



Procedure file

Basic information	
INI - Own-initiative procedure	2007/2150(INI)
Evaluation of the Peace programme and strategies for the future	Procedure completed
Subject 4.70.01 Structural funds, investment funds in general, programmes 4.70.03 Community initiatives, Community support frameworks	

Key players			
European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	REGI Regional Development		
European Commission	Commission DG Regional and Urban Policy	Commissioner HÜBNER Danuta	

Key events			
21/06/2007	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
27/03/2008	Vote in committee		Summary
07/04/2008	Committee report tabled for plenary	A6-0133/2008	
19/05/2008	Debate in Parliament		
20/05/2008	Results of vote in Parliament		
20/05/2008	Decision by Parliament	T6-0205/2008	Summary
20/05/2008	End of procedure in Parliament		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	2007/2150(INI)
Procedure type	INI - Own-initiative procedure
Procedure subtype	Initiative
Legal basis	Rules of Procedure EP 54
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	REGI/6/50548

Documentation gateway			

Committee draft report	PE396.729	28/01/2008	EP	
Amendments tabled in committee	PE402.797	04/03/2008	EP	
Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading	A6-0133/2008	07/04/2008	EP	
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading	T6-0205/2008	20/05/2008	EP	Summary
Commission response to text adopted in plenary	SP(2008)3593/2	12/06/2008	EC	

Evaluation of the Peace programme and strategies for the future

The Committee on Regional Development adopted the own-initiative report by Bairbre de BRÚN (GUE/NGL, UK) on the evaluation of the PEACE Programme (EU programme for peace and reconciliation in Northern Ireland), emphasising that local empowerment was an essential part of peace-building in Northern Ireland and that the participation of civil society significantly improved policy-making and implementation of local policies. MEPs welcome the contribution made by the PEACE and IFI (International Fund for Ireland) programmes to economic and social development in this region, noting that an enterprise centre established in a deprived area was developed with the support of the IFI.

MEPs emphasise that the cooperation between participants in programmes financed by PEACE and IFI should not cease when the programmes come to an end. MEPs call on government departments to ensure that cooperation continues once all PEACE funding finally comes to an end. They also call on the governments of both the United Kingdom and Ireland to put in place temporary funding arrangements specifically for community and voluntary groups in order to bridge the gap between the end of PEACE II funding programmes and the beginning of PEACE III funding programmes. In addition, they call on the Commission and the governments of the United Kingdom and Ireland to engage in dialogue with the Commissioners for Victims and Survivors with a view to finding a way for victim and survivor support groups to continue to receive financial support after the termination of all PEACE funding.

MEPs also call for the further development of cross-border work, given that cross-border work has been central to the regeneration of urban and rural communities in the border areas, as well as the further development of cooperation between local chambers of commerce and public sector bodies with voluntary organisations.

Recognising that peace-building is a long-term, evolutionary process and that robust development towards peace and reconciliation takes time, MEPs call for a longer timeframe for individual grants in order to allow projects to make a difference. They recognise that not only economic initiatives but also cultural and sporting initiatives can make a significant contribution to peace and reconciliation and should therefore continue to be promoted.

MEPs stress the fact that development in rural areas requires greater synergies between agricultural, rural and regional development funding and between nature conservation and ecotourism. Finally, they recommend that everyone should be better informed of the positive experience gained from the PEACE and IFI programmes, and suggest that comprehensive strategies be put in place to ensure not only that examples of good-practice are available, but also that they are used at every stage of the project cycle.

Evaluation of the Peace programme and strategies for the future

The European Parliament adopted by 603 votes to 21, with 12 abstentions, a resolution on the evaluation of the PEACE Programme and strategies for the future in Northern Ireland.

The own-initiative report had been tabled for consideration in plenary by Bairbre de BRÚN (GUE/NGL, UK) on behalf of the Committee on Regional Development.

The Parliament points out that local empowerment was an essential part of peace-building in Northern Ireland and that the participation of civil society in this process helped to improve policy-making and the way in which society is governed. The Parliament welcomes the contribution made by the PEACE and IFI (International Fund for Ireland) programmes to economic and social development of this region, noting that an enterprise centre was established with the support of the IFI.

Maintaining aid after the end of the European programmes: the Parliament emphasises that the cooperation between participants in programmes financed by PEACE and IFI should not cease when the programmes come to an end. On the contrary, it calls on government departments to ensure that this cooperation continues once all PEACE funding comes to an end. It also suggests that the governments of both the United Kingdom and Ireland put in place temporary funding arrangements for community and voluntary groups in order to bridge the gap between the end of PEACE II funding programmes and the beginning of PEACE III funding programmes. In addition, the Parliament calls on the Commission and the governments of the United Kingdom and Ireland to engage with the Commissioners for Victims and Survivors with a view to finding a mechanism for victim and survivor support groups to continue to receive financial support after the termination of all PEACE funding. It also calls for the further development of cross-border work, given that cross-border work has been central to the regeneration of urban and rural communities in the border areas, as well as the further development of cooperation between local chambers of commerce and public sector bodies with voluntary organisations.

A reconciliation based on time?: the Parliament recognises that peace-building is a long-term, evolutionary process and that robust development towards peace and reconciliation takes time. It therefore calls for a longer timeframe for individual grants in order to allow projects to make a difference, and points out that not only economic initiatives but also cultural and sporting initiatives can make a significant contribution to peace and reconciliation. Therefore such initiatives should continue to be promoted.

?and the development of the social and rural economy: the Parliament notes that the social economy sector is a sub-sector of the voluntary and community sectors, the consultation of which is important in order to develop local strategies and areas. The Parliament considers that

other local businesses are also influential participants and it emphasises that development in rural areas requires greater synergies between agricultural, rural and regional development funding and between nature conservation and ecotourism. The use of renewable energies must also be further emphasised.

Better information on the positive impact of PEACE: the Parliament believes that considerable effort should be made to inform people of the positive experience gained from PEACE and IFI programmes. It recommends that comprehensive strategies be put in place to ensure not only that examples of good-practice are available, but also that they are used at every stage of the project cycle. Finally, the Parliament believes that the experience gained from projects undertaken in Northern Ireland should be shared with those engaged in other international peace-building work. As a result, it calls for the establishment of a database as a learning tool for those involved in peace and reconciliation work at home and abroad.