

Minutes of Meeting 1 of the National LGBTI+ Inclusion Strategy Committee in
2020

Via Zoom, 16 June 2020 at 3pm

Present:

Name	Organisation
Oonagh Buckley (Chair)	Deputy Secretary General, Department of Justice and Equality (DJE)
Cathy Blake	Outwest
Gearóid Browne	D/Finance
David Carroll	Outhouse
Cmdt Gillian Collins	Defence Forces
Meadhbh Costello	Ibec
David Dillon	DEASP
Jane Ann Duffy	DJE
Paula Fagan	LGBT Ireland
Bill Foley	Gay Health Network
Michael Ganly	DPER
Mark Gately	DTTAS
Gerald Harty	DBEI
David Joyce	ICTU
Sinead Keane	Belongto
Cameron Keighron	AMACH
Paula Kelliher	D/Defence
David Kelly	DHPLG
Eileen Leahy	DCYA
Joan Maher	DCHG
Patrick McElligott	GOSHH
Eddie McGuinness	Dublin Pride
Padraig McMahan	DAFM
Caroline Moran	D/Defence
Kate Moynihan	LINC
Chris Noone	National LGBT Federation
Michelle O'Connor	Tourism Ireland
Michael O'Donnell	Gay Project Cork
Stephen O'Hare	HIV Ireland
Jean O'Mahony	IHREC
Sara Phillips	TENI
Bernardine Quinn	Dundalk Outcomers
Bernie Reape	DRCD
Lisa Tierney	NTA
Neil Ward	DJE LGBTI+ Employee and Ally Network

In attendance:

Name	Organisation
Deirdre Ní Néill	Secretariat, Department of Justice and Equality (DJE)
Sarah Mongey	Secretariat, Department of Justice and Equality (DJE)
Angela O'Neill	Secretariat, Department of Justice and Equality (DJE)
Edwina Steele	Strategic Policy team, CJE Pillar, Department of Justice and Equality (DJE)

Apologies:

Name	Organisation
Moninne Griffith	BelongTo
Aurélie Harel	OutWest
George Robotham	Outhouse

Item 1: Introduction

DSG Buckley opened the meeting, welcomed all attendees to the first meeting of the LGBTI+ Inclusion Strategy Committee and acknowledged the delay in getting the Committee up and running.

The negative effect the Covid-19 emergency has had on young and vulnerable persons was also acknowledged and the recent publication of research highlighting the issues was noted.

DSG Buckley confirmed that membership of the Committee was almost finalised. Apologies would be noted in the minutes. General housekeeping matters and the format of the online meeting were outlined.

Item 2: Agreement of Agenda

The agenda was agreed without amendment. No AOB items were raised.

Item 3: Terms of Reference

Members were advised that the ToR of the Committee circulated before the meeting draw on the proposed arrangements for monitoring implementation as set out in the Strategy.

No comments or points were raised on the ToR.

Item 4: Proposal to operate under the Regulation of Lobbying Act 2015 and under the Transparency Code

Members were referred to the summary paper on lobbying relations, circulated in advance of the meeting. It was proposed that the Committee would conduct its

activities in accordance with the Transparency Code published by the Minister for Public Expenditure and Reform. Under these arrangements, the ToR, membership list, agendas and agreed minutes of meetings, and reports would be published by the Department of Justice and Equality on its website. Committee members to whom the legislation applies would not then have to log their participation in the Committee on the register of lobbying activities.

The proposed approach was agreed by Members.

Item 5: Work Programme

Members were advised that, given the Strategy has a short timeframe, the Committee would be key to maintaining the momentum and ensuring progress is on track.

The Department of Justice and Equality had proposed the following:

- That the Committee would meet three times a year. An outline schedule of suggested meetings taking place during 2020 and into 2021 was circulated for consideration.
- That a thematic approach be taken to reviewing progress in detail, dedicating a meeting to a “deep dive” into each of the four thematic pillars in the Strategy, beginning with the meeting proposed for September.
- That the last two meetings would focus on final evaluation. The findings of this evaluation would feed into and inform the scope of future iterative strategies, and set the scope of what needs to be done; each one building on the next.
- Separate from the thematic focus, a summary progress report would be requested from all Departments for each meeting, in the form of a traffic light scorecard. Indicators to support monitoring (for discussion under our next agenda item) were referred to.

Members’ views were invited on this general approach.

The following points were raised by Members:

- Concern was expressed about the late circulation of the meeting papers, and the need for lead in time to consider material before meetings was highlighted.
- It was felt additional, more frequent meetings were required.
- The order in which themes were proposed to be reviewed in the workplan was queried, with a suggestion that the health theme would come earlier in the work plan.
- Whether there was any merit in using a sub-group structure instead, for in-depth consideration of specific issues.
- It was generally felt that a thematic focus was a good idea, but it would only work where it was tied to the traffic light scorecard more generally.

DSG Buckley thanked members for their input and agreed to:

- **Review the order of themes in the work plan.**

- Look at having an additional meeting at back end of 2020 to potentially facilitate the health theme.
- Consider the merits of subcommittees.

Items 6: Monitoring: Options for indicators and suggested traffic light scorecard for monitoring progress.

The Civil Policy Team outlined the purpose and potential options for indicators and the proposed progress scorecard. It was acknowledged the late circulation of the documents limited the Committee's ability to consider the proposals in advance. It was suggested that further time be given to study the documents and that observations could be returned to the team.

Preliminary views from Members were requested.

Discussion on indicators

The Civil Policy Team advised that indicators were tools to monitor progress. Monitoring the indicators is a task for the Committee to lead on; to monitor progress against outcomes. Referring to a draft paper circulated on possible sources of progress indicators, members were advised that this was a reference collection of indicators developed by other organisations such as the World Bank, results of research and surveys and statistical results. This draft paper was intended to provide food for thought and to facilitate a discussion amongst members, seeking their views of what kinds of indicators they felt were potentially relevant.

It was suggested that it might be useful to have indicators under each of the themes. Given there were 26 different outcomes to be progressed under this Strategy, some may have no identifiable indicators and others might have a group of indicators.

The following observations were made by Members:

- IHREC highlighted the opportunities afforded by implementation of the Public Sector Duty, including providing an overview of which public sector bodies are including LGBTI under their (S.42) duty. S.42 of the Irish Human Rights and Equality Commission Act 2014 puts an obligation on Public Sector bodies to try to shape how they act from a human rights point of view. By end of this year it was noted that every Government Department should have carried out an assessment and have data, possibly qualitative, pertaining to LGBTI staff and users. IHREC aimed to support Government Departments with an event in July. IHREC stressed that while it would monitor implementation of the Public Sector Duty, it was primarily a self-assessment process for Government Departments themselves and would show what they see as relevant to their functions.
- The usefulness of indicators was queried, reflecting on experience with the MIS where it was found no one followed the indicators. It was also noted the process of sourcing and populating indicators could be time consuming and take the focus off implementation of the action. Need to consider who will get the information, with quantitative data, not just

qualitative data required. Another concern with the MIS was its indicators were too vague or too high reaching.

- All of the frameworks and indicators proposed have a lot of value to them. The measurement is the question – how do you measure the impact. Interested in the how of it, and this would help in setting indicators that are doable.
- One of the issues with previous strategies is the difficulty measuring outcomes. It is worthwhile doing some baseline measurement to have something to measure against.
- It was suggested Members looked at existing data sets and were selective about what is on hand and what additional data would be required. It was felt there was a value in measure against a small group of important indicators and data sets, not just during the lifetime of the strategy but further on.
- Looking at how the NLGBTI youth strategy was monitored was suggested.

It was agreed that this would be useful.

- Given the indicators are so broad and wide-ranging it is very hard to imagine how you can get specific. May requires a level of new research rather than existing information. Finding a mechanism to achieve targets and a useful measure to indicate that would assist members when going back to our own organisations.

It was confirmed that once the Committee had decided the best metrics a baseline could be established and built on. It was agreed it would be worthwhile for all Members to reflecting on potential indicators and have a further discussion.

Discussion on scorecard

A draft Progress Scorecard template was presented. Members were advised that this was based on a traffic light template had proved very useful to foster common understanding among Committee members for both the National Strategy for Women and Girls (NSWG) and the Migrant Integration Strategies (MIS). The status of actions would be reported periodically – on track (green), minor issue (amber), significant issue (red), with the addition of Black for actions not yet started and Blue for those that have been completed.

The criteria for assignment of status to actions under the NSWG considered scope/quality and progress against deadlines, considered together when deciding how an action will be reported. The status is reported by the project manager progressing the action at a local level, and is then open for discussion with the Committee. In addition to the status, a brief narrative update is provided on progress since the previous report.

The following observations were made by Members:

- It was confirmed that line Departments would report on behalf of Agencies.

- A number of actions should have been started/progressed in Q3 and Q4 last year, but have not started. The possibility of there being scope to extend these timeframes was discussed, concluding that it would depend on the action and reasoning for the delay.
- As regards monitoring of reporting of status on the scorecard, it was confirmed that quality control is the role of the Committee. Members must challenge where it is not happening. It was felt that the Secretariat should do a sense check first on the status reported by other Departments, with a particular focus on addressing an optimism and a positivity bias in progress being reported to the Committee, where actions remain black or green, and perhaps should not. Not introducing a culture of blame, but being realistic.
- The decision on when the status of an action should change from in progress to complete was discussed. It was confirmed that the relevant Department, Secretariat and then the Committee all have a role in this. The Department reports on the status, the Secretariat may sense check this, but ultimately it is the Committee that the progress is reported to. It is up to the Committee to ask about it, to challenge it and to tease out whether an action is on track or should have been flagged as amber. The scorecard is a tool to encourage dialogue.

It was agreed that the scorecard would be refreshed and reviewed in advance of the next meeting.

Item 7: AOB:

The following matters were raised under AOB:

- Whether any funds received in the Funding Call due to be launched in Q3 2020 could be spent in 2021?

The Department of Justice and Equality was confirmed that the forthcoming call will cover expenditure in 2020 and 2021. Typically the funding is granted for 12 month period in phases.

Item 8: Date of Next Meeting:

It was suggested that a meeting before the end of July would allow the secretariat to accommodate a further meeting, in the second half of September and a final meeting in 2020.

**Actions arising from Meeting 1 of the National LGBTI+ Inclusion Strategy
Committee in 2020, 16 June 2020**

No.	Action	Responsible	Timeline
1.1	Review the ordering of the work plan.	DJE	For July Meeting
1.2	Review viability of additional meeting in 2020	DJE	For July Meeting
1.3	Consider possibilities for subcommittees	DJE	For July Meeting
1.4	Circulate report on how the NLGBTI youth strategy is monitored.	DCYA	For July Meeting
1.5	Committee members to provide observations on potential indicators. DJE would compile options for indicators and circulate for discussion at July meeting.	DJE	For July Meeting

DRAFT