

External evaluation of Access Europe: final report

by Brian Harvey

February 2018

*Brian Harvey Social Research
40 Templeville road, Templeogue
Dublin 6W, Ireland
Tel 00 353 1 4903039
e-mail: brharvey@eircom.net*

Executive summary and key judgments

This is the second and concluding report of a two-part evaluation carried out of Access Europe over 2016-2018. The role of Access Europe was to be a point of technical expertise to assist Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in both parts of Ireland to obtain European funding. Access Europe did so through the provision of a website; training; grants scheme; newsletter and publications; advice, information and liaison. Access Europe was delivered by between 1 and 1.2 Full Time Equivalent staff, with governance by a steering committee. A high level of human resources was applied to both. The budget for this time-limited project was €387,150 for three years.

Access Europe exceeded its headline targets by helping NGOs to bring in over €22.53m of funding (against a target of €15m to €22.5m), with 74 applications filed (target: 40), attracting 50 members (target: 35). Members and training participants rated their experience positively. The principal learning from the evaluation was that:

- Costs were over-estimated, with membership income, grant applications, data and office costs much less than expected;
- The most valuable form of assistance to members was not, as expected, the grants scheme, but one-to-one advice and training;
- Metrics were insufficient to measure the full scale of its operation.

Access Europe was successful in building the capacity of members to access European funding and devise strategies to do so, but a gap was identified in building capacity for financial, reporting and auditing management. The European funding environment degraded during the period of its operation, making Access Europe's achievement the more remarkable.

Although Access Europe has in Ireland been mainstreamed into The Wheel, the idea of a dedicated point of expertise on European funding for NGOs has yet to find a home in Northern Ireland. Although the original design of Access Europe expected it to leave behind a network to influence European funding, this was not factored into its operations and not done. The evaluation concluded that there is a community of interest in European funding that has the potential to form such a network and this could be the project's legacy.

Table of contents

Executive summary and key judgments	4
Terms of reference	5
Method	5
Acknowledgements	6
1 Profile of Access Europe	7
1.1 Financial and human resources	8
1.2 Website	9
1.3 Training	10
1.4 Grants	11
1.5 Newsletter and publications	11
1.6 Advice, information and liaison	12
1.7 Governance	13
1.8 Conclusions	13
2 Assessment	14
2.1 Funding	14
2.2 Training	15
2.3 Grants	16
2.4 Members	17
2.5 Governance	18
2.6 Conclusions	19
3 Issues arising	20
3.1 Assessment against original objectives	20
3.2 Low rate of applications for grants	21
3.3 Learning about European funding	21
3.4 The future of Access Europe	22
3.5 Metrics and documentation	24
3.6 Conclusions	
4 Legacy	25
4.1 Access Europe as a model	25
4.2 Leaving something behind	26
4.3 Final remarks	27

Tables

1	Projected income 2014-7, €	28
2	Projected spending, 2014-7 €	28
3	Spending, April 2016 - December 2017, £	29
4	Bespoke training and information	30
5	Training events	31
6	Grants provided	32
7	Briefs provided	33
8	Advice, information and liaison work	34
9	Promotional and third party events, 2017	35
10	Funding successfully generated	36
11	Unsuccessful applications	37
12	Applications submitted without outcome so far	38
13	Incomplete applications considered/prepared	39
14	Training evaluations	40

Terms of reference

Access Europe was funded by Atlantic Philanthropies from 2013 to end 2017. Access Europe asked for an evaluation to test its ability to increase:

- The levels of EU funding available to Irish organizations;
- The profile and impact of the work of organizations as a result of increased collaboration with national and EU policy makers and organizations from other EU Member States;
- The capacity of Irish organizations to access and manage EU and other sources of funding.
- The opportunities for shared learning across organizations accessing EU funding.

Specifically, Atlantic's letter of offer expected organizations to submit up to 40 applications and attract between €5m and €7.5m a year over the three years (total €15m to €22.5m); an increased impact and profile of the organizations participating; at least 35 members and their increased capacity; and shared learning. The objective was to leave behind a network of organizations and a sustainable database.

The researcher provided a first, interim report in October 2016 which reviewed progress up to that point. The purpose of this second stage of the evaluation is to provide a concluding, early 2018 report, reviewing the project and model as a whole. It draws from, but avoids unnecessary repetition of, the interim report, to which readers are referred for a more detailed examination of the earlier period.

Chapter 1 profiles Access Europe, while chapter 2 makes an assessment of tests listed above. Chapter 3 deals with issues arising from the operation of Access Europe and chapter 4 comes to conclusions.

Method

This evaluation was carried out by;

- Documentary examination of:
 - Grants programme;
 - Products (e.g. newsletter);
 - Records (e.g. information and training sessions; financial statements; advice provided; website analytics).
- Interview programme with:
 - Staff (3);
 - Steering committee (5); and
 - Grant beneficiaries (1);
- Survey of new members (6).

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank the following who assisted in the provision of information, by responding to the survey and by interview.

Personal interview: Hugh Quigley; Deirdre Finlay; Emma Murtagh; Siobhan Fitzpatrick; Noel McAllister.

Telephone interview: Pauline McClenaghan; Catherine Hickey, Liam Herrick, Brian Killoran, Sinead Keogh.

Survey: Denis Duggan, Macra na Feirme; Roisin Coulter, Hospice Foundation; Jennifer Harris Hennebry, One World Foundation.

I am especially grateful to Emma Murtagh for her work in compiling the figures supplied in the tables.

1 Profile of Access Europe

Access Europe was an initiative of Atlantic Philanthropies and 13 civil society organizations in both parts of Ireland in 2013.¹ Set in the context of the winding down of the work of Atlantic Philanthropies, its purpose was to provide support for Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) to assist them to extend their funding from the European Union (EU).

Access Europe worked from July 2014 to December 2017. Its work comprised a website on European funding issues; telephone and personal information and advice; publications and newsletters; training programme; and grant scheme (max €1,000), which funded organizations to prepare EU funding proposals (e.g. technical assistance, identify partners); or access to policy makers (e.g. meet officials, stakeholders, attend conferences) with a view to participation in European programmes. Members paid a fee of €100 and membership was small but stable (45 in 2016, 50 at the concluding point). Access Europe was governed by a steering committee which met quarterly.² To use a commercial analogy, the Unique Selling Point (USP) of Access Europe was as a single point of technical expertise for NGOs interested to attract European Union funding.

From an organizational point of view, its work may be divided into two stages. For the period July 2014 to autumn 2016, there was a bilocated full-time manager, hosted by two member organizations, Early Years in Belfast and the Immigrant Council of Ireland in Dublin.³ From early 2017 to closure, it was hosted in Belfast by Early Years and in Dublin by The Wheel. The Wheel was responsible for the website, publications, training and grants, while Early Years managed accounts and governance (the steering committee). Both provided information and advice. Atlantic Philanthropies funding concluded at the end of 2017, with a final steering committee meeting scheduled for February 2018.

The work of Access Europe is first reviewed under its resources (1.1) before examining its principal activities and products: website (1.2); training (1.3); grants (1.4); newsletter and publications (1.5).

¹ These were the Immigrant Council of Ireland (ICI), Free Legal Advice Centres (FLAC), Irish Council for Civil Liberties (ICCL), Irish Penal Reform Trust (IPRT), Barnardos, Foroige, Age and Opportunity, Early Years, Law Centre NI, Committee on the Administration of Justice (CAJ), Lifestart Foundation, National Energy Action (NEA), Age Sector Platform.

² Siobhan Fitzpatrick (Early Years); Hugh Quigley (chairperson); Karen Ciesielski, later Liam Herrick (ICCL); Catherine Hickey (FLAC); Pauline McClenaghan (Lifestart); Jennifer Greenfield (Law Centre NI); Brian Killoran (ICI).

³ Laurent Aldenhoff.

1.1 Financial and human resources

The size of the Access Europe project was €387,150 for the three-year period July 2014 to end June 2017. In practice, the project operated over a timeline about six months behind this schedule, effectively starting in 2015 and concluding end 2017, with some financial and organizational matters to be finished early in 2018.

Of the income of €387,150, some €300,000 took the form of grant-aid from Atlantic Philanthropies, with the balance to come from membership (€25,500) and from matching funding from organizations grant-aided under the two grant schemes (€43,650 and €18,000 respectively). The three year budget was detailed in table 1.

Projected spending was balanced at €387,150, of which the principal element, just under half, was staffing (€180,000). The next largest heading was the two grant programmes, which accounted for €123,875 of anticipated spending, or 32% of total anticipated spending. Next came travel, 11.6%; office, 11.3% and then database, 7.4% (full details in table 2).

If we compare the actual spending to that which had been projected, there were some significant differences. Analysis of the resourcing is complicated by different schedules being applied by Atlantic Philanthropies (calendar years) and the fiscal agent, Early Years (April to March), by different currencies (€ and £ respectively) and by different headings applied to accounts compared to the programme budget. The interim report provided details of projected and actual spending up to autumn 2016, while this report is able to provide audited accounts for April 2016 to March 2017, unaudited for April-December 2017.

Both income and spending budgets fell far short of those anticipated:

- Membership income, anticipated at €7,500 in 2015 and €9,000 in 2016 and 2017 each, in practice was only £2,246, £546 and £75 respectively. In the light of impending closure, the collection of subscriptions from members halted in April 2017. The fixing of the most appropriate fee proved problematical: the €100 fee took disproportionate time to collect, but a higher fee might not have been collectable at all. It is likely that the ability or preparedness of organizations to fund Access Europe was over-estimated;
- Demand for grants, originally anticipated at €123,875, came in at €7,700. As a result, the matching income from the beneficiary organizations was correspondingly reduced;
- Instead of the planned database, it was decided to update an existing guide to European funding, the much lower cost of which was subsumed into the 'office' heading;

- The 'office' heading included falling costs (e.g. telephone, fax, copying) and the replacement of published by paperless products (e.g. newsletter);
- The only area where funding increased was travel costs, which were higher than originally budgeted, attributed to staff investing time in meeting members individually and in developing training.

Overall, the original budget proved to be an over-estimate. The funding analysis tells us something interesting, which is that the costs of providing this form of support for voluntary and community organizations to participate in European funding was less than imagined. Second - and this is confirmed by the increased travel budget - the most valued form of support for members was not financial (i.e. grants) but took the form of personal, one-to-one advice and training.

The human resources available to Access Europe were substantial, comprising a steering committee of senior members of well-established voluntary organizations (footnote 2), including a chairperson who had worked in the Commission and had a long-standing reputation for his experience in and knowledge of European issues. On the staff side, in the first period, there was a high-qualified, multilingual manager who had worked both for the European institutions and NGOs. In the second period, the staff assigned by The Wheel in Dublin both had strong backgrounds, skills and expertise in European issues and the non-governmental community. The Early Years manager in Belfast was a long-established, well-known, voluntary sector leader, assisted by the organization's policy officer, an expert in contemporary political issues with previous experience in the Highland Council.⁴ The total human resource commitment in the closing period was 1.2 Full Time Equivalent (FTEs).⁵ Access Europe also benefitted from a *pro bono* contribution by trainer Sean McCarthy, who provided free a course normally charged at €475 per participant, with 50 copies of *How to write a competitive Horizon 2020 proposal* (normally €100 each).

1.2 Website

The site had a straightforward, simple, clean appearance from the start and was revised August 2017. At its conclusion, Access Europe had a seven-page website with headings *Home* (outlining its purpose); *About us* (which listed the original 13 members, with biographies and photographs of the chairperson and Wheel staff), *Getting started* (which provided a purpose-written guide to European funding and *European Development Plan* template to download); *EU opportunities* (funds currently open), *Events* (forthcoming

⁴ Oliver, Quintin: *Early years crossing boundaries - 50 years of ambition for young children*. Belfast, Early Years, 2015.

⁵ In Early years, Siobhan Fitzpatrick (1 day/week), Noel Mc Allister (1.5) and Audrey Rainey (0.5) (3 days a week or 0.6 FTE) FTE; in The Wheel by Deirdre Finlay (0.5 day/week) and Emma Murtagh (2.5 days/week) (3 days/week, or 0.6 FTE).

training), *Newsletter* (invitation to subscribe and archive of past issues); and *Contact*. Some of these pages had additional resources to download, notably *Horizon 2020*. Toward the end, *EU opportunities* was linked to the Wheel's *Fundingpoint* site, thus greatly increasing its reach. Information from Access Europe was also circulated through The Wheel's site and e-mail system, such as *Newswheel* (5,000 subscribers). For example, the Ireland-Wales INTERREG call was circulated to all Wheel members in the appropriate border region (3,021). There are monthly website figures for two periods: 24th September - 23rd October 2016 (429 unique visitors and 1,130 page views); and December 2017 (1,208 visitors, 2,028 page views), showing more than a doubling in traffic. At the end, its Twitter had 96 followers.

1.3 Training

Access Europe provided both themed training open to all members and tailored training for individual organizations. These comprised

- Six bespoke themed training events for individual members (table 4), though numbers were not recorded;
- 528 participants in 24 training events, or an average of 22 each, open to all members (table 5). Participation varied from four to as high as 46, so there was a combination of small, medium and large attendances.

Training events were initially balanced between north and south, but south-only from 2017, although northern participants travelled to events in Dublin and Louth.

The slides are an unpublished product of these sessions and constitute a substantial in-house resource.⁶ 14 sets of slides are available but have not been posted.⁷ A number of training templates were developed and posted on the site: *European Development Plan, Getting started* (5-point plan), *Horizon 2020 on-line course* and *Partner-finding tools and portal*.

⁶ *Connected communities*, webinar, 1st December 2017; *Erasmus+ application workshop*, Dublin, 8th August 2017; Deirdre Clune MEP, Cork, 24th February 2017; Hugh Quigley (two presentations), Limerick, 7th April, 2017; *Europe for Citizens*, Galway, 26th July 2017; *Europe for Citizens*, 7th December, 2017; *Creative Europe, Building a successful proposal, Erasmus+, Europe for Citizens*, Galway, 7th June 2017; *Horizon 2020*, Dublin, 18th July 2017; *EU funding - a refresher, Partnership building, Developing partnerships*, Dublin, 20th June 2017

⁷ Although most slides belong to Access Europe or The Wheel on its behalf, a small number are by external presenters and their posting may require their permission.

1.4 Grants

Grants were made available on a first-come, first-served basis. Eight grants were provided, with a total value of €7,700 (table 6). Although the guideline figure was €1,000, in practice there was some variation on this. No proposals were turned down, nor was less provided than what was requested. Although the original project design envisaged that grants would be one of its most important activities, with 22% of funds allocated thereto, in the event it was minor and the last year, 2017, saw only one grant application in the whole year. The increase of grant size to €2,000, following the recommendation of the interim report, did not in practice lead to increased demand. Only one grant allocated was in Northern Ireland (Early Years).

1.5 Newsletters and publications

From March 2015 to January 2018, the Access Europe newsletter was published 32 times. The original newsletter was published 27 times, averaged 13 pages, outlined information on funding prospects (calls due or expected), with links to their websites. The language was straightforward (e.g. *What does it fund?*), making it suitable for people not closely familiar with the area and gave the key details of funding schemes (e.g. size, maximum size of grant available, level of co-funding, closing dates, number of partners required). Newsletters were automatically sent to members, those who requested it on site, or may be downloaded from the website by non-members. Circulation rose over time, from 156 readers at the time of the first newsletter (March 2015) to 635 at the end (end 2017). Collating the newsletter was a time-consuming process, as not all information was online and it required research, checking and vigilance.

From summer 2017, the newsletter was reduced to two pages and new calls posted directly onto the *EU Funding* section of the website, both for convenience and to drive traffic to the site. The new style had an opening box of *News and events*, followed by sections on each set of funding areas (e.g. human rights, creativity and the arts), updated each time. The new version was five published times, the last a closing version. Final newsletter statistics showed an open rate of 27.8% and click through rate of 7.8%, against industry norms of 24.9% and 2.8% respectively.

The original publication product of Access Ireland was *Building the capacity to access EU funds - 2014 and beyond* (2014, 81 pages), a substantial guide written by Hugh Quigley and colleagues and available to download. At the mid-way point in the current financial framework, it was revised and republished as *Accessing EU funds - 2017 to 2020* (2017, 106 pages). This was sent directly to all all members and Wheel members, giving a dissemination figure of 2,039.

1.6 Advice, information and liaison

An important aspect of the work of Access Europe was one-to-one advice and information to members and others on European funding. It was originally understood that this would be largely by telephone, but in practice, the manager invested considerable time in introducing himself to, meeting with and briefing individual, new and prospective members in person. This proved an effective process in building communications and membership. Whilst most organizations were close to Belfast and Dublin and could be reached relatively easily, he also travelled further afield (e.g. Galway, Derry). During the first period, the manager provided eight thematic briefings and seven purpose-designed briefings at the request of individual organizations (table 7).

This function of providing one-to-one advice to members continued during the second period. This took the form of advice and information by phone and e-mail and it is estimated to be, in Dublin, in the order of one e-mail a day and two phone calls a week and in Belfast a handful a week. This could range from advice to those with little knowledge to helping others on quite specialized and technical issues, but whatever the case required a high level of knowledge and communications skill.

Liaison is equally important with organizations important in the broad field of European funding, which encompasses funding programmes, institutions, public representative, prospective funding partners and NGO coalitions. A significant effort was made to reach out to the academic community, which is important for partnerships in *Horizon* and science programmes. Table 8 lists the advice, information and liaison work for 2014-6 (22 examples) and 2017 (21 examples, with one-to-one advice for six members and four reviews of funding applications (10) (overall total: 53).

A feature of the second period was the participation of Access Europe in promotional and third party events. Here, Access Europe made presentations on European funding at events organized by The Wheel and other organizations and participated in events organized by third parties. Access Europe contributed to eight promotional events attended by 134 participants and contributed to nine third party events (table 9).

1.7 Governance

Access Europe had a steering committee which met quarterly and met on at least eleven occasions.⁸ Its role was to launch Access Europe; appoint a manager; agree the programme of work; oversee the grants programme; manage the budget; and take and consider progress reports from the manager and subsequently the two Wheel staff. In 2017, following the departure of the manager, it oversaw the subsequent re-organization and allocation of responsibilities to Early Years and The Wheel; and at the end supervised its winding up.

1.8 Conclusions

Access Europe was a small organization, hosted within two others, designed to enable Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in both parts of the island, its USP being as their single point of technical expertise. The human resources of Access Europe were substantial in the form of its chairperson, steering committee and staff engaged. It developed and ran a website; held 30 training events; published a substantial guide in two editions, with 32 newsletters and eight briefs; carried out 53 advice and liaison actions; participated in 17 promotional and third-party events; gave out one-to-one advice; and distributed eight grants. This is a high workrate.

⁸ Minutes are available of meetings in 2014 on 1st October; in 2015 on 21st January, 25th March, 9th June, 22nd September; in 2016 on 19th January, 19th April and in 2017 on 24th March, 23rd May, 19th July. The most recent meeting was 15th September and a final meeting was scheduled for 8th February 2018.

2 Assessment

This chapter makes an assessment of the work of Access Europe, based on documentation provided; a survey of new members; interviews with the steering committee and single grant applicant. First, it makes the key test European funding generated, including applications that were unsuccessful, submitted, pending or considered (2.1); training outcomes, based on contemporary evaluations (2.2); the grant scheme (2.3); membership (2.4); and governance (2.5). Conclusions are drawn (2.6).

2.1 Funding

First, dealing with funding generated, 17 organizations obtained a total of 36 grants worth €22.53m. Organizations in Northern Ireland did less well, with only four from Northern Ireland (Include Youth, Disability Action, Lifestart and Early Years), although between them they attracted substantial amounts, Early Years being the most successful of all (table 10).

18 organizations were unsuccessful in applying for 22 grants to the value of €7.9m (table 11).

9 organizations submitted applications for which no outcome is available (table 12). These are filed as 'pending', but some are so long-standing that even considering the slow pace of decisions, some may effectively be regarded as unsuccessful. These organizations submitted 16 applications to a value of €5.6m. In most cases, these applications may be considered lost. Even taking these figures into account, the total amount won (over €22.5m) is much more than those unsuccessful or those not concluded (€13.5m).

15 organizations also considered an application, or entered a preparatory phase, but did not complete, 26 applications worth €10.8m (table 13). The amount for which funding was considered is not known in every case. The reasons for non-completion may range from the unsuitability of the programme, difficulties in putting a proposal together or other organizational problems. Not proceeding further may be the right decision for the organization concerned, but it may also reflect on difficulties in the application process. Note that some organizations appear in all categories, being successful, unsuccessful, for where no outcome is available, or not completing.

Finally, 13 members were entered on the database but did not apply.

By way of observation, some organizations listed have been exceptionally active, with Early Years, the Immigrant Council of Ireland and the Irish Council for Civil Liberties standing out. These NGOs appear to focus on a limited range of programmes, the most popular being *Erasmus+*, *Europe for Citizens*, *Justice*, *Horizon 2020* and AMIF. What is most startling is Peace IV: only two organizations were successful. Quite a number considered it, but got no further, suggesting a high level of inaccessibility.

2.2 Training

The interim report made a summary of the training evaluations conducted over 2015-6. Those evaluations rated the training programme highly, with positive comments and limited negative comment. Additional commentary commended the trainers, course methods, delivery and information provided.

For 2017, the evaluations followed The Wheel training evaluation format, including different formats for some events, which between them made direct comparison impossible. The numbers responding were small, but The Wheel requires a consent for the return to be used, which is the appropriate ethical response, but may reduce the data available. Many more filled in individual anonymized contributions. Returns on the last three courses were probably too low to be of statistical value and are not included here but presented in the table.

Table 14 provides a summary of the 2017 training evaluations. Participants in eight events were asked to rate the course as 'too elementary', 'about right' or 'too advanced' and the following were the answers:

Too elementary	2
About right	57
Too advanced	2

Asked were expectations met, 42 said 'yes' and 8 said 'no'. Overall, this is a highly positive outcome, in line with the earlier evaluations.

Participants were invited to add additional comments: this is a summary:

- The trainers were commended for their knowledge, manner, approach, 'honest advice' and for being engaging and clear. Several were called 'impressive'. They avoided jargon. Deirdre Finlay was named repeatedly, a typical comment being 'open, flexible and friendly'.
- The training sessions were valued for de-mystifying funding. They now had a more realistic idea of what to apply for, they said. Several spoke of

- now feeling informed and confident in making an application, specifically 'we can now put our heads together and decide to apply or not'.
- They learned about partnership, strategy and using websites.
 - Venues were commended for comfort, functionality and even modernity. They were bright, clean, welcoming, accessible, spacious. Several commended the lunches e.g. sandwiches.
 - As for the learning from the training, participants liked the practical, shared knowledge and useful tips. Many spoke of the value of networking there with other organizations.
 - As for course methods, they liked the mix of presentations. They valued case studies, for example of success stories and first-hand experiences, hearing other people's stories. They liked the volume of content and slides to bring home. They liked being brought through the application process from start to project completion ('the journey').

There was a small number of critical comments. Some found the presentations too fast ('speedy'). One found the experience quite overwhelming and concluded that EU funding was unsuitable. Another was critical of a far too lengthy introduction (50min). At one event, there was criticism of the room, acoustics and lack of slides. Overall, though, the training was warmly received throughout the lifetime of Access Europe from the point of view of information, learning, method, delivery, information and quality of trainers.

2.3 Grant schemes

In the interim report, participants in the two grant schemes were interviewed about their experience. This found that participants valued the grant, which they believed made a big difference to the value of their proposal - even if their subsequent application was unsuccessful - or enabled them to meet prospective partners. Participants gained in the form of experience of the application process (e.g. how to coordinate partners), confidence in making future applications and became less consultant-dependant. Even those who were unsuccessful would re-apply and were hopeful of a positive outcome next time. They recommended a larger grant.

As there was only one grant application since then, the value of asking that applicant of the experience is limited, but it was nevertheless undertaken in order to identify any issues that may have arisen. The university-based applicant organization, which was experienced in European funding proposals and now sought *Horizon 2020* funding, applied for a €1,000 grant - which was understood to be the cap - toward the cost of a consultant application-writer, which was €4,800. She obtained the balance of €3,800 from Enterprise Ireland. Access Europe approved the grant speedily. The application scored highly, especially conceptually, but was unsuccessful, being marked down for its projected impact.

2.4 Members

In the interim report, members were surveyed on their experience of Access Europe. By way of reminder, this found that a small number had a high level of participation, most a medium level and the next largest group a low level or dormant. They most valued the telephone and advice service, newsletter and training, in that order, the website coming further behind. They valued the advice given as to whether and how to apply for funding, an equal number deciding *not* to apply for funding as a result, thereby saving them some wasted time and trouble. They believed that participation in Access Europe had improved their knowledge and capacity, but their profile and impact less so. Access Europe was rated as good value for money, compared well to other information sources and it was an efficient, time-saving way to learn about European funding and make decisions thereon.

For completeness, those members who joined since then were asked the same questions, although it is recognized that, taking place at different points in time, there is not strict comparability. Nevertheless, it is important to gain any fresh perspectives that may be found. This is a small group of only six members, all in Ireland, of whom three replied (50%).

Asked if Access Europe helped, one described Access Europe as ‘a great resource for training and information’, another as ‘supportive and encouraging’. One said no. Participants from all their organizations attended training events, one as many as three. One praised Access Europe for sending on resource materials and offering on-line support when unable to training attend in person. Asked to rate the services of Access Europe (one never used them), they scored them as follows:

Website	9
Telephone, information and advice	9
Training	8.5
Newsletter	8
Other (e-mail support)	10

These are high scores. Asked had they applied for European funding as a result of membership, one said no, but was looking into possibilities and was still at the early stage. Two said yes (*Erasmus* and *Europe for Citizens*). None considered other funding, but decided, following information or advice from Access Europe, decided not to do so. Asked how critical was Access Europe in helping them consider applying for funding, two said ‘of some help’ and one said ‘critical’.

Asked did they consider applying for the grant schemes, one said that it was still at the research stage. A second member was unaware of them. Asked did membership of Access Europe improve their knowledge or capacity, all said 'a lot'. The training was helpful and two praised Sean McCarthy's presentation. One explained that she had not even heard of *Citizens for Europe* before, but it was ideal for her organization.

Rating it against other information sources, two said that Access Europe compared 'quite well' and was knowledgeable and helpful, the third saying 'well'. Others used were the EU Commission office, the European Foundation Centre, FundingPoint and Leargas. One commended Access Europe for being responsive and always replied to e-mail within an hour. Elsewhere, one informant contrasted the quality of advice offered by Access Europe with the lack of knowledge of the university research department. Asked about cooperation with other Access Europe organizations, two said no, but one referred to informal sharing at the training session.

Asked what would have been the consequences if Access Europe had not been there, it would not have otherwise obtained such training. One said that it had already reached out to Sean McCarthy but Access Europe had speeded up the process for them. A third explained that she would not otherwise have applied for a *Citizens for Europe* grant, of which she was now hopeful of success. Asked about the future prospects of EU funding, two expected them to 'stay the same' and a third to increase.

One example - outside this group - of gain from membership is that of a successful application by Early Years and the Fermanagh Trust for a shared education project. The idea of presenting a joint proposal arose from the two members who attended a special EU Programmes Body (SEUPB) information session which led to their considering the idea of forming a partnership to present a joint proposal which later obtained funding.

2.5 Governance

As was the case in the interim report, members of the steering committee were interviewed to test its performance in the final year of Access Europe, 2017. To recapitulate, the interim evaluation found that the system of governance had worked well, was consensual, carried out the administrative functions required and was well-chaired. Accounts were compiled and presented, but some participants were more active than others. This evaluation found that the steering committee continued to carry out its governance functions efficiently. The problem of differential participation became more acute, with some members finding it more difficult to get the time for the travel involved. During the final year, with the committee concluding its work, there was little purpose in seeking replacement members.

2.6 Conclusions

This chapter assessed the work of Access Europe. In terms of its primary purpose, improving access to European funds:

- 17 organizations obtained a total of 36 grants worth €22.53m;
- 18 organizations were unsuccessful in applying for 22 grants to the value of €7.9m;
- 9 organizations submitted 16 applications for which no outcome is available to the value of €5.6m;
- 15 organizations also considered an application, or entered a preparatory phase, but did not complete, 26 applications worth €10.8m.

Evaluations of training rated the training experience highly, pitched at the right level and liked the style, knowledge and method of the trainers.

The survey of members in the final year found high scores for the website, information and advice, training and newsletter. Access Europe was rated highly for the quality of its new secretariat in The Wheel. Membership was valuable in helping them apply for funding and the training was again highly valued.

Only one member applied for and got a grant in the final year. Although the outcome was unsuccessful, the experience should be seen in the context of enabling the participant to make a second attempt later with more confidence. Information about the sharing role is more limited but one short case study was given as an example.

Examination of the governance arrangements found that the steering committee continued to discharge its functions efficiently, despite the level of participation being less than optimum.

Overall, compared to the original model, grants proved to be of much less value and importance than anticipated, but information, one-to-one advice, 'hand-holding' and training proved to be much more valuable.

3 Issues arising

As may be seen, Access Europe has been rated positively. Put quantitatively, Access Europe helped to bring in over €22.5m to the voluntary sector, a considerable achievement.

Five issues arose in the course of the study and these are explored further here. There are:

- Assessment against original objectives;
- The low rate of applications for grants;
- Learning about European funding;
- The future of the Access Europe;
- Metrics and documentation.

Each is explored in turn (3.1-5) and conclusions are then drawn (3.6).

3.1 Assessment against original objectives

In the first instance, it is important to test Access Europe against its original objectives, as listed in the terms of reference. By way of reminder, these were that the role of the organization was to build:

- The levels of EU funding available to Irish organizations;
- The profile and impact of the work of organizations;
- The capacity of Irish organizations to access and manage EU and other sources of funding.
- The opportunities for shared learning across organizations accessing EU funding.

Clearly, Access Europe did build the level of funding, which was €3.9m in autumn 2016, to over €22.53m by the end of 2017. The letter of offer specified that Access Europe have 35 members, make 40 applications and obtain €15 to €22.5m in funding. The outcomes were 50 members, 74 applications and €22.533m obtained. Those who received funding - such as Early Years, ICCL, the Immigrant Council - are in a position to claim a higher profile in recent years. The training lifted both 'access' and 'capacity to manage' and training in partnership development was especially helpful. Clearly, it built their capacity to manage such funding. The principal opportunities for shared learning were at the training events, a function of their informal and participative style, but there is less evidence of shared learning outside the training context, which may be a gap. In the view of contributors, the principal benefits to members have been, first, in the form of technical knowledge and second, equally important, in taking a strategic approach to applying for European funding, so that it is approached systematically and time not wasted.

A gap identified in the capacity to manage European funding was in financial and reporting management. This was a criticism less of Access Europe than of the rising level of such requirements in some programmes, which went far beyond the capacity of even well-organized medium-size voluntary organizations. Auditing, which may be applied to one organization in four, posed an additional strain, for audits could take six to eight months and were more than disruptive. Had this been anticipated, it might have been possible to seek *pro bono* help from accounting companies. In future, it would be important to build financial, reporting and auditing capacity.

3.2 Low rate of applications for grants

The surprisingly low rate of application of grants was one of the first items to arise from the interim report. Such grants were a cornerstone of the original Access Europe idea and of the original €123,875 allocated to grants, only €7,700 was used, a tiny proportion of what was expected. Contrary to any expectation that they might pick up in the last year, instead there was only one application, which was accepted.

Explanations were ventured in the interim report and the suggestion was made, following the views of members, that the grant level should be increased to €2,000 so as to obtain a better level of professional technical advice in the preparation of proposals. In the event, it appears that information that the grant was raised did not reach potential applicants; while the member survey found that one was unaware of the grant in any case.

Clearly, the explanation must go deeper and may lie in training proving to be a much more valued form of help to members. Furthermore, applications for grants from organizations in Northern Ireland were very low (only one). This may have reflected an overall lower level of engagement with European funding there. This was accentuated by the Brexit decision in general and increased difficulty in accessing the Peace programme in particular. This had a dampening effect and created an atmosphere in which groups were less and less willing to test programmes where, objectively, they might have had opportunities (e.g. *Erasmus+*, *Horizon 2020*).

3.3 Learning about European funding

This leads us on logically to what can be learned about European funding for NGOs and its changing nature. A hidden gain from Access Europe is that it - in the form of its staff and committee - is a reservoir of knowledge in European funding. It is able to gain an overview of such trends over time and is in a position to make a critical analysis thereon, should it wish to do so. Long-standing observers of European funding have noticed in the past 15 years the reduction of funding programmes for NGOs; the massifi-

cation of programmes and their growing complexity; and the nationalization of programmes from which NGOs used to benefit but which have become the preserve of national or local government (e.g. the Department of Education and Learning in Northern Ireland). The impenetrability of the Peace programme was especially evident. Informants commented on how the current design of European programmes ‘scared many groups away’. The manner in which the matching funding requirement of 20% was applied might work with large NGOs with substantial stable funding, but not many were in such a fortunate situation. Delays in delivering payment were an additional worry. The scope covered by programmes appeared to shrink: one European-minded organization, a member from the start, working very much in a field of European competence and activity, lamented the paucity of funding opportunities. The small membership of Access Europe (50) - in an NGO world of 12,816 (0.39%) - is of itself an important statement of the degree of retreat of the relevance of European funding.⁹ This degradation of the funding environment actually makes Access Europe’s achievement the more remarkable.

Positively, though, some have found simplification in some programmes (e.g. *Erasmus+*, *Europe for Citizens*, *Creative Europe*) and others expressed the hope that the social crisis in Europe may persuade the European institutions to find more scope for civil society in the new funding framework period that begins in 2021.

Commentaries on European funding trends, although plentiful in former years, are now scarce. Analysis and commentary is all the more important in the period leading up to the design of the new funding framework. Within Access Europe there is critical knowledge of the relationship between NGOs and European funding.

3.4 The future of Access Europe

Granted that the conclusion of Atlantic Philanthropies funding at the end of 2017 was already well flagged, sustainability was a key issue to arise in the interim report. At the risk of stating the obvious, it is a weakness in the European system of civil society funding that the European Union itself did not have a mechanism for funding or providing technical assistance for an organization like Access Europe that promoted the participation of NGOs in European programmes and projects. Historically, technical assistance was provided through the structural funds for this purpose (in Britain, for example, through the Third Sector European Network (TSEN)). With the impending end of Atlantic Philanthropies funding, the issue became one of how Access Europe and its USP of a unique centre of expertise could continue.

⁹ This figure is derived from combining the number of charitable organizations in Ireland (7,980) and Northern Ireland (4,836).

At the time of the interim report, consideration was being given to hosting Access Europe in The Wheel and in the Northern Ireland Council for Voluntary Action (NICVA) respectively, granted that both bodies had broadly similar roles and functions. In the event, the departure of the manager in autumn 2016 forced a reorganization, with Access Europe hosted in The Wheel (for Ireland) and Early Years (for Northern Ireland), NICVA being apparently not in a position to do so.

At time of writing, the operation of Access Europe in Ireland was effectively transferred to the Wheel, where the two staff continue to work. Access Europe will not continue as a brand, but its web resources will transfer there (there will no longer be an Access Europe newsletter, grant scheme, nor the same level of personalized one-to-one advice service). Members of Access Europe who join The Wheel (€25 to €450, depending on financial size) will be in a position to avail of its training events: The Wheel's 2018 calendar already includes three European funding events.¹⁰ At additional cost (€125), they may join *Fundingpoint* which provides information on all funding opportunities, including European. The Wheel has a strong European vocation, is the designated contact point for *Europe for Citizens* to 2020 and has defined European expertise, meaning that Access Europe's original USP is identifiably passed thereto.

The situation in Northern Ireland is unresolved. In effect, just as Access Europe was mainstreamed by The Wheel in Ireland, a similar process might have seen it mainstreamed by one of a number of potential candidates in Northern Ireland, the principal candidates being the NICVA; CO3, the association of chief executives; and the Community Foundation of Northern Ireland (CFNI). The foremost candidate was NICVA, which traditionally had an interest in European affairs and hosted a European unit, but it did not appear to be interested to take on such a function on this occasion. Unless this change, there will be no distinct, visible point of technical expertise on European funding for NGOs in this part of the island.

As noted earlier, Brexit had a demoralizing effect on the consideration of European issues in Northern Ireland, even if European funding programmes (e.g. INTERREG) are likely to continue. At the conclusion of this project, there was pessimism as to whether there would be any fresh interest in Northern Ireland in European funding, though existing organizations participating in European programmes expressed the wish to continue to follow these programmes and maintain their links with organizations in Ireland.

¹⁰ *EU funding workshop (Europe for Citizens)*, Cork, 24th January; *European funding for voluntary organizations*, Kilkenny, 7th February; and *Stories of success - EU funding for cultural organizations*, Dublin, 12th June.

3.5 Metrics and documentation

Finally, there is an important set of technical issues arising concerning metrics and documentation. The interim report warned that, although the high workrate of the organization was more than evident, there was a risk that inadequate metrics might understate its true level of activity and some new metrics might be necessary to ensure their full capture. The interim report drew attention to:

- The lack of logging of one-to-one enquiries by e-mail and phone;
- The lack of website analytics, which meant that it was not possible to map, longitudinally, traffic to the site in its multiple dimensions;
- Lack of an annual report, which meant that an opportunity to promote the service and the issues arising therefrom were lost.

These issues remain. Staff were unaware that they might be expected to log one-to-one work or activate analytics. The consequence, though, is that neither the one-to-one work, whose importance was evident in the interim report, was not formally logged; analytics from the website - one of Access Europe's most important instruments - were not captured; and an opportunity to promote Access Europe's work, brand, approach and issues through an annual report may have been missed, as well as a point of accountability to members.

3.6 Conclusions

In this chapter, the key issues arising were:

- The progress of Access Europe against its original objectives, where it had clearly built the level of funding. Beneficiaries claimed a higher profile as a result. Learning was shared at training events. Capacity was built, but a gap was identified in financial, reporting and auditing management as programmes became more onerous;
- The low level of applications for grants, with only one application in Northern Ireland. Compared to the original design, grants were valued much less than quality one-to-one advice and information, combined with quality training;
- The changing nature of European funding, which has become ever more problematical. Access Europe, though, is a reservoir of knowledge and in a good position to offer critical observations on these changes at a time when commentaries have become scarce;
- The future of the Access Europe. Although Access Europe has been mainstreamed into The Wheel in Ireland, a point of distinct expertise in European funding has not found a home in Northern Ireland, where interest in European funding has been severely affected by Brexit;
- Outstanding problems of metrics and documentation in the areas of logging, analytics and annual report, which mean that the full scope of Access Europe's work may be understated and under-promoted.

4 Legacy

The final chapter concludes with observations on Access Europe as a model (4.1), before looking at what can be left behind (4.2), before making some concluding remarks (4.3).

4.1 Access Europe as a model

The design of Access Europe by the 13 founder organizations working with Atlantic Philanthropies was validated. The concept of a small secretariat, overseen by a steering committee, providing information, publications, newsletter, advice, training and grants worked. The targets for funding brought in was met (€22.53m against a target of €15m to €22.5m), as was that of membership (50 against a target of 35) and applications (74 against 40). As identified by the interim and this final report, its actual operationalization did not turn out quite as expected, for there were some important divergences:

- The project cost less than was originally anticipated;
- Grants, a key instrument in the original design, were little in demand. Members valued much more highly one-to-one advice and quality training, supported by newsletters and publications;
- Most of the sharing and learning took place at training events, but little outside them;
- Take-up was much higher in Ireland than in Northern Ireland, even before the Brexit decision;
- Although a database was intended as a key product, in practice it proved simpler to provide a guide (published twice) and information provided regularly through the website and training.

In addition, some important issues emerged:

- The metrics applied were not comprehensive, with the risk that the full extent of activities and their electronic impact may be understated. No annual report was published, with the result that it was under-documented and an opportunity for accountability missed;
- There is evidence (with some exceptions) that negative trends in the European funding of NGOs accentuated during this period;
- Access Europe is a reservoir of unpublished knowledge of trends in European funding which could be put to considerable value in providing a critical commentary of benefit both to the European institutions and to European civil society, at a time when such critiques have become scarce. This would be timely, granted that funding from 2020 is currently in design.

As is the case with all projects of this nature, any successful model is dependant on the quality of its human resources at staff and steering committee and good choices here were significant contributors to the success of the model.

4.2 Leaving something behind

Section 3.4 *The future of Access Europe* outlined how the Access Europe idea of a place of expertise on European funding for NGOs had been mainstreamed into The Wheel in Ireland, where some of its elements have continued but others not, but that the idea has been left unresolved in Northern Ireland. There, the level of interest in European funding was already lower and is much diminished as a result of Brexit, even if European funding will continue to be available there after 2019. It is still open to those involved in Access Europe to continue to look for a home to sustain the concept in one of the remaining candidate organizations (CO3 or CFNI), obtaining the funding to support it, or make a conscious decision to let it go.

The letter of offer was clear that something should be left behind after 2017, as follows:

- *A network of organizations, with significant working relationships, to influence the framing of future funding parameters and ensure the maximum level of European funding is drawn down and managed effectively;*
- *A sustainable database on relevant sources of EU funding and a network of organizations with the capacity to continue accessing European funding.*

As explained earlier, the database idea mutated into the form of the twice-published guide and the regular publication of information through the newsletter, so is the less relevant of the two. The network idea was never operationalized. Although a network was expected to be an outcome of the project, it was never specified as an activity in the project design or budgetary allocations, a potential design flaw. A real network pre-supposes that its members actually meet to network. This never took place. Section 2.2 *Training* and 3.1 *Assessment against original objectives* made the observation that shared learning in the Access Europe was largely limited to the training events and that little sharing appears to have taken place outside them. There remains, though, a small group of 50 NGOs in both parts of the island interested in European integration and the funding that supports it, a 'community of interest'. Section 3.3 *Learning about European funding* made the point that Access Europe members are a reservoir of critical knowledge about European funding, that European funding has become ever more difficult and that there is a lack of commentary on these changing trends and tendencies, either on the island of Ireland or elsewhere. Such a network is not lacking in a potential programme of work.

This suggests that this might be the moment to prompt the notion, one encapsulated in the original Access Europe idea, that such a network be formed that could meet, share and in the words of the original offer develop 'significant working relationship' and 'influence future funding'. This could start as an annual meeting of such like-minded organizations, but grow in time and should it attract the financial and other support to do so, provide such critical analysis and commentary. At present, only The Wheel would be in a position to convene such a meeting, but this could be done jointly with whatever Northern Ireland-based organization was prepared to host the legacy of the Access Europe idea there, or, if not, with the remnant member organizations there.

4.3 Final remarks

The original design of the Access Europe idea was validated. It achieved its primary objectives of attracting both membership and European funding, functioning to a high degree of efficiency. There was a high level of satisfaction amongst members in general and those attending training in particular. The original design did not turn out quite as expected, some means of work proving more useful than others. The Ireland part of Access Europe has been mainstreamed into The Wheel, but no equivalent process had taken place in Northern Ireland, although it is not too late to do so. The original design envisaged a network as an outcome of the project, although it did not allocate time and resources to make the organization actually function as a network. Access Europe leaves behind 50 organizations which have the potential to fulfill the original injunction to form a network that would influence European funding, as well as other related functions of sharing European experiences, ensuring maximum draw-down of funding and providing critical commentary for all of civil society.

Table 1: Projected income 2014-7, €

Amount	2014 Jul- Dec	2015	2016	2017	Total
Atlantic Philanthropies	50,000	100,000	100,000	50,000	300,000
Membership		7,500	9,000	9,000	25,500
Proposal grants contribution		14,075	14,550	15,025	43,650
Access grants contribution		6,000	6,000	6,000	18,000
		127,575	129,550	130,025	387,150

Source: Atlantic Philanthropies, letter of approval, 25th June 2014.

Table 2: Projected spending, 2014-7 €

Amount	2014-5	2016	2017	Total	%
Staffing	60,000	60,000	60,000	180,000	46.5%
Travel	1,000	1,000	1,000	45,000	11.6%
Office	15,000	15,000	15,000	43,650	11.3%
Database	8,400 1,200	8,400 1,200	8,400 1,200	25,200 3,600	7.4%
Proposal grants	28,150	29,100	30,000	87,250	22.5%
Access grants	12,075	12,550	12,000	36,625	9.5%
Evaluation	1,750	2,300	2,465	6,475	1.7%
	127,575	129,550	130,025	387,150	

Source: *ibid.*

Table 3: Spending, April 2016 - December 2017, £

	April 2016 - March 2017 £	April- December 2017 £
Income (non-Atlantic Philanthropies)		
Membership	546	75
Spending		
Staff	43,204	20,868
Rent	1,358	1,250
Travel	2,965	362
Programme and training costs, incl. closing conference, consultancy	18,894	30,413
Office (telephone, fax, computers)	375	240
Depreciation, banking	260	250
Total	67,073	53,383
<i>Closing balance</i>	<i>72,908</i>	<i>19,600</i>

Source: *Early Years*. Atlantic Philanthropies provided €150,000 in each of these two periods, but, being in euros, are not included in this sterling table.

Table 4: Bespoke training and information for individual organizations

Date	Location	Organization
2015		
January	Dublin	TASC think tank
June	Galway	Prevention and Early Intervention
September	Belfast	Early Years
October	Belfast	NI Trust Group
2016		
July	Derry	Lifestart
September	Belfast	Third sector chief officers

Table 5: Training events

Date	Location	Theme	Participants
16 Jun 2015	Dublin	Human rights	6
24 Jun	Belfast	Youth and children	6
1st Jul	Belfast	Partnerships	10
2 Jul	Dublin		21
14 Oct	Belfast	Human rights	10
15 Dec	Dublin	Age sector	6
16 Dec	Belfast		6
28 Jan 2016	Dublin	<i>Horizon 2020</i>	46
18 Feb	Dublin	Children and youth	42
		Human rights	31
12 May	Belfast	Children and youth	28
		Human rights	10
19 May	Dublin	Financial management of grants	11
24 May	Belfast	Financial management of grants	6
24 Feb 2017	Cork	Deirdre Clune MEP	30
7 Apr	Limerick	Sean Kelly MEP	25
21 Apr	Monaghan	Matt McCarthy MEP	33
10 May	Dublin	<i>Horizon 2020</i> and Marie Curie	32
7 Jun	Galway	Funding for cultural organizations	35
20 Jun	Dublin	European Partnership Development	35
26 Jul	Galway	<i>Europe for Citizens</i>	20
28 Jul	Dublin	<i>European for Citizens</i>	7
8 Aug	Dublin	<i>Erasmus+ Youth</i>	4
1 Dec	Webinar	EU funding - Connected communities	34
5 Dec	Dublin	<i>Europe for Citizens</i>	12
7 Dec	Dublin	<i>Europe for Citizens</i>	22
Total			528

Table 6: Grants provided

Grant	Grant	Purpose
Preparation of proposal		
Centre for Disability and Law, NUIG	€1,000	<i>Horizon 2020</i> proposal
Age & Opportunity	€1,200	Meet partners for <i>Creative Europe</i> proposal
Nasc	€1,000	<i>Rights and equality</i> proposal technical assistance
National Women's Council of Ireland	€750	<i>Rights and equality</i> proposal technical assistance
Archways	€750	INTERREG proposal technical assistance
Early Years	€1,000	Business plan for INTERREG
Access		
Irish Council for Civil Liberties	€1,000	Conference in Lisbon
Disability Law Centre, NUIG	€1,000	Disability technology.
Total	€7,700	

Table 7: Briefs provided

Type	
Thematic	<p>EU funding for renewable energy and efficiency (September 2015)</p> <p>Anti-trafficking (April 2015)</p> <p><i>Erasmus+</i> for migration and asylum</p> <p>Ageing EU (August 2015)</p> <p>Age sector NI (April 2015)</p> <p>Children and youth work (NI) (Early Years, Barnardos, NCB) (October 2015)</p> <p>Children and youth (RI) (September 2015)</p> <p>Integration and anti-racism (August 2015) (8)</p>
Individual	<p>Big Telly</p> <p>Family Health Initiative</p> <p>Irish Penal Reform Trust</p> <p>Law Centre NI</p> <p>Integrated Education Fund</p> <p>National Energy Action</p> <p>Lifestart Foundation (7)</p>

Table 8: Advice, information and liaison work

	Liaison	Members and related
2014-6	Special EU Programmes body (SEUPB), Pobal, Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration, Leargas, The Wheel, NICVA, the Leuven Institute, the European Movement, <i>Erasmus</i> UK, LEADER (RI and NI), Fundraising Ireland, NI Trust Group, <i>Creative Europe</i> , Enterprise Ireland, Social Change Initiative and <i>Horizon 2020</i> NI. In Brussels, Eurochild, the Euro Citizen Action Service, the Age Platform, DG Home Affairs and <i>Horizon 2020</i> (22)	
2017	Irish Research Council, Marie Curie Sklodowska Actions, Irish Universities Association, Sean Kelly MEP, Matt McCarthy MEP, Campus Engage, Department of Foreign Affairs, SEUPB Review Panel, EU representation in Ireland (2), Irish Research Council, European Parliament, <i>Europe for Citizens</i> , Heritage Council, <i>Horizon 2020</i> , <i>Erasmus+</i> , Science Foundation Ireland, University College Dublin. In Brussels, ENNA, Citizens NCP. In Swansea, Ireland Wales INTERREG (21).	<p><u>One-to-one advice</u> Age and Opportunity, Irish Council of Civil Liberties, The Ark, Dublin Interfaith Forum, EAPN, One World Centre (6).</p> <p>Review of funding applications Prevention and Early Intervention Network (<i>Erasmus+</i>) Irish Writers Centre, Arklow town (<i>Europe for Citizens</i>) Irish Institute for European Affairs (<i>Europe for Citizens</i>) Centre for Creative Practices (<i>Erasmus+</i>, <i>Europe for Citizens</i>)</p>

Table 9: Promotional and third party events, 2017

Date	Event	Location	Participants
Promotional events			
September	Ploughing championship	Screggan, co Offaly	
8 Sep	Creative Entrepreneurs	Wicklow	25
21 Sep	Wheel Regional Forum	Athenry, co Galway	31
20 Oct	Ambassador School Training	Dublin	17
24 Oct	Meet The Wheel in Louth	Dundalk	7
7 Nov	Meet The Wheel Waterford	Waterford	30
24 Nov	Ambassador School Training	Limerick	9
29 Nov	Wheel Regional Forum	Ennis, co Clare	15
Total			134
Third party events			
Spring	Launch Campus Engage	Dublin	
20 Mar	<i>Europe for Citizens</i>	Brussels	
September	<i>Europe for Citizens</i>	Zagreb, Croatia	
12 Sep	<i>Horizon 2020</i>	Dublin	
18 Oct	<i>Horizon 2020</i>	UCD, Dublin	
19 Oct	Future of Europe	RIA, Dublin	
15 Nov	Future of Europe	TCD, Dublin	
28 Nov	Leargas Forum (<i>Erasmus+</i>)	Dublin	

Table 10: Funding successfully generated

Organization	Programme	No. of grants	Amount €
Early Years	<i>Erasmus+</i>	5	128,530
	TACS	1	833,580
	<i>Horizon 2020</i>	1	98,000
	Peace IV	2	5,674,000
	European Social Fund	1	2,853,782
Irish Council for Civil Liberties	Justice programme	5	1,652,147
	REC**	1	527,960
Immigrant Council of Ireland	Internal security (trafficking)	1	290,000
	AMIF trafficking	1	73,000
	AMIF national programme	1	215,000
National Women's Council	ESHTE*	1	366,000
Include Youth	European Social Fund	1	3,190,000
Disability Action	European Social Fund	1	1,444,000
Nasc	AMIF	1	200,000
Archways	INTERREG VA Health	1	2,760,000
Irish Traveller Movement	AMIF	1	150,000
Dublin City Volunteer Centre	<i>Europe for Citizens</i>	1	127,500
Holocaust Education Trust	<i>Europe for Citizens</i>	1	100,000
Arklow Town Twinning	<i>Europe for Citizens</i> twinning	1	5,000
Mendicity	European Social Fund	1	25,000
Youth Work Ireland	<i>Erasmus+</i>	3	88,000
The Wheel	European Parliament Information Office	2	123,240
Lifestart Foundation	Peace IV	1	1,333,917
Institute European and International Affairs	<i>Europe for Citizens</i>	1	275,174
Total		36	22,533,830

ESHTE = Ending Sexual Harassment and violence in Third level Education

REC = Rights, Equality and Citizenship

AMIF = Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund

Information in this and subsequent tables supplied by The Wheel

Table 11: Unsuccessful applications

Organization	Fund	No.	Amount
Early Years	INTERREG VA Justice	2	1,943,879 100,560
Integrated Education Fund	<i>Erasmus</i>	1	50,000
Immigrant Council of Ireland	REC	1	122,000
	<i>Europe for Citizens</i>	1	27,200
Tallaght West Childhood Development Initiative	<i>Erasmus+</i>	1	24,700
FLAC	AMIF	2	150,000
	European Social Fund		220,000
Nasc	REC	1	285,000
Children's Rights Alliance	REC	1	300,000
Barnardos	<i>Erasmus+</i>	1	400,000
Women's Aid	REC	1	300,000
Irish Traveller Movement	REC	1	194,000
Third Age	<i>Europe for Citizens</i>	1	95,000
Include Youth	<i>Erasmus</i>	1	6,000
Wheel	Europe Direct	2	90,000
	Citizen Dialogues		10,000
International Institute European & International Affairs	<i>Europe for Citizens</i>	1	150,000
National University of Ireland Galway	<i>Horizon 2020</i>	1	3,000,000
Young Social Innovators	<i>Horizon 2020</i>	1	180,000
Centre for Creative Practices	<i>Europe for Citizens</i>	1	150,000
All Ireland Institute Hospice & Palliative Care	<i>Horizon 2020</i>	1	180,000
Total		22	7,978,339

13 organizations were listed on the database but did not apply: Age Sector Platform; National Children's Bureau NI; National Energy Action; Big Telly; Committee on the Administration of Justice; Law Centre NI; Age NI; Irish Penal Reform Trust; TASC; Community Foundation for Ireland; Foróige; EPIC; Alone.

Table 12: Applications submitted without outcome so far

Organizations	Fund	No	Amount
Early Years	Instrument for Pre Accession <i>Erasmus+</i> dyslexia <i>Erasmus+</i> autism <i>Erasmus+</i> study trip <i>Erasmus+</i> inclusion training Development Columbia	6	2,850,000 20,000 20,000 7,000 69,970 170,000
Include Youth	REC	1	300,000
NIACRO	Peace IV	1	500,000
Tallaght West Childhood Development Initiative	<i>Erasmus+</i>	2	79,025
Immigrant Council of Ireland	<i>Daphne</i> <i>Creative Europe</i>	2	56,000 150,000
Prevention and Early Intervention Initiative PEIN	<i>Erasmus+</i>	1	200,000
Irish Traveller Movement	Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration	1	100,000
Centre Creative Practices	<i>Erasmus+</i>	1	125,009
The Wheel	INTERREG	1	811,523
Total		16	5,638,527

Table 13: Incomplete applications considered/prepared

Organization	Fund	No.	Amount
Barnardos NI	Peace IV (3)	2	-300,000
	<i>Horizon 2020</i>	1	
Suffolk Lenadoon Interface	Peace IV	1	
Fermanagh Trust	Renewable energy	2	150,000
Early Years	Peace IV	2	
Integrated Education Fund	Peace IV	1	
Include Youth	<i>Erasmus+</i>	1	450,000
VOYPIC	REC	1	300,000
	<i>Erasmus+ (2)</i>	2	30,000
Immigrant Council Ireland	<i>Erasmus+</i>	1	450,000
Irish Council for Civil Liberties	<i>Horizon 2020 Marie Curie</i>	1	170,000
Age & Opportunity	<i>Creative Europe</i>	2	2,000,000
	<i>Europe for Citizens</i>		150,000
Genio	Employment Social Inclusion	1	700,000
Active Retirement Ireland	<i>Europe for Citizens</i>	2	150,000
	Peace IV		30,000
Headstrong	<i>Horizon 2020</i>	1	2,000,000
Young Social Innovators	<i>Erasmus+</i>	3	450,000
	<i>Erasmus+</i>		150,000
	Peace IV		20,000
Irish Traveller Movement	<i>Erasmus+</i>	2	170,000
	<i>Horizon 2020</i>		
Total		26	10,820,000

Table 14: Training evaluations

Event	N	Rating	Expectations met	Rating trainer
24 Feb Cork	12	Too elementary 0 About right 12 Too advanced 0	Yes 8 No 2	
7 Apr Limerick	6	Too elementary 2 About right 3 Too advanced 0	Yes 2 No 2	
21 Apr Monaghan	2	Too elementary 0 About right 2 Too advanced 0	Yes 1 No 1	
10 May Dublin	12	Too elementary 0 About right 12 Too advanced 0	Yes 10 No 1	
7 Jun Galway	11	Too elementary 0 About right 10 Too advanced 1	Yes 8 No 1	
20 Jun Dublin	5	Too elementary 0 About right 5 Too advanced 0	Yes 4 No 1	
18 Jul Dublin	9	Too elementary 0 About right 9 Too advanced 0	Yes 9 No 0	
26 Jul Galway	5	Too elementary 0 About right 4 Too advanced 1		
1 Dec webinar	2	Excellent 1 Good 1 Average 0 Poor 0		Excellent 2 Good 0 Average 0 Poor 0
5 Dec Dublin	3	Excellent 1 Good 1 Average 0 Poor 0		Excellent 3 Good 0 Average 0 Poor 0
7 Dec Dublin	1	Excellent 1 Good 0 Average 0 Poor 0		Excellent 1 Good 0 Average 0 Poor 0

N = maximum number of answers (some did not answer all questions). Elem = elementary; adv = advanced. 8th August event not available.