Summary of discussions

Group 1: Proposal for the Gender-based violence entry point

The facilitator briefly presented the rationale behind the new entry point on Gender-based violence. Then, EIGE's consultant introduced the proposal to restructure the respective entry point so that data on Gender-based violence would be more accessible and visible. Experts were asked to provide their comments and advice to specific questions that concern the new proposal.

The following ideas were raised for consideration:

- Overall, experts were in favour of proposed structure of the new entry point and did not express any major concerns agreeing that it is important to raise visibility of gender-based violence area.
- Duplication of indicators within the entry point should be eliminated, though it is acceptable to have duplicates between the entry points. It was pointed out that the same indicators placed in different entry points create different narratives that help to improve users' reading ability.
- The distinction between survey data and administrative data must be visible and clear. Experts advised that each sub-division should have an additional division by type of data (i.e. administrative or survey data).
- Experts stressed the importance of metadata for gender-based violence data. It should be easily accessible for the users and potential of connecting the Glossary with metadata should be further analyzed.
- It was raised that stalking as such might be different from psychological violence, therefore, it not necessarily falls under the psychological violence.
- Data sources to be considered for including in the database – NGOs, social services working in the area of gender-based violence.
- The graphic presentation of the indicator '"D3. Victim support" (dummy variable with values 0 and 1) should be replaced by a question and table with Yes/No.
- Experts were interested in having data on economic cost of violence in the database. If no data on economic cost of violence is available, then the sub-theme "economic costs of violence" should be renamed to "use of services".
- Regarding the new structure of the entry point, the section "On the role of the EU" must be on the same line with "Opinions on public measures and support services".
- A new report on trafficking with data from 2014, 2015 and 2016 will be published next year. It will include new set of indicators that focus on children, asylum seekers and migrants.
- As trafficking in human beings is a gendered issue, experts think that EIGE should be involved in looking into this phenomenon.
- Even though comparability of data on trafficking in human beings is a major issue, the experts propose to disseminate these data through the database.

- To insert a pop-up window asking users what is their profession (e.g. researchers, academia, NGOs, etc.). This would help identifying the main users of the database. Consequently, improvement of the database interface and functionalities could then better reflect users' needs.
- A notification should be sent to the users when new data is uploaded to the database.

Group 2: Women and men in decision-making

The facilitator had presented the support on EIGE's focal areas of work by the collection of data on women and men in decision-making. Then, the key issues on the data collection were presented. The Rapporteur offered some additional comments on the same regard.

Afterwards, the group started the discussion following the given concept of the meeting by presenting the more specific questions.

Schedule of data collection and data coverage

The group discussed the relevance of the current data collection schedule. In general, it was considered appropriate. However, it was suggested that the frequency of collection for data on the largest listed companies could be reduced to annual (from biannual) as the work is resource-intensive and the 6-monthly changes are not significant enough to justify the effort. EIGE should discuss this possibility with stakeholders.

It was noted that the Gender Equality Index will be updated annually going forwards and that this might have some impact on the requirements for collection of WMID data.

It was suggested that alongside the regular quarterly collection of data on national parliaments, it would be useful to also have access to data on the last election results. Very often, the number of women increases post-election as some of those at the top of lists (usually men) do not take up their posts or quickly move to another position, allowing people further down the list (women) to take their place. This data would not be suitable for presentation in the GSD because observations refer to different years for different countries so an Excel file linked from the metadata could be a solution.

Everybody agreed on biennial data collection on local politics and national level social partners.

Regarding coverage, suggestions to expand the coverage included:

- Sports (needed for the Gender Equality Index). Note that for data on decision-making in sports federations it would be necessary to restrict the coverage (e.g. Olympic sports) in order to avoid to have a resource burden.
- Judiciary: it could be useful to expand the coverage beyond the highest level courts currently covered. It was noted that the CEPEJ already collects some data on first and second instance courts and that DG JUST has access to this data.
- Security: it was suggested that it could be interesting to collect data on decision-making in the police and/or armed forces. In the latter case, reference was made to UN resolution R1325 in relation to equal participation in peace and security forces.
- There was also some discussion about possibilities to have data on government ministers with more detail than the BEIS classification (e.g. so that finance

ministers could be identified separately). The microdata collected include this detail in most cases and it could be considered to publish this.

Some good practices were presented; e.g. Turkey collects sex-disaggregated data on police officers, public prosecutors, rectors of universities, ambassadors. Bosnia collects data on ambassadors from the ministry of foreign affairs.

It was noted that the new data on research funding organisations and national academies of science cover only the EU Member States whilst other WMID data cover 7 further countries. Where data are used in the Gender Equality Index (e.g. research funding organisations), non-EU countries need access to relevant data in order to calculate indicator values for their country. It was therefore requested that coverage be extended to include IPA countries.

How is the dataset satisfying user needs and dissemination of metadata

Useful features found by users: the forthcoming "pre-defined tables" were welcomed. It could also be interesting to include a configurable time-series chart in this file, though it was recognised that in datasets with multiple dimensions this could be complicated to implement in a user-friendly way. The comprehensive metadata provided for the WMID data was much appreciated, with the mapping tables describing the organisations and positions covered particularly useful. The use of separate tabs for the chart, data table and metadata makes the information much more accessible to users.

Issues raised: there are some technical issues with export of chart images – will not work in Microsoft Edge (though other browsers are fine), charts lack any title or EIGE logo. The flexible chart scales are problematic (difficulty to compare between datasets, axis to 110 for percent, etc.). One user found the dots on the charts confusing and would prefer separate bars.

Proposals: notifications to users when updated data is uploaded on the site; to make clearer the relation of the indicators used in the Gender Equality Index and in the database (e.g. it should be clear that values used in the indicator are fixed while the "live" series presented in the WMID entry point may be subject to revision, and also that some data used in the Index are an average of two or more periods).

Group 3: Gender Statistics Database quality criteria

The discussion has been focused on the following three aspects: the improvement of the report, the need of training and the dissemination channels.

Proposals for improving the report
- Extend the explanation of what gender perspective is, emphasising that it goes beyond data desegregated by sex.
- Provide more examples on the following biases:
    - The bias that the use of an unappropriated classification system could introduce.
- Example: The classification of professions (ISCO) provides more detailed options for those professions that traditionally are done by men than for the ones traditionally feminised.
    - The type of bias that can introduce the men and women non-responses.
    - The need to avoid leading questions. The alternatives should be balanced not only in the answers but also in the question.
- Example: The Eurobarometer has been identified as a bad practice.

- The importance of having data disaggregated by sex but also by other relevant characteristics: age, household composition, income…
- The inadequacy of concepts and definitions used in administrative registers for their statistical use.

- Example: In Finland, children are register in only one place of residence. In the case of children who change their place of residence regularly because they have different carers, the use of that administrative register is not effective to show who is in fact taking care of the children. Which is the position of Eurostat and other institutions as Eurofound in this regard?
  - The impact of different attitudes and perceptions on cross-country comparisons.
  - The non-coverage of the total population.

- Example: FRA survey on violence is identified as a bad practice because it excludes people that cannot speak the national language. The problem is that if a certain group is excluded, who are mainly migrants, then an important percentage of the population that might suffer more or less violence than the others is unrepresented.

- Need to have rules of thumb on how to apply the quality criteria. It is needed to develop a strategy on how to go from the conceptualization of the quality framework to its application.
  - How to assess that an indicator is relevant to analyse a certain gender issue?
  - What to do when criteria are not fulfilled? When to drop an indicator and when to flag it?
  - If the indicator cannot be used for country comparisons but it is valid at national level, should it be dropped?
  - Develop a system of flags (useful exercise that involve a massive work):

- Harmonised / not harmonised.
- Full description of the problem found.
- Checklist of possible biases (sample size, cultural biases…) with a 2 level classification (red, yellow, green).

Need of training

Experts have proposed more training on gender statistics to producers and users. Online courses or online tutorials on specific topics targeted to specific stakeholders have been identified as useful tools.

Dissemination channels

Regarding the channels through which EIGE should disseminate the need and importance to include the gender perspective into statistics, experts have highlighted the importance of involving and having on board the European Commission, in particular Eurostat, and the national statistical offices.