



## **REPORT ON 3<sup>rd</sup> PEER LEARNING SEMINAR:**

### **Transnationality in ESF**

#### **The way forward post 2014 - a new Common Framework**

*25-26 September 2012, London*

#### Context and objectives of the seminar:

The main objective of the 3rd annual peer learning seminar organized by the Learning Network on Transnational Cooperation in ESF and hosted by the English ESF Managing Authority and the Intermediate Body - the Innovation, Transnationality and Mainstreaming Unit of the Birmingham City Council, was to support and improve the overall quality and impact of transnational co-operation in the next ESF programming period by:

- Enabling participants to gain a general understanding and appreciation of transnational cooperation, drawing on the experience of the previous programming periods.
- Presenting and discussing proposals for a new Common Framework for transnationality post 2014.
- Providing an opportunity for participants to contribute to proposals for transnationality post 2014.
- Facilitating networking opportunities, the exchange of good practices and lessons learned between ESF stakeholders.

#### Agenda of the seminar:

##### **Tuesday 25th September 2012**

*9:00 Arrival and coffee*

10:00 Welcomes and introductions

10:30 Common framework for TNC post 2014

10.50 Simultaneous workshops – Part 1

- w/s 1: Themes and actions
- w/s 2: Thematic Networks
- w/s 3: Calls for proposals
- w/s 4: Partner search

*12:50 Lunch*

13:45 Simultaneous workshops – Part 2

*15:45 Networking opportunity – coffee/tea available*

16:00 Feedback from workshops

16:30 Close of Day 1

*19:30 Conference dinner*





### **Wednesday 26th September 2012**

- 9:00 *Arrival and coffee*
- 9:30 Summary/review of Day 1
- 9:45 Panel discussion – implementing the Common Framework
- 11:30 *Coffee*
- 11.45 The role of National Networks
- 12.15 TNC Learning Network – resources for you
- 12:45 Next steps
- 13:00 Closure of seminar – ESF England
- 13.05 *Lunch and further networking opportunity*

**Participants:** 60 attending (78 registered) participants from 18 Member States and the European Commission

### 25 September, 2012

#### Opening plenary session

**Moderator:** Lloyd Broad (ITM Unit, Birmingham City Council)

#### **Speakers:**

- Angus Gray (Head of ESF Division of the Department for Work and Pensions - Managing Authority of the England and Gibraltar ESF Programme) - on behalf of the hosting institution
- Szilard Tamas (Head of Unit F1 Geographical & Financial support, Thematic reporting, CELFI of DG Employment) on behalf of the European Commission
- Radana Leistner Kratochvílová (Deputy Director of ESF Management Department of the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, Czech Republic - Managing Authority of OP Human Resources and Employment) - on behalf of the Leader of the Learning Network on TNC in ESF
- Lloyd Broad (Head of European and International Affairs, Birmingham City Council) - on behalf of TNC Learning Network.

Mr. Angus Gray opened the seminar and welcomed all speakers and participants. All speakers in particular pointed out, that the seminar is an important forum which gives the opportunity for ESF stakeholders to share their ideas on various aspects of the Common Framework for transnational cooperation post 2013, to network and exchange good practice and lessons learned in the delivery of TNC in ESF.





### Common Framework for TNC post 2014

**Speakers:** Szilard Tamas (Head of Unit F1, DG Employment), Markéta Pěchoučková (TNC Learning Network, ESF Management Department of the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, Czech Republic)

The speakers presented and explained in brief the context and main components of the Common framework as proposed by the Working Group on TNC post 2013 and described in detail in the Background paper for participants of the learning seminar (*for details see the slide show and the Background paper*).

### Thematic workshops

Four thematic workshops dealing with most interesting topics with regard to the Common Framework were organized in 2 rounds of parallel sessions (morning and afternoon). The workshops consisted of brief presentations of topic(s) delivered by workshop leaders and/or facilitators (and in some cases also other contributors) followed by facilitated discussions on various aspects of presented topics based on the proposals outlined in the Background paper on TNC in ESF post 2013 and on participants' own experience. The key points resulting from the discussions are highlighted below:

#### Workshop 1 - Themes and actions

**Workshop Leader:** Susanne Strehle/Bettina Reuter (Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, Germany)

**Facilitator:** Howard Harding (TNC LN facilitator)

**Contributor:** Vicky Donlevy (Ecorys)

Two sessions of the workshop discussed selection of common themes and eligible actions (which and why) with the following outcomes:

#### Key points of the Workshop 1 presented at the wrap-up session:

##### **A. Common themes:**

1. The investment priorities in the EC's proposal for the new ESF Regulation represent the most appropriate starting point for developing common themes (as opposed to, for example, the more general thematic objectives, or EU-level "hot topics"). They are sufficiently broad to encourage MS/MA participation in the Common Framework, but sufficiently narrow to allow for the provision of targeted support by the EC/Thematic Networks and effective partner matching.
2. The 6 investment priorities indicated as most popular during an unofficial and informal canvassing of Working Group Members are generally wide enough to encompass almost all ESF initiatives foreseen by the draft ESF Regulation in the next programming period (apart from institutional capacity building), including those for which separate investment priorities exist (e.g. early school leaving could be addressed under "lifelong learning...", and integration of the Roma under "active inclusion").
3. In order to avoid debate about whether or not ESF initiatives for which there are separate investment priorities could be implemented under given common themes, the latter





should be 1) clearly institutionally distinct from investment priorities and 2) worded differently.

4. 1 of the common themes should be concerned with institutional capacity building, both from the side of public administrations and non-state actors (e.g. NGOs); however, consideration should be given to the number of MSs/MAs which might be interested given the experience of the related Learning Network in the current programming period, as well as to the possible dilution of the issue if it is open to a very wide range of types of organisation.
5. When developing common themes, consideration should be given to subjects that might be missed, for example, cross-cutting issues such as results based management and gender mainstreaming.
6. The common themes should be fleshed out in sufficient detail to allow for an informed decision by MSs/MAs concerning participation in the Common Framework (for example, “active inclusion” on its own will not be adequate). Such “fleshing out” should take account of the delineation of possible investment priority contents in the Community Support Framework.
7. The common themes as finally agreed between the EC and the ESF Committee are likely to require subsequent focussing to reflect the mutual interests of MSs/MAs participating in the Common Framework. It is therefore expected (and encouraged) that the Thematic Network for each theme will narrow the focus accordingly.
8. Thematic concentration should be a moot point with regard to common themes, since 1) if TNC is funded by an MA via a dedicated priority, it will be exempt from calculating thematic concentration, while 2) if it is implemented horizontally across priorities, the amounts will be so small as to have very limited, if any, impact on whether thematic concentration is met or not.
9. Consideration should be given to a formal review of common themes mid-way through the programming period – e.g. in 2017 – since the programme environment and labour market needs are liable to change.
10. There is a need to clarify what, if anything, can be included in the new Operational Programmes as “results” for TNC dedicated priorities in light of the fact that 1) what such priorities will fund is unlikely to be known until after the Common Framework is up and running (well after the programming process), and 2) TNC, being a mechanism rather than an investment priority/theme, is content free (and can therefore not really be assigned “results” as for other priorities). After internal EC consultation and clarification (as indicated at the plenary on the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of the seminar), relevant information will be included in the paper on TNC post 2013 to be submitted by the Working Group to the Ad-hoc Group in early December.

## **B. Eligible actions:**

1. Generally, there will be a need for guidance on what actions are eligible under coordinated calls. Such guidance should, in principle, be inclusionary (e.g. open lists) rather than exclusionary (e.g. closed lists); however, it should also allow for participating MSs/MAs to indicate the actions in which they are most interested.
2. How closely eligible actions are defined for a given coordinated call may well depend on what it addresses – certain cases might require that eligible actions are quite restrictive (e.g. mobility programmes), while others might not need any limits at all.





3. Actions eligible under a coordinated call should be sufficiently detailed to give potential applicants a complete picture of what MAs have in mind (e.g. delineation of the nature of study visits, shadowing).
4. There should be some kind of minimum standards established for action types – for example, study visits to other countries should only be eligible actions if they result in some effect in the original country. However, when developing such standards, care will need to be taken to allow for added value which is intangible and/or difficult to measure.
5. Consideration should be given to the link (or lack of) between TNC actions and innovation, particularly in light of the fact that both TNC and innovation are governed by separate articles in the draft ESF Regulation (not the case in the current programming period)

### Workshop 2 – Thematic Networks

**Workshop Leader:** Karolina Medwecka-Piasecka and Heather Law, ITM Unit, Intermediate Body, England and Gibraltar ESF Programme

**Facilitator:** Marta García, Spanish ESF Managing Authority

This workshop looked at Thematic Networks – in particular their roles and responsibilities - as one of the bodies constituting the EU-level platform and potential vehicles allowing for cooperation among Managing Authorities and the European Commission. Following issues were discussed with the following results:

### Key points of the Workshop 2 presented at the wrap-up session:

#### **1. Design of Thematic Networks:**

- More information regarding details needed in order to make an informed view.
- It is important to make sure that structures and quantities do not become unwieldy. Otherwise, there is a risk that the Thematic Networks will become not manageable.
- There seems to be a lack of space for the mutual learning between Managing Authorities. Will learning occur on the programme level as well (not only project level)?
- Formative evaluation is important.
- Regional organisation – do we expect all countries to establish their own national/regional TNs?
- What do we want the TNs to achieve? It seems there might be too much technical issues to deal with on the TNs level. Perhaps we should plan some less-technical meetings too?
- TNC Advisory Committee will need to be consulted before any decisions are taken.

#### **2. Involvement of right stakeholders:**

- External expertise may be required (external experts) – MAs should decide which experts and when to invite.





- Involving social partners like NGOs and beneficiaries could add value. They could play an important role in mainstreaming and dissemination. They could also be very useful for the evaluation purposes.
- Independent evaluation will need to be committed – to ensure objectivity.
- Policy maker involvement is crucial to ensure buy in from start to end – one of the methods of engagement.
- Different stages will require the involvement of different stakeholders as different input will be sought from them.

### **3. Roles clear and relevant?**

- It is still too soon to answer this.
- MAs and IBs need to start thinking about differing roles.

### **4. Other considerations:**

- Problem with auditing – mix of EC/national audits required – there will be complexities which will need to be solved.
- The level of Thematic Network involvement needs to be decided – i.e. focusing on implementation of projects only could lead to generalisation. Grand expectations could have an impact on efficacy though.
- We need to be clear about the scope – what we want to achieve through the TNs.
- What do we mean by mainstreaming?

## **Workshop 3 – Calls for proposals**

**Workshop leader:** Markéta Pěchoučková /Jana Jirků (Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, Czech Republic)

**Facilitators:** Aurélie Gaulin (Racine, France)

The workshop participants discussed various issues linked to the implementation of coordinated calls for proposals under the Common Framework, in particular different approaches to projects selection process, the timetable, parameters of calls, roles and responsibilities of bodies involved in preparation of calls.

## **Key points of the Workshop 3 presented at the wrap-up session:**

### **1. Project selection**

- Two scenarios for projects selection were discussed:
  - Scenario 1: Calls are issued → applications are assessed and selected (not yet indicating TN partners) → partner search events only for preselected applicants → after successful partner search projects are completed, assessed again and their implementation starts
  - Scenario 2: Calls are issued → applicants search for partners via partner search events, database → each applicant prepares its own application and submit it including all TN partners → applications are assessed and selected → project implementation starts





- Both scenarios have pros and cons. Thus it is necessary to state those pros and cons with detailed explanation of both scenarios in the final paper on TNC implementation post 2013 prepared by the TNC Network so that the Ad-hoc group (Member States) could make informed decision on which of these option is the most convenient.
- In the first round of workshop scenario 2 with support to find TNC partner seemed to be a better option.
- Second round workshop participants suggested developing 3<sup>rd</sup> option – combination of both scenarios – informal pre-selection or consultation of projects instead of strict two way selection process.
- Other interesting points:
  - Scenario 1 is useful for not experienced partners without TNC contacts but having good ideas;
  - Projects should include more partners to avoid the risk of project collapse if one partner does not get funding;
  - Scenario 1 – risk that projects will chose a partner just to agree with rules, to get the pre-agreed funding;
  - Some way of coordination among the MAs will be necessary during the project selection;
  - If projects fail to find a TNC partner they could continue as national project;
  - Question is what is the date of eligibility of costs – it is necessary to give projects eligible possibility to finance partner search;
  - Capacity of partner search fora under scenario 2 – a big ?;
  - Pre-selection of projects (scenario 1) - administrative burden for MA, but could result in higher effectiveness for partner search;
  - Terminology has to be developed, it is not necessary to speak about 2 full project selections under scenario 1 – there might be alternative ways not so administratively cumbersome;
  - Some MS pointed out that they will never go for any two-steps selection as even if it is very light it might it brings administration burden which their hierarchy will not support.

## 2. Timetable

- Generally the suggested timetable seems to be adequate, however some participants felt it is less ambitious – i.e. projects should start implementation sooner – however some participants felt the timetable is quite pretty optimistic;
- Changes in project selection should allow for faster start of the projects;
- Question when EC TA and database is available;
- Finding a partner depends on rules and restrictions in the call, if lot of restrictions, finding a partner may be difficult;
- Launching event for CF on national level.

## 3. Common parameters of coordinated calls

- This item was not discussed into details however it was agreed that certain common parameters should be agreed by MS to be respected in all national / regional calls (e.g. basic eligibility criteria – duration of projects, max. and min. budget etc.).





#### 4. Roles and responsibilities of different actors

- Roles and responsibilities of different actors as suggested by seminar background paper seem relevant.
- MS should decide who exactly from their MS will participate in which activity.

#### Workshop 4 - Partner search

**Workshop Leader:** Beata Rybicka-Dominiak, Magdalena Karczewska (National Supporting Institution, Center of European Projects, Poland)

**Facilitator:** Hana Smolková (TNC LN facilitator)

Two sessions of the workshop discussed (based on pre-defined questions) issues related to effective partner search database and partner search events with the following results:

#### Key points of the Workshop 4 presented at the wrap-up session:

##### C. Partner search database

1. Key features of the database:
  - simple, concise information related just to partner-search needs (see also point 5 below, i.e. not other type of information – see also point 2 below),
  - clearly defined categories with commonly agreed terms (glossary) – ideally in national languages (links to already prepared thesaurus of key words in 11 EU languages to be used) + information downloaded in English
  - user friendly (incl. simple search criteria), including non-password protected access for passive users – transparent
  - kept regularly updated
  - not very advanced software – this would limit the number of users.
2. The database should be newly established; not built on the Toolkit database as the latter is too ambitious with respect to the scope of information included (relevant not only for partner search but also info on systems of TNS implementation in MSs, products developed etc.)
3. Inspiration from other databases – ECT Programmes might be an inspiration as they use simple tools/criteria for partner matching (often just in a form of a project fiche)
4. Structure of the database – 2 separate parts (i.e. not separate databases)
  - 1) only information on projects selected<sup>1</sup> under the Common Framework
  - 2) information on other projects, for example:
    - Common Framework projects which have not been selected under the 1st coordinated call for proposals but are preparing for the 2<sup>nd</sup> round of calls
    - projects under flexible approach

---

<sup>1</sup> In case the original scenario is accepted when the partnerships are developed after the projects are selected (see the Background paper....)







- non-EU projects
- non-ESF projects.

5. Information categories most needed: issue/theme, target group(s), type of planned TNC activity(ies), outline of planned TNC activity(ies); preferred type of partner/organisation and his previous TNC experience related to the of planned TNC activities.

Other potential information required: objective(s) of the project, preferred location of the project; budget available for TNC activities, funding source(s); planned outputs; preferred working languages; contact details on institution and person responsible including the web page (if available).

As much information as possible should be entered through a pre-defined menu (as mentioned in Q1), which should include also the option „no preference“; other will be descriptive (text fields).

6. Uploading the information to the database: The responsibility for entering data to the database should rest with the MSs/MAs (i.e. project promoters would be allowed to upload certain information by themselves however the process would be monitored by MAs or for Common Framework projects a common form (or its part) could be used encompassing all information required for the database (as described under point 5 above). Thus, the information and data needed for the database could be easily exported directly to the DB from the form.

Similar format of description/procedure could be used with the non-CF projects.

#### **D. Partner search events (fora) – paid from the EC TA**

1. When to be held: to be organized for selected projects (not to wait for contracting as it would unnecessarily prolong the process)
2. Who should attend: should not be compulsory (projects may have found already their partners through the DB or any other means); should be open only to CF projects/promoters. Primarily addressed to project promoters who have not found partners yet, but also a chance to meet for those who have found potential partners via the DB and would like to contact them also personally.
3. Pre-matching of projects will be necessary in order to keep the control above the process. This should be done by the EC TA in cooperation with national experts from the relevant TN (they are supposed to know their MS' projects). Could be done based on the information inserted into the DB.
4. Preferred format:
  - Generally: Based on the current experience (PL) individual events should not host more than 100 people including the organiser's team; thus rather than big events organised by the EC TA (demanding on personal capacities of the organiser - many facilitators and moderators, also demanding in terms of sufficient space etc.) more smaller events per theme or even a sub-theme (if defined) are preferable. Foras should be organised by the EC TA in cooperation with the MSs



via experts from the relevant Thematic Network. Such meetings could be hosted by the country where the leader of the TN or a sub-theme is located.

- Specifically: discussions at round tables (participants for each table identified in advance) where projects/ideas are presented with the help of facilitators (i.e. TN's experts), all projects described on flipcharts and visible for all) + short plenary sessions with participation of national experts involved in the given TN to provide information related to the theme (inspiration for projects) and on higher level policy (i.e. Information on actual trends in a given area)
- Duration: 2 days

### Plenary wrap-up session - Feedback from workshops

- see above

**Moderator:** Lloyd Broad

**Speakers:** Howard Harding, Heather Law, Hana Smolková, Jana Jirků

26 September, 2012

### Summary/review of Day 1

**Speaker:** Lloyd Broad (Birmingham City Council)

Mr. Broad summarized main outcomes of the series of workshops held on Day 1 with respect to the Common Framework as a starting point for following discussions on Day 2.

### Panel discussion – Implementing the Common Framework

**Moderator:** Lloyd Broad (ITM Unit, ESF program England)

**Speakers:** Szilárd Tamas (Unit F1, DG EMPL); Angus Gray (Managing Authority of England and Gibraltar ESF Programme), Susanne Strehle (Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, Germany), Paweł Choraży (Managing Authority of Polish ESF Programme)

The panellists discussed in particular the idea of CF itself as well as the need to capture the TNC impact and demonstrate the results and the role of national thematic networks.

In general, it has been pointed out that CF builds on the past (Equal and transnationality in the current period) and the challenge is to integrate TNC into mainstream ESF programmes. TNC needs to align with the Europe 2020 strategy and results need to be delivered. The role of national networks is important in this process. Timing is of critical importance – TNC should be embedded at the beginning of the programming period. We need to be clear about mainstreaming and also to be realistic about what we can achieve.

Transnationality is visible at the EU level, but there is still a need to fight for demonstrable results which have to be captured and then disseminated at the national level. However





dissemination is often a problem if there is no link to national thematic networks. Thus, EU networks should be aligned with national thematic networks. Such a link could be the tool to deliver results at national level. There is a need to extend the representation of these groups to draw in those who don't participate in TNC. It would be useful to engage with policy makers at the point of project selection if we are dealing with innovative projects. Actions rendering few results, e.g. study visits without clear goals, should be avoided. The annexes to the common framework proposal will include tips and advice in terms of actions/substantive results.

We need to be very clear about the objectives of the learning networks. One problem of existing learning networks was they interpreted their scope differently; some addressing a high policy level, others focusing on the best practice learning. The COPIE network is a good example of what can be achieved by EU networks. Experts worked together over a sustained period and there were strong linkages with national networks. This provided a seamless route for the dissemination of the tools produced and results obtained. We need to focus on how to capture impact. IMPART developed a peer review method and this demonstrated success. This learning should be fed into the new programming period. A hand-over period would have been beneficial.

Regarding themes and actions, it is difficult to find indicators for processes such as learning. TNC might need to be linked to other priority actions. Devising an extra indicator for TNC is very difficult.

Finally it has been stated, that the Common Framework is seen as a good compromise between Equal and current period but it is necessary to find appropriate balance between flexibility and coordination. It is clear that CF will not cover all aspects of TNC; flexible approach is also viable and bilateral cooperation/ learning is also important.

### The role of National Thematic Networks

**Speakers:** Bengt Nilsson (European Community of Practice on Gender Mainstreaming, Sweden), Karolina Medwecka-Piasecka (ITM Unit, Birmingham City Council)

The current practice shows that national thematic networks are a useful element in the ESF context in those MS where established and working. The speakers provided us with examples from Sweden and England, showing in particular the purpose, structure of membership, institutional framework and benefits (*for details see the slide shows*).

### TNC Learning Network – Resources for you

**Speaker:** Jana Jirků (Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, Czech Republic - Leader of the TNC Learning Network)

The participants got acquainted with one of the outputs of the TNC Learning Network – a webpage [www.transnationality.eu](http://www.transnationality.eu) which serves not only to the members of the TNC LN but may be of interest also to other LNs. Jana Jirku has guided the audience through individual sections of the webpage showing how they work and what information can be found there (*for details see the slide show*).





### Next steps

**Speaker:** Szilárd Tamas (Unit F1, DG EMPL)

Szilárd Tamas briefly informed the participants about the next stages in negotiation of the ESF Regulation and summed up the necessary steps for preparation of the CF especially stating that the objective is to have the support structure (EU TA) ready by the end of 2013, therefore the ToR including the budget have to be prepared so that the tender is launched in time. Finally he underlined that the EC would like to continue the work with the Working Group on TNC post 2013.

### Closure of the seminar

**Speaker:** Angus Gray (Managing Authority of England and Gibraltar ESF Programme).

The ultimate message from the seminar is that the general perception of the Common Framework by the audience was positive. At the same time the workshops and also following discussions showed that there is a need for more debate and discussion on the TNC implementation, and the Common Framework.

### Evaluation of the seminar

*(based on a brief questionnaire filled out by the participants)*

Number of participants: 60 participants representing the following institutions/bodies:

- European Commission (9 i.e. 15% of participants)
- Managing Authorities (20 i.e. 33.3% of participants)
- Intermediary Bodies (11 i.e. 18.3% of participants)
- National Supporting Institutions (8 i.e. 13.4% of participants)
- Learning Networks (6 i.e. 10% of participants)
- Other (6 i.e. 10% of participants)

Number of respondents to the questionnaire: 24 out of 60 i.e. 40%

Participation in workshops (Day 1) - out of the 24 respondents:

- 16 people participated in workshops 1<sup>2</sup>
- 15 people participated in workshops 2
- 9 people participated in workshops 3
- 8 people participated in workshops 4

### **Evaluation questions:**

*(rating scale: 1 = very poor; 2 = poor; 3 = sufficient; 4 = good; 5 = excellent)*

General:

1) *Overall rating of the seminar:*

- 9 or 37.5% of respondents as excellent

---

<sup>2</sup> Two rounds of thematic workshops 1 – 4 were held during Day 1 (ie two workshops on the same topic).





- 14 or 58.3% of respondents as good
- 1 or 4.2% of respondents as sufficient

2) *Did the seminar meet your expectations?*

- 8 or 33.3% of respondents as excellent
- 13 or 54.2% of respondents as good
- 3 or 12.5% of respondents as sufficient

3) *Were the opportunities for your active participation sufficient?*

- 15 or 62.5% of respondents as excellent
- 8 or 33.3% of respondents as good
- 1 or 4.2% of respondents as sufficient

4) *Was the practical organisation of the seminar including the venue and meals good?*

- 13 or 54.2% of respondents as excellent
- 8 or 33.3% of respondents as good
- 2 or 8.3% of respondents as sufficient
- 1 or 4.2% of respondents as poor

5) *Did you like the balance between presentations and group interaction/participation?*

- 15 or 62.5% of respondents as excellent
- 5 or 20.8% of respondents as good
- 4 or 16.7% of respondents as sufficient

6) *Was adequate time left for social interaction/networking?*

- 13 or 54.2% of respondents as excellent
- 11 or 45.8% of respondents as good

Common Framework presentation

1) *Following the presentation on the Common Framework, how clear is your understanding of this now?*

- 7 or 29.2% of respondents as excellent
- 7 or 29.2% of respondents as good
- 6 or 25% of respondents as sufficient
- 4 or 16.6% of respondents have not answered the question

Simultaneous workshops

Workshop 1: Themes and actions (16 responding participants)

- 5 or 31.25% of respondents as excellent
- 7 or 43.75% of respondents as good
- 4 or 25% of respondents as sufficient



Workshop 2: Thematic Networks (15 responding participants)

- 4 or 26.7% of respondents as excellent
- 9 or 60% of respondents as good
- 2 or 13.3% of respondents as sufficient

Workshop 3: Calls for proposals (9 responding participants)

- 2 or 22.2% of respondents as excellent
- 6 or 66.7% of respondents as good
- 1 or 11.1% of respondents as sufficient

Workshop 4: Partner search (8 responding participants)

- 4 or 50% of respondents as excellent
- 3 or 37.5% of respondents as good
- 1 or 12.5% of respondents as sufficient

Panel discussion (*average rating for all speakers*):

- 10 or 41.7% of respondents as excellent
- 9 or 37.5% of respondents as good
- 3 or 12.5% of respondents as sufficient
- 2 or 8.3% of respondents have not answered the question

The role of National Networks:

- 5 or 20.8% of respondents as excellent
- 11 or 45.8% of respondents as good
- 8 or 33.4% of respondents as sufficient

Tools developed by the Learning Network on TNC in ESF (*average rating based on 2 sub-questions*):

- 7 or 29.2% of respondents as excellent
- 12 or 50% of respondents as good
- 2 or 8.3% of respondents as sufficient
- 3 or 12.5% of respondents have not answered the question

Presentation of next steps (ongoing EU timetable and update on status of negotiations):

- 11 or 45.8% of respondents as excellent
- 8 or 33.3% of respondents as good
- 1 or 4.2% of respondents as sufficient
- 4 or 16.7% of respondents have not answered the question

*Do you think the Common Framework outlined during the seminar is a good idea?*

- A good starting point for further discussion. It is necessary to improve the present system without returning to Equal
- Yes but it needs to be really assumed by national Managing Authorities
- Yes, generally it is a good idea but it depends on the national programmes and what problems we want to solve
- Yes but it needs refining in all areas bearing in mind the need to make it attractive to MSs and not too complicated to implement
- Yes, as far as it is not going to be too complicated. For MAs it may seem to be too a big administrative burden – we should keep it as simple as possible.



- Yes, great job done. However I am worried in terms of ownership by the MSs
- It is good that the approach is “user-friendly” for practical implementation.
- Yes in principle. But of course the devil is in details. For example there is a risk of spending a lot of money on preparatory phase of projects which may not find TNC partner after all.
- Yes, good starting point but there are still so many variables that are not settled at the EU level and at very early stages of national preparations that the framework is likely to be revised many times.
- Yes, it is a good idea but keep it simple. The common themes should be agreed by all MSs involved in TNC. Also it is necessary to leave flexibility within thematic networks to opt for variety of common calls

*Additional general comments:*

- Thank you! The seminar was most useful for the OP drafting. It was arranged in the right time.
- Great event and great job in the Common Framework.
- Fewer but bigger TNC projects are to be preferred above hundreds of small projects
- We should think more “out of box” – maybe it would be interesting to do a good preparation at the beginning (content wise) and give a chance to a lot of small projects at the start to pick afterwards the best project proposals which can work for 2 or 3 years
- Very strongly support the idea of a direct link between “mainstream” ESF programmes aimed at EU2020 goals and the TNC actions
- Transnationality axis at national level to be preferred above regional OPs
- Important stakeholders should be involved from the start
- Validation of products is necessary

