



REPORT ON 2ND PEER LEARNING SEMINAR:

“Transnationality in ESF - Reflections from the Past, Proposals for the Future”

15-16 September 2011, Berlin

Objectives of the seminar:

The main objective of the 2nd annual peer learning seminar organized by the Learning Network on Transnational Cooperation in ESF and hosted by the German Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs was **to support and improve the quality and impact of transnational cooperation in the new ESF programming period** mainly through:

- Enabling participants to gain a general understanding and appreciation of TNC, drawing on the experience of the current programming period.
- Showcasing examples of effective practices and added value of TNC
- Discussing potential options for programming TNC in new ESF post-2013.
- Facilitating networking opportunities, the exchange of good practices and lessons learned between ESF managers.

Agenda of the seminar:

Thursday 15 September 2011

9:30 *Registration and coffee*

10:00 Introduction – plenary session

10:30 1st round of 4 workshops (running in parallel):

w/s 1: Mutual learning (Learning networks)

w/s 2: TNC implementing models

w/s 3: Territorial cooperation

w/s 4: Instruments supporting TNC

12:30 *Lunch*

13:30 2nd round of 4 workshops (running in parallel):

w/s 1: Mutual learning (Learning networks)

w/s 2: TNC implementing models

w/s 3: Territorial cooperation

w/s 4: Instruments supporting TNC

15:30 *Networking opportunities – coffee available*

16:00 Wrap-up session – plenary session

16:30 TNC Learning network – tools for you

19:30 *Dinner: networking opportunities*





Friday 16 September 2011

- 9:00 Introduction – plenary session
- EC proposal of the new ESF regulation
 - Reflection paper of the Working group on TNC in new ESF post-2013
- 9:30 4 identical discussion workshops running in parallel based on the information provided in plenary session:
- 11:00 *Networking opportunities – coffee available*
- 11:30 4 identical discussion workshops - continue
- 13:00 Closing panel – reflections, questions and answers
- 14:00 *Lunch*

15 September, 2011

Opening plenary session

Moderator: Florence Gerard (AEIDL)

Speakers: Susanne Strehle (Head of Unit F1, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs – Germany) - on behalf of the hosting institution), Tamas Szilárd (Unit ... DG Employment) on behalf of the Commission.), Radana Kratochvílová, deputy director of ESF Management Department, MA of OP Human Resources and Employment, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, Czech Republic) - on behalf of the Leader of the Learning Network on TNC in ESF.

Participants: 76 participants from 19 Member States and the European Commission

Ms. Susanne Strehle opened the seminar and all speakers welcomed the participants. In particular, it has been pointed out, that a stronger link between TNC and policy (i.e. EU 2020) should be established and TNC should be more results-oriented; that future period needs coordination and initiative from the side of DG EMPL and that LNs should be linked to national networks to ensure mainstreaming. Last but not least, the participants were informed that the EC proposal for ESF regulation should be ready by 5 October.

Thematic workshops

Four thematic workshops were organized in 2 rounds of parallel sessions (morning and afternoon). The workshops consisted of informal presentations of speakers and facilitated discussion of all participants on various aspects of the workshop topic based on the past and current experience with special focus on added value of TNC and how this can be strengthened in the future. The issues discussed and key points related in particular to current barriers to TNC and challenges for the future are highlighted below:

Workshop 1 - Mutual learning (Learning networks)

Workshop Leader: Sabina Schlinke

Facilitators: Toby Johnson (AEIDL), Hana Smolkova (TNC LN)





Speakers:

- morning round:
 - o IMPART – Cigdem Ipek
 - o ESF - Age LN – Brenda Gietema
 - o EURoma – Inés Cedrón
- afternoon round:
 - o COPIE – Guzman Garcia Gonzalez-Posada
 - o ESF - Age LN – Brenda Gietema
 - o EURoma – Inés Cedrón

Context and objectives:

Learning Networks are a type of transnational cooperation that involves both Managing Authorities and projects. Based on previous (e.g. EQUAL National/European Thematic Networking Groups and COPs) and current LNs, the workshop pulled together lessons regarding policy development and implementation, how this type of cooperation has evolved and how it can be improved in the future.

Main points of discussion for each LN:

- How can LNs support policy and practice?
- How can LNs contribute to a specific thematic or governance issue? (what is the specificity of targeting the activities of each individual LN)
- Are LNs an ideal way/tool to involve stakeholders and promote partnership working?
- How do LNs facilitate mutual learning: what type of activities and methods are proving successful?
- How do LNs ensure impact and added value?
- How can a LN support / inform EU or national/regional policy levels (mainstreaming)?
- What is the role of a LN in the future - what are the current weaknesses/barriers and how these can be improved for the future?

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

- In order to support not only practice but also the policy level and to transfer the ownership of LN's results and achievements it is necessary to involve right from the beginning both policy makers and funders (ESF). The following 5-step approach has proven to work very well:
 1. identify right persons
 2. meet them face to face
 3. agree sensible targets





4. get pledges
 5. follow-up.
- Learning Networks post 2013 should reflect the EU2020 priorities and at the same time they should be well lined down to national thematic networks (incl. employers).
 - For ensuring a successful impact of LN activities the following 4 key elements should not be forgotten:
 1. Collecting sound and reliable information from existing established international/academic etc. sources (e.g. OECD) and through own research (e.g. peer reviews)
 2. Lobbying (if not possible directly it is recommendable to engage a friendly NGO or any recognized institution)
 3. Care about the sustainability
 4. Proper timing to push through the proposals (carefully plan time for addressing EU level, national level etc.)
 - The results achieved by Learning Networks should be capitalized through a single web site managed by the Commission.

Workshop 2 – TNC implementing models

Workshop Leader: Lloyd Broad

Facilitators: Katalin Kolosy (AEIDL), Dyma Švec (TNC LN)

Speakers:

- dedicated approach – EN – Lloyd Broad
- horizontal approach – PL – Hania Kadziela
- mixed approach – CZ – Šárka Mertová
- IDA – DE – Stefan Schulz-Trieglaff

Context and objectives:

During the 2000-2006 programming period TNC in ESF was implemented principally through the EQUAL Community Initiative. This provided Member States with a common framework in terms of the thematic design of the initiative alongside a common timetable and more coordinated support for Member States.

In the current period 2007-2013, Member States and Regions were required to embed TNC into their Operational Programmes, thus giving flexibility and choice in the design, content and format of TNC. To varying degrees of success a wide range of implementation approaches have subsequently been adopted across Europe and the purpose of this workshop was to explore four quite different approaches and examine the advantages and disadvantages of their implementation. Ultimately the workshop aimed to provide participants with some practical examples of different approaches taken to implementation





and offer participants the opportunity to probe and question each in terms of the benefits and added value generated as a result of these approaches.

Main points of discussion for each model:

- What were the key features of this implementation approach?
- How was the approach managed and structured?
- What type of projects did this approach support (size, value, geographical scope, nature of calls for proposals etc)?
- What added value and benefits does this approach generate (including impact and mainstreaming)?
- Is there a link between innovation and transnationality? In case there is, how does this approach support innovation (both at programme and at project level)?
- What were the barriers and challenges of the approach taken?
- What messages and learning should be considered for the next programming period?

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

- Each MS has different needs and thus current and future implementation models should allow flexibility to select the optimal approach reflecting individual needs of MS. Saying that, all MS participating in the workshop agreed that there is a strong need for centralized coordination and support of TNC from EC side.
- Experience with various models of implementation approach in MS confirm that horizontal approach is more demanding in terms of resources and administration needed to implement it (including considerations about transaction costs compared to dedicated approach), however experience indicates that horizontal approach enables promoting innovation through all priority axis and even though projects are relatively small TNC enables to build capacities of project promoters to design/enter more substantial projects.
- Ability to capture, validate and disseminate added value of TNC projects to policy makers, project promoters but also internally to employees of MAs and IBs is critical to improve motivation and readiness to enter/implement TNC. There is a need to clarify further how to approach added value of TNC and understand ways how to monitor and evaluate TNC.
- TNC should address concrete problems and give concrete solutions to promote employability, inclusion and other priorities within the ESF context. To this end it is critical to utilize TNC to tackle real issues of beneficiaries through innovative action and improved policy steer.





Workshop 3 – Territorial cooperation

Workshop leader: Christian Rabergh

Facilitators: Armelle LEDAN (AEIDL), Howard Harding (TNC LN)

Speakers:

- Baltic Sea strategy – Christian Rabergh
- Twinning arrangements – Fabienne Beaumelou
- MetropolisNET – Enikö Soujon
- LLP – Thematic Network on Inclusion – Rebecca Fothergill

Context and objectives:

Transnational cooperation is not an exclusive issue of ESF. There are programmes financed by other means than ESF which support – among others – the TNC. The workshop provided examples of interesting transnational cooperation financed by other means than ESF and draw lessons transferrable also to ESF programmes.

Main points of discussion for each type of cooperation:

- What does this cooperation look like?
- What are the rationale, objective and purpose (economic or cultural reasons etc.)?
- How does this work (organization and management aspects, funding and responsibilities)?
- What benefits and added value does it bring in relation to transnationality?
- What are the current barriers and challenges?
- How could these be addressed in the next programming period? (recommendations for the future and ESF)

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

- There are clear but unexploited synergies between ESF TNC and the Lifelong Learning Programme (LLP), both in terms of content and their networks. Thus, there should be 1) proper coordination at EC level (i.e. between DG EMPL and DG EAC) concerning aligning the 2 initiatives (e.g. with regard to eligibility rules) and their networks; 2) institutionalised coordination at LN level by including necessary text in their terms of reference; 3) coordination at MA and/or IB level (e.g. MAs and/or IBs should keep in close touch with the LLP National Agencies); 4) encouragement of strong inter-personal links between staff involved in both ESF TNC and the LLP; 5) use of tools available under the LLP (e.g. a partner search facility) for ESF TNC.
- Territorial cooperation as pursued under the Baltic Sea Strategy is to be encouraged in ESF, in particular in regions which share definable territorial issues (e.g. a common





river such as the Danube). However, the necessary complexity of programme management architecture has to be borne in mind, as well as proper coordination of programming the OPs involved (e.g. including matching/complementary priorities in the OPs of each country in the territorial grouping).

- It appears that ESF national level structures do not recognise European Economic Interest Groupings (EEIGs) as project promoters (and thus eligible for funding) because they fall outside the normal parameters. Since the EEIG legal form was established by EEC legislation precisely for the purpose of promoting cooperation across borders, such entities should be specifically indicated as eligible for funding in ESF TNC Calls for Proposals by MAs and/or IBs.
- Twinning should be stated specifically in either OPs or Calls for Proposals (or both) as an action supported by TNC. Any definition should allow for flexibility (e.g. secondment of staff to transfer know-how, placement of staff to gain knowledge, the length of a twinning action) but make clear that it differs in nature from study visits.
- Results achieved under EQUAL (funded under ESF) appear to have continued in the present programming period, but with support from the LLP. For example, the national thematic network for inclusion established in the UK under EQUAL was a basis for the EU-wide LLLP thematic network on inclusion, while the members of the EEIG MetropolisNet (which gave a presentation at the workshop) came together under the EQUAL programme but have received funding for project only under the LLP. It was therefore felt that ESF had somewhat dropped the ball with such initiatives and that it would be good for it to re-engage with them.

Workshop 4 - Instruments supporting TNC

Workshop Leader: Marketa Pěchoučková

Facilitators: Allen Mercer (AEIDL), Ruth Santos (TNC LN)

Speakers:

- Project level:
 - Partner search options (Partner Search Forums, fishing pools) – Beata Rybicka-Dominiak (in the morning) /Maciej Jamrozik (in the afternoon)
 - Instruments used in past programmes (EQUAL) and ETC – Ruth Santos
 - Instruments used in LLP – Anna Kowalczyk (Foundation for the Development of the Education System)
- OP level – Markéta Pěchoučková:
 - TNC website
 - learning seminars/events delivered by LNs
 - TNC LN
 - contact points
 - ad-hoc group





Context and objectives:

Experience from previous and current programmes has shown that the effectiveness of transnational cooperation very much depends on the quality of the support and tools provided to the actors involved to facilitate the process. The aim of this workshop was to present and review various tools and instruments used in the past and current programming periods to support TNC. The workshop looked at examples not only within ESF but also other transnational initiatives such as the Lifelong Learning Programme (DG Education and Culture) and European Territorial Cooperation (DG Regional Policy) in order to share learning and facilitate synergies.

Main points of discussion for each instrument:

- What is the instrument about?
- What purpose does the instrument serve?
- Who is responsible for the instrument (EU, MS etc. – who develops, finances etc.)?
- Who is involved?
- In practice, how is this instrument supporting transnational cooperation and which instruments should be used also in the future?

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

- Experience from previous and current programmes has shown that the effectiveness of **transnational co-operation** very much **depends on the quality of the support and tools provided to the actors involved** to facilitate the process. Previous experiences like EQUAL shown that the availability of professional programme support services has a decisive impact on the quality of transnational work actions and on its results. The current programming period shows that in many Member States experience on the management and implementation of transnational cooperation was not easily available and therefore need to be further developed and maintained.
- It was acknowledged that **‘preparing’ for transnational cooperation takes time and requires an effort**. Member States such as Sweden have opted to fund a ‘preparation phase’ for the identification of partners and preparation of the Memorandum of Understanding or Agreements.
- There is also a need to ensure the flow of information and communication. There is an important role to play by the **Network of Contact points** in providing up to date information on each MS/Regions on type, scope and form of TNC that is supporting, something essential when working on with different priorities and timetables. However this process should be better structured and organised. There has to be a clear and identified role for the Contact points, an agreed Work programme for the Network and clear commitment from the participating MS/Regions to actively contribute with information and ensure continuity of relevant staff.
- For transnational cooperation to work, the **Commission needs to play a ‘facilitator’ role**. For example, it was suggested that a number of tools can be





developed/managed at EU level to support the implementation of transnational cooperation. These tools are as follows:

- An **easily accessible platform/database** is needed for partner-search. This database should be simple, contained relevant and update information.
- **Partner forums** have an important role to play in supporting the identification of partners and initiating the commitment to collaborate. Current experience has shown the value of 'face to face' discussions between project promoters and the role of 'facilitators' in the discussion to ensure a better partner matching. These matching events should be organised with synchronised calls.
- **Better synergies** need to be sought with **other transnational programmes** such as the Lifelong Learning Programme.

Plenary wrap-up session - messages from 2 rounds of 4 thematic workshops

- see above

Moderator: Florence Gerard (AEIDL)

Speakers: Hana Smolkova, Dyma Švec, Howard Harding, Ruth Santos

TNC Learning network – tools for you

Speakers: Markéta Pěchoučková, Fabienne Beaumellou

The speakers presented in details three main activities of the TNC Learning network – Working papers and Good practice examples (Markéta Pěchoučková) and Training tools (Fabienne Beaumellou). Details are available on www.transnationality.eu.





16 September, 2011

Plenary session

Moderator: Florence Gerard (AEIDL)

Speakers: Tamas Szilárd (Unit F1, DG EMPL); Iva Šolcová (Director of ESF Management Department, Managing Authority of OP Human Resources and Employment, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs of the Czech Republic), Howard Harding (TNC LN facilitator)

Tamas Szilárd in his speech appreciated the establishment of the Working Group on TNC post 2013 (under the ESF Committee Ad-hoc Group on Innovation and Transnational Cooperation) and its contribution to the work of the EC in providing feedback from MS on this specific issue. Further, he briefly outlined main features of the TNC as proposed by the EC in the new programming period: 1) TNC to be compulsory, 2) 3 implementation approaches - common framework/flexible approach/combination, 3) with the common framework the EC will take a strong steering role and there will be an emphasis on outcomes and mainstreaming, 4) for the flexible approach some minimum level support will be available from the EC, 5) there will be incentives for TNC, 6) there will be specific rules on monitoring TNC.

Iva Šolcová informed the audience on the Working Group in greater detail (context, constitution, meetings, current and possible future outputs etc.) and together with Howard Harding briefly presented its **background paper 'Possible implementation modalities for ESF Transnational Cooperation initiatives during the EU Financial Perspective 2014 to 2020'** which was sent to all registered participants before the seminar to give them time to get acquainted with it.

Participants were also encouraged to send their comments to the paper by e-mail by 30 September at the latest.

Workshops

The workshops on Day 2 followed-up discussions of the previous day on TNC added value and barriers/challenges for the future. During almost three hours of facilitated discussions in 4 workshops the participants examined more closely the proposals outlined by DG EMPL in the morning plenary session, and further elaborated on the background paper drafted by the Working Group.

Main points of discussion for each workshop (topics for discussion were identical for all four workshops):

The discussions covered a broad variety of topics related to programming and implementation of TNC (though most of the time available was dedicated to points 1 and 2 below):

1. Models for implementation (General considerations)
2. Implications of a 'common framework' for implementation and management at MS/Regional and EU levels:
 - a) Organisation of Coordinated calls;





- b) Selection of themes for the calls;
 - c) Role of LNs in the coordination of calls;
 - d) Common tools;
 - e) Resources and assistance at EU level/MS;
 - f) General reflections on the Common Framework.
3. Discussion on the 'flexible' approach
 4. Monitoring and evaluating transnational cooperation
 5. Dissemination and Mainstreaming

Main consolidated messages/points from all workshops:

1. Models for implementation (general considerations)

Compulsory TNC in line with EU2020 strategy was seen as a very positive element.

Transnational Cooperation as an obligation should *preferably* apply at the level of each Operational Programme (OP) but in the case of regional OPs, there should be prior agreement with the Member State concerned. Regions should not be compelled to engage in TNC. Promoters in regions that opted out could be provided for through higher-level mechanisms as in DE.

Largely based on the experiences of EQUAL, most views favoured the Common Framework rather than the Flexible Approach. The common framework is seen as the easiest way to manage TNC. The minimum configuration is:

- At least ONE national OP in each MS should contain TNC. There should be flexibility at regional level.
- Each MS should choose at least ONE of the common themes. There is no strong feeling that any of the themes should be compulsory.
- If they wish, as an exception, to also pursue the 'flexible' approach, they can. But they should not opt out of the common framework entirely.

It should be optional whether MAs choose to implement common themes under the Common Framework (CF) or would take a flexible approach.

The "integrated approach" concept needs to be more clarified.

In MS with regional OPs, there is also a great need for a common approach in the choice of the model.

There should be a reduced number of LNs for the future, and they will match EU themes: As a conclusion, the issue is not a question of number of LNs, but rather an issue of better integration and stronger linkages of LNs with policy, projects and national thematic networks; in addition, there must be an increased focus on outputs and results. If there is a coordinated EU approach, links should be automatically stronger. ToRs for LNs need to be clear from the beginning on what their scope is to be and their financing. Horizontal LNs are seen as an optimal tool for training and enhancing mutual exchange of knowledge on TNC.



2. Common framework – implications for implementation and management at national/regional and EU levels

2a. Organisation of coordinated calls

It was confirmed that coordination of CF should be done by the EC.

It would be impossible to manage too a great number of calls. Some participants thought that there could be for example two calls per theme during the programming period (7 years), others would welcome 3 to 4 calls. MAs should publish their own calls, but they should be co-ordinated as far as possible as regards timing, size and duration of projects, basic eligibility rules etc. The differences in national eligibility rules will have to be coped with as before. Applicants should have enough time to react and respond to the calls.

There was some difference of opinion on whether it would be better to have a limited number of calls with each covering a number of themes or whether there should be more staggered calls with each devoted to a single theme. However, it was agreed that as soon as it was possible, a work programme for calls should be agreed for the first half of the new programming period (2014-2017).

Coordinated calls should be supported by transnational yearly events, in particular during the preparatory phase.

2b. Selection of themes

The Commission will propose to the ESF Committee once ESF Regulation is adopted. The common themes to be proposed for the CF should be known by the end of 2012 at the latest.

The MAs should be involved. The themes might be (1) of pan-European importance; (2) linked to the Europe 2020 flagships as expressed in the NRPs; (3) proposed by MSs. Even activity under the flexible approach should be related to the Europe 2020 priorities.

The MS would favour a formulation sufficiently general, at the level of ESF regulation priorities. The EC will sound out MSs on which common themes should be proposed to ensure that there is sufficient interest and uptake.

It might be advisable to review the themes halfway through the programming period to adjust to changing policy objectives.

There was an agreement on the need to select common themes. There was however, a slight tension between the proposed number of six themes that reflected the Commission's capacity to provide effective support and the selection of more themes that might then ensure that there would be a better chance of a match between these European themes and the priorities of national and regional OPs.

2c. Role of LNs in co-ordination of calls

The EC technical assistance was perceived as useful and better adapted to the coordination role; the role of LNs in coordinated calls might include:

- Support and advice in the design of the calls;
- Support and advice on content issues;
- Linking with national networks working on the same/similar themes;





- Facilitation in partner fora.

2d. Common tools

A partner search function is essential; participants have agreed the following tools to be important:

- A regularly updated database of projects;
- Partner fora to match projects supported by skilled facilitators;
- A European Platform with a web site providing information about calls and also publications/guides/advice to assist MAs/IBs/Projects in developing their transnational activities. This platform would also host the database of projects.

In addition, funding of a preparatory partnership-building period should be considered (e.g. attendance at partner forum).

2e. Resources & assistance at EU/MS level

The European Commission should establish a Technical Assistance Unit to support the Common Framework which would:

- Help to organise and coordinate the calls;
- Monitor implementation;
- Support dissemination;
- Evaluate TNC;
- Develop and maintain the common tools described at 2.d) above.

2f. Others

The incentive of 10% should be increased, up to 15% at least. However, the financial nature of the incentive was perceived as not sufficient by some participants; other incentives than money could be used - for instance coaching and training for TNC management.

Social innovation is a separate concept from TNC. It would make a suitable theme for TNC.

3. Flexible approach

It has been agreed that the relevance of the flexible approach option strongly depends on the level of details of the themes chosen in under CF.

The type and extent of EC support to the flexible approach should be different from the one offered under the CF.

The participants' views on this issue varied though in general it can be said that the flexible approach is perceived as similar to the current model, which is considered as unsatisfactory; thus the option is seen rather as an exception. Some participants felt that choosing this option should be justified on a case-by-case basis (however it is not clear who would decide) and it should not qualify for the incentive of a higher intervention rate.

In addition, there is a risk with regard to minimum intervention rates that this approach could negatively influence the robustness of the CF.





On the other hand, flexible approach could be justified in cases when it is necessary to ensure the continuity of support for important national priorities that could be left apart in the CF.

It was also noted that any initiative of MAs or MSs to work more closely (e.g. in the Baltic Sea Region) would most likely have to fall under the flexible approach; the MAs involved could therefore not rely on strong support from the EC and would have to provide the driving force behind any initiatives.

The strongest supporters of this approach (practitioners – IBs, TA) insisted that the diversity of projects should remain at the discretion of MAs.

4. Monitoring & evaluation

The more “result oriented approach” found a positive echo in the audience.

We should measure results, and try to measure impact. It was noted that (1) England is evaluating the added value of TNC; (2) Flanders obliges projects to use a self-evaluation tool; (3) the LLL programme’s European thematic networks are based at national level; they collect good practice but do not assess impact; (4) monitoring is easier if focused on a small number of big projects; (5) The German IdA (Integration durch Austausch) programme has shown clear quantitative results (60% of participants into work or training), but not all transnational projects have such easily measurable results.

LN participants insisted on the necessity to use many tools and soft indicators currently developed by various LNs (especially Gender) for the next programming period.

It was felt that direct monitoring and evaluation of projects should not be part of the portfolio of LN activities given the burden that this would entail; however, both should have a role in consolidating monitoring and evaluation information at a higher EU level.

There should be EU-level evaluation of the added value of TNC, done in collaboration with the MS ESF units (which should be given the capacity to do this). The evaluation framework should be established at the start.

5. Dissemination and mainstreaming

Dissemination and mainstreaming should be built into TNC CF projects themselves. However, it was also noted that LNs and the EC must have a role in disseminating and mainstreaming project results at a higher EU level.

Closing panel

Moderator: Florence Gerard (AEIDL)

Speakers: Tamas Szilárd; Iva Šolcová; Susanne Strehle

Florence Gerard briefly presented consolidated main messages from the 4 workshops - see above. The messages were then commented by the speakers.





The ultimate message from the second day of the seminar is that the lively and interesting workshops pointed up the need for more debate and discussion on the implementation arrangements for the Common Framework and, by default, the Flexible Approach.

Evaluation of the seminar

Number of participants: 67¹

Number of respondents: 30 out of 67 i.e. 44.8%

For evaluation respondents used the following rating scale:

1 = very poor; 2 = poor; 3 = sufficient; 4 = good; 5 = excellent

On Day 1 out of the 30 respondents:

- 14 people participated in workshops 1²
- 16 people participated in workshops 2
- 11 people participated in workshops 3
- 14 people participated in workshops 4

Evaluation questions:

1) *The clarity and relevance of workshop presentations and discussions on Day 1:*

- 7 or 23.3% of respondents as excellent
- 17 or 56.7% of respondents as good
- 6 or 20% of respondents as sufficient

Main comments:

- Different methods presented, gave good and useful comments from the group,
- Very relevant, clearly structured, smart presentations – served as a good basis for discussion.
- Clear and understandable topics, argued discussion.
- Good moderation and facilitation.
- Difficult to generate key messages, just shared approaches

2) *The clarity and relevance of topics and discussions on Day 2:*

- 9 or 30% of respondents as excellent
- 13 or 43.4% of respondents as good
- 7 or 23.3% of respondents as sufficient
- 1 or 3.3% of respondents as poor

Main comments:

- Interesting discussions but a lot of questions remain.

¹ All seminar participants except for facilitators

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



- Very useful discussion - chance to share ideas/suggestions/critical aspects from the point of view of TNC practitioners
- Good moderation and facilitation
- The focus was rather on bureaucratic aspects than on the needs of project promoters.
- Difficult to know to what extent is there a room for changes in the EC proposal
- Final panel discussion did not reflect many points discussed in workshops
- The suggestions of the group were too vague; we could have been more precise.

3) *The approach/ methodology of the workshops on Day 1:*

- 3 or 10% of respondents as excellent
- 19 or 63.4% of respondents as good
- 7 or 23.3% of respondents as sufficient
- 1 or 3.3% of respondents as poor

Main comments:

- Working with posters (easyflip) was a good idea – it gave a good overview.
- Well structured, interactive, great generation of ideas and sharing experience
- The sessions were too long.
- More participative methods should be used.

4) *The approach/ methodology of the workshops on Day 2*

- 6 or 20% of respondents as excellent
- 14 or 46.7% of respondents as good
- 7 or 23.3% of respondents as sufficient
- 2 or 6.7% of respondents as poor
- 1 or 3.3% of respondents as very poor

Main comments:

- Very structured and narrow discussion topics
- Participants got actively involved, interactive, opened and focused discussion
- Good role of facilitators and visible outputs of discussion
- The sessions were too long.
- More chaotic than the 1st day
- More participative methods should be used.

5) *The value of workshops in terms of what I learned*

- 9 or 30% of respondents as excellent
- 12 or 40% of respondents as good
- 8 or 26.7% of respondents as sufficient
- 1 or 3.3% of respondents as poor

Main comments:

- I have learned a lot – I am quite new in the field.
- Very useful to hear about problems and views of other MS
- Coffee breaks and dinner were very useful for networking





- Opportunity to get familiar with the EC proposal
- It has updated my knowledge of the subject matter.

6) *The quality of the logistics*

- 14 or 46.7% of respondents as excellent
- 14 or 46.7% of respondents as good
- 2 or 6.6% of respondents as sufficient

Main comments:

- Was good but time schedule should be more carefully kept to
- The space for the workshops was not ideal.
- Lack of the flexibility of the staff from the hotel.

