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1. Welcome
   Craig Georgiou (CG) and Phil Taylor (PT) welcome all Steering group members and thank everyone for attending the meeting.
From the Research meeting earlier held on 4th June at NOMS (London) there were a great deal of background and experienced people and hopes this will help with the project. PT stress’s the critical point from the meeting is ‘communications’ and to identify and agree on terminologies to be used.

2. Active Inclusion Steering Group

Phil Taylor starts introducing himself. He has a background in custodial and has been in the prison service for over 35 years. During his career within the prison service, he has been Governor to a few other prisons which include Bullingdon, Wormwood Scrubs and Latchemere House. He has seen impacts on a range of people and results from ‘social inclusion’. PT was invited to act as Project Director for Active Inclusion and wants to continue to help people in these situations supporting the network where possible. After presenting himself, he asks for round table introductions.

* Craig Georgiou has a background in the prison service for over 19 years and is keen to help offenders. This has led him to working in projects mainly in criminal activities. This is the first transnational learning network that he has been involved in. He hopes to deliver activities on time (as this project has been delayed for a month) and that everyone to share their ideas to assist with this network and to help deliver the project.

* Ioan Durnescu is from the University of Bucharest and is responsible for the research part of the network. His background is in the criminal justice field and is interested in this network as it deals with social problems for offenders.

* Aggeliki Stabouli is from Epanados and the Greek Ministry of Justice (MoJ) who has also participated in the EXOCOP Learning network. Epanados hopes the network will improve problems in Greece especially with the current high unemployment issue.

* Koen Detemmerman has a background in ethnic minorities, more specific in individual and group coaching of newcomers, refugees and immigrants. The ESF Agency Flanders is currently involved in addressing unemployment within vulnerable groups, in particular youth.

* Giovanna de Mottoni is from ISFOL and works with European projects for social inclusion. She dealt with women going back at work and ex-offenders under EXOCOP network. At present her work is in transnational cooperation under ESF.

* Giovanna Mangano works in the Transnational Cooperation Unit of ISFOL (research institute mainly conducting surveys on market labour and education issues for the Italian Ministry of Labour). She has been the project manager for Net@work, a transnational network for sharing information on employment policies implemented by States to face the crisis. GM was also briefly involved with EXOCOP. GM informs the SG that ISFOL will support the Active Inclusion network where necessary. GM also informs partners about the interest of some Italian regions and the Italian Ministry of Labour for the network.
* Rita Festi is from Open Consortium that is made up of 6 members all engaged in ex-offender issues. The organisation was created 3 years ago and all members are experienced with criminal justice issues. The organisation provides psychological support and guidance services and has strong links with the Ministry of Justice’s regional departments. RF works in the national area and manages EU projects.

* Marco Girardello is from Open Consortium which was created as a 3rd phase as a result of the EC Equal initiative. His experience is in the detention environment, prison economy and co-ordinating activities. MG hopes to contribute to the sharing of information, learn from other networks and to help with solutions to issues. MG was involved with the EXOCOP project.

* Paolo Bonesso emphasises Italy has poor prison conditions and the EU has ruled that they have 1 year to improve. However there are also huge spending cuts imposed. Therefore, Regione Piemonte would like to be involved in this network to learn practices and save costs for services within prisons.

* Rhianon Williams apologies from Jürgen Hillmer. Ministry of Justice for the Land of Bremen (MinJusBre) was the co-ordinator for the EXOCOP project. Bremen launched the EVIDENCE project straight after, putting EXOCOP’s inter-institutional approach into practice. Following its first yearly review, EVIDENCE just secured a further 10 years’ funding. (Ex)offender ETE/workplace reintegration is currently high on the German political agenda therefore a great deal of action taking place nationwide.

* Karolina Medweca is from Birmingham City Council contracted by Department of Work and Pensions (DWP). Their aim is to help the network deliver outcomes and results using best practices.

* Olwen Lyner welcomes everyone to NIACRO, a Non Government Organisation (NGO) that receives funds from different government and other organisations. It operates programmes for ex-offenders to help reduce re-offending. OL has worked in various programmes.

* Allen Mercer has worked in a range of EU programmes and is now part of a team that promotes the transnational area. AM was previously involved in the EXOCOP project and Parliament Inclusion, integration of asylum seekers and victims of human trafficking.

* Anna Tengqvist is commissioned by ESF and is also working on another network. The main focus for Sweden is ‘youth’, looking at what feedback and what outcomes result from this network.

* Nora Obenaus is working for the Ministry of Labour, Social and Family Affairs and Integration (BASFI), which is the administration authority for the ESF in Hamburg. Nora apologizes for her colleague Ulrich Wolff, who could not attend the meeting. Concerning the interest of BASFI/ ESF-Hamburg: The Hamburg Senate and the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs have set a clear focus on the labour market integration of young people (“No one should be left behind”).
The Ministry has backed this strategy with several ESF-Projects and is currently developing a project for drop outs/NEETS together with our partners in the Baltic Sea Region contributing to the Baltic Sea Strategy. Therefore we would like to concentrate our efforts in the AI-Network on this target group too.

* Egle Brazaityte is representing ESFA Lithuania and their theme is ‘social disadvantaged people’. They are interested in the knowledge that they can draw out of the network and how they can incorporate this into other networks.

Craig Georgiou would like to capture the theme and sub themes that each organisation leans more towards in order to create a table of meetings and allocate people to meetings of that specific theme their organisation is more interested in. then organisation will be approached to host and manage the meeting in that particular theme to draw out approaches. The idea is for all partner countries to work and input into the network.

3. EU Update – Allen Mercer (AM)

AM – The EU has funded 8 new networks in the second generation (see the document disseminated “ESF Committee – The ESF Learning Networks 2013-2014”). These new networks all met at the Kick Off meeting in Brussels in April. It was a chance to talk to contracts and operations and also for mutual work. AM will send some information on these new networks to Craig Georgiou.

4. Active inclusion presentation – Craig Georgiou (CG)

a) Active Inclusion background: NOMS was deeply involved in the EXOCOP network, led by Jurgen Hillmer who is funded by the BRIK institute University of Bremen, but EXOCOP was run by the Ministry of Justice, Land of Bremen. The two sub-projects Evaluation which was run by Natalie Woodier from NOMS, and Knowledge Management run by Ministry of Justice, Bremen. This is the wiki where all the good practice was uploaded. In this NOMS undertook very good work, as realised by NOMS CEO Michael Spurr after attending the final conference. Thus when the EC - DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion - released the call for proposals to “Reinforce learning networks” in June 2012 NOMS (CG) - with DWP, ISFOL, ESF Managing Authority from Scotland - was invited by the Aragon Region to a meeting hosted in Madrid by the Spanish Ministry of Labour. The aim was to create a learning network looking to help different vulnerable people into work. At the end of the meeting participants agreed on the following vulnerable groups: Disaffected Youth, Troubled Families and Marginalised in Communities. On the basis of the first inputs, NOMS (CG) supported Aragon Region in developing the first draft of the project but subsequently Aragon dropped out due to economic pressure. CG then continued the development of the project and produced the AI approach, Giovanna Mangano (ISFOL) and Karolina Medweca (DWP), who were at the meeting in Madrid, had provided a great deal of input.

b) Network direction
- This Network will operate under the ESF framework of encouraging transnational collaboration and learning, with a focus on the Active Inclusion of marginalised people.
- The network will bring together experts to exchange and review processes to tackle employment difficulties of disaffected people. These will be guided into sustainable employment with opportunities to earn income for a dignified life. An overall goal will be to enhance the employability and social inclusion of these individuals and make employers aware of this pool of individuals who will be a beneficial addition to their workforce.
- Research for approaches/interventions: what is good, deliverable and transferable). The network will examine government strategies and policies; it will identify programmes, interventions and innovative work across the EU that addresses unemployment for these groups.
- The network will capitalise on the outcomes of surveys already carried out at a national and European level and the results of previous learning networks, in order to develop and improve the tools and strategies already shared and proved by Member states.
- Identify experts and practitioners and NGO’s – the use of this group of experts can provide valuable input into the network.
- Choosing approaches for demonstration:
  * 1st round of meetings, to select the best practices.
  * 2nd round of meetings, to select the very best practices.
  * Use different experts, practitioners, NGO’s and interchange around the different expert meetings hence new experts do not have to be identified for every meeting. The advantage is experts from different backgrounds and roles can be a learning model to the network and use different eyes from another party.
- Dissemination: Systematic and structured reports on findings, database and the final conference in Rome (ISFOL).
- Inform ESF Managing Authorities of findings. Present them in a format that distinguishes between accredited, non-accredited, evaluated and non-evaluated interventions. The information will help ESF managing authorities in making informed decisions when introducing or assessing current policy when deciding where to allocate financial assistance for interventions in these areas.
- In the future the network will continue to add value to the field through cooperation with other networks, through mutual support, communication and sharing of studies and findings

c) **Timeline** – CG talks everyone through the timeline (Annex 2) where meetings and work roles is expected. An idea previously used and was successful is to collate everyone’s research, amalgamate it to draw out the methods and best practices to use for the network.

d) **Finance** – CG presents the finance chart (Annex 4). This also show’s partner’s committed time and travel costs. It would be useful to have an Evaluator as there are enough funds available. CG welcomes any recommendations for an Evaluator.

e) **Network outputs** – CG shows the amount of AI meetings (Annex 3). The structure of most meetings is a day and half with 2 night’s accommodation. This will be a similar time frame for the final conference too. Following the list of work and expected products:
   - First round of meetings: 10 meetings
   - Second round of meetings: 5 meetings
   - One dissemination conference (Rome)
- 15 meeting reports (framework structure). Karolina Medweca advises that the meeting structures will need to be agreed in advance, so that the organisation hosting the meeting has a guidance to follow. Olwen Lyner agrees to look at the framework structure.
- Final report with outputs from the meetings
- Systematic Review (it will be explained later)
- Website to disseminate findings:
  * Knowledge Management section
  * Database of experts
- Guide to inform ESF Management Authorities
- Information on obstacles and Opportunities to consider when implementing interventions
- Improvement of transnational cooperation
- Network evaluation

f) Project Delivery – CG mentioned the risks and issues that could cause problems for project delivery:
- Communication between partners
- Partners with own agenda
- Research not rigorous enough
- Not enough experts sourced
- Costs exceeds budget
- Change of administration
- Restricted NOMS finance processes
- Economic crisis

All risks will be managed firstly with a view on how the damage will affect NOMS and then the project.

5. Presentation on network methodology of work - Ioan Durnescu (ID)

ID presents the first draft of the “Guidelines for the Research Framework”. The document aims at defining the area of interventions and setting up the procedure used within the three identified themes (Disaffected Youth, Troubled Families and Marginalised in Communities) in order to produce consistency in the approach. ID starts the debate with partners explaining the following contents of the “Guidelines”:
* Overall objective
* Areas of interventions
* Composition and working method of the Working Groups
* The survey on good practices
* The Systematic Review (SR)
* First round of meetings: activities and aims
* Second round of meetings: activities and aims
* Dissemination of results
* Contacts

First and second round of meetings will be known as ‘platforms’ and each theme will have a round of meetings. A decision will need to be made of who will attend the meetings.

Particularly ID mentions two main activities to be carried on before the first round of meetings: the ‘survey on good practices’ and the ‘Systematic Review’, both to collate good practices around Europe and analyse them during network activities.
To this end, the network leader (NOMS) and SG partners need to identify as many contacts as possible and from as many EU member states as possible in order to then request them to send presentations of good practices that observe the general eligibility criteria presented in the first draft and through the “questionnaire” in the same draft.

Main suggestions and concerns from SG members:
- This project is only for 2 years, thus probably it cannot cover everything, we can input ‘the methods’ to attack social problems as one of the findings in the final report. After that, it can be down to each country’s jurisdiction.
- Some people may not feel they are the right person to provide this information or time permits.
- Problems for the collectors, the speed of getting the questionnaires back maybe difficult. We need another way if this fails.
- Even if we contact the right people, there may be language barriers for those who are ideal for completing the questionnaire. They may not be willing to send it back and getting the questionnaire translated will be costly and time consuming hence a delay in receiving it back.
- In Italy, there are quite a few regions so it takes time to find the right people. Even if you do find the right people, there will be different understanding which means it will be time consuming to go backwards and forwards finding clarity.
- We need to discuss and to ensure a clearer definition of the criteria while searching for practices. We could look at other networks and European Institutes and agencies to extract some information.
- We need to clarify the 3 themed groups – theme leads to explain and define what all themes mean before taking it further.

ID says a mailing list will be set up by partners through an on-line Google document, the aim is to cover as much as possible of the geographical region, though it is impossible to cover everywhere and to reach all the right people. However we may not receive anything back but sometimes we can get 1 very good one. As we do not know who will return the survey, the more people we can reach, the more chances we have of receiving the completed survey back. It is agreed that partners will help the network in setting up a list of organisations to send the questionnaire to.

Some partners provide suggestions on how to improve the “Eligibility Criteria” and the “Questionnaire”. These will be included in an updated version in the “Guidelines”.

ID explains the Systematic Reviews aim is to collate hard evidence where practices have succeeded in enhancing employability and employment for these themed groups. The review is to also start identifying the possible indicators that are connected with success of interventions in this area. It will be conducted by the Research Partners (RP) at the same time of the survey on good practices with assistant from theme leads by identifying the relevant papers based on the criteria listed in the first draft of “Guidelines”.

ID will send eligible criteria to partners in order to find peer review articles. It is best to look for papers that already shows evidence of success and failure and to also look at other papers for the purpose of analysing.
The timeline for the survey on good practices and the first draft of the Systematic Review is at the end of this year, when the SG will start contacting experts for meetings.

Giovanna Mangano proposes to debate the outcomes of both Survey and Systematic Review during the second SG meeting in Hamburg, in order to verify details and understandings before sending out the survey and in order to set up the structure of the platform 1 meetings and their participants and contents, on the basis of the survey results. The same should be done for the SG meeting due next summer of 2014, before starting the second platform of meetings. Partners agree on this.

All inputs from partners will be included in the updated version of “Guidelines” (draft 2) after the SG meeting.

6. AI Steering Group – discussion

Group looks at the survey criteria and debates on the impacts of employability in employment as outcomes.

Giovanna Mangano suggests looking at:
- Over lapping and not just best practices in specific themes. This could allow us to find out, for example, common approaches for managing common needs before developing and integrating it.
- The network should consider aspects crossing the three themes such as the ones already raised by partners, for example: coordination among agencies, link with business, education and health issues. It is necessary to clarify our aims and define contents to then develop the criteria and questionnaire for the survey and next activities.

How to put this into practice? The questionnaire needs to draw out the answer for this purpose. What is it that we are looking for? How does it work? How do we make it work?

ID stressed that using open questions will provide more information. Thus the network could have two options:

1. Keep questions simple but go into dept when it is necessary
2. Start with sophisticated questions which will provide more answers.

ID – there are many ways to go in dept, for example invite the person involved from previous meetings to attend the 2nd platform of meeting where they can provide in-depth information.

A few suggestions and concerns:
- The network could send the survey questionnaire to the European Agencies working in the same field.
- Everyone to send information and survey to relevant people who have previously been involved in good practices.
- Need to look at processes to collate information for the database. SG members feel it would be useful to use the collated information for learning purposes.
- Could use a survey website where everyone can look up the information but will only allow people to make minimal changes.
- Will need quality assurance as the website may give the impression that all best practices are those that send in the survey.
- It is important that the letter enclosed with the questionnaire explains, the contents and aims of the network, the survey and the advantage of filling in the questionnaire.

ID will send the updated research document to everyone.
Anna Tengqvist will send questionnaire on empowerment that was used in a previous project to ID.

7. Work strategy – Craig Georgiou (CG)

CG shows the “Work Programme”, a draft table of activities showing the following headings:
-What - e.g. workshop, peer review, seminar, study visit
-Who - partner responsible
-To whom - partners and stakeholders attending the event
-When - Month / year
-Products/outcomes - expected products and results

This table will show each meeting and which theme lead will facilitate it. The Facilitator will collate information, produce a report and then disseminate it to partners. Supporting partners will be aligned to each meeting and they can also invite help from other sources. This table will be completed and sent to partners by 28th July. NOMS will also produce a Risk Register using the information extracted from partners and will then circulate this.

Egle Brazaityte, – is concern that countries may not be able to find experts in all thematic groups, for example, in Lithuania there is no multi-generational unemployment like in the UK where there are loop holes where families rely on benefits hence not having to work from one generation to the next.
Ioan Durnescu – will include and clearly define this theme in the terminologies area of the updated “Guidelines” (draft 2).

Planning Out Dissemination of Strategies – CG emphasises the importance of communications for which the network has already foreseen the final conference in Rome (ISFOL) with a database collecting all data and outcomes from the Active Inclusion network. CG asks for input from everyone to improve communications. Some ideas and suggestions:
- AI Newsletter edited by NOMS
- Contact other networks to link AI newsletters.
- Using other ESF agencies and other European agencies such as CEP and the European Councils website to advertise AI work.
- CG will ask Allen Mercer to circulate AI information as he will know contacts.
- Tweet and publish on own websites. Although NOMS will do as much as possible to promote this on the NOMS intranet, but this is governed by what is communicated out.
- Use roll up stands to take to meetings.

All outcomes will be included in the updated “Guidelines” (draft 2) and developed in future meetings.
Close of meeting
Date 26th June 2013

8. **Project Manager** – Craig Georgiou (CG)

CG summarises the first day’s meeting aims and outcomes:
- Ensure everyone is aware of their roles and expectations in their areas
- CG asked Allen Mercer to provide an update at each SG meeting
- We looked at the research presentation and agreed on methodology. He thanks Giovanna Mangano for the great deal of input provided
- CG will work on the strategies, partnership agreement and Work Programme
- Risk register: CG will populate the Risk Register by sending the table out to partners to complete and return back to him to amalgamate. This will be updated on a monthly basis to ensure we are aware of any risks where some might turn into issues. This will help to mitigate it.

CG shows the following points:

**Partner’s Reports**
The Project Manager will send out the quarterly reporting structure for everyone to complete and return. This will be compiled into a quarterly report and then circulate to partners. This is to ensure we know where we are with the network and to advise partners if there is anything everyone needs to be aware of. The main report is a separate internal report which can be populated and any issues can be dealt with at the next SG meeting.

Partners all agree on the frequency and work of the report.

**Finance**
- *Timesheets* – this has to be evidenced and must match the budget. NOMS finance department will request a monthly timesheet. If no time was used for work on the network it must be returned stating ‘NIL’.
- *Highlight Report* – this is done quarterly and sent to the EU Commission to provide an update.
- *Bookings* – All travel and accommodation must be booked through NOMS who uses the national contracts. If ESF organisations can fund themselves, this would be extremely helpful as the extra funds can be used to invite more experts. But all expert attendees must book their travel and accommodation via NOMS or else NOMS cannot reimburse the costs. NOMS is unable to pay for alcohol on the per diem rate. The cost of each flight is up to and including €300. The next SG meeting will be in Hamburg in December and will organise this with Nora Obenaus from BASFI, the date is yet to be agreed. We need to book flights as soon as possible to avoid over budget flight costs as the flights booked to attend this SG meeting is already over budget by a great deal. We will ask partners to fund the difference in costs for flights if it is over budget. We cannot use the per diem rate to cover costs of flights. The per diem rate per country is in the official budget. Invitations will be sent out with a booking form which needs to be completed and sent back to NOMS to make the arrangements. A copy of the grant agreement will be sent to partners so that the budget is visible.

The 1st round of meetings - Expert meeting will have a maximum of 12 people
The 2nd round of meetings - Peer Review will have a maximum of 20 people
If we have to fund a partner to these meetings, then we will need to reduce the number of experts/peer review attendees.
The final conference will have around 70 delegates out of which approximately 60 flights will need to be booked. A total of 60-70 delegates will be held at ISFOL in Rome, with 2 night’s accommodation.

- **Translation Budget** – The budget is only for the final conference and not for small meetings. If partners can assist with translation for the network, this will help reduce costs. This can then be used for translation costs at the final conference. Ideally we want to seek English speaking experts unless, it is imminent to have a particular expert we would then need to find the budget for this. Another idea is to ask the host country/Member State to contribute to interpretation costs.

**Partnership Agreement**

This is yet to be completed but unsure if this is a requirement between the EU and partners. This agreement will set out the roles and expectations between partners and groups. The Partnership Agreement will be sent along with the Work Programme by the 28th July.

**Research**

With reference to the process of sending questionnaires, CG wants to be clear of each partner’s roles on who to disseminate to as this was slightly confusing the day before. Ioan Durnescu will clarify this on the updated “Guidelines” with the organisation of theme groups, so that everyone can agree.

**Agreement by all:**
- Theme Lead: the partner in charge with the general management of one of the three themes, this will be in the Work Programme. N OMS will lead Troubled Families theme.
- Sub Theme Lead: the partner in charge with the organisation and coordination of a specific theme meeting
- In order to create the list of contacts to send the questionnaire to, some European contacts, such as ESF Managing Authorities can be obtained from the EU, (Craig Georgiou will contact Marie-Anne Paraskevas from the EC). We will also seek experts within NOMS for other themes and will send the questionnaire to them and other organisations to obtain contacts from and will also approach NGO’s and European groups who represent people in this area. Ioan Durnescu suggests to:
  * organise a common mailing list
  * separate the contact lists for each theme
  * organise a list for each sub theme
  * design a template and then send it to NOMS who will amalgamate into one list.
  * send out as many questionnaires as possible as we cannot guarantee how many we will get back.
  * mailing list to be as long as possible and mail to contacts directly.

Ioan Durnescu will send the Google link to partners to fill in the contact sheet, however chasing other organisations to get it back with contacts and questionnaires maybe an issue.

Craig Georgiou – if this is unmanageable, we will arrange for a telephone conference to discuss. The only concern is if too many people are involved in collating information, we may lose track and cause confusion. Thus CG proposes NOMS to send out the agreed questionnaire in order to have one central point to
collate the information. NOMS will then forward replies to Theme Leads for deeper analysis. If necessary Theme leads could assist NOMS.

CG stresses the importance to set up a deadline: partners agree that while we are populating the contacts lists, Ioan Durnescu will update the questionnaires before circulating to partners. The questionnaire will be sent out at the end of July providing a 2.5 – 3 months deadline for the return period.

The questionnaire is to find the same information and if necessary go back to the person who filled in the questionnaire to obtain in depth information.

Egle Brazaityte – an issue in Lithuania is most organisations will not reply if they need to respond in English. This will result in Epanados having to translate all the questionnaires.

ID – if we do not receive any response in this situation, we will consider translation. To be discussed on a case by case basis.

Craig Georgiou proposes the first instance the survey goes out in English and if translation of the questionnaire is needed, NOMS will ask partners to assist. Partners agree.

9. **Next Steering Group meeting** – Hamburg December 2013, date yet to be agreed.

Close of 1st Steering Group Meeting
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Annex 1 - Action Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Send information on the 8 new ESF LNs in the second generation to CG to circulate to partners</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG to circulate information on the 8 new ESF LNs in the second generation</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To look at framework structure for meetings</td>
<td>OL</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To check possibility of translating research papers into English</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To send eligible criteria to partners in order to find peer review articles.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send survey information to relevant people who have previously been involved in good practices.</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To start looking at building the database to collate information.</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To send the updated research document to everyone.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To send questionnaire on empowerment that was used in a previous project to ID</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete the work programme document and</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To collate information and produce a Risk Register to send to partners.</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To send a copy of the grant agreement to partners so that the budget is visible.</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To produce the Partnership Agreement and send to network partners.</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To contact Marie-Anne Paraveskevas from the EC for a list of contacts to send questionnaires to.</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update the questionnaire, put it online, and send Google link to partners to populate the contacts list.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2

Timeline

**ACTIVE INCLUSION LEARNING NETWORK TIMELINE**

- **01/06/2013** Kick Off Meeting, Brussels
- **29/06/2013 - 02/12/2013** Key Indicator Questionnaire/Best Practice Identification
- **11/11/2013** Multi-Gen Unemployed Test Event
- **16/11/2013** Youth NEET Test Event
- **25/06/2013** Board Meeting
- **10/12/2013** Board Meeting
- **01/07/2014** Board Meeting
- **02/07/2014** Expert meetings completed
- **06/02/2015** Practitioners meetings completed
- **02/04/2015** Conference
- **31/05/2015** Report on network outcomes

**ACTIVE INCLUSION RESEARCH TIMELINE**

- **01/06/2013 - 31/03/2014** Design framework
- **01/06/2013 - 18/12/2013** Expert Meetings report Analysis
- **18/03/2014 - 04/11/2014** Practitioners Meetings report Analysis
- **01/04/2015** Deliver findings Conference
- **02/04/2015** Final report to board
- **31/05/2015** Meta Analysis Inclusion research

**Activities**

- **01/06/2013 - 30/09/2013** Expert/NGO Identification
- **01/06/2013 - 31/07/2013** Practitioner Identification
- **29/06/2013 - 02/12/2013** Key Indicator Questionnaire/Best Practice Identification
- **25/06/2013** Board Meeting
- **10/12/2013** Board Meeting
- **11/11/2013** Multi-Gen Unemployed Test Event
- **16/11/2013** Youth NEET Test Event
- **22/12/2013** Interim report to board
- **31/05/2015** Report on network outcomes
Annex 3

The Process and Network Outputs

Active Inclusion Learning Network

Disaffected Youth

- Expert/NGO Meeting: Employment, Education & Training
- Expert/NGO Meeting: Inclusion/Empowerment
- Research report on Disaffected Youth
- Practitioner/Expert Review, Quality Assurance

Marginalised in Communities

- Expert/NGO Meeting: Homelessness
- Expert/NGO Meeting: Drug & Alcohol Abuse
- Report on Offenders and Ex-Offenders/Mental Physical & Learning Disabilities
- Practitioner/Expert Review, Quality Assurance

- Expert/NGO Meeting: Offenders/Families
- Expert/NGO Meeting: Mental Health Physical & Learning Disabilities
- Practitioner/Expert Review, Quality Assurance

- Expert/NGO Meeting: Offenders/Families
- Expert/NGO Meeting: Employment Unemployment/Families
- Practitioner/Expert Review, Quality Assurance

- Expert/NGO Meeting: Education Problems
- Expert/NGO Meeting: Anti Social Behaviour
- Report on Anti Social Behaviour/Educational Problems
- Practitioner/Expert Review, Quality Assurance

Marginalised Communities

- 1st Steering Group meeting
- Steering Group
- Report on Multi Generational
- Practitioner/Expert Review, Quality Assurance

Troubled Families

- Expert/NGO Meeting: Employment, Education & Training
- Expert/NGO Meeting: Anti Social Behaviour
- Report on Anti Social Behaviour/Educational Problems
- Practitioner/Expert Review, Quality Assurance

- Expert/NGO Meeting: Offenders/Families
- Expert/NGO Meeting: Unemployment/Families
- Practitioner/Expert Review, Quality Assurance
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## SUMMARY OF THE BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Budget Heading</th>
<th>Estimated expenditure</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total budget (eligible costs) - (€)</td>
<td>499 578.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grant requested from EC - (€)</td>
<td>392 064.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grant requested from EC / Total budget estimate - %</td>
<td>78.47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Staff</td>
<td>95,554.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B Travel</td>
<td>249 256.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C Cost of services</td>
<td>107,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D Consumables</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E Administration costs</td>
<td>15,086.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F Indirect costs (max 7%)</td>
<td>32 682.72</td>
<td>6.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G Contribution in kind/non eligible</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H Total Costs</td>
<td>499,578.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I Other contribution from third parties and/or</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>generated by the activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K Financial contribution from the beneficiaries</td>
<td>107 514.00</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L Contribution from EC</td>
<td>392 064.72</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>499,578.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M Contribution in kind/non eligible</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>499,578.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Research Process
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25/06/2013
1st Steering Group Mtg

11/12/2013
2nd Steering Group

07/07/2014
3rd Steering Group Mtg

24/03/2015
Conference

26/06/2013 - 09/12/2013
Questionnaire colation

01/01/2014 - 01/07/2014
Platform 1 meeting structure

20/06/2014 - 05/10/2014
Follow up Interview

01/08/2014 - 31/12/2014
Platform 2 'Peer review'

01/04/2015

01/07/2015

01/04/2015

01/07/2014

01/04/2014

01/07/2014

29/04/2013

09/12/2013 - 11/12/2013

Active Inclusion

08/07/2014 - 10/07/2014
SG Actions

07/04/2014
Tele conference (progress review)

25/10/2014
Tele Conference (Progress review)

20/06/2014 - 05/10/2014
Follow up Interview

01/08/2014 - 31/12/2014
Platform 2 'Peer review'

RP designs questionnaire
Network lead emails to MA's
All partners source approaches
Network Lead compiles database
Approaches that meet questionnaire criteria selected for platform 1

Experts will examine within the structure by SG
Sub group faciltates report based on outputs in agreed format
Theme lead will collate and provide research pt in with results

Experts will examine within the structure that was agreed by SG
Sub group facilitates report based on outputs in agreed format
Theme lead will collate and provide results supported by the conduct telephone completed

RPC will provide SG with results of first round of meetings
SG will design platform 2 meeting structure (Key Criteria, Aims, Participants)
SG will provide list of approaches for experts examination at platform 2

Systematic Review will provide interim results to the SG at SG meetings and feed into the Key Criteria