

FSG MEETING

20 June 2011 - BRUSSELS

Report

Participants:

Gemma Arpaia, ISCOS-CISL
Nina Larrea, LO/TCO
Haridasan, ITUC-AP
Jan Dereymaeker, ITUC HQs/TUDCN Coordination
Mamadou Diallo, ITUC HQs
Paola Simonetti, ITUC HQs/TUDCN Policy Officer

Main discussion points:

- The FSG approved the report on the previous meeting
- The secretariat provided the activity report (narrative and financial) from the last two years (2009-2010):
 - Overall achievement of the expected outcomes for the first TUDCN-phase (construction of the network, positioning of TU as actors in development, training and information, strengthening of relations with EU and other international institutions, increased cooperation with CSO platforms).
 - Globally good participation of representatives from the South (40%), although more participation from the regions (and also national centres) to the TUDCN meetings is still desirable;
 - more opportunities for the regions to apply directly to EU funding will become concrete in the near future;

→ The secretariat presented the work plan for 2011:

- the planning scheme should be revised in order to streamline the most relevant axes of work and main results achieved;

→ The FSG discussed the monitoring/evaluation methodology on the TUDCN work, proposed by the secretariat:

- the FSG approved the structure of the methodology, although there is a need to revise the questionnaire;
- The FSG will give inputs for finalising the TORs of external monitoring/evaluation activity on the TUDCN;

Follow up:

⇒ The secretariat will send the narrative and financial report 2009-10 to the FSG members;

⇒ The FSG will give a feedback on the evaluation questionnaire by July 4 (see below highlighted in yellow).

TUDCN EVALUATION METHODOLOGIES 2011-2012

Mandate of FSG

- The Facilitation & Steering Group (FSG) will enhance the preparation of TUDCN meetings (chairing meetings) and will oversee the work of the TUDCN secretariat;
- The FSG will ensure the adequate monitoring and evaluation of the work of the TUDCN and also design, where appropriate, evaluation-monitoring mechanisms and follow up initiatives;
- The FSG will assess regularly the financial and administrative situation of the network;
- The FSG reports to the network meetings.

Objectives of evaluation

To assess the results of TUDCN activities and working methodology in order to increase the effectiveness of internal coordination, as well as, external impact.

Evaluation levels and tools

WHO?	WHAT?	WHEN?
TUDCN Secretariat	Regular reporting activity	On individual activity
FSG members	On-going monitoring reports on TUDCN results Give inputs for the external evaluation TORs	Twice a year, following TUDCN GM
General Meeting members	GM evaluation reports	Twice a year, at the end of TUDCN GM
Working Groups members	WG evaluation reports	Once a year (2011 & 2012)
External Evaluation	Mid-term and Final evaluation reports	End of 2011: midterm report End of 2012: final report

See annexes 1-3 below

ANNEX 1: FSG On-going monitoring reports

This questionnaire is addressed to the FSG members in order to monitor the TUDCN activities, assessing their results, and providing guidance to increase its effectiveness. This questionnaire is supposed to be filled in on the basis of activity reports delivered by the TUDCN secretariat and also on the basis of the Log Frame of the project, on the following sectors:

1. Policy & Advocacy:

- P&A activities are in line with TUDCN planning?
- P&A activities are relevant to the political objectives of TUDCN?
- The results of the P&A activities are satisfactory? If not, why?
- Further comments (optional)

2. Training Activities

- The trainings are consistent to TUDCN planning?
- The contents of the training are useful? If not, why?
- Did they produce the desired results (attendance, quality of participation etc...)? If not, why?
- Further comments (optional)

3. Information & Communication

- Information on seminars/events is duly disseminated?
- The communication tools used are sufficient and efficiently structured to disseminate relevant information? If not, why?
- Further comments (optional)

4. Administration

- The quality of organisation of seminars/event is suitable? If not, why?

ANNEX 2: GM evaluation reports & WG evaluation reports

LIKE (what will you bring home with you) DISLIKE (what can be improved)

(for example on “contents relevance”; “discussions steering”; “organisation/administration” etc..)

Free comments

ANNEX 3: Mid-term and Final evaluation reports

The secretariat will elaborate the TORs with external evaluators, following the inputs of the FSG.