



Evaluations: Crisis conference 2011

23 September 2011, Brussels

MEMBERS

Overall DRAFT! summary: (23 replies from 95 participants)

Positive response with highest appreciation for gaining knowledge, the organisers' preparation, workshops (content & methodology), their own preparation, venue, logistics, social activity & hotel/food.

Appreciation for advancing objectives, matching people's needs, strengthening EAPN, applying the knowledge gained & the afternoon plenary.

More neutral area – strengthening participation (with 11 saying neutral/undecided) & the morning plenary (6 saying neutral & 6 bad).

5 members evaluated the morning plenary as bad (note, a few commented that this didn't include Justine & Katherine). There were a few singular voices evaluating the venue, logistics, food, hotel, social activity as bad also.

Very good/Good:

Question 1: Advancing EAPN objectives: 20/21

Question 2: Strengthening EAPN NN: 15/22

Question 4: Matching needs: 20/23

Question 5: Relevant knowledge: 20/23

Question 6: Applying knowledge: 17/22

Question 8: Afternoon plenary: 17/22

Question 9: Organisers' preparation: 22/23

Question 10: Morning workshops: 19/22

Question 11: Afternoon workshops: 20/23

Question 12: Workshop methodology: 19/23

Question 13: Their preparation: 21/23

Question 14: Venue, Logistics: 20/23

Question 15: Food : 19/22

Question 16: Hotel: 18/21

Question 17: Social activity: 15/20

MEMBERS & NON-MEMBERS On questions:

Question 1: Did the event do anything to change your views on the need for an alternative approach for an inclusive recovery?

15 out of 21 answers said Yes! (Including 2 non-members) with 5 saying it didn't change their view but informed it (including 1 non-member)

Question 2: Do you agree with the EAPN proposals regarding the elements for a common alternative agenda?

22 out of 22 clear answers said Yes! Including 4 non-members.
EAPN France & J. Poirson didn't know what the proposals were!

Question 3: Do you support the idea of building stronger alliances around a common agenda? Why/Why not?

All answers said Yes! Including 4 non-members.
3 members questioned alliance with trade unions though

Question 4a: What were the strengths of this conference?

Various positive comments with some repetition of the conference’s relevance, inputs & workshops.

Question 4b: What were the weaknesses of this conference?

Various negative comments with the overriding one being on institutional speakers. Also, lack of time & policy-makers leaving.

Question 5: Comments, suggestions

A few comments and thanks. 2 (more) calls for better speakers & 2 for more participation of PEP.
1 request to send key points of conference (EuroHealthNet) & 1 from to meet up (ENIL).

NON-MEMBERS

Overall DRAFT! summary: (8 replies from 72 participants)

Only 8 forms! Positive responses to all 13 questions with 2-3 people neutral or undecided on the conference matching their needs, being able to apply the knowledge, PM workshop & workshop methodology..

The question on participation was more one of principle for non-members, and 7 strongly agreed it is important and 1 agreed.

	5 (very good)	4 (good)	3 (undecided/neutral)	2 (bad)	1 (very bad)
1. Did the event match your needs?	2	4	2		6/8
2. Did you gain relevant knowledge and information?	1	6	1		7/8
3. Can you apply this in your work?	1	4	3		5/8
4. Do you agree that the participation of people in poverty is important?	7	1			8/8
5. Morning Plenary sessions/ speakers	1	4	1		5/6
6. Afternoon Plenary session and speakers	1	4	1		5/6
7. Preparation by organizers (background documents/ mailing)	6	2			8/8
8. Morning Workshops content/speakers	4	2			6/6

9. Afternoon Workshop content/speakers	2	4	2		6/8
10. Workshop methodology	3	3	2		6/8
11. Your preparation and participation	3	4			7/7
12. Venue/ Logistics (incl. interpretation)	7		1		7/8
13. Lunch and Coffee	5	2	1		7/8

MEMBERS' POINTS GIVEN & TOTALS FOR JOINT QUESTIONS

	5 (very good)	4 (good)	3 (undecided/neutral)	2 (bad)	1 (very bad)
1. Is this conference helping advance EAPN policy objectives?	5	15	1		
2. Has this meeting helped strengthen EAPN National Networks and European Organizations?	3	12	7		
3. Did the meeting strengthen the role and participation of people experiencing poverty?	4	7	11		
4. Did the event match your needs?	5	15	3		
TOTAL:	7	19	5		
5. Did you gain relevant knowledge and information?	14	6	3		
TOTAL:	15	12	4		
6. Can you apply this in your work?	6	11	5		
TOTAL:	7	15	8		
7. Morning Plenary sessions/ speakers	4	6	6	6	
TOTAL:	5	10	7	6	
8. Afternoon Plenary session and speakers	4	13	5		
TOTAL:	5	17	6		
9. Preparation by organizers (bkgd docs/ mailing)	12	10	1		
TOTAL:	18	12	1		
10. Morning Workshops content/speakers	13(1-GR only)	7	4(1-BE only)		
TOTAL:	17	9	4		
11. Afternoon Workshop content/speakers	12	7	3		

TOTAL:	14	11	5		
12. Workshop methodology	6	13	4		
TOTAL:	9	16	6		
13. Your preparation and participation	4	17	2		
TOTAL:	7	21	2		
14. Venue/ Logistics (incl. interpretation)	14	6	2	1	
TOTAL:	21	6	3	1	
15. Food	6	13	1	1	1
TOTAL:	11	15	2	1	1
16. Hotel	11	7	1	2	
17. Social activities	6	9	3	2	

1. Did the event do anything to change your views on the need for an alternative approach for an inclusive recovery? If so how?

Yes, new paradigm of sustainable development taking economic, social, environmental, ethical & cultural factors into account

Solution & activities in Iceland, very interesting

Yes, best practices & interesting comments

Yes, lots of relevant info to use in our lobbying

Yes, knew need an alternative but reinforced main positions & clarified specific elements of socio-economic model needed

Yes, didn't change my views but helped inform them (x4). Important broad national/stakeholder input

Yes, the aspect of "power" and not only "national political will" will play a role in progress or not, in social territory

Yes (x4)

NON-MEMBERS

Yes, need to look beyond social agenda to econ/fin/environmental agendas

Yes, it made realize that with what exists & the will, there is hope for an alternative approach

No (x5)

Energy of social economy & defense of its actors didn't come out enough

2. Do you agree with the EAPN proposals regarding the elements for a common alternative agenda? Why/why not?

Yes (x11)

Yes, need a social Europe and to fight aspects of globalization/liberalization

Yes but need working groups with one target group or same methodology

Yes, Europe needs to change, become more social or we'll lose it

Yes because built on long experience & hope

Yes, solidarity is key value & subscribe to EAPN's proposals presented by Katherine

Yes, broadly but will have to look at them again

Yes, but we need to get more mad as Olmo said

Yes, not only about money & jobs, but dignity & solidarity of people

Reasonable to strengthen NNs instead of expecting advocacy from politicians in European structures

What proposals? (EAPN France! & Médecins du Monde- she requests we send her them: Juliette Poirson!)

Partly. A bit more realism can't hurt.

NON-MEMBERS

Yes, in line with ENIL's proposals

Yes, learnt that EU debate on how eu funds should deliver social inclusion targets – issue common to candidate countries like Serbia. Solution might be stakeholders' participation in programmes' design

Yes, real problems require regrouping to present alternatives to the EU

Yes, it's crucial for citizens to be at the core of EU constitution. Social investment is fundamental for long-term sustainable development of societies

3. Do you support the idea of building stronger alliances around a common agenda? Why/Why not? What next steps?

Yes (x5)

Yes, we must look for better solutions together

Yes, in principle but not solely on EU level. Alliance: Council of Europe

Yes, groups bring national info to EAPN who should catalogue it and make it more effective

Yes, I will try to be motivated for this

Yes, the current model is also based on strong alliances with its current goals & results (x2). Next step is to clearly define alternative model (including EAPN's key messages) at a level that enables public discussion to gain public's confidence & support

Yes but 1 catch: until civil society is the aim of the EU, trade unions cannot be alliances of NGOs: in post-communist countries, unions based on socialism & represent old-fashioned institutions, not NGOs; their aim is not to improve services etc but to enhance wages – we speak different languages

Yes, revitalize the Spring Alliance (x2); get all social organisations to build an agenda

Yes, essential to broaden this beyond the usual suspects & have political impact

Yes, regroup alliances like organisations; consumers..

Yes, but we must be sure that basic understandings are shared, eg unions are still unclear on minimum income

Yes, need to be less radical & more constructive though; compromising can take us far

NON-MEMBERS

Yes, next step can be for EAPN & ENIL to meet – contact Peter Lambrechts!

Yes, need more national authorities at EAPN events (I was the only national government rep! Serbia)

Yes, with key messages & expertise on economic situation & debt (ATTAC, CADTM)

Yes, we need to make pressure and activate actions on the EU (who should impose them on MSs)

No, I've got local alliances

Need to review alliance with trade unions

How can we strengthen alliances which are not built?

4. What were the strengths and weaknesses of this conference?

Lot of stakeholders/experts; active participants with alternative ideas, good preparation & panelists

Justine (x2) & Olmo

Time to consult questions

Relevant knowledge & inputs, engagement, convergence (x2)

Speakers in workshops; organization

Very actual with the imminent potential crash; up-to-date info; solidarity with Greece eg

Logistics of workshops; problems proofed from different points of view; good chairs & speakers; results were compact enough for everyone to use them

Workshops were good (x2), but too little time

Preparation, passion, vision of future

Good effort to shed new/different light & have an economic discussion

NON-MEMBERS

Diversity of people & organisations

Link between NGOs & social movements

Clear objectives & projections for EAPN

Balance between presentations and interaction was well-respected

Too little time..

Time-keeping - moderation

Recognised need to build stronger alliance but no clear political statement at end of doing so (x2)

Some panelists/institutional reps (x6)

No time for social interaction

Programme too long & speakers come but don't stay

No time to read working paper

Powerpoints need to be printed out and have the questions on them

Morning plenary; not seeing end of film!, not enough time in workshops (AF)

NON-MEMBERS

Participation should be even more promoted at such events

Where were the policy-makers?

Unclear objectives in W/s on services made it un-dynamic

Political action always lacking

5. Other comments, suggestions

We need an EAPN social charter

Hot rooms

Get better speakers (x2)

Thank you!

Thanks for working paper!

Important for EAPN to have this event & form common approach

More personal stories from PEP and EU people listening to them; more time for discussion

Focus more on workshop together on ways forward & less on irritating politicians – we know what they have to say – need more time to work together. We were sent so much info & preparatory documents it was not helpful, but confusing and overwhelming

NON-MEMBERS

Avoid demanding things too much without proposing acceptable solutions. Continue in this way and inform us. Small seeds grow into ideas more quickly(!)

Circulate key points of the event!