



## GENDER BALANCE POWER MAP

1

Co-inspiration between social and classic enterprises  
to promote equal access to decision making positions

---

# SEE:GO PROJECT “GENDER BALANCE POWER MAP” 2<sup>ND</sup> STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

## Minutes

Tuesday 14th April – Thursday 16th April 2014

Brescia and Milan

### PARTICIPANTS

#### **CGM Cooperative Group**

Mr. Pierluca Ghibelli - Responsible of international area  
Mrs. Sabina Bellione - President of local Consortium  
Mrs. Alessandra Piraino - Communication Officer and Events Manager

#### **FACE Foundation**

Mr. Simon Miclet - Gender Equality Project Manager

#### **INSTITUTE OF SOCIOLOGY, Academy of Sciences of Czech Republic**

Mrs. Hana Maříková - Senior Researcher  
Mrs. Lenka Formánková - Researcher

#### **JUMP**

Mrs. Amandine Peeters - Online Communication Manager  
Mrs. Stéphanie Tinel - Project Manager

#### **KOKKOTYÖ Foundation**

Mrs. Margita Lukkarinen - Chief Executive Officer  
Mr. Harri Tarkiainen - Secretary of Personal Issues  
Mrs. Niina Hämäläinen - Researcher

#### **PACT Foundation**

Mrs. Madalina Ene - Program Director  
Mrs. Laura Marin - Project Manager

#### **POUR LA SOLIDARITÉ**

Mrs. Estelle Huchet - Project Manager  
Mr. Alvaro Sanchez - Financial Officer  
Mrs. Christiana Weidel - Independent Evaluator





## OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT

### Overview of the project work streams (WS)

#### **See PLS' PPT – annex 3**

FACE asked what project name we should use; all the partners agreed on the fact that we should publicly talk about the project under the name “Gender Balance Power Map”. The administrative name of the project under which the project has been registered at the Commission will remain “SEE:GO” until the end of the project though. Therefore, we must be careful to mention the administrative name of the project in every deliverable we will write (see footer of the template).

### Overview of the communication activities

#### **See JUMP's PPT – annex 4**

All the partners were invited to promote the project through their national media, their own social media accounts (by using the #GenderPowerMap hashtag), their own website and newsletters. Regarding the timeline, SOU asked if it would be possible to have the templates for the European comparative study and the framework earlier than January 2015 so that we can work directly with it. JUMP was asked to work on the templates over the summer.

### Overview of the progress reporting

#### **See PLS' PPT – annex 3**

#### **See the progress report template – annex 5**

The partners were asked to send the reporting documents (i.e. the progress report, the indicators annex, and the financial report) fully filled in by 20<sup>th</sup> of May the latest. The partners agreed on the task division as follow (to be found as well in the PPT presentation):

- Implementation: PLS + SOU + KOKKOTYO + PACT + CGM (1/2 page per partner)
- Timetable: PLS + SOU + KOKKOTYO + PACT + CGM (1/4 page per partner)
- Scope of the project: Project coordinator – PLS (1 page)
- Overall assessment: Project evaluator – Christiana Weidel (1 page)
- Visibility: Communication partner – JUMP (1/2 page)
- Indicators, section 1.1: SOU + KOKKOTYO (list the methodologies developed)
- Indicators, section 1.2: SOU (list the national studies)
- Indicators, section 4.1: PACT + CGM (list the awareness raising seminars)
- Indicators, section 4.2: PACT + CGM (list the groups who attended the public seminars)
- Indicators, section 4.3: PACT + CGM (list the materials printed out for the public seminars) + JUMP (list the website, and the hashtag if relevant)

### Overview of the financial reporting

#### **For a reminder of the reporting rules, see annexes 6 and 7**

Regarding the financial reporting, the partners were asked to fill in the 5 tabs of the Excel sheet sent by Alvaro prior to the steering committee meeting. The partners attending the steering committee meeting in Brescia who are not in charge of the accounting in their organization should send Alvaro





[[alvaro.sanchez@pourlasolidarite.eu](mailto:alvaro.sanchez@pourlasolidarite.eu)] the contact details of the accountant of their organization so that Alvaro can explain him/her the financial reporting rules of the project.

The partners were asked to name properly their documents and gather them in folders named after the type of cost they are related to (i.e. staff costs; travel and subsistence costs; etc.). The documents should also be scanned in color in order to be read more easily.

The partners were asked not to add columns which might make the Excel sheet more complicated; Alvaro invites the partners to write to him in case of problems or questions. The partners were reminded that they will need to prove their expenses in order to get the money back from the Commission. The next provisions are planned for summer 2015 (20%) and summer 2016 (20%).

### WS1: PRESENTATION OF THE NATIONAL STUDIES

SOU underlined they were aware of the difficulties some partners can have since they are more expert in social economy than in gender issues. They thank the partners for the work achieved so far though. At the time we met, two national studies were ready. The others are expected to be finished by the beginning of May. The national studies were presented in alphabetical order.

- **For the Belgian PPT, see annex 8.** PLS will provide an updated version of the PPT when the national study will be ready; therefore the partners will have a brief sum up of the study.
- **For the Czech PPT, see annex 9**
- **For the Finnish PPT, see annex 10**
- **For the French PPT, see annex 11**
- **For the Italian PPT, see annex 12**
- **For the Romanian PPT, see annex 13**

All the studies will need to have appendix with the references, the other materials or texts that will have been used in the study, etc. Detailed information will be sent by SOU after the steering committee meeting (reminder of the steps in order to finish the study).

#### Printing of the studies

The national language version of the studies will need to be corrected according to the comments of the SOU as well as it was done for the English version. The national studies both in the national language and English versions will need to be formatted in the template provided by JUMP.

**The word template is attached to the minutes, see annex 14**

Since the lay out of the studies can be very time consuming, it was suggested that some of the translation budget (not used yet since the partners all wrote the national study in English by





Co-inspiration between social and classic enterprises to promote equal access to decision making positions

themselves) is used both for edition the English version (make sure we do not display content with English mistakes) and formatting (make sure all the studies are in the same template).

Please find below a reminder of the budget allocated per partner for the translation:

Budget heading	Name of Beneficiary	Workstream	Description of item	Unit	Amount per unit in EURO	Number of units	Total EURO
E	Co-ordinator	Workstream 1	Translation - National study (FR-UK)	A4 page	40,00	100,00	4.000,00
E	Co-beneficiary 1	Workstream 1	Translation - National study (IT-UK)	A4 page	30,00	100,00	3.000,00
E	Co-beneficiary 2	Workstream 1	Translation - National study (FR-UK)	A4 page	40,00	100,00	4.000,00
E	Co-beneficiary 3	Workstream 1	Translation - National study (RO-UK)	A4 page	30,00	100,00	3.000,00
E	Co-beneficiary 4	Workstream 1	Translation - National study (CZ-UK)	A4 page	30,00	100,00	3.000,00
E	Co-beneficiary 5	Workstream 1	Translation - National study (FI-UK)	A4 page	40,00	100,00	4.000,00

250 copies of the national studies are to be printed by each partner in charge of a national study (all but JUMP). The decision of how many studies to print in English and/or in the national language is left to the partners. The project website will only make available for downloading the English versions.

Please find below a reminder of the budget allocated for the printing of the national studies:

Budget heading	Name of Beneficiary	Workstream	Description of item	Unit	Amount per unit in EURO	Number of units	Total EURO
E	Co-ordinator	Workstream 1	Printing - National study (250 ex X 50 pages)	exemplar	3,50	250,00	875,00
E	Co-beneficiary 1	Workstream 2	Printing - National study (250 ex X 50 pages)	exemplar	3,50	250,00	875,00
E	Co-beneficiary 2	Workstream 2	Printing - National study (250 ex X 50 pages)	exemplar	3,50	250,00	875,00
E	Co-beneficiary 3	Workstream 2	Printing - National study (250 ex X 50 pages)	exemplar	3,50	250,00	875,00
E	Co-beneficiary 4	Workstream 2	Printing - National study (250 ex X 50 pages)	exemplar	3,50	250,00	875,00
E	Co-beneficiary 5	Workstream 2	Printing - National study (250 ex X 50 pages)	exemplar	3,50	250,00	875,00





### MID-TERM AND 2ND STEERING COMMITTEE EVALUATION

**See Christiana Weidel's PPT – annex 15**

**See Christiana Weidel's evaluation – annex 16**

The partners were reminded that the European Commission now focuses on the outcomes (something that follows from an action) and not on the outputs (quantity or amount of something produced) of the project anymore. It means that we should mainly get interested in questions such as: How was the communication with the partners? What were the highlights? Towards the public (any side effects)?

### AWARENESS RAISING PUBLIC SEMINAR

**See the minutes provided by CGM – annex 17**

**See PPT presentations of the public event – annex 18**

**See the evaluation of the public seminar in Christiana Weidel's evaluation – annex 16**

### WS2: PREPARING THE NATIONAL WORKSHOPS

**See the methodology prepared by KOKKOTYO – annexes 19 to 22. It includes:**

- **The methodology for the workshops;**
- **The guidelines for the workshops report.**

#### Participative approach

The partners were asked to bear in mind what are the motivations of the participants who come to the work streams, what are the energies, the motivations of the participants. We need to create the conditions that will promote everyone's participation. Our main task is to make the topic understandable to every participant.

#### Working groups

All the partners were asked to form a working group in their organization to prepare the workshops. Every working group must – at least – be composed of a gender expert and a moderator (not expert but able to implement participative approaches). Both need to have a common understanding of what we need to do, especially because it is a very sensitive subject.

Regarding the budget, a line is allocated to a gender expert; another one for an administrative support. The latter could be the person in charge of moderating the workshops. A reminder of the budget allocated to the WS2 activities will be sent to each partner prior to the launch of the workshops. The partners are invited to find some co-financing sources if possible.





### Creative methodologies

The decision of what creative methods to use is left to each working group according to what is suitable in every country. We must avoid doing it in a traditional way though. We want people to ask themselves the following questions: What would we like to see in my company? What would my position would be if I was a mother of two children? If problems are identified in the working group, we must be careful not to transmit them to the groups (like “women do not want to be promoted”, “women always stay at home with children”, etc.). Otherwise, somehow, we will transmit our stereotypes.

### Timeframe of the workstream

Regarding the timeframe, each partner can organize it the way he/she wants (for instance, two workshops in June and the last one in September; or two workshops in parallel in the morning and the third one in the afternoon). It will be interesting to have different experiences from the partners.

### Making people attend

We will have to be very active. The partners were asked to designate someone in charge of contacting these people (prefer personal invitations). The partners were also invited to use the contact of people interviewed and to suggest them to come with someone or ask if they know someone interested.

### Reporting

It should describe the working process but the focus should be on the outcomes and results of the workshops. It will be important to have somebody who takes notes during the workshops. The partners are reminded that the workshops reporting costs are covered by staff budgets.

### Schedule

All the partners agreed with the suggestion to have a skype in early June to check how everything is going with the organization of the workshops and share some tips (like what ice breakers to use); it is important that each partners will have discussed prior to the skype meeting among a working group.

All the workshops need to be over by the end of September. Another skype meeting will be organized in late September to exchange on the workshops and talk about the reports. The workshops reports will have to be sent and validated by KOKKOTYO by the end of October so PLS and FACE can start working on the European framework in November.

In order to choose the dates of the skype meetings, the partners are kindly asked to fill in the Doodle available at the following link with the approximate dates of their three national workshops before 20<sup>th</sup> of May: <http://doodle.com/xps6sqnt8t5y5q35>.





### WS3: EUROPEAN COMPARTIVE STUDY AND EUROPEAN FRAMEWORK

See FACE's PPT – annex 23

#### Timeline of the work stream

The partners agreed with the timeline of the work stream. JUMP underlined the fact that they will need the deliverables one month prior to the final conference (planned for mid-March). The partners agreed to change the deadlines for the following:

- Mid-December 2015: first drafts of *both* deliverables;  
⇒ Feedback by all the partners until early January 2016
- End of January 2016: final corrections of the deliverables;  
⇒ Validation by all the partners by the end of January 2016
- Early February 2016: transmission to JUMP (WS4 leader)

All the partners also agreed on the fact that having 4 video conferences to give feedback might not be necessary as long as all the partners are able to comment and validate the study by email. The possibility of setting up a Google document to facilitate the sharing of comments was mentioned.

#### Language of the deliverables

All the partners agreed on the need to have the final deliverables (European comparative study and European framework) both in English and in their own language. It was reminded that the printing of these deliverables will have to be taken in charge by each partner. They will be able to decide how many exemplars – out of the 250 exemplars per deliverable – they want to print out in English and in their national languages.

Please find below a reminder of the budget allocated for the printing of the WS3 deliverables:

Budget heading	Name of Beneficiary	Workstream	Description of item	Unit	Amount per unit in EURO	Number of units	Total EURO
E	Co-beneficiary 1	Workstream 3	Printing - Comparative study (250 ex X 100 pages)	exemplar	5,00	250,00	<b>1.250,00</b>
E	Co-beneficiary 1	Workstream 3	Printing - Best practices recommendations framework (250 ex X 50 pages)	exemplar	3,50	250,00	<b>875,00</b>
E	Co-beneficiary 2	Workstream 3	Printing - Comparative study (250 ex X 100 pages)	exemplar	5,00	250,00	<b>1.250,00</b>
E	Co-beneficiary 2	Workstream 3	Printing - Best practices recommendations framework (250 ex X 50 pages)	exemplar	3,50	250,00	<b>875,00</b>
E	Co-beneficiary 3	Workstream 3	Printing - Comparative study (250 ex X 100 pages)	exemplar	5,00	250,00	<b>1.250,00</b>





Budget heading	Name of Beneficiary	Workstream	Description of item	Unit	Amount per unit in EURO	Number of units	Total EURO
E	Co-beneficiary 3	Workstream 3	Printing - Best practices recommendations framework (250 ex X 50 pages)	exemplar	3,50	250,00	<b>875,00</b>
E	Co-beneficiary 4	Workstream 3	Printing - Comparative study (250 ex X 100 pages)	exemplar	5,00	250,00	<b>1.250,00</b>
E	Co-beneficiary 4	Workstream 3	Printing - Best practices recommendations framework (250 ex X 50 pages)	exemplar	3,50	250,00	<b>875,00</b>
E	Co-beneficiary 5	Workstream 3	Printing - Comparative study (250 ex X 100 pages)	exemplar	5,00	250,00	<b>1.250,00</b>
E	Co-beneficiary 5	Workstream 3	Printing - Best practices recommendations framework (250 ex X 50 pages)	exemplar	3,50	250,00	<b>875,00</b>
E	Co-beneficiary 6	Workstream 3	Printing - Comparative study (250 ex X 100 pages)	exemplar	8,00	250,00	<b>2.000,00</b>
E	Co-beneficiary 6	Workstream 3	Printing - Best practices recommendations framework (250 ex X 50 pages)	exemplar	5,00	250,00	<b>1.250,00</b>

The question of the budget for translating the deliverables from English to national languages was raised. PLS will look for a solution and suggest it to the partners on the occasion of the third steering committee meeting in November.

### Additional interviews

Partners agreed with the suggestion to ask for further information on best practices and be able to display some short “case studies” in the European framework. PACT also suggested to have surveys to fill in during the national workshops in order to ask for best practices and the contact details of the person to get in touch with for more information (contextual factors, implementation process, etc.). The partners agreed on the fact that we will not have to collect data necessarily through formal interviews. This matter will be discussed by PLS, FACE and SOU while working on the methodology of the WS3.

According to SOU, potential additional interviews of experts should be possible in the framework of the European comparative study depending on the needs for clarification. All the partners agreed. Again, the format of data collection will be discussed by PLS, FACE and SOU.

Except for the methodology that needs to be validated over the summer, the organization of the WS3 activities will be discussed in details on the occasion of the 3<sup>rd</sup> steering committee meeting, in November 2015 (date to be scheduled – see below).







### NEXT STEPS

Five dates have been identified so far for the next steering committee meeting. The partners are kindly asked to fill in the following Doodle document before 20<sup>th</sup> of May: <http://doodle.com/ntrsz5caghcbqqms>

- Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> of November (am / pm)
- Thursday 19<sup>th</sup> of November (am / pm)
- Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> of November (am / pm)
- Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> of November (am / pm)
- Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> of November (am / pm)

This third steering committee will be the last one before the final steering committee to be held in Brussels on the occasion of the final dissemination conference (mid-March 2016). In the meantime:

#### WS 1 – NATIONAL STUDIES – Next steps:

1. End of April 2015: SOU will send further collective recommendations and individual comments to the partners whom the national study is still to be finished;
2. Mid-May 2015: have all the national studies reviewed and validated by SOU;
3. End of May 2015: have all the national studies finished both in English and your national language, formatted in the right template (furnished by JUMP);
4. June 2015: dissemination of the national studies;
  - ⇒ Send the English digital version to JUMP for the upload on the website and to PLS;
  - ⇒ Print the national study in 250 exemplars (to be divided among exemplars in the national language and in English if relevant for the national workshops).

#### WS 2 – NATIONAL WORKSHOPS – Next steps:

1. End of April 2015: the methodology and tools of the workshops are attached to the minutes;
2. May 2015: Set up a working group and start organizing the workshops;
3. Beginning of June 2015: Skype meeting prior to the launch of the workshops;
4. June to Sept. 2015: organization of three workshops in each partner country;
5. End of September 2015: Skype meeting after the end of the workshops;
6. Sept. to October 2015: writing the report of the workshops, have it validated by KOKKOTYO.

#### WS 3 – COMPARTIVE STUDY & EUROPEAN FRAMEWORK – Next steps:

1. May to June 2015: working on the methodology (2 analytical grids + 1 list of criteria for the best practices) to be established by SOU, FACE and PLS; they will be send to the partners by email for comment and validation of the methodology;
2. June to December 2015: writing of the comparative study and the European framework;
3. Early February 2015: validation of the deliverables and transmission to JUMP.

