



Enabling Our Future

Youth Intervention
Project

Practice to Policy Report

November 2014



Belfast
Interface
Project



pobal

government supporting communities

Community Relations Council



EUROPEAN UNION
Investing in Your Future
European Regional
Development Fund





CONTENTS

01	Introduction	3	04	Summary and Conclusions	24
02	Methodology	6	05	Recommendations	25
03	Learning	7			
	Appendices				
	<i>i. Cluster Partnership Action Plans</i>				

INTRODUCTION

This report provides an end-of-project account of the evaluation findings of the Enabling Our Future Belfast Interface Project Youth Intervention Project. The report details

- A full analysis of the peace and reconciliation outcomes of the project
- Identification of factors that affected the achievement of the desired outcomes in terms of peace building and reconciliation and acknowledging and dealing with the past
- Recommendations for future activities and policy

Belfast Interface Project

Belfast Interface Project (BIP) was established in 1995 with a remit to identify the major issues of concern to interface communities in Belfast and, in consultation with community, statutory and voluntary sectors, to assist in identifying effective means of addressing these issues and facilitating these processes where possible.

BIP is a membership organisation developing creative approaches to the regeneration of Belfast's interface or 'peaceline' areas. BIP has a membership of approximately 50 community groups from nationalist and unionist interface areas of Belfast, and approximately 20 associate and individual members. The BIP vision is:

.... Of a Belfast in which today's interface communities:

- Are free of tension, intimidation and violence both within and between communities
- Have come to terms with legacies of the past
- Are socially and economically vibrant, within an attractive physical environment
- Enjoy freedom of movement in accessing facilities and services
- Have respect for cultural difference and diversity

To achieve this vision BIP has a number of key aims and objectives, including:

- To influence policy and advocate for change;
- To advocate with agencies and others in order to address issues of safety in interface communities;
- To support interface communities to develop positive relationships;
- To ensure that membership remains reflective of interface communities and that the organisation is managed efficiently and effectively.

In 2007 BIP became a company limited by guarantee while retaining its charitable status, membership-base, and accountability structures. Over this period BIP consistently commissioned research and disseminated publications in relation to core issues for interface communities. In more recent times BIP has developed its delivery to encompass a broad range of areas including providing advice, guidance and practical support in several areas including:

1. Representation on the Interface Working Group (IWG) and the Interface Community Partnership
2. Board and Committee membership (Community Dialogue Executive; board of Institute for Conflict Research, Suffolk Lenadoon Interface Group)
3. Regeneration Projects (Stewartstown Road Regeneration Project (SRRP), Black Mountain Shared Space Project (BSSP), Cromac Regeneration Initiative (CRI) and Skainos)
4. Programme and project delivery (Inner East Outer West project, and Youth Engagement Programme).

BIP has secured funding from sources including, the Community Relations Council (CRC), Belfast City Council, the European Union Peace III Programme managed for SEUPB by the CRC / POBAL Consortium, Esmée Fairbairn Foundation, Department of Foreign Affairs, the Northern Ireland Housing Executive, and Lloyds TSB Foundation for Northern Ireland.

Peace III Programme Priority 1. Theme 1.2 Acknowledging and dealing with the past

The Peace III Programme is a distinctive programme part-funded by the European Union (€225 million from the EU with further national contributions of €108 million) through its Structural Funds programme. The full title of the PEACE III Programme is the EU Programme for Peace and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland and the Border Region of Ireland. The programme covers the period 2007-2015.

The main aims of the PEACE III Programme are to reinforce progress towards a peaceful and stable society and to promote reconciliation by assisting operations and projects which help to reconcile communities and contribute towards a shared society for everyone.

The programme is divided into two main priorities. These are: Reconciling Communities and Contributing to a Shared Society.

It delivers these priorities through “themes” – these themes are:

- 1 To build positive relations at the local level
- 2 To acknowledge the past
- 3 To create shared public spaces
- 4 To develop key institutional capacity for a shared society

PEACE III follows on from the PEACE I and PEACE II Programmes and will carry forward some of the key aspects of the previous programmes. PEACE III has a renewed emphasis on reconciliation. Like the earlier programmes, it also has a focus on cross-border initiatives.

Introduction and Background

BIP’s Enabling Our Future project is funded under Priority 1 – Reconciling Communities and Theme 1.2 – Acknowledging and Dealing with the Past. This theme aims to build upon the capacity of individuals to deal with the transition to peace and reconciliation and ensure that victims and survivors of the conflict are able to deal with the past on their own terms

The consortium of POBAL and the Community Relations Council are the Implementing Body appointed to manage a Global grant of €50 million under this Theme.

The Youth Intervention Project (YIP)

Belfast Interface Project received an offer of funding from the Peace III programme for the Enabling in September 2012 and concluded in November 2014. The project employed 2 full time Development Workers and one full time Financial Administrator and aimed to deliver a citywide, strategic and co-ordinated Youth Intervention Programme to geographically based interface clusters across Belfast. The project focused on developing cross-community and cross-sector partnerships in specific interface areas to reduce youth-led violence and address youth alienation and disaffection in these areas. The project developed and implemented eight locally responsive, integrated and collaborative action plans across 30-35 Belfast interface areas and worked to build the capacity of statutory, voluntary and community based organisations to deal with the needs of young people in each area.

The Project Objectives were as follows:

1. To develop a strategic innovative pilot Belfast initiative which will build positive sustainable inter-community relationships and will contribute to an increase in the positive outcomes of youth intervention approaches in interface areas.
2. To identify the effects of conflict on young people and addressing this by ensuring that they have opportunities to hear a balanced view of the conflict, repair relationships, thus ensuring that youth violence is reduced and the past is not repeated

01

3. To scope existing provision and identify gaps in provision in relation to inter-community youth development support work in interface areas
4. To develop and implement geographical cluster plans to support a more coordinated and directed approach to year-round inter-community youth development support in interface areas
5. To build capacity in local communities in collaboration with other community, voluntary and statutory bodies to deliver youth-centred development support programmes in a strategic manner.
6. To develop a collaborative and integrated approach to community/voluntary and statutory youth provision on a cross-community/ cross-sectoral basis.
7. To share and disseminate learning from the project model and approach, on a regional and cross border basis.

The project delivered the following actions:

- An Advisory Group for the project was set up and met nine times over the period of the project times per year to support the delivery of the project
- **HOW MANY** information sessions about the project were held in local communities and with local statutory and community youth support organisations / providers, youth representatives and young people
- 8 Cluster Partnerships were set up involving up to 35 interface areas across Belfast with each partnership meeting at least 6-8 times per year e.g. one in South Belfast, two in West Belfast, one in East Belfast and four in North Belfast.
- Undertook a scoping exercise in each cluster area and facilitated a series of planning sessions to assess the current needs and to ensure that those not predisposed to peace building and reconciliation will become involved and benefit from the project.
- Planned and piloted integrated, collaborative and co-ordinated approaches in each interface cluster.
- Provided opportunities to build relationships between community and statutory providers in each cluster area and across Belfast in terms of meeting the needs of young people.

Introduction and Background

- Drew up 8 customised interface action plans targeted at young people and agreed these with the SEUPB / local Consortium.
- Oversaw and supported the implementation of the 8 agreed interface action plans.
- Collected and analysed information and data on the outputs and outcomes agreed for each cluster plan.
- Exchanged information on a regular basis on an inter-community and inter-sectoral basis regarding interface cluster specific patterns of youth led interface violence.
- Produced one practice to policy report outlining the learning from the approach adopted the challenges and recommendations for policy and decision makers.
- Delivered a series of cross community and cross border learning seminars.



INTRODUCTION

This section outlines the process agreed by Belfast Interface Project and Copius consulting in completing this evaluative Policy to Practice report. It identifies the methodology and actions that have been undertaken in order to collate raw data and complete an initial review of the programme delivery to date.

AGREED METHODOLOGY ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION/ACTUAL OUTPUT	RATIONALE
Project initiation meeting with key BIP personnel.	Initial meeting conducted with the BIP Director and two members of the programme staff immediately upon appointment of contract.	Used to agree proposed methodology, timeframe for delivery and all related information. All relevant information and documentation was exchanged at this meeting.
Desktop research and review of project objectives, current project status and associated evaluation processes.	Thorough desk research phase considering original proposal to SEUPB, associated letter of offer and all available documentation pertaining the project, particularly all relevant Partnership action plans.	To gain a thorough understanding of the aims and objectives of the project, the rationale for its delivery and the context in which it has been devised. All relevant information and processes and documentation were also reviewed.
Series of meetings and detailed consultation exercises with all established Partnerships	Thorough consultation process with each of the 8 Partnerships that followed a consistent and detailed consultation framework directly aligned to project and letter of offer objectives.	To gain an understanding of Partnership establishment, action plan implementation, young people recruitment, programme delivery and impact on peace building / reduction of interface issues locally. This information was collected from the Partnership's constituent community and voluntary partners directly.
Series of direct interviews and discussion sessions with BIP management and operational staff.	A series of interviews and discussion sessions with relevant BIP staff including the Director; and 2 Programme Coordinators.	Used to gather the thoughts of those with responsibility of programme management and implementation. This included for example, the current position pertaining delivery, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and anticipated delivery.
Facilitated consultation with young people/programme participants.	Questionnaires conducted with all young people across 6 of the 8 Partnerships.	Used to gather evaluation information regarding programme impacts, relationship development, and likelihood of involvement in interface violence, and programme peace building relevance and duration.
½ day information sharing facilitated workshop with Partnership representatives.	Post completion of consultation with Partnerships and young people – a three hour facilitated workshop with representatives of constituent Partnership groups.	Used to share programme delivery learning across Partnerships, promote joint working and allow best practice to be shared across and within Partnership groups. This session focused on Partnership establishment, Partnership delivery, cluster approach analysis, next steps, and programme improvements.
½ day workshop with the programme management and delivery team.	Post completion of early consultation findings – a two hour workshop was conducted with the programme management and delivery team.	The session was used to gather collective and individual comment on the emerging findings. This included an assessment of project delivery to date, performance meeting agreed project targets and objectives, as well as, potential recommendations and future project adjustments.

INTRODUCTION

The Enabling Our Future project successfully delivered on the programme theme output target to engage **32** interface areas in initiatives which address barriers (physical and non-physical) to acknowledging and dealing with the past.

The agreed project output targets and how the Enabling Our Future project performed against them are detailed below.

PROJECT OUTPUT	TARGET	ACHIEVED
Number of area Partnerships established at interface areas of Belfast	8	8
Number of Partnership Interface Youth Action Plans implemented	8	8
Number of Practice to Policy reports produced	1	1
Number of Shared Learning Seminars delivered	4	1

As can be seen, the project has been successful in establishing all of the proposed area partnerships at Interface areas of Belfast, and in producing and implementing action plans for each of those partnerships. Action Plans were produced through a facilitated process which worked with individuals and organisations at neighbourhood level to:

- Map the scope and range of community, voluntary and statutory provision available in each of the cluster areas and identify gaps in provision.
- Describe and quantify levels of disadvantage and need in each of the selected interface areas.
- Collect qualitative perceptions from key individuals in each of the clusters on the gaps in provision and the issues for young people.
- Design an integrated, collaborative approach to addressing the issues, and specify lead partners for delivery.
- Develop a customised action plan for the cluster.
- Assess and specify the resources required for delivery of the agreed action plan.

After a period of significant and wide ranging preparation work to encourage as many interface community partners to participate in the programme as possible, the following areas self selected for the process and published their action plans between June 2013 and May 2014 . This action planning process was comprehensive and targeted. The process took between 3 to 5 months to complete depending on individual Partnership positions and circumstances.

CLUSTER AREAS	ACTION PLAN PUBLISHED
Ardoyne/Woodvale	June 2013
Lower Ormeau/Sandy Row/Donegal Pass	June 2013
Market/Short Strand/Unionist East Belfast	September 2013
Shankill/Falls	November 2013
Limestone	November 2013
Duncairn	January 2014
Upper Springfield	January 2014
Lower Shankill/Carlisle Circus	May 2014

Comment from the Enabling Our Future development staff indicated that the phased approach to developing the local partnerships and producing the plans allowed them to

- Provide greater levels of support to each at the crucial stages of developing relationships between the partners
- Define partner roles
- Clarify the expectations from delivery of the action plan

This contributed to the long-term stability of the partnership and the successful achievement of project outcomes.

Including statutory agency participation 35 separate organisations or services were involved in the delivery of the action plans in across the 8 cluster areas. The table below outlines the community partners involved in the each Partnership area. These groups were supplemented by a range of statutory agencies including PSNI, NIHE, and Youth Justice Agency.

CLUSTER AREAS	PARTNERS
Ardoyne/Woodvale	Ardyone Shankill Youth Education Health Advice Project Stadium Youth Projects Streetbeat
Lower Ormeau/Sandy Row/Donegal Pass	LORAG Donegal Pass Youth Club Markets Development Association
Market/Short Strand/Unionist East Belfast	Ballymac Youth Club Doyle Youth Club Short Strand Community Forum Ballymac Friendship Trust
Shankill/Falls	Clonard Youth Centre (Falls) Hammer Youth Club (Shankill) LinC
Limestone	Holy Family Youth Centre Mountcollyer Youth Club North Belfast Community Bridges
Duncairn	Start Neighbourhood Centre Macrory Church Dean Clarke Foundation
Upper Springfield	Upper Springfield Youth Team Blackmountain Action Group Integrated Services for Children and Young People
Lower Shankill/Carlisle Circus	Denmark Street Community Centre Lower Shankill Community Association Rathbone Belfast

The communities involved in the Enabling Our Future project experience some of the highest levels of social and economic deprivation and crime in Northern Ireland have higher than average numbers of young people and have been disproportionately affected by the troubles.

Each of the action plans contains a chapter describing the evidence of need for the project in the selected neighbourhood(s). In accordance with the 'customised' nature of the action plans, the nature of the evidence presented is influenced by the process undertaken to produce the action plan and consequently the evidence is not consistently expressed across the 8 action plans.

Although each of the action plans identified different needs and different approaches to addressing these needs, a level of commonality is evident across all plans, albeit that the terms in which it is expressed may vary. Common approaches include

- Building awareness of cultural difference and commonality.
- Promotion of tolerance and mutual respect.
- Investment in the personal development of young people as a basis for a longer term, more sustained impact on peace building.
- Provision of diversionary activities as an alternative to anti-social behaviour and the risk of involvement in violence and conflict at interface sites.
- Facilitation of opportunities for young people from different communities to work together on small project activity based on common issues.
- Engagement with 'hard to reach' young people, or those considered to be at greater risk of involvement in anti-social behaviour or on the periphery of, local dissident / paramilitary / emerging gang culture.

One action plan, Inner East Belfast, focused on developing employability services for young people, demonstrating the potential for responsiveness to the evidence of need and the priority issues in each of the clusters, and opportunity for flexibility in the nature of the activities selected in response to those needs and issues.

Summary of Action Plans

In order to fully understand the context of the findings a brief summary of the action plans has been presented below:

Ardoyne/Woodvale

A range of issues were identified during consultation within the Ardoyne Shankill Cluster Area. Those most relevant to the justification for interventions specifically funded through the Belfast Youth Intervention Project are:

- Unemployment due to a relative lack of educational attainment and training amongst young people leads to frustration, crime and drug abuse.
- Historical issues remain contentious with the Ardoyne Woodvale area and that cross community work often 'puts young people off'.
- The project should identify and target young people on the verge of youth crime rather than those who have already been 'lost'. A consistent theme throughout consultation is the focus on prevention rather than rehabilitation, and finding an 'engagement point' to prevent young people underachieving and falling into the youth justice system.
- Young females are perceived to be just as problematic as young males.

The BIP Ardoyne Shankill Youth Intervention Programme planned to work closely project partners in the Ardoyne/Woodvale area of North Belfast in order to target, recruit and retain 25-30 young people aged between 14 and 24 years (with a degree of flexibility at either end of the age spectrum depending on need) into the programme. The programme was planned to begin on 1st December 2013 and run to 1st November 2014. Three groups of ten young people were expected to participate in a 12 week programme at 3 hours per week. The programme was divided into four distinct phases:

- Targeting and recruitment
- Cross community personal development and issue based group work sessions with teambuilding activities
- OCN Level 2 - 3 Credits Drugs awareness qualification
- Cross-community activity residential

Shankill/Falls

The Falls and the Shankill areas of West Belfast are the site of the first, and arguably still the most prominent, peace wall in Northern Ireland. Despite this there have been continuous efforts by those dedicated to working with youth in the Falls Shankill area to build bridges between young people and in this context the work of the Belfast Interface Project has been prominent. There is evidence that Nationalist and Loyalist youths were in conflict with not only themselves but the PSNI and local residents on both sides of the divide. When these young people did engage it was clear that they felt they had minimum contact or awareness with young people from the other community.

Through engagement with the Belfast Interface Project a group of 26 young people 16yrs + of mixed gender considered to be most at risk was identified and engaged in dialogue about the project. The group identified five themes and are committed to exploring their own and each other's perception of these themes through the project. The themes are:

- Policing
- Parading
- Religion
- Paramilitaries
- Bonfires
-

An overarching theme of "Same but Different" has emerged, and has guided activity. Specific activities are

- 2 young people from each community to undertake a LinC (Leadership in the Community) OCN Level 1 with Belfast Activity Centre.
- 9 young people from each community to undertake 2 residentials and a 16 week group work programme leading to the production of a manual and DVD that other young people and youth organisations can use as a tool for when working in a community relations setting.
- 9 young people from each community to participate in a longer term programme of trips and activities to build on and maintain relationships.

Upon establishment of this programme the young people developed a genuine engagement in the programme – one that they wished to take a step further. They did so through by enhancing the existing programme with a cultural identity element that expanded their engagement with others broader than Protestant / Catholic lines to wider cultures.

The young people chose to engage Asylum Seekers as this was a group they had no experience of. Having initially conducted a first meeting between the two groups by video link as they were too afraid to meet in person the young people and the Asylum Seekers undertook a 6 week programme of activities that aimed to challenge perceptions & understanding fostered through the sharing of experiences. This programme culminated in a residential and the whole process was filmed with a 45 minute film being produced at the end.

This element of the programme received an award from the West Belfast District Policing and Community Safety Partnership for its impact on relations for participants. This is a significant achievement in the context of the sectarian and interface related issues these young people experience.



Inner South (Lower Ormeau/Markets/Donegall Pass

A range of needs were identified during consultation within the Lower Ormeau, Markets and Donegall Pass as part of the development of a Strategy For Young People in 2012 and facilitated discussion to produce the Action Plan for the Youth Intervention Project 2013. These included

- Concerns about anti-social behaviour, drug/alcohol abuse, vandalism, sectarianism, suicide, high rates of teenage pregnancy and associated police presence and the area.
- Lack of adequate 'green space' limits young people to playing on the streets
- Relations between communities during the summer months / contentious periods such as the 12th of July where rioting and interface violence have become the norm
- Lack of access to sporting facilities
- Unemployment and insufficient opportunities for training and education.
- Insufficient youth provision during evening / weekend periods
- Insufficient youth provision in the morning, particularly for young people who fall within the NEET population

Key activities include:

- 200 young people from across Lower Ormeau, Markets and Donegall Pass areas to participate in a Summer Diversionary Programme made up of trips, activities within the individual communities and activities at tension hotspots between the 3 communities.
- 5 young people from each of the three areas to form a youth forum to discuss the issues and to shape, inform and guide on-going youth intervention activities.
- A total of 15 young people from across the three communities to undertake an accredited training programme in youth work.
- An unspecified number of young people to take part in diversionary sports activities.

Limestone YIP

The communities of Tiger's Bay and Newington populate the Limestone Road interface area and represent the focus of this YIP Action Plan. The area also locates Alexandra Park with its 'peace gate', a couple of hundred yards from Newington Street. Since 1994, a 120 metre long, 3.5 metre high corrugated iron fence has effectively split this tidy Victorian park into Catholic and Protestant areas.

The Holy Family and Mountcollyer Youth Clubs are the main youth providers in the area which has a youth population exceeding 37.5%. The area in which the centre is situated is an area considered to be at an extremely high level of relative deprivation.

In 2012 a group of young people from Holy Family Youth Centre (Newington Area) and Mountcollyer Youth Centre (Tigers Bay Area), worked on a process of understanding their cultures and being able to identify with their respective and other cultures. Evaluation of this activity highlighted the following concerns:

- Their future as young people.
- Their lack of ability to impact on the development of their respective communities.
- Lack of employment opportunities and basic employment skills training for 16-18 years olds.

Key activities delivered include:

- 18 young people (9 from each community) participated in a residential event.
- 18 young people (9 from each community) undertook a Shared History Level 2 OCN.
- 18 young people (9 from each community) undertook a Peer Education Level 2 OCN.

Upper Springfield

The Upper Springfield YIP Cluster area includes Turf Lodge, Moyard, Springmartin and Highfield, which are areas of high disadvantage and of mainly social housing with some small private developments. Highfield comes close to the nationalist Springfield Road and there is limited access between the two areas. As a consequence the Springmartin Road is home to a peace wall that runs for the length of the road from the junction with the Springfield Road until near that with the Ballygomartin Road. There are a relatively high number of young people in the interface area, with 1800 young people aged 10-24 in the Upper Springfield Ward and 1175 young people aged 10-24 in the Highfield Ward. The research and consultation findings evidence that there was a clear need to increase understanding and awareness among young people to provide a context as to why troubles and interface issues exist, and a perceived need to target the most hard to reach young people who are known to be actively involved in interface related crime and anti-social behaviour.

Key activities include:

- Young people aged 11 – 18 living in the Upper Springfield /Whiterock and Highfield/Shankill areas participate in a 'Common Issues' Youth Project.
- 40 families with young people aged between 11 and 18 participated in cross community delivery involving the physical interaction of families living in Upper Springfield/Whiterock, Highfield/Shankill.

Inner East YIP

The four electoral wards which make up Inner East Belfast have consistently low levels of educational achievement, low levels of economic activity and high levels of unemployment. In May 2013 the Northern Ireland Housing Executive's Research Unit's 'Inner East Local Area Network Shared Community Survey' identified strong community support for vocational skills training, such as carpentry, bricklaying and business administration, for young people from different community and religious backgrounds in the area.

Consultations with both statutory and community representatives revealed that there are large groups of young people congregating in certain areas who are not involved in any interventions in the area and that there are tension points throughout the year when there is an increased risk of young people engaging in rioting. The consultation suggested that employment is a key motivating factor for young people and indicates a need for employability based initiatives.

Following the serious outbreak of violence in East Belfast following the vote to remove the flag from Belfast City Hall on Monday December 3rd, the local environment changed quickly and considerably in terms of young peoples' preparedness to be involved in cross-community programmes of youth work. Local youth workers were concerned that there was a need to engage with young people urgently in relation to the on-going protests and felt that they could not wait until the Cluster Action Plans were implemented before beginning critical work with them. Additional budget was made available through the Youth Intervention Project to address the above concerns and was used to enable the delivery of a 'History and Culture Education Programme' as a critical preparatory stage for implementation of the subsequent YIP Action Plan. Through this preparatory work, the young people, and cluster group members formed relationships which enabled cross-community training to take place.

Key activities include:

- 5 groups of 10 young people: (male and female) aged 16-24 from both communities took part in initial structured one day workshop aimed at preparing young people for training.
- 10 young people (male and female) aged 16-24 from both communities undertake a 5 day forklift training course.
- 10 young people (male and female) aged 16-24 from both communities undertake a NVQ Level 1 ICT.
- 10 young people (male and female) aged 16-24 from both communities undertake a Construction Skills Register (CSR)
- 10 young people (male and female) aged 16-24 from both communities undertake Security Industry Authority license training.
- 10 young people (male and female) aged 16-24 from both communities undertake FA Coaching Skills level 1 training.
- 10 young people (male and female) aged 16-24 from both communities undertake preparatory training towards a City and Guilds NVQ Level 1 in Hairdressing.



Duncairn YIP

North Belfast is considered the most 'fragmented' part of the city with on-going intra-community conflict that creates unrest and heightened tensions. The Duncairn ward is ranked 14th in MDM, 17th in employment and 9th in education and training skills. There are 1,165 young people and over half (544) of them being between the ages of 10-18yrs old. In total there are approximately 900 young people that are at the age to engage with youth providers. In the Duncairn Ward, 49% of children live in poverty. (Belfast North Constituency Profile 2013- Northern Ireland Assembly). The area is characterised by relatively high levels of crime and disorder with for example 26,117 crimes recorded (2011 Census- NI Neighbourhood Information Service) and 831 incidents of anti-social behaviour during 2012-2013 (PSNI statistics).

The project focused on meaningful engagement between young people from both communities through participative and interactive group based delivery where physical co-location of all young people will allow a sharing of common experiences, exploration of difference and practical building of positive relationships).

Activities included

- 12 young people aged 10-12 will participate in a 10 session project based on transitions, focused on leaving primary school and getting ready for secondary school.
- 12 young people aged 12-15 participate in a 14 week cross community programme based on personal and social development. 12 young people aged 16+ participated in a 25 week BEWAC level 1 delivered by BYTES programme. The group will publish a booklet that will house their stories on the peace walls in their community and how they feel about them.

Carlisle YIP

The Carlisle YIP Cluster covers the area around the Lower Shankill, Carlisle Circus locality, a key interface area in Belfast. The area is characterised by high levels of social and economic deprivation. The Shankill Ward is ranked the fourth most socially deprived in Northern Ireland (out of 582) whilst the Crumlin ward is ranked sixth, according to the Northern Ireland Multiple Deprivation Measures (2010). A survey by Lower Shankill Community Association found that only 39% of heads of households were in full time employment, that more than two thirds do not have access to private transport, and the majority of households have a weekly income of £200 or less. The area is characterised by relatively high levels of crime and disorder with the Shankill ward being ranked 27th and Crumlin 51st out of the total of 582 wards (NISRA statistics).

The project focused on meaningful engagement between young people from both communities through participative and interactive group based delivery where physical co-location of all young people will allow a sharing of common experiences, exploration of difference and practical building of positive relationships).

Outputs included:

- 20 young people aged 13-17yrs and 4-5 leaders from 2 communities participate in a series of team building activities and group visits.
- 40 young people from both communities age 16-18 participate in a series of training courses and outdoor diversionary activities in partnership with PSNI.
- 20 young people from both communities age 13-18 participate in practical cross community training.
- 60 young people from both communities aged 13-18 participate in an "end of project" event will be held, bringing together all beneficiaries of the project

Financial spend against delivery

Financial spend against delivery is detailed in the table below:

CLUSTER AREAS	PLANNED SPEND	ACTUAL SPEND	VARIATION
Ardoyne/Woodvale	£16,000	£16,000	0
Lower Ormeau/Sandy Row/Donegal Pass	£16,000	£16,000	0
Market/Short Strand/Unionist East Belfast	£16,000	£16,000	0
Shankill/Falls	£16,000	£16,000	0
Limestone	£16,000	£14,400	-(£1,600)
Duncairn	£16,000	£12,500	-(£3,500)
Upper Springfield	£16,000	£16,000	0
Lower Shankill/Carlisle Circus	£16,000	£14,400	-(£1,600)

As can be seen from the above table, the majority of the Partnerships spent its full allocation with the 3 of the 5 experiencing some under spend. Across the overall programme this equates to approximately 5% of a variance between budgeted and actual spend. This is viewed as minimal given the target population and the nature of the work the Partnership's were involved in. This again is a substantial credit to BIP and the various partners making up the Partnerships. The evidence suggests the decision to allow BIP to undertake overall financial oversight and management of the processes of procurement was sound and justified. This appears to have allowed a more consistent control over spend levels in each of the clusters, and minimisation of the potential for less experienced individuals to obtain lower value from procurement.

Achievement of Outcomes

The Enabling Our Future project was designed to deliver the following outcomes:

- People demonstrate change in attitude towards cross community and cross border activity
- People demonstrate positive change in behaviour towards individuals from other communities.
- People demonstrate improved levels of trust and tolerance within and between communities.
- Different experiences, memories and legacies of the past have been acknowledged

People demonstrate change in attitude towards cross community and cross border activity

29% of young people across all 8 cluster partnerships stated that they had been affected by the conflict, and 71% of young people said they had not been affected. Qualitative comment from young people however reveals that although some young people believe that they have not been directly or personally affected by the conflict because "*I wasn't born at the time*", there was still evidence that were still affected on an everyday basis by family and community attitudes, by limitations on their behaviour both perceived and real, by the way that others perceived and treated them, and by being secondarily affected by the manifestations of conflict between other parties.

The conflicts affect me because...

"Because Catholics and Protestants can't go into certain areas."

"[it] makes us turn against each other."

"I lived across from the riots."

"Family members murdered and I was arrested for rioting."

Young people were primarily motivated to participate in the programme to *"meet new friends"* or *"meet new people"*, indicating that they feel that there are insufficient opportunities at present to meet new people and that they are predisposed to positively viewing the idea of meeting young people from different areas and different backgrounds. This willingness to meet new people pre-existed the establishment of the cluster partnerships.

The activities delivered by the cluster partnerships made it possible for young people to have the opportunity to meet new people from other areas and backgrounds in a supportive and safe setting. It also gave some purpose to maintain contacts and building relationships between groups of young people who may not otherwise have met in positive circumstances. Evidence suggests that young people have continued to travel outside of their own communities to maintain the relationships and friendships they have developed through the Enabling our Future.

I got involved because...

"I found it interesting to make friends with people from a different religion."

"[I wanted] to have fun and get to know people from a different place"

"[I wanted] to learn more things and meet new friends."

"My mates put my name down and I wanted to get involved in a cross community group"

To some extent the Enabling Our Future project has allowed young people to explore negative attitudes that they may not have consciously acknowledged before, and to develop positive attitudes that they had held, but had had few opportunities to express.

43% of young people indicated the main thing they enjoyed about the programme was "everything". Further exploration revealed that meeting new people, making new friends and learning new things were the primary reasons for young people's enjoyment of the programme. Trips away and residential elements were identified as the more memorable activities and those that contributed the most to their enjoyment.

The thing I liked best about the programme was...

"Meeting new people, finding things out that I never knew, filming, and everything."

"Residential, getting to know others and making friends"

"Making friends and playing games."

It proved difficult to identify anything about the programmes that participants did not enjoy. Very few participants could come up with anything in response this question. The very few that could, raised peripheral issues over which they, and the delivery agencies had little or no control, e.g. their project not receiving press coverage, or it not lasting long enough. This high level of satisfaction is likely to be a result of the extent to which the delivery agencies were rooted in the communities they work in, and the skills of the youth workers they employ.

The cross border element of the programme did not reach the expectations of the original programme plan. Initially Finglass Residents Association, a representative group from an urban inner city area of Dublin committed to the programme and participated actively during the programme's early delivery. This group were chosen as they shared many similar issues that inner city areas of Belfast would, including for example, gangland crime and violence, territorialism, and drugs and alcohol issues etc and were fully committed to the programme, however a number of key factors contributed to an erosion of this commitment that limited the cross border impacts as first anticipated – this included:

- Programme evolution – certain Partnership programmes evolved slightly differently than anticipated with less of a focus on direct interface related intervention. For example, Inner East pleased a greater focus on employability of young people who could be involved in interface violence and sectarianism. This move from a direct approach reduced the correlation between Finglass Residents Association and the programme / Partnerships.
- Environment Change – the programme was devised and developed three years ago. In that time substantial change has been experienced in a number of ways that have negatively impacted Finglass' involvement, including; the financial environment, organisational capacity, and differing organisational priorities. The culmination of these factors have minimise the benefits of the programme for Finglass Residents Association.
- Lack of Programme Financial Resources – the programme did not have a dedicated budget to sustain the cross border engagement which it is believed an inherent weakness in the model. It was difficult to justify to Finglass staff / volunteers travelling to Belfast on a monthly basis with little or no financial reimbursement.

People demonstrate change in behaviour towards individuals from other communities

All of the young people involved said that they believed that the project had allowed them to build relationships with young people on the 'other side'. 80% of those involved said that after taking part in the Programme and getting to know young people from the 'other side' they would not get involved in interface violence. The main reasons for this were that they believed that violence was 'stupid' and 'pointless', that they had more commonalities with than differences from the 'other side' and because having got to know real people from the other side they would not wish to fight with them.

I wouldn't fight with young people from the other side because...

"It's stupid and pointless."

"We are all the same and there is no point fighting for things that happened in the past."

"I wouldn't fight with them because I got to know them."

"All of us are the same and should get on well."

It was notable that, of the 20% of young people who felt that there was still a chance that they would get involved with interface violence, none of the reasons given were associated with sectarianism, territorialism or historical conflict. The reasons they gave were more closely associated with ideas of personal conflict, disrespect and status.

This suggests that although there was still a risk of violence taking place in interface locations, the reasons for the violence are less likely to be about broader social constructs like sectarianism, and more likely to be individualised. It may also suggest that there is an ongoing need for interventions of the nature of Enabling Our Future, to address issues of interface violence, whether explicitly sectarian in nature or not.

I might still get involved in interface violence...

"If they talking smack about my personal life."

"In case they sleg you."

"If they slabber."



People demonstrate improved levels of trust and tolerance within and between communities

Although the majority of young people began their participation with a view that conflict did not affect them, it was clear that they had limited experience of meeting with young people from other communities in positive circumstances. As a result, their views of other young people were coloured by some mistrust and fear. On the occasions when they had met in the past, there had been a perceived potential for conflict and/or violence. Even if no violence had taken place or been intended by either side, the perception that it might take place negatively affected meetings between young people from different communities.

The Enabling Our Future project, by working with young people from each community to explore their own perceptions, consider the position and circumstances of young people from other communities and facilitate opportunities from young people from multiple communities to meet in a safe and supportive environment and work together on joint projects, provided an opportunity for all young people to have a different and more positive experience of meeting with peers from other communities.

Comment from young people at the conclusion of the Enabling Our Future project demonstrates that the levels of mistrust and fear present at the beginning of the project had been reduced or eliminated and replaced with a new sense of commonality and shared experiences and issues.

Young people reported that they would be less likely to be afraid of meeting with young people from other communities, and less likely to believe that other young people would dislike them or wish to act aggressively or violently towards them. They took the view that violence and conflict between young people from different communities was not only something that they would not wish to take part in, but something that was inherently 'stupid' and 'pointless', and therefore something that their peers in other communities could also regard as 'stupid' and 'pointless'.

Young people further reported that the thing they had most enjoyed about their experience on the Enabling Our Future project had been the opportunity to meet new people, and that they hoped to continue their relationships with the young people they had met from other communities and to develop new ones as time goes on. The Enabling Our Future project has clearly been effective in producing demonstrations of improved levels of trust and tolerance within and between communities.

Different experiences, memories and legacies of the past have been acknowledged

The project focus on young people meant that their personal experience of the troubles was limited, and hence the idea of the past was limited and in some cases young people reported that they had not been affected by conflict.

Qualitative discussion with young people demonstrated that, despite their perceptions, they had in fact been affected in numerous ways that they had not recognised as being a legacy of the past. In this way, the project has produced an unexpected and potentially powerful method of acknowledging the legacy of the past: by exposing it and making it explicit, it has been possible to support young people to move on from simply accepting the legacies as 'normal' and 'unavoidable', to a new mindset where there is an enhanced understanding of how things came to be, and that these things can in fact be changed.

Identification of factors that affected the achievement of the desired outcomes in terms of peace building and reconciliation and acknowledging and dealing with the past

Consultation highlighted a range of factors that impacted the achievement of peace building and reconciliation, including:

1. The Flag protest – this issue developed in December 2012 and led to widespread disruption, protest and, in some instances, violence across particularly interface areas across Belfast. Whilst the programme had established strong bonds with committed community partners the participation of partners from PUL communities was particularly difficult to secure. This slowed the pace at which the programme was implemented as many people residing in PUL communities were reluctant to get involved in programmes of this nature.
2. The processes involved in the administration of Peace III and the time period involved in draw down of funding to BIP (6 months) resulted in a delayed start to the overall programme. The impact of this was a delay in the impetus and momentum BIP had generated with community partners in establishing the Partnerships, developing action plans and implementing the programme. Subsequently some partners dropped out of the proposed Partnerships.
1. An initial period of uncertainty felt by both BIP and proposed community partners has now been dispelled by the successful delivery of the programme across the eight Partnerships.
4. Original plans attempted to involve relevant statutory agencies in this cluster based partnership approach – in practice this appeared relatively straightforward for those already established partnership groups, but more complicated for interface areas where no existing partnership work existed. This was mainly due to competing priorities for statutory agency representatives and the lack of ability to fit additional time and resource requirements into an already busy schedule at an operational level. However, the programme received significant support at a strategic level from the various statutory agencies (i.e. PSNI, NIHE etc) particularly through participation at advisory board level.

5. At an operational level certain partnerships were required to make links, create additional relationships and secure the participation of additional members to engage and secure the participation of target young people. This was the case of for Duncairn Partnership who created links with the Dean Clarke foundation who had direct links and existing relationships with young people in the Tigers Bay area. Whilst an issue at the commencement of the process this eventually was a great strength of the programme as it encouraged the development of new partnerships and relationships across interfaces.
6. Early in the process some community partners were sceptical regarding the genuineness of the application and programme, particularly BIP's lead role in its delivery. This is not uncommon in an extremely competitive funding environment. However, after issuing an open invite to all potential community partners to participate, a process of self selection was used to develop the current Partnership structures.
7. Local interface issues have impacted the development and implementation of the programme, including for example, Twaddell Avenue and its impact on the surrounding Ardoyne / Woodvale area.
8. BIP had to be significant persuaders given the scale of the programme (8 interface areas, targeting participation from 32 communities). This work involved breaking down initial barriers and really selling the local ownership of the programme – very clearly articulating that whilst BIP facilitated and supported programme delivery but ultimately it was community led. The work invested in preparing and working with community partners allowed smooth implementation of the programme upon commencement.
9. Whilst BIP took responsibility for programme administration, procurement of services and liaison with the funder, which allowed community partners to concentrate just on delivery.
10. Changing needs of young people was a major issue for Partnership delivery given the programme duration. This was eased somewhat by the flexibility POBAL displayed in allowing changes to be made to action plans but the timeframe involved in making amendments was excessive and slowed delivery in some cases.
11. The process involved to change and amend proposed actions was highly bureaucratic and at times lengthy. This delayed and slowed delivery where changes were required.
12. Different communities have different demographics (i.e. fewer young people) that impacted on the ability to deliver the programme effectively with parity, particularly with recruitment and participation of young people.
13. Managed by BIP, the resource requirement to undertake procurement of services was excessive and slowed programme delivery at times.
14. One Partnership set a slightly ambitious action plan that aimed to involve and include a wide range of communities and relevant community groups. This was a new partnership attempting to cover all areas / groups that was difficult in the timeframe to deliver.
15. The lack of resources available through the programme to contribute to youth worker's time to deliver the programme at a local level was an issue that required attention. In the majority of cases, constituent partnership groups were able to demonstrate complementary with existing delivery and allocate time to YIP on that basis. Also it is acknowledged that BIP staff had responsibility to administer the programme, liaise with funder, and procure services thus limiting the additional non-programme related responsibilities / duties for groups.

16. Identified need across the Partnership areas was quite diverse and required a bespoke yet robust action plan to address interface issues. The link between action plan delivery and peace building / addressing interface issues was not always obvious (i.e. the east Belfast partnership's action plan had a common employability focus).
16. The development of bespoke and well considered action plans that met programme criteria and addressed identified need in the distinct areas alleviated this issue. This coupled with effective communication between BIP and POBAL to provide context and direct impacts of programme delivery ensured that the peace building element of action plan implementation was genuinely understood, recognised and accepted.
16. The Partnerships had, at times, to consider and account for wider socio-economic issues that affect interface communities when both developing and selling the programme participation to young people. This was particularly, although not exclusively, true of Protestant / Unionist / Loyalist (PUL) communities.
17. The use of the community activists and elected representatives at the early stage of the programme development was critical to garnering support, recruiting and securing participation of community partners and young people.
18. Young people seemed disillusioned with peace building work in some areas and demonstrated a reluctance to get involved. As a means of securing participation, Partnerships, and their constituent community partners, maximised opportunities to access young people who were engaged with other groups across their areas. Additionally, the process was led by young people (action planning, delivery, participation, ongoing amendment to meet need etc) which was a strong selling point to secure young people's participation.

Cluster Based Approach

A key element of this evaluation exercise was to assess the value placed on the cluster based approach championed by BIP in this programme. This concept of cluster approaches to address interface issues originated from the Interface Community Partners group and this was the first genuine opportunity to test its impact in a practical and live setting. Consultation has indicated the following positive and negative aspects of this approach:

PROS	CONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very effective mechanism through which interface issues can be impacted. • Allows partners delivering similar services to maximise resources to address interface issues across a wider geographical area. • Greater coordination of provision – less duplication of effort and resources. • Attracts other partners/participants that would not have participated previously. (i.e. Carlisle – young people coming from Ardoyne; Rosapenna Street etc.). • Coordinated attempt by BIP to attract other resources to the programme through other complementary programmes (Inner East Outer West and Youth Engagement Project). • Natural reason why they should work together. • Allow wider influence across interface areas. • The network of contacts operating in Partnerships allows movement of young people to be picked up and monitored assisting coordination of response. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity imbalance between partners within PUL and CRN communities • Inability to bring cluster partnerships together to operate across clusters (and greater geographical area). • The cluster partnership would benefit from an audit of service across the interface area thus avoiding duplication, although it was acknowledged DSD currently has a similar programme operated in North Belfast that aims to coordinate resources and access to services.

Learning from Experience

The project and the process of producing this report has contributed to increased knowledge and understanding in relation to dealing with interface violence and sectarianism involving young people. It has also produced learning on the factors that can affect the achievement of outcomes associated with peace building and reconciliation and with acknowledging and dealing with the past.

There was a tension between the dual demands of the programme to deliver work with young people on their issues and to build capacity within organisations and communities. The action plans focused more fully on the former, and this is likely to have had the effect of framing the projects in these terms, leading to a lower emphasis being placed on capacity building. The clearer outputs, targets, processes and resourcing associated with delivering work with young people may have contributed to workers placing a greater emphasis on this element, and to the more limited availability of evidence for the achievement of the latter.

In a few cases, the scoping exercise identified issues at neighbourhood level that could not be addressed within the scope of this project, e.g. lack of access to facilities for young people. These issues can only be addressed through investment of significant practical and financial support to communities. Nevertheless, it was considered a valuable outcome of the project that these needs were expressed and articulated, and that the action plan may provide some evidence to support future actions to attract investment to address these issues.

The relatively small numbers of young people targeted allowed the staff in each project to develop strong relationships with the participants, and hence the quality of the work developed was higher than if targets had demanded higher numbers of young people engaging with the project. Youth workers reported that if they had not had the opportunity to develop this quality of relationship there was a risk that the young people targeted would not have engaged as fully with the project, and may have not completed all the planned activities. It also meant that the most appropriate young people could be targeted and were more likely to be engaged by the projects, thus increasing the effectiveness of the project in addressing negative attitudes and behaviours.

On a similar note, the relatively small numbers of young people participating from each of the communities targeted meant that workers could invest more time in facilitating the development of relationships between young people, and young people could develop stronger and deeper connections with their counterparts from other communities. Young people reported that the smaller group processes meant that they developed better quality relationships with their peers from other communities and were more likely to have changed their attitudes, and to wish to maintain a relationship beyond the period of the project.

A few participants raised the idea that the relatively small numbers of young people participating could mean that the overall impact was on a small number of individuals and the impact at broader community level was consequently limited. They suggested that there was significant value in the delivery a similar project multiple times, allowing the total number of young people who have participated to increase and to cumulatively grow the impact on communities and on levels of mistrust and intolerance at community level.

Youth workers reported that a major strength of the project approach to working with young people was to allow them to set the agenda. Young people were supported to focus on the issues that affected them. This then allowed discussion to focus on experiences and issues that were common to young people in each community, rather than starting from the factors that set them apart. Issues of sectarianism were not raised by the staff; sectarianism only became a focus when young people raised it. This meant that when sectarianism was raised, it was raised at a time when young people were comfortable with raising it, and in a context that they understood and felt strongly about. It offered the topic of status of being owned by young people and so their engagement with the topic was observed to be at a deeper level than if had been a subject imposed by youth workers.

There were some intra-organisational challenges in situations where there had been historic mistrust, tension or conflict between community organisations in each of the cluster communities. This presented some challenges to establishing productive working relationships, over and above that of facilitating positive relationships between the young people in each community.

However the scoping and auditing process undertaken to produce the action plans, also clearly indicated which of the organisations present in the interface communities was best placed to deliver on the action plan. This provided some impetus for organisations to set aside historic differences and agree to work together. This may represent an unplanned benefit of the Enabling Our Future project, in that it has increased the capacity of multiple communities to work together on future initiatives.

One of the strengths of the Enabling Our Future project was that delivery was undertaken by organisations with a history and expertise in delivering cross-community work aimed at fostering improved relations between young people between whom there had been a history of conflict. This meant that, to some extent, the Enabling Our Future delivery could be treated as part of, or akin to, the core business of the delivery organisation. Although this was the case, the scale of the project was such that it did imply some additional work for these organisations, and their contribution in terms of staff time should be taken account of when considering the overall resourcing required to deliver the projects.

Some youth workers reported that despite there being additional resources for new activities, the volume of youth worker time available to support the planning and delivery of the Enabling Our Future programme did not increase with the increased activity, therefore delivering the project became an additional burden to the youth worker. It was not possible within the scope of the evaluation to establish if processes were in place in any of the employing organisations to effectively prioritise youth worker time, i.e. to decide what they would not do, if they were to dedicate time to supporting the Enabling Our Future project.

Additionally, in terms of Peace and Reconciliation outcomes directly attributable to the programme, consultation indicated the following:

PEACE AND RECONCILIATION IMPACTS	NON PEACE AND RECONCILIATION IMPACTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced crime and Anti Social Behaviour around interfaces who participated in the programme. • Some of the early concerns (ownership of programme, sceptical of BIP's lead involvement etc.) have been unfounded and benefitted from key activists involvement. • Reduced incidents of interface violence or if it does sporadically occur, it is managed effectively and typically short in duration. • With direct and active involvement of PSNI in the Duncairn Partnership young people had the opportunity to take part in law and order training which gave them the chance to experience policing and how it is conducted in an interface setting. Additionally, the course allowed to fully appreciate the impact of criminal records, anti social behaviour, and getting involved in interface violence on their future prospects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback indicated that key workers, particularly those living in the communities they work in, invested a substantial amount of time in informal programme delivery outside of normal working hours. As they lived in the community there was a greater tendency for residents and those interested in participating in the programme to call to their houses at night and at weekends to enquire regarding the programme. • Evidence suggested participant organisations and groups benefitted directly from the programme, for example Star Youth Club (part of the Duncairn Partnership) gained 12 new young people as participants (from within and outside the club's catchment area). This, in turn, led to 12 new families participating in youth club activities. Interestingly, these young people / families did not necessarily reside within the area the centre was located in. • The programme has allowed relationships to be strengthened between key individuals / groups / areas who are not typically focused on peace and reconciliation work.

PEACE AND RECONCILIATION IMPACTS	NON PEACE AND RECONCILIATION IMPACTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced crime and Anti Social Behaviour around interfaces who participated in the programme. • Some of the early concerns (ownership of programme, sceptical of BIP's lead involvement etc.) have been unfounded and benefitted from key activists involvement. • Reduced incidents of interface violence or if it does sporadically occur, it is managed effectively and typically short in duration. • With direct and active involvement of PSNI in the Duncairn Partnership young people had the opportunity to take part in law and order training which gave them the chance to experience policing and how it is conducted in an interface setting. Additionally, the course allowed to fully appreciate the impact of criminal records, anti social behaviour, and getting involved in interface violence on their future prospects. • Relationships between organisations and groups working at interfaces have been developed and strengthened. • The level of parental support for the programme has been extremely successful. In total only one parent objected to their son participating in the programme. This is a significant finding given the traditional view of this type of programme in Catholic / Nationalist / Republican (CNR) areas. • PSNI through its involvement has eradicated barriers to engagement with young people and relevant community and voluntary groups. This was particularly relevant and true of work delivered in CNR communities. • The programme design and implementation was intentionally provided over a longer period of time offering longer term support which directly impacted peace building (i.e. young people's involvement / participation) and interface violence (reduction in many areas). This was in contrast to many other interface related programmes which offered short term solutions to interface issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The success of the programme has seen other clusters/ areas approaching BIP to express their interest in getting involved. • A number of the cluster partnership worked together naturally, for example, Upper Springfield, and Falls and Shankill. • The community led process involved in developing the Partnership, producing the action plans and implementing the programme has ensured projects are grass roots and grounded in reality. • There is evidence to support wider employability benefits to young people, for example, as a direct result of young people sampling hair and beauty training as part of the Carlisle Partnership programme, participants have changed their school subjects. The BIP programme has given them a flavour of the hair and beauty environment and they have subsequently pursued careers in that area.

Summary and Conclusions

The Enabling Our Future project successfully piloted an innovative approach to working in interface areas to reduce youth-led violence and address youth alienation and disaffection in these areas. The 'cluster' approach, which supported organisations that enjoyed credibility in their own communities to work together with each other to develop a single joint programme, has enabled the clusters to consistently deliver processes which engaged young people over a longer period, and on projects where they were allowed to meet their peers in safe and supportive environments.

The role of local youth workers with local connections, who know the young people who are most at risk, and who are trusted by the young people targeted was consistently raised by stakeholders, including young people, as key to project success. It is important that this factor is considered in any future iteration of the Enabling Our Future programme, if levels of success are to be maintained.

It was evident from the comments young people made on their perceptions of conflict and how it affected them, that they may not immediately identify the numerous ways that conflict affects their daily lives. Instead, they perceive the effects of conflict as being 'normal' circumstances. This suggests that there is a need and an opportunity to develop new work with young people to open up their perception of what is, and is not, a normal set of circumstances, and how circumstances that affect them negatively, and limit their opportunities can be understood addressed.

All of the young people who participated felt that participating in an ongoing programme enabled them to get more from the project, and that they would like to see the project continued on a longer-term basis, further indicating that there is a demand as well and a need for the continuation of interventions of this nature.



The following outlines 13 robust yet practical recommendations that should be considered by BIP and its relevant stakeholders.

1. The cluster based approach which required an exploration of issues and needs across different communities, and the establishment of delivery focused partnerships between community organisations was the most important factor in the achievement of project and programme outcomes. Further investment in developing the cluster based approach, and capturing the learning available from the approach may produce valuable lessons for peace building and fostering good community relations in Northern Ireland.
2. The scoping studies produced by the project are likely to remain current for a reasonable period of time, and hence may be used as evidence for the value in investing in further iterations of Enabling Our Future project.
3. The scoping studies provided strong evidence of the levels of disadvantage in each community targeted and of the tension between communities. They were however limited in the extent to which they provided measurable indicators of mistrust and intolerance between the targeted communities. Some investment in designing measurable indicators and collecting quantified evidence would allow the development of a more robust baseline from which to measure the impact of cluster based partnerships.
4. The absence of resources to support additional youth worker time limited the capacity of delivery organisations to contribute to the project. Future iterations of the project should consider the allocation of resources to enable youth workers to support the process without any consequent impact on their other work priorities.
5. Community impact was evident, but the time bound term of the project meant that there is a risk of this impact not being maintained over the longer term. Longer term impact is likely to be more fully realised if concurrent or multi-annual programmes are delivered.
6. Young people reported that the educational excursions and residential elements of their experience were the most enjoyable, and the situations where they felt they best got to know their peers from other communities. Any subsequent action plans should bear this in mind and seek to maximise the impact of these activities.
7. Although the project is designed to address issues of perceived difference between young people from different communities, experience demonstrated that, in the early stages, a focus on the common issues and experiences for young people from different communities is more effective in facilitating positive relationships.
8. One aspect of the programme that was not maximised fully was the development of cross cluster working over a larger geographical area. The value of this has been confirmed by participating Partnerships and thus it would be logical to suggest that any future programme would aim to build on the current infrastructure and enhance that with wider connections between partnerships over a larger geographical area.
9. As well as the coordination of youth intervention strategies across Partnership areas it is recommended the extent of this coordination could be expanded and widened to include access to services (i.e. mentoring provision) that could be operating in one cluster partnership area but offered or accessed by other cluster partnerships.
10. To maximise any opportunities to influence policy it is suggested a forum could be established, representative of the various cluster partnerships, to bring together relevant youth work orientated stakeholders to discuss and debate strategic youth issues (with a particular interface focus). This forum could then have responsibility for informing strategic level opinion regarding interface related youth work, which is based on practical experience.

11. The success of the programme has been such that it would remiss not to attempt to replicate this model in other interface areas across Belfast and wider. BIP has identified 15 areas that could be classed as clusters – this programme has touched 8 of those 15. It is therefore recommended that resources should be sought to not only secure future delivery within the 8 existing cluster areas, but also extend the programme in another 7 areas.
11. It is anticipated funding to secure this programme may not be obvious until Peace IV is released. Should this be the case there will be a gap in financial support to sustain this programme beyond December 2014. It is recommended that discussions, conversations and potential partnership work should be initiated now to ensure that funding can be secured when opportunities are presented, whether this is Peace IV or other potential avenues (i.e. Belfast Met, Belfast Health and Social Care Trust etc).
12. An issue that led to limited impact of the cross border element of the programme was the lack of resources to support and sustain cross border activity throughout the duration of the programme. Although very committed to the programme throughout the planning, development and early delivery stages practical financial issues led the partner to question the justification of their involvement. It is therefore recommended that if the programme is delivered in the future adequate dedicated resources should be incorporated into the programme budget to support and sustain cross border activity.
13. The Intercultural Diaries element of the programme developed and delivered by the Falls Shankill Cluster Partnership was a major success of the programme. This happened naturally and was led by the young people themselves. The young people expressed plans to further develop this in the future through an international trip to gain a further understanding and experience of other cultures, particularly to a country where the Asylum Seekers originated from. Whilst the Asylum Seekers would not wish to take part in the travel it would be appropriate to garner their support in the planning and organising aspect of any future programme. It is therefore recommended that an international element should be explored as a potential programme element in any future programme.
15. The film produced as part of the Intercultural Diaries has been used by other youth groups as a valuable resource to replicate good practice intercultural work. The further use of this resource could allow the programme to maintain its legacy as well as offer income potential opportunities to generate income for the Partnership. Although it is acknowledged this may be minimal it could be a valuable source of income nonetheless. It is therefore recommended the film produced by the Falls Shankill Partnership participants should be considered for further development and potential social economy value.





109-113 Royal Avenue, Belfast BT1 1FF

Tel: 028 9024 2828

Email: admin@belfastinterfaceproject.org

www.belfastinterfaceproject.org



Belfast.Interfaces



@BIP_Interfaces