

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PAIN RELIEF AND RESPITE CARE

Pain Relief

4.1 This was a difficult area to research as Health Service records are decentralised and statistics are not readily available; in any case, current record keeping does not appear to differentiate between victims of terrorist crime and others. It is understood that, following the publication of the Bloomfield Report, guidance on a DHSS response to victims was issued centrally to HSS Boards and Trusts in the Autumn of 1998. But it would appear that progress, if any, has been slow and there has been no noticeable difference in the delivery of services in relation to pain management.

4.2 Enquiries also revealed that the DHSS did secure some additional funding during the Comprehensive Spending Review as part of a total mental health bid. However, discussions with medical specialists revealed there may be clinical difficulties in managing funding specifically earmarked for victims of terrorist violence as the Health Service currently prioritises treatments on the basis of clinical need. It will, therefore, be for individual Boards to prioritise their needs and it has been suggested that it is unlikely that victims will be identified as the highest clinical priority.

4.3 While the Directors appreciate there will always be priorities and conflicting demands within the Health Service, it considers that clinical priority alone cannot be regarded as the sole deciding factor if the Bloomfield Report is to be implemented.

4.4 It also became apparent that while there was a need to provide more services, there would be inertia between recognising this need and providing the service. For example, it is estimated that it would take at least a year for a skilled consultant anaesthetist to become competent in this area or between two and three years of a five to six year course for a Specialist Registrar to become competent.

4.5 The Directors concluded that the delivery of pain management and relief services is the proper responsibility of the Health Services. The Directors appreciate that the demands facing the Health and Social Services outweigh the resources currently available, and that from a purely clinical viewpoint, victims may not fall into a high priority category. It is also appreciated that to redirect resources from other areas may create clinical dilemmas.

4.6 The Bloomfield report recommended that the DHSS give higher priority to the treatment of chronic physical pain for victims (Bloomfield Report, Page 50, para 8.1(k)). The Directors did not consider it appropriate, realistic or feasible to direct the Fund's limited resources into the statutory sector. Therefore, until such time as the Health Service addresses its obligations under the Bloomfield Report, the Directors agreed that the best way to ensure victims receive pain relief treatment is to provide victims with small grants to enable them to obtain private consultations and associated treatment of their choice for the management of their pain and, subject to a positive clinical assessment, assistance to enable those victims suffering chronic physical pain to undergo appropriate surgery.

Recommendation 1: That the DHSS review the level of services currently provided to those victims suffering chronic physical pain with the aim of increasing the number of pain clinics and specialists providing the service, improving existing facilities and treatments and reducing the current referral times and waiting lists to an acceptable level. The Government is therefore, urged to provide the DHSS with additional funding to specifically improve the provision of treatment for victims suffering chronic physical pain.

Recommendation 2: That the Northern Ireland Memorial Fund provide those victims suffering chronic physical pain with a maximum individual grant of £500 per annum to enable them to obtain private consultations and associated treatments of their choice for the management of their pain.

Recommendation 3: Victims suffering chronic physical pain who consider they would benefit from a surgical implant to block the pain, should be referred to a specialist for a clinical assessment. Subject to a specialist report recommending benefits to the individual, the Memorial Fund will provide the individual with a maximum grant of £7000 to enable them to undergo this surgical procedure.

Artificial Limbs

4.7 Mr Roger Parke, Consultant in Rehabilitation Medicine at Musgrave Park Hospital, advised that he has 117 civil disturbance amputees on his database; 24 of these amputees have lost more than one limb, one having lost 3 limbs. The typical cost of a standard limb varies between £1200 and £1500 and the better "Flex Foot" costs a further £1000. The standard limbs are generally considered by users to be heavy and unattractive. While Musgrave Park Hospital do have a variety of limbs available, some which would appear to be either lighter or of better quality than others, decisions on the suitability of any particular limb for any given individual are based on clinical judgement. A cosmetic limb with textured finish would cost up to £6000 and, given existing resources, could not currently be provided through the NHS. It would also appear that limbs provided by a source other than Musgrave Park Hospital could not be serviced at the Hospital.

Recommendation 4: That the Northern Ireland Memorial Fund provide a £10,000 research bursary to allow a suitably qualified specialist to identify and report on the most suitable and up-to-date prosthetics available.

Recommendation 5: Any victims who consider they would benefit from an alternative type of artificial limb should be referred to Musgrave Park for a clinical assessment as to the suitability of an alternative limb. Subject to a specialist report recommending benefits to the individual, the Memorial Fund will provide the individual with a maximum grant of £6000 to enable Musgrave Park to purchase and fit an alternative limb. The unit at Musgrave Park would, in this case, be responsible for servicing the new limbs.

Wheelchairs

4.8 The HSS Executive Policy Evaluation Unit produced a report in 1996/1997 on the Wheelchair Service. The Unit recommended that the service remain regional; despite this, the Wheelchair Service has recently been devolved to Trust level. The decision has resulted in different prioritisation of services in different Trust areas. Enquiries also suggest that the current service is very under-resourced. The basic model wheelchair costs between £200 and £300. Users generally agree that it is very heavy and awkward to manoeuvre. A lighter and more manoeuvrable model is available, but not through the NHS.

Recommendation 6: That the Memorial Fund provides, subject to a clinical assessment, a maximum grant of £1500 to enable individuals to purchase a lighter, more suitable wheelchair than that currently offered by the Health Service.

Respite Care

4.9 The Directors reported that respite care per se is not available on the NHS. An individual currently in need of essential respite care may, occasionally, be sent to a general hospital ward. For those carers who look after victims, the only means of acquiring a short break is often to pay for the victim to enter a private nursing home. For many victims and carers this is not an option for financial reasons. The Directors acknowledge the commitment and indeed the long-term responsibility placed on carers.

Research reveals that most private nursing homes have provision for short-term respite care which typically costs between £300 to £400 per week.

Recommendation 7: That the Northern Ireland Memorial Fund provide a maximum individual grant of £400 per annum, subject to a positive recommendation from the individuals General Practitioner, towards the cost of one week's respite care in a private nursing home.

TRAUMA AND COUNSELLING

4.10 The Directors discussed the current level of services with members of the Family Trauma Unit, DHSS Social Security Inspectorate, and representatives from victims' groups with a view to identifying how the Fund might respond and provide assistance.

4.11 The Directors discovered that a piecemeal approach to counselling services exists at Trust and Board level. Against this backdrop, victims' groups considered there was an urgent and growing need for counselling, particularly as more victims were coming forward as the peace process develops. In many cases, counselling is bought in by groups as and when it is needed. Some groups have indicated a wish to take their befriending services to the next level and provide counselling from within their own organisations: individual victims often feel more comfortable talking to someone they know and trust. Courses are currently available in counselling at Further Education Colleges, but there would appear to be no standardisation of courses, training or accreditation, and this gives groups cause for concern. Generally, groups do not have professionally qualified counsellors on their staff and are therefore obliged to buy the services of outside agencies.

4.12 The Social Services Inspectorate's report *Living with the Trauma of the 'Troubles'* identified numerous concerns about counselling. Widespread confusion was apparent regarding what constitutes counselling and there were many concerns regarding the level of expertise attained by individual practitioners and the degree of supervision which they receive. Practitioners are not required to be trained to any particular standard, neither is there a universally accepted accreditation or registration process. The report recommended that the DHSS should convene a working group to address these concerns and a project group, led by the Social Services Inspectorate, has been established to review the standards of counselling practice, taking a general approach to counselling, rather than the 'Troubles'-related focus as suggested in their report. The review group will report by March 2000, outlining the findings of the project, identifying and promoting good practice examples, suggesting a minimum set of

counselling standards and recommending the appropriate qualifications, accreditation and supervision requirements for counsellors.

4.13 Staff at the Family Trauma Centre in Belfast are committed to the provision of training in best practice and are pursuing with universities, the possibility of creating a recognised diploma and post-graduate qualification in counselling. The centre also has good training facilities and is keen to utilise these facilities to the full.

Recommendation 8: That the Northern Ireland Memorial Fund provide a £20,000 research bursary to support research into best international practice in the area of counselling. The results would be the basis on which an agreed standard of accreditation might be based.

Recommendation 9: Following on from recommendation 1, the Fund should then support institutions offering counselling training and qualifications in an attempt to standardise and accredit courses currently available. Grants could then be offered to individuals, tied into a selection procedure that would help test the extent of commitment to victims, to attend accredited and recognised courses.

Recommendation 10: The Fund should pursue the possibility of funding the Family Trauma Centre to develop a programme to train representatives from groups supporting victims to enable them to provide basic counselling within their own organisations.

RELIEF/SUPPORT FUND

4.14 The Directors met with representatives from several groups supporting victims to discuss how the Fund might offer assistance to individual victims and their families. In all cases the groups expressed the view that there was a definite and very urgent need for some form of scheme to provide financial assistance for those who, in many cases, continued to suffer financial problems as a result of their experiences. In many cases these are single parent families, where the main breadwinner (usually the husband) has been killed. The Directors were advised that, as a result of this, many families continue to struggle to make ends meet. Their situation is often the result of a culmination of events following the death or serious injury of a family member.

4.15 Inadequacies in the compensation system, particularly but not solely, during the seventies and early eighties, resulted in many families either not receiving compensation, or receiving inadequate compensation. The reasons for this ranged from lack of, or inappropriate, legal advice to disqualification on the basis of a previous criminal record. For those low income families that did receive some compensation, the sums awarded reflected their income at the time of the incident: for those who were unemployed at the time of their death, the families received little or nothing. Inflation over many years has eaten into compensation awards that appeared reasonable at the time. Many traumatised survivors were unable to avail themselves of good financial advice. Many awards took little or no account of long-term emotional and mental trauma.

4.16 The financial drain that this sequence of events has placed on many individuals and families has been compounded over the years. Many grandparents have been left with the responsibility of raising their grandchildren. Many mothers continue to struggle to raise their families, often holding down several jobs to make ends meet. Others continue to rely on state benefits and many have fallen into debt with loan sharks to ensure their children receive Christmas presents and to enable them to replace school uniforms and other essentials.

Recommendation 11: That the Northern Ireland Memorial Fund launch a small grants scheme with a maximum individual grant of £1000 for individuals suffering financial hardship to help towards domestic and household appliances, minor household maintenance, school uniforms etc.

Short Breaks

4.17 Following on from the Directors consultations surrounding the provision of a small grants scheme to help those suffering financial hardship, it became apparent that many individuals and families were unable to avail of short breaks for financial reasons. In some cases families have not been able to enjoy a break from their own communities from some ten to twenty years. Experience within support groups would suggest that short breaks are therapeutically very beneficial for both individuals and the family unit, and support groups would see very positive benefits for some families from a scheme that would enable them to avail of such breaks.

4.18 The Directors have contacted Sir John Jarvis, owner of the Jarvis Hotel International Group. Sir John was recently involved in providing transport and accommodation for a group of victims who, accompanied by the VLU, travelled to London to have lunch with HRH The Prince of Wales. Sir John is sympathetic to the issue of victims and has made a generous offer to the Memorial Fund for the use of the Jarvis Hotel in Ayr, Scotland, at substantially reduced rates. The Directors also made contact with the Haven Holiday Site (Craig Tara) in Ayr and secured a similar

discounted arrangement for use of the park which is ideal for families. The Directors also made contact with the Church of Scotland which has a residence at Troon, and has secured arrangements for the use of the residence by victims. Further options will be investigated and the practicalities developed in due course. The Directors hope to operate this scheme with the assistance of a local travel agent

Recommendation 12: That the Northern Ireland Memorial Fund launches a scheme to provide small grants to individuals, families and groups to allow them to avail of short breaks at a selection of locations in the British Isles.

TRAINING AND EDUCATION

4.19 The Directors met with Mrs Linda Wilson, Director of Children's Services at Bernardos, and Mrs Kim Bums, Victims Liaison Unit, both of whom were responsible for administering the Educational Bursary Pilot Scheme on behalf of the VLU. This pilot scheme provided grants to individuals whose education had been affected by their personal experience of the Troubles. Over 350 individuals were helped with grants ranging between £500 and £2000 for items such as tuition, fees, books, and home computers. The total cost of the pilot scheme, which ran between January and April 1999 was £300,000. Although this pilot scheme had specifically focused on individuals who were in education at the time of their personal trauma, the experience of the pilot scheme had shown there was a clear need to extend the scheme to include individuals who had missed opportunities and now wished to return to education following their personal experience, as well as individuals who as a result of their experience now required re-skilling or re-training to either improve their chances of employment or assist in a career change.

4.20 The Directors also concluded that it would be important to assist children and young people currently in education who have either been personally traumatised or have experienced trauma within their immediate family circle. Any extended scheme should, therefore, provide assistance at transitional points in any victims educational or professional career. This should also include pre-school assistance to enable parents to place three to four year olds in playschools or playgroups, and one option may be to link into the Childcare Voucher Scheme.

Recommendation 13: That the Northern Ireland Memorial Fund re-launch the Educational Bursary Scheme offering grants up to a maximum of £1000 towards tutoring, course fees, attendance fees and books, to a broad range of individual victims at six specific transitional points:

1. **Pre-school - to provide assistance for children aged three to four to attend playschool or playgroups.**

- 2. Primary education - to assist children aged four to nine.**
- 3. Transfer Test - to prepare children moving from Primary to Secondary education - ages nine to eleven.**
- 4. Secondary education - to assist young people approaching GCSE/ A levels - ages twelve to eighteen.**
- 5. Tertiary education - to assist young people entering further education and universities - age sixteen plus.**
- 6. Re-skilling/re-training - to assist individuals seeking vocational and skills training - age sixteen plus.**

NETWORKING, LOBBYING AND INFORMATION SERVICES

4.21 Following consultations, the Directors concluded that future funding for groups supporting victims is likely to become more difficult to obtain. Fortunately, some additional money has been made available for the next three years through the Peace and Reconciliation programme, but as the peace process becomes more stable, many new victim support groups are forming and competition for these limited resources is increasing. Currently, all groups operate independently of each other and tend to pursue their own sources of funding. To a large extent they are in competition with each other for the same limited resources.

4.22 The Directors believe that for groups to grow, develop and continue to provide support to victims into the twenty first century, a more collaborative approach may need to be adopted to ensure the best use of whatever resources may be available. This approach will necessitate groups working more closely together in areas of common interest and, if approached properly, should not in any way diminish a group's individual identity. Clearly, there are areas that are particular to individual groups, but there is much common ground where collaboration and a co-ordinated approach should be possible and beneficial, particularly in the areas of securing funding, training and education, counselling, and the exchange of information and experience.

Recommendation 14: In view of the increase in the number of groups supporting victims and the limited resources that are available, the Northern Ireland Memorial Fund will develop with groups the benefits of working more closely together to share resources and experience. The Memorial fund will provide financial assistance towards setting-up appropriate physical or human structures to facilitate a collaborative and co-ordinated approach to the provision of support for groups and victims.

THE DISAPPEARED

4.23 The Board of Directors has followed closely the plight of the families of the Disappeared. The Directors are conscious that an additional financial burden has been placed on those families who have travelled to, and remained close to the alleged burial sites, with the hope that the excavations will reveal the remains of their loved ones.

4.24 Following the passing of the Location of Victims Remains Act and the announcement by the IRA that it had identified the location of the graves of nine individuals, the Memorial Fund felt it would be appropriate to offer financial assistance to each of those nine families following the identification of the bodies, at a time when the families will be making arrangements for burial.

Recommendation 15: That the Northern Ireland Memorial Fund provide a one-off payment of £4000 following the identification of the remains to each of the families of the nine victims identified by the IRA, at a time when they will be making arrangements for the burial of their loved ones. This offer will be extended to other families if the remains of their loved ones are discovered and identified.

CRITERIA

4.25 Appendix 3 provides details of the criteria that the Directors believe should be the basis on which eligibility should be assessed for most of the schemes contained in section 4 of this report. The Directors accept that these criteria are both broad and general and will require further refining as the precise details of each scheme are developed. They do, however, provide a good indication of the general target audience for each scheme.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE SCHEMES

4.26 While a great deal of effort has been directed into researching and developing the Fund's initial response to each of the five areas identified, the Board of Directors realise that neither they nor the Fund's Secretariat are currently in a position to administer any of the recommended schemes. There are, therefore, two decisive factors which will influence the success or failure of the Fund in providing help to victims under each of the five areas: (1) the need for a suitable channel to administer the above schemes; and (2) the resources available to sustain them.

4.27 The Directors have identified three broad areas which provide alternative means by which the Fund can approach this problem.

- 1.** The schemes could be administered by the Fund's Secretariat. Given current staffing levels (two), the Government would need to allocate additional members of staff to the Secretariat. These staff could be provided by the NIO or seconded from any of the NICS Departments. Additional staff would be dedicated to administering most or all of the above schemes. There are clear advantages to using civil servants. Civil servants are supremely well placed to be, and to be perceived to be, neutral. The Government's commitment to the Fund, and hence to victims generally, would be underlined. If the Government provides the administration, then all contributions from donors will go direct to the beneficiaries of the schemes. This will be very helpful in selling the Fund to potential donors. The Fund would be able to control and monitor more precisely the development of each scheme if the Secretariat were to administer them.
- 2.** The Memorial Fund could hire additional staff. This would be a large additional drain on the Fund's limited resources and would be fraught with administrative problems such as advertising, equal opportunities, interviewing and selecting, PAYE, salary administration, national insurance, pension schemes, office accommodation and staff turnover.

3. The Memorial Fund could negotiate for third party organisations to administer the schemes on the Fund's behalf. There are few organisations geared to handle these type of schemes, and the task of finding suitable organisations that would be willing to take on some or all of these schemes may be difficult. This option will probably, and Option 2 will certainly necessitate the Fund financing the administration of all of these schemes which will be a drain on the Fund's resources and ultimately, will mean less money to distribute through the schemes. Therefore, the total administrative cost of delivering all of the schemes will need to be carefully considered in light of current and anticipated future funding. (The Directors have made an exploratory approach to the Northern Ireland Voluntary Trust (NIVT) with a view to negotiating the possibility of that organisation administering the small grants scheme on behalf of the Fund. Following an initial meeting to discuss this possibility, the NIVT have indicated a willingness to co-operate with the Memorial Fund and negotiations are ongoing.)

4.28 The Directors recognise that each of the recommended schemes will require a suitable vehicle to administer them. The administration of all the schemes will require a degree of experience and expertise that at present does not exist within the Fund's current structure. Different schemes will attract different responses from different groups of victims and it is optimistic to envisage one central point from which all schemes might be successfully administered. The Directors realise that further enquiries will need to be made to investigate the best or most appropriate channel to administer each of these schemes and that the realistic options for doing so are limited. However, the Directors believe that a combination of Option 1 and Option 3 is the most likely scenario for the effective administration of the schemes, but this is only possible if additional staff are made available, and organisations can be secured to administer some of the schemes. The Directors consider Option 2 as unnecessarily expensive and realistically unmanageable given current financial and human resources.

The Directors are conscious, however, that they are constrained by the number of suitable organisations available and that securing agreement with those organisations for the delivery of all of the schemes identified will be very difficult, and will have financial implications for the Fund. Equally, the Directors are conscious that the Victims Liaison Unit have indicated that additional staff are unlikely to be made available and the combination of these two factors has effectively placed the potential administration of all of the schemes somewhere in limbo. The Directors will, however, proceed to examine the best or most appropriate method of delivering each scheme and report further in due course.

Recommendation 16: That the Northern Ireland Memorial Fund negotiate with the Northern Ireland Voluntary Trust and other organisations to administer some or all of the schemes identified. If the Fund's attempts to secure organisations to deliver all of the schemes are unsuccessful, then the Government should provide additional members of staff to administer the above schemes.

FUNDING

Current Financial Position

5.1 Following the establishment of the Memorial Fund on 18 May 1999 as a company limited by guarantee and having charitable status, the Directors opened a market yield and current account with the First Trust Bank, Belfast. Three contributions have been received and lodged:

A. UK Government Funding

£1,000,000 transferred to the Memorial Fund from the NIO on 18 June 1999.

B. Private Funding

£18,000 private donation from John and Pat Hume.

£15,625 (equivalent of US\$25,000) private donation from the American businessman, Tom Tracy, via the American Ireland Fund.

C. Miscellaneous

The Fund has been promised, but has not yet received, the following donations:

1. £5,000 from the Ireland Fund of France,
2. £1,000 from an unknown American donor via the Ireland Fund,
3. US\$30,000 from the American firm, Raytheon.

D. The American Ireland Fund

The American Ireland Fund (AIF) has intimated that they will be supportive of the Fund, but to what extent is yet unknown. Contact has, and continues to be made at the highest level and we understand that the Memorial Fund will receive financial support as a result of our attendance at the Ireland Funds' Grants Fair in June 1999.

Estimated Requirements

5.2 The task of estimating what the Fund will require to deliver a meaningful response in each of the five areas identified for the next five years is difficult. There is no previous precedent by which to measure the extent of the need in each of these specific areas. The Directors did, however, find the Bloomfield Report, the consultation exercise carried out by the VLU and the research carried out by the Cost of the Troubles Study, very helpful and informative in this regard. In relation to Educational and Training assistance, the Educational Bursary Pilot Scheme proved a useful yardstick by which to estimate the level of need and the amount of funding the Memorial Fund would likely require. The Directors did accept that the need was far greater than the Memorial Fund could ever realistically hope to address.

5.3 The projection of estimated funding required to enable the Memorial Fund to respond adequately yet meaningfully to the needs of victims is detailed in Appendix 4. The Directors estimate the Fund will require approximately £7.5 million to distribute over the next five years if it is to make both a positive difference to the lives of some victims and, at the same time, successfully reflect the Government's commitment to support victims following the Good Friday Agreement and the Bloomfield Report. Seven and a half million pounds spread over five years is, the Directors believe, a reasonable sum by comparison with the Government resources that have, and continue to be, directed to other issues recognised under the Good Friday Agreement.

5.4 In producing these estimates, the Directors have attempted to include estimated provision for the likely costs to the fund to have the schemes administered by outside

organisations. This was difficult to estimate across the range of recommended schemes as it will be influenced by a number of factors, including the current staffing levels of any given organisations, the number of organisations required to administer the package of schemes, and the size of any given scheme as reflected by the anticipated level of response. Provision has not been made to allow the Fund to develop its response further or into different areas largely because the Directors believe the current projection stretches potential fundraising capabilities to the limit. As for the future development of the Fund, it is impossible to say where the fund will be in the next year or two, and to estimate what funding might be required to develop further responses would be both unrealistic and optimistic at this early stage. Further responses will, therefore, have a direct correlation with the success of future fundraising and support from Government.

Marketing and Fundraising

5.5 The Directors consider that the composition of the Board of the Northern Ireland Memorial Fund does not suggest the Board was appointed primarily as a fundraising body. Indeed, a majority of Directors made it clear from the start that they would not wish, for a variety of reasons, to be involved in fundraising. This must be borne in mind when measuring the Board's potential to fundraise.

5.6 Following discussions with many potential donors in the United States, the Fund's US based Director, Dr George Moore, reported that it will be difficult to market the Fund or raise significant funds in the USA for the following reasons:

- America is 'tired' of being asked to support Irish/Northern Irish issues.
- America, albeit naively, considers the problems in Ireland have largely been resolved by the Good Friday Agreement.

- Competition with other established organisations (such as the American Ireland Fund and the new Northern Ireland Reconciliation Fund launched recently by Senator Mitchell) will make the task very difficult.
- Victims are not an attractive issue (less than 1.5% of the US's annual charitable donations go to this type of humanitarian cause).
- The Government's initial contribution of £1 million suggested to potential donors that either the Government was not serious about this issue, or the issue was not a significant problem, or both.

5.7 Mr Edmond and Miss Wells, the two consultants who advised the Directors, also concluded that the Directors will have great difficulty marketing the Fund. They advised that as a worthy cause, potential donor support will rely on basic humanitarian appeal and there were already thousands of organisations in the UK and Ireland, not to mention America, competing on this basis.

5.8 Taking into consideration the points raised in paragraphs 5.5 through to 5.7, the Directors have concluded that their capability to raise significant funding will be limited.

Current Progress

5.9 The Directors have formed a fundraising committee which has met regularly over the past several months under the chairmanship of Prof George Bain. With the co-operation, commitment and enthusiasm of Mrs Daphne Trimble, Mrs Pat Hume and Dr George Moore, a number of in-roads have been made into the philanthropic community both at home and in the USA. This has been primarily to raise awareness of the Fund, but has also proved a good indication of the likelihood of the Fund receiving current and future support.

5.10 As previously stated in paragraph 5.6, Dr Moore has made contact with a number of potential donors in the United States, including the Board of the American Ireland

Fund. Mrs Trimble and Mrs Hume also met with a number of influential people and philanthropists during the St Patrick's Day festivities in Washington earlier in the year. These contacts resulted in an invitation from the Ireland Funds to attend their Annual Grants Fair in Dublin in June and the result of this further contact has been an indication by the American Ireland Fund that they will support and assist the Memorial Fund in its endeavours. While a relationship with the American Ireland Fund will be necessary to enable the Fund to tap into the American market, the details of the relationship have yet to be discussed as has the extent of their offer of support. Following developments on this front, the Directors would hope to arrange a fundraising visit to the United States later in the year.

5.11 On the home front, consideration is currently being given to the idea of a UK/Ireland wide fundraising campaign to offer the wider community the opportunity to support the work of the Fund. Directors are also considering setting up fundraising sub-committees comprising members of the business community who may be supportive of the Fund. In addition, the Directors are also examining the feasibility of acquiring the services of a professional fundraiser to raise money on behalf of the fund and to develop a fundraising strategy for the Directors.

Achieving the Goal

5.12 Throughout this exercise the Directors have been conscious that to deliver the Fund's response as reflected in the proposed estimates, additional funding will be required above and beyond that which the Directors believe they are capable of raising. The Directors believe, based on the above information, that with considerable effort and commitment they should be able to raise up to £2.5 million for victims over the next four financial years. Combined with the £1 million already received from the Government, this makes a total estimated fund of £3.5 million.

5.13 The Directors are mindful that the primary responsibility for victims rests with the Government and that the Memorial Fund is a clear reflection of Government policy. The Directors have therefore concluded that for the Memorial Fund to respond on

behalf of the Government to the needs of victims as detailed in this report, the Government will need to meet the shortfall and commit a further £4 million to the Fund over the next four years. The Directors therefore make the following recommendation:

Recommendation 17: That the Directors commit to raising £2.5 million over the next four years, and the British government contribute a further £1 million per year, for each of the next four financial years.