

EMBEDDING GOOD RELATIONS IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Challenges and Opportunities

Good Relations Associates

Equality Commission

FOR NORTHERN IRELAND

EMBEDDING GOOD RELATIONS IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Challenges and Opportunities

Good Relations Associates

Equality Commission for Northern Ireland
Equality House
7-9 Shaftesbury Square
Belfast BT2 7DP

Tel: 028 9050 0600

Fax: 029 9033 1544

Textphone: 028 9050 0589

Email: section75@equalityni.org

Website: www.equalityni.org

April 2007

ISBN Number 1-903941-98-9

Foreword

The Review of Public Administration (RPA) provides an unique and unprecedented opportunity for local government, through new powers and structures, to ensure that both equality and good relations are placed at the heart of local government policy and service delivery - in particular, using community planning partnerships and the new power of well being to further promote equality and good relations within the communities which they serve.

In recognition of this, the Equality Commission, on behalf of the Good Relations Forum, commissioned Good Relations Associates to prepare this challenge paper on embedding good relations in local government and governance through the RPA.

This is an independent piece of research which is designed to stimulate the Forum's thinking on how the proposed new Councils to be created under the RPA, could creatively embed good relations into local services and governance arrangements, and on how the RPA transition processes and structures could best support this.

The Commission established the Good Relations Forum in 2005 to explore the good relations agenda in Northern Ireland, to stimulate debate and to challenge thinking. The Forum is co-chaired by the Equality Commission and the Community Relations Council. Its role is to act as a think-tank to explore creatively the promotion of good relations and the implementation of the good relations duty. It does this by bringing together key policy-makers and experienced practitioners working in the field of good relations, conflict transformation and community regeneration to offer innovative approaches, to highlight challenges and to act as a stimulant to the debate on the promotion of good relations in Northern Ireland.

Good Relations Forum members have broadly endorsed this report and when discussing the 14 key recommendations set out in the report, focused on the following as key issues that it wished to see progress on:-

- Ensure that the RPA structures fully utilise greater powers to embed good relations and in particular use the Community Planning Partnerships and power of well being to this end. Good Relations and equality should be fully developed at all stages and within all structures, including the shadow arrangements and all consultative processes.

- Give serious consideration to both a) strengthening the existing Section 75 good relations duty and/or b) placing an additional good relations statutory duty on local Councils to sharpen their focus
- Develop a Community Engagement Strategy to facilitate the community/voluntary sector role within Community Planning partnerships. This strategy to draw from the national standard adopted by the Scottish model and prioritise engagement of minority ethnic communities.
- There is a need to legislate with regard to flags and emblems and such legislation must be accompanied by development work at a local level. This will reduce offensive emblems whilst ensuring that symbols of identity are recognised.
- Develop enforceable and transparent codes of conduct that comply with the standards to be adopted in Community Planning Partnerships.

Members of the Equality Commission have also endorsed this report; subject to the caveat that they considered that a Standards Commissioner may not be required.

The newly created councils under the RPA will have a key contribution to make as regards the promotion of good relations in Northern Ireland - both in relation to their employees, as well as within and between the communities which they serve. As highlighted in the report, ‘embedding good relations at a local council level is and should be regarded as a central plank of the implementation of *A Shared Future* and the *Racial Equality Strategy*.’

The Commission wishes to thank Good Relations Associates for their challenging and thought-provoking report and is of the view that the report highlights important findings and recommendations that merit careful consideration and early action.

Bob Collins
Chief Commissioner
Equality Commission for Northern Ireland

Abbreviations

ASF	A Shared Future
CEP	Community Empowerment Partnerships
CNR	Catholic, Nationalist, Republican
CPP	Community Planning Partnership
CR	Community Relations
CRC	The Community Relations Council for Northern Ireland
CRE	Commission for Racial Equality (for England and Wales)
CRO	Community Relations Officer
ECNI	The Equality Commission for Northern Ireland
EDI	Equity, Diversity and Interdependence
EU	European Union
EUPR	European Union Peace and Reconciliation
GR	Good Relations
NI	Northern Ireland
OFMDFM	Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister
PUL	Protestant Unionist Loyalist
RES	Race Equality Strategy
RPA	Review of Public Administration
UK	United Kingdom

Contents	Page
Executive Summary	7
Background	10
Aims and Objectives	12
Methodology and Activities Undertaken	13
Findings	15
Analysis of findings	22
Conclusions	43
Recommendations	46
Appendix 1	48
Appendix 2	49
Appendix 3	50
Appendix 4	52
References	55

Executive Summary

The overall aim of this project was to produce a challenge paper on how the proposed seven new local Councils outlined by the Review of Public Administration (RPA) can creatively embed good relations into local services and governance arrangements, and how the current RPA transition processes and structures could best support this.

The purpose of the challenge paper was also to inform the thinking and decision-making of the Equality Commission and the Good Relations Forum in this area. Those contracted to develop the work were Good Relations Associates (in this instance, Bríd Ruddy, Joanne Murphy and Katy Radford). The initial meeting between the Equality Commission and Good Relations Associates took place on 23 October 2006 and the Draft report was presented on December 2, for finalisation by 5 December 2006.

It was acknowledged at the outset that a major and unique opportunity had presented itself in the form of the RPA. This gave the possibility of a fresh start to the process of embedding Good Relations within mainstream structures and clarifying the existing duality with regard to the concepts of Section 75 (1) and (2).

The methodology developed by the consultants was unique in that it incorporated an extensive up-to-date literature review with a wide ranging individual/group interview process and use of community based case studies, as well as taking into account the lessons of the evaluation of the first phase of the Scottish Community Planning Partnership (CPP) model.

It drew its analytical approach from the literature review, but also considered and incorporated the views of people whose professional and personal commitments straddled a variety of sectors and/or interest groups.

A series of recommendations flowed from this process and are as follows:

Recommendations

- (1) Ensure that the RPA structures fully utilise greater powers to embed good relations and in particular use the Community Planning Partnerships and power of well being to this end. Good Relations and equality should be fully developed at all stages and within all structures, including the shadow arrangements and all consultative processes.
- (2) Embed Good Relations at local Council level as a central plank of the implementation of '*A Shared Future*' and '*The Racial Equality Strategy*'. This should be fully reflected in the processes of developing Good Relations further as a statutory duty within the structures of the RPA.
- (3) Develop the high level actions contained with the Race Equality Strategy to make them applicable within the context of good relations strategies in the new Council structures.
- (4) Propose the Belfast Good Relations model of a dedicated staff complement and budget, situated within the Chief Executive's office, as the most appropriate model for local Councils. Ensure that this mainstreams good relations throughout the Council structure and provides a sound framework for developing inter-agency public/private partnerships.
- (5) Give serious consideration to both:-
 - a) strengthening the existing duty; and/or
 - b) placing an additional good relations specific statutory duty on local Councils to sharpen their focus.
- (6) Develop a Community Engagement Strategy to facilitate the community/voluntary sector role within Community Planning partnerships. This strategy to draw from the National standard adopted by the Scottish model and prioritise engagement of Minority ethnic communities.
- (7) Train all Councillors and staff in good relations as an overarching theme of their capacity building training for the new structures. The existing duty has been utilised this way by Derry City Council, which serves as a model of good practice. The need for capacity building along transformational leadership models should also be reflected within training and awareness raising processes.

- (8) Do baseline research within new local authorities to establish the current state of relations, identify existing and developing concerns and provide a benchmark for measuring progress in the promotion of good relations.
- (9) Use the CRC “*A Good Relations Framework*” (GRF) as the current best available analytical framework for measuring the impact of the new Good Relations Challenge Framework in local Councils.
- (10) Ensure that Good Relations is part of an integrated impact assessment in general and is an integral part of all management systems within the new structures.
- (11) We propose that there is a need to legislate with regard to flags and emblems and that such legislation must be accompanied by development work at a local level. This will reduce offensive emblems whilst ensuring that symbols of identity are recognised.
- (12) The success factors highlighted in the Scottish model evaluation, complemented by the addition of a Good Relations principle, should serve as a minimum baseline for the development of a Good Relations implementation strategy with Community Planning Partnerships. This model would include the following principles:-
 - Committed leadership among all partners;
 - A citizen focus to the work;
 - A shared vision for the area;
 - Clearly resourced action plans;
 - Clear performance management arrangements;
 - An agreed Good Relations/Equality framework.
- (13) During the period of the RPA transitional process, develop one pilot model of a Community Planning Partnership, supported by sources inclusive of Peace 3 funding.
- (14) Develop enforceable and transparent codes of conduct that comply with the standards to be adopted in Community Planning Partnerships. Consider the appointment of:-
 - Standards Commissioner (with function of an Ombudsman); and,
 - Standards equivalent to the Standards Board for GB.

2. Background

2.1 The overall aim of this project was to produce a challenge paper on how the proposed seven new local Councils can creatively embed good relations into local services and governance arrangements, and how the current RPA transition processes and structures can best support this.

The purpose of the challenge paper is also to inform the thinking and decision-making of the Equality Commission and the Good Relations Forum in this area.

2.2 Outline of Section 75 (2)

Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act (1998) requires designated public bodies to promote equality of opportunity and good relations. It states:-

“75 (1) A public authority shall in carrying out its functions relating to Northern Ireland have due regard to the need to promote equality of opportunity:-

- a) between persons of different religious belief, political opinion, racial group, age, marital status or sexual orientation;*
- b) between men and women generally;*
- c) between persons with a disability and persons without; and*
- d) between persons with dependents and persons without.*

(2) Without prejudice to its obligations under subsection (1), a public authority shall, in carrying out its functions relating to Northern Ireland, have regard to the desirability of promoting good relations between persons of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group.”

2.2.1 According to the Equality Commission for Northern Ireland, the two Section 75 duties are “*inter-dependent*” (ECNI, 2003b, 33, para 2.12). Similarly, the view of the Community Relations Council for Northern Ireland is that promoting good relations and equality “*go hand in hand*” (CRC, 2004).

2.2.2. It is clear from the above that the first duty (Section 75 (1)) requires “*due regard*”. In contrast, Section 75 (2) requires only “*regard*”. The heavier emphasis on Section 75 (1) naturally overshadowed the good relations duty until the governmental policy initiatives such as *A Shared Future* consultation (2003), strategic policy (2005) and Triennial Action Plan (2006). These have brought good relations to the core of NI governance and placed it firmly on the policy agenda and within the ongoing political process.

2.3 Review of Public Administration (RPA)

The government’s Review of Public Administration (RPA) offers a unique and historic opportunity for restructuring governance within Northern Ireland. (Collins, 2006; Hinds et al, 2005; Palley, 1972).

The duty to promote good relations between those of different political opinion, religious belief and racial group is inextricably linked to the equality agenda. As such, it is articulated in the strategic government policy *A Shared Future* and is one of the core strands running through the RPA.

3. Aims and Objectives

3.1 The paper is constructed to:

- be firmly based on the principles, objectives and requirements of Section 75 (2) of the Northern Ireland Act 1998;
- take full account of the vision and policy aims outlined in *A Shared Future*;
- identify the opportunities and challenges presented by the new structures and systems of local government through the RPA, to promote better relations in Northern Ireland;
- make recommendations on what issues need to be taken into account in the current transition phase to properly embed good relations at local government level;
- identify some key areas of public administration for promoting good relations that arise from the Review taking account of the three key concepts outlined by RPA for local Councils:-
 - the power of well-being;
 - community planning;
 - statutory system of safeguards.
- consider a vision for good relations as delivered by local government in Northern Ireland, including proposals for indicators of success on good relations, leading to the development of Forum recommendations; and,
- consider, if appropriate, models of local governance applied successfully to other jurisdictions.

3.2 In addition, the challenge paper considers the following issues facing local Councils in the context of the RPA;

the potential for regulation as regards the display of flags and emblems; and,

code(s) of conduct for Councillors (particularly in light of the St Andrews Agreement and the statutory systems of safeguards).

3.3 Consideration is also be given to issues faced by both urban and rural communities as well as specific issues facing 'interface' Councils.

4. Methodology and Activities Undertaken

- 4.1 As outlined in the original tender and subsequent PID, Good Relations Associates undertook to follow a particular methodological approach for this piece of work. Research methods chosen adopted a qualitative approach with the aim of eliciting relevant information from participants and also gathering views, opinions and concerns about how best to embed good relations within a new local Council structure (Bryman, 2004; Cattle, 2002; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Key questions were agreed with the Equality Commission and this framework informed the primary research and data collection process.
- 4.2 A literature review, semi-structured interviews, and group interviews were used in combination to bring together diverse and multi-level perspectives on the question of how most effectively to embed good relations in NI local government. The research team were concerned at all times to emphasise the work is a ‘challenge’ paper and therefore to explore as broadly as possible new and innovative thinking among participants and their constituencies.
- 4.3 This piece of work is multifaceted in that its analytical approach draws on a wide ranging literature review, but also considers and incorporates the views of people whose professional and personal commitments straddle a variety of sectors and/or interest groups. These individuals possess a range of skills, competencies and concerns. As such it operates a hybrid methodology.
- 4.4 This report also takes account of an external environmental context (political, social, policy) which is evolving rapidly and unpredictably.
- 4.5 The literature review for this piece of work covered a wide range of issues, policy initiatives and recent public sector change processes pertinent to this research. This included a comprehensive review of RPA material and relevant documents on the development of ‘good relations’ practice in existing Councils.
- 4.6 Additionally, the wider public management context of this work precipitated a brief review of material on new models of governance, public value management and consultation/ participation.¹ The ‘sector

¹ Bovaird , Tony; Löffler, Elke; “*Public Management and Governance*”, Routledge, London, 2003, Moore, Mark H. “*Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in government.*” Harvard University Press, London, Cambridge Ma, 1995.

spanning' is reflected in the discussion which encompasses material relating to good relations and related policy initiatives ("*A Shared Future, Triennial Action Plan*", "*Race Equality Strategy*" etc), material specific to the RPA and its development, key literature on the general development of models of governance, public participation and consultation, the St. Andrews Agreement, and analysis on flags, emblems and symbolism in Northern Ireland.

- 4.7 While the 'Power of Well being' is as yet undefined in relation to Northern Ireland, its genesis lies in the work of Ted Cattle - the Chair of the Community Cohesion Review Team who has overseen the development of 'Well-being' within UK context. As such, it is approached within this document from that perspective.
- 4.8 Where appropriate findings and recommendations are cross-referenced with the relevant policy or academic literature.
- 4.9 Twenty three individual and group interviews were completed. The agreed questionnaire is replicated in Appendix 1 and participants are detailed in Appendix 2.
- 4.10 Face-to-face and telephone interviews, employing a short series of questions, were developed to focus discussion within the semi-structured interview format (see Appendix 1). It became apparent that respondents were at times unaware of policy detail, particularly in relation to the RPA, and on these occasions the project team reverted to open unstructured questions in an attempt to clarify points.
- 4.11 As the research progressed and initial findings were emerging it was decided to conduct a small number of additional interviews, principally with individuals who were initially unavailable for interview but whose views were considered necessary to further develop findings and recommendations.
- 4.12 Group interviews were facilitated as discussions around both the questions detailed in Appendix 1 and broader issues of related concern to participants. Group Interviews tended to be less structured and more wide-ranging in their scope than individual interviews.

5. Findings

The summary findings below have been developed from three sources:-

- the general literature review including an evaluation of the Scottish model; and,
- Σ the primary data collection process (individual and group interviews);
- Σ discussions and analysis within the consultant team.

5.1 The RPA as a Unique Opportunity

5.1.1 The RPA represents a major and historic opportunity for local government to systematically embrace good relations work alongside equality as a key element of good business practice (Collins, 2006; Hinds et al, 2005). It also represents an opportunity for the good relations sector to further communicate its message to a wider audience (CRC, 2006). The reasons for this are clear. Northern Ireland is emerging from division to diversity. Diversity requires that each person and many cultures are able to actively participate in public life and to make their own unique contribution.

5.1.2 A failure to identify and clarify the principles and process of this social and political transition can lead to instability and further inter-communal tension. This has a serious impact on the whole of society and, in particular on those who are vulnerable or in minority communities. Developing Good Relations entails creating an enabling framework that promotes equality, welcomes diversity and enhances social cohesion. This can prevent the development of new social schisms, racism and loss of economic and social potential arising from a divided community.

5.2 Interconnected with ‘A Shared Future’

Embedding Good Relations at a local Council level is and should be regarded as a central plank of the implementation of ‘*A Shared Future*’ and ‘*The Racial Equality Strategy*’. The seven new Councils will form the skeleton structure for public policy development in Northern Ireland and as such have a key contribution to make.

5.3 Real requirement for Leadership

- 5.3.1 One of the clearest findings of the report is the recognition on behalf of almost everyone consulted, underlined by the relevant contextual research, that there is a real requirement for leadership on this issue at both a political and organisational level. However, such leadership needs to be positively ‘transformational’ in focus, rather than the ‘transactional’ model traditionally adopted (Bass and Avolio, 1993). ‘Transformational’ leadership is generally associated with organisational change, in contrast to a more ‘transactional’, managerial approach.
- 5.3.2 Good Relations, by its very nature, should not just be modelled in legislation, but should be reflected in the positive behaviour of politicians in relating to each other and in viewing the whole of the new Council area and all its residents as their constituency (Connolly, 2006; Gormley–Heenan, 2001).

5.4 Governance in a divided society

- 5.4.1 This research suggests that there needs to be due consideration given to issues of governance in a divided society and the particular challenges that such governance presents. Such a debate feeds into new thinking around issues of ‘*public value management*’ and consultation and participation at local government level.
- 5.4.2 Modern public sector management is based around the principles of ‘New Public Management’ which has since the 1980’s dominated the public sector in these islands. New public management moves away from a traditional bureaucratic model of the public sector to one which bases its approach on the a ‘market driven’ and efficiency based model which has more in common with the private sector.
- 5.4.3 Recent innovations in public management include the rise to prominence of ‘public value management’; a concept which seeks to place the concept of ‘public value’ at the heart of public administration. ‘Public value’ is constructed as public management equivalent of shareholder value in the private sector.
- 5.4.4 The voluntary and community sector is an important key partner in representing the views of citizens, and the private sector also needs to be fully engaged within the new structures. There are issues of accountability and legislation relating to the inclusion of both of these partners.

5.5 Flags and Emblems

- 5.5.1 Issues around flags and emblems continue to be profoundly contentious in NI and this research has concluded that comprehensive legislation with which to frame this debate is required. Recent research (Bryan et al, 2005) suggests there is some support for the need to legislate sooner rather than later on the issue. However, it is clear that any legislation must also be accompanied by development work at local level to assist local communities in making tailored agreements to reduce offensive emblems, whilst ensuring that their symbols of identity are recognised ².
- 5.5.2 Examples given of successful work in removing contentious symbols include projects in Larne, the PLACE project in Portadown, and the cross- community Flags Forum in Ballymena. The community and voluntary sector, because of their extensive experience on this issue, is well placed to work in partnership with public and private sectors (CRC, 2006). The NIHE, as the lead public housing agency stands out as a model of good practice through its partnership work in this area.

5.6 Equality v Good Relations?

- 5.6.1 During the primary research process we encountered real concern among participants that Good Relations somehow presents a challenge to or detracts from a commitment to 'equality' (CRC, 2006; Hinds, 2003). Such a perception needs to be urgently and firmly counteracted to preserve both the integrity of Good Relations approaches and the interconnected nature of such approaches to a commitment to equality (Collins, 2005 Wilson, 2002a & 2004; CRC, 2006).

5.7 A stronger legislative requirement

This research suggests there is an articulated and acknowledged requirement that the promotion of Good Relations is a stronger statutory obligation on the new Councils.

² See NIHE 'Flag Booklet' for example of good practice in the field
<http://www.nihe.gov.uk/publications/leaflets/flagbooklet.pdf>

Indeed, most consulted felt that the promotion of good relations should have equal weight with the first duty.

5.8 Engagement with politicians

One of the crucial issues that runs through the findings of this research is the need to engage and create a dialogue with politicians at a local level, specifically about the promotion of good relations.

Such an ‘engaged’ approach is a key requirement for transitional peace-building (Peake, 2003).

5.9 A well informed Statutory Sector-a less informed Community Sector

5.9.1 We found that, in general, participants in the statutory sector were well informed, and quoted from their participation in a variety of sub-groups discussing the RPA structures. They stated that the systems proposed were all in a state of transition, as were the structures of current Councils. They fed back the concerns of local authority staff anxious about their status within the current change process.

5.9.2 Community and voluntary sector representatives felt that, whilst there had been some discussion and some responses to the RPA from the sector, there was in general a poor understanding.

5.9.3 This was most prevalent in relation to organisations representing minority ethnic groups.

5.10 ‘Power of Wellbeing’

5.10.1 The ‘power of wellbeing’ potentially allows local Councils to intervene to fill gaps in information and practice, and create innovative opportunities regarding good relations (Collins, 2006).

5.10.2 This is essentially underpinning legislation and is thus part of the Community Planning process, though it is still being developed in Northern Ireland. As such it is important that it is used imaginatively, creatively and with good relations as a specific objective and desired outcome.

5.11 Code of Conduct

- 5.11.1 The issue of a Code of Conduct for Councillors is a contentious one and it is recognised by almost all surveyed that appropriate behaviour by representatives will itself emerge in tandem with progress towards good relations.
- 5.11.2 Existing arrangements are that the behaviour of members is written into (binding if not often enforced) local government standing orders. In addition, failure to comply with these and/or with Section 75 (1) has been subject to judicial action.
- 5.11.3 The emphasis on safeguards for post RPA local government in NI is on Section 75 duties (Hinds et al, 2005, 33), combining equality obligations and (as yet untested) good relations frameworks of appraisal.

5.12 North South/East West

- 5.12.1 Promoting good relations in NI is fundamentally bound up with the realities of a society emerging from conflict and building ties, organisational, social and personal within and between communities. Those with a background and experience of conflict resolution work are aware of the difficulties that such a transitional process brings and much work has been done to translate the experiences of other places to NI.
- 5.12.2 However, the ‘totality of relationships’ within these islands still holds scope for further work and investigation. Good Relations is not just internal to Northern Ireland and there are valuable lessons to share with other regions and countries.

5.13 New majorities and minorities

- 5.13.1 Responses indicated that there was a need to take cognisance of a changing society and develop appropriate Good Relations strategies to ensure future social cohesion and celebration of diversity. The proposed 7 Council Structure will bring about a situation of 3 PUL, 3CNR and 1 ‘neutral’ Council - Belfast.

This re-organisation will involve the development of:-

- New (CNR/PUL/non nationals) minorities in areas where citizens of one background had normally been a majority;
- Reinforced minorities in areas where groups which had been a large minority become a small minority.

5.13.2 In addition, new Councils made up largely from one tradition may fail to engage with each other appropriately .

5.13.3 From a minority ethnic perspective there is an acknowledgement of the need to ensure equality and also a recognition of the growing number of ethnic minorities living in Northern Ireland.

5.13.4 As such the need for Councillor training in anti-racism, cultural diversity and standards in public life is particularly relevant in this regard. It is also recognised that minority ethnic communities in rural areas are particularly hard to reach: an extra consideration in this regard.

5.13.5 Minority ethnic groups also believe that employers in the public and private sector have a responsibility to promote good practice and counteract isolation and lack of availability of appropriate services ³.

5.14 Local experience of Partnerships

5.14.1 There is extensive experience at local level in partnership working. A community workshop on the RPA⁴ identified several partnerships that participants were involved in, as an example:-

- Community Empowerment Partnerships;
- Local Strategy Partnerships;
- Employers' Forum;
- Health Action Zones;
- Neighbourhood Renewal Partnerships;
- Health & Social Services Trusts;
- NIHE Community Forums;
- Church/Community Partnerships;
- Springvale Community Outreach Initiative;
- Area Partnerships.

³ NICEM and MCRC, Consultation report – RPA, September 2005.

⁴ Community Technical Aid, Consultation, Sept. 2005.

- 5.14.2 Many local agencies thus have extensive experience of partnership working, which should translate well into the new Community Planning partnership structures.
- 5.14.3 The new Community Planning Partnerships will have the clear benefit of being led by one partner, the Councils and will have a clearer legislative focus underpinned by Equality legislation.
- 5.14.4 Some Councils, such as Ards, currently have existing partnership working with other agencies and believe this provides a firm foundation for any new future arrangements.
- 5.14.5 This Council gave an example of an underused classroom in a local school being used as a weekly chest clinic due to co-operation between the Education and Library Board and the local Health and Social Services Trust under the aegis of the inter agency partnership developed.

6. Analysis of findings

This section draws together points of relevance from the literature review, the field research and relevant case studies, and also forms the analytical backdrop to the conclusions and recommendations. In order to conceptualise this discussion appropriately it is structured to reflect particular historical developments, concerns and issues.

6.1 Current strategic framework and the need to embed Good Relations

- 6.1.1 The Review of Public Administration provides a major opportunity to embed the concept of Good Relations within the new governance structures proposed. The changing demographic framework within Northern Ireland has led to an increasingly diverse community and highlights the need to prevent future conflict around ethnic lines through consideration of relationship building and developing trust, therefore avoiding the need for prohibitive legislation.
- 6.1.2 At this time of change and development in all spheres and in particular within the context of the St. Andrew's Agreement, there has seldom been a more opportune time to develop a community of diversity with a strong focus on citizenship and rights.
- 6.1.3 Before considering how to develop this approach, it is necessary to examine the separate development to date of the Equality Duty and the Good Relations Duty.

6.2 Equality and Good Relations

- 6.2.1 While the equality agenda remains politically contested it is no surprise that most attention has focused on the Section 75 (1) positive equality duty. Indeed, some argue over the form, substance and definition of equality in general ⁵.

⁵ Hayward et al define the equality agenda as more than the positive equality duty of Section 75 (1), by including measures that address "*the structural, cultural and political forms of inequality*".

6.2.2 Section 75 has advanced beyond any other equality legislation and is “*the fourth generation equality laws, based on a positive duty to promote equality, rather than simply to refrain from discriminating*” (Fredman, 2002: 122) ⁶. Yet the second Section 75 duty, to promote good relations, was for a period of time almost entirely overlooked. Commentators have speculated on the fact that it did not form part of the review of Section 75 (McCrudden, 2004), and “*public discussion of the ‘equality agenda’ has almost entirely ignored the existence of s75 (2)*” (Wilson, 2000b: 9).

6.2.3 For some the very relationship between the two Section 75 duties is tense, with claims of conflict between them. However, ECNI cites statements in the House of Commons, in their revised “*Guide to the Statutory Duties*”.

“In the Parliamentary debates on the Northern Ireland Bill, the Secretary of State said: “[W]e regard equality of opportunity and good relations as complementary. There should be no conflict between the two objectives.”

House of Commons, Official Report, 27 July 1998, col. 109

“There is an inter-relationship between both duties. Essentially good relations cannot be delivered without equality also being delivered.” (33, 2.13 and 2.16)

6.2.4 Although the relationship is not clear in law, this statement should have settled the matter. However, arguments continued that the positive equality duty had primacy, and claims about that Section 75 (2) might be used to undermine it. Hinds (2003) notes a “*failure to place promoting good relations firmly within a fundamental rights and equality framework.*”

6.2.5 The argument that good relations could be used to subvert the equality duty clearly had some impact. Some, such as McVeigh (2002) claim that the equality agenda is undermined by promoting good relations because it derived from CR.

“The continuing hegemony of the community relations paradigm threatens to remove this commitment to equality and replace it with what

⁶ Fredman argues for a value driven approach, which challenges liberal assumptions of state neutrality and individualism, claiming them insufficient to promoting equality.

is little more than the latest version of a tired and fraudulent pacification programme." (44)

6.3 Governance, 'modernisation' and current government policy

- 6.3.1 While the Belfast Agreement was regarded as a remedy for the 'democratic deficit' of nearly 30 years of direct rule in Northern Ireland by Westminster (Hughes et al, 1998), the limited powers of local Councils that made them the "*bottom tier*" of government have not altered since their diminution under the Local Government (N.I.) Act 1972 (Palley, 1972: 427). Local Councils have, nevertheless, been affected by the general 'modernisation' of public administration in the United Kingdom.
- 6.3.2 The Northern Ireland peace process coincided with a new trend in UK governance, after the 1997 general election, and the emergence of public governance (Bovaird et al, 2004) or governance (Morison, 2006). Public management or administration⁷ was quite distinct from public governance. The former concentrated on managerial ('top-down') techniques and 'value for money' where public governance directed its focus on consultation, partnership⁸ and the participation of civil society.
- 6.3.3 A new relationship between civil society and the state is now possible. An exemplary text on consultation can be found in the Cabinet Office "Listen Up!" document.
- 6.3.4 A more far-reaching relationship between government and civil society developed during the Blair administration, with the 'modernisation' agenda which required government to work in partnership, consult 'stakeholders' and function in 'joined up' governance (Morison, 2006; Richards, 2003; NIO, March 2006). Willmott (2003) claimed the role of government, both locally and centrally, was to enable local communities to be "*the main driver of change*", following Bovaird and others.

⁷ For Bovaird, "**public management** ... uses managerial techniques (often originating in the private sector) to increase the value for money achieved by public services. ... in public sector organisations ... [and] in public service organisations, whether public, voluntary or private sectors." (5)

⁸ See Knox (2003) for a critical analysis of the failure of 'joined-up' government, or integrated response to communal violence and the victims of so-called 'punishment' beatings.

6.3.5 In as much as governance requires ‘stakeholders’ working to achieve ‘joined up government’, it is more likely to effect positive results for a divided society and contested polity, than top-down public management.

To embed equality and good relations it has to be clear if the process is good governance, or merely public management, often manifesting as crisis management in District Councils ⁹.

6.3.6 Indeed the tangible outcomes of good relations policies are crucial in establishing whether Councils are implementing Section 75 (2). In the context of Northern Ireland, and with the diminished powers of local Councils, the change to (consultative and participative) governance is conducive to the creation of less formal and more democratic spaces after the Belfast Agreement (Morison, 2006).

“It may be that new forms of civil society involvement developing beyond the formal State and its institutions provide an indication of how the values behind the settlement can be developed in all the realities of governance as it now actually takes place.” (239)

6.3.7 This new form of government not only created a new democratic space outside the formal politics of government, but also entailed the operational imperative that government and the public sector ‘be on tap not on top’; which resonated strongly with the methods of community development work (McShane,2000). Community development methodology was integral to British Government strategic policy response to the conflict in 1969 (Frazer et al, 1994) and current community relations policy encompasses community development and ‘social cohesion’ (Cantle, 2002; OFMDFM, 2006).This requires the involvement of the voluntary-community sector (Morison, 2006).

6.4 Government policy and proposed assessment of good relations

6.4.1 “A Shared Future” (2005) sets out government’s strategic policy on improving relations and ‘normalising’ Northern Ireland society. It takes

⁹ Councils had to adapt to initiatives such as Best Value, modernisation and so on. There was also the ongoing Review of Public Administration as well as the equality and good relations duties. Although these will have important implications for the way in which Councils implement the good relations duty in the future, the focus of this research was not on such reforms and changes.

account of the results of an extensive consultation¹⁰, and articulated an agreed vision based on that (Darby et al, 2004). This was government's overarching strategic policy framework to promote a more shared and civic society, which aimed to reduce very high levels of segregation in every aspect of life in Northern Ireland.

6.4.2 The public consultation on this policy was seen, positively, as “*another ‘constitutive moment’ in the life of the community*” (Morison, 2006: 248). “*A Shared Future*” contained no aspiration to create a homogenous society although its ambiguous terminology gave opportunity for disagreement in the detail. However, “*this document is most definitely not the end point*” (OFMDFM, 2005: 4).

6.4.3 “*A Shared Future: Triennial Action Plan*” and ASF require that local government replace CR work with the Good Relations Challenge Programme (OFMDFM, 2005: 71, 3.3). By 2006 good relations was a core element – “*a lightning rod*” – of the proposed new structures of governance emerging from the Review of Public Administration.

“Equality, social need, good relations, human rights and rural considerations have been key threads woven into both the developments of the reform and the way in which the review was conducted.”
(Hain, 2006: 4)

6.4.4 The question is where this ‘lightning rod’ will strike and if it can deliver on the ‘*wicked problems*’ of hostile and often violent communal relations throughout Northern Ireland (Wilson, 2006). Those problems range from people feeling unwelcome in a public place to serious public disorder. Both Section 75 (2) and its policy strategy of “*A Shared Future*” are paralleled in the duty in the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 (RR(A)A) for England and Wales – which had been the state response to ‘racial’ discrimination, intimidation and public disorder ¹¹.

¹⁰ There were over 500 written responses and over 10,000 people involved in the consultation. The final policy response was framed in terms of “community cohesion” and rested on the findings and recommendations of the Cattle Report (2002). It was not the purpose of this research to critique Cattle’s work. Suffice to say that Ben Tovim (2002) had been coherently and cogently critical of this.

¹¹ Rumney (2003) provided a history of British race hate law, and detailed the ‘law and order’ response to racism and fascism in Britain in the 19030s. Law and order was one of the three priority issues for consultees to “*A Shared Future*”. The Cattle Report (2002) on race riots in the North of England concluded that the key issues were those which promote “social cohesion”, and this was fully accepted within the lexicon of government throughout the UK.

- 6.4.5 This has its local NI policy counterpart in the *Racial Equality Strategy* (RES). The RES provides a framework to; tackle racial inequalities in Northern Ireland and provide opportunities for all; eradicate racism and hate crime; and together with *A Shared Future* promote good race relations in NI ¹². It proposes only high level actions at Departmental levels, which is a disappointment to the minority ethnic community.
- 6.4.6 Implementing the ASF policy is a long-term prospect, yet controversies about contentious parades, flags and emblems, and segregation often demand immediate action. Long-term policy has to be accompanied by short and medium-term initiatives and mechanisms to improve relations. For example, community fora and community dialogue initiatives have frequently been proposed as cure-all mechanisms but are considerably more complex, with no assurance of successful outcomes (Kelly, 2004).
- 6.4.7 Also, advocates of this peace building mechanism have made claims they could not deliver (Mulcahy, 2000). And it must be remembered that local Councils are limited in the degree to which they can persuade citizens and politicians to engage meaningfully in new relationship-building structures created to promote good relations.

6.5 Evaluation mechanisms

- 6.5.1 To assess the evidence requires a framework and so it is necessary to examine existing and proposed evaluation mechanisms. Existing templates and work in progress included the ECNI report “*Good Relations in Practice: A Report and the Progress on the Good Relations Duty*” (April 2006), the OFMDFM “*A Shared Future: First Triennial Action Plan 2006-2009*” (April 2006), and the CRC “*A Good Relations Framework*” (March 2004).
- 6.5.2 The ECNI “*Good Relations in Practice: A Report and the Progress on the Good Relations Duty*” is based on information provided by public bodies in their annual reports on the Section 75 duties. ECNI did not include a question on good relations until 2003, so it only covers the years 2003-2004 and 2004-2005. The report provides an overview of some good practice.

¹² www.ofmdfmi.gov.uk/racial-equality-strategy.pdf

- 6.5.3 The OFMDFM “*A Shared Future: First Triennial Action Plan 2006-2009*” takes a quantitative approach, proposing the use of survey results and statistics as a measure of change in the general Northern Ireland population. It would assess differentials in levels of sectarian and racist crime, intimidation, and monitor government and public sector interventions to ameliorate relations in Northern Ireland.
- 6.5.4 However, neither of these gives a qualitative method of gauging how, and to what degree the duty is being implemented. Indeed the policy document “*A Shared Future*” named and commended “*The Equity, Diversity and Interdependence Framework, A Framework for Organisational Learning and Change*” (Eyben et al, 2002) and “*A Good Relations Framework*” (CRC, 2004). However, neither of these appeared in the First Triennial Action Plan.
- 6.5.5 “*The Equity, Diversity and Interdependence Framework, A Framework for Organisational Learning and Change*” emphasises the ‘learning organisation’ rather than the outcomes of policy implementation, and does not specifically address the Section 75 statutory duties on designated public bodies.
- 6.5.6 The CRC “*A Good Relations Framework*” (GRF) may be the best available analytical framework. This template provides a series of base line indicators of advances of good relations work in local government, and contributes new knowledge that might assist in good relations practice and the development of first generation guidance. It is not a one-fits-all model, but a methodology for auditing improved relations.

6.6 St Andrew’s Agreement

- 6.6.1 While the political environment in Northern Ireland is still in a state of flux, it is difficult for this paper to make clear recommendations relating to recent political developments. However, the significance of the St Andrew’s Agreement makes it important to look at it through the prism of good relations.
- 6.6.2 A number of particular issues emerging from St Andrew’s are significant in this respect. They include the introduction in Annex A of the agreement of a statutory ministerial code.

“An amendment to the Northern Ireland Act 1998 would provide for a statutory ministerial Code, and place a duty upon Ministers (including

junior Ministers), notwithstanding their executive authority in their areas of responsibility as defined in the Agreement, to act in accordance with the provisions on ministerial accountability of the Code. The Code would reflect a requirement for safeguards to ensure that all sections of the community could participate and work together successfully in the operation of these institutions and that all sections of the community were protected. There would be arrangements to ensure that, where a decision of the Executive could not be achieved by consensus and a vote was required, any three members of the Executive could require it to be taken on a cross-community basis”.

- 6.6.3 Such a code, active at Executive level would underline the significance of good practice at other governmental levels, and would begin to inculcate the NI political culture with an understanding of good conduct and respectful interaction.

6.7 Efficiency Review Panel

- 6.7.1 The Agreement states that;

“The First Minister and Deputy First Minister would appoint an Efficiency Review Panel, to examine efficiency and value for money of aspects of the Strand One institutions. The FM/DFM would put to the Assembly for approval proposals for the panel's remit, which might include the size of the Assembly and the departmental structure. The Panel would take into account as appropriate the work of the Review of Public Administration. The Panel's report would be considered by the Executive and Assembly, and, where agreed changes required legislative steps outside the scope of the devolved institutions, by the British Government in consultation as appropriate with the Irish Government”.

This possibility of change within the current local Council future structure should be taken into account and good relations proofed as the situation becomes more defined.

6.8 Human Rights, Equality, Victims and other issues

- 6.8.1 In relation to human rights, victims and other issues the agreement states;

“The British Government has also agreed to take forward a number of measures to build confidence in both communities and to pursue a

shared future for Northern Ireland in which the culture, rights and aspirations of all are respected and valued, free from sectarianism, racism and intolerance”.

Two issues in particular are outlined by the governments in Annex B. They state that;

“The Government will introduce legislation this autumn to establish a Victims' Commissioner for Northern Ireland”.

“The Government will work with business, trade unions and ex-prisoner groups to produce guidance for employers which will reduce barriers to employment and enhance re-integration of former prisoners”.

- 6.8.2 The introduction of such guidance for employers particularly in the private sector addresses a long standing issue and has the potential to have a real and positive impact on the development of good relations.

6.9 Managed Change

- 6.9.1 Evidence of good governance should emerge where local Councils demonstrate working effectively with partners, in an inclusive process of promoting good relations. Such processes, and their outcomes could also provide evidence of ‘managed change’ and at least the beginning of mainstreaming the equality and good relations duties in local government.

- 6.9.2 Belfast City Council has reached this situation through a process of taking it upon itself to go beyond accepted understanding of statutory duty and develop the Good Relations framework as an inherent part of all working methods.

“We have comprehensively trained all staff, to the extent that, when Managers present policies, we are sure that they are based on Good Relations principles. To do an EQIA would, to us, be a sign that something is wrong. When Good Relations is effectively mainstreamed, then good relations and equality outcomes flow”. Hazel Francey, Director, Good Relations Unit, Belfast City Council.

- 6.9.3 Implementing Section 75 (2) requires managed change. In organisational change theory some key factors were widely accepted as essential to managing change and ‘mainstreaming’ new policy and initiatives (Burnes

2000; Rees 2004). These include administrative and practical mechanisms that have the support of the most senior management, and the necessary resources, as is the case in Belfast City Council.

- 6.9.4 ‘Doing’ good relations work is not something that can simply be imposed. Legislation provides the minimum requirement of compliance. Yet, there has to be ‘buy in’ and a commitment to implementing the principles rather than simply adhering to new procedural requirements (Collins 2005). In an environment where some citizens and elected representatives dispute the normative and political basis of both the equality and good relations duties, the complexity of introducing such a change in local government has to be recognised.
- 6.9.5 Rees (2004) emphasises that mainstreaming is a long-term process – “a *very long term agenda*” – and is not achieved simply by conducting impact assessments, monitoring or equality proofing of documents. These are necessary – essential indeed – but not sufficient for mainstreaming change. Mainstreaming requires more than these tools to effect change in outcome.

“ [T]hey will have little impact on policy development, implementation and outcome. Moreover, there is a danger that these tools may be seen as a substitute for the more far thoroughgoing and difficult approach which mainstreaming could and should be.” (191)

- 6.9.6 Improving relations through local government contains some high expectations. It is a long-term prospect but controversies often demand immediate action. The political alignment of elected representatives influences their belief in, and commitment to, promoting good relations, during times of street violence, conflict over symbols and flags and such like. It is important to establish if the change process shows that the good relations duty has been mainstreamed or a ‘tick box’ exercise for politicians.

6.10 Flags and Emblems

- 6.10.1 Issues of ‘culture’, ‘identity’ and ‘tradition’ have been recognised as a serious potential threat to the political process – and not least in contentious marches (Jarman, 1999).

“Over the past four years, disputes over the right to march, the expression of cultural traditions, and the displaying of symbols, emblems

and regalia have grown in significance and have often dominated the political agenda.” (1415)

6.10.2 Conflict over symbolism and territory marking threaten the peace process, in existing relationships and building trust (Darby, 2006). “[S]uch moments are transitory: the often mentioned ‘window of opportunity’ is barely ajar and soon slams shut.” (223) Transitory as they are, these moments in the peace process and promoting good relations can be sustained or endangered by the dynamics of symbolism in a society in transition from conflict to peace.

6.10.3 Political and ‘ethnic’ division and disagreement in Northern Ireland is expressed by the use and abuse of symbolism in flags and emblems. The Belfast Agreement recognises the importance of symbolism in the conflict and the potential for future disputes about symbols and symbolic actions. Paragraph 5 of the “*Rights, Safeguards and Equality of Opportunity*” Section confirms an all-party acknowledgement of,

“the sensitivity of the use of symbols and emblems for public purposes, and the need in particular in creating the new institutions to ensure that such symbols and emblems are used in a manner which promotes mutual respect rather than division. Arrangements will be made to monitor this issue and consider what action might be required.” (20)

6.10.4 It is in the management – by agencies of government and their partners – of the continued use and abuse of symbols and symbolic behaviour that promoting good relations might be, to some degree, evaluated (Bryan et al, 2005). The importance of symbolism is well established. Jarman (1998) notes “*the place of murals in the symbolic construction of urban space*”, where Kenney (1998) and Buckley (1998) depict the powerful mythologizing capacity of symbols and icons in Northern Ireland.

6.10.5 Often this potent and divisive symbolism takes the form of displays of flags and emblems as ‘celebration’ (Jarman, 1997). The ethno-political power of the Union flag has always been strong in Northern Ireland (Wilson, 2000a).

“The flag has acquired an ethnic, Protestant connotation that it may not carry in the rest of the UK.” (2)

6.10.6 Flags function to communicate strong if sometimes ambivalent messages. They are integral to sustaining sectarian violence in

Northern Ireland, and especially at interfaces (Jarman, 2003 and 2005) Flags “are associated with allegiance, loyalty, territory and authority” and “can be used to challenge another group, to assert dominance or to seek a confrontation” (Bryson et al, 1994: 10 and 26).

- 6.10.7 Displays in working class housing estates, and on main roads in urban areas, assert the dominance of a particular political allegiance – and often paramilitary presence – and threaten confrontation with those who differ. Displays of flags, emblems and symbols at public events express exclusive possession rather than civic or shared ownership. For example, flying the Irish Tricolour in St Patrick’s Day parades and the Union flag in the Twelfth of July Orange parades are powerful symbolic messages of exclusion, and sustain bitter divisions and hostility between factions.
- 6.10.8 Displays of flags reflect increasingly polarised politics in which “*people across the political spectrum are looking for ways to assert themselves*” so that in the context of Northern Ireland they are “*political artifacts. This element of the debate is often not articulated, but it is often understood*” (Bryson et al, 1994: 130 and 184). It is precisely because this is understood, and needs no articulation, that disputes around flags, emblems and symbols continue to be violent and must be addressed.
- 6.10.9 Flags and emblems mark out territory as dangerous to live or work in. Painted pavement kerbstones delineate where Unionists and Nationalists can safely travel, and where newly arrived non-nationals can live without threat. Flags and murals let citizens know where they can exist without danger to their welfare and life (Shirlow, 2006).
- 6.10.10 Challenging displays of flags and emblems in workplaces carries considerable risk and people are subject to threat or injury for removing such symbols (Counteract, 1999-2003). Flags, emblems and murals are used to mark territory and intimidate ‘the other side’ in ways that are not ‘cultural’ but overtly political (Rolston, 1992; Jarman, 1997). Insofar as these are expressions of ‘identity’ such displays are about the sovereignty and constitutional status of Northern Ireland. The convenient equating of constitutional issues with ‘culture’ and ‘identity’ serves political purposes, for some political parties and all paramilitary groups. Flags, emblems and symbolism are visible evidence that segregation in almost every aspect of life in Northern Ireland is the only safe option (Darby et al, 2004).

6.10.11 National flags and associated symbolism express “*the structures and beliefs that underpin a particular aspect of politics*” (Jarman, 1997: 21). Expressions of political and national ‘identity’ have remained bitterly contested throughout the conflict and since. Bryan et al (2005) claim that government management of displays of symbolism in public places could,

“*offer the possibility of developing public spaces that allow community celebration and commemoration without intimidation.*” (5)

6.10.12 Flags and emblems mark the boundaries of safety for most people and they also mark how far protagonists are prepared to adapt to advance the peace process. In many areas, clear lines demark segregated “*boundaries through both symbolism and force*” (Shirlow, 2006: 227). And the working of the peace process is, at least in part, determined by the use and meanings of flags (McCall, 2006).

6.10.13 The Flags and Emblems (Display) Act (Northern Ireland) 1954 was repealed in 1987 because of its “*controversial and infamous implementation*” but it took account of the public disorder implications of displays of flags and emblems (Bryan et al, 2005). The use of symbols in Northern Ireland has continued to create serious tensions both in public places and in local government property. Some regulation is necessary, without any claim that the state should ‘control’ the process and this must be in consultation with the local community (Bryan et al, 2005).

6.10.14 This reflects the broadly accepted view among community sector practitioners that consultation with local communities is essential to regulating the public space. At the same time the good relations aspects entail equality considerations as is evident in the June 2006 ECNI determination on the practice of flying flags in Lisburn City Council.

6.11 Power of Wellbeing

6.11.1 This is a new and relatively undefined concept, yet its meaning is rooted in the ideas and policy approaches proposed in the Cantle report on the 2001 race riots in the North of England (Cantle, 2002). This has been favoured by existing Councils and featured in their responses to the RPA consultation. The limited powers of local government in Northern Ireland (Palley, 1972) reduce the scope of Councils since many beneficial changes and developments require primary legislation.

- 6.11.2 For local government to have a general power of well-being would provide Councils with the opportunity to increase participation, stakeholder engagement and consultation on ‘quality of life’ issues – pertaining directly to promoting good relations. The ‘new democratic space’ (Morison, 2006) could be developed further in this way and in particular in community planning.

6.12 Community Planning

- 6.12.1 The importance of community planning has been fully accepted (Collins, 2006) and relates to the implementation of the two Section 75 duties (and equality schemes, EQIA etc). In planning public facilities, service delivery, housing and the regulation of the public space, Councils could make informed decisions about both policy and strategic action. The work of NIHE on flags demonstrates the ‘joined up’ nature of this work. The Community Planning process would make the regulation of flags, emblems (murals, etc) in the public space considerably more effective because of the fact that there is full community participation in decision making (Bryan et al, 2005).
- 6.12.2 This ties into Community Development and capacity building in neighbourhoods that are shared rather than single identity (Byrne et al, 2006). Discussing “*Social Capital, Cohesion and Shared living*” Byrne et al note that the conflict had resulted in greater levels of residential segregation and so it was “*assumed that levels of bonding social capital were high within the single identity groups. This assumption is true for segregated housing areas in Northern Ireland. However, in the mixed areas analysed for this research there appeared to be a fair degree of bridging social capital evident.*” (131)

There is a note of caution needed, however, as Byrne et al state.

“*Good relations among the community appeared to be maintained through neutrality rather than diversity.*” (41)

- 6.12.3 Having established criteria of a mixed residential area, Byrne et al (122-123) also caution that it is “*important to note the difference between mixed and integrated*”. (123) Shared living and shared space require more than a ‘mixed’ population of residents, and even where there are indicators of integration this does not ensure that the space is truly mixed (as can be seen from the Lenadoon-Suffolk ‘shared’ centre which has two separate entrances). The generational factor is also crucial to

promoting more integrated space and living as young people,

“were often more likely to see invisible interfaces and lines of demarcation” and “felt that there was a lack of shared space in their immediate area” (127).

6.12.4 The ‘rural proofing’ agreed as part of the RPA is of importance to community planners. Byrne et al have findings on this.

“The research findings indicated that there were very few differences between urban and rural mixed communities. Residents had similar views on why they perceived their communities as mixed, which was based on relationships and levels of sectarian violence and disorder and not on the numerical balance of the community.” (128)

6.13 Scottish Review of Community Planning

6.13.1 A review of community planning has taken place recently in Scotland (Community Planning; an initial review by Miranda Alcock et al, 2006). This sets out the background to the process that has developed in Scotland and we have summarised some of the findings.

6.13.2 The report highlights that community planning is the process through which public sector organisations work together and with local communities, the business and voluntary sectors, to identify and solve local problems, improve services and share resources. It also highlights the statutory basis for community planning and the process followed and identifies the agencies involved at local level. These include all relevant agencies including the police.

6.13.3 The Scottish evaluation highlights that the purpose of community planning is to provide an overarching framework and rationalise a cluttered landscape. Findings however, indicate that the opposite appears to have happened, with a further proliferation of agents acting within the statutory sphere.

6.13.4 The evaluation further highlights:

- the differing capabilities of each of the community partnerships, with varying quality in development of local community plans;
- the need to develop an evaluation framework that would assist CPPs

to improve the effectiveness of community planning;

- the need for connections between local and national priorities- providing mechanisms to balance national priorities at local and neighbourhood levels. It is proposed that the Scottish Executive agrees priorities for Community Planning;
- the need for community engagement to be improved and become more systematic through implementation of a national strategy;
- the difficulties of engaging local politicians;
- the fears expressed over power struggles between the community and voluntary sector and elected politicians.

6.13.5 The Scottish model has several sources of funding for CPPs:

- fourteen are funded by NHA;
- thirteen by Enterprise network;
- eight receive funds from the police;
- four receive funds from the fire and ambulance service.

There are other occasional contributions from Shell UK, Scottish Natural Heritage and Visa Scotland. A passing reference is made to the EU funding received by the South of Scotland Alliance.

6.13.6 The Scottish evaluation report identifies some characteristics that improved CPPs chances of success as follows:-

- Committed leadership among all partners;
- A citizen focus to the work;
- A shared vision for the area;
- Clearly resourced action plans;
- Clear performance management arrangements.

Similar themes have been fed back to us in our consultation with stakeholders in the statutory and voluntary sectors in Northern Ireland.

6.13.7 Similarities of the Scottish model with the experience of Belfast are identified as:-

- Visions, strategic objectives, thematic actions;

- Integrated service plan or framework;
- Consultation based approach to community planning.

Some local respondents commented that the Dundee plans were somewhat similar to Neighbourhood Renewal Vision Frameworks.

6.13.8 The differences between local partnerships and Community Planning partnerships are constructed as:-

- Community Planning process is Council led, with wide accountability and access to wide range of resources;
- There is a high level of commitment by all partners;
- Good communications strategy – the use of Newsletters to keep the local community informed was considered to be an example of best practice;
- Better level of resourcing for the implementation of the plan;
- Glasgow Community Plan has a ‘Social Justice Milestones’ section with specific, challenging targets;
- The different political situation in Belfast as opposed to Scotland.

There were also concerns expressed about the following:-

- How will Belfast City Council maintain ‘shared future’ priorities?
- Shared Council - v- Green/Orange Council;
- Some concerns about a return to a ‘sectarian’ Council.

6.13.9 There was some debate about how the Scottish Plans (or Councils in the future) focus in on specific areas of need and it was believed this would require a linkage to the policy of 'Targeting Social Need'.

6.14 Partnerships

6.14.1 The political and policy organisational landscape of Northern Ireland is littered with partnership initiatives. There are some significant characteristics of partnership which work well and need to be further clarified. Within this piece of work we have identified them as:-

- Sharing of information, learning and viewpoints of other stakeholders;
- Sharing of resources;
- A forum for community leadership/champions/ commitment;
- Encourages community engagement/individual engagement;
- Allows for networking and interpersonal relationships to be formed;
- Allows for collective action by high performing Partnerships;
- Explicit objectives/targets can be agreed.

6.14.2 Partnership structures also contain the elements which can lead to disengagement and lack of partnership working. We have identified some of these as:-

- Power games - not having shared agenda/objectives;
- Political divisions in some cases, often reflecting inter-community tensions in some parts of Belfast;
- Blame games - problems of accountability;
- Short-term funding - groups within a Partnership competing for resources;
- Exclusion of some groups. Is the Partnership fully representative of the community and various interests?
- Community/voluntary sector not equal partners with statutory agencies in some cases;

- Lack of buy-in to partnership by some statutory agencies;
- Gap in actually influencing wider Government policy;
- Lack of co-ordination;
- Having to go through the ‘democratic hoops’ to get agreement;
- Slow decision-making processes - structures can be cumbersome and slow things down;
- Some resistance to partnership working by some groups / members;
- Members’ training needs not being met;
- Behind the scene agreements, sectional interests dictating decisions, personal alliances;
- Lack of a communications policy to disseminate information to wider sectors.

6.14.3 Many of these issues are highlighted in the summary of the partnership process in Sterling, Scotland which is attached at Appendix 3 of this report.

6.14.4 What have we learned from local Partnerships?

- Partnerships take time, hard work and need to be maintained and nurtured;
- There is a need for more co-ordination;
- There are too many Partnerships;
- Partnerships need to be fully representative of the communities / sectors / various stakeholders;
- Statutory agencies and community groups are all accountable in the process;
- Bottom-up ownership and leadership gives credibility to the whole process;

- Capacity building is still needed in some areas;
- There are continuing areas of weak community infrastructure (often in PUL communities) where partnership development is particularly underdeveloped.

6.15 Identification of rural needs

- 6.15.1 RCN, in their submission to the RPA, highlighted the need to seize the positive opportunity presented and focused on the importance of community planning as the ‘key to success’. RCN see broad and meaningful engagement in decision making as a process which needs to be encouraged and facilitated and that contributions are acknowledged and should be equally valued across the spectrum of stakeholders.
- 6.15.2 Concerns were also expressed in relation to ensuring access to services and the quality of those services for rural communities.
- 6.15.3 The issue of changing demographics and a growing migrant worker and minority ethnic population was also recognised a point of challenge and opportunity for the future.

6.16 Statutory Codes of Conduct

- 6.16.1 Safeguards within the legal and constitutional framework must accompany the “*strong local autonomy*” that the RPA promises for local government in Northern Ireland (Hinds et al, 2005). The cornerstones of the Belfast and St Andrew’s Agreements are equality, human rights and good relations, along-side power sharing and adherence to the rule of law.
- 6.16.2 The need for Codes of Conduct and standards of behaviour (for elected members) is a recognised fact. It is less often appreciated that these are already contained in the standing orders of Councils, though the enforcement of these codes and standards is less than a landmark in the public mind. Therefore we commend the recommendations made in the RPA report on safeguards:-
- Consider the appointment of a Standards Commissioner with functions of an ombudsman;

- Develop Standards equivalent to the Standards Board for GB.

6.17 Leadership: Transformational Models

- 6.17.1 There is a recognised requirement for engaged constructive leadership from political agents within societies undergoing political transition (Peake, 2003). Such leadership should incorporate a positive transformational model which moves away from a tendency to create political capital by the manipulation of ethnic divisions (Bower and Doz, 1979; Gormley-Heenan, 2001).
- 6.17.2 There is evidence to suggest that such transformational models are currently being developed at a community level ¹³ and at a management level within policing organisations ¹⁴.
- 6.17.3 As Connolly, 2006, states with reference to interface communities:-

“On the political level more constructive leadership needs to be shown by Councillors and local representatives. The shared seeking of resources for interface communities by political opponents helps increase trust and optimism and can provide an acknowledgement of the ‘shared’ issues.” (124)

¹³ See Intercom – ‘Conflict Transformation Forum’, 2006

¹⁴ See www.centrex.police.uk/courses

7. Conclusions

- 7.1 The RPA represents a major opportunity for local government to systematically embrace good relations work alongside equality as a key element of good business practice. Post RPA Councils will have greater powers such as responsibility for community planning which could be an enabling factor for greater consultation, equality and good relations.
- 7.2 The need for further developing Good Relations is clear. Northern Ireland is emerging from division and moving towards diversity. Diversity requires that each person and many cultures are able to participate in public life and to make their own unique contribution.
- 7.3 A failure to identify and clarify the principles of social inclusion and good relations can lead to inter-communal breakdown and new patterns of exclusion which may escalate into violence. This may have a serious negative impact and major economic costs for the whole society and, in particular, for those in minority communities.
- 7.4 Developing Good Relations entails creating an enabling framework that promotes equality, welcomes diversity and develops social cohesion, thus preventing new social schisms, racism and promoting social potential through the development of a united community working for common social and economic goals.
- 7.5 Promoting good relations (GR) is more than traditional Community Relations practice and cannot be left in a 'depoliticised ghetto' (Morrow et al, 2003). Compliance with equality legislation alone is not sufficient to promote good relations. At the same time GR has to connect in a meaningful way with the work of public sector.
- 7.6 There is perceived conflict between the equality and good relations duties because Section 75 (1) is stronger legislatively than Section 75 (2). However, this is a misapprehension (McCrudden, 2004). It is clear that equality and Good Relations are interdependent and that one is not possible without the other.
- 7.7 Governance has changed with 'modernisation' and current government policy so that local government's role is increasingly facilitative and open to participative democracy. It can work in partnership, consult 'stakeholders' and function in 'joined up' governance. This is conducive to the creation of less formal and more democratic spaces.

- 7.8 Government policy of “*A Shared Future*” requires that local government replace CR work with the Good Relations Challenge Programme.
- 7.9 ‘Mainstreaming’ good relations is a long-term process and requires organisational change and support at the highest level – in the executive and the Chamber. The ‘ideological alignment’ of members and government is therefore a vital factor (Alcock, 2006; Squires et al, 2002). So too is the political profile of each of the new ‘Super Councils’. In local government the party political positions (for or against promoting good relations) of members is vital.
- 7.10 Understanding the meanings and ab/uses of flags and emblems is of fundamental importance in promoting good relations. Political and ‘ethnic’ division and disagreement in Northern Ireland is expressed by the use and abuse of symbolism in flags and emblems (and murals and symbolic actions). Managing the public space is therefore a key role of NI Councils (in consultation with the local community) because they mark the boundaries of safety for most people and they also mark how far protagonists are prepared to adapt to advance the peace process.
- 7.11 The evaluation of the Scottish model presents many useful lessons for the future development of Community Planning Partnerships in Northern Ireland and we have incorporated the learning from this into our key recommendations.
- 7.12 It is also clear, however, that there is mutual learning to be had. Northern Ireland is advanced in many respects:
- In this region, we will implement Community Planning Partnerships within a framework where boundaries of most agencies will be co-terminous;
 - We have the most advanced Equality legislation in Europe to underpin the development of the partnerships;
 - We have pre existing, major experience of inter-agency partnership working;
 - We have EU Peace funding in place, and this is underpinned by principles of Good Relations and inclusion.
- 7.13 The case studies presented from local communities show how this positive policy and funding environment, allied with an agency

partnership approach (led by the Northern Ireland Housing in one instance and supported by BCC and NIHE in the other).

- 7.14 There is articulated concern over the lack of implementation of existing codes of conduct for Councillors and the lack of a collective approach that would enable meaningful intervention where codes are being breached. In particular, feedback from minority ethnic communities indicates the need to prevent the articulation of racism in local Councils and public fora.

8. Recommendations

- 8.1 Ensure that the RPA structures fully utilise greater powers to embed good relations and in particular use the Community Planning Partnerships and power of well being to this end. Good Relations and equality should be fully developed at all stages and within all structures, including the shadow arrangements and all consultative processes.
- 8.2 Embed Good Relations at local Council level as a central plank of the implementation of 'A Shared Future' and 'The Racial Equality Strategy'. This should be fully reflected in the processes of developing Good Relations further as a statutory duty within the structures of the RPA.
- 8.3 Develop the high level actions contained with the Race Equality Strategy to make them applicable within the context of good relations strategies in the new Council structures.
- 8.4 Propose the Belfast Good Relations model of a dedicated staff complement and budget, situated within the Chief Executive's office, as the most appropriate model for local Councils. Ensure that this mainstreams good relations throughout the Council structure and provides a sound framework for developing inter-agency public/private partnerships.
- 8.5 Give serious consideration to;
- a) strengthening the existing duty; and/or
 - b) placing an additional good relations specific statutory duty on local Councils to sharpen their focus.
- 8.6 Develop a Community Engagement Strategy to facilitate the community/voluntary sector role within Community Planning partnerships. This strategy to draw from the National Standard adopted by the Scottish model and prioritise engagement of minority ethnic communities.
- 8.7 Train all Councillors and staff in good relations as an overarching theme of their capacity building training for the new structures. The existing duty has been utilised this way by Derry City Council, which serves as a model of good practice. The need for capacity building along transformational leadership models should also be reflected within training and awareness raising processes.

- 8.8 Do baseline research within new local authorities to establish the current state of relations, identify existing and developing concerns and provide a benchmark for measuring progress in the promotion of good relations.
- 8.9 Use the CRC “*A Good Relations Framework*” (GRF) as the current best available analytical framework for measuring the impact of the new Good Relations Challenge Framework in local Councils.
- 8.10 Ensure that Good Relations is part of an integrated impact assessment in general and is an integral part of all management systems within the new structures.
- 8.11 We propose that there is a need to legislate with regard to flags and emblems and that such legislation must be accompanied by development work at a local level. This will reduce offensive emblems whilst ensuring that symbols of identity are recognised.
- 8.12 The success factors highlighted in the Scottish model evaluation, complemented by the addition of a Good Relations principle, should serve as a minimum baseline for the development of a Good Relations implementation strategy with Community Planning Partnerships. This model would include the following principles:-
- Committed leadership among all partners;
 - A citizen focus to the work;
 - A shared vision for the area;
 - Clearly resourced action plans;
 - Clear performance management arrangements;
 - An agreed Good Relations/Equality framework.
- 8.13 We recommend that, during the period of the RPA transitional process, one pilot model of a Community Planning Partnership be developed, supported by sources inclusive of Peace 3 funding.
- 8.14 Develop enforceable and transparent codes of conduct that comply with the standards to be adopted in Community Planning Partnerships. Consider the appointment of:-
- Standards Commissioner (with function of an Ombudsman); and,
 - Standards equivalent to the Standards Board for GB.

Appendix 1

Questionnaire on embedding Good Relations in Local government and governance through the Review of Public Administration (agreed with EC 23rd October, 2006).

Background

THE EQUALITY COMMISSION FOR NORTHERN IRELAND have contracted with GOOD RELATIONS ASSOCIATES to produce a Challenge paper on embedding Good Relations in local government and governance through the Review of Public Administration. The overall aim of this project is to produce a challenge paper on how the seven new local Councils can creatively embed good relations into local services and governance arrangements, and how the current RPA transition processes and structures can best support this. The purpose of the challenge paper is also to inform and challenge the thinking of the Commission and the Good Relations Forum.

Questions

1. How can Good Relations be implemented within the following key concepts:-
 - The power of well being;
 - Community planning;
 - The statutory system of safeguards;

And also taking into consideration:-

- Potential regulation as regards the display of flags and emblems;
 - Code(s) of conduct for Councillors particularly in light of the St Andrew's Agreement.
2. How would you measure the outcomes of your proposals, if implemented?
 3. Do you have any other comments to add?

Thank you for your contribution

Appendix 2

Fieldwork Participants

Interview participants

Billy Gamble (OFMDFM)
Lorna Parsons (LGSC)
Peter McNaney (BCC)
Evelyn Collins (EC)
Ian Maye DOE (RPA Team)
Frances McCandless (NICVA)
Denise Wright (SBRR)
Ellen Kavanagh (DCC)
Monina O Prey (CFNI)
Tony Kennedy (Co-Ireland)
Ashley Moreland (CEO Newtownards BC)
Avila Kilmurray (CFNI) – Thursday 23 / 11/ 06
Dympna Mc Glade (CRC)
Ali McAllister (CRC)
Margaret Ward (WRDA)
Gordon Blevins, (PLACE)
Clifford Forbes, (Craigavon Borough Council)
Terry Deegan (NICEM)
Jackie Patton (Ballymena Borough Council)

Group interview participants

NILGA (representative of CRO's and Councillors from Alliance, SF and UUP)
East Belfast Community Activist Group (representing PUL)
Peace and Reconciliation Group, Derry (representing CNR tradition)
Community Dialogue (representing urban/rural, PUL and CNR)

Appendix 3

Stirling Community Planning Partnership

Summary

Stirling Community Planning Partnership is the local Community Planning Partnership (CPP) for the Stirling Council area. Its membership comprises representatives from key agencies and organisations from the public, community, voluntary and private sector which are active in the area. The vision of the Community Planning Partnership is to work together to provide a good quality of life for all our citizens and communities. CPP partners have agreed a community plan which contains the shared strategic vision for the future of Stirling. Partners will work together, with collective resources, skills, knowledge and expertise to progress the vision and the eight shared strategic priorities.

The priorities are:-

- Health improvement;
- Community safety;
- Regeneration;
- Economic development;
- Sustainable development;
- Lifelong learning;
- Citizenship;
- Community engagement.

The CPP works to share ideas, knowledge, skills and information amongst all partners across all sectors, to develop a shared understanding and commitment to the future of Stirling. All partners work singly and collectively to:

- Provide a good quality of life
- Promote inclusion and reduce inequalities
- Deliver improved more efficient services that best meet community need

Community Planning can be of best effect in tackling cross cutting issues which are not the sole responsibility of one partner agency. Stirling CPP has done a lot of work to maximise the role of community planning in linking a number of strategic developments. This has resulted in positive exploitation of linkages and dependencies, and a reduction in duplication.

SCCP realises its statutory duty to provide an overarching framework for a growing number of key strategies, including:-

- Community Learning and Development Strategy;
- Dialogue Youth;
- Economic Development Strategy;
- Regeneration Strategy;
- Lifelong Learning Strategy;
- Joint Health Improvement Plan;
- City Visioning;
- Local Housing Strategy;
- Community Safety Strategy;
- Children's Service Planning;
- Anti-Social Behaviour Strategy.

Appendix 4

National Standards for Community Engagement

Summary

The National Standards for Community Engagement have been developed with the involvement of over 500 people from communities and agencies throughout Scotland. They are a practical tool to help improve the experience of all participants involved in community engagement to achieve the highest quality of process and results.

The standards can be used in both formal and informal community engagement. During the development of the standards for more formal settings such as community planning partnerships, community engagement was defined as:

Developing and sustaining a working relationship between one or more public body and one or more community group, to help them both to understand and act on the needs or issues that the community experiences.

These formal arrangements for community engagement are very important, however, it should be noted that the standards are also applicable to less formal ways of engaging people and can be used to enable large numbers to participate.

In testing the standards a number of useful learning points were identified.

These included:-

- seeking agreement to use the standards from all those involved in the process;
- nominating a key person to lead on the use of the standards; and
- prioritising the standards to reflect the purpose of the engagement and experience of community partners and agencies.

The standards are based on following principles:-

- Fairness, equality and inclusion must underpin all aspects of community engagement, and should be reflected in both community engagement policies and the way that everyone involved participates;
- Community engagement should have clear and agreed purposes, and methods that achieve these purposes;
- Improving the quality of community engagement requires commitment to learning from experience;
- Skill must be exercised in order to build communities, to ensure practice of equalities principles, to share ownership of the agenda, and to enable all viewpoints to be reflected;
- As all parties to community engagement possess knowledge based on study, experience, observation and reflection, effective engagement processes will share and use that knowledge;
- All participants should be given the opportunity to build on their knowledge and skills;
- Accurate, timely information is crucial for effective engagement;
- In summary, these principles highlight the importance of equality and recognising the diversity of people and communities; a clear sense of purpose; effective methods for achieving change; building on the skills and knowledge of all those involved; commitment to learning for continuous improvement.

National Standards for Community Engagement

1. **INVOLVEMENT:** we will identify and involve the people and organisations who have an interest in the focus of the engagement.
2. **SUPPORT:** we will identify and overcome any barriers to involvement.
3. **PLANNING:** we will gather evidence of the needs and available resources and use this evidence to agree the purpose, scope and timescale of the engagement and the actions to be taken.
4. **METHODS:** we will agree and use methods of engagement that are fit for purpose.
5. **WORKING TOGETHER:** We will agree and use clear procedures that enable the participants to work with one another effectively and efficiently.
6. **SHARING INFORMATION:** we will ensure that necessary information is communicated between the participants.
7. **WORKING WITH OTHERS:** we will work effectively with others with an interest in the engagement.
8. **IMPROVEMENT:** we will develop actively the skills, knowledge and confidence of all the participants.
9. **FEEDBACK:** we will feed back the results of the engagement to the wider community and agencies affected.
10. **MONITORING AND EVALUATION:** we will monitor and evaluate whether the engagement achieves its purposes and meets the national standards for community engagement.

http://www.communitiesscotland.gov.uk/stellent/groups/public/documents/webpages/cs_010771.hcsp

References

- Aldrich, H. and Herker, D. “*Boundary Spanning Roles and Organisation Structure*”, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 2. No. 2, 1977.
- Alcock, M. Laird, A. Jordan. G. Evan, P. Segessenmann, T. Seidel, R. and Pia, D. *Accounts Commission and Auditor General for Scotland*, 2006.
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. “*Transformational Leadership: A Response to Critics*” in *Leadership Theory and Research*, p. 49-80, New York, Academic Press, 1993
- Bell, Christine “*Peace Agreements and Human Rights*”, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000.
- Ben-Tovim, Gideon “*Community Cohesion and Racial Exclusion: A Critical Review of the Cattle Report*” *Renewal*, Spring, 2002.
- Bovaird, Tony; Löffler, Elke “*Public Management and Governance*”, Routledge, London, 2003.
- Bower, J. L. and Y. Doz. *Strategy formulation: A social and political process*. Strategic Management. D. E. Schrendel and C. E. Hofer. Boston, Little Brown: 152-166, 1979.
- Bryan, Dominic; and Gillespie, Gordon “*Transforming Conflict: Flags and Emblems*” Institute of Irish Studies, Queen’s University Belfast, Belfast, March, 2005.
- Bryan, Dominic “Ireland’s very own Jurassic Park: the mass media, Orange parades and the discourse on tradition” in Buckley, Anthony, “*Symbols in Northern Ireland*”, Institute of Irish Studies, Queens University Belfast, Belfast, 1998.
- Bryman, Alan “*Social Research Methods*” 2nd edition, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004.
- Bryson, Lucy; McCartney, Clem “*Clashing Symbols: A report on the use of flags, anthems and other national symbols in Northern Ireland*”, Institute of Irish Studies for the Community Relations Council, Belfast, 1994.

Buckley, Anthony “Symbols in Northern Ireland”, *Institute of Irish Studies, Queen’s University Belfast, Belfast, 1998.*

Burnes, Bernard “*Managing Change: A Strategic Approach to Organisational Dynamics*” 3rd Edition, Prentice Hall, London, 2000.

Byrne, Jonny; Hansson, Ulf and Bell, John “*Shared Living: Mixed residential communities in Northern Ireland*” Institute for Conflict Resolution, Belfast, 2006.

Cabinet Office “*Listen Up! Effective Consultation*” London, 1998.

Cantle, Ted “*Community Cohesion: A Report of the Independent Review Team*” Home Office, London, 2002.

Collins, Evelyn “*Mainstreaming Equality – the Statutory Duties in Northern Ireland*”, Mainstreaming Equality Models for Statutory Duty Conference, 13-19, Belfast, 2005.

Collins, Evelyn “*How can we gain the maximum benefit for equality from the third sector bodies within the local community planning framework*” Developing Effective Community Planning Conference paper, Equality Commission for Northern Ireland, Belfast, October 2006.

Community Relations Council for Northern Ireland, “*Sharing Over Separation – Actions towards a Shared Future*” Belfast, 2006.

Community Relations Council for Northern Ireland, “*Good Relations Framework*” CRC, Belfast, 2004.

Connolly, Paul “*Interfaces*” in Community Relations Council for Northern Ireland, “*Sharing Over Separation – Actions towards a Shared Future*” 115-127, Belfast, 2006.

Counteract “*Annual Report.*” Belfast, 1999, 2002, and 2003 (for the years 1998, 2001, 2002).

Daly, M “*Governance and Social Policy*” *Journal of Social Policy*, Vol. 21, No. 1, 2003, 113-128.

Darby, John “*A Truce rather than a Treaty? The effect of violence on the Irish peace process*” Chapter 14 in Cox, Michael; Guelke, Adrian; and

Stephen, Fiona “A farewell to Arms? Beyond the Good Friday Agreement” 2nd Edition Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2006.

Darby, John; and Knox, Colin “A Shared Future: Improving relations in Northern Ireland” Executive Summary and Key themes, Conference paper January 2004, Belfast. Available on www.asharedfutureni.gov.uk/conference/index.htm

Donaghy, Tahnya Barnett, “Mainstreaming: Northern Ireland’s Participative-Democratic Approach”, Occasional paper 2, Centre for the Advancement of Women in Politics, Queen’s University Belfast, Belfast, February 2003.

Equality Commission for Northern Ireland, “Good Relations in Practice: A Report and the Progress on the Good Relations Duty”, Belfast, April 2006 (2006a). <http://www.equalityni.org>.

Equality Commission for Northern Ireland, “Final Report of Commission Investigation under Paragraph 10 of Schedule 9 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998: Paul Butler & Lisburn City Council”, Belfast 26 June 2006. (2006b) http://www.equalityni.org/statutory_duty (6 July 2006).

Equality Commission for Northern Ireland, “Guidelines to the Statutory Duties” Belfast, 2005.

Equality Commission for Northern Ireland, (2003a) “Report on the Implementation of the Section 75 Equality and Good Relations Duties by Public Authorities” Belfast, 2003.

Equality Commission for Northern Ireland, (2003b) “Revised Draft Guidelines to the Statutory Duties”, consultation document, Belfast. <http://www.equalityni.org>.

Eyben, Karin; Morrow, Duncan; Wilson, Derick; Robinson, Billy “The Equity, Diversity and Interdependence Framework, A Framework for Organisational Learning and Change.” Belfast, 2002.

Foley, Frank; and Robinson, Gillian, “Politicians and Community Relations in Northern Ireland” INCORE Report 5, Londonderry, November 2004.

Frazer, Hugh; and Fitzduff, Mari, “Improving Community Relations” (Third edition) Community Relations Council, Belfast, 1994.

Fredman, Sandra “*Discrimination Law*” Clarendon Law Series, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002.

Giddens, Anthony “*The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*” Cambridge, Polity Press, 1998.

Gormley-Heenan, Cathy “*From Protagonist to Pragmatist: Political Leadership in Societies in Transition*” INCORE, 2001.

(on behalf of the) Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of Ireland, “*The Agreement*” Cmnd. 3883, Belfast, 1998.

Guelke, Adrian; Cox, Michael and Stephen, Fiona “*Conclusion: peace beyond the GFA?*” in Cox, Michael; Guelke, Adrian; and Stephen, Fiona “*A farewell to Arms? Beyond the Good Friday Agreement*” 2nd Edition Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2006, 443-452.

Hain, Peter, “Review of Public Administration – QUANGOs announcement”, Belfast, 21 March, 2006 available at www.rpani.gov.uk (13 April 2006)

Hamber, B; and Kelly, G “*A Working Definition of Reconciliation*” Democratic Dialogue Monograph, Belfast, 2004.

Hamber, B; and Kelly, G “*A Place for Reconciliation: Conflict and locality in Northern Ireland*” Democratic Dialogue Report 18, Belfast, 2005.

Hayward, K; and Mitchell, C, “*Discourses of equality in post-Agreement Northern Ireland*” Contemporary Politics, Vol. 9, No. 3, 293-312, September 2003.

Hinds, B; Loughlin, J “*The Review of Public Administration in Northern Ireland: Checks, Balances and Safeguards*”, Belfast, Nov 2005. www.rpani.gov.uk.

Hinds, B “*Good Relations demands equality*” Scope magazine, Belfast, 2003.

Hughes, Joanne; Knox, Colin; Murray, Michael; Greer, Jonathan; “*Partnership Governance in Northern Ireland: the path to peace.*” Oak Tree Press, Dublin, 1998.

Jarman, Neil “*No Longer a Problem? Sectarian Violence in Northern Ireland*” Institute for Conflict Research, Belfast, March, 2005.

Jarman, Neil “*Managing Disorder: Responses to Interface Violence in North Belfast*”, Chapter 11 in Hargie, Owen and Dickson, David (Eds) “*Researching the Troubles: Social Science Perspectives on the Northern Ireland Conflict.*” *Mainstream Publishing, London and Edinburgh, 2003.*

Jarman, Neil “*Regulating Rights and Managing Public Order: Parade Disputes and the Peace Process*” *Fordham International Law Journal*, Vol. 22, No. 4, 1415-1439, April 1999.

Jarman, Neil “*Painting landscapes: the place of murals in the symbolic construction of urban space*” in Buckley, Anthony, D “*Symbols in Northern Ireland*” Institute of Irish Studies, Queen’s University, Belfast, 1998.

Jarman, Neil “*Material Conflicts: Parades and Visual Displays in Northern Ireland*” *Explorations in Anthropology Series*, Berg Publishers, London, 1997.

Kelly, Grainne “*Shared space, shared problem: Local civic fora and intercommunal relations*” *Democratic Dialogue*, Belfast, May 2004.
www.democraticdialogue.org

Kenney, Mary Catherine “*The phoenix and the lark: revolutionary mythology and iconographic creativity in Belfast’s republican districts.*” in Buckley, Anthony, D “*Symbols in Northern Ireland*” Institute of Irish Studies, Queen’s University, Belfast, 1998.

Knox, Colin “*‘Joined-up’ government: an integrated response to communal violence in Northern Ireland?*” *Policy and Politics*, Vol. 31 No. 1 19-35, The Policy Press, 2003.

Local Government Task Force Community Planning Sub Group “*Recommendation Paper*” (DRAFT) Belfast 2006.

McCall, Cathal, “*From ‘long war’ to ‘war of the lillies’: ‘post conflict’ territorial compromise and the return of cultural politics*” in Cox, Michael; Guelke, Adrian; and Stephen, Fiona “*A farewell to Arms? Beyond the Good Friday Agreement*” 2nd Edition, Manchester University Press, 302-316, Manchester, 2006.

McCrudden, Christopher, “*Mainstreaming Equality in Northern Ireland 1998-2004: A Review of the Issues Concerning the Operation of the Equality Duty in Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998.*” In McLaughlin, E; and Faris, N “*Section 75 Review*” Office of First Minister and Deputy First Minister, Belfast; 2004. www.section75review.info

McLaughlin, E; and Faris, N “*Section 75 Review*” Office of First Minister and Deputy First Minister, Belfast, 2004. www.section75review.info

McShane, Liz; O’Neill, Martin (Eds) “*Community Development in Health and Social Services*” Craigavon and Banbridge Community Health and Social Services Trust, Gilford, Northern Ireland, 1999.

McShane, Liz; “*Policy to Practice: Community Development methods in Health and Social Services – an Evaluation*” Newry, Northern Ireland, 2000.

McVeigh, R “*Between reconciliation and pacification: The British state and community relations in the North of Ireland*” *Community Development Journal*, Vol. 37, No. 1, 47-58, 2002.

Meehan, E, unpublished ESRC Conference paper, Edinburgh, June 2005.

Miles, Matthew, B. & Huberman, Michael, A. “*Qualitative data Analysis*” Sage, London, 1994.

Moore, Mark H. “*Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in government*” Harvard University Press, London, Cambridge Ma., 1995.

Morison, John “*Constitutionalism, civil society and democratic renewal in Northern Ireland*” Chapter 16 in Cox, Michael; Guelke, Adrian; and Stephen, Fiona “*A farewell to Arms? Beyond the Good Friday Agreement*” 2nd Edition Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2006.

Morison, J; and Livingstone, S “*Reshaping Public Power: Northern Ireland and the British Constitutional Crisis*” Sweet & Maxwell, London, 1995.

Morrow, D; Eyben, K; and Wilson, D “*From the Margin to the Middle: Taking Equality, Diversity and Interdependence seriously*, in Hargie, Owen and Dickson, David, (Eds) “*Researching the Troubles*” Mainstream Publishing, Edinburgh and London, 2003.

Mulcahy, Linda “*The Devil and the Deep Blue Sea? A Critique of the Ability of Community Mediation to Suppress and Facilitate Participation in Civil Life*” *Journal of Law and Society*, Vol. 27, No. 1, March 2000, 133-150.

Northern Ireland Office “*Better Government for Northern Ireland: Final Decisions of the Review of Public Administration: Securing our future*” Belfast, March, 2006, available at www.rpani.gov.uk.

O’Cinneide, C “*Beyond the Limits of Equal Treatment: The Use of Positive Duties in Equality Law*” *Mainstreaming Equality Models for Statutory Duty Conference*, 20-33, Belfast, 2005.

O’Cinneide, C “*Taking Equality Seriously: The extension of positive duties to promote equality*” *Equality and Diversity Forum*, London, 2004.

Office of First Minister and Deputy First Minister “*A Shared Future: First Triennial Action Plan 2006-2009*” Belfast, April 2006.
www.ofmdfmni.gov.uk

Office of First Minister and Deputy First Minister, Community Relations Unit (2005a) “*A Shared Future: policy and strategic framework for good relations*” Belfast, 2005 (2005a). www.asharedfutureni.gov.uk

Office of First Minister and Deputy First Minister, Community Relations Unit (2005b) “*Views on Public Services – “Local Identity” Final Report*” Belfast, 2005. www.rpani.gov.uk

Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister, News Release, May 2004. www.ofmdfmni.gov.uk

Palley, Claire “*The Evolution, Disintegration and Possible Reconstruction of the Northern Ireland Constitution*” *Anglo-American Law Review*, Vol. 1, 1972.

Peake, Gordon “*From Warlords to Peace lords?*” *Journal of International Affairs*, Spring 2003, 56, 2.

Rees, Teresa, “*Mainstreaming equality in Northern Ireland: An International Perspective*” in *McLaughlin, E and Faris, N “Section 75 Review”* Office of First Minister and Deputy First Minister, Belfast 2004.
www.section75review.info

Rees, Teresa “*Mainstreaming Equality in the European Union: Education, Training and Labour Market Policies*” Routledge, London and New York, 1st edition, 1998.

Richards, Sue “*Leadership – an exploration of issues relating to leadership in the public domain*” Paper for the Northern Ireland Review of Public Administration, Belfast, September 2003. www.rpani.gov.uk

Rolston, Bill “*What’s wrong with multiculturalism? Liberalism and the Irish Conflict*” in Miller, D “*Rethinking Northern Ireland: Culture, Ideology and Colonialism*” Longman, London, 1998.

Rolston, Bill “*Drawing Support: Murals in the North of Ireland*” Beyond the Pale Publications, Belfast, 1992.

Rumney, Philip “*The British Experience of Racist Hate Speech Regulation: A Lesson for First Amendment Absolutists?*” *Common Law World Review*, Vol. 32, 117, 2003.

Rutherford, Sarah; and Ollerearnshaw, Sue “*The Business of Diversity: How organisations in the public and private sectors are integrating equality and diversity to enhance business performance*” Schneider and Ross report sponsored by the Cabinet Office and Barclays, London, 2002.

Shirlow, Peter “*Segregation, ethno-sectarianism and the ‘new’ Belfast*” Chapter 15 in Cox, Michael; Guelke, Adrian; and Stephen, Fiona “*A farewell to Arms? Beyond the Good Friday Agreement*” 2nd Edition Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2006.

Squires, Judith; and Wickham-Jones, Mark “*Mainstreaming in Westminster and Whitehall: From Labour’s Ministry for Women to the Women and Equality Unit*” in Ross, Karen (Ed) “*Women, Politics and Change*” Oxford University Press, 2002.

Willmott, Ross “*The Power of Community Action: creating the momentum to sustain just and peaceful communities*” *Local Environment*, Vol. 8, No 3, 337-343, June, 2003.

Wilson, Robin “*Evidence-based policy-making: Monitoring and evaluation*” Conference paper, Community Relations Council, Belfast, 27 April, 2006.

Wilson Robin “*Northern Ireland: What’s going wrong?*” Working Paper No 1, Institute of Governance, Public Policy and Social Research, Queen’s University, Belfast, Belfast, 2003.

Wilson, Robin “*Flagging concern: the controversy over flags and emblems*” Democratic Dialogue, Belfast, July 2000. (2000a)

Wilson, Robin “*The equality debate*” paper presented at the Democratic Dialogue Conference on Equality, Belfast, 25 September 2000. (2000b)
Wright, Susan “*The politicization of ‘culture’*” *Anthropology Today*, Vol. 14 No. 1, Feb 1998.

Zalewski, Marysia “*Intervening in Northern Ireland: Critically re-thinking representations of the conflict*” in Barry, John; and Zalewski, Marysia “*Intervening in Northern Ireland: Critically re-thinking representations of the conflict*” Special issue of *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 2005.

Zapone, Katherine “*Charting the Equality Agenda.*” Equality Commission for Northern Ireland and Equality Authority, Dublin and Belfast, 2001.

Equality Commission for Northern Ireland

Equality House
7-9 Shaftesbury Square
Belfast BT2 7DP

Tel: 028 9050 0600

Fax: 029 9033 1544

Textphone: 028 9050 0589

Email: section75@equalityni.org

Website: www.equalityni.org



April 2007