

SOUTH TIPPERARY COUNTY DEVELOPMENT BOARD

FIFTEENTH MEETING REPORT

Meeting held: February 3, 2003

Members present: 22 (76%)

Chair: Cllr. Michael Fitzgerald.

SUMMARY

The key decisions arising in a member review of the operations and procedures of South Tipperary County Development Board were:

- ❑ It was agreed to amalgamate the Social Programme Management Group and the Social Inclusion Measures Working Group. The amalgamated group will be known as the Social Inclusion Measures Working Group and will be responsible for: overseeing the implementation of the Social Programme and RAPID; addressing social inclusion issues especially those that need co-ordination; and responding to Board requests including the Board's annual Social Inclusion Watch.
- ❑ It was agreed to defer the decision of appointing an independent evaluator and to appoint a board sub-group consisting of the chairs of the Programme Management Groups (Ned O'Connor, Seamus Moore, Cllr Barry O'Brien and Cllr Brendan Griffin) together with Alan Curtis (Clonmel Community Partnership) and Ciaran Lynch (Tipperary Institute) to guide evaluation of the County Strategy and input into the Board annual reviews in 2004 and 2005.

Board members also reviewed the requirement for 'Proofing' at its February 2003 meeting. The Board recommended that the Proofing Work Group review the Board meeting output and revert with a proposal that clarifies the purpose of proofing, what is to be proofed (programmes or actions), and with examples of their proposed proofing methodology which should be user friendly.

The County Development Board **adopted** amendments to the County Strategy as follows

- ❑ Measure 1.3 – Action 1.3.3 (Micro Enterprises) Tipperary Business Advisory Network will be the lead stakeholder.
- ❑ Measure 1.4 – Action 1.4.2 (Town Economic Strategies) South Tipperary Co Council has agreed to be the lead stakeholder.
- ❑ Measure 1.2. New Action 1.2.5 Prepare and implement a **Regional Employment Development Strategy**. (Lead Stakeholder: South East Regional Authority)
- ❑ Measure 1.5. – New Action 1.5.6 Establish a **Regional Third Level Education Forum** to inform future provision of Third Level Education in the region. (Lead Stakeholder: South East Regional Authority).

- Measure 2.2 – Addition to Action 2.2.1 – Help to provide equal opportunities for young people in Clonmel through support of the inter-agency strategic plan and to develop school completion plans and implement the school completion plans in Clonmel and Tipperary Town (Lead Stakeholders: Clonmel Community Partnership, Clonmel Technical Institute and St Ailbe’s School).

A 2003 annual action plan for South Tipperary County Development Board has been prepared.

The Social Inclusion Measures Working Group has agreed that once the crime and security modules of the RAPID process are completed that it will facilitate a county review of the issue of crime prevention.

The Social Inclusion Measures Working Group (SIM) is to direct RAPID Area Implementation Teams to proceed with their work programmes as planned but that any projects requiring funding from the National Development Plan be included in a second interim plan to be forwarded to SIM for either its April 7 or July 7 meetings. The final more comprehensive plans will also look at community development and public and community service integration issues in the three RAPID areas in December 2003.

In Tipperary town the promoters of two projects (housing management and pre-development access training included in the RAPID Interim Plan have received positive responses for funding under the National Development Plan.

The local authorities in South Tipperary have prepared a plan of action in response to the National Spatial Strategy.

1. Review of the County Development Board’s operations and procedures

The key points arising in a member review of the operations and procedures of South Tipperary County Development Board were:

- The people of South Tipperary will judge the County Development Board by how well/how many actions that require inter-agency co-operation are delivered to achieve results that can improve their quality of life.
- The Board meetings are operating well to date. A key role which the Board needs to take on in 2003 is to ensure linkage between its four Programme Management Groups as well as reviewing how well each programme is being implemented. There may be common barriers and problems in implementing actions across the programmes in which Board support might clear blockages. Given the changes in Government department responsibilities, there may be a need for the Department of Community, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs to be represented at the County Development Board table.

- The four Programme Management Groups operated as planned in 2002. The Local agenda 21 Programme Management Group has the biggest challenge in that the actions included in the programme are quite disparate. The two Programme Management Groups who have already met in 2003 have set priorities and have focussed on key issues. In that regard, the Social Programme Management Group has focused on one of the areas where there was delay in action implementation (Travelling Community) and a clear agreed action has emerged that will address the barriers and problems identified by all parties (Travelling Community, public and community service providers and the South Tipperary Forum).
- In reviewing the process of the Board, there is a need to ensure that agenda items are effectively dealt with and do not appear across a range of meetings. There is a danger in the structures that the same agenda items recur at different levels. Chairs play a key role in ensuring that the business operation of the Boards and its sub groups are efficient. In that regard, Seamus Moore, Chair of two social inclusion related groups, had set up a small task group to address the efficiency issue, particularly as a major new task had arisen since the launch of the County Strategy – the overseeing of the implementation of the RAPID programme. The recommendations of the task group are appended to this report. The recommendations had been endorsed by the members of the two groups it was proposed to amalgamate – the Social Programme Management Group and the Social Inclusion Measures Working Group. The **recommendations** in summary are: amalgamation of the two groups under the name of the Social Inclusion Measures Working Group. The new group will take on all the tasks of the two older groups, will meet five times a year (in 2003) to oversee the implementation of the Social Programme and RAPID; to address social inclusion issues especially those that need co-ordination; and to respond to Board requests including the Board’s annual Social Inclusion Watch.
- In relation to action implementation, there were 67 actions in the County Strategy at the end of 2002. Of these 67 actions, 4 were completed (establishment of Programme Management Groups), 40 other actions were started in 2002 and are ongoing, 11 further actions are scheduled to start in 2003 while 11 actions are currently deferred.
- The actions which are achieving the best performance are those where the stakeholders involved have resourced the action with dedicated or strongly designated (main job) staff support. This is the key indicator of stakeholder buy-in to the County Strategy. The Board needs to keep its eye on actions especially if anticipated budget allocations from stakeholders are not forthcoming.
- Despite the short time since the launch of the South Tipperary County Strategy in April 2002, there is already some clear evidence of positive impact in the county. For instance there are three new rural transport services and there are four additional locations in the county where there are full time child care services. But it is difficult to claim that the County Development Board is successful in such a short time. What

can be argued is that the methodology being pursued in South Tipperary is right so far.

- The County Strategy also contained a commitment to appoint an independent evaluator. Draft terms of reference for evaluation were reviewed. It was accepted that the annual board reviews with specific monitoring and evaluation information should be sufficient to meet the Board's own evaluation requirement in the short term (up to 2005). This requirement related to determining how effective is the board's operation, how well actions are being implemented and how well the concerns of individual stakeholders were being met. The Board had access to sufficient expertise between members and support staff to do this work. There was a danger that self-evaluation could be subjective. Independent reviews on occasion might be appropriate. It was also suggested that the Directors of Community would look at the issue on a regional basis. The Board could review the issue again if there was a regional proposal or alternatively further direction coming from the national level.

Decisions:

It was agreed to amalgamate the Social Programme Management Group and the Social Inclusion Measures Working Group. The amalgamated group will be known as the Social Inclusion Measures Working Group and will be responsible for: overseeing the implementation of the Social Programme and RAPID; addressing social inclusion issues especially those that need co-ordination; and responding to Board requests including the Board's annual Social Inclusion Watch.

It was agreed to defer the decision of appointing an independent evaluator and to appoint a board sub-group consisting of the chairs of the Programme Management Groups (Ned O'Connor, Seamus Moore, Cllr Barry O'Brien and Cllr Brendan Griffin) together with Alan Curtis (Clonmel Community Partnership) and Ciaran Lynch (Tipperary Institute) to guide evaluation of the County Strategy and input into the Board annual reviews in 2004 and 2005.

2. Proofing of the County Strategy

Board members were requested to review the output to date of the Proofing Work Group, and a SEHB Health Impact Assessment seminar. The purpose of the review was to examine some of the issues involved in establishing a realistic and effective way for the CDB to use.

The Proofing Sub-Group established in June 2002 had met twice and raised the following issues:

- ❖ Each action or initiative can have positive or negative impacts on vulnerable groups, often unintended.

- ❖ While each vulnerable group or environmental element requires a specific intervention, there is a commonality among all proofing/impact statement demands.
- ❖ Taken at its broadest extent, proofing extends to examining the impact of an action not only upon the target, but also upon the ‘quality of life’ of other target groups and of the wider community and environment. This would include issues such as equality, health (personal, family and community), socio-economic, cultural etc.
- ❖ Much of the CDB work deals with integrated service provision. Would it not be appropriate to have an integrated proofing approach? But how will we do that in effect and how will we ensure that the impacts upon small target groups will be noted without a huge monitoring and proofing programme? We need to decide on the focus on the proofing: is it monitoring small groups or the totality of life or both. (This is a critical issue for the Board to debate).
- ❖ Consultation is vital as it brings the end-user or person impacted upon by the service in direct contact with those providing the service.
- ❖ Monitoring the results of an action can be done on a ‘check-list’ basis which is efficient but we also need an ethos of openness among service providers to consultation, change and impact assessment.
- ❖ What will the strategy of the CDB be in trying to come to terms with proofing? Can we find an efficient series of guidelines, in effect an integrated impact assessment framework, which will help avoid negative impacts? Would investment in a county ‘quality of life’s survey help us see changes in society and culture?

Following a South Eastern Health Board held a training day on Health Impact assessment in late December, a draft scheme was circulated to assist the Board in its input into ‘Proofing the County Strategy’.

Proofing of action	Impact on Target Group (+ or = or -)
Environmental	
Rural	
Poverty	
Equality (nine aspects)	
Health	
Employment	
Has the Target Group been consulted (actively engaged in the design and (proposed) implementation of the action) (Yes or No)	
How will the action impact on the delivery (integration or improvement) of services? (+ or = or -).	
Summary statement on proofing of action.	

Board members made the following input:

- There is a range of publications and systems on proofing (Equality Authority, ADM, etc). Some of the systems proposed are very intensive but it may be possible to devise a format that is user-friendly. For instance when proofing an action – is it in a rural or urban setting? If it (say) relates to training for women (gender) is there childcare available? Is there transport available so that the venue can be accessed? What barriers will there be? To advance this issue, the Proofing Sub-Group should consider testing available models including the draft circulated on a range of actions in the County Strategy. It may be that different approaches are needed for economic as distinct from social actions.
- It is important to clarify the purpose of proofing, especially as proofing is a task being directed at the Board from Government policies. The Government interest is clear in that proofing is seen as a tool to help eliminate discrimination and other harmful effects of policies. But there is little evidence that proofing is useful in a practical sense. There is a need to distinguish the differences between proofing and monitoring. Monitoring assesses if actions are meeting objectives and the way in which they are being delivered. Is the purpose of proofing to decide whether or not the outcome of an action is catastrophic? Or is the purpose of proofing to identify negative impacts and consider if these negative impacts can be mitigated? The proposed model does not meet either of these purposes.
- Scaling from 1-10 might be better than a positive, neutral or negative scale to summarise the impact of an action and to make an overall judgement on the action. The final box might need to contain questions such as: should the action go ahead? If not, why not? Any recommendations re constraints identified?
- There are probably 3-4 key questions under each of the main headings to guide making a judgement on the proofing approach. For example on environment – impact on water quality, impact on air quality, impact on rural/urban setting?
- Begin with an approach that is user-friendly. It can always be built upon. If the Board starts with a complicated system, it will not be used.
- Who is going to use it? Will it be the responsibility of the lead stakeholder in proposing an action? For the current strategy, the responsibility for proofing has been devolved to the Programme Management Group by the Board. But actions would not have been proposed unless stakeholders had already proofed the actions?
- Should the Board be proofing its programmes rather than individual actions given that the lead stakeholders are likely to have already proofed individual actions? The Board could then report its programme proofing outcomes in future annual reports. This would address the issue of mitigation and ensure that the Board is more structured rather than intuitive in its assessment of its work.

Recommendation:

- That the Proofing Work Group review the Board meeting output and revert with a proposal that clarifies the purpose of proofing, what is to be proofed (programmes or actions), and with examples of their proposed proofing methodology which should be user friendly (either one programme proofed or one action in each programme proofed using the methodology).

3. Implementation and amendments to the County Strategy

Economic Programme

The Economic Programme Management Group met on January 14 and reviewed the implementation of actions. Priorities for 2003 were established and these will be presented to the County Development Board at the April Board meeting. Two changes in lead stakeholders of actions in the County Strategy were agreed and two additions to the County Economic Strategy are proposed.

Decision: The following recommendations were adopted by the Board:

Changes in lead stakeholders:

Measure 1.3 – Action 1.3.3 (Micro Enterprises) Tipperary Business Advisory Network replaces the Local Development Company Network as the lead stakeholder.

Measure 1.2 – Action 1.4.2 (Town Economic Strategies) South Tipperary Co Council has agreed to be the lead stakeholder (action not formally allocated in published strategy but in domain of the Economic Programme Management Group).

Addition to the County Strategy – Economic Programme. Measure 1.2 Matching Skills with Jobs. Action 1.2.5 Prepare and implement a **Regional Employment Development Strategy**. (Lead Stakeholder: South East Regional Authority).

(The regional action arises from a successful bid by SERA under the European Union's Article 6 initiative and attracted a €352,799 grant. The matching funding element is made up of personnel costs from a range of stakeholders and cash contributions of €7,000 from the six main local authorities in the region. A steering group for the Project has been set up (Chaired by the Regional Manager of FAS) and a project co-coordinator should be in place by March 1, 2003).

Addition to the County Strategy – Economic Programme. Measure 1.5 Sectoral Strategies. Action 1.5.6 Establish a **Regional Third Level Education Forum** to inform future provision of Third Level Education in the region. (Lead Stakeholder: South East Regional Authority).

(As part of the consultation process for the County Strategy, the Directors of Community and Enterprise in the South East had suggested a common action to request the third level

institutes to participate in a forum to examine the needs of third level education in the region and the ways such education might be provided in a coherent and integrated way. An initial meeting between the Directors and the Third Level Institutes was held in Kilkenny in December 2002, arising from which, it was agreed that the proposed forum should formally become a SERA sub-group and would also inform the evolution of two tasks which SERA has to carry out in 2003 - the Regional Economic Strategy and the Regional Planning Guidelines. The SERA Director has agreed to chair the forum. The initial meeting also carried out a market analysis of third level provision and identified a series of issues for the Forum to address).

Social Programme

The Board also noted a clarification on the wording on Action 2.2.1 to read:

- ✓ Measure 2.2 – Addition to Action 2.2.1 – Help to provide equal opportunities for young people in Clonmel through support of the inter-agency strategic plan and to develop school completion plans and implement the school completion plans in Clonmel and Tipperary Town

Co-ordinating partners: Clonmel Community Partnership, Clonmel Technical Institute and St Ailbe's School.

4. Other Information

New members of the County Development Board include: Cllr Patsy Murphy (Urban Local authorities Nominee) and Ciaran Lynch (Tipperary Institute).

All the projects approved under CLAR in 2002 have been completed with the exception of a small water scheme upgrading in Clogher DED. This latter project will be completed by the end of February 2003.

The three Interim Rapid Plans for Carrick on Suir, Clonmel and Tipperary Town have been endorsed by the Social Inclusion Measures Working Group and submitted to ADM in Dublin. In Tipperary town the promoters of two projects included in the RAPID Interim Plan have received positive responses:

code: ST-TIPP-001

title: "Housing Management Initiative"

agency: Tipperary Town Council

dept: DoELG

allocation: 7,500eu

code: ST-TIPP-006

title: "Knockanrawley Resource Centre Pre-Development Access Training"

agency: FAS

dept: Education and Science
allocation: 10 places x 240 hours.

An end of year RAPID report has been submitted to ADM on behalf of the Social Inclusion Measures Working Group (the report is available from pat.holland@southtippcoco.ie on request). ADM has set dates for further RAPID submissions under measures relating to the National Development Plan. The final plan has to be submitted by July 2003, which is not in accord with the work programmes recommended by the Director and endorsed by the Area Implementation Teams (final plan target date: December 2003). The Social Inclusion Measures Working Group (SIM) accepted the Director's recommendation that the Area Implementation Teams be directed to proceed with their work programmes as planned but that any projects requiring funding from the National Development Plan be included in a second interim plan to be forwarded to SIM for either its April 7 or July 7 meetings. The final more comprehensive plans will also look at community development and public and community service integration issues in the three RAPID areas in December 2003.

Since October 2002, the main focus of the RAPID Area Implementation Teams has been on the physical and environmental improvements. Task groups on this module have been working actively to recommend priorities for inclusion in the final Rapid Plans. Other work has focused on building community support structures and each Area Implementation has been provided with a budget (€44,500 between the three towns) to support agreed actions in community capacity building. Clonmel Community Partnership, Waterford LEADER Partnership and Tipperary Town Council have agreed to handle the administration of the capacity building budgets.

A submission on behalf of South Tipperary County Development Board was made to the National Crime Council's Consultation Paper on tackling the underlying causes of crime. The main recommendation in the consultation paper was the establishment of an independent local crime partnership. An amendment was proposed in the submission: that if a partnership approach is being adopted, the partnership should be led (serviced) by an existing key local partner. This could be agreed at the level of the Social Inclusion Measures Working Group in each county/city. (Copies of the submission are available on request from pat.holland@southtippcoco.ie). The Social Inclusion Measures Working Group has agreed that once the crime and security modules of the RAPID process are completed that it will facilitate a county review of the issue.

The Task Force (on the Integration of Local Government and Local Development Systems) has carried out a review of the CDB strategies. It has recommended that each CDB prepare and submit an 2003 annual action plan and also to select and report on the progress of two actions that specifically relate to the integration of services. The 2003 annual action plan report is based on the outcomes of Programme Management Group meetings held in Autumn 2002 (and the Economic Programme Management Group, which met in January 2003). The actions selected in relation to integration of services will include the Rapid action (2.2.8). (A copy of the 2003 Annual action Plan is available from breda.oconnor@southtippcoco.ie).

NDP Equal opportunities Childcare Programme update (at December 9, 2002) - 52 grants have been approved at an NDP cost of €3,371,773. If all these grants are drawn down, it is projected that:

- Number of full time childcare places in the county will increase by 158
- Number of sessional childcare places will increase by 169
- Number of full time staff will increase by 33
- Number of part time staff will increase by 15.

There were 5039 births in the county between 1997 and 2001.

The local authorities in South Tipperary have prepared a plan of action in response to the National Spatial Strategy following a joint meeting on February 3. (Copies of the plan of action are available from breda.oconnor@southtippcoco.ie).

Submissions are currently invited to a review of Community Employment Schemes and should be addressed to Sean Gorman, Assistant Secretary, Department of Enterprise Trade and Employment, Davitt House, Adelaide Road, Dublin 2.