and legacy issues within society impacts on minority ethnic and faith communities; and
- the need for a strong link with the Racial Equality Strategy, or else we will lose complementarity.

Furthermore, a number of other categories or groupings receive a guarded mention in the strategy, rather than being viewed as important contributors to the vital work of peace-building e.g. women, NGO's, churches, faith-based organisations, ex-combatants, trade unions, private sector and business community, and finally those organisations working to develop and strengthen communities through a community development approach.

Resourcing the sector. Declining and inadequate funding, as well as delays associated with release of Government funding delivery is leading to a diminishing

and fractured sector. It is critical that government consider both current and long term consequences of a reduced sector, such as 'How can peace building work continue in the current climate where experienced staff and good projects have closed, or are at risk of closure?' and 'Who will be left to implement TBUC on the ground?'

Future funding must move from piecemeal to long term community based activity based on hard indicators with results that are outcome based. The outcome of the Good Relations Funding Review should detail OFMDFM's commitment to sustainable, long-term resource allocation for community relations activity and CRC recommends that the Committee call for the publication and full consultation on the review findings as part of this inquiry.

Affirmation and inclusivity. There is growing concern regarding the genuine political commitment to the TBUC strategy. The Interface Community Partners group is made up of community relations practitioners from across the region, and at a recent meeting (July 2014) the group expressed deep concern at what they viewed as a potential emerging crisis over the coming period and called on the Executive to acknowledge the good practice on the ground and give due focus, support and leadership to peace-building activities on the ground. The voluntary/community sector and the communities for whom they work, have invested time, energy and reputation in the peace process and need to be reassured that the Executive will commit to the principle that the achievements throughout the conflict and peace process, is the bedrock of future progress and ensure that there is no regression from current levels of inter-community activity and partnership.

Additionally, the planning process that has started now to build on TBUC in the development of the next reconciliation and peace-building plan, must involve civic society in its planning and production.

In order to build confidence in the process, political and government representatives must exercise stronger influence and be more engaged in community relations issues at local and regional level to show that TBUC is being supported collectively by all political parties. Anything short of a united stance by the Executive places TBUC at an immediate disadvantage and the community cannot be expected to achieve a level of unity which is beyond the politicians.

Local Government reform also provides a golden opportunity to mainstream the work within all eleven council structures. In particular, area community planning within Councils should be harnessed as an effective tool to mainstream cohesion, sharing and integration into real decisions at local level.

Another potential method of providing confidence at local level and developing a united peace building approach is for regular cross party plenary surgeries within communities involving all of the political parties. This method has been successfully used by the Greater Whitewell Community Surgery group. Statutory organisations are already using the '*Collaborative Working in Disadvantaged Areas*' and '*Delivering Social Change*' frameworks to try to work together more effectively. Other models of good practice in community engagement could also be helpful in relation to engagement with the sector. For example CRC's commissioned research 'A

Model of Consultation? Transformation and Regeneration at the Interface (ICR September 2013) (<http://www.community-relations.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/A-Model-of-Consultation.pdf>) identifies partnership, comprehensive preparations, creative and open community engagement; evidenced action; and thoughtful follow-up as the core elements that have made for successful consultations in Northern Ireland. A further example of how practice has influenced policy is CRC's publication '*From Conversation to Transformation – a journey of change at the interface*'. The pack is a helpful tool for those engaged in conflict transformation at local and international level and contains a set of publications (see list below) drawn together by CRC to help capture the work it has been leading in the development of a policy and practice framework for the transformation of interface barriers and the regeneration of interface areas:

A Model of Consultation? Transformation and Regeneration at the Interface ICR 2013 (link above)

Interface Community Partners seminar – Towards a United Community (November 2013) <http://www.community-relations.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/Interface-Community-Partners-Seminar-Towards-a-United-Community-November-2013.pdf>

Interface Community Partners & Interagency Group Annual Conference (December 2013) <http://www.community-relations.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/Interface-Community-Partners-Interagency-Group-Annual-Conference-2013.pdf>

The Interface Working Group – A Review ICR 2012 (<http://www.community-relations.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/IWG-review-with-exec-summary-130313-final.doc>)

Report on the Joint Conference of Interface Working Group and Interface Community Partners on City Interfaces CRC 2011 (<http://www.community-relations.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/crc-remembering-the-future.pdf>)

Beyond Belfast – Contested Spaces in Urban, Rural and Cross Border Settings RCN & CRC 2010 (<http://www.community-relations.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/master-beyond-report-web.pdf>)

Challenge of Change Conference CRC 2009 (<http://www.community-relations.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/IWG-Final-CoC-report.pdf>)

Towards sustainable Security – Interface Barriers and the Legacy of Segregation in Belfast CRC 2008 (<http://conflictresearch.org.uk/reports/sectarianism-segregation/CRC-Towards-Sustainable-Security.pdf>)

SECTION 4 EXAMINE THE THEORY AND PRACTICE WITH REGARD TO GOOD RELATIONS, SHARED SPACE AND SHARED SERVICES IN BRINGING DIVIDED COMMUNITIES TOGETHER

CRC comment on TBUC priority area: Our Shared Community

As an organisation responsible for the promotion of reconciliation and peace building, CRC believes it is critical to afford opportunities for interaction across all spheres of life. This involves enhancing and increasing access to public facilities and services regardless of their geographical location. In a society emerging from conflict this often means navigating a segregated landscape peppered with perceptions as to who the 'space' belongs too. Whilst much progress being made in opening up and maintaining public spaces as 'shared' it is important to continue a range of efforts across local and central government.

CRC has developed the following positions regarding shared space:

- Public resources and services should be of good quality, and should be equally welcoming, accessible and safe for all members of society;
- Shared space must be developed within a framework of economic and social relevance to town and city centres, access and arterial routes, retail centres, public services and housing estates;
- Shared spaces must be useful, well designed, thoughtfully located and managed;
- Regeneration can play a key role in the transformation of communities, particularly those that are in close proximity to physical barriers and interfaces;
- A systematic commitment is required to ensure that all future development maximises the openness of all resources, commits to shared public realm and integrates the concept of sharing into the planning and management of assets;
- Progress requires serious inter-departmental working. No commitment to this idea in practice will materialise without significant resources, determination and effort and a willingness to manage the difficulties;
- Achieving shared space will require actions from a range of Departments e.g. DSD - ensuring *city and town centre master-planning programmes* promote shared spaces and that physical development and public realm projects work to remove physical evidence of the conflict such as redundant security measures; and DRD developing guidance on strengthening community cohesion, fostering a stronger community spirit and the importance of city and town centres as shared spaces; and
- Communities are working hard to address barriers and to enable change - this progress must be supported and mentored and Inter agency/community initiatives must continue to be developed.

Housing. Housing is a critical matter for community relations. Housing in Northern Ireland touches on profound issues of territorial control, choice, freedom of movement and intimidation³. Intimidation and fear prevent and reduce housing choices, and also create an unequal and unfair reaction of the relocation of the victims of intimidation and discrimination. The continuation of the SPED programme

³ In 2011 twenty-eight homes were purchased under the Special Purchase of Evacuated Dwelling Scheme (SPE³), and between November 2010-October 2011 fourteen properties were purchased at a total cost of £2.898 million. Intimidation and fear prevent and reduce housing choices, and also create an unequal and unfair reaction of the relocation of the victims of intimidation and discrimination.

is a sharp reminder that the legacy of the past continues to impact negatively on people's lives, people's housing choice and the economies of housing provision. Therefore reducing fear and intimidation could enable greater housing choices in previously restricted areas, thereby contributing to efficiency savings in the current budgetary climate.

To address the legacy of housing patterns and choices requires a re-framing of public policy around a framework of equality and conflict-transformation. Equality in housing provision is of critical importance and CRC believes that the allocation of housing and the pattern of living together must be addressed so as to end effective segregation in public housing and the ongoing distortion of free choice through fear.

Progress has been made, yet the self-developing and maintenance of shared neighbourhoods has depended largely upon the level and effectiveness of local voluntary and community organisations in terms of offering support and leadership and commitment. CRC has endeavoured to assist those seeking to achieve this transformation.

In moving forward, the future long term direction for housing must fully acknowledge the difficulties facing our society, specifically the communal segregation of communities along religious and political demarcations.

Workplaces. The workplace has been paramount in the promotion of change in Northern Ireland. It is currently one of the few genuinely shared spaces where people mix as a matter of routine, and businesses and the trade unions are to be congratulated for their efforts. CRC has and continues to engage with the business sector and trade union movement and has offered support through a range of activities.

Community Development. Community development organisations and groups play an important role in creating shared resources, strong partnerships and networks within and between communities.

Developing the various aspects of a shared community requires broader thinking, encapsulating issues such as tackling poverty, regenerating communities and utilizing future opportunities under community planning to ensure positive developments for communities.

MOVING FORWARD

Shared Spaces/Regeneration/Social clauses. In order to maximise opportunities for creating shared spaces/community cohesion CRC has the following suggestions:

- Values such as open, welcoming, safe and accessible spaces should underpin the usage of all assets/facilities/services;
- Proposals for use of space located in 'contested spaces' should clearly demonstrate how they will contribute to the development and maintenance of community relations;
- Proposals emphasising shared ownership should demonstrate this within its governance arrangements e.g. competencies of the managing organisation should include a knowledge of community relations, as well as a willingness to promote and develop relations and partnerships;

- Infrastructure that helps develop good relations partnerships should be supported;
- Local assets/facilities led by government agencies/community organisations should explore the opportunities to form partnership consortia which take advantage of the competence and capacity that has been built up by those involved in peace building activities via cross-community partnerships;
- Economic, social and environmental benefits should be shared by all in the area. Applications should clearly demonstrate what positive impact the transfer will have on the local community.

Housing. Given the post-conflict nature of Northern Ireland it is important to give further consideration as to how housing providers can meet objective need as well as making a positive contribution to better community relations. This could include the following:

- Examination of what shared housing looks like in a post-conflict society and how this moves forward in terms of equality, reconciliation and transformation;
- Housing Stock should be looked at in the context of the legacy of the past. There is a clear need to examine how *all* agencies can build confidence that enables consideration of all available housing and examine impact of communal chill factors;
- Proactively monitored reasons for accepting, reluctance or refusals specifically relating to communal issues e.g. spatial segregation, murals, flags or physical barriers - the collation of this data should be used to help inform the development of programmes/interventions which could be used to widen the geographic boundary of choice;
- Develop a set of indicators to measure change i.e. (a) demand for shared housing, (b) how shared housing is being supported and developed within a range of policy areas e.g. planning statements and how are designs being modified to maximise safety (c) what is the experience of living in a shared neighbourhood?
- Investigate short-term approaches that can measure the ability to meet objective need whilst also enabling more choice in housing provision;
- Shared communities supported in the context of increasing choice and promoting a shared and cohesive society i.e. could include the monitoring of trends, for example where intimation and exclusions occurs in Housing Executive estates, (albeit a significant amount of the housing stock may now be privately rented), trends could usefully be monitored in conjunction with PSNI and the shared neighbourhood charter;
- Housing Associations and other housing providers should work with their tenants to commit to living in Shared Future communities - this should be measured under performance inspections;
- Future commitments are needed to support, develop and incentivise pilot schemes on integrated housing (without having a negative impact on equality and objective need); mixed home ownership to promote less divided territory; new build shared housing projects in both the public and private sector; supporting the intervention of an increased level of housing management in potential Shared Future Estates to tackle early attempts to destabilise these areas.

CRC response to the Inquiry into Building a United Community

Workplaces. There is insufficient recognition of the central role of trade unions have played in combating harassment. It would be appropriate if design teams that are engaging on workplace actions and employment opportunities identified a role for trade unions, as well as businesses, in order to reduce existing or potential barriers to cohesive shared workplaces.

Community Development. In moving forward under this current strategy it is perhaps timely to re-emphasise community development principles of participation and inclusion, and highlight the importance of a commitment to acknowledge the impact its work can have on good relations as well as potential opportunities to promote good relations through its activities.

CRC comment on TBUC priority area: Our Safe Community

Interface Communities. Cities and towns are divided by the physical barriers which were once seen as short term protection for embattled communities but have now become part of the permanent structural landscape. These structures serve to remind us that the hostility, fear and anger of the past remain alive and continue to threaten the peace of people and communities on either side of the barrier – the fact remains that, without the barrier, lives will be put at risk. Safety, both in terms of its perception and its reality, is critical.

Whilst the physical barriers serve to remind immediate and wider society of a continued fear and uncertainty between communities, there are consequences other than segregation, such as sustained and ingrained patterns of poverty. Many of these areas have been those most traumatized and shaped by conflict and many have been left as the poorest areas in our society. Therefore tackling the removal or dismantling of physical barriers and non-physical barriers is a complex issue. It needs to have the regeneration of these communities at its heart encompassing inward investment, public realm, increased employment opportunities, and the creation of a culture of safety and openness.

It is therefore CRC's vision, where possible, to find ways to provide structured support for initiatives to regenerate interface areas, leading to the eventual creation of open and vibrant communities free from fear, threat or any obstacle to interaction across the region.

To achieve this CRC has long prioritised Interfaces in its peace-building activities and has committed a range of resources – both financial and developmental – to assist communities move from a culture of management i.e. mobile phone networks towards a culture of transformation. CRC believes that a key principle in all responses to the legacy of physical segregation is that the safety and security of those people living near to interfaces and interface barriers must be the priority. Yet, at the same time it is the responsibility of government to develop responses to the real challenges of fear and threat which do not rely on permanent barriers or patterns of exclusion and violence.

CRC's investment in people, organisations and programmes to alleviate violence and to create advocacy for communities on the interfaces has led to the development of a range of policy comment and practical developments. In 2009

CRC response to the Inquiry into Building a United Community

CRC brought forward a framework '*Towards Sustainable Security: Interface barriers & the Legacy of Segregation in Belfast*' which focused on the regeneration of interface communities. CRC's 2011 *Guidance Paper on Proposed Process for Interface Barrier Transformation/Removal* (<http://www.community-relations.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/iwg-interface-barriers-guidance-nov-2011.pdf>) advocated for the development of local strategic approaches to barriers, safety and security (both BCC and DOJ have formally adopted the Barriers Interface Guidance as a framework for working within interface communities).

CRC calls for a strategic approach that includes:

- supporting peace-building initiatives in the development and delivery of short, medium and long-term actions to address social, community, physical, economic and security and safety issues in interface areas;
- build upon existing good practice and address any gaps in provision;
- calls on government departments to adapt a flexible approach to practices which may be beneficial to enabling or sustaining regeneration and transformation approaches which take full account of the problems and opportunities for local areas and the entire region;
- Departments should create the conditions for the removal of all interface barriers across the region;
- The process of removing interface barriers should be part of an inclusive, community approach towards building a shared society;
- New barriers will only be built if all other avenues of intervention have been tried and failed. Priority must be given to other forms of investment in communities to ensure their safety and security without the need for physical structures.

CRC also recognises that interfaces are not just about physical barriers but also invisible barriers that separate communities often demarcated by CCTV cameras, derelict buildings, flags etc. CRC's 2010 publication *Beyond Belfast - contested space in urban rural and cross border settings* outlines an even broader range of contested space/interface typologies which must also be recognised in relation to the physical division of communities.

Safety. All people should be free and safe to live where they want, and all people should be safe to walk the streets and access services as workers, service users or visitors. It is important that policy aspirations realise these high level goals in practice. Creating cities, towns and neighbourhoods as safe places for everyone should involve the goal of 'shared space' as a central theme in the designing, developing and implementing of measures and programmes.

In addition to this it is very important that society works to eliminate attacks on cultural and symbolic property. This requires effective strategies and action plans to improve protection and enforcement in relation to hate crime and attacks on cultural, faith and symbolic property and monuments. In developing protection it is important to acknowledge the vulnerability of property belonging to all faiths and symbolic properties relating to minority ethnic groups.

CRC supports efforts to ensure that justice is served on those who intimidate - this requires strong connections between policing and communities as well as the

CRC response to the Inquiry into Building a United Community

engagement of statutory services. This should be directly connected to community policing strategies and community development plans.

Local organisations who are involved in tackling hate crime at local level are critical to any policy development, interventions or programmes aimed at promoting better community safety and reducing tensions and violence, as well as creating shared spaces, especially at interfaces. Likewise, targeting hotspots will require a joined up approach and must include work with community leaders.

TBUC highlights a wide range of important and relevant issues such as rural and urban interfaces. Central to the TBUC priorities is the elimination of peace barriers by 2023, and the development of an Interface Barrier Support Package. In addition to these actions the strategy also refers to issues such as designing out crime, the involvement of government and local communities, as well as the development of an Inter-Agency group.

Another TBUC objective is the aim of creating a culture where more people feel able to report intimidation and harassment, and highlights the role of the Community Safety Strategy as well as the Policing & Community Safety Partnerships in supporting and developing confidence and access to relevant reporting structures. Other issues include safety and young people and safety of property.

CRC has invested heavily in this area with the aim of empowering communities to live peaceful, safe and interconnected lives. The following are a number of suggestions that would help support OFMDFM and the Executive achieve the aim of creating *'a community where everyone feels safe in moving around and where life choices are not inhibited by fears around safety'*.

Firstly, the removal of barriers and the opening of gates between communities represent a very important exchange of trust which must be carefully nurtured for the sake of the next generations that should never have to live in fear. However, the responsibility for changing our segregated landscape does not rest solely on the shoulders of local communities. It will take vision, investment, and changes in strategy across a wide range of public policy areas including housing and social development, education, culture, and physical economic regeneration.

Secondly, it is imperative that government departments and agencies utilise the knowledge and expertise currently in place for any long-term intervention - local learning must permeate the policy making process across all government departments. In moving forward CRC suggests the following actions:

CRC's recommends that the *Guidance Paper on Proposed Process for Interface Barrier Transformation/Removal* (<http://www.community-relations.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/iwg-interface-barriers-guidance-nov-2011.pdf>) is used as a framework for moving forward to ensure the following:

- Interfaces should be considered at a strategic level therefore ensuring they are given due regard when developing local action plans.
- An inter-Departmental approach needs to tie changes in communities to changes in regeneration and investment.

CRC response to the Inquiry into Building a United Community

- Build on the desires and knowledge of local communities and tie interface communities into the regeneration of our cities and region.
- Use regeneration to develop opportunities for social inclusion and cohesion, both at inter and intra community level.

It is important that OFMDFM considers existing structures such as the Interface Community Partners and the Inter-Agency Group. There is a coherency to these relationships and associations, and it would be useful to examine possible duplication and overlaps, as well as learning from what is currently working.

Regeneration. The generation of a ‘vibrant, inclusive and diverse environment’ needs to build in social, economic and environmental benefits, and these should be addressed collectively in a coherent and coordinated fashion. Benefits should be mobilized to local communities, the wider city and region and visitors, connecting previously marginalised areas into the local economy and society.

Safer Communities. Tension monitoring is an important tool drawing on policing methodologies at local government level to measure potential or growing problems in a locality, as well as tasking and coordinating cross-agency interventions. Some thought is required to consider how this can be developed as an effective tool in de-escalating and preventing tensions, and in other district council areas with high level of sectarian and racist incidents and crimes, and criminal damage.

Community relations and good relations should be mainstreamed into the management of shared space programmes and central to intervention and diversionary programmes. This would create committed partnership rather than dialogue as the prime model of interface management. This could create programmes which allow people to explore both intra and inter community violence, the damage it causes and to devise shared practical outcomes.

Children and young people.

It is clear from the work that CRC supports on the ground that there is a huge appetite from young people to engage and interact with difference and ‘otherness’ both in formal and non-formal settings.

It is therefore the role of the TBUC strategy and those who will support its implementation, to facilitate and meet these expectations.

In order to help achieve the aspirations of children and young people CRC has the following comments and suggestions to make in relation to the proposed strategy initiatives:

- The range of commitments and actions set out in the strategy has the potential to add value to current and past work, yet it is crucial that all actions are looked at holistically.
- The strategy rightly acknowledges the critical role children and young people play in reconciliation and peace building⁴.

⁴ CRC is pleased that OFMDFM have listened to concerns from the previous CSI consultation and have instead taken a more positive view of the role young people have in society.

CRC response to the Inquiry into Building a United Community

- The strategy acknowledges many of the challenges facing children and young people, and refers to a range of research and good practice which sets the context for the future development of this work with young people.
- The strategy welcomes the various initiatives set out to help develop and build on current practice; in particular OFMDFM's commitment to developing longer-term interventions, as well as the crisis interventions required at certain periods and in particular areas during the year.
- However, it is important to move beyond the rhetoric and ensure action that will address the structural and political issues that continue to impact on the ability of generations of young people to live in a shared and peaceful society.

CRC is aware that much of this work is in a developmental phase and is being taken forward by various departmental design teams. It is imperative progress updates are regularly published, as well as continual engagement with relevant stakeholders and experts involved in current/past initiatives. In particular, this should include schools, youth organisations, communities and researchers. Work with children and young people on the ground that evidences need and acknowledges good practice will help shape these initiatives.

CRC expects the TBUC strategy to support children and young people to understand the challenges facing them in a society emerging from conflict, as well as leading the way to challenge the patterns of the past and assist in building a shared and reconciled society. In light of this, CRC makes the following suggestions for moving the various proposals forward:

- All children should have the opportunity to engage in activity that promotes, encourages and develops better community relations.
- Proposed activities should seek to enhance and increase existing and current engagement in order to take full advantage of best-practice relationship-building activity.
- Continue to support targeted and intensive work in areas experiencing communal tensions, and examine how any new work will compliment/align with local peace-building activity i.e. compliment and develop a whole community/school approach.
- Summer camps/schools, cross-community sporting events and buddy schemes should support/link with other areas of the curriculum and ensure a collective approach that brings added benefit to ongoing work as well as providing a continuum of progressive activity.
- CRC is represented on the United Youth Programme oversight group which has engaged extensively with key stakeholders and is making progress in the development of programmes in relation to young people not in education or training. Nevertheless, the programme does not have a confirmed dedicated budget to carry out its stated aims.
- CRC recommends that the United Youth Programme undertake a survey of young people's attitudes and experiences of good relations. This should then be fed back into the formal education system to ensure current practice is reviewed in light of experiences – opportunities to adjust methods/material earlier in the formal and non-formal structures.
- In relation to shared campuses, it would be useful to engage with the trade union movement that has led the way in creating and ensuring safe workplaces regarding sectarianism and racism.

CRC response to the Inquiry into Building a United Community

- Shared Campuses should build upon the practice of current sharing and integration, and the department should establish a benchmark for these campuses and their progression post-financial support.
- Proposals/applications for 10 Shared Campuses should identify existing local peace-building activity and identify opportunities for complementarity.
- In addition to Shared Campuses, the department should indicate how previous/existing models that have delivered positive outcomes will be mainstreamed into public policy; as well as update how/when the recommendations set out in the Ministerial Advisory Group Report on Advancing Shared Education will be progressed.
- Existing and current engagement should not be affected by new initiatives i.e. should avoid displacing funding from interventions that have positive outcomes/outputs;

Finally, appropriate budgets must be set to meet these obligations, as well as indicating how the work will be mainstreamed.

CRC comment on TBUC priority area: Our Cultural Expression

Culture remains a vital and unresolved area of concern for inter-community relations affecting all communities. In this context of faith and minority ethnic diversity and the legacy of the conflict, important issues include language, commemoration; cultural expression as part of shared space i.e. flags, emblems, parades and protests, as well as the important role of arts, culture and sport as critical parts of a policy of participation, culture and change.

CRC supports a cultural diversity policy that has at its heart a commitment to reflect the variety and complexity of cultural life, to raise questions, to create safe and open places for interaction and debate, to create gateways for engagement and to resolve political issues in a way that is consistent with the overarching values of equality, human rights and reconciliation.

CRC has a long history of work with Parades and Protests, Arts, Sports, Festivals and Museums. Recent examples include long term work both directly and through funded organisations that work on parades, protests and local disputes. CRC has partnered with the Arts Council on Cultural Diversity and Re-Imaging Communities, and has offered strategic and local support for festivals and community arts and sports initiatives including the Belfast St Patrick's Day festival, Orangefest, the Mela, the Maiden City Festival, Feile an Phobail, Football for All and Peace Players International. Finally CRC has worked with museums on conflict, cultural diversity, symbols, and religious diversity.

CRC believes that culture and arts make a positive contribution to peace-building, reconciliation and the promotion of good relations, and using these practical interventions CRC has developed a range of policy comment which is relevant to this policy and practice discourse.

- The link between culture, investment in arts, culture and creative industries and tourism is well made, and engaged and active communities are a prerequisite of success. It is important that opportunities exist to access and engage with high-quality arts and culture, but in doing so stakeholders need

to recognise that the divided geography and existence of contested space continues to impact on mobility and accessibility. These issues would be especially applicable to Community & Youth Arts programmes, and the application of a good relations lens at the development stage of programmes/projects with relevant groups and stakeholders would help identify barriers and develop actions to redress exclusions.

- Promoting access to culture and arts presents huge potential for the promotion of good relations outcomes. This could be facilitated by encouraging and supporting inter-community dialogue within and between the particular categories. In particular engagement with the Department of Education and ESA/ELB's should explore how this interaction can create opportunities for inter-community school contact. This is especially relevant given the recent publication of the Ministerial Advisory Group's Report on Advancing Shared Education.
- Museums have a vital role as places of interaction and public education. In a divided society this has a particular importance, as museums offer a safe space to engage with evidence, experience, artefacts and stories which may be different from our expectations. There can be few more important places which enable us to make sense of our diversity, our interdependence and all of our cultural traditions and identities. Museums have the vital task of reflecting and reframing debates on key issues and events, through demonstrating a commitment to plural voices, encouraging active engagement with the stories and experiences of self and of others, and providing an open, safe and shared context within which that discussion can be validated in the public realm. It is important that museums in Northern Ireland make a commitment to open and shared learning, in relation to all aspects of the past. It should allow for a confident approach in dealing with divisions of the past, with the commemoration of controversial or divisive events or the legacy of violence. CRC views our local languages as an integral element of the rich cultural tapestry which we all share. This important part of our intercultural heritage needs to be respected. CRC welcomes opportunities to broaden acceptance and knowledge of Irish and Ulster Scots languages as well as encouraging usage and participation.

Commemoration. In post conflict contested societies the process of commemoration carries within it particular challenges and these challenges require specific responses, which should incorporate good relations approaches and dialogue as key components. Alternatives are needed in post conflict societies so that people are not locked into binary identity, and the European Convention proclaims that states need to involve states, institutional and private actors, including the public sector, in taking responsibility for cultural engagement in divided societies.

In developing our perspective on the importance of cultural expression in the context of making the politically significant decade of anniversaries, both CRC and the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) have worked in partnership from 2010 to stimulate a conversation which seeks to raise the issue of remembering in public space and to promote a process that leads to the development of practice models and principles.

As society engages with the legacies of this revolutionary period there is potential to reinforce the development of political and civic culture – engaging with culture and

identity, rights, what we mean by democracy and the nature of political change. We may also be able to acknowledge the legacy of the decade and support engagement with the complexity of our history.

Following a wide consultation the following principles were developed by CRC and HLF for Marking Anniversaries

- Start from the historical **facts**;
- Recognise the implications and **consequences** of what happened;
- Understand that different **perceptions** and interpretations exist; and
- Show how events and activities can deepen **understanding** of the period;

All to be seen in the context of an ‘inclusive and accepting society’.

These have been endorsed by DCAL, agencies and local authorities as programmes are developed to mark these events. It is also important to earmark principles for expressing commemorative practices in the public space. CRC strongly advocates that principles underpinning exploration and anniversary activities in the public arena should aim for a plural, interactive and modern approach. Understanding and practice of models for how commemoration set in broad historical contexts should be fostered in the public as opposed to private space.

Moving Forward

TBUC raises valuable points on issues such as principles of respect and tolerance, sharing traditions, responsible expression. It also highlights an Intercultural Arts Strategy, as well as the use of festivals as vehicles for expressing cultural difference and promoting understanding. The Strategy goes on to highlight a new Annual Community Relations/Cultural Awareness Week, Sports and Safety, as well as Commemoration work with museums, libraries, and a strategic discourse. Other issues mentioned include music, language, arts, and literature.

However, CRC considers the opportunities to promote culture, arts and sports as vehicles for integration and participation as undeveloped, and it remains unclear as to what constitutes new activity as opposed to current activity.

Finally, CRC highlighted in its response to TBUC’s predecessor the lack of reference to faith diversity, as well as a lack of exploration of the barriers to integration and expression of faith and minority ethnic groups. This continues to be the case.

In Northern Ireland sectarianism is increasingly rooted in international standards. In fact, any ambiguity has been removed by recent decisions of the UN and Council of Europe – *for the purposes of human rights law sectarian identity is to be regarded as an ethnicity and sectarianism as a form of racism*. TBUC does not explicitly take into account existing protections under European Charter on Human Rights (ECHR) of Council of Europe Conventions. While couched in aspirational terms, building on the ECHR and The Council of Europe’s Faro Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society would give a stronger baseline from a cultural rights perspective.

CRC therefore recommends further work to be carried out on the definition of cultural heritage, ensuring it is inclusive and in line with Article 3(b) of the Convention on Cultural Heritage that draws together “the ideals, principles and values, derived from

CRC response to the Inquiry into Building a United Community

the experience gained through progress and past conflicts, which foster the development of a peaceful and stable society, founded on respect for human rights, democracy and the rule of law”.

The UN Special Rapporteur has also focused on culture in contested and post conflict societies and argues conflicting views are not the issue. How they are expressed or resolved is the critical issue. Culture has a potential role in bringing people together. However, it can be problematic if, for example, cultural expression becomes the battlefield or the place of future confrontation. In this context a cultural rights based approach suggests:

- The principle that one is free to express one’s own perspective of past events
- State has primordial role to set minimum standards
- Use all means to reduce tensions
- Importance of mutual respect and understanding
- Zero tolerance to calls for violence in the public sphere.

The basic principles suggested by the UN Special Rapporteur on Culture are:

- Healing process only if all included (memorials and narratives)
- Neutral space to enjoy and invent culture
- Individual identities privilege diversity and collective identities privilege similar; important to leave room for diversity
- We all have a stake and responsibility in a shared future based on non-discrimination and equality.

Cultural expression needs to take as its starting point the importance of movement between and within these identities. There is no one settled way of doing this and therefore the development of principles at a regional level are critical in assisting both the creation and management of conflicting views about culture. Against this backdrop CRC wishes to see:

- policies and programmes designed to renew and reclaim public space and reaffirm that community ownership has the potential to build good relations within and between communities;
- support given to sports bodies who seek to open up their sports to the participation of all;
- the utilisation of art galleries, museums and other creative approaches to contextualise how our society and communities has changed, as well as embracing growing diversity e.g. creating more collections concentrating on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and the present day;

Regarding commemorations, government should explore how a cultural rights approach can inform the marking of the anniversaries of the recent conflict as these enter into the 20th, 30th, 40th and 50th anniversaries. As communities mark these tragedies with their own commemorative events, the development and adoption of principles based on the understanding gained from 2012 -23 work would provide a helpful framework over the coming years. It will be important in order to promote healing, acknowledge pain and avoid the prospect of increasing tensions or the threat of renewed violence.

CRC response to the Inquiry into Building a United Community

Cultural diversity programmes within TBUC would be significantly enhanced if it incorporated the following :

- encourage a more complex debate about cultural expression, linking TBUC cultural expression aspirations with the ECHR e.g. practical implications and workable principles; and
- draw on expertise of UN Special Rapporteur on Cultural Rights.

SECTION 5 LEGISLATION AND DEFINITIONS.

Following consultations with various funded and none funded groups that have a relationship with CRC and the promotion of community/good relations issues, it has become increasingly clear that there is a need to define what is meant by the term good relations. The TBUC strategy cites the concept of good relations but makes no attempt to provide a definition for the purposes of legislation. The strategy proposes to enhance the good relations duty through the establishment of an Equality and Good Relations Commission. This newly established body has the potential to significantly enhance the role of good relations in terms of a scrutiny role. CRC believes that TBUC must provide a formal definition of good relations, sectarianism and reconciliation and this must be included in the strategy and contained within the forthcoming legislation to establish an Equality and Good Relations Commission along with guiding principles.

However, an obvious gap in the strategy is the lack of progress around legislation which continues to leave the tensions between equality and good relations largely ignored. Definitions of good relations, sectarianism and racism should be included in any proposed legislation and conform to international standards. Particular attention should be paid to those treaties ratified by the United Kingdom through inter-governmental processes at the United Nations and Council of Europe. Relevant general comments issued by the treaty bodies and other soft laws should also be referred to when drafting the proposed definitions.

The outworking of the proposed legislation must also provide:

- an appropriate and robust legal framework to support good relations work at a regional level, and localised within communities;
- direction to public authorities in light of future changes regarding their statutory duties; and
- a robust legal framework for the private, community and voluntary sectors.

Any future Equality and Good Relations Commission must be cognizant of the expertise within the Equality Commission for Northern Ireland and CRC in the provision of advice to the Northern Ireland Executive and Legislative Assembly with respect to measures necessary for the effective promotion of good relations, including reconciliation and peace-building. The new Commission must also have its independence guaranteed and protected.

What good relations means. The promotion of good relations, under Section 75 (2), is about breaking through the denial and avoidance of sectarianism and racism in Northern Ireland by acknowledging its impact on society and the organisations working within it. It states a public commitment to these beliefs and continually seeks ways to build on them for the future.

However, the term *good relations* is not defined within TBUC. Nor is there any detailed information about the good relations principles referred to. This will need to be addressed since 'good relations' is the goal of the policy and the rationale for initiatives and methods that will be deployed. Organisations will approach this process from their own, unique perspective and with their own particular concerns. For example, words such as sectarianism, racism, equality and diversity can have

different and sometimes, loaded meanings as people work through issues from individual and community viewpoints. Below is a sample definition of good relations developed by CRC in the *Good Relations Framework* publication 2004:

“Good Relations challenges sectarianism and racism, promotes equality, develops respect for diversity and raises awareness of the interdependence of the people and institutions within NI” (http://www.community-relations.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Good_relations_final.pdf)

TBUC outlines a vision of *“a united community, based on equality of opportunity, the desirability of good relations and reconciliation - one which is strengthened by its diversity, where cultural expression is celebrated and embraced and where everyone can live, learn, work and socialise together, free from prejudice, hate and intolerance.”*

Reconciliation. CRC believes that TBUC’s *‘desirability of good relations and reconciliation’* should be strengthened. The PEACE III programme is based on a widely accepted definition of reconciliation developed by Hamber and Kelly for the PEACE II programme as a result of support agreed through CRCⁱ (<http://cain.ulst.ac.uk/dd/papers/dd04reconddef.pdf>). The programme was agreed by the current Executive in 2007 and the definition still appears to us to be both accurate and helpful and should be reinstated:

“The definition regards reconciliation as a voluntary act which cannot be imposed and involves five interwoven and related strands, as follows:

- **Developing a shared vision of an interdependent and fair society:** *The development of a vision of a shared future requiring the involvement of the whole society, at all levels. Although individuals may have different opinions or political beliefs, the articulation of a common vision of an interdependent, just, equitable, open and diverse society is a critical part of any reconciliation process;*
- **Acknowledging and dealing with the past:** *Acknowledging the hurt, losses, truths and suffering of the past. Providing the mechanisms for justice, healing, restitution or reparation, and restoration (including apologies if necessary and steps aimed at redress). To build reconciliation, individuals and institutions need to acknowledge their own role in the conflicts of the past, accepting and learning from it in a constructive way so as to guarantee non-repetition;*
- **Building positive relationships:** *Relationship building or renewal following violent conflict addressing issues of trust, prejudice, intolerance in this process, resulting in accepting commonalities and differences, and embracing and engaging with those who are different to us;*
- **Significant cultural and attitudinal change:** *Changes in how people relate to, and their attitudes towards, one another. The culture of suspicion, fear, mistrust and violence is broken down and opportunities and space opened up in which people can hear and be heard. A culture of respect for human rights and human difference is developed creating a context where each citizen becomes an active participant in society and feels a sense of belonging; and*
- **Substantial social, economic and political change:** *The social, economic and political structures which gave rise to the conflict and estrangement are identified, reconstructed or addressed, and transformed.*

Definition of sectarianism. Sectarianism has shaped the structures which we have inherited from education, to public safety to community development. It has shaped

the most basic personal choices like where we might live, what school we go to, what we can wear and what we might say to whom. All of this shapes our attitudes to politics, economics, our ideas about the law and culture and our understanding of history and morality in Ireland.

In relation to a definition of sectarianism TBUC states that for the purposes of the strategy *'sectarianism is defined as: threatening, abusive or insulting behaviour or attitudes towards a person by reason of that person's religious belief or political opinion; or to an individual as a member of such a group'*. CRC welcomes the opportunity to respond to the draft legislation (when published) to establish the Equality and Good Relations Commission which will seek to find an appropriate consensus around a definition of sectarianism to be included in the legislation. Sectarianism has not been defined in law in either Ireland or the UK. In Northern Ireland but is increasingly rooted in international standards. For the purposes of human rights law sectarian identity is to be regarded as an ethnicity and sectarianism as a form of racism. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) convention states:

'In this Convention, the term "racial discrimination" shall mean any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life.'

(<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CERD.aspx>)

The UK government is a signatory to international human rights standards which also bind the devolved administration and its executive agencies. In addition there is a body of important domestic human rights, equality/non-discrimination and good relations statutes, as well as criminal law. TBUC also rests on key international commitments such as the European Convention on Human Rights, United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, United Nations Resolution 1325, World Programme for Education, and the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, as well as domestic legislation and policy commitments. CRC recommends that this legal framework is reflected in the draft legislation to establish the Equality and Good Relations Commission.

CRC's publication *Good Relations Framework - An approach to the development of Good Relations* (see above link) uses Ken Logue's definition of sectarianism in *Anti-Sectarian Work – A Framework for Action (1993)*

'Sectarianism in the context of Northern Ireland is discrimination arising from political or religious prejudice, leading to relationships of distrust between the two major politico-religious communities. Sectarianism is not just a matter of economic, social or political consideration; nor is it simply a question of personal attitudes or behaviour. It is an historical and cultural phenomenon arising out of political and religious differences and perpetuated by group and self interest'ⁱⁱ.

Logue's definition clearly points to political and religious prejudice as the identifiers of sectarianism. He also identifies the outcome of sectarianism in Northern Ireland as one of 'distrust' between the two main communities (British unionist, majority

Protestant and Irish nationalist, majority Catholic). It is this issue of 'distrust' that begins to be addressed by good relations.

Sectarianism beyond the two main communities. Sectarianism in NI has tended to be in relation to fractured relationships between Protestants and Catholics. Beyond NI, sectarianism extends to discrimination or disadvantage suffered by someone because of their religious belief which goes beyond Catholic and Protestant and includes all minority faiths - Muslim, Bahá'í, Hindu, Judaism etc. Therefore, it is important to recognise that sectarianism goes beyond intra-Christian conflict.

TBUC must not only tackle the specific and enormous legacy of sectarian division, but also address hostility, discrimination and hatred targeted at those from minority ethnic communities. The relationship between sectarianism and the commitment to an inter-cultural future are clearly important aspects of TBUC including its relationship to the Racial Equality Strategy. Unfortunately TBUC made very little reference to this link. Similarly, the draft Racial Equality Strategy *A Sense of Belonging* does not make a strong or clear enough connection between these two interdependent strategies. However, the inclusion of both offers an opportunity to strengthen the connections and jointed up processes and programmes where possible.

Given the clear linkages between racism and sectarianism, CRC recently facilitated a number of discussions with a wide range of stakeholders to discuss and reflect on OFMDFM's draft Racial Equality Strategy, *A Sense of Belonging*. Emerging from this discourse was the desire to find common ground on a number of issues that concerned those working for and with people from a BME and minority faith background living and working in Northern Ireland. Subsequently, a unified response was developed and launched in the form of a '*Common Platform*' paper (<http://www.community-relations.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/CommonPlatform.pdf>) which highlighted an agreed twelve common themes and principles critical to the successful implementation of a strategy.

Recommendations

CRC would welcome the co-ordination of reconciliation and good relations efforts on regional bases and believes that this work should be facilitated by a regional body responsible for the management and allocation of long term funding, to address good relations, racism and sectarianism. The regional body should also provide long term developmental support in partnership with organisations (voluntary and statutory) working within communities at a grass roots level.

The promotion of understanding is also a concept referenced in human rights instruments (see Article 7(3) of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages in relation to promoting understanding -as well as respect and tolerance- in relation to minority languages.) Instead of looking for Northern Ireland based interpretations, good relations framed within legal international law and concepts could be adopted. This would then allow us to draw on international instruments and good practice. If this was to be implemented in Northern Ireland, it would bring a

CRC response to the Inquiry into Building a United Community

measure of legal certainty to the good relations duty by actually having a definition of the concept on the face of the legislation.

CRC believes that definitions of good relations, racism and sectarianism are required in order to address these difficult issues. Definitions provided should meet with international standards and obligations ensuring practise is recognised as a standard-bearer for international protection and good governance. When giving consideration to this it is important to reflect on The Equality Act 2010 which states that good relations are about *'tackling prejudice and promoting understanding'*. The Explanatory Notes to the Act give examples of how this duty might apply in practice. In relation to 'tackling prejudice' strategies to tackle homophobic bullying in schools is mentioned (good relations duties in Great Britain cover sexual orientation and many other sub sections that we have in Section 75 (1) (2)). In relation to 'promoting understanding', measures to facilitate understanding and conciliation between different communities is referenced to.

SECTION 6 GOOD RELATIONS INDICATORS IN MONITORING AND MEASURING THE PROGRESS OF GOVERNMENT INTERVENTIONS.

Peace-building evaluation has the potential to empower and to capacitate users and communities⁵. Therefore the development of appropriate indicators and outcomes provide an opportunity to strategically consider how societies are building peace, and what else needs to be done.

CRC has a strategic interest in monitoring and evaluating peace building activities, and uses this information to map progress in the building and development of good community relations. In addition to internal evaluation processes, CRC has also recently undertaken a 3 year (2012-2014) independent review of the condition and impact of the peace process in Northern Ireland. This appraisal was independently funded by the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust and Joseph Rowntree Foundation, and resulted in the publication of 3 Peace Monitor Reports⁶. As previously stated the first report appeared in February 2012 and drew mainly on statistics that are in the public domain but which had not been previously assembled across the wide range of issues affecting life here⁷. Detailed and statistical evidence was gathered across four dimensions - security, equality, political progress, and cohesion and sharing. This annual monitoring provided a mechanism to measure the distance we have travelled either closer to or further away from the shared goal of a peaceful and inclusive society.

Given our strategic interest in this work, CRC contributed to the Good Relations Indicator Review 2013/2014 both as members the various thematic advisory sub-groups, as well as by a formal written submission. CRC's submission agreed with the development of high level indicators, thereby enabling a review against strategic objectives, but stressed the importance of being very clear as to what outcome was being sought, and then setting out how this would be achieved. CRC's formal response also drew attention to the Outcomes-Based Accountability model highlighting it as a useful process for devising outcomes which would be useful for further consideration by the department. .

In addition to this CRC drew attention to the ambiguity of the consultation i.e. it appeared the intention was to measure proposals put forward in Together: Building a United Community, yet this would prove difficult given the lack of published detail on programme activity under each of the priorities.

However, if the intention was a wider measuring of good relations i.e. additional to TBUC, then CRC was of the strong view that the department, and consequently the indicators must then address how other elements of peace building work would be monitored and presented. CRC concluded that a TBUC *only* approach would be restrictive and would result in an incomplete picture on the health of good relations in our society, and CRC recommended comprehensive monitoring that included a

⁵ Bush, K. (2004) 'The Commodification, Compartmentalization and Militarization of Peacebuilding'. In Keating and Knight (eds) *Building Sustainable Peace*. Tokyo and Edmonton: UN University Press and U of Alberta Press, 23-46.

⁶ Under A Shared Future Strategy CRC was tasked with preparing a three-year assessment on the 'health' of community relations in Northern Ireland – this assessment would form part of the Government's main triennial report which the Assembly would be invited to consider, debate and report. This aspect was not taken forward by the local administration but CRC has been able to carry forward the concept of independent assessment with the support of JRCT & JRF.

⁷ Where official statistics did not tell the full picture survey-based data was also used.

CRC response to the Inquiry into Building a United Community

broad range of programme activity such as schemes and projects from across the Executive that are outside the TBUC sphere e.g. DE's Community Relations, Equality and Diversity Policy and its corresponding Enhancement Scheme, as well as making efforts to include *all* peace-building programmes.

It is CRC 's position that indicators must act as a key stimulus for further change and should inform how much is being done and how well it is being done i.e. is society better off? The following are a number of general recommendations made within our submission and are relevant to this current TBUC Inquiry:

- **Research Forum:** a research forum should be established and used to identify gaps in the available data and advise on further research needed to create a coherent view of what is happening regarding peace-building (an expansion of the advisory panel).
- **Interpretation:** peace building is unpredictable and often experiences unexpected set-backs. Consequently it is important to capture the various realities of success so as not to discourage innovation and learning. It is for this reason the interpretation of data is such a critical aspect of monitoring peace as it can provide a wider perspective on how society is benefitting from peace-building activity e.g. impact of symbolic events. If wider interpretation of the data does not occur the framework could end up as a limited compendium of statistics (albeit useful but not as beneficial as it could be). Part of this interpretation would involve tasking each department to provide a yearly analyse of the impact of the work carried out or supported by them, either under TBUC or other programme activity?
- **Addressing gaps:** Currently the indicators appear to have a regional output. This is useful for a broad sense of progress, but another useful addition would be a geographical breakdown of progress under the various outcomes. The categorisation of data in this format would support local interventions, as well as assisting policy development, particularly for district councils. It is important to note that not all areas experience good relations in the same way, and it is important to be able to carry out comparative analysis and lesson learning within and between different geographies – this could support targeted good relations work on a range of thematic areas e.g. housing, regeneration, education, cultural diversity etc.
- **Together Building a United Community Remit.** However, if the proposed Good Relations Framework is to be guided by TBUC actions then the following should take place (a) an essential purpose of the good relations indicators is that they map achievements, change and impact. It is therefore necessary that officials devise a framework that charts trend lines across various indicators/outcomes; (b) review the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms for *each* of the TBUC actions and replicate/align with a corresponding indicator; (c) engage with the various design teams and delivery bodies to devise data collection methods that will accumulate both quantitative and qualitative data; (d) as programmes develop OFMDFM should develop time series evaluation frameworks – it is important to measure the outcomes for participants within a scaled timeframe.
- CRC recommended further exploration regarding the measurement of attitudinal change across specific TBUC interventions – this additional data would bring added value to quantitative data.

CRC response to the Inquiry into Building a United Community

- Statistical data, research and information from evaluations should be considered collectively – a cooperative approach would provide a valuable overview of progress and support engagement on next steps between departments and strategic partners.

It was of particular concern that despite an objective of removing interfaces by 2023 there was no corresponding indicator to measure progress on this goal.

Finally, CRC made a response to the OFMDFM January 2014 public consultation on its good relations indicators. CRC is considering OFMDFM's recent consultation summary report set against CRC recommendations made.

Key Priority 1: Our Children and Young People

Shared Aim: to continue to improve attitudes amongst our young people and to build a community where they can play a full and active role in building good relations.

Outcome 1.1 - Improving attitudes between young people from different backgrounds.

Outcome 1.2 - Young people engaging in bringing the community together.

Generally CRC is content with the outcomes, but considers other indicators are needed to capture success and progress/non-progress.

At first glance, the indicators appear loosely connected to TBUC. There needs to be a stronger association with the TBUC actions i.e. the buddy scheme, united youth, summer schools. If this connection is not made it will be difficult to prove it is the TBUC actions that are achieving the impact rather than other non-TBUC related activity. Clarification is needed as to whether OFMDFM intends to establish a monitoring framework within each of the proposed actions to measure attitudinal changes following engagement e.g. United Youth Programme, Buddy Scheme and Summer Schools etc?

It is unclear what data the framework will use as its baseline if it has omitted information held about other non-TBUC activity e.g. data on integrated education and CRED enhancement scheme. It is important that integrated education is included as a measurement within this outcome - it is a critical partner in bringing children together and influencing change. Again, there is confusion as to why certain aspects of community relations activity are not considered as a critical measurement tool for appraising government progress in building a shared and united community. This needs to be resolved.

Capturing the amount and type of sharing within education is important. Yet, much more crucial is the quality of this sharing. It is important to develop measures that measure this i.e. is the sharing experience a one off event, or part of a longer-term programme of engagement. Again it would be beneficial to know how different areas of the curriculum help facilitate this interaction, as well as which sectors are engaging with each other, and if this changes over time. As previously suggested a geographical breakdown would be extremely useful for planning and helping to target future support.

CRC response to the Inquiry into Building a United Community

Furthermore the indicator framework needs to capture data from sporting organisations and their related programmes - a corresponding indicator is needed. This also applies to diversionary activities etc and discounting this data would be a lost opportunity.

Finally, it is necessary to widen the age category across *all* the indicators, and not just a few. This is particularly important given Paul Connolly's research into children as young as 3 and their awareness of communal symbols. Given that OFMDFM has invested in a number of childcare initiatives within the 'Contested Space' Programme it would be useful to capture this attitudinal change amongst these participants as well.

Key Priority 2: Our Shared Community

Shared Aim: to create a community where division does not restrict the life opportunities of individuals and where all areas are open and accessible to everyone.

Outcome 2.1 - Increased use of shared space and services (e.g. leisure centres, shopping centres, education, housing)

Outcome 2.2 - Shared Space is accessible to all.

Again, CRC has similar concerns that the data collected for this outcome is narrow. Indicators that could enhance outcomes include:

Education:

- %/number of teachers involved in shared education programmes;
- %/number of trainee teachers who undertake placements in two or more different sectors.

Housing

- %/number of people living in non-single identity areas;
- %/number of people requesting to live in a mixed area;
- %/number of residents activity involved in creating and supporting shared neighbourhoods.

Social clauses

- %/number of government contracts incorporated with social clauses carrying out work in interface communities/contested space.

An indicator measuring shared employment should be developed given the emphasis on OFMDFM's United Youth Programme. It is also unclear how the indicators will monitor progress on Urban villages/Shared neighbourhood developments e.g. CRC would welcome a conversation given the recent announcement on the two urban villages which give little detail as to how they will facilitate a shared community.

Finally, the conclusions above are primarily focused on quantitative data. CRC has highlighted the need to supplement these indicators with qualitative data, either through specific research or data from evaluation processes. This supplementary data would enable an examination of the hows and the whys, as well as helping to inform future interventions.

Key Priority 3: Our Safe Community

Shared Aim: to create a community where everyone feels safe in moving around and where life choices are not inhibited by fears around safety.

Outcome 3.1 - Reduce the prevalence of hate crime and intimidation.

Outcome 3.2 - A community where places and spaces are safe for all.

From the outset CRC is extremely disappointed at the absence of a specific indicator focusing on interfaces and contested space. This, despite a TBUC headline commitment to reduce and remove interface barriers by 2023, is very concerning. This requires urgent reviewing. CRC has a long history of working with community and interface workers and wants to ensure the work they are involved in is represented and recorded in the indicator framework. Again we would be happy to assist officials in this work, but in the meantime possible indicators could include:

- %/Number of Interface barriers removed;
- %/Number of new/strengthening of interface walls/gates/security barriers etc;
- %/Number of groups funded to carry out work at interfaces and contested spaces;
- %/number of people who feel positive and harmonious relationships exist between communities at interfaces/contested spaces.

Additional indicators for other aspect of the above outcomes could record:

- %/number of people who feel area they live in is safe;
- %/number of families/households applying for SPED or re-housed by SPED;
- %/number of people who would report a hate crime to the police;
- %/number of attacks on symbolic premises i.e. churches, chapels, schools, orange halls, GAA clubs.

Key Priority 4: Our Cultural Expression

Shared Aim: to create a community which promotes mutual respect and understanding, is strengthened by its diversity and where cultural expression is celebrated and embraced.

Outcome 4.1 - Increase sense of community belonging (widens contribution beyond community background)

Outcome 4.2 - Cultural diversity is celebrated

The draft consultation documentation highlights possible modification/amendments to reflect the outcomes of the Haass/ O'Sullivan Talks and their subsequent recommendations. Given the current stalemate interim indicators, need to be developed (taking into account previous indicators), which monitor progress as well as attitudes to parades/protests/flags etc.

Other indicators that could improve this section are:

- %/number of people who have attended an event that celebrates a different cultural tradition;
- %/Number of cultural events held during Community Relations/ Cultural Awareness Week;
- %/Number of cultural events supported by the District Council Community Relations Programme.

CRC response to the Inquiry into Building a United Community

It is unfortunate given the Decade of Commemoration that no corresponding indicators have been included. CRC works in partnership with the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) and would be happy to discuss possible indicators for mapping this important area of work.

Finally, as with other outcomes it is important to balance quantitative with qualitative data i.e. local decision making could be affected by capacity issues or power relations within the local community. This is a main concern across the indicator framework as a whole.

APPENDIX 1 CRC SUPPORTED WORK

Over the past three years the Council's Pathfinder, CR/CD and Core Grants Schemes have supported many hundreds of good relations programmes across a wide and diverse range of communities.

The Council's Core Funding Scheme has been able to support and strengthen over 26 regionally focused organisations all of whom are focused on developing and sustaining peace building activities.

Our Core Groups have been at the heart of tackling the many CR issues that still have to be fully resolved such as dealing with the legacy of the past, parading disputes and interface tension community tensions. Through CRC support groups have been able to mediate local solutions to flags, bring together a range of communities to discuss the painful legacy questions that remain, intervene to help restore peace when community violence breaks out and look for collaborative approaches to how groups and communities can better work together.

In line with our core funded networks the programme has also supported nearly three hundred unique community relations programmes. There continues to be remarkable breadth and depth to the work that is supported through the Council's CR/CD Scheme. To give a flavour of the type of peace building activities that has been supported outlined below are the types of programmes that are receiving support:

- Programmes looking at the decade of commemorations and how they can unite communities and improve relationships between them.
- Public debates tackling very difficult issues around sectarianism, the legacy of the past and parading.
- Arts programmes that seek to explore and reflect on conflict and peace-building as well as celebrating the growing diversity of our community.
- Support towards improving relationships between and with minority ethnic communities.
- The programme supported this year Mela Event which attracted over 20k people in a positive & vibrant celebration of cultural diversity and the value that this brings to all.
- Work has been supported to provide diversionary activities particularly during times of community tension when communities are at risk of taking part in riots and civil disturbances.

Through this work, the Community Relations Council is seeking to assist communities to deal with the past, embrace the present and to dream a new future for Northern Ireland which is at peace with itself and which embraces and celebrates diversity.

CRC response to the Inquiry into Building a United Community

CRC core funded groups include:

Armagh City & District Council

REACT

REACT provides opportunities for individuals and groups of different cultures and identities to work together to develop mutual understanding and respect to reflect the Protestant and Catholic communities in Armagh City.

Belfast City Council

174 Trust

174 Trust work to build peace and promote reconciliation in North Belfast

Ballynafeigh Community Development Association

BCDA works to sustain, support and celebrate mixed communities and neighbourhoods within Ballynafeigh and elsewhere.

Ballymoney CRC

Ballymoney Community Resource Centre promotes development and sustainability in local communities and good relations is an integral part of its core work.

Belfast Interface Project

Belfast Interface Project works to support Interface communities in order to develop positive relationships.

Community Relations In Schools

Community Relations In Schools provides support to schools to reach out to and engage adults with active cross community and peace building programmes.

Interaction Belfast

Interaction Belfast aims to initiate, encourage and enable inter-community development and community action and to promote greater understanding and the reduction of community divisions along the Springfield /Falls/Shankill interface.

Intercomm

Intercomm works to address social and economic issues prevalent in North Belfast and other interface areas to build relationships within and between communities.

Linc Resource Centre

LINC Resource Centre works to develop good relations in North Belfast with the aid of the church and the community.

North Belfast Interface Network

North Belfast Interface Network aims to improve understanding and develop better relations within the community by addressing interface problems and improving inter community relations.

Suffolk Lenadoon Interface Group

SLIG was established by two community forums in the neighbouring, but religiously divided, districts of Suffolk and Lenadoon who united to discuss social issues affecting both communities.

Down District Council

Harmony Community Trust

Harmony Community Trust works to bring about positive community relations and social inclusion focusing on the North Down, Ards, Down and Greater Belfast areas.

CRC response to the Inquiry into Building a United Community

Derry City Council

Junction / Holywell Trust	The Junction/Holywell Trust provides a safe space for cultural activity enabling it to build partnerships and networks across the community.
Peace & Reconciliation Group	The Peace and Reconciliation Group bring various communities together develop community relations learning through programmes incorporating training and residential programmes.
St Columbs Park House	St Columbs Park House seeks to contribute to peace-building and social inclusion through a range of programmes promoting civic participation, human rights and democratic pluralism.

Craigavon Borough Council

Shankill Parish Caring Association	Shankill Parish Caring Association brings people together to promote facilitate understanding reconciliation and compassionate response to social need in Lurgan.
------------------------------------	---

Multiple Councils

Community Dialogue	Community Dialogue has a unique facilitated dialogue process which provides an opportunity for participants to deepen their understanding of conflict and peace-building.
Corrymeela Community	Corrymeela Community is a Christian Community of reconciliation. Drawn from many traditions, members individually and together are committed to reconciliation through the healing for social, religious and political divisions that exist in Northern Ireland and throughout the world.
Groundwork NI	Groundwork NI is a regional organisation working to promote community relations through training, network developments, addressing CR based issues whilst promoting dialogue, partnerships and capacity for change.
Irish School of Ecumenics	The Irish School of Ecumenics is an institute at Trinity College Dublin, Christian in its inspiration and committed to dialogue, peace and reconciliation.
Partisan Productions	Partisan Productions produces high quality theatre and film in relation to society and politics, in order to raise public awareness of development within different cultures and political opinions.
Rural Community Network	The Rural Community Network has a shared vision of reconciliation throughout the rural community and works to promote tolerance and mutual trust which can be translated into practical policies and actions.
Tides Training	TIDES Training delivers training in diversity, conflict management, good relations, labour mobility and capacity building themes across Northern Ireland.
Trademark	Trademark works towards social change in which the principles of social justice, equality and pluralism are actively pursued.

CRC response to the Inquiry into Building a United Community

Training for Women Network	Training for Women Network is a cross community network aimed at supporting women in training, employment and business.
Women's Information NI	Women's Information Northern Ireland works to provide women with support to enable them to have greater access to information and community conversations, a key area to this work is brokering good community relations.