



Civil Society Dialogue Network Training Seminar

Gender, Peace and Security Advocacy towards the EU

10 & 11 March 2016, Brussels, Belgium

SUMMARY FEEDBACK FORMS (19 forms)

1) Content of the training seminar:

Session: Basic facts about the functioning of the EU institutions and gender, peace and security issues in international debates (Thursday 10 March, morning)

excellent	good	average	poor	very poor
6	12	1		

Comments (what worked well, what did not):

What worked well:

- Clear and specific information: 4
- Anna's presentation: 4
(very good: 1, good, clear and simple: 2, very clear: 1)
- Worked well: 2
(as an introduction to the topics discussed: 1)
- Useful information: 1
- Detailed information: 1
- Well-structured: 1
- Very useful overview on GPS issues in international debates: 1
- Overall well done: 1
- Very useful organigram: 1
- Very informative: 1

What worked less well:

- Too much text on quiz on GPS issues in international debates: 3
(visuals and videos would have been more useful than overwhelming text: 1, many words and slides made it difficult to follow the key points: 1)
- Information on GPS could have been better introduced: 2
(for people with only EU background, e.g. more on content and EU frameworks and on how to do GPS advocacy in general: 1, more framing of the issue to bridge different understandings in the room and one session on to design an advocacy strategy: 1)
- Too much information in a short time: 2

- Could be more interactive: 1
- Should be case-based: 1
- Would have liked to know where exactly (at unit level) the gender advisors sit: 1
- Would have been better to jump into in-depth issues: 1
- Too little time to discuss issues raised by the quiz: 1
- A little bit too basic, could have been skipped: 1

Session: Gender, Peace and Security in the EU, part I and II (Thursday 10 March, late morning and early afternoon) (no comment or rating: 1)

excellent	good	average	poor	very poor
3	15			

General comments (what worked well, what did not).

What worked well:

- Giulia’s presentation: 4
(very interesting and useful: 1, important insight into how it actually works for EU delegations: 1, very good and useful: 1, very clear: 1)
- Very good presentations: 2
(Presenters were helpful and smart in their choice of topics, answering questions and engaging the group for feedback and questions: 1)
- Ben’s presentation: 2
(very insightful: 1, very technical and specific, giving useful framework of financial aspects: 1)
- Good analysis of gender and WPS dimensions (up to date and coherent): 1
- Graziella’s presentation (very clear and effective): 1
- Part II more helpful because of specific examples: 1
- Resource persons moving around the different tables for Q&A: 1
- Very clear and concise: 1
- Useful information: 1
- Very informative: 1

What worked less well:

- Sessions were a bit rushed and it got a bit confusing at times: 1
- Too fast: 1
- Graziella’s presentation not actually focused on specific GPS issues: 1
- Graziella’s presentation being cut short due to time constraints: 1
- WPS vs. GPS discussion should be anticipated by preparing an exercise to discuss more in depth (even though false dichotomy like ‘peace vs. justice’ debate): 1
- Would have liked a bit more content information on GAP II: 1
- Too much information on PowerPoint presentation in too short time (sometimes impossible to read

everything before the next slide): 1

- Ben's presentation a bit quick and with many technical facts, harder to follow: 1

Session: Influencing the EU institutions: Case studies of past advocacy strategies (Thursday 10 March, afternoon) (no comment or rating: 3)

excellent	good	average	poor	very poor
6	8	2		

General comments (what worked well, what did not).

What worked well:

- Stina's presentation: 2
(‘Good practice’ pointers: 1, interesting and well presented: 1)
- Giulia's presentation: 2
(Complexity and challenges mentioned by Giulia: 1, very interesting, pertinent, useful and effective: 1)
- Great to see past real examples of advocacy strategies: 2
- Interesting session: 1
- Good practical approaches to advocacy: 1
- Clear stages of process and stakeholders: 1
- Theory became clear when presented through a case study: 1
- Able to learn more about the differences between GPS and WPS: 1
- Showed the diversity of issues which can be lobbied for: 1 (from external inclusion of women's rights to working on institutional change within the EU)

What worked less well:

- Too broad: 2
(not focused enough on process of advocacy and not practical enough: 1, not very concrete: 1)
- Did not relate to topics advocated on so found it a little less relevant to my work: 1
- Would be better to have more mixed tables on day 1 (participants knew each other on one table): 1

Session: Conversation with EU officials (Friday 11 March, morning) (no comment or rating: 1)

excellent	good	average	poor	very poor
10	8			

Comments (what worked well, what did not):

What worked well:

- Diversity of 'voices' from EU officials: 3
- Presentation by member of EU Military Staff: 3
(appreciated his empirical input: 1, very interesting: 1, military angle was very helpful: 1)
- Presentation by EU official from IcSP: 2
(good presentation, expert on the topic and useful Q&A: 1, presenting target priorities of EU officials: 1)
- Very useful, honest and insightful: 2
- Hearing about thoughts and official positions of EU officials: 1 (especially after more frank discussion on EU's approach to GPS/WPS: 1)
- Very good and interesting speakers: 1
- EU officials committed to the topic: 1
- Good to hear the language used by EU officials themselves, how they think they are doing in terms of gender mainstreaming and what it means to them: 1
- Interesting presentations: 1

What worked less well:

- More of this would have been beneficial: 2 (more time for interaction: 1)
- Might have been good to have one of the 'unconvinced' or realist EU officials present as well (although maybe they couldn't easily agree to come): 1
- Some "sweet talking": 1
- Would have been good to have more time to prepare questions: 1
- Would be good to ask EU officials to present a result/success, not only what routines they have: 1
- Would be good to tell member of EU Military Staff not to refer to all militaries as 'him', especially as gender advisor this person needs to be gender neutral when talking about positions: 1
- Would have appreciated an introduction or a general framework of the different EU components involved (e.g. Military Staff): 1
- A little uneven, as IcSP official was committed but a bit rhetorical whereas EU Military Staff gave useful insight into his role: 1

Session: Discussion with Staffan Jonsäter, First Secretary, Permanent Representation of Sweden to the European Union (Friday 11 March, late morning) (no comment or rating: 1)

excellent	good	average	poor	very poor
9	7	2		

Comments (what worked well, what did not):

What worked well:

- Very open and useful insights: 6

(Good to hear real experience and what is being done by Member State 'behind the scenes': 1)

- Informative: 2

(Good to hear how an EU Member State thinks things work in practice: 1, good to know about their advocacy strategy on gender at EU level and to know we have allies at the Swedish PermRep: 1)

- Excellent: 2
- Interesting input and practical insight into role of Sweden in the appointment of Special Advisor on GPS: 1
- Good to get tips on how things can be done/what it takes/what Member State can do (and how CSOs can use Member States): 1
- Perfect explanation of the situation: 1
- Useful to understand the political implications and developments: 1

What worked less well:

- More insight on internal dynamics would be interesting: 1
- Would like to know more about challenges the foreign feminist policy has met: 1

Session: Working group exercise: Devising an advocacy strategy, part I and II (Friday 11 March, afternoon) (no rating: 2)

excellent	good	average	poor	very poor
13	2	1		

Comments and recommendations:

What worked well:

- 3 scenarios: 6
(really good: 1, interesting and inspiring: 1, well prepared case studies: 1, clear task and structure: 1, very well structured: 1)
- Very good to learn from ideas and experience of others: 6
(both in the small groups and in plenary: 1, lots of practical considerations and strategies to learn: 1)
- Good to put things into practice: 5
- Good mix of participants in the group: 3
- Crucial to have people with EU advocacy experience in the group to get more exactly pin-pointed whom to target and how: 2
- Best part of the training: 2
- Each group having to give feedback on other groups: 1
- Constructive exercise which should be used in future trainings: 1
- Resource person giving additional information after all questions of scenario where answered: 1
- Good, productive groups: 1
- Very useful: 1

What worked less well:

- Group did not share a common background on advocacy strategies and aspects: 1
- Facilitator did not help in setting the methodology and making the process inclusive: 1
- Distribution of teams could have been a bit more balanced: 1
- Missed an advocacy basics session with methodologies, comparing value of different approaches (which approach to use in which circumstance): 1
- Difficult to get started and decide which information from scenarios to prioritise: 1
- Would have liked to engage more on the content (which would have needed more time): 1
- Role of the resource person was slightly unclear but did a good job of keeping everyone in time: 1

2) How would you rate the exercises and the icebreakers?

	excellent	good	average	poor	very poor
Thursday 10 March: Icebreaker (beginning of training)	4	11	3	1	
Thursday 10 March: Quiz on gender, peace and security (morning)	2	7	9	1	
Thursday 10 March: End of the day writing moment and exercise	2	11	3	1	
Friday 11 March: Icebreaker (early morning)	4	10	3	2	
Friday 11 March: End of the training session (and writing moment)	4	8	2	1	

Any further comments:**Icebreaker 10 March:**

- Uneven pairs: 1
- A bit too long, could have been done in quicker/more fun way: 1

Quiz on gender, peace and security:

- Too much text: 3
- Would be better to try mobile platform to post answers, e.g. Hans Rosling style: 1
- Quiz was a bit 'amputated': 1

End of the day writing moment and exercise 10 March:

- Did not refer to questions at all, seemed like a workshop requirement: 1

Icebreaker 11 March:

- Did not seem like an icebreaker: 1

Overall comments:

- Start of the training could have been a bit more energising and ambitious, e.g. 'why are we here' initial speaker: 1
- Very good idea to have several breaks (especially on day 1) but breaks could have been less/merged on day 2: 1

3) How would you rate the quality of the background documents that were distributed in advance of the training seminar? (no rating or comment: 1)

excellent	good	average	poor	very poor
8	9	1		

Comments and recommendations:

- Very good: 2
- Power Analysis useful: 2 (Excellent resource: 1)
- A bit repetitive: 1
- There could have been more independent critique as assessment of more official documents: 1
- Too many background documents: 1
- Useful to prepare for the seminar: 1
- List of acronyms would make it easier to follow: 1
- Very specific: 1
- Useful linkage to web pages: 1

4) How would you rate the overall facilitation of the training seminar?

excellent	good	average	poor	very poor
6	12	1		

Comments:**What worked well:**

- Very smooth: 3 (holding the feedback/discussion and managing overall process: 1)
- Good time-keeping: 3
- Inclusive: 2
- Very engaged, passionate and motivated facilitator: 1
- Very enjoyable overall: 1
- Clear guidance on tasks: 1
- Very good on day 1: 1
- Good at noticing when people wanted to speak: 1
- Good idea of 'yoga breaks' on afternoon of day 2: 1

- A little more background discussion on gender would have made for a richer discussion (not sure everyone was on the same page): 1
- Could have included more small energizers on the way: 1
- Rules set strange atmosphere at the beginning but good to have laptops banned: 1
- Not clear enough in all sessions on day 2 as to what was facilitator's role: 1
- Would have been more interactive with more discussion among participants: 1

What worked less well:

- At times a bit time-pressured: 3 (sometimes cutting into interesting discussions: 1)
- Breaks were not planned well: 1
- More small breaks, especially on first day: 1
- A little more background discussion on gender would have made for a richer discussion (not sure everyone was on the same page): 1
- Could have included more small energizers on the way: 1
- Rules set strange atmosphere at the beginning but good to have laptops banned: 1
- Not clear enough in all sessions on day 2 as to what was facilitator's role: 1
- Would have been more interactive with more discussion among participants: 1

5) How would you rate the logistical arrangements for the training seminar?
(no comment or rating: 1)

	excellent	good	average	poor	very poor
Communication before the training seminar	13	2	1		
Logistical info kit	13	2	1		
Training facilities	11	4	1		
Accommodation	7	4	1		
Meals	6	5	3		

Any further comments:

- Super communication, nothing to change: 1
- All important information given in advance: 1
- Excellent organisational skills, excellent pre-event information, support, very friendly, helpful and professional approach: 1
- Very good info kit: 1
- Easy to reach the hotel: 1
- Room was a bit small: 1

6) Usefulness of the seminar: (No answer: 1)

Did you find the seminar useful?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Yes: 15• Learned a lot: 2• Good crash course: 2 (introductory step to advocacy with EU: 1)• Useful in terms of EU advocacy (learning from others) but would have liked more information on GPS advocacy more generally and not only at EU level: 1• Sometimes too much time spent on stating the obvious (EU institutions and importance of GPS/WPS): 1• Useful in some aspects but not in all aspects if you work outside of Brussels: 1• Inspirational: 1• Full of information: 1• Interesting participants: 1• Relevant guest speakers: 1• Stimulating: 1• Opportunity to network: 1• Appreciated hybrid nature of the training seminar: 1• There could have been more training on advocacy approaches and styles in a structured way: 1• Useful to deepen knowledge: 1• Would suggest another training seminar with a more interactive approach on the subject and to address actual fact of mainstreaming gender in P&S: 1• Useful to demystify the bureaucratic monolith of the EU institutions and unpack key mechanisms for progressing WPS: 1
How much did you learn at the seminar? Please give examples. (No answer: 1)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Gained more (specific) knowledge on EU institutions/instruments: 8 (Made connections about EU institutions and ways of working that I didn't have before: 1, Learned whom to approach within EU institutions on funding: 1, Learned about funding priorities/mechanisms: 2, Learned about EU commitments on WPS/GPS: 2, Learned about structures of EU institutions: 2, Learned many acronyms: 1, EU policy instruments: 1, Gender in EU institutions: 2, learned about role of EU delegations in implementation of GPS policies: 1, learned from EU officials and Swedish PermRep Representative about how they try to incorporate gender into their work: 1, learned about key EU institutions and their roles/responsibilities: 1, learned about problem of outsourcing by EU delegations to gender facility: 1)• Learned how to do advocacy: 8 (Learned (more) about advocacy entry points: 3, Learned about 3-pronged approach: 1, tools and instruments to build advocacy strategies, e.g. theory of change: 2)• Gained more (specific) knowledge on GPS: 5 (Learned that there is still much to do to ensure EU officials understand better what GPS agenda is about: 1, Learned that gender analysis is key: 1, Difference between GPS and WPS: 2, gender mainstreaming and tools for it in EU system: 2, gender perspective in operation: 1, learned that agenda of gender advisor still had be defined and that EPLO gave its input on this: 1, overall structure of GPS/WPS: 1, discovered that WPS suffers from same challenges as many other issues

in the institutions, useful to know: 1)

- Seminar raised many questions that otherwise would have been overlooked in my daily work: 1
- Networking: 1
- Deep look at one issue gives confidence: 1

Will you apply what you learned in your work? Please give examples. (No answer: 2)

- Yes: 15
- Not yet sure how: 2 (need to reflect more on this: 1)
- Will use it when doing advocacy: 8
(To better target advocacy in my programme: 1, will use information on how and whom to approach at EU level for GPS advocacy: 2, will use techniques for advocacy strategies learned during exercise: 1, when developing an EU advocacy plan (investigate entry points): 1, will try to mainstream gender in EU advocacy in order to increase understanding, awareness and support of EU officials on GPS agenda: 1
- Will keep in mind the issues related to gender perspective in treatment of victims of torture from conflict zones, taking into consideration the differences of clinical approach: 1
- Plan to do more to look at gender in day-to-day work (good to clarify targets and meet others already working in this field): 1
- Will share knowledge with others: 1 (with my working group of 20 HR/WR organisations from Euro-Med region: 1, will inform my discussion with colleagues when doing general EU advocacy work on human rights: 1)
- Will add EU advocacy points when producing documents: 1
- Will use it in work with EU delegations: 1 (asking them what to push for in Brussels)
- Might work with some of the partners at the training on joint actions: 1
- Will try to advocate for GPS more effectively in general, non-advocacy work: 1
- Will try to incorporate gender analysis in projects when it is missing: 1
- Will use information on EU priorities for funding in third countries: 1

Which of the topics touched upon in the training would you like to explore further in the future?
(No answer: 3)

- Advocacy best practices/methods: 4
(how to formulate effective message/how to deliver advocacy: 1)
- Gender analysis: 4
(main global policy frameworks on UNSCR 1325: 1, analysis techniques for GPS: 1)
- Men and masculinities: 1
- Low gender mind set in CSDP: 1
- Develop strategies to improve communication on gender: 1
- Evaluation of gender policy application: 1
- WPS vs. GPS: 1
- Possible links among different advocacy levels (national, European, global): 1
- Training engagements for EU staff/departments/groups: 1

- Regional strategising amongst participants: 1
- How to ensure gender is integrated in funding instruments: 1
- Challenges of implementation of GPS agenda in external policy: 1
- More information on GAP II: 1

7) How would you rate the training seminar overall?

excellent	good	average	poor	very poor
5	14			

Comments and recommendations for future improvements:

Suggestions for improvement:

- More time for discussions: 4
(More time or less content to allow for more unstructured discussions: 1, Less introductions, more in-depth discussion: 1, More focused discussion on mainstreaming gender on peace and security and less introduction on how institutions work: 1, shorter presentations and more time for discussion: 1)
- Shorter evaluation form: 2
- Maybe only one day of training seminar: 1
- Take care of learning process in working groups: 1
- Make sure there is a common understanding among participants about basic facts (e.g. CSDP missions): 1
- More informal setting might be more effective: 1
- Less text on PowerPoints: 1
- Make sure discussion on GPS, what it means and how to frame it, takes place at the beginning: 1

Further comments:

- Some parts were very technical: 1
- Sheet with relevant EU institutions & advocacy entry points was helpful to focus on learning in a forward-thinking way: 1
- Thank you for communication and detailed organisation: 1
- No talk about how to include more men in EU advocacy and within EU: 1
- Informative and inspiring: 1
- Possibility to network: 1
- Concrete case studies: 1