

Title of Report:	Northern Ireland Executive Office Funding to District Council Good Relations Programme.
Committee Report Submitted	Leisure & Development Committee
Date of Meeting:	19 September 2023
For Decision or For Information	For Information
To be discussed In Committee	NO

Linkage to Council Strategy (2021-25)	
Strategic Theme	Healthy and Engaged Communities
Outcome	The Borough comprises cohesive and stable communities which work collaboratively with a range of stakeholders to address issues and deliver on opportunities
Lead Officer	Head of Service for Community & Culture. Good Relations Manager

Budgetary Considerations	
Cost of Proposal	Additional - circa £20,000
Included in Current Year Estimates	YES/NO
Capital/Revenue	Revenue
Code	1041
Staffing Costs	£20,000 additional staff costs required

Legal Considerations	
Input of Legal Services Required	NO
Legal Opinion Obtained	NO

Screening Requirements	Required for new or revised Policies, Plans, Strategies or Service Delivery Proposals.		
Section 75 Screening	Screening Completed:	<u>Yes/No</u>	Date:2017 for strategy - additional screening not yet complete In put into TEO Equality Impact Assessment June 2023
	EQIA Required and Completed:	Yes/No	Date:
Rural Needs Assessment (RNA)	Screening Completed	<u>Yes/No</u>	Date: same as above
	RNA Required and Completed:	Yes/No	Date:
Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA)	Screening Completed:	Yes/No	Date:
	DPIA Required and Completed:	Yes/No	Date:

1.0 Purpose of Report

To inform members of the funding cuts being imposed by The Executive Office on the District Council Good Relations Programme for 2023 to 2024 and implications to Council's Business Plan for 23/24 period.

2.0 Background /Context

Good Relations was first introduced into law by Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998, which requires public authorities to comply with two related yet independent statutory duties. These duties were intended to change the practices of government and public authorities so that equality of opportunity and good relations are central to policy making and service delivery.

The Equality of Opportunity Duty can be found in Section 75(1) of the Act, requiring public authorities in carrying out their functions to have due regard to the need to promote equality of opportunity between a total of nine equality categories. The Good Relations Duty in Section 75(2) states;

'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.'

This duty requires that public authorities must be proactive in contributing towards a shared society.

As such, The Executive Office has provided local Councils with funding via the District Council Good Relations Programme to assist in implementing their Good Relations Duty since the Good Friday agreement.

The overall annual contribution from the Executive Office to the Council's Good Relations programme has been £174,452.51. Of this amount the salary contribution has been £106,084.30 and the contribution to programme costs has been £68,368. The total costs allocated in 2022/23 were as follows: Programme costs £90,000. Salary and admin costs £157,480.34. Total costs £247,480 with a total net cost to council of £73,027.

In 2023/24 council submitted the annual action plan to The Executive Office reflecting the costs allocated to council in the previous years *requesting a total amount of £174,452,51 from TEO*. Council's net 23/24 budget is £83,519 towards staff and programme costs.

On 12th May 2023, Council received notification via an EQIA consultation that the Executive's grant towards the District Council Good Relations programme would be reduced by 47% across all councils for the 23/24 period. The rationale provided was that councils were in a better position than arm's length bodies to absorb such cuts into their own budgets.

Officers have significant reservations regarding the impacts these cuts will have on the progress made on good relations issues locally, the knock-on effects on local community efforts and adverse impacts on Section 75 groups. Council submitted a response to the EQIA prior to the first deadline of 7th June for initial responses, attached in **Annex A** for reference. The Head of Service subsequently met with NIEO management to reaffirm concerns and to reiterate the financial pressures are not confined to the third sector and that councils also face significant financial challenges across Northern Ireland.

Council received the annual Letter of Offer on 7th July which states that TEO contribution to Causeway Coast and Glens Good Relations Programme will be £92,459.83 towards salary and programme costs.

As per the 2023/24 business plan for Good Relations, the **total (gross) costs are £252,275**. Council contribution was agreed as £83,519. This is an increase in last year council contribution which is to cover the agreed pay increment and back pay. With the reduction in TEO contribution, this currently means a **shortfall of £74,296.17** (programming and staff) for the delivery of the Good Relations programme as submitted to TEO.

3.0 Impact / Risks

	Action	Outcome	Impact
EQIA response	Council has submitted a response to the EQIA reflecting the negative impact on both the Equality and Good Relations as a result of cuts to the DCGRP.	The final EQIA report has been published by TEO however no changes to the allocation of funding was made. The report states the negative impact on the DCGRP and says that should further funding become available, the DCGRP will be prioritised.	The EQIA report shows no change to the position on 47% cuts to the District Council Good Relations Programme. If further money becomes available at a later stage, with limited time to spend, the GR impact is still negative on local communities as meaningful GR work requires time to engage with local communities to build positive relationships.
GR Action Plan	Prioritise actions within the plan to reflect the reduction in programme costs which will decrease by 47% from £90,000 to £47,700. <i>Annex B provides a the revised prioritisation of projects based on the most pressing priorities and those projects which provide maximum impact</i>	Continue regular liaison/communications with TEO to highlight any issues that arise and the impact of lose of funding via cuts Provide council with briefing papers and funding options for 24/25	This places the GR programme in a negative position where meaningful GR work and engagement may be negatively impacted because of significant reduction in funding. This will have a knock-on effect on local communities who avail of / or are supported through the Council's Good relations Programme as well as having a negative impact on some section 75 groups.

4.0 Mitigations

Due to the significant reductions in funding to the District Council Good Relations Programme, a number of projects have been removed from the Good Relations Action Plan for 2023/24 to reflect the 47% reduction in programme costs (from £90,000 to £47,700).

Annex B provides detail of planned projects and those 'on hold' based on the most pressing priorities and projects which provide maximum Good Relations impact.

There still remains, at this time, a deficit of £34,000 towards staffing costs, however, staff continue to work at full capacity, in part due to delivering aspects of the asylum seekers programme funded through the Home Office for the 2023/24 period. As such a percentage of management /delivery costs can be utilised for staffing costs to help mitigate reduction in budget for staff, potentially reducing the staffing deficit to circa £20,000.

Moving forward, should the current budget deficits remain, an options report will be provided to council in terms of how to proceed in the 24/25 financial year.

5.0 Recommendation

It is recommended that the report is noted and that officers will provide updates regarding any funding agreements and considerations for council moving forward.

Annex A

Consultation on the Executive Office Budget Allocation 2023-2024 EQIA Responses

The Executive Office has undertaken an Equality Impact Assessment on the Department's budget allocation for 2023-2024.

The process aims to avoid any adverse impacts and, where possible, take action to mitigate against specific adverse impacts. The Equality Impact Assessment examines potential options for funding reductions and the potential equality impacts of these options. Please use this form to share any views you have.

Confidentiality of Information

The Executive Office processes personal data in accordance with the General Data Protection Regulation and in most circumstances, this means that personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

Name:	Julie Welsh
Position:	Head of Service, Community & Culture
Organisation:	Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council
Address:	Cloonavin, Portstewart Road, Coleraine, BT52 1EY

Question 1

Do you agree that TEO has gathered the necessary data to inform its decisions around the allocation of its budget?

Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council does not agree that TEO has gathered the necessary relevant data particularly on the decision of a 47% cut to the DCGRP.

CCGBC were first notified about this reduction in an informal TEO update meeting with GR staff on 12th May. This was during the pre-election period which did not allow for political engagement particularly as the council AGM takes place on the 31st May. Given that councils rates and rates grant had already been agreed, this notice period does not allow for council to plan for any reductions on income thereby having impact on council budgets to cover the shortfall that will be made to the salary of permanent staff members and programming costs.

The Executive Office has indicated that District Councils Good Relations Programme (DCGRP) is an important vehicle for promoting reconciliation and building a united community. It is noted as one of the key means of delivering effective good relations interventions. The significance of the DCGRP is detailed in the Together: Building a United Community Strategy which states that the DCGRP 'is an important link between the high-level strategic priorities outlined through the strategy and delivery of community relations locally.' This has been reinforced through the Executive's commitment to the full implementation of the Together: Building a United Community Strategy in the Stormont House, Fresh Start and New Decade, New Approach agreements. Reductions to the extent of 47% to the DCGRP are not reflective of the commitment detailed in any of these documents.

The Executive Office has indicated that the District Council Good Relations Programme is an important link between high-level strategic priorities and delivery of community relations activity on a local level however there is no information that this has been considered in the report nor does the report consider the very positive review of the DCGRP in the 2019/20 annual report. The DCGRP is mentioned in only 2 lines of the document.

As per any EQIA, initial equality screening should be carried out which would include evidence of potential inequalities. With such significant reductions in provision of funding for one particular programme an audit of inequalities should have been carried out and included within the report however it is not nor is this available from TEO.

Furthermore, there is no evidence of a rural impact assessment as a result of cuts and again this is not mentioned or considered in the report. Cuts to this level will have a significant impact in Council with such a high rural area.

The report does not consider that unlike other programmes, the DCGRP is the only programme that delivers locally across all Council areas, is evidence and needs-based through the development of a 3 year audit and strategy, and has annual Action Plans that are approved by local Government Elected Members with a mandate to represent local residents. This is unique to the DCGRP. Local groups and arm's length bodies depend on the local council Good Relations audit to provide them with the necessary evidence of required needs.

The DCGRP is also one of few evidence based and outcomes focused programmes which gives consideration to value for money and indicates areas of complementarity to other programmes and to capacity building.

DCGRP provides significant Good Relations outcomes in local council areas which hasn't been taken into consideration or mentioned in the report. Reduction in funding will result in negative impact on section 75 (ii) as well as the wider section 75 groups.

In terms of targeting Section 75 (ii) impact, Good Relations Audit, previous Action Plan outcomes, identify evidence-based interventions and are not considered.

For example: In CCGBC, the following data has been gathered for 2022/23:

- 64.8% of participants had not attended a Good Relations event before, so we are reaching new people all the time
- 50% of participants said that their knowledge had increased
- 83% of participants felt that the Good Relations programme had played a positive role in bringing people from different backgrounds together
- 43% of participants reported that their attitude towards people of other ethnic backgrounds had improved
- 41% of participants felt that their attitude towards people of other religions had improved
- 80% of participants said they would recommend the Good Relations programme to others

All of this data should have been considered before decisions were made around allocation of budget.

Furthermore, there is no evidence that hate crime statistics have been considered in the report. Hate crime across NI is on the rise and with Asylum dispersal across the CCGBC area this is likely to have impact particularly as funding is being sponsored by the Home Office for Asylum Dispersal to support integration. The document makes no reference to hate crime or newcomer statistics. Considering the number of asylum seekers & refugees recently arrived in NI & with more

coming, the community tensions around this, and the rise in hate crime statistics (which are now at their highest since 2016) both sectarian and race-related will likely impact local communities which may result in civil unrest in some areas. We have already seen an anti-Asylum protest in the council area.

The District Council Good Relations programme deals with Race, Religion and Political background across the entire Borough. With only one community group having staff funding for provision of support for minorities ethnic communities in the CCGBC they are already at full capacity in terms of their delivery. They only service one area of the Borough meaning that the wider CCGBC area does not benefit from this support. When recently asked about capacity building for longer term sustainability for provision of support to Asylum Seeker / refugee led organisations, TEO responded saying they are committed to working with council's in this area saying that TEO provides other funding to councils and others that potentially overlaps here, for example to Good Relations, Minority Ethnic Development Fund, Crisis Fund etc and that TEO will continue to explore other funding avenues. However, cuts to the DCGRF are not reflective of this commitment and will increase pressure on already stretched limited resources and those most vulnerable will be negatively impacted.

Much of the data included in the Spending Plans document focuses on the Arm's Length Bodies and TBUC programmes with the majority of detail on the Minority Ethnic Development Fund. The report does not reflect the value and importance of Good Relations staff as a resource and the work that is delivered through the DCGRP. The report also isn't reflective what is relayed at meetings with TEO as CCGBC are often commended for many elements of progressive good relations work which the council programmes deliver at a local level, with many references to the statistics highlighting the impact GR work locally.

The EQIA references mitigation to protected groups and groups that generate an income; the DCGRP generates match funding through Council and external partners and should therefore be protected. Councils generally provide more than the 25% in monies. They contribute significant in-kind resources, eg. desk space, ICT support, time invested by staff in other Council depts who deliver GR-focused projects (at no cost to the programme), additional match funding over and above Council 25% contribution from other council departments, administration of grants funding via Councils funding unit, Ukrainian refugee response, Asylum Seeker response, assistance to TEO and arm's length bodies in scoring various funding schemes etc. Council's GR staff are always requested to be part of scoring panels to bring local knowledge and expertise to the panel, their role and expertise and assistance to the arm's length bodies are not considered in the report.

The document has neglected to calculate the “opportunity cost”/ significant negative differential impact on communities & Section 75 categories if key staff are lost and the DCGRP programme reduced. Good Relations underpins much of what goes on in our communities & the significant proposed cuts can and will have wide-reaching consequences for other issues eg. economic development. Long term savings on other Government services can be achieved through investing in Good Relations; building Good Relations is an investment to save money in the future.

Data collected from participants on DCGRP events in 2022/23 who had completed monitoring surveys concluded **that a minimum of 94 of those who completed surveys considered themselves to have a disability**. This is well above the average for this group’s participation in any programmes in other areas. Should the proposed cuts be implemented, this would mean at least 94 people with a disability being further negatively disadvantaged by being denied access to Good Relations programmes. If the full impact on cuts to the DCGR programmes was considered in the report, there would be recognition of the negative impact on Section 75 groups would be much greater.

Question 2

Do you agree with TEO’s assessment of the options for budget reductions?

Having studied the Spending Plans document, CCGBC do not consider the range of options presented to be sufficient. Only 2 options were put forward: Option 1 shows a reduction of 11.1 % across all non-ring-fenced business areas with option 2 as using the EQIA to inform decisions on where cash releasing savings could be reached in a way that limited the impact on the most vulnerable people served by TEO. Option 1 is not fully considered with a rationale that applying a fixed amount would have an adverse effect on disability, age and dependants Section 75 categories disproportionately”. No further explanation of this general statement was given as if it was in some way self-evident, yet no evidence is provided, and no inequalities audit available.

The results of option 2, as set out in the spending plan, have a huge and severe impact on all Section 75 and section 75(ii) groups including those with a disability, age, dependants and females as well as those who different community and political background, as well as racial group. And likewise has not considered the wider funding lose through the contributions usually made by council which should be considered as additional generation contributions to local funding.

There should also be the option to look at more equal proportionate cuts to all programmes including arms-length groups and the DCGRP. However no other options have been considered nor has the report considered the value for money in funding so many arm's length groups / organisations and their efficiency / or inefficient spending. **A 47% budget reduction to the DCGRP is by far disproportionate with no detailed rationale for protecting particular programmes in the Spending Plans document.**

At present, CCGBC would have concern in arms-length-bodies being expected to and ensuring they deliver across all council areas. Some of these organisations primarily deliver in the greater Belfast area or deliver sporadically in some areas. As some arm's length bodies are Belfast centric, the decision to cut local funding at such a high rate and not cut arm's length bodies to the same level will have a greater negative impact locally.

Whilst we are aware that arm's length bodies have provided funding locally in the CCGBC area, they often struggle to get applications submitted from grass roots groups and often request that the GR staff encourage and assist groups to submit applications. Only a few groups in the CCGBC area receive funding from arm's length bodies and many depend on the DCGRP to provide projects in which their groups can participate. This is particularly evident in more rural areas.

Good Relations cannot be successfully delivered at arm's length, it must be done by local delivery. Good Relations funding providers including regional and national programmes, come to Council GR staff as the "local experts" to support them in their ventures/ funding schemes therefore questioning why the DCGRP is the one programme to be cut so significantly

The report suggests that particular programmes and arms bodies have been given preferential treatment in the proposed cuts. The report implies that larger organisations such as Councils can afford to "take the hit". Councils are already working within strained budgets alongside the 'cost of living crisis'. Councils are disproportionately impacted on cuts from their rates grants and other department cuts such as those of DFC. Councils are also impacted in their budgets in resourcing and dealing with increases in the delivery programmes to support the cost-of-living crisis, these proposed cuts will have a very significant impact on the ability to provide a full Good Relations service in the area.

If there are further cuts there is also the potential of job losses and lip service GR programme to deliver. GR staff will no longer be available as a expertise resource to Arm's Length bodies.

Question 3

Do you agree with TEO's assessment of equality impacts of the options considered for budget reductions?

Whilst some of the equality impacts are listed, they are not comprehensive. As previously mentioned, an audit of inequalities is not referenced in the report nor is one available from TEO.

The T:BUC Strategy has at times been found to be restrictive in terms of its interpretation of good relations and failing to include other Section 75 groups such as the disabled. There is clearly further progress to be made and a need to ensure that the Strategy continues to work for all communities and to reflect the needs of all in Northern Ireland society. This is not taken into consideration in the budget reductions. The report does not consider how councils have been aiming to ensure inclusion of all section 75 groups. CCGBC DCGRP has been successful in including the wider section 75 groups in its programmes. In 2022/23, 920 people who completed outcome-based monitoring, 94 participants said they have a disability. This is over 10% of only those participating on the CCBGBC programmes who have completed the survey saying they have a disability. Cuts to the DCGRP will therefore result in less programming and therefore have a greater impact on the wider section 75 community. With 94 people being a minimum number. The equality impacts were not fully included with the report and there is limited reference on Section 75 groups which are targeted through DCGRP

- young people
- older people
- interface areas
- ethnic communities
- most vulnerable in communities
- rural communities
- hard to reach

Again, no rural needs assessment appears to have been carried out – CCGBC is a significantly rural area with many arm's length groups focusing on certain areas via receipt of grant applications. Groups are at different levels of capacity on terms of being able to complete funding applications and those that have lower capacity are supported through the DCGRP. Reduction in funding including programme costs will result in less resources to be able to support groups with lower capacity. The need for recognition of lower capacity and capacity building was referenced in a recent report by TEO but is omitted from this report.

With the reduction in DCGRP, there may be individuals within Council areas (where there is a low uptake of other TEO funding programmes) at a greater disadvantage. People of all ages, genders, ethnicities & religious backgrounds are reached by the DCGRP in the CCG area. The reduction in budget will have an impact on all of these groups; and whilst any cuts will result in a potential a negative impact, cuts to the magnitude of 47% will have a significant negative impact across all of the section 75 groups.

The emphasis is on Arms Length Bodies', MEDF and TBUC camps have been the main focus with strong cases being made for their importance with accompanying statistics. This has not been the case for the DCGRP and suggests that it is less important, less impactful and less meaningful.

In CCGBC the impact of such cuts will be reflected in rural areas, single identity areas and areas where young people are vulnerable to recruitment to paramilitary organisations.

CCGBC delivers several programmes in schools for young people as part of the programme. The 2022/23 GR audit suggested that young people should be enabled to come together more easily to participate in Good Relations, reconciliation and diversity awareness programmes. With cuts already being made to Education and Schools budgets, these programmes will no longer be resourced impacting negatively on the provision of Good Relations participation opportunities for young people.

In addition to this the CCGBC area has a higher older population than the NI average. Many of whom are isolated and participation in GR programmes is a means of addressing the legacy of our history and heritage for them. Another section 75 group that will potentially be impacted by the cuts to the DCGRP.

Question 4

Do you agree that TEO has correctly identified all relevant mitigations that could help reduce the adverse equality impacts of the budget

TEO have identified mitigations but failed to take these into account when looking at areas to cut expenditure. The recent audit of Good Relations need in the CCGBC area suggested that DCGRP is best placed at a local level to engage the hard to reach, marginalised and isolated members of the community and those involved in tackling difficult issues. Local groups do not respond well to arm's

length bodies being “parachuted” in to offer short term projects that have less meaningful long-term impact.

TEO have not given the DCGRP a proportionate cut similar to other programmes and bodies or had a 10-15% cut across all programme areas but instead they proposed an arbitrary cut of 47%.

The Department in its plans states that it identifies the following potential areas for mitigation;

“seeking to protect the most vulnerable people with whom TEO works”

Council’s events last year had 11% participant attendees from those with disabilities. These people will be suffering a negative differential impact from the cuts. A 47% cut does not seem to reflect consideration of these issues.

“Prioritising projects for funding where the safety of a group is at risk or there is a risk of civil disorder”.

Currently within the CCGBC area there is an underlying issue with recruitment to paramilitary organisations. CCG ranked 3rd highest with 16 TACT arrests in the 12 months to September 2022 and 2nd in terms of persons charged subsequent to TACT arrests. With reduction in funding, initiatives that focus on community cohesion and community interventions will become less likely to deliver and may have potentially a negative impact in some particular areas within the Borough. Young people may become more vulnerable to paramilitary recruitment and in return issues of civil unrest during times of heightened tensions in some areas may be experienced.

Positive relationships, and trust take years to build up and arm’s length bodies don’t have the relationships that are built locally. The cut in funding may well have consequences on initiatives around community cohesion, cultural celebrations such as bonfires and the facilitation of meaningful collaborative interventions at key times of tension.

GRO’s provide a lot of local knowledge and expertise to these and other programmes and the proposed cuts could mean a reduction in GRO numbers. A reduction in GRO’s will mean loss of local GR knowledge and expertise, this will have a knock-on effect on the support GRO’s can offer in future.

Cuts to DCGRP which may also impact on the staff resource which could result in redundancies. Given that Council’s Good Relations Sections have been tasked with Asylum Dispersal planning and delivery by TEO, with a reduction in staff resources, councils will be unable to facilitate the delivery of Asylum Dispersal programmes with lesser staff available to facilitate this which again will have a negative impact on some of the most vulnerable who are being placed in the Council area.

Question 5

Do you agree with TEO's overall assessment of the business areas where budget reductions will need to be made?

TEO have outlined the business areas which they suggest will be most and least affected by the proposed budget cuts. The rationale provided was detailed in defence of the areas taking the least cuts but lacks any detail on the areas taking the highest level cuts. **The report implies that larger organisations such as Councils can afford to “take the hit”, this does not constitute valid assessment of impact on budget cuts to the DCGRP.**

Over the years, since the implementation of RPA, CCGBC has reduced the staff levels from that of the previous 4 councils employed for developing and delivering the DCGRP. This was done to ensure a more efficient and effective programme is delivered and to ensure that the best use of resources has been at the forefront of Good Relations provision for CCGBC. This proposed cut will have a serious negative impact on the programme delivery but also retention of staff who have the extensive knowledge of GR issues locally.

The business assessment does not consider that DCGRP involves the mainstreaming of GR across other council departments e.g. museums service, events and corporate services therefore the proposed cuts will be more far reaching than just the GR Team and GR action plan.

It has not been considered that Councils are already responding to significant central cuts and cuts from many government departments and it is impossible to absorb such cuts without impacting on rate payers during a cost of living crisis.

Furthermore, it has not been considered that crucial relationships will be lost & underfunding will lead to long term damage. Significant Good Relations issues are still sensitive and need to be addressed (eg. segregated education costing so much, flags/ emblems/ bonfires etc). In the meantime, in the absence of any Stormont agreement, the DCGRP has been 'keeping a lid' on issues in the community – what impact would this have if Councils weren't doing this work? It would be scandalous to lose the local knowledge/ experience/ relationships and who knows what the consequences of this would be on the ground, making staff retention a priority.

With this cut, Council's contribution may represent a bigger % of the budget – will this give councils greater control of the budget?

There is potential for split in Good Relations staff time if delivery must be funded through a range of funding streams to mitigate against potential reduction in staff resources.

The report does not take into consideration the wider impact across other Council departments who provide in-kind contribution to DCGRP projects.

There has been underinvestment from central government in Good Relations to date, yet despite this Councils through the DCGRP have produced a very positive impact.

Question 6

Do you have any other comments you would like to add about this consultation?

CCGBC recognise the need for cuts to be made, however, the timing of the delivery of the cuts has not allowed for political representatives to input into any responses given the information being provided in the election period.

CCGBC believe a more balanced and proportionate implementation of the budget cuts across all TEO programmes needs to be considered.

It is of concern that the DCGRP has not been given due diligence in assessment of potential inequalities in the report on the impact of cuts to this programme in spending plans document given that it is a statutory duty and is enshrined in Section 75(2) of the NI Act. The programme has delivered over many years with significant evidence to provide outcome based accountability. The OBA results provided by the programme have been very positive and demonstrated increasing positive impact year on year on a wide range of stakeholders.

CCGBC believes that a 47% cut is significantly disproportionate with no valid rationale or explanation in the absence of any evidence-based assessment.

The DCGRP programme is grass roots, evidence based on audits of GR issues, delivered locally and approved by those elected in their local areas. The DCGRP is designed in consultation with the community and elected representatives to meet local good relations needs. All section 75 groups are consulted as part of the needs assessment and included in the planning and development of the good relations strategies for councils. The DCGRP is highlighted in the T:BUC strategy as a valuable programme yet it is not ring fenced.

CCGBC finds a 47% cut being proposed for the DCGRP as unacceptable while others are given much more favourable cuts with little impact. Impact of the disparity of cuts on delivery has the potential to have a negative impact on

relationships with other agencies eg. Arm's Length Bodies, unwillingness to assist in scoring panels etc.

TEO consistently highlight the importance of Councils Good Relations programmes with positive OBA statistics being highlighted to us by TEO representatives who commend the outcomes and impact of our programmes.

It has not been considered that the DCGRP underpins much of the other GR and TBUC programmes, e.g. The CRC funding application asks applicants if they have consulted with their GRO in council and very often CRC staff will consult directly with GRO's in their decision to award funding or not thereby GR officers' role is central to Good Relations provisions regionally.

TEO relies on the knowledge of GRO's in their local areas and rely on this when FOI's or ministerial queries at short notice 47% cuts could potentially impact on staff levels who will no longer have the time or resources to be able to respond to such requests for information in a timely manner.

CCGBC would request that TEO to consider the points provided in this response and consider a more considered, evidence based rationale to budget cuts in order to protect Section 75 groups and to protect local communities in disadvantaged and rural areas, and support local communities, working alongside councils to address grass roots Good Relations issues.

	Proceed with some budget revisions	ANNEX B		
	Hold and may proceed should further funding become available			
	Do not proceed unless full programme budget is available			
Project	Outputs	Budget	Revised budget to reflect cuts	Rationale
CCG1	Memorials Policy			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 x EQIA Memorial Policy 	£10,000	£9,500	If DAC approved no public advert for invitation to tender – reduces costs
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 x staff training on memorials after EQIA 	£500	£0	Postponed until next year
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Memorial Launch 	£400	£400	Already planned and in progress
CCG2	Sports Development Project			
	4 x schools engaged <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 x target areas 1 x finale event 200 x participants ↑ in playing a positive role in bringing 	£6,500	£0	Soft outcomes. If more funding secured from TEO this can go ahead in the final quarter
CCG3	Cultural Diversity in Schools			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> min 10 x schools participating 4 x workshops at each school = 40 x workshops in total. 200 x participants in schools workshops ↑ understanding of people from different ethnic and religious backgrounds	£13,000	£5,000	Limit to a maximum of 10 schools. Recruitment of schools complete. Increasing awareness of cultural diversity is a priority due to Asylum Dispersal in local areas. In 2022/23 100% of the teachers said positive attitudinal change towards people of a differ ethnic background
	Community Integration Projects			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 x ESOL 2 x community integration 	£6,000	£0	Alternatively work in collaboration with GR officer working on AS dispersal as well as community organisations
	Diversity awareness / education and training			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 x cultural awareness training initiative 1 x other training initiative that will assist those supporting new arrivals in the Borough (this could be identified according to need in order to build the capacity of those who provide support) 	£3,000	£0	Work with AS dispersal programme to deliver initiatives. Provide support to community organisations. Support BCRC Hate Crime Forum.
CCG4	BUCF and Participatory Budgeting			
	4 x grants	£6,000	£4,500	3 grants allocated as of 30.05.23. Close grant programme
	Participatory Budgeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 x area identified to engage in the project for PB. 1 x Participatory budgeting initiative delivered in conjunction with Community Services department. Minimum of 6 projects funded through PB ↑ in sense of community belong ↑ in more positive attitude 	£8,000	£7,300	Reduced budget will not have high impact on project. Project can still be delivered but possibly 1 or 2 less grants to groups involved. Groups still avail of funding.
CCG5	Arts Projects and Shared spaces			
	Arts 2 x Shared spaces events in arts centres. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 x Ulster Scots & Irish Culture activities. 1 x Samhain/Halloween initiative 1 x Diwali & ethnic minority workshops 	£6,000	£0	Low level soft outcomes
	Shared Environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 x areas involved 2 x environmental projects 10 participants for each project (20 participants) 	£3,000	£1,000	Shared spaces environmental project already planned for areas where tensions increase during cultural celebrations
	GR Week Activities			
CCG6	Ulster Scots and Irish Language			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 x Ulster Scots cultural shared visits, events or initiatives 	£1,500	£1,500	Cultural recognition priority
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 x Irish Cultural initiatives 	£1,500	£1,500	Cultural recognition priority

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 x joint cultural initiatives 	£2,000	£1,500	
CCG7	Community Cohesion			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 x meetings statutory Cohesion • 1 x borough wide site visit 	£1,100	£500	Budget for reactionary resources if required. May be reallocated
	Bonfire liaison / community engagement	£0	£0	Staff is resource
CCG8	History and Heritage			
	A World of Stories programme <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 x Exhibition • 1 x Story Telling initiative • 1 x Exploring diversity via cuisine 	£7,000	£7,000	Continuation of 2022/23 project. Exhibition already produced. High participation levels contributing to positive attitudinal change.
	Peace Heroines <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 x research • 1 x exhibition 	£2,800	£2,800	Complementary to existing wider project
	Written in Ink <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 x research 	£2,000	£0	Can be carried out if funding becomes available at a later date
	Shared Music of Dalriada <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1x residential weekend • 1x public performance 	£3,000	£0	High costs for low participation.
	HMD – Exhibition – January	£200	£200	
CCG9	Developing the voice of young people			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 x co design meetings • GR attendance with Youth Voice • 4 x workshops 	£5,000	£4,000	Civic engagement is a high level priority highlighted in the GR audit / Strategy 2023. Request for in-kind contributions and request for EA to contribute additional if required,
	Youth voice			Staff resource contribution on advisory group only
CCG10	Positive Promotion			
	6 x GR Newsletters (Lorraine will put onto mailchimp) 15 x News Articles	£2,000	£1,000	Reduction in photographer costs Staff resource for compiling positive PR
	TOTALS	£90,300	£47,700	TEO contribution £35,775, Council contribution £9,925