



CONFERENCE REPORT

1. Participation	1
2. Plenary sessions.....	2
3. Workshop 1: “Learning” (monitoring, evaluation, mutual learning, etc.).....	4
3.1 Presentations.....	4
3.2 Discussions.....	5
4. Workshop 2: ESF Complementarity & coordination with other EU policy instruments...	6
4.1 Presentations.....	6
4.2 Discussion	7
5. Workshop 3: More effective ESF.....	8
5.1 Presentations.....	8
5.2 Discussions.....	9
6. Workshop 4 Priorities and added value of ESF	12
6.1 Presentations.....	12
6.2 Discussions.....	12
7. Speakers and pannelists.....	14

1. Participation

The conference took place in the European Commission's Charlemagne building in Brussels. Not counting Commission staff members five hundred persons from all EU Member States and from outside the EU, registered. Approximately 450 persons attended the one and a half day conference. The lists of the registered participants are given in [annex](#).

Country	Total ¹	Of which registration per workshop			
		WS 1 – “Learning” (monitoring, evaluation, mutual learning, etc..)	WS2 - ESF Complementarity & coordination with other EU policy instruments	WS 3 – More effective ESF	WS 4 – Priorities and added value of the ESF
Austria	6	1	2		3
Belgium²	193	26	40	26	86
Bulgaria	6		1		5
Cyprus	4	1	1		1
Czech Republic	12	5	1	2	3
Denmark	4	1	2		1
Estonia	9	3	1	1	3
Finland	7	1	1	2	2
France	15	2	2	2	8
Germany	43	5	5	14	16
Greece	5	1	2		2

¹ These are the numbers as recorded in the conference registration database.

² The figure for Belgium include a large number of persons representing institutions with an interest in EU affairs and based in Belgium. They also include those European Commission officials who had an active role at the conference (as speaker, chair or discussant).



Country	Total ¹	Of which registration per workshop			
		WS 1 – “Learning” (monitoring, evaluation, mutual learning, etc..)	WS2 - ESF Complementarity & coordination with other EU policy instruments	WS 3 – More effective ESF	WS 4 – Priorities and added value of the ESF
Hungary	8	1	2	1	4
Ireland	3	1			1
Italy	36	12	7	4	13
Latvia	4			3	1
Lithuania	8	3	2	1	2
Luxembourg	3	1		1	1
Malta	4		1	1	2
Netherlands	9	1		2	6
Poland	36	7	10	9	9
Portugal	6	1	1		4
Romania	7	2		1	2
Slovakia	7	2	1	2	2
Slovenia	7	1	2	1	3
Spain	18	1	4	5	7
Sweden	16	6	2	1	7
United Kingdom	18	3	2	2	8
USA	3	1	1	1	
other	4	2			1
Grand Total	501	91	93	82	203

2. Plenary sessions

The different speeches and interventions of the plenary, including the opening and closing, session and the video recordings can be accessed by clicking on the following links:

23 JUNE 2010

Moderator: Lenia Samuel
 Deputy Director General, Employment, Social Affairs & Equal Opportunities

Opening Session

- [László Andor](#)
 Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs & Inclusion
- Maravillas Rojo Torrecilla
 Secretary General for Employment
 Minister of Work & Immigration, Spain
- [Pervenche Berès](#)
 Chair of the Employment Committee, European Parliament

Coffee Break

Plenary Session: ESF Contribution to the 2020 strategy

In this plenary session the panellists will be exploring the links the future ESF should have to the overarching EU policy objectives & notably to Europe 2020.



-
- Panellists**
- [Daniel Tarschys](#)
Professor of Political Science & Public Administration
Stockholm University, Sweden
 - [Xavier Prats-Monné](#)
Director, Employment, Lisbon Strategy, International Affairs
DG Employment, Social Affairs & Equal Opportunities
 - [Jørgen Rønne](#)
Chairman, Social Affairs Committee, Business Europe
 - Józef Niemiec
Confederal Secretary, European Trade Union Confederation
 - [Conny Reuter](#)
President, Social Platform
-

- Discussant**
- Thomas Bender
Acting Director ESF, Coordination
DG Employment, Social Affairs & Equal Opportunities
-

Debate with participants

Day 2: 24 June 2010

- Moderator:** Peter Stub-Jorgensen
Director ESF, Monitoring of Corresponding National Policies II
DG Employment, Social Affairs & Equal Opportunities
-

Workshops Feedback Session

The chairs of the four workshops held the previous afternoon, summarise the contributions & ensuing debates

Debate with participants
led by moderator

Coffee Break

2 views of the future

- [Brian Burgoon](#)
Senior lecturer political science department, Amsterdam School for Social Science Research,
University of Amsterdam, Netherlands
 - [Pascale Gruny](#)
Permanent rapporteur on the European Social Fund to the Employment Committee
President of the European Parliament Working Group on the European Social Fund
-

Debate with participants
led by moderator

Closing session

- Overview of the conference
[Robert Verrue](#)
-



DG Employment, Social Affairs & Equal Opportunities

- The way forward

[László Andor](#)

Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs & Inclusion

3. Workshop 1: “Learning” (monitoring, evaluation, mutual learning, etc.)

In this session speakers and participants were asked to focus on how to maximise or facilitate learning in the formulation and implementation of ESF actions. Another point of reflection was what the role of the Commission should be in this and how it could facilitate mutual learning.

[Workshop 1 “Learning” \(monitoring, evaluation, mutual learning, etc..\)](#)

This session is about how to maximise or facilitate learning in the formulation & implementation of ESF actions & about the role of the Commission in this & in facilitating mutual learning.

Room Sicco Mansholt

Chair	Antonella Schulte-Braucks Head of Evaluation & Impact Assessment Unit DG Employment, Social Affairs & Equal Opportunities
Panellists	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Jacques Toulemonde Partner & co-founder of Euréval, France• Herta Tödting-Schönhofer Director, Metis GmbH, Vienna, Austria• Carolyn Heinrich Professor, La Follette School of Public Affairs, University of Wisconsin Madison, USA• Göran Brulin Senior analyst, Swedish Agency for Economic & Regional Growth Professor, University of Linköping, Sweden Sven Jansson National Coordinator "Evaluation & Monitoring" Swedish ESF Council, Sweden
Discussant	Robert Walker Professor of Social Policy, Deputy Head of Department Social Policy & Social Work, University of Oxford

3.1 Presentations

There were four presentations:

- Dr Jacques Toulemonde referred to work prepared for the Commission to make proposals on how to better use evaluations for learning purposes;



- Dr Göran Brulin and Dr Sven Jansson explained the system set-up in Sweden;
- Dr Carolyn Heinrich built on her experience in evaluating the US Workforce Investment act to explore the key challenges and prospects in evaluating active labour market policies and ESF-funded schemes and feeding results back into the policy-making cycle;
- Dr Herta Tödting-Schönhofer built on the experience evaluating EQUAL to formulate five recommendations on how to improve learning from evaluations.

3.2 Discussions

The workshop identified a number of challenges, key messages to consider and formulated a number of recommendations for the future.

Data collection and storage: Estimating short- and long-term effects of ESF interventions is impossible without good data, including data covering a longer period of time. Yet, there is often a lack of reliable data and information comparable across several operational programmes and Member States. Data collection can not be organised ex-post. Therefore the workshop identified a clear need to build in evaluations and monitoring systems before programme implementation. This requires a consensus about data collection needs and standards. To ensure comparability, ideally, the Commission could identify a limited number of common indicators and provide methodological guidance for data collection and storage standards. The workshop also noted that routine monitoring data alone will never be sufficient. There is a need to conduct surveys and link up with administrative data.

Learning from evaluation findings: While much progress has been achieved promoting an evaluation culture in all Member States, evaluations are sometimes ritual and symbolic. Those evaluations are carried out in response to a regulatory requirement linked to the programming cycle and do not necessarily answer to given information needs. This may be explained to some extent by the fact that there is still relatively little demand for evaluations and because the political ownership of evaluations is rather limited. Experience shows that even well conducted evaluations with clear conclusions in a well written final report do not automatically lead to learning. In practice, findings are often confined to a small group of actors. Moreover, evaluation findings rarely speak for themselves. Learning from evaluations therefore requires better dissemination strategies and engaging policy makers with a view to develop ownership. Part of these strategies should include the interpretation of the findings through dialogue with stakeholders. The Commission should provide incentives for learning and knowledge communities in which evaluation findings can be discussed and interpreted. These learning and knowledge communities should also identify concrete knowledge gaps which will then be addressed by impact evaluations. The Commission should facilitate a clustering of evaluations across several MS.

Using impact evaluations for performance management: Net impacts need to be measured over relatively long periods of time. The workshop suggested that a number of years are required. The techniques available to measure net impacts are demanding in terms of data availability. They are methodologically complex and need to focus on very specific questions. Therefore, the workshop noted a tension between performance management of a broad instrument such as an ESF programme and impact evaluation. Impact evaluations can not be used for performance management but are useful at the stage of programme design.



4. Workshop 2: ESF Complementarity & coordination with other EU policy instruments

The focus of this workshop was on how the ESF should relate to other EU policies in order to ensure coordination and complementarity. The workshop was chaired by Peter Berkowitz (Head of unit of the conception, forward studies and impact assessment unit in the Directorate General for Regional Policy).

Workshop 2 ESF Complementarity & coordination with other EU policy instruments

This session will explore how the ESF should relate to other EU policy instruments in order to avoid overlaps, ensure complementarity. *Room Lord Jenkins*

Chair	Peter Berkowitz Head of Conception, forward studies & impact assessment Unit, DG Regional Policy
Panellists	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• László Herczog Expert, former Minister of Employment & Social Affairs, Hungary• Kadri Uustal Counsellor, Economic & Financial Affairs Permanent Representation of Estonia to the EU• Duarte Rodrigues Deputy Coordinator, NSRF Observatory, Portugal• Dianne Blank Assistant Director, Education, Workforce & Income Security U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO), USA
Discussant	Hélène Clark Director, Lifelong Learning: policies & programme, DG Education & Culture

4.1 Presentations

- Laszlo Hertzog highlighted the need to simplify procedures to increase the focus on results and suggested a number of ways to accelerate the funding process. He raised the question of whether some of the provisions in the general regulation for structural funds were inappropriate for the ESF.
- Katri Uustal made a strong argument for an integrated approach using the example of combining revenue and infrastructure expenditure to deliver training. In her view, there was a need for a strong central pillar to pull policies together.
- Duarte Rodrigues argued that integration is a cornerstone of development policy and is important at all levels and all times during the process of developing and implementing policy
- Dianne Blank presented the US experience where all employment policies had been pulled together into a one stop shop. Interestingly, funding streams remain separate but beneficiaries have one single access point to programmes.



In responding Ms H el ene Clark drew attention to the need to go beyond the question of the ERDF but look at questions of LLL, CIP, EGF, Integration Fund, rural development. She stressed that there are a range of different approaches to complementarity and highlighted the difference between a top-down (from policy objectives) and bottom-up (defined by needs on the ground). She drew attention to the fact that even in the current situation integration didn't always work on the ground.

4.2 Discussion

There was a clear view that the questions of coordination and complementarity were important to both the visibility and effectiveness of EU interventions. There is a need to build on past experience and in this respect both EQUAL and LEADER were mentioned. It was a complex discussion reflecting the different starting points of participants:

At national and EU level, coordination and complementarity are often seen as questions of how to organise different policies and instruments in a way that provides visibility and clarity of objectives within the overall framework (Europe 2020). But the issue of the organisation at EU level was not much discussed as there seemed to be a consensus on the need for a strategic framework.

At Member State level the focus was more on the concrete organisation of different policies in a specific context to ensure effective and simple delivery. Complementarity and coordination done at EU level should not be regarded as rigid framework offered to MS to deliver policies and should not hamper flexible solutions. There is also a need to put in place systems that allow space for local innovation.

For beneficiaries, it is about putting together projects from a range of different funding streams to meet their concrete needs. Most of the discussion focused on concrete questions related to effectiveness and delivery. A key message is to keep it simple:

- Any new system which replaces the existing one should not be more complicated;
- Procedures should be user friendly to enhance implementation of all funds;
- Use more technical assistance as a tool for creating more synergy between funds and getting more complementarity; targeted to enhance partnership;
- There remains a need for some common rules.

Another issue is the dual legal basis of the ESF in its double function of supporting employment policies and contributing to cohesion policy. Views of organising complementarity depended on the perspective taken (more placed-based or more people based). The possibilities are:

- "One policy, one instrument" – each fund supports policies which are complementary (e.g. education for ESF, innovation for ERDF)
- Multifund (mix of different instruments) – same policy supported through different funds



- Cross-financing (a certain amount of funds could address other policy needs)

5. Workshop 3: More effective ESF

This workshop looked more specifically at the delivery systems & proportionality.

Workshop 3: More effective ESF

This workshop will look more specifically at the delivery systems & proportionality.

room Jean Durieux

Chair	Santiago Loranca-Garcia Head of Belgium, France & Slovakia Unit DG Employment, Social Affairs & Equal Opportunities
Panellists	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Michael Wiseman Professor of Public Policy, The George Washington University, USA• Alessandra Tomai Ministry of Labour, Health & Social Policy, Italy• Paweł Choraży Director, Department for European Social Fund Management Ministry of Regional Development, Poland• Iva Šolcová Director, Ministry of Labour & Social Affairs, Czech Republic• Louis Vervloet Director, ESF-Agency Flanders, Belgium
Discussant	Manuela Geleng Head of Germany, Austria & Slovenia Unit DG Employment, Social Affairs & Equal Opportunities

5.1 Presentations

The workshop started by two presentations. The presentations were made by:

- Mrs Alessandra Tomai about the main problems faced by the ESF. Her starting point was that the current focus on delivery systems implies an administrative burden not always justified by the objective of “sound financial management” while at the same time the socio-economic crisis highlights obstacles in the management of ESF programmes.
- Dr Michael Wiseman who presented the description of the functioning of a result oriented system in the United States. It gave a flavour of what could be a result based system



The subjects and issues raised were then further discussed by the panel of experts who besides the two speakers also included representatives of ESF managing authorities in Belgium (Mr Louis Vervloet), Czech Republic (Mrs Iva Šolcová) and Poland (Mr Paweł Choraży).

5.2 Discussions

Two main issues were discussed during the workshop:

1. How to move the ESF from an input oriented approach to a more output / result oriented financial instrument?
2. How to make the ESF simpler, more flexible and more efficient?

Moving towards an output or result based management: There was a consensus on the need to move towards a performance-oriented system. Such a system could be organised not only at programme level but also at priority and certainly at project level. However, it will take time to implement it and require building capacity of all the stakeholders (including the Commission). Some actions should be launched immediately across the partnership. It was also mentioned that what already exists should be capitalised upon. There are some experiences already present in the European Union (DE, PL, BE) and there is also a community of practice on result based management. However there was also the feeling that this move should be carefully organised. Performance-oriented systems are probably suitable for standard activities but a too general or too systematic application could endanger some types of activities (for instance innovative activities, complex support packages, ...).

Regarding the types of performance measures to use for payments (outputs, results or impacts) there was also a consensus on the use of outputs: results are more difficult to measure and impacts are delayed in time and are influenced by many external factors.

There was also a warning on the risk of creaming at project level: namely to go to the easiest participants in order to be sure to reach the agreed performance level at the expense of the hardest to help even though they would have been more in need of ESF support.

The possibility to establish a kind of performance reserve provoked mixed feelings. Speakers gave some indications on how to ensure the success of such a reserve. The ground has to be prepared (well in advance) by a definition of the criteria that will be used. In order to assess performance, data should be easily assessable in order not to create an additional risk in terms of audit.

In terms of conditionality there was a widespread feeling that it should be a positive conditionality. The focus should rather be on the carrot than on the stick, go for bonuses instead of sanctions.

Simplification: A number of lessons can be drawn from the 2007-2013 programming. The positive effects of simplifications are only now starting to be felt. One lesson is that any successful simplification requires a lot of preparatory work. Once understood it is attractive for beneficiaries and it allows concentrating on performance.

There are high expectations for a more pro active role from the Commission to ensure the legal certainty of the simplifications. There is also a need to further disseminate experience



and knowledge that has been gathered. Currently there is a kind of gap in the partnership principle in this respect.

Linked to this is the need to ensure better communication not only for those implementing simplifications but also for those auditing them. There were examples of national auditors not fully aware of the rules and their implications on their work.

Regarding the scope for further simplification, the message was to concentrate on the implementation of the standard scale of unit costs and lumps sums and to define some standard methodologies to calculate them. Now that we have gained experience with flat rate for indirect costs suggestions were also made for introducing a single rate for indirect costs instead of a maximum.

A key consensual message was that unification of the rules does not mean simplification. ESF specificities have to be taken into account and actually in many of the cases common rules between ESF and ERDF are not helpful, but on the contrary complicate the work of managers and beneficiaries.

The proposal of the Commission for the revision of the Financial Regulation, i.e. to suppress one authority by merging Managing Authority and Certifying Authority, was viewed as real progress. However it could be a limited progress if it means that there would be additional tasks of control for the Managing Authority. So it would be an illusion of an institutional simplification.

It was also proposed in the future to develop the use of micro credits for micro projects and financial engineering instruments to support NGOs.

Administrative burden: Some examples were cited where the application of EU rules is hampered by national rules or the way EU rules are interpreted at national level. The advice of the group was that national rules or their interpretation should not be more complex than EU rules.

In addition national rules should be harmonised with EU rules. But this requires that EU rules are defined early in order to give time to Member States to adapt their own rules.

Audit burden: The audit should not be the core issue of all the discussions between the Commission and the national authorities. Two main advices were given:

- The single audit principle should be implemented in practice. It is foreseen but not applied. There are still cases where for a given project the same controls are repeated several times.
- More responsibility for auditing operations should be given to the Member States providing that international audit standards are respected. The role of the Commission should be to verify the quality of audits.

Enhance legal security: There were some comments to ensure that there is more consistency in the interpretation of the rules. Rules should be stable and not changed constantly. Nevertheless, rules could be changed provided the changes are communicated sufficiently in



advance. The rules should be defined very early so that everybody knows when and how they should be applied.

The example of the compliance assessment was quoted. The compliance assessment was generally felt as a step forward but in the end it became problematic because:

- it did not provide the assurance to national authorities or the legal security intended;
- it did not reduce the audit burden.

The Commission was advised to organise more pilots, to test the solutions and proposals for the new rules before they are formally proposed and adopted.

Application of the proportionality principle at programme and at project level: Proportionality should not mean that the quality standards of the systems are different. Actually they should be the same across the OPs. However not everything can and should be the same for everybody. The terminology was changed and instead of proportionality the wording "intelligent differentiation" was used. Some types of operations simply require different types of controls and implementation rules. Intelligent differentiation should allow adapting the rules to the specificities of projects. Obviously for small projects some of the requirements like document retention could be examined.

More effective partnership: Many interventions underlined the need for trust: the Commission does not sufficiently trust the Member States and the various institutions and partners involved in the implementation of the ESF.

The allocation of responsibilities between the Commission and Member States should be clarified.

In order to strengthen the partnership two issues were mentioned: more capacity building and better communication between all the stakeholders.

Summary: the key notions for the future were: go for outputs, differentiation, bonuses, clear rules set in advance, clear separation of functions between the Commission and Member States and trust.

Every speaker gave also a final advice for the future:

- don't promise too much, deliver;
- think of it as an experiment; know what questions you want to answer;
- think twice, act as soon as possible, don't be afraid of changes and communicate them to the field;
- ESF is about helping people and changing people's life!



6. Workshop 4 Priorities and added value of ESF

In this session speakers and participants were asked to focus on the added value of ESF in its present interventions and to reflect upon the priorities ESF should pursue in the future with the objective of optimising this added value.

Workshop 4: Priorities & added value of ESF Workshop ([video1](#), [video 2](#) – [list of participants](#))

This workshop would look more specifically than the second plenary session into possible priorities & scope of ESF & linked to that the question of added value

Room Alcide de Gasperi

Chair	Thomas Bender acting Director ESF, Coordination DG Employment, Social Affairs & Equal Opportunities
Panellists	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Aurelio Fernandez Lopez Chair, Social Protection Committee• Tom Bevers Vice Chair, Employment Committee• Philip J. O'Connell (paper – presentation) programme coordinator of labour market research & head of Social Research Division, ESRI• Ágota Scharle (paper – presentation) executive partner, Budapest Institute for Policy Analysis Ltd.
Discussant	Radek Maly Head of Employment Analysis Unit DG Employment, Social Affairs & Equal Opportunities

6.1 Presentations

There were two presentations by researchers.

- Dr Philip J. O'Connell outlined the findings of research on continuing vocational education and training and sets out their implications for priority setting and added value in policy interventions.
- Dr Ágota Scharle discussed more specifically the issue of the added value.

In their interventions, Mr Aurelio Fernandez Lopez (Chair of the Social Protection Committee) and Mr Tom Bevers (Vice-chair of the Employment Committee), took a more political view on the subject matter, reflecting the ongoing discussions in their respective committees.

6.2 Discussions

The added Value of the ESF: There is a clear consensus on the policy relevance and the volume effect of the fund. The discussion has also put forward other sources of added value:



the ESF brings some support to those who are not heard (most disadvantaged people, minorities, migrants...) or those without a voice (future generation). There is also a global agreement on the added value of the ESF in terms of transparency and governance. The policy spill over in terms of innovation, mutual learning and transnationality was also widely acknowledged, but the ESF does not fulfil its full potential. Some participants argued for a Community initiative for innovation and transnationality as the best way to strengthen these dimensions, but there were some disagreements about this idea. However, many participants called upon the Commission to play a more active role in the future. Mutual learning should be reinforced in the ESF and linked to the policy debate in Council, including at ministerial level.

The future priorities of the ESF: One message was very clear from the different speakers - the priorities are already well identified in the Europe 2020 strategy and the integrated guidelines. The ESF will be crucial for the good implementation of Europe 2020. Its role has been particularly emphasized in the Employment Guidelines. The ESF should be active in the three following fields: Employment, Social inclusion, Education. More specifically:

- Enhancing employment rates, de-segmentation of the labour market, identification of needs (in particular green jobs) and transition to a low carbon economy (the ESF should be actively part of the solution). The investment in continuous vocational education and training is seen as a central part of the response to the crisis. However, training is highly stratified (people with higher skills are more likely to receive training, the inactive, migrants, temporary workers less). Member States and the ESF can play an important and cost-effective role in bridging the information gap which characterises continuing vocational education and training (monitoring trends, collection and dissemination, guidance services).
- Social inclusion: The Europe 2020 Strategy presents 3 important innovations. Firstly, social inclusion is at the centre of the strategy - growth should be inclusive. Secondly, the strategy stresses the enhanced coordination between EU policies and national policies through EU and national targets. Thirdly, there is an European quantified target to reduce poverty, (without changing the competencies between EU and MS but working together more closed toward a common objective). Some participants questioned the idea of the ESF as the most adapted instrument to fight poverty and pointed out the risk for the ESF of losing its core identity linked to employment. But is there a real choice? Many participants argued that we need to invest more in those with highest needs in order to achieve in particular our target in terms of employment participation.
- Gender equality should also remain a cornerstone of the ESF priorities in the future.
- Institutional capacity building: In the "new" Member States, this priority is seen as highly relevant, in order to improve the general efficiency of the public administration and to strengthen civil society. Some participants argued for specific provisions which ensure a better partnership between the public administration and the civil society including in the "older" Member States.



Governance of the Europe 2020 Strategy: There is still a lot of uncertainty on this point. Could we use the EU targets and the national targets in the programming and the reporting of the ESF? Is it possible to use them and to give enough room to regional and local needs? The NRP could be the place for setting objectives (identification of national bottlenecks, national targets...), but they are not the adequate tools for reporting and monitoring the articulation between the policy priorities and the ESF OPs. Should we foresee a separate reporting? Many questions were raised without definitive answers.

Conditionality: In order to ensure a better articulation between policy priorities and the use of the ESF, some participants proposed that payments should be made if the EU policy objectives are really implemented (example of early retirement and active ageing). Funds should be a policy instrument fostering change. There were mixed reactions to this proposal. Many participants had reservations, using the following arguments: (i) Employment and social policies are mainly national competencies, so we should be cautious about conditionality; (ii) the ESF is only one part of a large policy mix. Thus it could be difficult to design a fair system of conditionality. (iii) The volume of the funds is not sufficiently high to be a good incentive.

7. Speakers and pannelists

László Andor is a Hungarian economist, holder of a Ph.D in economics, associate professor. Since 10 February, 2010 he has been European Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion. Prior to this, he has been member of the board of directors of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) in London, where he represents Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Croatia. He is also an Associate professor at the Economics Department at the Corvinus University of Budapest (currently on unpaid leave) and at the King Sigismund College (currently on unpaid leave). He has participated in a number of international research projects like the European Union supported project for European Economic Policy Co-operation (EPOC 2002-2005), or the UK co-funded project on economic policy and combating poverty (2001-2002).

Thomas Bender, PhD, is a political scientist who joined the European Commission in 1994 to work on education and training programmes and policies. He has been with the Directorate General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities for more than 10 years. He programmed and managed structural interventions funded by the European Social Fund (ESF) in Ireland, England, Northern Ireland, Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria and the Netherlands, and was in charge of the pre-accession instrument IPA in Croatia. He was also in charge of analysing national employment policies in the context of the European Employment Strategy as well as national strategic reports on social inclusion and protection within the Open Method of Coordination. Since 2007, he is Head of Unit in charge of ESF co-ordination and since August 2009 also Acting Director for ESF Coordination, Directorate General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities, European Commission.

Pervenche Berès is the Chairwoman of the Employment and Social Affairs Committee and a substitute member in the Economic and Monetary affairs committee in the new Parliament elected in 2009. She has been appointed rapporteur of the temporary committee on the



financial, economic and social crisis. Previously she was Chairwoman of the Economic and Monetary affairs Committee (2004-2009), head of the French socialist delegation and vice-President of the Socialist group in the European Parliament (June 1997-June 2004). From December 1999 to October 2000, she was the Vice-president of the European Parliament delegation to the Convention in charge of elaborating a European Union Charter of fundamental rights. She was also a member of the European Convention in charge of drafting a Constitution for Europe from February 2002 to July 2003. Graduated from the "Institut d'Etudes Politiques" in Paris, she worked from 1981 to 1988 and from 1993 to 1994 as an administrator in the French National Assembly; from 1988 to 1992 she was an advisor for International and European affairs to Laurent Fabius, Speaker of the National Assembly. Pervenche Berès was a member of the City council of Sèvres (Département des Hauts-de-Seine) between 2001-2008.

Peter Berkowitz is head of unit of the conception, forward studies and impact assessment unit in the Directorate General for Regional Policy in the European Commission. From 2002 and 2007, he was assistant to Dirk Ahner, currently Director General for Regional Policy. During his career in the Commission he has worked on regional policy, enlargement, CAP reform, rural development and environmental questions. Before joining the Commission he taught politics at Oxford University and worked on the political economy of European industrial relations systems.

Tom Bevers is Vice-Chair of the Employment Committee of the European Union (EMCO).

Dianne Blank is an Assistant Director in the Education, Workforce, and Income Security Team of US Government Accountability Office (GAO), which is the investigative arm of the U.S. Congress. With GAO since 1994, her responsibilities include managing a body of work that examines many aspects of U.S. workforce development system, including numerous reviews of the Workforce Investment Act. In her 10 years in this role, she has led teams in producing reports for the U.S. Congress on a broad range of issues including integration of services, performance measurement, and workforce development services to special populations, such as veterans and workers affected by trade.

Göran Brulin is senior analyst at the Swedish Agency for Economic and Regional Growth – Tillväxtverket. He is also professor in local and regional innovations at the University of Linköping. His main research areas cover such topics as on-going evaluation, interactive research, new forms of work and firm organization, entrepreneurship and local and regional development processes. Göran Brulin has also carried out research about rationalization methods, work organisation and the Swedish industrial relations model.

Brian Burgoon received his Ph.D. from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1998, and has been at the University of Amsterdam - where he works as a senior lecturer in the political science department - since Autumn 2000. His research focuses primarily on three projects. The first, "Reimbedding Liberalism: Political and Policy Responses to Economic Globalization," investigates the different policy and political responses to the vagaries of international economic openness -- varying attempts to rebuild the fallen domestic and



international compromises of 'embedded liberalism' of the post-War economic order. The second, "Worlds of Working Time," investigates the politics of working time in industrialized countries, emphasizing the role of macro-political economy struggles that underlie very different working time patterns across OECD countries. And a third project focuses on developments in the political economy of post-Cold War conflict and grand strategy. His work has appeared in a range of book chapters and academic journals, including *International Organization*, *Politics and Society*, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, and *Review of International Studies*. Before coming to the ASSR he taught at Johns Hopkins SAIS, Brandeis University, Harvard, and MIT.

Pawel Choraży is Director of the Department for European Social Fund Management of the Ministry of Regional Development in Poland. He read International Relations and Latin American Studies at University of Warsaw (1998). He graduated from National School of Public Administration (2001). The same year he joined the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, where he worked in different teams responsible for World Bank's Rural Development Programme, pre-accession assistance and preparations of Poland to EU accession in the area of structural funds. Starting from 2004 he became Director responsible for coordination of ESF in Poland and management of two ESF OPs: Human Resources Development and EQUAL Initiative. He is responsible in this programming period for unique Polish ESF OP Human Capital (€11,4 bn). He is also in charge at national level for European Globalization Adjustment Fund and OECD LEED Programme. He was fellow of Robert Bosch Foundation in the Programme for Young Executives from Central and Eastern Europe (2003-2004).

Hélène Clark graduated in Political Sciences and Public Law at the University of Bordeaux (France) and in European Economics at the College of Europe, Bruges (Belgium). She entered the European Commission as an official in 1988. She spent a number of years in DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities, where she was mainly involved in employment policy, in charge successively of EURES and European Employment Services, of the European Employment Strategy, and of the implementation of the European Social Fund in Austria, Germany and Slovenia. Since 1st November 2008, she has been Director in the Directorate General for Education and Culture, responsible for "Lifelong learning: policies and programme".

Aurelio Fernandez Lopez is Chairman of the EU Social Protection Committee since January 2009. He is Adviser of the Secretary of State for Social Security in the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs of Spain since 2004. He is also a High Level Expert of the Spanish Social Security Administration and a Member of the High-Level Task- Force of the Council of Europe on Social Cohesion in Europe, responsible of the Report: "Towards an active, fair and socially cohesive Europe".

Manuela Geleng works at the European Commission, where she is Head of Unit in the Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities. She is responsible for the implementation of European Social Fund programmes and for monitoring employment, social inclusion and social protection policies in Germany, Austria and Slovenia. She has been working at the European Commission since 1995 in the Directorates-



General for Employment and Trade. Prior to that, she worked in the private sector as management consultant and for the United Nations Development Programme in the United States and Central Africa. Manuela Geleng studied languages at the University of Trieste in Italy. She holds an MSc in Financial Economics from the University of London and a Master in Public Administration and Management from the Solvay Business School in Brussels. She completed her postgraduate studies at the Diplomatic Academy in Vienna.

Pascale Gruny is a chartered accountant by training. From May 2004 to February 2009, she was Member of the French Parliament, in particular of the Parliamentary Committee on Agriculture. Since 7 June 2009, Pascale Gruny is MEP for the North-West (Picardie, Basse and Haute-Normandie, Nord Pas-de-Calais). She is a member of the political group European People's Party (EPP). In the European Parliament, she is a member of the Employment and Social Affairs Committee and of the Petitions Committee in which she is the EPP coordinator. She is also a substitute member of the Budget Committee. Since 22 February 2010, Pascale Gruny is Chair of the Working Group on the European Social Fund (ESF) within the European Parliament. She has also recently been appointed standing rapporteur on the ESF in the Employment and Social Affairs Committee.

Carolyn Heinrich (Ph.D., University of Chicago), is director of the La Follette School of Public Affairs, professor of public affairs and affiliated professor of economics at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Her research focuses on social welfare policy, labor force development, public management and econometric methods for program evaluation. She works directly in her research with governments at all levels, including with the U.S. and other national governments on performance management and the evaluation of social welfare, workforce development, poverty reduction and human capital development programs, and with state and local governments on education, employment and family support programs. She also collaborates with nongovernmental organizations such as the World Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, UNICEF and others in ongoing research to improve program and policy design and the impacts and effectiveness of economic and social investments in middle-income and developing countries. She has published more than 50 peer-reviewed books and journal articles.

Laszlo Herczog holds Mastery in Economics by the Karl Marx University of Economics, Budapest (1974), and a PhD by the same University (1983). He was editor of the Financial Review from 1974 to 1977. From 1977 to 1990 he served in several positions as senior officer and Head of Unit in the Ministry of Finances and in the Ministry of Labour. From 1998 to 2002 he was Deputy State Secretary and Commissioner of the Minister in the Ministry of Economy. Between 2002 and 2006 he was Deputy State Secretary and State Secretary in the Ministry of Labour and Employment and in the Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour. He was appointed as Minister of Social Affairs and Labour in April 2009

Sven Jansson is National Coordinator for Evaluation and Monitoring in the Swedish ESF Council in Sweden.



Santiago Loranca-Garcia is Head of Unit responsible for monitoring ESF and employment and social inclusion policies in Belgium, France and Slovakia in the Directorate General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities of the European Commission. Born in Madrid (Spain) in 1960, he is an economist. European Commission official since 1987, he began his career at the Statistical Office (EUROSTAT) in the field of wage statistics and national accounts. Since 1995 he worked at DG Employment, in areas such as the adaptation to industrial changes, the social dimension of the Information Society, local development, the third sector and the innovative actions of the European Social Fund. He has been Head of Unit responsible for the Evaluation Unit (2001-2003) and was Head of the geographical unit ESF and monitoring policies in Ireland, Latvia and United Kingdom (2004-2009).

Radek Maly graduated from the Prague School of Economics (1992, Labour Economics) and Oxford University (1995, M.Phil., European Politics). In the following years he worked as an economist for Citibank in the Czech Republic and also acted as an external advisor to the Office of President Havel. In 2005 he joined the European Commission, DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities as the Head of Unit Employment Analysis.

Józef Niemiec is Confederal Secretary of the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC) since 2003. Responsible for: social protection, the disabled, regional policy and economic and social cohesion, internal market, and services of general interest. Member of NSZZ Solidarność since 1980, with responsibilities at the enterprise, regional and national levels. From 1992 to 2003, member of the National Commission, its Secretary from 1998 and Vice-President from 1999 to 2002, with responsibilities related to internal affairs and European affairs. From 1998 to 2001, member of the Consultative Committee reporting to the Minister Plenipotentiary, responsible for integration into the European Union; from 1999 to 2001, member of the CONSENSUS Programming Council (PHARE programme on social protection).

Philip J. O'Connell is Research Professor and Head of Social Research at the Economic and Social Research Institute, Dublin. He received his doctorate from Indiana University, Bloomington and taught at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. He has served as a consultant on human resource development and labour market issues to the European Commission and the OECD, and is currently involved in a number of comparative European research projects. Much of his research focuses on education, training and the labour market. He has written several books on the effects of work-related education and training, and published papers on this and other labour market issues in the leading peer-reviewed journals, including the *British Journal of Industrial Relations*; the *Economics of Education Review*; the *European Sociological Review*; *Gender Work and Organization*; *Industrial Relations*; *Industrial and Labour Relations Review*; *Labour: Review of Economics and Industrial Relations*, and *Work Employment and Society*. Current research interests: Continuing education and training of employed workers, Active labour market programmes for the unemployed, Workplace change, Migration.

Xavier Prats Monné is Director for employment policy, Lisbon strategy and international relations at the European Commission (DG EMPL); his main current policy brief is the Europe 2020 Strategy and in particular the new Employment Guidelines. He is also a member of the Commission's Impact Assessment Board, which vets all impact assessments produced



by Commission departments and reports to the President. His main recent policy briefs were the EU common principles of Flexicurity, the establishment of the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund, and the EU "New Skills for New Jobs" initiative on skills upgrading and labour market anticipation. He previously served as Director for ESF coordination and in the Cabinets of the Commission Vice President for external relations and of the Commissioner for Cohesion and Regional policy. He studied European Affairs at the College of Europe, where he graduated first of the Class of 1982 and served as assistant professor.

Paolo Emilio Reboani is the president and CEO of Italia Lavoro. Previously he was economic adviser and head of the technical secretariat of the Minister of Labour and Social Policy and advisor to the CNEL. He served on the expert group that drafted the Marco Biagi "White Paper on the labour market". After graduating in Economics at the University of Rome, he specialized in industrial relations at the London School of Economics. As a researcher he collaborated with several institutions, including the ISAE and ISTAT, and European organizations. Paolo Emilio Reboani has been adviser to the Ministry of International Trade and European policies and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as well as to the vice-president of the European Committee on Employment in Brussels.

Conny Reuter has been Secretary General of SOLIDAR, a European network of NGOs working to advance social justice in Europe and worldwide, since 2006. In April 2008, he was also elected President of Platform of European Social NGOs. A German national, Conny Reuter studied languages (French and Spanish) and educational science in the universities of Bonn and Cologne. He went on to work at La Ligue de l'Enseignement, both in Paris and in Germany, where he headed the organisation's liaison office. He also represented the French Youth Council at the European Youth Forum from 1995 to 1998, after which he went to work in Paris and Berlin, heading the Franco-German Youth Office Department for School and Youth Exchanges

Duarte Rodrigues is Deputy-Coordinator of National Strategic Reference Framework Observatory since 2008. He is also Portuguese delegate on Territorial Development Policy Committee of OECD since 2008. Previously, he has been Adviser of the Portuguese Secretary of State for Regional Development (2005-2008) and Coordinator of Territorial Statistics in Portuguese Statistics Office (1999-2005). He was also Researcher of Regional and Urban Research unit (CIRIUS) of Business and Economics Institute at the Technical University of Lisbon (1996-2005).

Maravillas Rojo Torrecilla is the Secretary General for Employment and the Ministry of Work & Immigration of Spain.

Jørgen Rønne has been director for international affairs in the Confederation of Danish Employers since 1989. In September 2008 he was appointed chairman of the Social Affairs Committee in BusinessEurope and in 2009 he was elected to the Governing Body of ILO. He holds a master's degree in political science and worked for more than ten years in the Danish Ministry of Finance and in six years as chief economist in Danske Bank. In 2007-2008 he was acting Social Affairs Director of BusinessEurope. He has been employer spokesman in the



negotiations between BUSINESS EUROPE, CEEP, UEAPME and ETUC on telework, on stress at work and on harassment and violence and has represented BusinessEurope on other occasions as well.

Lenia Samuel has been Deputy-Director General in DG Employment, Social Affairs & Equal Opportunities, since 1st June, 2005. She is responsible for the European Social Fund, the EU's main financial instrument for investing in people, with a budget of 76 billion for the period 2007-2013. Prior to this, she had a long and successful career in the Cyprus Civil Service, which culminated in her appointment as Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Labour and Social Insurance. In this capacity, she coordinated/monitored all the work involved in the preparation of accession to the EU, in the areas of labour law, gender equality, non-discrimination and working conditions and health. She has wide International and European experience in the area of Labour and Social policies.

Ágota Scharle, Ph.D in Economics (University of Oxford) is senior research partner at the Budapest Institute for Policy Analysis, responsible for designing and implementing evaluations of public policy interventions. Her main research interests are the effects of taxes and benefits on labour supply and income redistribution. She has also been founder and co-editor of the working paper series of the Hungarian Finance Ministry, where she worked as Head of research until 2008.

Antonella Schulte-Braucks Head of the Evaluation and Impact Assessment Unit of the Directorate General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities, responsible for planning, coordinating and reporting on the evaluation and impact assessment exercises of the DG, support the DG's operational units in preparing and managing evaluations, prepare and manage ESF evaluations and other evaluations on cross-cutting themes, providing guidance to Member States on evaluation, especially for ESF programmes, supporting the DG's operational units in preparing impact assessments. Previous fields of activities at the Commission include equal opportunities, policies to support people with disabilities, management of the European Social Fund. She has a Law degree from the University of Rome, after graduation she spent one year at the University of Freiburg i.Breisgau (DE) and was then a stagiaire in the Legal Service of the European Commission. Subsequently she earned a Master of Laws (LLM) from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Before joining the Commission she worked as an assistant at the Institute for International Public Law of the University of Göttingen, dealing in particular with International Environment Law. She speaks Italian, German, English, French and Spanish.

Iva Šolcova, a 1986 graduate of Charles University in Prague, has been active in the fields of international cooperation, negotiation and EU funds management, both at the national and international levels, for more than 18 years. Starting in early 1992 as the co-author of a study financed by the pre-accession Phare Programme on training needs analysis, she then worked until 2001 as the Deputy Director of the Phare Multi-Country Programme Coordination Unit designated to assist the European Commission in managing Phare funds in the 13 countries of Central and Eastern Europe. From 2001 to 2003 Ms Šolcova worked as Programme Manager at the Centre for Foreign Assistance of the Czech Ministry of Finance. Beginning in March 2003 and to this date Ms. Šolcova has been the Director of the ESF Management Department



at the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs of the Czech Republic, dealing with ESF programmes preparation, management and implementation.

Peter Stub-Jorgensen is Director at the European Commission, Directorate General Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities. Responsible for Directorate B : European Social Fund, Monitoring of Corresponding National Policies II and the European Globalisation adjustment Fund. Between 1997 and 2003 Peter Stub Jorgensen was Head of EC Representation in Denmark. From 1995 to 1997, he was Head of unit responsible for Cohesion Fund General co-ordination, economic and legal issues, information (Unit XVI.E.1). Previously, Peter Stub Jorgensen was Assistant to Director - General Steffen Smidt, Task Force Enlargement in DG Enlargement. From 1989 to 1993, he was Member of Cabinet Christophersen, responsible for co-ordination of structural policies, competition policy and state aids. He was also cooperating on the preparation of the Delors II package.

Daniel Tarschys is Professor in Political Science at the University of Stockholm. In 1994-1999 he served as Secretary General of the Council of Europe. He has been a Member of the Swedish Parliament where he chaired the Standing Committees on Social Affairs and Foreign Affairs. In the 2000 Convention drafting the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights he was the Personal Representative of the Swedish Prime Minister. He has also been a Vice President of the International Political Science Association (IPSA). Tarschys now chairs the Board of Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (The Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation) and the Swedish Council on Medical Ethics. His publications include *Reinventing Cohesion: The Future of EU Structural Policy* (2003) and *The Enigma of European Added Value: Setting Priorities for the European Union* (2005), both available at www.sieps.se

Herta Tödtling-Schönhofer is director of Metis GmbH in Vienna.

Jacques Toulemonde, evaluation expert, is director and co-founder of Eureval. He works as a leader of evaluation teams and as an adviser for public organisations in many countries. He has led a series of evaluation syntheses across EU policies. He is currently managing a study on learning from impact analyses in the area of human capital investment. He is associate professor at Lyon University where he manages the Master of Public Policy Evaluation. He is the author and editor of articles and books dealing with quality and professionalism in the field of evaluation, evaluation techniques and causality analysis, performance measurement, evaluation in partnership, and evaluation cultures. He is a board member of the French Evaluation Society, and member of the International Evaluation Research Group (INTEVAL).

Kadri Uustal has been involved in the topic of EU funds for over 12 years. Since 2001, she has been working in the Ministry of Finance, preparing Estonian systems for the management of EU structural funds. Today she works in the Permanent Representation of Estonia to the EU, focussing on such issues as the past, present and future of the Cohesion Policy and EU Budget review.



Robert Verrue is currently General Director of Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities in the European Commission. He holds a Degree in International Economics (College of Europe) and an MBA (INSEAD). Attached to the European Commission since 1973, he has served as Head of Unit for Monetary Policies Coordination in the Directorate General for Economic and Financial Affairs (1985-1988), Director in the Directorate General Industrial Affairs and Internal Market (1988-1993), Deputy Director General of Relations with Central European Countries and CIS Republics in the Directorate General for External Affairs (1993-1995), General Director of the Information Society services (1996-2002), and Director General for Taxation & Customs Union (2002-2009).

Louis Vervloet has been working at the ESF national authority since late 1991. He has a vast experience in working in public administration. As director programme management in the managing authority he is responsible for relations with the EC and implementation, monitoring and control of ESF in Flanders. Additionally, he is member of the European ESF Committee representing Belgium and chair of the Leonardo da Vinci selection committee in Flanders as part of the life long learning programme. Louis Vervloet studied Public Administration at the State University in Ghent.

Robert Walker is Professor of Social Policy and Fellow of Green Templeton College. He was formerly Professor of Social Policy at the University Nottingham and Director of the Centre for Research in Social Policy, Loughborough University. He is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts and Academician of the Social Sciences. As an adviser to ten governments and a member of the statutory UK Social Security Advisory Committee Policy, his policy concerns embrace social security and social assistance, welfare to work and labour market policies, policy evaluation and policy transfer. In 2009, he was an expert adviser to a Peer Review: (*Measuring the impact of active inclusion and other policies*) for the European Commission (DG Employment). He is currently directing a seven country research project on '*Shame, social exclusion and the effectiveness of anti-poverty programmes*' and has published 19 books and well over 100 articles and research reports.

Michael Wiseman is Research Professor of Public Policy, Public Administration, and Economics at The George Washington University and Visiting Scholar in the US Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service (ERS). Before coming to GWU, he was Professor of Economics at the University of California at Berkeley and Professor of Public Affairs, Urban and Regional Planning, and Economics at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. He has served as consultant on and contributor to policy evaluation and program management for various federal government agencies, state governments, social welfare agencies, international organizations, and evaluation contractors. Professor Wiseman is currently working on disability assistance program innovation and evaluation for the US Social Security Administration and collaborating in a multi-national study of conditionality in social assistance programs. At the ERS, his work is focused on development of procedures for merging administrative and survey data as a resource for policy analysis and program evaluation.