

LTEG MEETING (10.11.2012)

PRESENT:

1. LTEG situation:

- PARTICIPATION OF LTEG IN THE INTERNATIONAL MEETINGS

In 2012 Magda joined a meeting on the topic on MLTV volunteer exchanges. She was representing LTEG in the meeting with Alliance and other volunteer networks. Some initial steps were planned in the field of the standards and accessibility of mid-term and long-term voluntary projects. Larissa read the summary of Magda's report from the meeting in Bangalore.

The question remains: what does LTEG want out of these meetings? Do we participate in them further (especially if it would mean big financial costs)?

Magda would like to be involved in organising the activity next year, but if nothing gets done during the year maybe it is not worth it.

ACT: Before the next meeting we send around the report of what was done in the course of the year after the last meeting and we can decide, whether it is worth to join again or not.

- NSPM 2012: topic was reactivating working groups. Magda and Michael Kreutz were present there and they were the voice of LTEG. Larissa presents a brief summary of what has happened during NSPM.

The question remains: should LTEG keep joining NSPM? General opinion: It is good for visibility and for networking, but one person should be enough.

There wasn't much communication with prep-team beforehand, as they had their own problems, so it was difficult to pre-schedule some sessions or bilateral meetings. But it is important for visibility sake.

ACT: Set upper limit to what amount of money will be spent to cover participation of LTEG representatives at NSPM – number of people will be dependent on participation costs

- LTEG will have a new contact person from next year in the IS.
- Steering Group: Magda, Maria, Marta and Sarah are willing to join SG for one more year. LTEG Skype meetings are open to all LTV activists.

2. Visibility

- Documents
 - a. Where can you find LTV PPs?
 - i. www.sciint.org → member's area → ???
 - ii. www.lteg.info → member's area should be accessible soon
 - iii. Some branches have own resources (e.g. wiki)
 - b. For LTEG easiest is to develop www.lteg.info What should be there?

- i. Collect all documents related to LTEG/LTV exchanges (LTV PPs, minutes, old “Did you know that?”, database of information for current and new LTV coordinators)

ACT: collect documents, set up structure and upload the documents

ACT: make sure all LTV coordinators and activists have access to member’s area. New look of the web page should be implemented some time soon.

- ii. www.sciint.org changed already, as soon as we get the template from the IS (or tech team)

ACT: update when template is provided

- Mailing lists
 - a. activists: for all involved in some LTEG activities
 - b. Itvcoord: for LTV coordinators (not very active yet)
 - c. Itnews:

ACT: send information about how to (un)subscribe to the mailing lists

- Did you know that...?
 - a. Sent to Itvcoord and activists mailing list
 - b. Potential topics:
 - i. why OPS is not merged with LT database
 - ii. LTEG plan of action, regular progress feedback
 - iii. Results from meetings where LTEG participated
 - iv. LTEG SG member presentation
 - v. LTV coordinator presentation (and info about his/her branch, which projects, how many sent/hosted vols, how many staff,...)
 - vi. Feedback about training in Slovenia
- Facebook: Magda puts some information from time to time to ensure visibility on this platform

3. Trainings

- POT 201: Poznań, Poland – everything went well
- On-line POT – for people, who couldn’t join the POT in Poznań; it was useful from technical point of view, general feedback: it should still exist; it would be good if the activity could be supported by someone, who has more ideas about how to organise it from technical side;
- POT 2013: it was submitted by SCI Cataluña. The result should arrive around the half of December 2012.

What do we do if the training is not approved?

SCI Cataluña might have the chance to host it even if the grant is not approved. At this point we wait for the results of the application process.

PLOT 2012 – there were not many participants and in addition many have cancelled. But the meeting itself is important and the general feel is that it should be organised regularly. But we can work on changing the formula. Ex. We could have separate sessions for the newcomers and for more experienced LTV officers. Or LTV officers could facilitate sessions for the

newcomers. Experienced coordinators could come earlier and prepare to facilitate sessions for newcomers. The part for more experienced LTV coordinators could be shorter, or else. The meeting is also very important because of the networking possibility it provides.

The advanced LTV cords: what could they talk about? Best practices, evaluation of shared projects, prepare outlines for new documents, bilateral evaluations (more like EEM?), talk about common problems with specific projects, presentation of projects, challenges of each projects; Some sessions should still be shared;

Ask for suggestions from the coordinators.

Send around the list of participants, so coordinators can see that people they work with will be there.

What would be the possible topic:

- training for mentors or how to train mentors

Potential hosts:

- VCV Serbia (with financing via SCI CH for example)
- KVT Finland
- SCI Germany
- OWA Poland

ACT: send reminder to interested branches to give us their answer by end of November

4. Participation fees

- Fees for participation in an LTV project can be paid to: to hosting organisation, hosting project or sending organisation
- Background: fees seemed to get higher and higher, and there was a need to try to set some rules (for workcamps and for LTV projects). A first try to set a maximum fee had limited success. Regional working groups want to regulate their projects themselves. Recent communication with Paolo (from IEC) lead to the conclusion to rather strive towards transparency of fees (how much, and what it is used for) rather than to regulate, and maybe to make an overview of who is charging how much (for hosting and for sending).

When do fees become discriminating? Not everyone can afford to pay the same amount of participation fee typically to the hosting organisation.

- Can we pay participation fees according to our capacities?

Then we run the risk that volunteers paying lower fees by default will not get accepted in projects anymore, because the hosting branches would rather accept volunteers from countries of higher default fees.

Regulate it through an international solidarity fund? Sending organisations could provide a fee to an international fund for each sent volunteer. Participation fees to projects are then financed through this international fund, divided equally among branches hosting volunteers.

- If some organisations really can only exist thanks to the participation fees, the sustainability of these projects is very questionable. Can we expect cooperation over several years? What if they get less volunteers one year, and there is no diversification in the funding?

=> There are long-term cooperation between “northern” and “southern” branches to tackle this issue.

=> Try to set up an international working group for fund raising last year did not lead to anything (no interest/time)

- Temporary solution suggested by Paolo from IEC (worked out during NSM 2012): Create a clear overview of fee practices: strive for transparency and collect data to plan further steps to achieve less discrimination for the volunteers (based on their sending organisation), for example in the form of stratified participation fees or an international solidarity fund.

ACT: gather data to make the overview of sending and hosting participation fees

5. Database:

Changes from last year:

- infosheet was made mandatory
- statistics have been simplified
- Vacancies List can be generated automatically by clicking on one button (soon it will be customised easily, depending on the preference of the branch; possibly soon some branches who cooperate with non-partner organisations will be able to add these projects to – if that happens volunteers will need to state the branch of origin to see the projects that are accessible for this branch members)
- we are on the same server as OPS
- TechTeam is taking over management of the LT data-base and updating the programming language of the database

6. Statistics

Background: TV DataBase has a mechanism, which allows collecting statistics, but in the course of the last years there were very few entries. Are there any suggestions, which would help to improve it?

Clara: maybe the form should be more general, ex. just statistics, just goal of the project, etc.

Larissa: if you make it shorter, maybe it will be too general to recognise project which didn't go very well.

Sarah: if you answer the “satisfaction” question yes, then we don't care about the details really. But if you say no, then you need to answer more questions.

Sandra: There should be more positive information as well.

Sarah: As Sandra suggested, at the bottom there could be information about who did send their volunteers there and ask them about the current feedback. Also the more details we add, the bigger chance that we will not get the evaluation. We could simplify it to 5 yes/no categories and put a small box for comments next to it. Tick ok, mostly ok, not ok with the possibility to add comments. If it is mostly ok it will be discussed during the AM. If it has at least one not ok someone will assess it and could take immediate action

Additionally there will be an automatic e-mail generated informing the other branch that the first branch has evaluated the project – the other branch will be able to accept or reject/comment the project.

Larissa: what to do with the data there? What can we do, if the project is not OK?

The question is difficult and need more work in the course of the year.

ACT: Add to the DataBase: information at the bottom of project description available: statistics for the project (how many volunteers were hosted, from which branches and what was their evaluation)

ACT: Simplify the evaluation form to 5 categories and a text box for comments: logistics, work, aim, support, general satisfaction. Tick ok, mostly ok, not ok with the possibility to add comments.

ACT: Add to the DataBase: an e-mail will be generated to inform the other branch that the first branch participating in the project has filled out the evaluation and the branch can accept or reject and comment on it.

7. Practical Procedures 2012

Summary of the suggested changes:

- upon arrival check list (based on the form from SCI Germany)
- regional annexes
- application form: it was changed during NSPM, we don't know the minutes and details yet, but we would ask for the form from last year to be kept the way it was
- remove the words "placement season" from section II
- evaluation form updated to correspond with the online evaluation form
- updated list of branches, partners and codes

New suggestions for changes:

- see annex 1 to the minutes

8. LTEG provisional budget for 2013

| LTEG BUDGET 2013 | |
|------------------------|--------|
| Expenses | Income |
| - NSPM – 400 EUR | 0 |
| - LTEG AM – 1100 EUR | |
| - POT 2013 – 500 EUR | |
| TOTAL: 2000 EUR | |