



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL JUSTICE

Directorate A: Civil Justice
Unit A4: Programme Management

THE DAPHNE III PROGRAMME (2007-2013) TO PREVENT AND COMBAT
VIOLENCE AGAINST CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE AND WOMEN AND TO
PROTECT VICTIMS AND GROUPS AT RISK

ACTION GRANT Final Narrative Report

- Please, download and fill in this form on your computer.
- In addition to one paper copy of this report please provide the Commission also with an electronic copy of this report (e-mail to JUST-DAPHNE@ec.europa.eu or provide a USB Key/disk)
- Please provide the Commission also with hardcopies and electronic copies of all relevant publications/outputs (speeches, studies, brochures, reports, manuals, surveys etc.)

A) PROJECT

1. **Reference number** of the project: **JUST/2009-2010/DAP3/AG/0898**

2. **Title** of the project: **DAPHNE-DIFFUSION : European DAPHNE Directory**

3. **Co-ordinating Organisation's name**: **Naturalia et Biologia (NEB)**

4. **Start date and end date** of the project (if this information differs from the information provided in your application form, please, explain also the reasons thereof):
15/01/2011-14/01/2013: 24 months

5. Contact person:

Name: Pr Marcel Spector

Address: ERTE - Université Paris Descartes - 45 rue des Saints Pères

Postal code: 75006 City: Paris

Email: spector@naturaliaetbiologia.fr

Phone: (+33) 1 42 86 90 35

Fax: (+33) 1 42 86 33 00

Contributors to this report: Pr. Marcel Spector (NEB), Maïté Albagly (NEB), Marie-Christine Elgard (NEB), Marc Nectoux (Psytel), Claude Mugnier (Psytel), Jean-Pierre Darlot (Psytel), Dr Duarte Rei Vilar (APF), Aija Vule (FCC/SSA), Helmut Sax (LBG)

6. **Partner(s)** and **associate partner(s)** involved in the action during the lifetime of the project:

Partner 1: **Associação para o Placamentoda Familia** (APF - PT)

Partner 2: **Psytel** (FR)

Partner 3: **Ludwig Boltzmann Gesellschaft** – Institute of human rights (LBG - AT)

Partner 4: **Social Services Agency** (SSA - LV) formerly Family Crisis Center

7. Amongst the **planned activities** in the project financed by the European Commission, please outline those that were **implemented**. Indicate them in chronological order and per workstream.

The goals of the project DAPHNE-DIFFUSION (short name « DAPH-DIFF ») were to facilitate the search for partners, the exchange of information amongst DAPHNE actors and the dissemination of DAPHNE project results by creating a Web-based Directory. The project activities, grouped into 6 workstreams, were as follows:

Workstream 0: Management and coordination of the project (January 2011 - January 2013)

A0.1: Scientific management of the project (related to the kick-off meeting and internal monthly work meetings)

implemented

A0.2: Coordination of the project team and partners (related to the 2 general project meetings)

implemented

A0.3: Production of intermediary reports and internal work documents

implemented

A0.4: Administrative and financial management of the project

implemented

Workstream 1: Project deliverables and their dissemination (July 2012 - January 2013 and beyond)

A1.1: Make available an IT tool titled the DAPH-DIFF Directory containing contact information of all of the actors in the DAPHNE community, including a Web-Directory search and results interface

implemented

A1.2: Publication of specific project documents: final scientific report, summary report (FR/EN) consisting of 4 pages, a document "provisionary conclusions" disseminated in M18, a user manual for the Directory, it serves as an example of a project which meets the axis priority n°5 « work providing women with the means to protect themselves and their partners against violence ».

implemented

A1.3: A CD-ROM containing all of the documents produced by the project.

implemented

A1.4: All project documents will also be available for downloading within a specific module on the Website of the NEB

Implemented and to be found on the Psytel website, the technical project office (www.psytel.eu)

Workstream 2: Interviews with project leaders regarding issues with dissemination of project results (M2-M6)

A2.1: Definition of the scope of the project and the study dynamics

implemented

A2.2: Interviews with DAPHNE project leaders (reporting on the strengths and weaknesses of dissemination within the programme, ways to improve this), with a minimum of 3 project leaders per Member State (MS) partner, analysis of Commission reports on this topic

implemented

A2.3: Analysis of issues arising related to dissemination of DAPHNE project results

implemented

Workstream 3: Collection of the contents for the DAPH-DIFF Directory (M5-M16)

A3.1: Establish the descriptors for the Directory and their nomenclature

implemented

A3.2: Acquisition of pertinent information already available on the DAPHNE Toolkit: addresses present

implemented

A3.3: Collect the contact information of supplementary national DAPHNE project partners to complete the Directory (ministries, institutions and national NGOs - EU27)

implemented

A3.4: Collect, based on specific requests, the contact information of European networks and organisations linked to activities related to the DAPHNE programme

implemented

A3.5: Acquisition of contact information of journalists in charge of questions related to activities of the DAPHNE programme within the major European media (EU27)

implemented

Workstream 4: Development of the DAPH-DIFF Directory, the Web-based search tool and test (M9-M16)

A4.1: Documentation of uploads to the Directory and the DAPH-DIFF Web application

implemented

A4.2: Development of the Directory, the DAPH-DIFF Web application and the update module

implemented

A4.3: Testing of the software (beta version) with groups of potential users in the countries AT, PT, LV and FR

implemented

A4.4: Corrective actions as seen necessary and availability of the final application

implemented

Workstream 5: Implementation of the DAPH-DIFF Directory (M17-M24)

A5.1: Analysis of the contents of the new dissemination Directory: quantitative and qualitative approach

implemented

A5.2: Example of querying the database which fulfills priority 5 axis of the « work DAPHNE programme 2009 » : « Field work at grass-roots level with involvement of women, in particular programmes that aim to empower them to protect themselves and their peers against violence ».

implemented

A5.3: Implementation of the Directory (sites Toolkit, NEB, other NGOs) and referencing (Google, Yahoo, etc.)

Implemented + in process

- This work was accomplished with strict adherence to the initial project timeline. We only extended the time period for collection of contact information which was to finish in M16 to M20, in parallel with other work planned for during this time period.

- We communicated with a lawyer to study the legal issues related to this Directory.
- We regularly contacted the DAPHNE team concerning progress of our work: meeting with Ms. Benedetta Turdo (Unit A4 of DG Justice) in Brussels, specific sending of work documents to the DAPHNE team, requests for meeting (see the chronology of work in Annex 3).

8. Amongst the **planned activities** in the project co-financed by the European Commission, please outline those that were **not implemented** and give reasons why this was the case. Indicate them in chronological order and per workstream.

We have completed the entire work programme as planned and documented in detail via the activities of the workstreams. **All activities planned were implemented.**

However, it remains to be considered how the DAPHNE team plans to exploit our project results, that is to say essentially the DAPH-DIFF web application (organisations forms database + query application and web consultation). A number of options are possible:

- (1)- no specific exploitation of the project results by the Commission. We make the dissemination of the project results as for a standard DAPHNE project;
- (2)- put a link referencing our site on a Commission website, for example, on the website of the DAPHNE Toolkit;
- (3)- Commission utilises the contact information database within the Directory for its work;
- (4)- Commission uses the DAPH-DIFF software in its entirety (Directory of contact information and web application).

These different options are discussed in more detail in Chapter 13 and are still open for discussion now that the project has been completed.

9. Were any **unforeseen activities** in the project co-financed by the European Commission **implemented**? If yes, please indicate them in chronological order and per workstream.

We have undertaken at least four tasks that were initially not planned and completed these in addition:

- To complement activity A2.3 (Assessment of issues related to project dissemination) we wrote a document (reference D058) titled «Placement of various tools within various stages of a DAPHNE project». What we realised during our work is that there is some confusion amongst the project leaders and partners regarding the role and utilisation of the following tools:

- DAPHNE III Website of the Commission - DG Justice;
- DAPHNE Toolkit (contains information about the projects from 1997 to 2005);
- Priamos system (system of electronic submission of the DG Justice);
- DAPHNE-DIFFUSION Directory product of this project.

This document is available in the web application (Results of the project, then Other), in the CD-ROM, as well as in the website which contains all of the project documents to be found at www.psytel.eu.

- To complement activity A3.3 (Collect contact information of additional national contacts) , we thought to make contact with the Embassies of France from 12 Member States where it seemed not to have enough cards collected at the time of the project (May 2012). We sent a request for information (reference D072), usually to the press service of the embassy of France in these countries. We had several useful responses.

- To complement activity A4.3 (Testing of the software) we asked organisations included in the Directory to test the Directory and provide feedback regarding improvements: 271 organisations tested the final version, a dozen making us proposals for improvement.

- To complement activity A5.1 (Qualitative approach) we produced a document of global thinking on the « DAPHNE Actor-Network » (reference D106).

10. Which **results** were obtained for each activity of each workstream described above? Please include details on how the end results helped the achievement of the initial goals of the project and if other goals, not initially foreseen, were also fulfilled. How has this been evaluated (which **evaluation criteria /methods** have been used)? How would you describe the **impact** of this project? What was the impact on the target group(s) and the beneficiaries?

10.1 Results by workstream:

- Activities of workstream 0 (Activities 0.x) allowed us to put together a project work team. We produced a set of documents referenced from D000 to D112 consisting of intermediary and internal work documents and contract documents. The team NEB/Psytel ensured the scientific management of the project and the project leader NEB the administrative and financial management. All of the project documents (meeting notes, box of ideas, reports, coding manual, etc.) were distributed to all partners and available on our « Dropbox », which is a shared work space. The collaboration with the partners was entirely satisfactory.

- Activities of workstream 1 (Activities 1.x) allowed us to structure forms for more than 2450 organisations within a database of contact information and to make this available to the general public, including a search interface. We published, in addition to this final administrative report (D109) FR/EN (in French and English), a summary report (D110) FR/EN, a coding manual for the data forms (D056) FR/EN, an example of how to use the Directory (D112). In addition, we regrouped the major project documents and put them on a CD-ROM, as well as on the website www.psytel.eu (see point 14).

- Activities of workstream 2 (Activities 2.x) allowed us to define the scope of the project, to meet with DAPHNE project leaders (3 in FR, 3 in AT and 3 in PT) in order to assess the issues related to dissemination and to identify the needs of these users regarding a DAPHNE Directory. We established an interview guide for this work (D008). In turn we also completed an analysis of the information received. In performing these activities we were forced to more precisely define the core of the project: collect and organise the contact information of the following organizations, according to descending priority: partners of all DAPHNE projects from 1997 to 2010, major national and regional NGOs working in the field, universities and researchers in the field, ministries, and major media in charge of this work, within the 27 Member States.

- The interviews performed allowed us to realise that there is a certain amount of confusion regarding the function of the « DAPHNE Directory », « DAPHNE Toolkit », « Priamos submission system » and the « DAPHNE website ». We have written a document stating the features of the Directory as compared to other tools (D058).

- Our project is clearly a project consisting of creating an « intelligent Directory » meaning a Directory which serves as a list of contacts (postal address, email, contact name, etc.), and « **intelligent** » in that it allows for the classification of information, essentially by country, by type of organisation, by field of action, by target population and by type of action. This Directory serves to facilitate the search for partners (rather « small » structures not included in

networks already strongly established), using the search content assistance in a project or outside (any actor Daphne), the dissemination of results at the end of the project (any actor Daphne) and advocacy (rather for the « big » structures).

- Activities of workstream 3 (Activities 3.x) allowed us to establish the first versions of the descriptors needed for the Directory and the thesaurus (or nomenclature) associated with the information variables of the DAPH-DIFF Directory. These descriptors and the thesaurus evolved over the first months of the project with the support of the partners, and most of all due to the testing of the application as we started data collection. After the first general meeting in Paris with all of the partners (07/10/2011) we established the version V2.1 which is the definitive version. The construction of the thesaurus had to meet the following criteria: utilise the present thesaurus found in the DAPHNE Toolkit and update it according to the new needs. Then we published a final coding manual (D056) FR/EN which still serves as reference.

- Data collection first started with acquiring useful, existing information such as that found in the DAPHNE Toolkit (projects 1997 to 2005), then data collection from DAPHNE project leaders not present in the Toolkit (2006 to 2010). We also sought organisations which submitted proposals to DAPHNE without however being selected. We sought additional information on national organisations by inquiring with the organisations already included in the Directory (for data on ministries, institutions and national NGOs - EU27), then collection of European networks and organisations linked to activities of the DAPHNE programme, followed by data on journalists in charge of such questions in the 10 major media of the (EU27). The project partners also searched for organisations by using search engines online (see document (D054 - search methods). We defined two levels of searching: complete form and short form with 6 mandatory variables completed (country, international name of organisation, email of institution, type of field, type of action, target population). All of the information present in the Directory was validated by the organisations themselves or were already available in the public domain.

- The activities of workstream 4 (Activities 4.x) allowed us to develop the Directory of contact information, to create a search interface (web search application) and to follow the data collection on the number of organisation forms collected. Then we developed and updated the website for searching and consulting the Directory (web application EndUser). We tested this software with our partners and project leaders, which led to improvement necessary to produce the final application. The informatics development were performed in the *PHP* language with the management of the information in the Directory using the open source *MySQL* and *CMS WordPress* for the management system of free contents, for the presentation of the website EndUser. These are known standards for informatics development.

- The activities of workstream 5 (Activities 5.x) allowed us to undertake a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the Directory, to provide examples of searches, notably following the priority axis 5 in the work DAPHNE programme 2009: « Field work at grass-roots level with involvement of women, in particular programmes that aim to empower them to protect themselves and their peers against violence ». We then started the referencing work for the Directory. This work is in progress and its implementation can be influenced by the Commission's plan for this Directory in the future (see the different scenarios in Chapter 13 of this report). Whatever the outcome, we are committed to maintenance of the site and of the Directory for up to two years after the end of the project (14/01/2013-14/01/2015).

- All project deliverables are discussed in detail in Chapter 14.

10.2. Evaluation:

- As announced in our proposal we applied the concepts from the MBO (*Management by objectives*) for project management. During the internal work meetings of NEB/Psytel – approximately every 6 weeks – each team member had specific objectives to accomplish (Chapter « To do » as documented in the meeting notes) which was then discussed at the next project meeting. In this way we were able to track work progress towards accomplishing the objectives.
- We utilised an evaluation procedure and internal follow-up as performed by PsyteI in previous Daphne projects which NEB chose to also use:
 - The coordinator establishes the *work programme in detail, the allocation of work among the partners and the timeline in a Gantt diagram* serving to determine the « critical pathway » for this project. This document was distributed at the start of the project and updated at each internal project meeting.
 - *The internal project meetings* took place between the team members of the project leader NEB and PsyteI and meeting notes were shared with all partners.
 - The coordinator follows the progress of the project and the timeline for implementation, dealing with potential delays. The coordinator verifies that the results of each activity are available and clearly identified.
 - *All project documents are numbered and referenced.* The final report is a summary of documents surrounding the implementation of the Directory. *These final documents were created during the entire length of the project.*
 - *Two general project coordination meetings* were held for follow-up of the project and to discuss the intermediary results between the partners.
 - We distinguish between *three types of different documents*: the « administrative report » which is a part of the contract at the end of the project, the working papers (WP) which are « documents of important results » and other project documents, rather detailed, which summarise the methodology and analysis of results and finally, the « summary report » which is a summary document for communication, by concentrating on the results obtained and targeted for dissemination.
 - The partners and project leader are in constant contact during all project activities by email, telephone, etc.
- To verify the validity of the results achieved in this project we used the « SMART » method. The results had to be:
 - Specific**, meaning adapted to the project and clearly formulated: our annual Directory and the linked web application, as well as the different WP respond to these criteria;
 - Measurable**, meaning measurable according to qualitative and quantitative characteristics: our initial proposition describes the performance indicators (see below);
 - Attainable**, meaning attainable with the human and financial resources available: to undertake the work within the financial framework available;
 - Realistic**, meaning that the work meets the specific needs and acknowledges that identifying partners and dissemination are being done for a long time now by the actors and partners of the DAPHNE programme.
 - Timely**, meaning the deliverables have to be accomplished within the planned timeline: we accomplished the work without any delay.
- Project follow-up was performed **utilising appropriate performance indicators**. We identified two types of indicators:
 - **Internal performance indicators for monitoring:**
 - number of internal meetings: **17 project meetings, of which 2 general meetings.**

- number of meeting notes from internal and external meetings: **21 meeting notes** including external meetings.
- number of internal documents produced: **112 project documents referenced and classified as D001 to D112.**

- Result-based performance indicators:

- number of organisations collected in the Directory as forms: **2 463 forms on 19/09/2012. No organisation declined to be included in the DAPH-DIFF during the duration of the project.** This indicator evolves constantly as new forms are created by users of the Directory. This is the snowball effect.
- evaluation of the ergonomics and accessibility of the application: **the application was tested by 271 partners which validated their forms;**
- contact information selected and assigned to categories: **see statistical table D096;**
- number of partners contacted and active: **271 organisations explicitly validated their form after being contacted;**
- statistics on searches: **integrated within the application DAPH-DIFF.** This can only be analysed once the DAPHNE Directory will be used routinely.

- In addition, the external evaluation of the project was undertaken by Ms Maïté Albagly, previous Secretary General to the French Family Planning organisation and an expert in the field. She participated in all of the internal project meetings and analysed all of the project deliverables.

- We initially identified 5 risk factors during the duration of the project, corresponding to 5 « critical activities »:
 - Assessment of input from DAPHNE project leaders (Activity A2.2)
 - Choice of descriptors for the Directory (Activity A3.1)
 - Methodology for acquisition of contact information (Activity 3.2)
 - Testing of the Directory with potential project users (Activity 4.3)
 - Referencing the Directory for dissemination (Activity 5.3)

These activities were undertaken as expected without problems arising. The evaluator was attentive to these project milestones and carefully analysed the deliverables related (references supplied in Chapter 14).

10.3. Project impact:

- Our project is rather a technical project which does not have a direct impact on the general public, but rather concerns experts in the field and also experts in the DAPHNE community, notably project leaders and partners of DAPHNE projects. From this point of view the project impact is as follows:
 - The search interface and consultation of the DAPH-DIFF Directory is now accessible. One needs to login to gain access to a list of complete results based on the selection made and the contents available. Otherwise we only provide the international names of the first 10 organisations that correspond to the search variables, without being able to see the contents of the organisations.
 - We believe this project is important in that it provides the DAPHNE community with a tool that facilitates the dissemination of project results. Each project leader had to ensure himself the dissemination of the results, often without having the necessary tools or experience to do so. Each project leader found this task challenging and was not able to benefit from work done in this area by previous projects. That is the reason why we created this Directory which is a tool for dissemination: an « intelligent » Directory with contact information from DAPHNE partners.

- We presented the project numerous times at meetings: WAVE PROTECT II conference in June 2011, meeting with the Director of Equality between women and men at the DG for Social Cohesion (FR), meeting with the Inter-ministerial Mission for the protection of female victims of violence (FR), etc. To go forward, we expect the possible reactions of the Commission.

- Information about the project is also presented in partner websites (www.psytel.eu ; www.apf.pt, www.krize.lv/lv/projekti/projekts-daphne-programmas-rezultatu-izplatisana; <http://bim.lbg.ac.at/en/womens-rights-childrens-rights-trafficking-human-beings/daphne-diffusion-information-tools-daphne-programme-community>) and were presented to the members of the IPPF (International Planned Parenthood Federation), to the members of the consultation Forum of the CIG (Commission for Gender Equity and Citizenship).

11. What were the main **problems/difficulties** encountered during the implementation of the project activities? How were these solved?

11.1- Problem concerning the definition of the scope of the project:

Initially we wanted to collect information about the DAPHNE project leaders and their partners, institutional contacts (ministries), main national associations and organisations working in this field, European networks and major national media.

→ Chosen solution

During the implementation of the project and after performing interviews with project leaders and members of the DAPHNE team, we were led to create a hierarchy of priorities for the search of organisations and to extend our search field:

- We sought for thoroughness concerning two types of organisations: partners who have already participated in the DAPHNE programme and major national NGOs working in the field. The useful information from ministries was harder to collect and continuously changing. The data on media, in turn, were willingly limited to the press offices of the 10 largest newspapers who deal with questions relevant to DAPHNE, as well as the 10 largest magazines.

- We also had to extend our definition of « large national NGOs » to « large national and regional NGOs » in order to account for the administrative organisations which are highly decentralised in certain Member States, such as Austria, Germany and Italy.

- We also searched for organisations that submitted proposals to DAPHNE without being selected, and researchers or participants to recent conferences related to themes linked to the DAPHNE programme.

11.2- Problem concerning the operating rules of the Directory:

We analysed over many months the potential functioning of the DAPH-DIFF search interface (the EndUser website). We asked the Commission for recommendations on this issue.

→ Chosen solution:

We made the following choices which seemed the most adapted given the project context:

- access to the EndUser site is free;

- to update or create a form you have to identify yourself using a Login and Password. These are provided by the technical operator of the site (Psytel).

- the organisations identified can only modify their own form, but can consult the forms of other organisations;

- Without identifying oneself a user can only access a list of the first 10 organisations that correspond to the search and cannot access the contents of the forms. To do so one has to login. Thus the free access is a kind of incentive to authenticate and create your own form;

- once logged in, the user can search the Directory, select organisations of interest and export certain information (Country, international name, type of organisation, email, Url) in an Excel file;

- regarding the contents of the Directory, it contains information validated by the organisations themselves and public information already freely available on the Internet.
- an organisation can remove itself from the Directory by making a technical request; no such request has been made to date.

11.3. Problems of access with other Directories:

During the implementation of the project we tried to have access to Directories already existing, such as the one from the DAPHNE team of the Commission or that of GAMS (Group for the Abolition of Sexual Mutilations). Despite contacting these organisations we were not able to have access to these Directories, due to arguments made such as «due to the sensitivity of the information it cannot be shared».

→ Chosen solution:

We thus chose to:

- have a stronger hierarchy for prioritisation of our collection process (see 11.1);
- reinforce our own data acquisition (hire additional data collectors within the framework of the planned budget);
- accentuate our own searching on the Internet;
- automate as much as possible the recovery of certain lists in the public domain.

12. How was the visibility of the European Union's financial support ensured in the project?

- All contacts taken with project leaders and partners of DAPHNE projects, national NGOs, the ministries, networks, journalists, national experts were told that this project is taking place within the DAPHNE programme of the European Commission (DG Justice). This is clearly obvious as the goal of the project was to establish a «Directory for the DAPHNE community» and that our project title is DAPHNE-DIFFUSION.
- All published documents within the project clearly state that support was received by the Commission within the DAPHNE III programme, notably with use of the DAPHNE logo on all documents.
- The main deliverable, meaning the EndUser site is available at <http://psytel.eu/daph-diff>, which clearly indicates that funding was provided by the Commission and that the project is a DAPHNE III programme project; this is stated in the summary report as well (FR/EN).

13. Will the project continue after the end of the financial support from the European Commission? If yes, how?

The project DAPH-DIFF will continue beyond the financing of the Commission. There are a number of potential scenarios for continuation depending on the Commission, as stated in Chapter 8:

(S1)- The Commission does not wish to make specific use of the results. Thus we are responsible only for dissemination of the Directory and maintenance of the site using auto-updating for the Directory. An automatic update could be made, for example, once a year when the Call for Proposals is announced for the DAPHNE programme. The NGOs or other organisations will have an interest in to be included in the Directory to facilitate their partnership research. This is a “snowball effect” that we commented on several times. Concerning the updating of the information in the Directory, we plan to send out each New Year an email to all of the organisations present in the Directory asking them to validate or modify their information and to inform us of new organisations that should be added.

(S2)- The Commission makes a link towards our project website, for example in the DAPHNE Toolkit website or in the DAPHNE website of DG Justice.

(S3)- The Commission is interested in uptake of the forms on the organisations present in the Directory.

(S4)- The Commission is interested in the uptake of the DAPH-DIFF application (organisation forms + web application). During our meeting on 17/06/2011 in Brussels, Ms. Benedetta Turdo (UnitA4 – DG Justice) stated a « possible acquisition by the Commission of the application developed ».

These different options remain to be decided upon at the end of the project.

- It is certain that scenarios (2), (3) and (4) are preferable for the continuation of the project and to augment its utility. Whatever the choice taken we are committed to the dissemination and maintenance of the DAPH-DIFF for at least two years after the end of the project (14/01/2013-14/01/2015).

14. What are the concrete **results/outputs** per workstream that came out of the project (for example: CDs, video, manual, brochures, books, website, etc)?

Workstream 0: Management and coordination of the project

- The 112 project documents produced and referenced during the implementation of the project and published in the list D003 (see Annex 2).

Workstream 1: Project deliverables and their dissemination

- The main project deliverable is the DAPHNE Directory-DIFFUSION (also referred to as the EndUser application) which is available at: <http://psytel.eu/daph-diff>

- This final administrative report - D109 - FR/EN

- Summary report - D110 (see Annex 2) - FR/EN

- An example of the utilisation of the Directory according to the priority axis n°5 concerning « work providing women a means to protect themselves and to protect their partnerships against violence » - D112 (see Annex 2)

- The CD-ROM containing the main documents produced (to be found in Annex 2), as well as the forms for the EndUser web application in order to install the application locally (with Wordpress, PHP and Mysql which are « open source »):

- daph_diff_Directory.dump : database of contact information under MySQL

- daph_diff_wordpress_Directory.dump : WordPress database of contact information under MySQL

- daph_diff_wp-content.tar : wp-content of WordPress with the template and dynamic PHP programmes which provides a search tool for searching for the organisations in the Directory. This has to be installed in order to access the contact information forms but these are available under MySQL also.

- All of the Annex 2 documents are also found for downloading on the Psytel website, the technical advisor for the project (www.psytel.eu)

- Dissemination was completed among the organisations found in the Directory and in presentations about the project, notably with the national Ministries of the project partners (see Chapter 15).

Workstream 2: Interviews of project leaders and analysis of issues related to dissemination

The published work documents linked to this workstream are as follows:

- Interview with F. Brié (FNSF) - D021
- Interview with I. Gillette Faye (GAMS) - D024
- Interview with D. Seignourel (CNDIFF) - D029
- Summary of the 3 interviews AT - D034
- Summary of the 3 interviews PT - D047

For a more global view please consult:

- Placement of various tools within a DAPHNE project - D058 (see Annex 2)
- DAPHNE Actor-Network - D106 (see Annex 2) as well as Chapter 4 of the section Comments.

Workstream 3: Collect the contents of the DAPH-DIFF Directory

The published work documents linked to this workstream are as follows:

- Coding Manual v2.1 - D056 (see Annex 2) FR/EN
- All referenced work documents related to the collection of contact information for organisations in the field: to be found in the meeting notes of the internal work meetings, spreadsheets of follow-up work, statistical spreadsheets (see list D003 published in Annex 2).

Workstream 4: Development of the DAPH-DIFF Directory and the Web search interface

The published work documents linked to this workstream are as follows:

- In the meeting notes of the internal work meetings taking place on a monthly basis it is possible to follow the development of the Directory and its two applications – the data collection form and the search interface (website EndUser). We also regularly published an updated list of all organisations present in the Directory (D061, D066, D086, D091). It is also possible to follow the evolution of the number of data forms collected.
- Finally, please access the EndUser application at <http://psytel.eu/daph-diff>

Workstream 5: Implementation of the DAPH-DIFF Directory

The published work documents linked to this workstream are as follows:

- Statistical analysis spreadsheets: from D097 to D101 (see Annex 2)
- Instructions for searching the Directory on the application website
- Example of utilisation of the Directory according to the priority axis n°5 concerning « Field work at grass-roots level with involvement of women, in particular programmes that aim to empower them to protect themselves and their peers against violence » - D112 (see Annex 2)
- Implementation of the Directory and its referencing are in progress, and depend on what the Commission wishes for usage of this Directory in the future (see Chapter 13).

15. How – and to whom - did you **disseminate** the results of this project within existing and/or new networks? What are your intentions for **further dissemination**? What do you think the **follow-up** of your project should be? Do you plan to carry out yourself (part of) this follow-up?

15.1. Dissemination:

- The DAPH-DIFF Directory consists of a specific virtual network. We contacted the members of the « Directory network » to disseminate information about the project.
- Dissemination was also done at meetings via presentations, notably with the national Ministries of the project partners: for France we had a meeting with the Director of the Office for Equality between women and men at the DG for Social Cohesion, and a meeting with the Inter-ministerial Mission for the protection of women as victims of violence.
- Information about the project is also presented on the partner websites (www.psytel.eu, www.apf.pt, www.krize.lv/lv/projekti/projekts-daphne-programmas-rezultatu-izplatisana;

<http://bim.lbg.ac.at/en/womens-rights-childrens-rights-trafficking-human-beings/daphne-diffusion-information-tools-daphne-programme-community>) and were presented to the IPPF (International Planned Parenthood Federation), as well as to members of the Commission for Gender Equity and Citizenship.

15.2. Project follow-up:

- We already discussed this in Chapters 8 and 13. The follow-up of this project depends on the wishes of the Commission. On our part we would like to continue to pursue dissemination work, to make the Directory known to a maximum number of actors and to do maintenance on the DAPH-DIFF site for at least two years after the end of the project (14/01/2013-14/01/2015).

- Concerning the mechanism for updating the information in the Directory, we plan to send out each year to all the organisations in the Directory an email asking for validation or editing of the information, and to inform us of new organisations to add to the Directory.

B) COMMENTS

1. Do the end results (outlined under point 10 above) appear to correspond with the initial objectives? Please explain.

- The deliverables developed correspond fully to the initial project objectives. A Directory for the DAPHNE community is now available. It is certainly not exhaustive but it constitutes without a doubt a « core Directory ». This is an « intelligent Directory » as it contains a list of contacts (postal address, email, contact name, etc.), and « intelligent » in that it allows for the selection of organizations, essentially by country, type of organisation, field of action, by target population and by type of action.
- This Directory assists in: the search for partners (rather « smaller » organisations which are not already included in large networks, search for contents during the implementation of a project or after a project has been completed (all DAPHNE actors), dissemination of project results at the end of a project (all DAPHNE actors) and plea work (rather for « large » organisations).
- Corrections and modifications can be made to this Directory in a continuous manner.

2. In light of the experience gained, please describe what you view positively in the preparation and implementation of the project, e.g. analysis of the problems to solve, organisation, methodology and administrative, technical and financial management.

During the implementation of this project we would like to highlight the following five positive points:

2.1. Validity of the project objectives:

- Given the contacts taken throughout the project and in the interviews performed, it was clear that a tool such as the « DAPHNE Directory » was lacking in the tools currently available.

2.2. Adaptations to the implementation of the project:

- We believe we were able to adapt the project to the context found while implementing the project, notably by:

- make a stricter hierarchy for the priorities regarding data collection;
- reinforce our own acquisition of data (hiring responsible for data collection within the planned budget);
- strengthen our own searching of the field organisations on the Internet;
- make automatic as much as possible the downloading of certain lists available in the public domain.

- We also developed and adapted the EndUser site by following input from the interviews and input from testing of the site in order to make available to the community: a tool « easy to use », « friendly », « that does not require much investment of time for use » and « with not too much information to be encoded by the forms creators ».

- Finally, we were in contact with a lawyer regarding the legal issues posed by making the contents of the Directory available online.

2.3. Project management and coordination tools:

The tools used for management of the project proved to be effective. For example:

- *Internal project meetings* took place regularly between the members of the project leader team and Psytel, which was disseminated with all partners in order to follow finely the progress of work, achievement of milestones, and for better coordination with all partners.

The writing culture in the core work team and the referencing of the project work documents was a very effective way to construct a solid documentation which facilitated the writing of contractual reports such as this present report.

- *The box of ideas* allowed us to gather suggestions from all team members.
- Use of the *Dropbox* as a shared work space was found to be a very useful tool.
- Finally, the collaboration with all of the partners in the project worked very well, with each partner accomplishing the work without delay and according to the method disseminated amongst the team.

2.4. The contribution of a statistical vision:

Our work allowed us to provide a statistical approach to the Directory and thus to the « DAPHNE activity » in different Member States. For example:

- We document (D097) that the type of action taking place on the prevention of violence against women and children greatly varies according to the country under study. For example « victim assistance » represents 6,6% of work in Austria compared to 1,6% in France. « Psychological assistance » concerns 7,4% of work in Austria compared to 2,2% in Spain. It appears that there are specificities per country: 5,3% of work is « treatment for aggressors » in Latvia (LV), and 15,2% is studies in Finland, while 10,8% of work in Sweden is on « victimology ».

- We document (D098) that logically the target population most frequently cited is the same as that of the DAPHNE programme objectives: women, children and adolescents. But media are rarely cited as a target population with 2,9%, as well as aggressors which represent only 1,0%. We noted that the target population varies greatly from country to country. « Adolescents » represent 10,8% of the target population in Austria compared to 5,6 % in Denmark and 5,8% in Belgium. In contrast « children » which represent 11,5% of the target population in Austria represent 13,6 % in Denmark. The « public at large » represents 18,6% in Slovenia (SI) the target population but 1,2% in Poland and 3,8% in Spain. The « medical personnel » is more often a target population in Lithuania (7,8%), Finland (6,4%) and Denmark (4,3%) compared to the average (2,8%).

- In order for these data to be pertinent and significant it is necessary for the number of organisations in a given country be relatively high (for example > 50), to signify a homogenous data collection between the countries, which is not the case to date. These data can highlight the different focus each Member State has on prevention of violence work.

- We also document (D100) that there are characteristic fields of action domains for certain types of organisation. Thus:

- Violence at work (searched on 2,2% by all organisations combined) are more often sought out by ministries (5,2%).

- Sexual exploitation (3,3%) is more frequently sought out by multi-country organisations (6,7%), as is trafficking (8,3% compared to 4,2% for all organisations combined).

- Urban violence are of interest for media (5,0%) compared to all organisations combined (2,6%).

- Forced marriages are of interest for European organisations (4,1%) compared to all organisations combined (1,9%), and that also goes for female genital mutilation (4,1% compared to 1,9%).

- Gender violence is of interest for universities (21,8%) compared to all organisations combined (11,1%).

- Family violence is of more interest to private national organisations (15,0%) than for all organisations combined (11,7%) or for the media (2,3%).

- Psychological violence is more of interest to European public organisations (10,2%) than to all organisations combined (4,9%).

2.5. The contribution of a global vision:

- We attempted to bring a global vision to the tools made available in the document D058 by describing the added value of each tool (DAPHNE web site, DAPHNE Toolkit, Priamos submission system and the Directory) for the phases for a DAPHNE project.

3. In light of the experience gained, please describe what you view negatively in the preparation and implementation of the project.

- As mentioned earlier the access to other existing directories was not possible within the timeframe of this project, as the institutions we asked stated that the information was « too sensitive » to share.

- Concerning the project partners in DAPHNE, the Belgium company TRANSTEC (technical support for the Commission for the management of DAPHNE files to 1998), followed by the Priamos submission system of the Commission have a documentation of all of the DAPHNE projects submitted between 1997 and 2010, and thus all of the contact information of all of the project partners selected or not selected for funding. Legal and technical problems made the access to these data impossible.

- Therefore we were not able to use existing, useful contact information for our Directory. We had to rely on gathering the information with our own project resources: search the Toolkit, search the Internet for all of the partners, direct contact with organisations and networks, search lists of DAPHNE projects, participant lists to conferences in the field, contacts with embassies and bibliographic work.

- We cannot guarantee the thoroughness of the Directory, nor the validity of all of the information it contains, yet we created a useful tool that serves as the « core of the Directory » which allows one to modify the information included if needed, as well as create new forms.

4. Please describe below any other information, which would help the European Commission in making a balanced evaluation of the project, and/or improving the functioning and management of the Programme.

Here we would like to share the points discussed during the interviews concerning the Directory and the functioning of the DAPHNE programme:

4.1.- There was often amongst the members of the organisations consulted a certain amount of **confusion between the tools available**: DAPHNE website, DAPHNE Toolkit, Priamos submission system and the Directory. We tried to clarify this in the document D058, and recommend a one page explanation to be made available on the Commission website.

4.2.- A number of partners stated the necessity of **updating the DAPHNE Toolkit** which provides for the moment information on projects funded from 1997 to 2005, but not beyond. Psytel presented to the Commission in August 2011 a document on possible improvements to be made for the DAPHNE Toolkit.

4.3.- The partners interviewed stated their need for the **development of other community dissemination tools** based on project results or information, such as:

- the development of a « **DAPHNE web site of content** », providing the most pertinent project results, those that the Commission would like to display;

- intensify the activities of « **DAPHNE editions** », by editing more documents based on project results;
- create a « **DAPHNE newsletter** », or more broadly « Fundamental rights of citizens newsletter », each trimester for example, providing information about the programme, the colloquials, presentations of certain projects, interviews, as well as information on Commission activities, in addition to those of the Council of Europe and other international organisations such as the UN-Women. This could reinforce the "feeling of belonging" and a community identity within DAPHNE.

4.4.- Finally, more globally, the partners participating for a long time in the DAPHNE programme expressed their desire to have the **DAPHNE team extend their role** so that it is not only an administrative-financial team, which is essential, but also to have a « more political» role in order to increase the radiance of the programme and assist in the dissemination of project results acquired.

5. Please sum up in a short paragraph what your project has achieved, its impact on beneficiaries and what remains to be done. Please bear in mind that this paragraph will be used as the **summary report** that the Commission plans to circulate largely via the Daphne Toolkit website and other means. Therefore, ensure that it is clear and precise.

5.1. Goals of the project:

- The goals of the project DAPHNE-DIFFUSION were essentially to facilitate the search for partners, the exchange of information between DAPHNE actors, and to assist with the dissemination of project results by making available, via the web, a Directory of contact information from different types of DAPHNE actors.
- Experience shows that dissemination is often an element that is inadequately developed in DAPHNE projects. Yet it is a key element which guarantees the way in which the project continues to live in time and space beyond the end of the project, and shows the added value of the project. This DAPHNE-DIFFUSION project aimed to develop a tool that facilitates dissemination.
- Our project is clearly a project consisting of creating an « intelligent Directory» meaning a Directory which serves as a list of contacts (postal address, email, contact name, etc.), and « **intelligent** » in that it allows for the classification of information, essentially by country, by type of organisation, by field of action, by target population and by type of action. This Directory serves to facilitate the search for partners (rather « small » structures not included in networks already strongly established), using the search content assistance in a project or outside (any actor Daphne), the dissemination of results at the end of the project (any actor Daphne) and advocacy (rather for the « big » structures).

5.2. Project activities:

- Firstly we defined the scope of the project and then interviewed project leaders from the DAPHNE programme to assess the issues involved in dissemination and to learn the needs of users for the DAPHNE Directory. In doing so we established a summary of this feedback.
- We were able to make the core of the project more precise: collect and organise the contact information on the following organisations, according to descending priority: partners of all DAPHNE projects (from 1997 to 2010), major national and regional NGOs in the field, universities and researchers, ministries, main media in charge of this topic; all of this within the 27 Member States.
- The interviews performed enabled us to realise that there is a certain amount of confusion regarding the different tools available: DAPHNE web site, DAPHNE Toolkit, Priamos system and the

Directory. We attempted to reduce the confusion by writing up the added value of the Directory in the document D058.

- We established the descriptors (variables) for the Directory and the thesaurus associated with the DAPH-DIFF Directory. The construction of the main thesaurus had to correspond to the following criteria: use the framework of the thesaurus present in the DAPHNE Toolkit and update these to meet the current needs. Then we published a final coding manual (D056) FR/EN to serve as a reference tool.

- The data collection first took place by acquiring information already existing in the DAPHNE Toolkit (projects from 1997 to 2005), then data from project partners not present in the Toolkit (2006 to 2010). We also sought out organisations which submitted proposals to DAPHNE but were not selected.

- We pursued the work of data collection for additional national organisations by asking for information amongst the partners in DAPHNE who were already included in the Directory (ministries, institutions and national NGOs - EU27), then contact information from European networks and organisations undertaking activities linked to the DAPHNE programme. Finally we sought information from the major European media (EU27), meaning the 10 biggest newspapers and magazines). The project partners also searched by themselves for organisations using search engines online.

- We were also convinced of extending our definition of « large national NGOs » to « large national and regional NGOs » in order to include the administrative organisations that are highly decentralised in certain Member States, such as in Austria and Germany or Italy. We also sought out the organisations that submitted projects to the DAPHNE programme without being selected, as well as researchers or participants to recent conferences linked to the DAPHNE themes.

- Then we developed the database of contact information, constructed a search interface and developed the website for consultation (EndUser web application). We tested this software with our partners and project leaders, and undertook corrective actions deemed necessary prior to making this final application available.

- Then we performed a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the Directory and began with the dissemination work. The implementation of the Directory and the referencing of the site are in progress, and also depends on what the Commission would like to see happen with this Directory.

5.3. Project deliverables:

- The main deliverable of the project is no doubt the DAPHNE-DIFFUSION Directory accessible at the address: **<http://psytel.eu/daph-diff>**

- This final administrative report - D109 (FR/EN)

- Summary report - D110 (FR/EN)

- A CD-ROM containing all of the major documents produced (those of Annex 2), as well as the application files of the EndUser website in order to install the application locally.

- The working papers (WP) such as:

- Coding manual v2.1 - D056 (FR/EN)

- Placement of different tools based on the DAPHNE project phases - D058

- DAPHNE Actor-Network - D106

- Statistical tables based on the Directory (from D96 to D101)

- The documents in Annex 2 are also available for downloading on the Psytel website, the technical operator of the project (www.psytel.eu)

- We created an « intelligent » Directory regrouping more than 2450 organisations from 27 Member States: partners of all of the DAPHNE projects (1997-2010), major national and regional NGOs in the field, European networks, ministries, universities and media linked to the topics of DAPHNE.

- We cannot guarantee the thoroughness of this Directory, nor guarantee the validity of all of the information it contains, but we created a tool that acts as a « core Directory » which is user friendly, allows for searching the Directory in order to extract useful information, and to modify information in it as needed and to create new forms for adding organisations.

5.4. A few suggestions concerning the functioning of the programme:

- We often found amongst the members of the organisations consulted a certain amount of **confusion regarding the different tools available**: DAPHNE web site, DAPHNE Toolkit, Priamos submission system and the Directory. We attempted to reduce the confusion by writing up the added value of the Directory in the document D058, and suggest a one page explanation on the Commission website would be useful.

- A number of partners stated the need for an **updated version of the DAPHNE Toolkit** which currently contains information on projects from 1997 to 2005, but not beyond this. Psytel presented potential improvements to the DAPHNE Toolkit to the Commission in August 2011.

- The partners interviewed stated their need for the **development of other community dissemination tools** based on project results or information, such as:

- the development of a « **DAPHNE web site of content** », providing the most pertinent project results, those that the Commission would like to display;

- intensify the activities of « **DAPHNE editions** », by editing more documents based on project results;

- create a « **DAPHNE newsletter** », or more broadly « Fundamental rights of citizens newsletter », each trimester for example, providing information about the programme, the seminars, presentations of certain projects results, interviews, as well as information on Commission activities, in addition to those of the Council of Europe and other international organisations such as the UN-Women. This could reinforce the "feeling of belonging" and a community identity within DAPHNE.

- Finally, more globally, the partners participating for a long time in the DAPHNE programme expressed their desire to have the **DAPHNE team extend their role** so that it is not only an administrative-financial team, which is essential, but also to have a « more political» role in order to increase the radiance of the programme and assist in the dissemination of project results acquired.

Annexes:

1. List of keywords describing best your project (please use the form attached);
2. The hardcopies of the outputs/results produced during the implementation of the action (see point 14);
3. The agendas and the attendance lists for all conferences, meetings and seminars which took place during the lifetime of the action.

DECLARATION AND SIGNATURE

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the information in this final narrative report and its enclosures is complete, accurate, true and in accordance with the activities undertaken in the implementation of this project.

I understand that the Commission may use all the information provided and the documents sent with this report within the framework of its information and dissemination strategy and agree with the publication of this information¹.

YES

NO

Legal representative of the beneficiary:

Title: (Mr, Ms, Prof., etc.,)

Family Name:

First Name:

Position:

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

(signature)

Done at _____, on _____

¹ Please circle the relevant reply (YES/NO). If you have refused publication, please provide an explanation.

ANNEX 1: KEYWORDS

The main purpose of the Daphne Programme is to create networks and to encourage the exchange of information and best practices. The Commission has therefore set up a dataDirectory – 'The Daphne Toolkit' - containing the details of all completed Daphne projects:

http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/daphnetoolkit/html/welcome/dpt_welcome_en.html

The matrix below allows us to categorise your report according to certain pre-set search words. Please complete it carefully.

Mark the main areas of action and types of activity listed below which were covered by your project (respecting the limits mentioned).

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Beneficiaries | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Children | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Young people | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Women |
| Specific groups (maximum 2) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Homosexuals | <input type="checkbox"/> Migrants | <input type="checkbox"/> Refugees |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Asylum Seekers | <input type="checkbox"/> Trafficked Persons | <input type="checkbox"/> Ethnic minorities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Handicapped | <input type="checkbox"/> Domestic workers | <input type="checkbox"/> People in prostitution |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Elderly | <input type="checkbox"/> Prisoners | |
| Targeted Audience (maximum 2) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Violent men | <input type="checkbox"/> Perpetrators / offenders | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Authorities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Public | <input type="checkbox"/> Medical staff | <input type="checkbox"/> Educational staff |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Police staff | <input type="checkbox"/> Judicial staff | <input type="checkbox"/> Media / Journalists |
| Daphne II Objectives (maximum 1) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Set up of multidisciplinary networks | <input type="checkbox"/> Studies of phenomena linked to violence | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Expansion of the knowledge Directory, including the exchange of good practice |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Raising awareness among targeted audiences towards violence | | |
| Specific Objectives (maximum 1) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Treatment programmes for offenders | <input type="checkbox"/> Treatment programmes for victims | <input type="checkbox"/> Identification and exchange of good practice and experience |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mapping surveys, studies and research | <input type="checkbox"/> Field work with involvement of the beneficiaries | <input type="checkbox"/> Creation of multidisciplinary networks |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training and design of educational packages | <input type="checkbox"/> Awareness-raising activities targeted to specific audiences | <input type="checkbox"/> Awareness-raising material |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dissemination of the results obtained under Daphne I and II programmes | <input type="checkbox"/> Development of activities contributing to positive treatment | |
| Areas (maximum 3) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual violence | <input type="checkbox"/> Gender violence | <input type="checkbox"/> Violence in family |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Violence in domestic context | <input type="checkbox"/> Violence in schools | <input type="checkbox"/> Violence in institutions |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Violence in urban areas | <input type="checkbox"/> Violence in rural areas | <input type="checkbox"/> Violence in the work place |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Trafficking in human beings | <input type="checkbox"/> Commercial sexual exploitation | <input type="checkbox"/> Internet |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Child Pornography | <input type="checkbox"/> Racism | <input type="checkbox"/> Self-harm |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Physical punishment | <input type="checkbox"/> Female genital mutilation | <input type="checkbox"/> Health impacts |
| Instruments (maximum 2) | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Network with NGOs | <input type="checkbox"/> Multisector network | <input type="checkbox"/> Awareness-raising |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dissemination of good practice | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Guidelines / Counselling | <input type="checkbox"/> Models (analysis / Development) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Production of materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Conference / seminar |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Telephone / Internet Helpline | <input type="checkbox"/> Field work | |

ANNEX 2

Outputs/results produced during the implementation of the action

Les numéros en (Dxxx) renvoient à notre propre nomenclature de documents de projet

A2.1 – La liste des principaux documents produits pendant le projet (D003)

A2.2 - Le site de l'annuaire DAPHNE-DIFFUSION : <http://psytel.eu/daph-diff>

A2.3 - Le présent rapport administratif final (D109) EN/FR

A2.4 - Le rapport de synthèse (D110) FR/EN

A2.5 - Un exemple d'utilisation de la Directory selon l'axe prioritaire n°5 concernant « un travail de terrain associant les femmes visant à leur donner les moyens de se protéger et de protéger leurs pairs contre la violence » (D112)

A2.6 - Le CD-ROM du projet DAPHNE-DIFFUSION contenant les fichiers de la Directory de données et tous les documents de l'Annexe 2

A2.7 - Les documents du projet téléchargeables sur le site Psytel : www.psytel.eu

A2.8 - Place des différents outils en fonction des étapes d'un projet DAPHNE (D058)

A2.9- L'acteur-réseau DAPHNE (D106)

A2.10 - Le manuel de codage v2.1 (D056) EN/FR

A2.11 - Des tableaux statistiques (D096, D097, D098, D100)

ANNEX 3

Chronology of the project with the agendas and the attendance lists for all conferences, meetings and seminars which took place during the lifetime of the action.

Chronologie des principaux travaux effectués

Réf. : Daph_Diff_111_mn130116

avec les références aux documents de projet produits et référencés dans le document D003

- 15/01/2011 : Début officiel de l'action

Janvier 2011 :

- Contact avec l'équipe Daphné pour signature du contrat
- Annexe n°1 au contrat (D000)
- Rédaction du document préparatoire : « Description du projet » (D001)
- Abstract du projet (D001_2) FR/EN (français/anglais)
- Le résumé des tâches du projet (D001_3)
- Mise en place de l'équipe, prise de contact avec les partenaires
- Rappel sur les objectifs et les produits du projet
- Le chaînage des travaux (*6 workstreams*) avec le découpage en tâches
- Les infos de Directory sur les 27 EM (D002)

Février 2011 :

- Mise en place de la liste des principaux documents du projet (D003)
- Mise en place de la collaboration NEB et Psytel
- Rappel des fondamentaux du projet (D004)
- Mise en place de la boîte à idées (D005)
- Contact avec les partenaires pour l'établissement d'un contrat de collaboration
- **Réunion interne de projet NEB/PsyteL n°1** (22/02/2011) et CR (D006) FR/EN
- Discussion sur le périmètre du projet
- Rôle des partenaires
- Problématique spécifique du projet

Mars 2011 :

- Principe de fonctionnement de l'application *Daph_Diff*
- Schéma de fonctionnement de la Directory (dans D006)
- Les éléments spécifiques de gestion (dans D006)
- Les premiers descripteurs de la Directory et les thésaurus associés (D007) FR/EN
- Test de la fiche papier
- Répertoire les différentes sources de données
- Proposition de répartition de la collecte dans les EM entre partenaires
- Envoi d'un mail d'information aux partenaires (04/03/2011) avec en ensemble de documents
- Le guide d'entretien avec les porteurs de projet DAPHNE (D008) FR/EN
- Liste détaillée des activités du projet (D009)
- Liste des travaux à faire (D010)
- Suivi des signatures des conventions NEB/Partenaire (D011 à D014)
- Première version de la chronologie du projet (D015)
- **Réunion interne de projet NEB/PsyteL n°2** (29/03/2011) et CR (D016)

Avril 2011 :

- Début du développement de l'application
- Contact avec le site d'hébergement OVH
- Etude de l'acquisition automatique des adresses du DAPHNE Toolkit
- Lettre d'accréditation et de présentation du projet (D017)
- Début du développement du masque de saisie (la fiche type)
- Acquisition des premières références bibliographiques
- Test de la fiche type et des thésaurus
- Critères d'évaluation de la qualité d'un annuaire (D018)
- Lettre de présentation des entretiens (D019) FR/EN
- Recherche de documents sur les problèmes de diffusion dans le DAPHNE programme
- Recherche des premières coordonnées pour les EM dont Psytel est en charge
- Réflexions sur les contacts à prendre pour la collecte des annuaires constitués
- Réflexions sur les contacts à prendre pour la collecte des données dans les médias
- Evolution de la fiche et des thésaurus
- Entretien avec F. Brié (FNSF) (21/04/2011) et CR (D021)
- **Réunion interne de projet NEB/Psytel n°3** (26/04/2011) et CR (D020)

Mai 2011 :

- Etude des problèmes juridiques posés par l'annuaire
- Utilisation de la Dropbox (espace partagé de travail) pour partager et synchroniser les documents de travail
- Envoi d'un mail de travail aux partenaires (04/05/2011) avec un ensemble de documents
- Liste des structures internationales dans le périmètre du projet
- Chargement automatique dans la Directory des adresses des partenaires DAPHNE présentes dans le Toolkit
- Collecte de « listes papier » utiles
- Mise à disposition des coordonnées des Plannings familiaux
- Recherche des premières coordonnées en France des NGO dans notre périmètre
- Recherche des premières coordonnées en France des médias dans notre périmètre
- Evolution de l'application <http://www.psytel.eu/daphdif/>
- Les 3 protocoles d'acquisition des coordonnées
- Evolution de la fiche et des thésaurus
- **Réunion interne de projet NEB/Psytel n°4** (30/05/2011) et CR (D022) FR/EN

Juin 2011 :

- *Préparation de la réunion avec l'équipe DAPHNE*
- Le schéma du projet (D023)
- La question juridique
- Définition de la saisie simplifiée (3 niveaux) et des variables obligatoires
- Evolution de l'application pour tenir compte de la saisie simplifiée
- Estimation de la volumétrie
- Collecte des listes de projets DAPHNE avec les partenaires 2006-2010
- Entretien avec I. Gillette-Faye (GAMS) (10/06/2011) et CR (D024)
- Application de saisie en EN
- **Réunion avec l'équipe DAPHNE (17/06/2011) et notes sur la réunion (D026)**
- Fin de la saisie des adresses France (ministères, journalistes)
- Envoi d'un mail d'information aux partenaires (27/06/2011) pour l'accès à la Directory
- **29 et 30/06/2011 : Réunion avec Wave à Vienne.** Présentation de notre projet

Juillet 2011 :

- **Réunion interne de projet NEB/Psytel n°5** (07/07/2011) et CR (D027) FR/EN
- Le point sur la saisie dans la Directory
- Le point sur l'orientation du projet après notre rendez-vous avec l'équipe DAPHNE
- Collecte des listes de projets DAPHNE avec les partenaires 2006-2010

- Envoi d'un mail d'information aux partenaires (12/07/2011)
- Saisie des listes des partenaires DAPHNE des années 2006-2010 (suite)
- Entretien avec D. Seignourel (CNIDFF) (12/07/2011) et CR (D029)
- Evolution de l'application (ex. : pour distinguer partenaire et porteur de projet)
- Réunion générale de projet prévue à Paris les 6 et 7 octobre 2011
- Contact avec le GAMS concernant leur annuaire

Août 2011 :

- Premiers développements de l'application d'exploitation <http://www.psytel.eu/daphdif/EndUser>
- Réception des 3 entretiens autrichiens (D030 à D032)
- Poursuite de la saisie des structures dans la Directory
- Evolution des thésaurus
- Echange avec le GAMS concernant leur annuaire
- Préparation de la réunion générale de projet à Paris les 6 et 7 octobre
- L'agenda prévisionnel de la réunion (D033) FR/EN
- Synthèse des trois entretiens autrichiens (D034)
- Questions aux partenaires (D035) FR/EN
- **Réunion interne de projet NEB/Psytel n°6** (25/08/2011) et CR (D036)

Septembre 2011 :

- Réception des 3 entretiens portugais (D037 à D039)
- Réponse PT au questionnaire (D040)
- Réponse AT au questionnaire (D041)
- Poursuite de la saisie des structures dans la Directory
- Poursuite du développement de l'application <http://www.psytel.eu/daphdif/EndUser>
- Listes relatives au projet « Separated Children in Europe »
- **Réunion interne de projet NEB/Psytel n°7** (22/09/2011) et CR (D042) FR/EN
- Manuel de codage des fiches de l'annuaire (D043) FR/EN
- Réponse LV au questionnaire (D044)
- Préparation de la première réunion générale de projet du 7 octobre

Octobre 2011 :

- Poursuite de la préparation de la première réunion générale de projet du 7 octobre
- Works to do by partners (D045)
- Poursuite de la saisie des structures dans la Directory
- Les points importants du projet (D046)
- Synthèse des trois entretiens portugais (D047)
- **Première réunion générale de projet (n°8)** (07/10/2011) et CR (D051) FR/EN
- Les variables et les thésaurus de la fiche type de l'annuaire Daph_Diff v2.1 (D053)
- Contact avec la juriste
- Liste de travaux à faire par Psyte (D052)
- Fiche et thésaurus post réunion générale (D053) FR/EN

Novembre 2011 :

- Modifications et évolution de l'application de saisie
- Ecriture du manuel de codage définitif
- De quelques méthodes de recherche de structures (D054)
- Poursuite de la saisie des structures dans la Directory
- Rédaction du rapport intermédiaire (D055)
- Intervention d'un web designer
- Le manuel de codage de la fiche (D056) FR/EN
- **Réunion interne de projet NEB/Psytel n°9** (14/11/2011) et CR (D057)
- Place des différents outils en fonction des étapes d'un projet DAPHNE (D058)

- Liste des structures présentes dans la Directory au 18/11/2011 (D059)
- **Réponse à Benedetta Turdo (équipe DAPHNE) sur l'état du projet (19/11/2011)**

Décembre 2011 :

- Contrôle des résultats des travaux de saisie et de leur répartition entre partenaires
- Le point sur nos applications Web : l'application de saisie et l'application Enduser
- **Réunion interne de projet NEB/PsyteLNEB n°10 (15/12/2011) et CR (D060)**
- Poursuite de la saisie des structures dans la Directory
- Etude des scénarios de fonctionnement global de la Directory EndUser
- Exploitation possible d'une Directory regroupant les principaux journaux européens
- Les astuces de collecte et de saisie à diffuser aux chargées de collecte

Janvier 2012 :

- Poursuite de la saisie des structures dans la Directory
- Etude des scénarios de fonctionnement global de la Directory EndUser
- Etude de la répartition des fiches par pays en fonction des partenaires responsables
- Développement d'un outil de gestion des doubles
- Poursuite de l'évolution de l'application web de saisie
- Poursuite du développement de l'application web EndUser
- Mise en place du processus de validation de la fiche par la structure
- Travaux avec le web designer

Février 2012 :

- Poursuite de la saisie des structures dans la Directory
- Liste des structures dans la Directory au 06/02/2012 par chargés de collecte (D61)
- Liste des structures en double dans la Directory au 06/02/2012 (D062)
- **Réunion interne de projet NEB/PsyteL n°11 (07/02/2012) et CR (D063)**
- *Mail à l'équipe DAPHNE (le 16/02 - D064)*
- Recherche de listes complémentaires (participants aux conférences sur les sujets DAPHNE, par exemple)
- Recherche des mails institutionnels manquants
- Point avec les partenaires sur la saisie, les problèmes rencontrés et ce qu'il reste à faire
- Développement de l'interface d'interrogation « full text »

Mars 2012 :

- Poursuite de la saisie des structures dans la Directory
- Etat de la Directory au 13/03/2012 (D065)
- Liste des structures présentes au 13/03/2012 (D066)
- Tableaux EM X Type de structure au 13/03/2012 (D067)
- **Réunion interne de projet NEB/PsyteL n°12 (13/03/2012) et CR (D068)**
- Bilan de la saisie dans les EM au 13/03/2012 (D069)
- *Contact avec Mme Parmantier (le 16/02 - DAPHNE) et demande de rendez-vous*
- Projet de mail aux ambassades
- Liste des structures internationales dans le périmètre du projet
- Recherche des listes des projets DAPHNE non sélectionnés depuis 2006

Avril 2012 :

- Poursuite de la saisie des structures dans la Directory
- Liste des travaux à faire pour PsyteL (D070)
- Liste des mails à problème (D071)
- Projets de mails aux ambassades (D072)
- Liste des mails des ambassades (D073)
- *Nouveau mail de demande de rendez-vous à Mme Parmantier (16/04)*

- Tableaux EM X Type de structure au 24/04/2012 (D074)
- Envoi des lettres de demande d'information au service de presse des ambassades de France
- Développement du mode d'interrogation « en tableau-liste » *daphdif/advanced_query*
- **Réunion interne de projet NEB/Psytel n°13** (24/04/2012) et CR (D075)
- Projet de mail de validation (D076)
- Liste des porteurs de projet DAPHNE (D077)
- Première campagne de validation des fiches par les structures
- *Envoi d'un mail à Anda-Otila IVAN (DAPHNE) pour prise de rendez-vous (26/04) – elle doit revenir vers nous*

Mai 2012 :

- Poursuite de la saisie des structures dans la Directory
- Liste des porteurs francophones de projet DAPHNE (D078)
- *Les 10 thèmes à aborder avec la Commission (D079)*
- Liste des mails de validation en erreur (D080)
- Tableaux EM X Type de structure au 29/05/2012 (D081)
- Les fiches validées au 29/05/2012 (D082)
- **Réunion interne de projet NEB/Psytel n°14** (29/05/2012) et CR (D083)
- Liste des structures sans Type au 29/05/2012 (D084)
- Eléments sur les problèmes de diffusion (D085)
- Liste des structures au 31/05/2012 (D086)

Juin 2012 :

- Enrichissement de la Directory pour les médias
- Poursuite de la saisie des structures dans la Directory
- Préparation de la seconde réunion de projet en septembre
- Réflexion sur l'ordre de grandeur prévisionnel du nombre des structures dans la Directory
- Suivi des travaux avec le web designer
- Traitement des mails en erreur
- Analyse des « trous » d'information dans la Directory comme pour la variable « Type de structure » manquante
- Voir le centre d'information en Slovénie <http://www.cnvos.si>

Juillet 2012 :

- Poursuite de la saisie des structures dans la Directory
- Le point sur la validation des fiches (D087)
- Liste définitive des mails de validation en erreur (D088)
- **Réunion interne de projet NEB/Psytel n°15** (03/07/2012) et CR (D089)
- Réflexion sur l'arborescence du site final
- Examen de la question des noms internationaux
- Poursuite de la campagne de validation des fiches
- Introduction d'une variable explicite de validation
- Premiers travaux statistiques sur la Directory
- Traitement des réponses des ambassades SI et PL
- Examen du mécanisme d'authentification dans l'application

Août 2012 :

- Poursuite de la saisie des structures dans la Directory
- Préparation de la seconde réunion générale de projet
- Réflexion sur l'arborescence du site final
- Agenda prévisionnel de la 2ème réunion générale (n°16) (D090)
- Liste des structures au 22/08/2012 (D091)
- Liste des travaux à faire au 22/08/2012 (D092)
- Tableaux EM x Type au 22/08/2012 (D093)
- Compléter les mails institutionnels non présents

- Examen de la question de la pérennité du projet
- Examen des « manques » dans la Directory

Septembre 2012 :

- Poursuite de la saisie des structures dans la Directory
- Remarques sur l'application web (D094)
- Liste des structures validées ou non au 17/09/2012 (D095)
- Préparation de la seconde générale de projet
- Préparation des tableaux statistiques par programme spécifique
- Tableaux EM x Type au 17/09/2012 (D096)
- Tableaux EM x Action au 17/09/2012 (D097)
- Tableaux EM x Cible au 17/09/2012 (D098)
- Tableaux EM x Domaine au 17/09/2012 (D099)
- Tableaux Type x Domaine au 17/09/2012 (D100)
- Tableaux MS x validation au 25/09/2012 (D101)
- **Seconde réunion générale de projet (n°16)** (27/09/2012) et CR (D102) FR/EN
- Contribution AT à réunion n°16 (D103)
- Contribution PT à réunion n°16 (D104)
- Contribution LV à réunion n°16 (D105)

Octobre 2012 :

- Poursuite de la saisie des structures dans la Directory
- Début du nettoyage de la Directory
- Harmonisation des fiches et des noms des structures
- Rédaction du document « L'acteur-réseau DAPHNE » (D106)
- Le site web est quasiment opérationnel dans sa version finale
- Etablissement d'une liste de diffusion (nationale et internationale)
- Action de diffusion des partenaires pour faire connaître la Directory
- Examen de la question de la durabilité du projet en fonction des réponses de l'équipe DAPHNE
- Modification de l'application pour se prémunir contre le piratage
- Reprise des recommandations contenues dans les interviews et les contacts avec les partenaires

Novembre 2012 :

- Poursuite du nettoyage de la Directory
- Liste des travaux à faire au 29/11/2012 (D107)
- **Réunion interne de projet NEB/Psytel n°17** (29/11/2012) et CR (D108)
- Rassembler les éléments de contenu pour la rédaction du rapport final
- Suivi de la diffusion
- Etablissement des textes définitifs sur le site web
- Mise en place des statistiques de connexion
- Réduction du nombre des « Other » et sans « type d'organisation » pour chaque partenaire
- **Réunion avec la cheffe du Bureau de l'égalité entre les femmes et les hommes** au sein de la Direction générale de la cohésion sociale (22/11/2012)

Décembre 2012 :

- Collecte des documents administratifs et financiers auprès des partenaires
- Rassembler les éléments de contenu pour la rédaction du rapport final
- Début de l'écriture du rapport administratif final (D109) FR/EN
- Début de l'écriture du rapport de synthèse (D110) FR/EN
- Fabrication du CD-ROM
- Suivi de la diffusion

Janvier 2013 :

Final narrative report – Daphne 2009-2010 action grants

- Ecriture du rapport administratif final
- Collecte des documents administratifs et financiers auprès des partenaires
- Réunion avec la nouvelle chargée de la Mission interministérielle pour la protection des femmes victimes de violences (09/01/2013)
- Ecriture du rapport de synthèse (D110) FR/EN
- Chronologie des travaux effectués (D111)
- Un exemple d'utilisation de la Directory selon l'axe 5 (D112)
- Chargement des documents de projet sur le site internet www.psytel.eu

- 14/01/2013 : fin officielle de l'action