**EUISG Webinar Member Exchange**

**Thursday, 8 July, 9:30-12:30**

**Meeting link:** [**https://zoom.us/j/98224953244**](https://zoom.us/j/98224953244)

Co-Chairs: Graciela Malgesini (EAPN ES), Marija Babović (EAPN SB), Philippe Seidel (AGE-Platform), Martina Brandstätter (EAPN AT)
Staff in support: Sabrina Iannazzone, EAPN Policy Officer; Rebecca Lee, Information and Events Officer; Magda Tancau, Participation & Development Officer; Giulia Caratelli, Policy Assistant

Notes: Giulia Caratelli, Policy Assistant

**Main Objectives of the Meeting**

1. Exchange on the FPA preparation and decision on priorities
2. Exchange on gender guidelines in Poverty Watches

**Agenda**

1. Introduction, adoption of agenda and minutes from last meeting, 10`
2. Exchange on the FPA preparation and decision on priorities, 120’

*Comfort break, 5`*

1. Exchange on gender guidelines, 40’
2. Any Other Business, 5`

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Thursday, 8 July 2021** |
| **9:30-9:40** | **1. Introduction, adoption of agenda and minutes from last meeting (Chair: Philippe)*** Agree minutes, check Action Points
* Agree agenda and main objectives for the meeting

Documents* 1a [Draft minutes from 20 April EUISG](https://www.eapn.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/EAPN-1a-EUISG-20.04.2021-draft-minutes-5162.docx)
 |
| **9:40-11:40** | **2. Framework Partnership Agreement 2022-2025 preparation (Chair: Marija)***Objective: Exchange on the preparation of the FPA and decision on priorities**Action plan:* -Helder/Sabrina to present COM documents and timeline-Graciela to present her proposal -Marija to announce breakout room and questions to be discussed * Present key aspects of the Commission’s call for proposals (12 min approx.)
* Present Graciela’s proposal (20 min approx.)
* Launch groups’ discussion in the breakout rooms (45 min approx.)
* Ask each group ‘rapporteur’ to report main input and conclusions in the plenary session (20 min approx.)
* Have a final open discussion in the plenary session (10 min approx.)
* Chair’s conclusions (10 min approx.)

Documents* 2a [FPA call](https://www.eapn.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/EAPN-2a-call-fiche_esf-2021-og-netw-ngo-fpa_en-5163.pdf)
* 2b [SGA call](https://www.eapn.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/EAPN-2b-call-fiche_esf-2021-og-netw-ngo-sga_en_under-FPA-5164.pdf)
* 2c [Graciela’s proposal for the application](https://www.eapn.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/EAPN-2c-Final-Proposals-FPA-application-Graciela-Malgesini-5165.docx)

Back-up for notes: Rebecca  |
| *11:40-11:45* | *Comfort break* |
| **11:45-12:25** | **3. Exchange on gender guidelines in Poverty Watches (Chair: Martina)***Objective: Exchange on gender guidelines** Short presentation on including the preparatory work for PeP into the PW reports and updating the EUISG on the topics chosen for the PeP Meeting – Magda Tancau – 10’
* Presentation of the Gender Checklist, Marija Babovic – 15’
* Discussion based on the presentation – 15’

Documents* 3a [PW revised template](https://www.eapn.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/EAPN-3a-2021-Revised-Poverty-Watch-ToR-and-Template_10.05.2021-5166.docx)
* 3b [gender checklist](https://www.eapn.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/EAPN-Gender-Checklist-07072021-5183.docx) (updated 7 July and to be discussed on the day)

Back-up for notes: Sabrina/Magda |
| **12:25-12:30** | **4. AOB (Chair: Martina)** |

**Attendance**: *Graciela Malgesini (ES), Philippe Seidel (AGE), Jeanne Dietrich & Nolwenn Foy (FR), Judith Tobac (BE), Paul Ginnell (IE), Ryszard Szarfenberg (PL), Rimgaile Matulionyte (LI), Martina Brandstaetter (AT), Ziva Humer (SI), Honoratte Muhanzi Kashale (NO), Marija Babovic (RS), Dina Vardaramatou (EL), Egils Rupeks (LV), Aleksandra Selak Zivkovic (HR), Damjan Nikolovski (MK), Jürgen Schneider (DE), Laufey Lindal Olafsdottir (IC), Krisztina Jasz (HU), Paula Cruz (PT), Katherine Duffy (UK), Iva Kuchynkova - partially (CZ), Ziva Humer (SI)*

Staff*: Sabrina Iannazzone, Rebecca Lee, Magda Tancau, Giulia Caratelli, Claudia Guerra, Helder Ferreira*

Apologies: *Fran McDonnell (IFSW)*

**Notes**

**1. Introduction, adoption of agenda and minutes from last meeting (Chair: Philippe)**

Philippe chaired the introductory session, presenting the discussion and the agenda of the current meeting. [The minutes of the last meeting](https://www.eapn.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/EAPN-1a-EUISG-20.04.2021-draft-minutes-5162.docx) and agenda were adopted.

**2. Framework Partnership Agreement 2022-2025 preparation (Chair: Marija)**

*Objective: Exchange on the preparation of the FPA and decision on priorities*

*Action plan:*

* Helder [presented](https://www.eapn.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/EAPN-FPA_SGA-Presentation-of-the-call-Helder-5179.ppt) the Commission’s documents and timeline for the parallel call, released on the 23rd of June, on the [FPA](https://www.eapn.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/EAPN-2a-call-fiche_esf-2021-og-netw-ngo-fpa_en-5163.pdf) and [SGA](https://www.eapn.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/EAPN-2b-call-fiche_esf-2021-og-netw-ngo-sga_en_under-FPA-5164.pdf) (the operating grant for 2022). The FPA’s deadline is on the 28th of September whereas the SGA’s one is on the 30th of September. The applications are subject to a tandem mechanism, meaning that to submit the SGA application one needs the reference number of the submitted FPA application.

*Remarks*:

* The Commission feedback on EAPN’s work is very positive, both on the key policy publications as well as on the Poverty Watch and the work on the Semester.
* EAPN could play an important role on the distributional impact assessment.
* The challenge now is to integrate new policy issues and agendas transversally into the previous EAPN workload. The first year’s focus will be channelled to the SGA.
* Overall, FPA and SGA’s objectives, priorities, themes (scopes), activities, expected impacts and results are the same. Many of the listed objectives have a good fit with EAPN’s actions and activities, focusing in particular on EPSR AP and the green and digital transition. Due to this similarity, EAPN’s rationale and inputs could be developed simultaneously for both applications.
* Within the FPA, in the second section of the technical description focusing on “quality”, EAPN could highlight as added value the several experts at its disposal.
* The cost-effectiveness, size, and frequency of physical events should be carefully considered and be reasonable.
* Only the fourth part differs: in the FPA, section 4 addresses the multi-annual action plan, distinguishing between “standard activities” (that will be present in all four years of the FPA) and “ad hoc activities”, representing more reactive actions to be taken as a response to adapt to future changes. This division of activities and how to split between them in the long term needs to be carefully considered for EAPN’s work. Section 4 of the SGA includes: work plan, work packages, timing and subcontracting. A description of the work plan, presenting each work package, needs to be included, identifying tasks, duration, participants, addressing the in-kind contributions and subcontracting, identifying milestones and deliverables. It is a project-based structure, different from other applications, but if well organised it could facilitate our future activities, in terms of management, planning and reporting.

**Graciela** [presented](https://www.eapn.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/EAPN-FPA-proposal-presentation-Graciela-5180.pptx) her initial [proposal](https://www.eapn.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/EAPN-2c-Final-Proposals-FPA-application-Graciela-Malgesini-5165.docx) for the FPA, suggesting to take into account cross-cutting issues, and building on a Fundamental Rights Approach. The proposal covers 5 years (4 years + 1 wildcard year), to be checked against the Commission’s priorities in the Call for proposals, and it attributes one specific thematic focus for each year with several sub-themes, related activities and deliverables.

She noted many reasons to be positive: A lot of human assets despite the staff situation. We are experts working for several years and we include candidate & EFTA countries so a very special network.

She tried to align proposed themes with the call’s objectives. This was already done in a more instinctive way in the Exco meeting earlier and she took ideas from there. Themes & priorities are aligned with objectives on communication and capacity building.

The EC said we shouldn’t duplicate semester report with the poverty watch report. We can centre on the process and governance and whether progress made or not with this, in the semester report, to avoid duplication. (slide 7)

Extra survey idea is for individual inputs from PeP in frame of the PeP meeting as an input for campaigning work. (slide 7)

* Year 1: Ongoing consequences of Covid-19 on PeP: Health and social consequences of Covid-19, Mental health problems and PeP, Healthcare more accessible and affordable to PeP, Right to Food Security: quality, sustainable, and affordable nutrition (related to the French Presidency of the EU during second part 2022).
* Year 2: EPSR Implementation. Sub-topics: EU position on MI and MW; Pay Transparency Act Implementation and update. (*Capacity Building deliverable*); Detection and exchange of good practices in addressing child poverty and guaranteeing children’s access to services (as assessment of Child Guarantee and national implementations).
* Year 3: EPSR Implementation Plan (continuation). European Semester Update, focus on different and changing reasons for non-take up of people in poverty of MI, e.g. migration and digital divide. EU position on the Renewed Youth Guarantee. EU position on Discrimination, Racism and Poverty (*Capacity building deliverable*). Detection and exchange of good practices in addressing youth poverty (NEETs) and granting youth rights to social inclusion.
* Year 4: Implementation of the Recovery and Resilience Plans: Green Deal implications for low-income families and groups (*Capacity building deliverable)*. Social Economy and the 2030 Agenda (e.g. programmes in the new business areas, upcycling, energy efficiency, foresting, long-term care). Sustainable and affordable housing. Detection and exchange of good practices in addressing Energy Poverty.
* Year 5: Implementation of the Recovery and Resilience Plans - Follow-up: Implications of digitalisation, Social Economy and Digitalisation, poverty reduction assisted through digitalisation and technological innovation, detection and exchange of good practices in addressing the intergenerational, rural-urban and gendered digital divide.
* **Questions**:
* Marija asked about the timing flexibility of the proposal; the reason why the green and digital transition appear only in the fourth year and what the work packages will be.
* Graciela answered that this is just a thematic approach thus the division of the work packages will be done accordingly to the final decision on the themes. The idea of putting forward some standard activities could help to structure work packages. The Green Deal & digital transition are at the end of the framework because it will take some time to develop these policies and see their impacts. (e.g. RRPs will not have any visible effect until, at least, the end of 2022, more likely in 2023-2024). Thus her idea was to prioritize the work we are already doing (Pillar, Implementation plans, impact of Covid-19) and then introduce more “distant” issues. She stressed the importance of being consistent in the different parts.
* Jeanne: she thanked Graciela for her recognition and inclusion of the French proposal on the right to food security.
* Philippe: he thanked Graciela for the proposal and explained the process they followed in AGE for their Framework agreement, mapping out things they know will happen in the following couple of years and getting prepared to input. We should adapt our policy work around the European Parliament elections (2024), trying to come up with a manifesto for the elections, demands for new MEPs, briefings for the new Commissioners. After the election: have something on new Commission work programmes and priorities. This is relevant in light, for example, of the Just transition, which is a priority for the current Commission but there is no guarantee it will remain in place. We should be aware of this and make our deliverables flexible, by giving indications on thematic areas we want to focus on, but formulating it in a non-definitive way because things could change. Secondly, he suggested not to have too many deliverables. It is fine to mention activities we do, but not necessarily outline all the sub-deliverables associated with each event or activity. Pulling all together in an introduction would be easier for reporting.
* Judith thanked Graciela for the work and made one remark on MI, claiming it should remain an important focus in the upcoming years, being a cornerstone for EAPN and PeP. Good idea suggesting topics for PeP meeting but since they like to choose the topics themselves maybe there could be a discussion on how to make a better alliance with EUISG and PeP. There are good opportunities on this side, but we are not yet there at this point.
* Graciela: agrees on the importance of MI, especially focusing on the problems PeP have in accessing these schemes. Important to take PeP’s opinions into account and connect it with policy teams, working jointly and in the same direction.
* Marija agrees with the proposal of having a stronger link between the policy work and PePs’ opinions. She suggested having a thematic focus of the year and one part of it being reconsidered by PeP, inputting on it. Also, she suggested opening some lines of the Annual Work on emerging issues faced by PeP, and what they place as issues, and adding them in the policy work for that year. This would allow a stronger exchange.
* Martina: on Poverty Watches, does the Commission not want it reflected in the Semester?
* Helder clarified that the Commission simply pointed out that sometimes there have been overlaps between EAPN’s deliverables for the Semester and the Poverty Watch, thus they suggested rethinking the structure of both deliverables to avoid repetitions. Graciela said the messages are the same but we could avoid repeating the same statistics for example. We should discuss how to link topics between the years as well as reflecting on their relevance in the upcoming years.
* Paul: an intersectional and broader approach on social-economically disadvantaged communities and their different experiences of poverty is missing. He didn’t agree with the previous modalities of choosing PeP meeting’s topic, but a joint work and balance between the policy and PeP groups are needed. He expressed some doubts on giving an over-emphasis on one specific topic each year and stressed the fact that since many topics EAPN works on are intertwined, they should be considered jointly. (e.g. food issue is linked to adequate income, food banks and issue of food security). Good to keep a broader and integrated approach in addressing poverty, despite the fact that there could be overlapping messages.
* Graciela agrees with the comments and clarifications.

**From the chat:**

* Honoratte Muhanzi: I agree With Judith about the link between PEP and EUISG. And the fact that PEP should be involved in the choice of topic.
* Jürgen Schneider: yes Honoratte: I am agree Judith and you
* Judith Tobac: i agree that food security is linked strongly with MI and we need to address it carefully

Marija [presented](https://www.eapn.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/EAPN-FPA-themes-presentation-for-votes-in-breakout-groups-5181.pptx) the voting methodology for Graciela’s proposal, then announced the breakout rooms and questions to be discussed.

* **Exchange in break-out rooms – detailed notes:**

**Break-out room 1
Participants**: *Philippe Seidel (AGE), Jeanne Dietrich (FR), Dina Vardaramatou (EL), Egils Rupeks (LV), Aleksandra Selak Zivkovic (HR), Damjan Nikolovski (MK), Magda, Giulia, Helder*

**Philippe**: he de-prioritized good practices and making health care more accessible (Item 2 and 3 of Y1) since item 1 Y1 already covers them. They are quite important and need to be integrated, either in item 1 on the importance of Covid-19 or have them as main topics, but with different timing to avoid overlaps.

**Jeanne****FR**: she prioritized the right to food security (item 4 Y1), because they are working a lot on it in France. They had a position in EAPN FR on this topic, made an event in South France and want to continue focusing on it during the French Presidency. Real effort and willingness to work on it. Even other national networks have worked on it so it could be interesting for them as well. Despite acknowledging its importance, she de-prioritized mental health (Item 2 Y1), because there is one EU network working on it but in France, no member has real expertise on it.

**Dina**: difficult process since all subjects are important. She took the national situation in Greece as a stepping stone to have the framework of gender approach and human rights approach. They have been facing unfriendly legislation on women, human rights. Safeguards of our social and civic rights should be a priority.

**Helder**: Graciela’s proposal included a transversal approach and cross-cutting issues to be considered and both the gender mainstreaming and human rights approach are included. We need to check how to include them and prioritize them.

**Philippe**: on the EPSR AP and its targets: it could be a priority for Y5 as a mid-term assessment.

**Philippe**: Good to have ranking and voting exercise but important to have a final overview of priority topics selected to ensure no overlaps and no missing of big topics.

**Magda**: Reflect on why items in Y5 scored so high. Maybe work on them earlier.

**Helder**: Y5 is related to the digital divide. We assumed this would become an important topic and asked the Commission how important would be for EAPN to tackle both transitions and how early. They suggested staying attentive to the transitions and position EAPN on them. EAPN could schedule its involvement and deliverables on the twin transitions across the 4 years framework. We could consider starting working on early positioning (e.g. on green transition with coalition work or start working on the digital transition), and have a progressive approach starting with narrow and more reactive inputs, and then expanding to a more comprehensive approach in the form of a report. The work on the impact distributional assessment should also continue due to its policy work implications. We could integrate one section focusing more concisely on the transitions and then develop it more extensively, including it transversally into the deliverables and deepen the work in the further period. Being able to follow the transition is important and the investment in terms of work dedicated to it should be scaled progressively across the 4 years.

**Jeanne:** better to have the Green Deal theme earlier but she understands the reasoning for postponing it and the need to first collect expertise.

**Year 1:**

* Item 1: .Health and social consequences of Covid-19, focusing on intersectional poverty (Gender, Roma and black minorities, migrants, refugees, with disabilities, single-parent parents. LGTBI\*). Capacity building.
* Item 2: Mental health problems and People Experiencing Poverty. The situation of persons with disabilities, in unvoluntary isolation, irregular migrants, homeless persons and single-parent families.
* Item 3: Detection and exchange of good practices in making healthcare more accessible and affordable to people in poverty
* Item 4: Right to Food Security: quality, sustainable, and affordable nutrition (related to the French Presidency of the EU during the second part of 2022).

**Year 2:**

* Item 1: EU position on Minimum Income. Update.
* Item 2: EU position on Minimum Wage
* Item 3: The Pay Transparency Act. Implementation and update. Capacity building.
* Item 4: Detection and exchange of good practices in addressing child poverty and guaranteeing children’s access to services, from an integrated approach, centred in the person.

**Year 3**

* Item 1: Minimum Income and the issue of non-take up of people in poverty.
* Item 2: EU position on the Renewed Youth Guarantee
* Item 3: EU position on Discrimination, Racism and Poverty. Capacity building.
* Item 4: Detection and exchange of good practices in addressing youth poverty (particularly NEETS) and granting youth rights to social inclusion, from an integrated approach centred in the person.

**Year 4**

* Item 1: Green Deal: implications for low-income families and groups. Capacity building.
* Item 2: Social Economy and the 2030 Agenda: programmes in the new business areas, revamping of deteriorated habitats and buildings, upcycling, energy efficiency, foresting, long-term care.
* Item 3: Sustainable and affordable housing: how the new strategies are affecting people experiencing poverty’s access and affordability of housing in the cities, and in rural areas.
* Item 4: Detection and exchange of good practices in addressing Energy Poverty

**Year 5**

* Item 1: Implications of Digitalisation with regards the Fundamental Rights. Capacity building.
* Item 2: Social Economy and Digitalisation. Challenges and Opportunities for CSOs’ work with people experiencing poverty and vulnerability.
* Item 3: Poverty reduction assisted through digitalisation and technological innovation.
* Item 4: Detection and exchange of good practices in addressing the Intergenerational, Rural-Urban and Gendered Digital Divide

**Break-out room 2
Participants**: *Laufey Lindal Olafsdottir (IC), Jurgen Schneider (DE), Krisztina Jasz (HU), Graciela Malgesini (ES), Paul Ginnell (IE), Judith Tobac (BE), Paula Cruz (PT), Katherine Duffy (UK), Sabrina*

*Y1 Proposed thematic focus – Ongoing Consequences of Covid on PEPs*

**Katherine** after the first plenary session: thinks that food security should be considered in a broader framework and supports Paul’s suggestion that we should consider socio-economic communities rather than particular groups included (no cluster-based approach).

**Graciela**: mental health issues are very relevant in Spain as mental health care is private and access is not easy. There is a proposal to change social security and include mental health care. Furthermore, the social consequences of Covid-19 have mostly hit the poor.

**Paul**: we did a lot of work on health inequalities before Covid-19 (e.g. a big report), and these are linked to social determinants of health. Covid-19 has exacerbated the consequence but structural causes and inequalities were already there. As for mental health, disadvantaged communities have suffered from the trauma of poverty. Mental health is relevant but under-resourced at the moment.
 **Paula**: health and social consequences of Covid-19 are very much relevant for us now and next year(s): we are currently doing a survey on this. As for mental health, we look at it regardless of Covid-19. In fact, we planned research on mental health and poverty but we had funding issues. However, it remains a concern for EAPN Portugal. As for the exchange of good practices, national networks have some difficulties in finding good practices. The right to food is relevant but in relation to other issues such as decent work, because providing food only is not sufficient. The connection between food and other issues should appear clearly in our proposal.

**Katherine**: social determinants creating poverty have been there as a cause much before Covid-19. Little housing and education have appeared in social determinants analysis. Mental health is important for children: we should bring children issues cross-cuttingly in our themes as child poverty in Child Guarantee will be the workhorse of other organizations. Food should be contextualized differently (food issue and rights in a broader sense in relation to fight against poverty) and not be considered as a separate issue. In this respect, we need to make space to re-adjust our topics in a flexible way as things could change a lot, such as new economic issues.

**Graciela** concludes that determinants of poverty and the long-term impact of Covid-19 could be better phrased to analyse both and not only the long-lasting effects of Covid-19.

**Judith**: mental health is very important but needs to be fine-tuned as poverty has an impact on mental health: we need to refine the approach.

**Laufey**: health services and mental health services should not be dealt with separately. During Covid-19 time, people with mental issues have been isolated. Health services are extremely important due to the service shortages that Covid-19 brought out (health services are too expensive and/or private so access needs to be improved).

**Krisztina**: death rate by population in Hungary was very high and the mental status of the population became bad with the Covid-19, many children lost their parents. Bad statistics did not urge the government to make any change: we are worried about the political response, there was a lot of detrimental propaganda.

**Katherine**: long-term care should be considered in the health sub-theme in Year 1; elderly people have been abandoned although propaganda highlighted that young people have lost their future for the old. Under Covid-19, persons in care homes died for lack of access to health services.

*Y2 Proposed thematic focus – EPRS Implementation (MI, MW, pay transparency act, child poverty):*

Not everybody knows the Pay Transparency Act.

**Jurgen**: digital divide should be moved from the wildcard year to the second year.

**Paul**: MI should remain a priority across all years, we need to be ready for the Recommendation. Child Guarantee has a narrow focus and we need to keep a critical eye on it. We need to look at MW from a broader perspective across years, such as quality jobs as National Plans are focusing on jobs. Graciela highlights that we should say ‘quality of work’. From MW to a broader approach to issues of unemployment related to Minimum Wage directive: we need to maintain a focus on decent work as it has an impact on all plans; income services and quality jobs should be part of an integrated approach to the MW.

**Judith** highlighted the problems of self-employed in Belgium during Covid-19, they are vulnerable.

**Graciela** suggests that we include decent work and self-employment as topics in the second theme. We should use the wording ‘decent work’ and not decent jobs to take into account voluntary work and all type of work contributions.

**Paula**: as for child poverty, we need to critically look at national plans on the child guarantee prepared by national governments and monitor CSOs involvement. Graciela pointed out that we should produce guidelines for members to follow up/engage on this: in Spain they are also monitoring the Spanish government’s behaviour.

**Jurgen** says parents guarantee should complement child guarantee.

**Laufey**: ‘children must not pay for services’ is the main point and campaign in their country.

*YEAR 3, YEARs 4 and 5 (wildcard – not covered by application) have only been voted: no time for discussion.*

**Judith** agreed that the digital divide and digitalisation should be addressed sooner than year 5, so these should be moved to the previous years.

*Comments by Paul Ginnell shared by email after the meeting:*

He would give a low value to Item 4 Y1 (Food Security), but if it is refocused to link to looking at the causes of food poverty and insecurity, then he would give it a high. On item 3 Y2 (Pay Transparency Act) he cannot really vote since he does not have enough knowledge of it. MI has to be an ongoing priority for EAPN, particularly on EAPN’s work to impact on the Council Recommendation, thus it needs to be a priority in Y1 as well. Importance of addressing decent work in the programme and access to work for marginalised communities and groups. Agrees with not having too many deliverables and have the space to work collectively on providing our assessment on the Semester and EPSR AP. Need to reflect on what the asks from EAPN’s members will be each year, according to their different levels of capacity and national commitments.

**Year 1:**

* Item 1: .Health and social consequences of Covid-19, focusing on intersectional poverty (Gender, Roma and black minorities, migrants, refugees, with disabilities, single-parent parents. LGTBI\*). Capacity building.
* Item 2: Mental health problems and People Experiencing Poverty. The situation of persons with disabilities, in unvoluntary isolation, irregular migrants, homeless persons and single-parent families.
* Item 3: Detection and exchange of good practices in making healthcare more accessible and affordable to people in poverty
* Item 4: Right to Food Security: quality, sustainable, and affordable nutrition (related to the French Presidency of the EU during the second part of 2022).

**Year 2:**

* Item 1: EU position on Minimum Income. Update.
* Item 2: EU position on Minimum Wage
* Item 3: The Pay Transparency Act. Implementation and update. Capacity building.
* Item 4: Detection and exchange of good practices in addressing child poverty and guaranteeing children’s access to services, from an integrated approach, centred in the person.

**Year 3**

* Item 1: Minimum Income and the issue of non-take up of people in poverty.
* Item 2: EU position on the Renewed Youth Guarantee
* Item 3: EU position on Discrimination, Racism and Poverty. Capacity building.
* Item 4: Detection and exchange of good practices in addressing youth poverty (particularly NEETS) and granting youth rights to social inclusion, from an integrated approach centred in the person.

**Year 4**

* Item 1: Green Deal: implications for low-income families and groups. Capacity building.
* Item 2: Social Economy and the 2030 Agenda: programmes in the new business areas, revamping of deteriorated habitats and buildings, upcycling, energy efficiency, foresting, long-term care.
* Item 3: Sustainable and affordable housing: how the new strategies are affecting people experiencing poverty’s access and affordability of housing in the cities, and in rural areas.
* Item 4: Detection and exchange of good practices in addressing Energy Poverty

**Year 5**

* Item 1: Implications of Digitalisation with regards the Fundamental Rights. Capacity building.
* Item 2: Social Economy and Digitalisation. Challenges and Opportunities for CSOs’ work with people experiencing poverty and vulnerability.
* Item 3: Poverty reduction assisted through digitalisation and technological innovation.
* Item 4: Detection and exchange of good practices in addressing the Intergenerational, Rural-Urban and Gendered Digital Divide

**Break-out room 3
Participants:** *Ryszard Szarfenberg (PL), Rimgaile Matulionyte (LI), Martina Brandstaetter (AT), Ziva Humer (SI), Honoratte Muhanzi (NO), Marija Babovic (RS), Rebecca & Claudia*

* On Y1:, **Martina** suggested, in relation to the first item on Covid-19 consequences, to include young people and students. **Ziva** agreed and further proposed to include the group of elderly. Concerning the mention to minorities she would include all minorities, not only Roma and black ones.
* On Y2, **Ryszard** suggested adding in the attempt to input to the MINET governmental network on Minimum Income, which could be important for EAPN.
* On Y4, **Rimgaile** agreed with **Marija’s** point made to the whole group: the work on the green deal should be brought forward, especially the capacity building. It was thought that bringing it forward one year would be needed.
* On Y5: **Ryszard** raised one point concerning the first item on digitalisation and fundamental rights on the need to specify rights relating to poverty impact and not the full array of fundamental rights which would be beyond EAPN’s scope and capacity (e.g. digitalisation in terms of social rights to be able to access services. Similarly, digital divide should be renamed “digital poverty”).
* **Rimgaile** made an additional point on social services as such, although not sure if it could come in as not in pillar as such. As she mentioned in previous meetings, she pointed out the issue of over-indebtedness.
* **Ryszard** agreed on the suggested topic, even if it is less of an issue in post-soviet states. The execution of debts from bank accounts is a topic for EAPN Poland. Regarding social services, their last report was on Access to social services. He suggested addressing the point of the relative importance of social work vis-à-vis access to energy.

**Year 1:**

* Item 1: .Health and social consequences of Covid-19, focusing on intersectional poverty (Gender, Roma and black minorities, migrants, refugees, with disabilities, single-parent parents. LGTBI\*). Capacity building.
* Item 2: Mental health problems and People Experiencing Poverty. The situation of persons with disabilities, in unvoluntary isolation, irregular migrants, homeless persons and single-parent families.
* Item 3: Detection and exchange of good practices in making healthcare more accessible and affordable to people in poverty
* Item 4: Right to Food Security: quality, sustainable, and affordable nutrition (related to the French Presidency of the EU during the second part of 2022).

**Year 2:**

* Item 1: EU position on Minimum Income. Update.
* Item 2: EU position on Minimum Wage
* Item 3: The Pay Transparency Act. Implementation and update. Capacity building.
* Item 4: Detection and exchange of good practices in addressing child poverty and guaranteeing children’s access to services, from an integrated approach, centred in the person.

**Year 3**

* Item 1: Minimum Income and the issue of non-take up of people in poverty.
* Item 2: EU position on the Renewed Youth Guarantee
* Item 3: EU position on Discrimination, Racism and Poverty. Capacity building.
* Item 4: Detection and exchange of good practices in addressing youth poverty (particularly NEETS) and granting youth rights to social inclusion, from an integrated approach centred in the person.

**Year 4**

* Item 1: Green Deal: implications for low-income families and groups. Capacity building.
* Item 2: Social Economy and the 2030 Agenda: programmes in the new business areas, revamping of deteriorated habitats and buildings, upcycling, energy efficiency, foresting, long-term care.
* Item 3: Sustainable and affordable housing: how the new strategies are affecting people experiencing poverty’s access and affordability of housing in the cities, and in rural areas.
* Item 4: Detection and exchange of good practices in addressing Energy Poverty

**Year 5**

* Item 1: Implications of Digitalisation with regards the Fundamental Rights. Capacity building.
* Item 2: Social Economy and Digitalisation. Challenges and Opportunities for CSOs’ work with people experiencing poverty and vulnerability.
* Item 3: Poverty reduction assisted through digitalisation and technological innovation.
* Item 4: Detection and exchange of good practices in addressing the Intergenerational, Rural-Urban and Gendered Digital Divide

**Summary in the plenary session on exchanges in break-out rooms:**

**Group 1:**

* Most of the proposals were scored coming from a national perspective. Some points were raised and opportunities for integration in Y1 (suggested the third priority on impact should be connected to the overall first priority: instead of focusing on examples and good practices we could interlink it with health and social impacts of Covid-19). Importance of food security aspect since EAPN FR is working on that already. Important to build expertise on this level.
* A second input was made on the need to focus on human rights and gender dimension, and he recalled these are among the 2 cross-cutting issues included within Graciela’s presentation.
* Suggestion on considering Y5 as the year for intermediate monitoring for the AP of EPSR, marking the mid-term assessment.
* Suggested need of a final overview of the priorities and how they are graded and distribute it to members, both to reflect on the results and further think if some important topic in the policy agenda may be overlooked, or identify something is missing etc.
* Priorities on wildcard Y5 on digitalisation were all very highly scored, so we could consider how to reshuffle them.
* On the question on how important would be for EAPN to take a very comprehensive position on the green and digital transition, the Commission answered that it is not necessary to produce an extensive report, but it would be important to be prepared to position EAPN along the way and prevent poor policies to be implemented. This means we could consider working in coalitions (as we do for the green transition), trying to build up our capacity and position ourselves in a progressive way during the years. Helder suggested starting integrating into the structure of deliverables a section on the early impacts of transitions and then elaborate it more in the upcoming period.

**Group 2:**

* In-depth discussion on Y1 and Y2 while for Y3 and Y4 they only voted.
* Priorities highlighted: digitalisation and digital divide should be reshuffled in Y2.
* MI needs to be included as well and MW, and should be connected broadly with employment.
* Idea of including decent work and self-employment as topics in the second theme. We should use the wording ‘decent work’ and not decent jobs to take into account voluntary work and all type of work contributions.
* Right to food is relevant but in relation to other issues such as decent work. Providing food only is not sufficient.
* Health inequalities and covid-19 impacts highly valued. They reflected on the importance of addressing the determinants of poverty and long-term impact of Covid-19. Katherine shared the importance of considering Long-term care and the aging population phenomenon.
* They highlighted the lack of equal access to basic services , especially after the pandemic, considering national experiences: in some countries, mental health services and other health services are private, expensive and not accessible for all. Mental health should be better defined and connected to poverty. Maybe better to have a framework with social protection and health.
* Additional comment from Paul: An integrated focus on decent work has been suggested by Paul as an extra topic to be included, in relation to MW, and that could be important in terms of the focus on jobs of RRPs and the transitions. Food security needs to have a broader focus and link to the causes of food poverty, adequate income, etc. Finally, in terms of communities’ intersectional poverty, he stressed the issue of social-economically disadvantaged communities (“class issue”).

 **Group 3:**

* They scored all items and the main impression is that Graciela’s proposal is very relevant and touches on EAPN’s core tasks.
* All item scores are above 2, except for digital economy and digitalisations. Most highly ranked topics: MI, Sustainable and affordable housing, item 3 on “poverty reduction assisted through digitalisation and technological innovation” and item 4 on “detection and exchange of good practices in addressing the Intergenerational, Rural-Urban and Gendered Digital Divide” in Y5.
* Suggestions on the intersectionality point in Y1: change of “black minorities” with “minorities” in general.
* Important during Y1 strong focus on young people affected through education , employment and stigmatisation during the pandemic and health measures.
* For Y2 - proposal around MI: explore the “minet” (minimum income network): see how to engage with this network and what we could do.
* Y4: Agreement in the group that green deal and all packages around recovery plans, impact assessments, should be moved 1 year before since COM will change and we need to engage in that as well.
* There is a proposal for Y5 for an additional first topic more strongly focused on poverty (e.g. digitalisation “in access of rights of PeP”). For topic 4 (exchange of good practices) they suggested using more “digital poverty”, “digitally poor” terms. They further suggested 2 additional topics:
1) Over indebtedness of households, especially concerning in some countries. it could be linked to MW and MI work.2) Social Services: stronger focus needed.

*General remarks:*

* Marija – this is for her the first time the FPA has been built in such a participative bottom-up way with demonstrable support for particular points.
* Katherine – it is good to vote but she misses the chance to moderate opinion listening to others by discussing first.

**3. Exchange on gender guidelines in Poverty Watches (Chair: Martina)**

*Objective: Exchange on gender guidelines*

Magda recalled that already in the last EUISG meeting, they introduced the idea of trying to better bridge the PeP and policy work by including in the Poverty Watch (PW) at the national level the preparatory work done for the EU meeting of PeP – see [template](https://www.eapn.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/EAPN-3a-2021-Revised-Poverty-Watch-ToR-and-Template_10.05.2021-5166.docx). This was further discussed at the end of 2019 with Sian as a possible solution to reinforce the policy work and better ground it with PeP and voices from the ground.

*Remarks:*

* There will be a session at the end of this year to discuss with national coordinators how to better bridge these two areas of work.
* National contracts have been submitted and approved so there are resources to start working on Poverty Watch (PW).
* The following priorities have been chosen by PeP for this year’s online Conference:
1) access to housing, 2) Minimum Income, 3) access to health and digitalisation in the context of the pandemic. Also the impact of the pandemic on the mental health of people and consequences of social isolation they had to live in. Digitalisation is a cross-cutting issue, very much mentioned and proposed by national members. Same three topics of EU PeP meeting in 2019 but still unaddressed.
* More discussion on how to strongly connect PeP and EUISG groups is needed.
* Building strong synergies between the EUISG and PeP should start at the national level since they are very connected areas of work. She encourages national networks to contact the national coordinators, that will soon receive guidelines with questions for the PW to discuss in the national groups .
* Deadline Poverty Watch: 6th of September

Marija [presented](https://www.eapn.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/EAPN-Gender-check-list-presentation-Marija-5182.pptx) the [checklist](https://www.eapn.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/EAPN-Gender-Checklist-07072021-5183.docx) for gender mainstreaming in EAPN reports prepared with Graciela, by highlighting some of the recommended topics to be addressed in the next PW.

*Remarks*:

* Key questions and examples have been presented (e.g. disaggregating questions by gender, compare male and female situations, take into account cultural values and backgrounds, intersectionality, etc).
* When analysing policies, the “distributional impact” on men and women should be considered.
* Importance of using different sources: academic articles, researches from NGOs, international organisations, PeP’s voice and direct experiences.
* Ziva thanked both Marija and Graciela for having prepared this work and Slovenia will definitely include gender as a cross-cutting issue in their PW. They decided to have a discussion group with experts with NGOs representatives working with women and children victims of family gender-based violence.
1. **AOB (Chair: Philippe)**
* Philippe further thanked Marija and Graciela for the last presentation and its importance.
* Results of the meeting will be circulated as soon as possible. The idea is to bring a structured proposal at the ExCo meeting on the 23rd of July.
* On ABSPO project, which is on the agenda for next week’s EUISG, Paul has not received yet the report document update. He will circulate it once he gets it and will revise the timeline accordingly.
* Concerning the application process, Graciela suggested preparing, as an added value, a one-page CV format and link to academic records of all EUISG members to be incorporated in the EUISG application, to reinforce it.
* Maybe have CVs and expertise for key groups (EAPN Bureau, Steering Group). Or this could be presented in the Annex with CVs of people listed already in the staff. There is also a “special annex” where we could include documents to properly argue or support our proposal.

**ACTION POINT**: EAPN EU to send minutes and FPA results asap and EUISG members send their inputs asap, before 23rd July.

**ACTION POINT**: Rebecca will think about the CV format.

**In-dept focus on Graciela’s FPA proposal, voting and following discussion**

**Overview**:

The graph shows the overall scores coming from the votes of the three breakout rooms.
Members voted each of the four proposed items for each of the five years. In total 18 people voted, ranking each item according to its importance. The following measurement scale was used: 0 - not to include; 1 – low; 2 – medium; 3 – high priority. The highest score is 52 whereas the lowest is 32.

The five most highly valued items are: Health and social consequences of Covid-19 in Y1, EU position on Minimum Income update in Y2, Minimum Income and the issue of non-take up of people in poverty in Y3, sustainable and affordable housing in Y4, and poverty reduction assisted through digitalisation and technological innovation in Y5.

**Key suggestions**:

* Reshuffling topics: put digitalisation and digital divide issue in Y2 rather than Y5. Move topics of Y4 at least one year in advance.
* Better discussion on food security rights in terms of its interpretation and focus.
* Item 1 Y1: Include young, older people and minorities in general, not only Roma and black ones.
* Item 2 Y1: Include young and elderly.
* Item 1 Y2: Explore European minimum income network and see how to engage with it.
* Topics Y5 should be put in the framework of poverty (e.g. digitalization in access to social welfare rights of PeP)
* Item 4 Y5: Include terms such as: “digitally poor”.
* Y5 could be the year for intermediate monitoring of the AP of EPSR, marking the mid-term assessment.
* Three extra themes have been suggested: i) Over- indebtedness, ii) Social services, iii) decent work in relation to MW.
* Some topics were de-prioritized not because of their low importance but rather because of the lack of expertise on them in the national networks.
* Better not to over-emphasize one specific issue per year, considering that many themes are linked with each other (e.g. food poverty should be a stand-alone activity or work area as it is linked with adequate income and other areas EAPN deals with; mental health should be better defined and connected to poverty, maybe having a framework on social protection and health; consider the impact of covid-19 in relation to the lack of equal access to essential services).
* Green and digital transition could be transversally integrated into EAPN’s deliverables. Scaling the focus on it progressively, starting with narrow and more reactive inputs and subsequently deepen them in a more comprehensive approach.
* Topics and deliverables should be flexible and formulated in a non-definitive way, because things could change, both in terms of new European priorities (European Parliament election in 2024) and emerging economic and social issues. Furthermore, it was suggested not to have too many deliverables. It is fine to mention activities we do, but not necessarily outline all the sub-deliverables associated with each event or activity.
* Idea of having an intersectional and broader approach on social-economically disadvantaged communities and their different experiences of poverty, which is still missing. Good to keep a broader and integrated approach in addressing poverty, despite there could be overlapping messages.
* Idea of deepening the health inequalities and covid-19 impacts, addressing the determinants of poverty and long-term impact of Covid-19,and further considering Long-term care and aging population phenomenon.