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1 Executive Summary

European Social Fund 2007-2013

1 The European Social Fund (ESF) is the EU’s main instrument for strengthening economic and social cohesion. This report examines the achievements of the ESF over the 2007-2013 programming period.

2 Actions under 6 policy fields can be supported:

- “Increasing adaptability of workers, enterprises and entrepreneurs with a view to improving the anticipation and positive management of economic change.
- Enhancing access to employment and the sustainable inclusion in the labour market of job seekers and inactive people, preventing unemployment, in particular long-term and youth unemployment, encouraging active ageing and longer working lives, and increasing participation in the labour market.
- Reinforcing the social inclusion of disadvantaged people with a view to their sustainable integration in employment and combating all forms of discrimination in the labour market.
- Enhancing human capital/expanding and improving investment in human capital.
- Promoting partnerships, pacts and initiatives through networking of relevant stakeholders ... in order to mobilise for reforms in the field of employment and labour market inclusiveness.
- Strengthening institutional capacity and the efficiency of public administrations and public services... with a view to reforms, better regulation and good governance especially in the economic, employment, education, social, environmental and judicial fields.”

Methodology

3 This is the fifth Synthesis Report of the Expert Evaluation Network and reviews the main achievements of ESF 2007-2013. The methodology adopted has been as follows:

- At the outset, a network of experts was set up drawn from all 27 member states. These experts have been responsible for reviewing evaluation evidence for their member states, recording this in the Inventory1 developed and maintained by Metis GmbH and preparing country reports based on a number of themes.
- As with earlier themes, using a template to ensure consistency, the country experts undertook a desk-based review of AIRs and evaluations carried out in the member state to create a country report organised around the 6 policy fields. Each country report synthesises the key findings in relation to financial expenditure, outputs, results, effectiveness, good practice and community added value (CAV).
- Drawing on the evidence presented in the 27 country reports, this synthesis report has been prepared to provide an overall picture of what has been achieved by the ESF.

It is important to underline that no primary research has been undertaken during this study.

1 The inventories were last updated on 12.12.13.
Conclusions

Context is key

4 ESF 2007-2013 was launched at a time of growing employment and prosperity across most of the EU. Labour market problems were increasingly shifting from too much unemployment to too many unfilled vacancies, although significant inequalities between groups, regions and member states still applied. The plans for the 2007-2013 programming period, however, received a major shock with the onset of the global recession. This has led to substantial increases in unemployment and social exclusion. At the same time many member states have entered a period of significant public sector expenditure reduction, raising problems in terms of co-finance for the ESF. Many of the interventions funded by the ESF are focused on employment returns which are harder to achieve in depressed labour markets. All this means that ESF implementation over the 2007-2013 programming period has been extremely challenging.

Improving the evidence base

5 Although comprehensive data are available on outputs for each of the member states, the position for results is much less favourable. Even for three key results – job entry, qualifications achieved and self-employment – it was not possible to obtain the absolute numbers on a consistent basis for a number of member states. In the absence of absolute numbers it is not possible to generate aggregate figures across member states for the results associated with ESF supported interventions.

6 Fortunately, the Guidance Document on monitoring and evaluation for the ESF programming period 2014-2020 sets out a requirement for all OPs to gather data on a set of common ESF indicators. The rationale the collection of these is to “make available and aggregate data from Member States in order to report achievements at the EU level”. The common intermediate results indicators to be reported annually from 2016 and the common longer-term results indicators to be reported in AIR 2019 cover the kinds of results this synthesis report has tried to assemble.

7 There remains the issue of measuring the impact of ESF interventions in a robust way which genuinely demonstrates what difference the ESF has made to the final recipients of interventions. The country reports were generally unable to present a significant amount of compelling evaluation evidence in relation to this issue at a broad level, never mind the more detailed findings around specific interventions that would provide guidance on what works for which groups of final recipients.

8 The concept of Community Added Value (CAV) captures the overall contribution of the ESF to the member states engaged and the EU as a whole. However, to date, there have been very few robust assessments of CAV within member states. To some extent, this reflects the feeling expressed in many country reports that the evaluations carried out in most member states are “too little, too late” to educate the ongoing development of ESF 2007-2013 and to demonstrate convincingly in a consistent fashion that significant value is indeed being added.
Responding to the challenges

9 The country reports taken in aggregate show that the ESF has generated substantial achievements in terms of the volume of co-financed activity to end December 2012.
- The reach has been massive with over 68 million individual participations. Even allowing for some double-counting this equates to a substantial number of individuals assisted.
- Women have been involved in over 35.2 million (52%) of participations, young people in over 20.9 million (31%), the unemployed in over 22.1 million (32%) and those with low levels of educational achievement (primary or lower secondary education) nearly 26.7 million (39%).
- The results have also been impressive with over 5.7 million job entries and almost 8.6 million qualifications gained. Good results have also been achieved in relation to new enterprises started and people going into self-employment in some member states, with almost 550,000 achievements in this respect.
- Results for Social Inclusion interventions are harder to measure as these often entail progress towards job outcomes. However, in some member states there are significant results in relation to young people staying in education, as well as young people and adults progressing into further education and training.
- The effects have mostly been significant and sizeable in the limited number of robust evaluation studies which considered some specific ESF interventions and programmes. These show, for example, that individuals in ESF-supported interventions are more likely to find employment than control groups – with some evidence that this effect is more marked for more disadvantaged groups of people.

10 Planned expenditure for ESF 2007-2013 is €116.0 billion, with €76.7 billion from the EC, €35.6 billion from national public authorities and €3.7 billion from national private sources. By end December 2012, nearly €55 billion of expenditure had been certified by the member states. This is 47.4% of allocated funds.

11 It has been possible to bring through this major contribution because in many member states the ESF has proved adaptable and flexible, allowing more resources to flow towards those activities, such as promoting A2E and supporting new enterprise starts, which can make the most significant contribution to the recovery in these member states. Similarly, many member states, in responding to the dramatic rise in youth unemployment, have been able to redirect ESF resources towards interventions to young people.

12 The ESF has made this contribution in the main by working alongside and adding value to mainstream member state provision. In some instances, ESF funds have allowed mainstream provision to be maintained and increased to meet the high demands placed upon it by the recession but in many other instances the ESF has helped enhance the intensity and quality of mainstream provision.

13 At a lower level of territorial governance, the ESF has been a key investor in supporting the development and maintaining the service delivery of local partnership-based service delivery particularly in relation to A2E and Social Inclusion. In so doing, the ESF has contributed significantly to the development of substantial and sustainable local partnership delivery capacity and capability.

14 By setting strong prioritisation for groups such as women, migrants and minorities the ESF has helped secure a higher focus on the need to do better and the need to
perform more effectively for these groups across the key policy fields – both in terms of securing higher output levels but also greater results.

15 In most country reports, the assessment of the Social Inclusion policy field proved to be the least positive. One element within this is the often relatively poor targeting of disabled people and those with mental health issues, and the generally poorer results once engaged in ESF funded activity. Admittedly there is great diversity of perspective across member states in terms of policy commitment to social inclusion, and to the groups that should be prioritised, given scarce resources. This raises significant challenges in terms of designing out an effective role for the ESF in relation to this deeply embedded socio-economic problem, and one which continues to grow.

Looking forward

16 The nature and scale of the results show the potential of the ESF to contribute towards meeting some of the headline targets for the EU 2020 Strategy. For example, the role of the ESF in achieving over 5.7 million job entries, as well as supporting new enterprise starts and sustaining the employment of those at risk of losing employment, all play into pushing up the employment rate to at least 75%.
2 Background and study objectives

2.1 Background to report

This is the fifth and final synthesis report from the ESF Expert Evaluation Network (EEN) established in September 2010. The network brings together experts from all 27 member states to collect, analyse, aggregate and synthesise evaluations and other relevant studies on the nature and contribution of the ESF in each member state. The experts compile an inventory\(^2\) of evaluation plans, activities, studies and key findings as well as reports on specific themes.

The first synthesis report\(^3\) produced an analysis of evaluation plans and activities across the 27 member states and identified the common features of the ESF evaluation landscape. Enhancing Access to Employment (A2E) was chosen as the first theme for the thematic country reports, as this generated the highest number of findings in the first synthesis report.

The second synthesis report focused on A2E and built upon 27 country reports. The preparation of the country reports was underpinned by the inventory of evaluation materials prepared and updated by the country experts, as well as Annual Implementation Reports (AIRs) and contextual reports.

The third synthesis report focused on promoting Social Inclusion, and followed the same methods adopted for the report on A2E.

The fourth synthesis report concentrated on ESF achievements in relation to the two main priority groups – women and young people. The approach was slightly different with five detailed country reports for each priority group, and 17 background reports for the other member states.

This final synthesis report is based on 27 country reports organised around the 6 policy fields for the ESF. The emphasis is on assessing the overall achievements of the ESF in the 2007-2013 programming period. Where output and results data have come from the AIRs this relates to the period to end December 2012. Examples of good practice in individual member states are captured as well as the community added value (CAV) arising from ESF co-investment in the member states.

All of the analysis for the country reports and the synthesis reports has been based on existing statistical evidence, evaluation studies and relevant research reports. No original research has been carried out as part of the study programme.

It is important to note that beyond the sets of country reports and synthesis reports the EEN has added value in a number of ways. By bringing the experts together in network meetings in Brussels and by the regular exchange of views around the preparation of country reports the following benefits have been generated.

- The community of experts has increasingly come together to gain a common appreciation of key terms relevant to the evaluation process in relation to inputs, outputs, results and impacts – as well as the challenges of estimating CAV.

\(^2\) The inventories were last updated on 12.12.13.

\(^3\) Metis and Euréval (2011) ESF Expert Evaluation Network synthesis report 1
A broader appreciation of the need for counterfactual and theory-based evaluations has been created as experts have shared their difficulties in bringing forward robust findings in the absence of these.

More generally, the difficulties experienced by the experts in generating their country reports, and the fact that these difficulties are shared across member states, has helped identify the need for improvement in monitoring and evaluation systems for the ESF and how these need to change. Clearly this is only one small element in driving improvements in the systems, however.

2.2 ESF 2007-2013

The European Social Fund (ESF) is a central component of the European Union (EU), with provision for the ESF set out in the 1957 Treaty of Rome. The Consolidated Structural Funds Regulations for 2007-2013 outlines that Article 158 of the Treaty of Rome provides that 'in order to strengthen its economic and social cohesion, the Community is to aim at reducing disparities between the levels of development of the various regions and the backwardness of the least favoured regions or islands, including rural areas’ and that Article 159 requires that this is supported through Structural Funds alongside other instruments. The Lisbon and Goteborg European Council meetings (of 2000 and 2001 respectively) stipulated that cohesion policy should contribute to sustainable development through increasing:

- Growth
- Competitiveness
- Employment

The ESF is organised into seven-year programming periods, with 2007-2013 the most recent. In determining the scope and focus of ESF 2007-2013, the following key issues were considered.

- The enlargement of the EU resulting in increasing disparities across regions
- Increasing globalisation impacting on the employment opportunities within the EU

Given this, ESF 2007-2013 was tasked with “strengthening economic and social cohesion by improving employment and job opportunities, encouraging a high level of employment and more and better jobs”.

Actions that can be supported under the ESF 2007-2013 are organised around 6 policy fields.

- “Increasing adaptability of workers, enterprises and entrepreneurs with a view to improving the anticipation and positive management of economic change.
- Enhancing access to employment and the sustainable inclusion in the labour market of job seekers and inactive people, preventing unemployment, in particular long-term and youth unemployment, encouraging active ageing and longer working lives, and increasing participation in the labour market.
- Reinforcing the social inclusion of disadvantaged people with a view to their sustainable integration in employment and combating all forms of discrimination in the labour market.
- Enhancing human capital/expanding and improving investment in human capital.
Promoting partnerships, pacts and initiatives through networking of relevant stakeholders ... in order to mobilise for reforms in the field of employment and labour market inclusiveness.

Strengthening institutional capacity and the efficiency of public administrations and public services... with a view to reforms, better regulation and good governance especially in the economic, employment, education, social, environmental and judicial fields.”

The ESF is intended to support member state policies. The EC and member states worked in partnership to determine the priorities within each member state for 2007-2013. These are set out in the Operational Programmes (OPs) – with each member state having at least one OP. The EU provides ESF funding to each member state to part-finance the OP. However, public and private co-financing from within the member state is also required. The ESF contribution towards the OPs varies from 50% to 85% depending on whether the region it covers is a convergence, phasing-out, phasing-in or competitiveness and employment region (determined by the timescale at which the region’s GDP per head reached 75% of the EU average).

### 2.3 This synthesis report

#### Key questions addressed

The overall purpose of the synthesis report is to answer a number of major questions in relation to ESF activity.

- What progress has been made in delivering the ESF across the member states?
- What have been the major key areas of intervention and which have been the key priority groups for the ESF?
- What significant results have been achieved to date in relation to the ESF?
- What can be said about the effectiveness of ESF interventions?
- What good practice in implementation can be identified?
- What is the CAV of ESF activity to date?
- What are the overall achievements of the ESF?

#### Methodological approach and reporting process

The broad approach was to work from a base resource of 27 country reports. This involved collecting and analysing in depth the evidence from the evaluations conducted on the ESF, and developing a full understanding of the results obtained from ESF investment related to these themes through a review of evaluations undertaken in each of the 27 member states, but building also on data held in the Annual Implementation Reports (AIRs).

This report deals with each of the six ESF policy fields, but also aggregates the information across policy fields to provide an overall picture of the achievements of the ESF. This is in keeping with the Commission’s remit to evaluate the effects generated by the money spent within the ESF.

#### Structure of report

The report is structured in the following way to address the key questions which require to be considered.
- Changing economic climate. Some of the key indicators capturing socio-economic changes in the EU as a consequence of the global economic crisis are briefly discussed.

- Overall progress in delivery of the ESF. This section of the report looks at the ESF in an aggregate fashion across the 27 member states and considers progress to date.

- Analysis of policy fields. This is made up of 6 sections covering each of the ESF policy fields. Within each section, the following topics are covered.
  - Analysis of interventions. This section discusses the types of ESF interventions and the target groups across the 27 member states and also pulls together information on the effectiveness of interventions.
  - Overview of outputs. The overall volume of participations is reviewed. The range of priority groups covered and the level of engagement is also described in detail.
  - Assessment of results and effectiveness. This central section focuses on the results and effectiveness of the interventions delivered with ESF support.
  - Good practice in implementation. Examples of good practice are described.

- Community added value. The CAV flowing from ESF activity in the member states is reviewed, with examples provided for individual member states.

- Conclusions of country experts. This section analyses the broad conclusions drawn by the country experts on the achievements of the ESF in their member state.

- Overall conclusions and issues for the ESF. The final section provides some overarching conclusions on the achievements of the ESF.
3 Changing economic climate

3.1 Building on economic growth

The EU economies enjoyed strong growth in output and employment for most of the 1990s and 2000s, but continuing relatively high rates of unemployment in particular regions and sub-regions and for specific groups of the population such as the young and older unemployed, people with health issues and disabilities, those with low or no qualifications and other groups excluded due to discriminatory factors (e.g. ethnic minority groups).

The strong growth in global employment across the EU from the mid 1990s through to 2007 provided a supportive socio-economic environment for an ESF effort directed towards ‘closing the gap’ between more disadvantaged groups and residents of more disadvantaged regions and sub-regions and the average economic and employment experiences within member state economies, while at the same time supporting the long run economic development of the EU by investing in economic resilience through adaptability and skills through human capital formation.

This broad context of improving experiences in relation to group and spatial labour market disadvantages provided significant scope for the ESF 2007-2013 OPs to work in a focused and targeted way to reinforce the positive forces associated with strengthening labour markets to accelerate the closing of the gap between the more and less advantaged in the labour market, at the same time promoting the rate of sustainable economic growth across the EU as a whole.

The broad challenges for the design of the ESF for the 2007-2013 programming period were:

- To design out a set of actions to tackle disparity between regions.
- To develop and support actions that would create a more resilient employment base and more competitive workforce to address the long run global economic challenge.

However, at an early stage in the programming period, the ESF had to be able to confront and respond to the global economic recession.

3.2 Responding to economic decline

A critical change in the socio-economic context, however, was the onset of a serious global recession from around the summer of 2008. At this point the most significant changes were:

- A rise in unemployment and economic inactivity across all member states.
- An associated reduction in the recruitment by employers making it most difficult for those already out of the labour market trying to get in, e.g. young people.

In effect, ESF-funded interventions were now having to prove their effectiveness in an environment which switched radically from one where employers were keen to recruit labour and were suffering labour shortages, to one where recruitment was at a much lower level and employers had a greater choice of candidates.
The 2007-2013 OPs were designed before the onset of the recession, and this means that OP implementation strategies were based on the needs and opportunities associated with the pre-credit crunch labour market. The challenge in terms of making the best use of later tranches of funding during the 2007-2013 programming period for many economies has been how to maintain a targeted and focused approach on groups and regions most in need of ESF resources to raise their competitiveness at a time when labour market opportunities were declining significantly. In broad terms, the response has been to resource interventions that support the economic recovery, for example by creating stronger focus on the employability and vocational skills required in sectors of the economy projected to grow across the European Union.

A second major consequence of the global recession and the factors giving rise to it is the retrenchment in public expenditure in a large number of member states. As is well known, this is particularly severe in economies such as Ireland, Greece, Spain and Portugal – but there were significant reductions in public expenditure across most if not all member states since 2008. This meant that the mainstream funding deployed alongside ESF resources was declining in many member states.

Given the more challenging economic environment and the decline in public spending in most member states, it has been harder to achieve as good outputs and outcomes from ESF funded interventions compared to pre-recessionary years. Organisations in receipt of ESF funds had to work much more intelligently, be more innovative and create much more effective partnership with other organisations. In effect, partnership working and the alignment of ESF and mainstream funds needed to become the norm for most of the 2007-2013 programming period.

Reacting to the recession
The report on Evaluation of the Reaction of the ESF to the Economic and Financial Crisis^4, notes that member states responded quickly to the economic crisis.

- 27 member states deployed a 28% increase (€201bn to €256bn) in expenditure on Active Labour Market Policy.
- New key areas of intervention introduced included short-time working arrangements (STWA), temporary wage subsidies, reductions in non-wage costs, public sector employment, assistance to become self-employed and business start up, upgrading skills and promoting mobility.

In terms of the reactions of the ESF, the report acknowledged the rational response to the crisis by the ESF. The traditional focus on employability and skill development was still seen as a coherent and rational long-term labour market strategy. However, the report pointed up the need for changes in relation to the short-term labour market environment.

The analysis in this report underlines the challenge of assessing the effectiveness of ESF interventions in such a turbulent period for EU economies. The report also showed the very varied responses of member states in terms of the ESF and their capacity to respond to change highlights the challenge of drawing broad comparisons across member states within this analysis.

This report is largely focused on A2E expenditure and interventions but similar challenges exist for the other 5 policy fields. For example, the economic crisis impacts directly on income levels generated in the labour market which has consequences for

^4 Evaluation of the Reaction of the ESF to the Economic and Financial Crisis (2012). Metis and WiiW.
Social Inclusion. The crisis also impacts upon the attractiveness or otherwise of education and training options with implications Human Capital. Clearly with many enterprises and their employees at risk in recession, the Adaptability policy field becomes extremely relevant.

### 3.3 Variations in socio-economic impacts of recession

Our analysis shows that since the crisis, the countries in the EU27 exhibit a wide spectrum of socio-economic outcomes on some key indicators.

**Employment across EU**

Figure 1 looks at changes in employment levels between 2007 and 2012. The red bars show the percentage change over the period, and the absolute numbers presented as labels at the end of the bars show the absolute change in employment.

- LV, LT, GR, ES, IE, PT and BG all had employment levels approximately 10% or more below those prevailing in 2007.
- For member states where employment levels have declined modestly, there is a mix of member states including both newer and well established EU members.
- A small group of member states have shown employment growth – DE, AT, BE, CY, PL, SE, FR and RO. The very small economies of MT and LU have done particularly well. Employment growth for CY is surprising given the onset of the banking crisis there during 2012 but this probably reflects the timing of the measurement of employment levels.

**Figure 1. % change in employment levels (aged 15-64), 2007 to 2012**

![Chart showing percentage change in employment levels](image)

Source: Eurostat – Labour Force Survey

Note: Figures in labels at end of bars are absolute change in employment, presented as thousands.
Figure 2 provides an insight into one of the key elements of employment change associated with the recession, namely that where there has been job recovery it has been stronger for part-time employment.

- Whereas EU-wide employment fell by around 1.6%, part-time employment grew by nearly 8%.
- The performance of PL is interesting here as its employment levels have grown while at the same time part-time employment has fallen.

Part-time employment is a key labour market characteristic influencing ESF measures seeking to move people into sustainable employment, as part-time employment generates a lower financial incentive to move from welfare to work.

**Figure 2. % change in part-time employment (aged 15-64), 2007 to 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>-12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>-11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>-10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Eurostat – Labour Force Survey

**Unemployment across EU member states**

The change in unemployment over the same period clearly maps closely into the employment changes with some variations for individual member states. Although it is possible to group member states the unemployment experiences of each one tends to sit on a spectrum

- The Baltic and Southern European countries have fared very badly in terms of unemployment with massive increases in levels of unemployment – but Ireland has also been severely impacted.
In line with the employment changes Germany, Austria, Belgium, Malta and Poland have fared relatively well over the 5 years since 2007.

**Figure 3. % change in unemployment levels (aged 15-74), 2007 to 2012**

Source: Eurostat – Labour Force Survey

Note: Figures are annual figures

The major finding is the great diversity of employment experience around the EU average of a 49% increase. The range runs from an increase of 247% in Cyprus to a fall of 36% in Germany. This illustrates the variation in the changing need for ESF support, but also the very different challenges for those charged with the effective implementation of the ESF in the individual member states.

**Poverty and social exclusion**

Figure 4 captures the extreme variations across member states in terms of the change in the percentage of the population at risk of poverty or social exclusion since 2007:

- For EU-27 the percentage has grown by around 3%.
- The member states showing a significant growth are very diverse. The Mediterranean economies (CY, ES, GR, IT, MT) perform badly – but the same can also be said for IE. The percentage growth is also substantial for LU and SE, but from a low base.
- A number of the Eastern European economies (BG, CZ, LV, PL, RO, PL, SK) show significant decline in the population at risk of social exclusion, but this may well reflect migration patterns mitigating the consequences of economic decline.
The decline in the population at risk of social exclusion in DE is probably a reflection of the success of that member state in recovering from recession.

**Figure 4. % change in population at risk of poverty or social exclusion, 2007-2012**

Source: Eurostat

Note: Figures for Austria and Ireland show change 2007-2011

**Overview of economy and employment**

This short section has demonstrated that there has been a significant socio-economic and labour market impacts on EU27 as a result of the economic crisis and subsequent recession with employment falling by over 3.4 million and unemployment rising by almost 50%. However, even more striking has been the variation in the impacts across member states.
4 Overall progress in delivery of the ESF

4.1 2007–2013 ESF Operational Programmes

€75.95 billion was allocated in 117 OPs across the 27 Member States for the 2007-2013 programming period. These OPs were drawn up at national/multiregional or regional levels reflecting the differing constitutional and institutional backgrounds. They provided information on the priorities chosen, the allocation of funds, the targets set and the target groups approached. Table 1 shows the aggregate picture by Member States, giving the total amount of ESF funds and the proportional amount by Member States as well as the number of OPs under each of the objectives, differentiated by national/multiregional and regional programmes. The countries with the highest allocations are marked in red. Most Member States with large allocations have regional ESF programmes.

Table 1. Number and volume of ESF OP by member state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total ESF Funds (Meuro)</th>
<th>Funds per MS in % EU 27</th>
<th>nat/multireg</th>
<th>nat/regional</th>
<th>Convergence</th>
<th>Competitiveness</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>0,7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>1,4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>1,6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0,2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>3,775</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>9,381</td>
<td>12,4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>0,3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>0,5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>8,057</td>
<td>10,6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>0,8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>5,395</td>
<td>7,1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>4,364</td>
<td>5,7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>3,629</td>
<td>4,8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>0,5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>6,938</td>
<td>9,1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>1,4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>0,7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0,1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1,1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>9,707</td>
<td>12,8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>6,512</td>
<td>8,6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>3,684</td>
<td>4,9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>0,9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Number of programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Convergence</th>
<th>Competitiveness</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>1,0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>4,475</td>
<td>5,9%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU 27</td>
<td>75,953</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Metis compilations from ESF Data base (http://ec.europa.eu/social/home.jsp), 31.10.13

### 4.2 Overview of financial progress

**Planned and certified expenditure by member state**

Table 2 shows overall progress in relation to ESF 2007-2013.

- €116.0 billion of funding has been allocated to ESF activities for 2007-2013, with €76.7 billion from the EC, €35.6 billion from national public authorities and €3.7 billion from national private sources.
- 7 member states (DE, ES, FR, IT, PL, PT and UK) account for 70% (€81.6 billion) of the allocated funds.
- By end December 2012, nearly €55 billion of expenditure has been certified by the member states. This is 47.4% of allocated funds. Whilst the current ESF programming period runs until 2013, the ‘n+2’ rule means member states have until the end of 2015 to claim funds.
- There is significant variation in the proportion of allocated funds that have been certified to date – from 12% in RO to 69% in LV. There appears to be no clear cut pattern in terms of which member states have a high proportion of certified to available funds.
Table 2. Financial inputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member state</th>
<th>Total planned(^5) (MEURO)</th>
<th>Total amounts (including private) certified to the EC (€ millions)(^6) by end December 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>1,160.5</td>
<td>711.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>2,329.2</td>
<td>1,214.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>1,394.7</td>
<td>317.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>140.9</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>4,451.4</td>
<td>1,356.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>15,946.1</td>
<td>8,463.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>509.6</td>
<td>212.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>461.3</td>
<td>285.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>11,272.7</td>
<td>6,148.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>1,420.4</td>
<td>809.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>10,227.2</td>
<td>4,402.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>5,133.9</td>
<td>1,943.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>4,269.5</td>
<td>1,318.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>750.7</td>
<td>469.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>14,483.5</td>
<td>6,440.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>1,209.8</td>
<td>589.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>686.0</td>
<td>476.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>131.8</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>1,959.8</td>
<td>834.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>11,773.4</td>
<td>6,141.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>9,245.0</td>
<td>5,938.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>4,334.1</td>
<td>498.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>1,383.1</td>
<td>717.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>889.1</td>
<td>424.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>1,764.2</td>
<td>618.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>8,655.3</td>
<td>4,514.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (EU27)</strong></td>
<td><strong>116,033.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>54,976.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Financial execution from SFC extract (31.12.12) provided by EC.

Financial absorption rate by policy field

Given the structure of this synthesis report where each of the six policy fields is given in detail, we have tried to provide a breakdown of the absorption by Policy Field. Given the fact that the Priorities for which the financial information is available do not always correspond to the Policy Fields, some Member States could not be included in the calculation: Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Lithuania, Malta, and the Netherlands. For the other Member States, an attempt was made to attribute the financial data to the Policy Fields with the following result\(^7\). Figure 5 provides a useful financial context by showing financial absorption by policy field.

- A2E has the major claim on ESF financial resources with 32% of the total.
- Human Capital is the next largest with 31%.
- Adaptability and Social Inclusion both have 17%.
- The remaining two policy fields account for 1% (Administrative Capacity) and 2% (Promoting Partnerships) respectively.

\(^5\) Total funding allocated in approved OP documents (including any approved amendments). Includes ESF, national public and national private.
\(^6\) Total costs certified by means of documents which permit the identification of real costs paid or in-kind contributions provided by the public authority concerned for that operation.
\(^7\) It should be noted that not all the Priorities in all the Member States could be attributed to a Policy Field and that the figure should therefore be considered a rough estimate of the actual absorption.
The heavy weighting towards A2E and Human Capital is understandable as these two policy fields are more likely to be driven by the consequences of recession and the support needed to promote recovery.

**Figure 5. Financial absorption by policy field**

![Financial absorption by policy field](image)

Sources: Financial execution from SFC extract (06.12.13) provided by EC.

Note: Adaptability = 1, A2E = 2, Social Inclusion = 3, Human Capital =4, Promoting partnerships =5 and Administrative Capacity = 6.

### 4.3 Overview of physical progress

**Overall outputs**

Table 3 shows clearly substantial volume of participation in terms of individual recipients of interventions co-financed through the ESF.

- Over 68 million participations had been achieved by end December 2012. There will be some multiple counting with some individuals moving between different ESF supported interventions but nonetheless this is a substantial total.
- It is the case that a small number of major EU economies make up a significant proportion of the total participations, with ES alone accounting for over 16%.

It would also be valuable to have the figure for a number of entities supported through the ESF but this does not appear to be available on a consistent basis. This is a shortcoming particularly in a period of recession and recovery where there is an increasing priority around supporting existing and new enterprises.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Of which self-employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Of which LTV</th>
<th>Inactive</th>
<th>Of which in education/training</th>
<th>Young people (15-24)</th>
<th>Older people (55-64)</th>
<th>Migrants</th>
<th>Minorities</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Primary or lower secondary education</th>
<th>Upper secondary education</th>
<th>Post-secondary non-tertiary education</th>
<th>Tertiary education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>706,224</td>
<td>389,543</td>
<td>420,785</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>152,302</td>
<td>46,319</td>
<td>133,137</td>
<td>36,885</td>
<td>215,694</td>
<td>63,473</td>
<td>140,891</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>101,055</td>
<td>31,057</td>
<td>181,652</td>
<td>291,436</td>
<td>42,819</td>
<td>83,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>1,343,032</td>
<td>618,708</td>
<td>257,101</td>
<td>10,968</td>
<td>851,557</td>
<td>358,170</td>
<td>234,374</td>
<td>165,095</td>
<td>445,386</td>
<td>42,812</td>
<td>273,947</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48,041</td>
<td>242,519</td>
<td>463,866</td>
<td>469,007</td>
<td>48,694</td>
<td>188,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>1,230,902</td>
<td>696,017</td>
<td>401,300</td>
<td>20,927</td>
<td>118,819</td>
<td>30,605</td>
<td>710,783</td>
<td>632,962</td>
<td>317,855</td>
<td>74,044</td>
<td>2,464</td>
<td>116,800</td>
<td>51,360</td>
<td>26,214</td>
<td>420,968</td>
<td>268,082</td>
<td>81,761</td>
<td>236,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>25,406</td>
<td>16,403</td>
<td>13,572</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>8,552</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>3,282</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>2,748</td>
<td>1,692</td>
<td>7,195</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>2,267</td>
<td>2,487</td>
<td>6,624</td>
<td>2,049</td>
<td>14,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>5,154,020</td>
<td>2,655,694</td>
<td>1,371,611</td>
<td>27,230</td>
<td>326,450</td>
<td>166,826</td>
<td>3,455,959</td>
<td>3,373,887</td>
<td>1,432,933</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>151,801</td>
<td>442,918</td>
<td>819,166</td>
<td>44,409</td>
<td>2,030,053</td>
<td>743,303</td>
<td>66,945</td>
<td>765,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>4,886,552</td>
<td>2,128,494</td>
<td>1,766,458</td>
<td>188,944</td>
<td>1,230,084</td>
<td>700,753</td>
<td>1,890,010</td>
<td>893,826</td>
<td>2,497,006</td>
<td>215,188</td>
<td>833,983</td>
<td>16,334</td>
<td>94,675</td>
<td>135,403</td>
<td>2,794,874</td>
<td>1,028,358</td>
<td>107,512</td>
<td>488,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>55,739</td>
<td>26,457</td>
<td>32,505</td>
<td>2,308</td>
<td>4,599</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>18,635</td>
<td>17,656</td>
<td>21,170</td>
<td>6,110</td>
<td>4,628</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,917</td>
<td>19,399</td>
<td>6,854</td>
<td>5,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>779,093</td>
<td>487,252</td>
<td>348,063</td>
<td>5,252</td>
<td>148,817</td>
<td>69,730</td>
<td>282,213</td>
<td>251,811</td>
<td>274,113</td>
<td>70,672</td>
<td>3,834</td>
<td>90,467</td>
<td>17,441</td>
<td>27,401</td>
<td>237,671</td>
<td>137,647</td>
<td>94,052</td>
<td>300,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>11,234,650</td>
<td>6,214,556</td>
<td>2,710,456</td>
<td>437,415</td>
<td>6,624,913</td>
<td>819,411</td>
<td>1,899,281</td>
<td>1,227,166</td>
<td>3,573,289</td>
<td>786,958</td>
<td>1,445,030</td>
<td>81,844</td>
<td>325,490</td>
<td>439,556</td>
<td>4,749,686</td>
<td>3,202,593</td>
<td>458,383</td>
<td>2,335,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>397,001</td>
<td>207,790</td>
<td>263,755</td>
<td>40,303</td>
<td>76,585</td>
<td>18,853</td>
<td>56,661</td>
<td>45,278</td>
<td>68,854</td>
<td>44,890</td>
<td>22,897</td>
<td>2,069</td>
<td>3,689</td>
<td>8,120</td>
<td>73,707</td>
<td>135,571</td>
<td>47,894</td>
<td>139,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>4,914,336</td>
<td>2,493,043</td>
<td>1,026,942</td>
<td>177,240</td>
<td>2,861,633</td>
<td>1,036,056</td>
<td>1,025,761</td>
<td>357,797</td>
<td>1,884,891</td>
<td>194,610</td>
<td>264,122</td>
<td>18,749</td>
<td>153,398</td>
<td>654,221</td>
<td>2,397,039</td>
<td>1,395,470</td>
<td>746,038</td>
<td>352,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>2,457,677</td>
<td>1,404,268</td>
<td>585,248</td>
<td>92,802</td>
<td>350,231</td>
<td>90,803</td>
<td>1,522,198</td>
<td>902,239</td>
<td>438,918</td>
<td>64,944</td>
<td>44,201</td>
<td>7,787</td>
<td>8,233</td>
<td>53,971</td>
<td>1,291,914</td>
<td>577,709</td>
<td>92,093</td>
<td>436,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>3,112,741</td>
<td>1,734,946</td>
<td>1,095,261</td>
<td>65,249</td>
<td>284,803</td>
<td>85,685</td>
<td>1,732,877</td>
<td>1,423,563</td>
<td>1,213,527</td>
<td>226,442</td>
<td>3,718</td>
<td>114,334</td>
<td>49,729</td>
<td>320,065</td>
<td>688,792</td>
<td>773,054</td>
<td>231,052</td>
<td>791,431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 Outputs are total number of participations by individuals from each group. The total number of participants will be lower as some individuals will have participated more than once.
9 Self-employed is sub-group of employed.
10 Long term unemployed is sub-group of unemployed.
11 In education/training is sub-group of inactive.
12 Educational attainment on entering. This applies to all educational categories.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Of which self-employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Of which LUE</th>
<th>Incite</th>
<th>Of which in education/training</th>
<th>Young people (15-24)</th>
<th>Older people (65-64)</th>
<th>Migrants</th>
<th>Minorities</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Pri/ter sec education</th>
<th>Upper secondary education</th>
<th>Post-secondary non tertiary education</th>
<th>Tertiary education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>6,683,608</td>
<td>3,462,913</td>
<td>2,234,043</td>
<td>118,164</td>
<td>1,057,487</td>
<td>173,350</td>
<td>3,392,078</td>
<td>3,132,275</td>
<td>2,043,886</td>
<td>475,703</td>
<td>141,564</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>89,731</td>
<td>256,850</td>
<td>3,295,822</td>
<td>1,811,308</td>
<td>80,588</td>
<td>648,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>717,015</td>
<td>443,430</td>
<td>333,364</td>
<td>23,150</td>
<td>220,872</td>
<td>84,864</td>
<td>162,779</td>
<td>142,176</td>
<td>144,646</td>
<td>74,738</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>20,362</td>
<td>32,679</td>
<td>93,280</td>
<td>170,837</td>
<td>140,002</td>
<td>84,827</td>
<td>306,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>24,249</td>
<td>10,071</td>
<td>18,629</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>2,581</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>3,039</td>
<td>3,035</td>
<td>4,657</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>12,070</td>
<td>5,101</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>4,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>82,856</td>
<td>35,960</td>
<td>41,704</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>23,532</td>
<td>8,456</td>
<td>17,620</td>
<td>7,892</td>
<td>25,044</td>
<td>6,451</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,324</td>
<td>10,127</td>
<td>45,675</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>7,249</td>
<td>17,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>927,331</td>
<td>303,239</td>
<td>698,435</td>
<td>6,863</td>
<td>63,364</td>
<td>38,682</td>
<td>165,532</td>
<td>82,143</td>
<td>295,721</td>
<td>79,259</td>
<td>125,273</td>
<td>150,802</td>
<td>37,460</td>
<td>88,750</td>
<td>303,901</td>
<td>282,469</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>158,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>5,930,026</td>
<td>3,340,149</td>
<td>2,285,163</td>
<td>83,728</td>
<td>1,259,601</td>
<td>438,207</td>
<td>2,385,262</td>
<td>2,047,407</td>
<td>2,076,967</td>
<td>270,380</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>217,977</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,255,284</td>
<td>1,501,164</td>
<td>583,232</td>
<td>1,590,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>6,586,821</td>
<td>3,640,205</td>
<td>3,899,474</td>
<td>193,213</td>
<td>1,660,299</td>
<td>495,157</td>
<td>1,027,048</td>
<td>261,447</td>
<td>748,879</td>
<td>282,725</td>
<td>23,618</td>
<td>134,546</td>
<td>190,934</td>
<td>27,257</td>
<td>1,828,905</td>
<td>1,062,907</td>
<td>67,067</td>
<td>731,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>1,024,613</td>
<td>594,807</td>
<td>471,882</td>
<td>31,095</td>
<td>216,263</td>
<td>79,099</td>
<td>336,368</td>
<td>125,352</td>
<td>258,455</td>
<td>57,471</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>82,726</td>
<td>17,981</td>
<td>317,191</td>
<td>320,754</td>
<td>286,158</td>
<td>45,959</td>
<td>351,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>354,748</td>
<td>188,331</td>
<td>260,011</td>
<td>4,778</td>
<td>17,423</td>
<td>17,423</td>
<td>77,314</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54,141</td>
<td>59,976</td>
<td>64,424</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,922</td>
<td>155,093</td>
<td>19,620</td>
<td>117,052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>485,132</td>
<td>291,100</td>
<td>265,085</td>
<td>15,689</td>
<td>90,779</td>
<td>24,231</td>
<td>128,268</td>
<td>80,909</td>
<td>110,872</td>
<td>57,043</td>
<td>3,888</td>
<td>4,297</td>
<td>10,544</td>
<td>11,574</td>
<td>101,295</td>
<td>187,421</td>
<td>10,115</td>
<td>172,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>1,708,636</td>
<td>743,148</td>
<td>346,962</td>
<td>27,567</td>
<td>1,112,126</td>
<td>429,083</td>
<td>250,448</td>
<td>100,254</td>
<td>426,959</td>
<td>169,541</td>
<td>2,172</td>
<td>199,887</td>
<td>70,050</td>
<td>395,429</td>
<td>749,469</td>
<td>274,507</td>
<td>69,730</td>
<td>189,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>6,005,540</td>
<td>2,270,272</td>
<td>1,697,746</td>
<td>61,453</td>
<td>2,746,289</td>
<td>1,039,133</td>
<td>1,561,505</td>
<td>147,657</td>
<td>1,995,374</td>
<td>395,697</td>
<td>143,562</td>
<td>1,028,262</td>
<td>928,737</td>
<td>935,417</td>
<td>1,597,766</td>
<td>2,200,199</td>
<td>20,112</td>
<td>372,616</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Outputs from SFC extract (31/08/13) provided by EC.
Outputs for priority groups
The participations are also broken down by priority groups which provides very valuable information on the final recipients of ESF-supported activities.

- Women account for over 35.2 million participations, nearly 52% of the total.
- In relation to age, over 20.9 million participations are associated with young people, under 25 which is nearly 31% of the total. Older people (55-64) account for just over 4 million participations, nearly 6% of the total.
- In terms of economic status, the employed are involved in 23.2 million participations, 34% of the total. Of these, over 1.6 million are self-employed.
- Over 22.1 million participations involved unemployed people, just over 32% of the total. Of these, over 6.4 million are long-term unemployed.
- The inactive are heavily engaged with close to 23 million participations, nearly 34% of the total. Of these, nearly 15.7 million are in education or training.
- In terms of the educational background of people joining ESF-supported activities, the largest category are those with primary or lower secondary education. These account for nearly 26.7 million participations – 39% of the total. People with upper secondary education are associated with over 17.4 million participations, nearly 26% of the total. Those with tertiary education generate nearly 11 million participations, 16% of the total.
- Finishing with some specific disadvantaged groups, over 3.7 million migrants are engaged in ESF participations, 5.5% of the total. Nearly 2.7 million participations involved engagement with people from minority ethnic groups, nearly 4% of the total. Over 3.3 million participations involve disabled people, nearly 5% of the total. Finally over 4.5 million participations involve others in this broad category, nearly 7% of the total.

Results
Information on results at the EU level is unfortunately not quite as comprehensive as that available for outputs. The three results indicators for which most information is available are job entries, qualifications gained and people in self-employment or new enterprise starts. A major shortcoming is the lack of consistency in the recording of results across member states with many providing only percentages of participants securing a result. Where there are multiple OPs, it is difficult to aggregate the results in a simple fashion as a consequence. An additional problem is that in a number of situations ESF is used to support entities or to provide social infrastructure (e.g. contact points or networks). These interventions do not generate data providing results for individual participants.

In the face of these problems, efforts have been made to generate best estimates of results where measurement difficulties existed, but for some member states and some results this did not prove possible. Table A1 sets out clearly how the best estimates were constructed to allow people to see the limitations associated with these. All of this means that the figures for results probably understate the true position. On the basis of what is presented in Table 4:

- Over 5.7 million job entries were achieved by end December 2012. Considering those member states for which results were available, a small number account for a high percentage of job entries with 79% generated by ES, FR, PL and UK. Job entries are defined in different ways across member states ranging from entry to employment on leaving ESF activities through to job entries sustained for varying lengths of time.
Almost 8.6 million qualification results were achieved. Again, for those member states where results were available, a small number accounted for a large proportion, with CZ, DE, ES, FR, IT, NL, PL, SK and UK generating 78% of all qualifications results.

Almost 550,000 results reflect people supported into self-employment or a new enterprise start – with DE, ES, FI, FR, GR, IT and PL generating significant numbers of these results.

The sources for the results are presented in Table A1 and the definitions in Table A2 in the Appendix.

### Table 4. Results at end December 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Job entries</th>
<th>Participants gained qualification on leaving</th>
<th>Participants in self-employment/new enterprise starts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>33,220</td>
<td>152,990</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>74,712</td>
<td>255,987</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>21,440</td>
<td>355,991</td>
<td>14,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,290,412</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>299,870</td>
<td>570,767</td>
<td>52,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,059</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>155,250</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>2,714,584</td>
<td>941,361</td>
<td>74,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>193,753</td>
<td>2,329</td>
<td>32,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>574,638</td>
<td>460,568</td>
<td>115,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>22,552</td>
<td>101,720</td>
<td>72,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>34,235</td>
<td>146,311</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>251,417</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>222,000</td>
<td>992,701</td>
<td>31,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>101,945</td>
<td>274,068</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>16,177</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>64,471</td>
<td>39,835</td>
<td>1,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62,741</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>41,624</td>
<td>823,027</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>626,598</td>
<td>629,960</td>
<td>148,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>7,918</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>1,506</td>
<td>70,600</td>
<td>3,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>22,831</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>10,229</td>
<td>3,111</td>
<td>1,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>54,208</td>
<td>450,862</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>608,038</td>
<td>544,653</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (EU27)</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,737,679</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,599,638</strong></td>
<td><strong>548,709</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Sum of results from AIRs reported in Country Reports under 6 Policy Fields.

---

13 Definitions for job entries and qualifications are listed in Table A1 in the Appendix.

14 Expert's calculations based on SFC-data and own categorisations applied. It should be noted that for NRW and Saxony, two of the largest German Länder, and for Saxony Anhalt and Thuringia no result indicators were available.
Overview
The analysis in this section shows that the ESF has supported:

- Significant volumes of activity in terms of participations.
- Outputs which have reached in significant numbers of priority groups such as women and young people.
- Impressive results for key indicators such as job entry and qualifications.

A disappointing feature is that on moving from inputs and outputs to results, the comprehensiveness of the available data declines.
5 Increasing adaptability

5.1 ESF scope

The first policy field set out under the framework ‘Convergence and Regional Competitiveness and Employment’ is:

“increasing adaptability of workers, enterprises and entrepreneurs with a view to improving the anticipation and positive management of economic change, in particular by promoting:

- (i) lifelong learning and increased investment in human resources by enterprises, especially SMEs and workers, through the development and implementation of systems and strategies, including apprenticeships, which ensure improved access to training by, in particular, low-skilled and older workers, the development of qualifications and competences, the dissemination of information and communication technologies, e-learning, eco-friendly technologies and management skills, and the promotion of entrepreneurship and innovation and business start-ups;

- (ii) the design and dissemination of innovative and more productive forms of work organisation, including better health and safety at work, the identification of future occupational and skills requirements, and the development of specific employment, training and support services, including outplacement, for workers in the context of company and sector restructuring”.

With the onset of the severe global recession from the summer of 2008, the issue of adaptability became much more important in terms of responding to global economic challenge both in the short and the long term. The sharp declines in employment in key sectors, such as construction and manufacturing, placed increased strains on the longer term needs for adaptability particularly in those member states and regions of the EU needing to move their sectors and businesses away from more traditional economic activities.

5.2 Types of intervention

Increasing Adaptability has been delivered across member states through a range of different types of intervention which are described in the country reports. These have been broken down into 6 main groupings. The process for creating the groupings involved the following:

- Lists of specific interventions were generated on the basis of the country reports.

- Interventions with similar objectives or approach were subsequently grouped to provide a more coherent description or analysis of the types of activity delivered within the policy field.

Supporting start-up enterprises

Both for the long run economic development of the EU, but greatly reinforced by the impact of the global recession, there is a need to support the development of new enterprises, and promote their sustainability, to raise both output and employment.
A range of interventions have been delivered with ESF support, including initial advice on enterprise start up, guidance on funding sources, assistance with business planning and marketing, and a range of other essential services at the start up stage.

Ongoing support beyond start up to help sustain the new enterprise, including coaching and mentoring for the new entrepreneurs.

Building adaptability and capacity of existing enterprises

Even in the best of times, enterprises are operating in a competitive environment and many go out of business. In a recessionary context the risk of enterprises closing is greatly heightened, and at the same time it becomes difficult for new enterprises to start up. In this context there is an important role for the ESF in helping to build the resilience of the existing base of enterprises. From the country reports this has been delivered through a wide range of interventions.

- By supporting existing entrepreneurs as well as the managers of SMEs, in terms of advice, mentoring and coaching to build up their skills and capabilities and so raise the effectiveness of the management effort.
- Assistance with the development of systems and processes help to promote innovation, secure access new markets, etc.
- Some interventions focus on the development of key sectors (for example, tourism and manufacturing in DK) as part of a process of working across groups of businesses.
- Work involving enterprises and social partners has been supported as part of a general thrust to raise the awareness of enterprise managers in relation to new ways of realising the full potential of their employees.

Upskilling existing employees

The upskilling of existing employees can help both to increase the adaptability and resilience of enterprises, but it also promotes the process of lifelong learning at the level of the employee for their benefit and also for the wider benefit of the EU economies. The interventions here have included primarily the following:

- Additional investment in the training of employees, including apprentices in a number of member states.
- Providing qualifications for existing employees.

In general these interventions have worked within the context of the need to change skills in response to new technologies and changing markets.

Maintaining employment levels

A key preventative measure in a recession is to reduce the probability of redundancy. In a number of member states (AT, BG, ES, SK), measures were introduced to:

- Facilitate a shift to a shorter working week.
- Provide a subsidy to employers retaining their workforces.

Facilitating redeployment of employees

Redundancies are the inevitable consequence of recession, although interventions can be introduced to make these less likely. Where they do occur the ESF has provided support for the redeployment of those employees affected.
Where employees are at risk of redundancy upgrading their skills and qualifications to meet the needs of expanding sectors can help smooth the transition from one enterprise to another.

More of a longer term task, the ESF has supported the move of employees from declining sectors (such as agriculture) into new and expanding sectors.

**Bringing through new skills and employees**

The recession has made it more difficult for young people in particular to make the transition from education to work. The ESF under the adaptability policy field has supported this process.

- Work placements and internships have been ESF co-financed in a number of member states, many focused at graduates from tertiary education. These internships can help both to improve the longer term employability of the individual but also contribute to the higher level employee needs of very small enterprises in particular, struggling due to the recession.

### 5.3 Analysis of outputs

Table 5 summarises the outputs flowing from the interventions within the adaptability policy field. The outputs are broken down by member state. A shortcoming in the data is that there is no robust source of the number of ‘entities’ supported by the ESF within this policy field. This is a major data issue as enterprises are a key focus of the policy field.

**Total outputs**

Over 13.1 million participations have been achieved.

- Employees are the most substantial group at over 8.5 million – of whom almost 847,000 are self-employed demonstrating the importance of the ESF support for start-up enterprises within the Adaptability policy field.
- The inactive are a major group accounting for over 874,000 participations – of which over 516,000 are in education or training.
- The unemployed are also a substantial group accounting for in excess of 1.9 million participations – of which over 777,000 involve the long term unemployed.

**Outputs by participant characteristics**

Outputs are also broken down to identify some priority groups.

- Over 6 million participations involve women – 46% of total participations.
- In terms of age, although the main category is those aged 25-54, over 2 million (15%) involved young people and nearly 1.5 million (11%) older people.
- The interventions also reach significant but more modest numbers from more disadvantaged groups with almost 475,000 (4%) migrants, nearly 399,000 (3%) from ethnic minorities and over 331,000 (3%) disabled people. The relatively low numbers here are in part a result of the focus of the policy field on employees, and these groups have lower employment rates.
- In terms of the education background of participations most have a lower or upper secondary education, although well over 2.2 million (17%) have a tertiary education background behind them.
### Table 5. Increasing adaptability outputs to end December 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total number of participations</th>
<th>Participations in education/training</th>
<th>Participations in employment</th>
<th>Participations in self-employment</th>
<th>Participations in primary or lower secondary education</th>
<th>Participations in non-formal education</th>
<th>Participations in tertiary education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>320,121</td>
<td>317,289</td>
<td>20,805</td>
<td>17,004</td>
<td>39,205</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,241,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>105,333</td>
<td>37,320</td>
<td>51,504</td>
<td>12,338</td>
<td>25,856</td>
<td>2,317</td>
<td>2,367,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>236,952</td>
<td>9,109</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7,721</td>
<td>31,246</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1,205,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>626,931</td>
<td>7,670</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>21,994</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>1,205,038</td>
<td>1,066,086</td>
<td>65,967</td>
<td>25,001</td>
<td>117,757</td>
<td>85,569</td>
<td>20,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>30,071</td>
<td>2,982</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>2,445</td>
<td>5,796</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>39,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>22,251</td>
<td>21,963</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1,954</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>2,267,246</td>
<td>724,259</td>
<td>257,382</td>
<td>725,563</td>
<td>440,298</td>
<td>90,225</td>
<td>124,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>165,161</td>
<td>132,216</td>
<td>33,537</td>
<td>15,365</td>
<td>11,516</td>
<td>14,008</td>
<td>160,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1,194,969</td>
<td>706,376</td>
<td>142,845</td>
<td>308,588</td>
<td>84,681</td>
<td>115,769</td>
<td>484,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>26,826</td>
<td>26,826</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>368,567</td>
<td>147,067</td>
<td>11,780</td>
<td>19,980</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>198,000</td>
<td>249,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>1,241,947</td>
<td>1,208,129</td>
<td>89,535</td>
<td>28,898</td>
<td>6,939</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>158,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>420,615</td>
<td>178,915</td>
<td>12,871</td>
<td>219,219</td>
<td>84,207</td>
<td>4,423</td>
<td>155,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>12,777</td>
<td>4,487</td>
<td>12,134</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>154,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>39,835</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 Self-employed is a sub-group of employed.
16 Long term unemployed is sub-group of unemployed.
17 In education/training is sub-group of inactive.
18 Educational attainment on entering.
19 Adaptability measures as well as enhancement of human Capital are covered by one priority axis in the Cypriot OP and cannot be disaggregated.
20 Only data for ‘total’, ‘employed’ and ‘tertiary education’ is available.
21 Annex XXIII data for the Policy Field “Increasing adaptability of workers, enterprises and entrepreneurs” is reported under Priority 1.3. “Promotion of Employment and Health at Work”. There were 39,835 participants in the one activity corresponding to “Increasing adaptability of workers, entrepreneurs and entrepreneurs” namely training of health care professionals but these cannot be further subdivided into Annex XXIII categories. They are included in the table which reports Annex XXIII data for the Policy Field "Enhancing access to employment".

March 2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of participations</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Of which self-employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Of which LTU</th>
<th>Inactive</th>
<th>Of which in education/training</th>
<th>Young people (15-24)</th>
<th>Older people (55-64)</th>
<th>Migrants</th>
<th>Minorities</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Primary or lower secondary</th>
<th>Upper secondary</th>
<th>Post-secondary non-tertiary education</th>
<th>Tertiary education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>43,150</td>
<td>14,664</td>
<td>16,021</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>20,666</td>
<td>7,378</td>
<td>6,463</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11,661</td>
<td>3,679</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>32,770</td>
<td>6,170</td>
<td>1,905</td>
<td>2,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>654,208</td>
<td>196,413</td>
<td>618,559</td>
<td>5,509</td>
<td>9,150</td>
<td>2,447</td>
<td>26,499</td>
<td>11,859</td>
<td>152,007</td>
<td>54,182</td>
<td>59,382</td>
<td>66,745</td>
<td>14,250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>238,769</td>
<td>258,850</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>1,005,69122</td>
<td>522,813</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>1,049,609</td>
<td>587,510</td>
<td>710,275</td>
<td>23,976</td>
<td>247,090</td>
<td>72,006</td>
<td>92,244</td>
<td>15,225</td>
<td>124,610</td>
<td>50,704</td>
<td>15,481</td>
<td>35,556</td>
<td>44,895</td>
<td>3,253</td>
<td>244,252</td>
<td>173,628</td>
<td>14,352</td>
<td>130,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>260,011</td>
<td>144,145</td>
<td>260,011</td>
<td>4,778</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,304</td>
<td>53,392</td>
<td>31,623</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21,765</td>
<td>112,332</td>
<td>16,616</td>
<td>107,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK26</td>
<td>49,300</td>
<td>12,818</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,720</td>
<td>14,790</td>
<td>14,790</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1,456,484</td>
<td>667,487</td>
<td>1,229,278</td>
<td>59,213</td>
<td>197,391</td>
<td>27,990</td>
<td>29,815</td>
<td>4,928</td>
<td>362,191</td>
<td>114,553</td>
<td>50,320</td>
<td>192,537</td>
<td>92,955</td>
<td>213,489</td>
<td>441,209</td>
<td>676,061</td>
<td>5,591</td>
<td>148,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,165,729</td>
<td>6,078,062</td>
<td>8,527,127</td>
<td>846,923</td>
<td>1,937,239</td>
<td>777,200</td>
<td>874,780</td>
<td>516,010</td>
<td>2,021,909</td>
<td>1,488,745</td>
<td>474,822</td>
<td>398,605</td>
<td>331,423</td>
<td>998,011</td>
<td>3,033,527</td>
<td>3,891,342</td>
<td>805,578</td>
<td>2,270,466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 Total number of participants put here refers to whole data of Priorities 2 and 8. However, part of them are from the other Policy Field(s).
23 Data not provided for all priority groups in SE CR.
24 Data for SE is for PA 'Skills Provision'.
25 Annex XXIII data from SFC is not allocated to specific Policy Fields in SI Country Report.
26 Data is estimated based on the number of contracted projects.
5.4 Analysis of results

Overview
The analysis is based upon the 27 country reports, where the experts have drawn together their discussion of results based largely on 2012 AIRs (i.e. results to end December 2012).

Table A3 in the Appendix summarises the information on different indicators of results across the 27 member states. As Adaptability covers a wide range of interventions it is not surprising that the coverage for any one result is fairly limited across all member states. Additionally, in some member states, results are captured as percentages which cannot be aggregated to provide a single figure estimate in absolute or percentage terms for the member state. Finally, in some member states it proved impossible to break down results by policy field and therefore the results reported below will be underestimates. Bearing these caveats in mind, the following points can be highlighted:

- The numbers gaining a qualification is the principal results reflecting the strong emphasis on upskilling existing employees within Adaptability. Over 3.4 million qualifications have been achieved.
- Job entry numbers are much more modest, but again this reflects the emphasis within Adaptability on working with people who are already employed. Over 107,000 job entries have been achieved. Both here and in subsequent chapters on policy fields, job entries are defined in different ways across member states ranging from entry to employment on leaving ESF activities through to job entries sustained for varying lengths of time.
- Supporting moves into self-employment are an important priority within Adaptability in a number of member states, and over 97,000 have started in self-employment.
- There are substantial numbers of individuals reported with results in the ‘other’ category. In a number of instances these are badly defined but it is worth noting that in MT over 31,000 moved on to employment or further study after training and in RO nearly 60,000 are reported as having improved their general management competencies. In ES, nearly 16,000 with temporary contracts were hired to permanent contracts. In UK, over 120,000 gained basic skills.

Analysis of country experts
The discussion below draws upon the analysis presented by the country experts which appears in the country reports. In addition to the AIRs, evaluations were also used, where available, including those published in 2013.

Broad conclusions
Some broad conclusions around the results associated with the implementation of this policy field emerged from the country reports.

- Generally it is reported that the results have been positive in terms of meeting targets for implementation, but this is much more so the case for individual participants than for individual enterprises (BG, DE, DK, ES, PL, PT and RO).
- There is a great deal of positive evidence around results measured in terms of feedback from individual participants, and also in terms of qualifications gained by these participants. The evidence is less strong in relation to the positive
consequences for the upgrading of the skills and productivity of the employees engaged. In effect the benefits for the enterprises are less well evaluated.

Results for interventions
Some positive feedback appears in the country reports around particular types of intervention.

- Support for start-up enterprises including development grants have shown good results in terms of growth in sales revenue and employment in some member states (DE, EE, ES). Much of this appears to focus on enterprises starting with a much better business plan.

- Achieving sustainable enterprise starts is key to the good use of ESF resources and there is evidence from some member states that support for sustainability has been effective producing survival rates above national averages (FR, IT).

- Advice to enterprises on how to respond effectively to the challenges of the recession have evaluated well in some member states (AT). This advice can extend to accessing funding for restructuring but also for shorter term responses such as short time working and other measures to facilitate job retention.

- Support for social innovation as well as for work with social partners to promote social dialogue has proved important in maximising the value of employee competencies and skills, and greater employee involvement has led to more autonomous working situations and higher work quality (NL).

- ESF co-financed investment in knowledge and skills development amongst employees has helped maintain higher levels of skills investment by enterprises in the face of declining markets (EE).

- There is some evidence that vocational training is more attractive to employees and the enterprises for which they work than the improvement of general education and broad competencies such as IT, literacy and language skills (BG).

- Also in relation to vocational training, some country reports suggest that the returns are greater the longer the training, at least in terms of employment retention (IT).

Less positive evaluation results have been recorded in the following situations.

- Helping develop organisational development strategies within enterprises (DE).

- Although the results suggest that upskilling existing employees has positive consequences, one country report (SI) notes that there is no evidence of the employees becoming more adaptable in terms of horizontal and/or vertical mobility.

Results for specific groups

- Women tended to participate less in ESF supported enterprise starts. This mirrors the general situation in many member states where women are under-represented in enterprise starts more generally.

- The range of training interventions produce stronger results for young people and women, but much less so for disabled people. This also carries over to the specific result around qualifications where not only do disabled people benefit less, but also those with no qualifications at the outset (MT, UK).

5.5 Analysis of Effectiveness

Overview
The country experts were asked to assess the effectiveness of the actions undertaken under each policy field, where effectiveness was defined in terms of making significant
and sustainable differences for sizable numbers of participants or for smaller numbers of particularly disadvantaged participants. In relation to Adaptability, the country experts struggled to find robust evaluation evidence on effectiveness. In broad terms:

- A significant amount of evidence from evaluation studies suggested that individual participants, such as employees undergoing training or individuals supported into self-employment, valued the service or support they had received with ESF co-financing.
- The same groups were, however, less able to explain what difference it had made to their earnings or employability, or to the success of their new enterprise.
- Only a very modest number of countries could produce evidence from counterfactual or theory-based evaluations, although some were able to benchmark issues such as new enterprise sustainability against national figures.

The challenge here is that much of the activity undertaken within this policy field is an investment in the skills of employees, entrepreneurs and SME managers – or in the implementation of improved processes within SMEs and other organisations. The impacts of these investments can only be observed over a longer period of time than has elapsed to date. This may explain why a number of country reports (EE, SE) noted that there were no impact indicators for some actions in the Adaptability policy field upon which they could draw.

**Findings**

Some more specific findings are worth highlighting.

- A number of instances were cited (e.g. EE) where evaluation evidence suggested that the effect of ESF co-financing was to maintain investment by enterprises in training and other development activities at a higher level than would have prevailed with the onset of the recession.
- In a small number of country reports (FI, FR) it is suggested that interventions under Adaptability were successful in engaging with SMEs and launching new enterprises. In relation to new starts, these had been particularly successful in helping the low skilled, but much less so young people (FR).
- In terms of apprenticeship opportunities, there is one country report (FR) where these have impacted significantly on young people and the low skilled, but much less so on disabled people.
- It is claimed that a significant effect has been achieved through improving the sustainability of new enterprises (EE). FI and IT evidence suggests that ESF-supported new starts sustain at approximately the same rate as normal national averages, which could also be interpreted as an achievement in a recessionary setting.
- There is evidence that interventions to support enterprises confronting redundancies or downsizing more generally have helped stabilise employment levels, but not grow them (AT, SE, SI). However, the report for CZ suggests that these interventions have enhanced employment levels, although it is unclear if this is above what they would otherwise have been.
- Despite significant investment in upskilling and providing qualifications for existing employees, there is limited evidence of the effects on their productivity within the enterprise, or the positive benefit for their own earnings and job mobility. There is some evidence for UK suggesting job progression for modest percentages of participants but it is not possible to attribute this to the ESF co-financed training investment.
5.6 Good practice

Overview
For 17 member states there was either no good practice available, or the evidence was too slight to merit reporting. Where good practice has been reported, a range of different examples are described below. The selection of good practice examples was based on the following principles:

- There had to be sufficient descriptive material and a clear explanation of why the activity was regarded as good practice.
- An attempt was made to report a range of good practices which addressed different issues or different client groups.
- Having good practice examples from a range of member states was also a desired feature.

Flexibility Advice for Companies – FBB (AT)
This measure can be considered good practice as the overall satisfaction with the measure was high based on evaluation evidence. Additionally, during the economic crisis it has had a direct influence on the take up of the short-time work offers of the Public Employment Service (PES). The PES offers FBB to companies with over 50 employees to help them overcome changes in the organisation and environment without negative consequences for the workforce. The advice covers a range of action fields including:

- Adaptation of organisational structures.
- Adaptation of workforce qualifications.
- Strengthening the mobility of the employees both within the company and in the regional labour market.
- Flexibility of working times.
- Flexibility of working teams.
- Diversity management.
- Productive approaches to ageing workforces.

The advice is offered in three steps within a maximum of 15 days:

- The first meeting lasts up to eight hours to inform the companies of the offer and assessing whether the company can benefit from the advice.
- The flex-check, which lasts a maximum of five days, assesses the existing situation in the company and explores possible areas in which greater flexibility would be an advantage. A flexibility strategy is then developed.
- The implementation of the strategy is carried out within the framework of the flex advice which can last up to eight days (or nine in the case of special measures for women).

The advice is given by external consultants under contract from the PES.

According to the evaluation, 60% of the companies only went as far as Step 1 of the advice. A further 15% did not go further than Step 2 and 25% completed all three steps. The satisfaction of the companies with the service offered grows with the length of participation. The most satisfied companies were those that went through all three steps of the advice: 57% of companies were satisfied with the first meeting, 65% with the flex-check and 67% with the flex advice.
One indicator of the usefulness and sustainability of the measure is whether the advice was actually implemented in the companies; and 72% of the companies which completed the flex-check or the flex advice implemented the advice. The level of implementation varies depending on the field. It is particularly high in the fields of productive ageing, women, flexible teams, strengthening the mobility of the workers, adapting the organisational structure and the qualification portfolio. Interestingly, the field of working time is the one most in demand and least implemented.

According to the PES staff working in the field of the Service for Enterprises (SfU), the FBB and FBB+ were programmes open and flexible enough to attract companies of different types and with different needs. Indeed, the FBB seems to have both supported companies and provided a door opener to the PES to introduce companies to other measures even if it did not have the effect of getting companies to take on new employees, which was not its aim.

**Vocational training for elderly care in Franche-Comté (FR)**
In relation to the indicator of ‘senior participation in territorial mainstream employment policies and facilitate job retention’, the region of Franche-Comté implements a strategy targeting care homes for elderly dependent persons (EPHAD27). In this sector there is a great need for training and professionalisation of care personnel, where the average age is high and the jobs are mainly staffed by women. The majority of them have entered caring following redeployment from declining industries. The region is particularly concerned with late career paths of its labour force, due to many declining industries (mechanics, automobile and metalworking) trying to find conversion paths into the service sector. Existing skill levels in the field are low and require to be upgraded in order to allow for professional treatment of elderly people.

In 2012, 559 trainees registered with the scheme supported by an ESF grant of €195,000. Women represent 93% of the trainees and 76% of the group is low skilled. There are 29 care homes involved at regional level. The scheme is repeated in 3 year cycles, closing at the end of 2013.

**Equality mainstreaming through social partners (IE)**
There is no information in evaluation reports in IE that identify good practice in the implementation of ESF support to increase adaptability. However, the AIR 2012 suggests some good practice in extending the benefits of direct interventions in sectoral responses to workplace equality supported under the Equality Mainstreaming Measure (Activity 2.9). For instance, one sectoral initiative involved a partnership across three trade unions. Actions were focused on three different sectors – retail, communications and financial services. The project produced a general equality policy and training outputs applicable to the three trade unions. An added benefit identified in AIR 2012 is mainstreaming this equality policy training into all trade union training courses, promoting a model policy that will apply to 75,000 trade union members. The partnership across the trade unions enabled a wider transfer of the effects.

**Artisan Jobs and Apprenticeship Project – AMVA (IT)**
The AMVA pilot project has been implemented from 2011 by Italia Lavoro (an agency of the Welfare Ministry) and uses both ESF and ERDF resources. The programme, which covers both Convergence and Competitiveness areas, is structured in three blocks of interventions:

---

27 Etablissement d’Hébergement pour Personnes Agées Dépendantes
Apprenticeship support through subsidies.

Work-experience and internship support (through services and subsidies) to match labour and skills demand and supply in “Made in Italy” production districts (especially concentrated in Competitiveness areas).

Support (again through services and subsidies) to SME and artisan enterprises needing to transfer from an older owner, generally the founder, to a younger one).

Only the first two activities are under implementation: outputs by the end of 2012 include more than 21,000 apprentices employed and almost 4,000 applications for work experience and internships.

This project is considered good practice as:

- It is implemented with the involvement of many central and local (mainly Regions/AA.PP) organisations which are also formally and legally responsible for the different measures involved.
- It covers all the national territory.
- It integrates ESF and ERDF funds.
- It is aimed at confronting two relevant issues for youth employment in Italy: a) the structural and historical difficulty in apprenticeship becoming the main instrument for young people to enter labour market; b) the mismatch between labour demand and supply (mainly for material reasons) in SMEs and the artisan sector.

Transferability is potentially high because the project is both based on a formal legislative framework and tries to cope with a question that has been on the Italian agenda for many years. The link with regional policies and interventions could also be further developed, mainly in terms of financing and the division of competences.

**Human Resources Invest LT+ (LT)**

This aims to develop the qualifications, knowledge and skills of employees and managers in enterprises which involve foreign direct investment for the establishment and/or development of large value-added manufacturing or services businesses. This is achieved through the organisation of employee training and developing competences, training human resources specialists and establishing human resource management systems. Under this measure funding was provided to these enterprises which matched the requirements of the Ministry of Economy because this measure was directly related to another measure administered by the Lithuanian Business Support Agency (LBSA) where the support was provided to attract foreign direct investment and/or develop the large value-added manufacturing or services businesses in the country. Thus, the support under the ‘Human resources Invest LT+’ was provided to the enterprises receiving support under the ‘Invest LT+’ measure administered by the LBSA in order to provide training for employees.

This measure was identified as a good practice for two main reasons.

- The synergies with the measure administered by the LBSA providing support to attract foreign direct investments for the establishment and/or development of the large value-added manufacturing or services businesses in the country. This helps enhance the business and employment base.
- The successful inter-institutional cooperation and relatively simple and efficient administration and implementation of projects under this measure.
There is limited information on the transferability of this good practice example to other countries. However, it is assumed that this model could be transferred to the countries with a governmental structure similar to that of Lithuania.

**TAF Aid Scheme (MT)**
The TAF Aid Scheme supports local companies to invest in their human resources. Funds are granted to undertakings to invest in their human capital with the aim of improving and adapting their skills so as to be better placed to face the challenges of a competitive market. The key elements of the scheme include the following.

- It is available to companies in the private sector and the subsidy varies according to the type of training and the size of the enterprise. Each company is eligible for a maximum of €250,000 each year\(^2\).  
- Self-employed persons are also eligible.  
- Courses offered varied from general training which provides trainees with transferable skills to university degrees up to the level of PhD.  
- Training can be in-house or out-sourced, and can be given in Malta or abroad through distance learning.  
- The TAF is a demand-driven scheme and therefore no calls for projects are published.

The scheme is considered good practice because:

- It is the best short term solution in an environment where changes in technology are so fast that the education system may need time to adjust to new requirements.  
- It can be applied to countries which have been laggards in realising that changes in the education system were required to meet foreseen changes in their economic structures. Such environments require departures from the normal approach of adjusting to abrupt changes in the economy through the formal education system.

The scheme has been highly effective. Three years after the launch of TAF the number of enterprises supported was five times more than expected. It is also worth noting that 90% of the training courses sponsored under TAF were for general training, which provides trainees with transferable skills, hence increasing their adaptability and employability both within the same company and elsewhere. The areas of finance and IT were amongst the most common.

The allocation of €8.85m for TAF was overcommitted by up to €9.52m as at end 2012, but was extended to 2014. The ETC (IB) promoted this initiative through various activities, such as issuing trainees with certificates or a letter bearing the visual identity and information that the training was being financed through the ESF, and issuing certificates to be placed in prominent places for eligible undertakings participating in the scheme.

**Promoting social innovation (NL)**
Evaluation evidence reveals a number of success factors for social innovation projects. These underpin good practice as opposed to being specific examples of good practice projects. The key success factors are:

- Recognising that social innovation and technological innovation belong together and should therefore not be considered separately from one another. Social innovation

\(^2\) [http://etc.gov.mt/etc-portal/Page/55/taf-employers.aspx](http://etc.gov.mt/etc-portal/Page/55/taf-employers.aspx)
is necessary in order to safeguard technological innovation. Although technical innovation can create new knowledge, social innovation is needed to get the organisation and its workers ready for its implementation. Social innovation will therefore enable new knowledge to be recognised and spread more quickly. Conversely the implementation of changes in connection with social innovation projects requires technological innovation within the organisation. In the evaluation report this is illustrated by the implementation of Work Remotely by the Southern Agri- and Horticulture Organization (ZLTO). Work Remotely is task-oriented, so it is not necessary for workers to come to the office every day as they can carry out tasks at home or on the move. The ZLTO wanted to implement this type of work to become more flexible and productive at times of moving. The implementation of new IT systems and advanced mobile devices (technological innovation) turned out to be a condition for facilitating the new way of working (social innovation).

- The use of external expertise helps persuade and mobilise the various stakeholders within the organisation and support the change process. Involving external expertise especially helps small and medium sized organisations as most of the time they have no specialized HR department.

- Incorporating practical experiences of other organisations with comparable social innovation projects in the development and execution of the projects. This involves both positive experiences and ‘pitfalls’ which these case study organisations encountered. The external adviser can use these examples as good practice on which to base the work in the organisation at hand.

- Making use of the knowledge, competencies and practical experiences of employees on the shopfloor to identify scope for improvement and innovation. Such an approach not only delivers ideas for improvement and innovation, but also creates support for the change process which the organisation will be undertaking. In the evaluation report this is illustrated by the implementation of self-managing teams in Dutch neighbourhoods by ‘De Vierstroom’ (a care institution that is providing home care for the elderly). In this project workers gained more control over the planning and execution of their work. From the very beginning, with the establishment of new job descriptions all parties were involved, so the various needs could be taken into consideration. As a result, the organisation became more flexible, workers were more involved, clients were more satisfied and costs were saved.

- Not assuming one-off involvement of employees at a particular moment in the change process, but ensuring a more on-going form of involvement. The employees are thereby involved in all phases of the change process. The example shown above (self-managing teams of ‘De Vierstroom’) is also applicable for this success factor. Because all the different parties were involved in a more on-going way, again the organisation became more flexible, workers were more involved, clients were more satisfied and costs were saved.

**Diversity index (PL)**

The Diversity Index project, implemented by the confederation LEWIATAN within the HC OP Priority 2, is focused on managing diversity, defined as any action by organisations which seeks to provide for and make optimal use of diversity in the workplace.

The project involves the development of innovative methods and instruments. The Diversity Index tool was developed, adapted to the circumstances of Polish companies, tested and now is being disseminated among entrepreneurs. The Diversity Index is a reliable instrument for analysis and monitoring of diversity management in the

---
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workplace, allowing for a real and objective diagnosis of the employer's policy. What distinguishes this tool from other diversity management tools is its focus on all types of discrimination, i.e. gender, ethnic/national background, sexual orientation, age, socio-economic status, disability etc. The project promoters carried out a research on many tools for diversity management used in other countries. All of these instruments were focused on the gender or multi-cultural aspects only.

The tool is available on-line and off-line. The manual and guidance which are its integrated parts facilitate both auto-diagnosis and assessments of a company from a diversity management point of view, as well as playing an educational role explaining in detail what diversity management really means and giving examples of how to implement it. In the testing phase most of the participants underlined that just going through the tool (in the form of a questionnaire) gave them a lot of examples and inspiration to introduce some elements of the proposed approach in their own enterprises. The manual which is the integrated part of the tool described in details how to use and implement every part of the tool.

This is considered good practice as it allows areas of diversity in Polish organisation to be identified, and it is a part of a process aimed at long-term promotion of the idea of the diversity management in Poland. The tool is adjusted to different types of enterprises, i.e. small, medium and big. It can be easily transferred and adapted, e.g. to other types of institutions like NGOs or public administration, as well as implemented in another country. It is also a very good tool for self-assessment or auto-diagnosis and can be implemented as a whole or its particular parts. According to the research conducting before the project, Poland is the first to use such a wide approach to diversity management.

**Training of laid-off employees (SI)**

The programme was implemented as an intervention to respond to effects of the crisis. It aimed to engage 20,000 people in training in the years 2009-2011, which would enable them to gain further skills or change / develop their careers linked to newly acquired skills. It was planned that 80% of the 20,000 people participating would successfully finish the training.

This training programme was intended for persons who still held regular employment status, but for whom the employer could not guarantee continuation of the work, so they were partly laid-off (waiting for work, while still having the status of an employed person). Employees were required to participate in the training programme for at least 6 months and then they were to return to their work. In the meantime, they participated in training and received 85% of their salary (of which half was financed by the PES).

The instrument aimed to prevent people moving into open unemployment while simultaneously offering a new approach to flexicurity and stimulating internal flexibility within companies. The vast majority (90%) of people participated in internal training and, through this, companies gained workers who could assume different posts depending on the current needs of the employer. Most often, the knowledge which was transferred addressed technological processes, mechanics and mechatronics, personal development, communication, motivation and other issues.

This intervention was active for two years and supported approximately 25,000 people. Approximately 90% of those who participated in training retained their employment, in the majority of cases within the same companies.
Competence centre ‘tool making as development actor of technological development of Notranjsko-kraška region’ (SI)
The competence centre brings together 12 partners from Notranjsko-kraška region of Slovenia. Craftsmanship demands specific competences from workers in this area and they often cannot be obtained in the labour market. This is why partners decided to cooperate and systematically develop an approach to competence development. The basis for the activities was a competence model, which defines technical and business models of workplaces in the field of tool making. 418 employees (35% of the partners’ employees) were assessed in terms of their current skills level and their desired skills level. On this basis, an assessment was made of the gap between the desired and actual level of competences in order to prepare a plan for competence development.

The main skills needed were for optimal management of programme tools (e.g. for constructors, technologists, measurers). Machine (CNC) operators were also found to need knowledge on specific treatments of tools (turning, milling, grinding). In addition, effective sales, process optimisation and effective leadership skills were found to be needed to operate successfully in international markets.

In the first year (2011), external training was the main focus of the intervention. 35 external programmes were offered in addition to 6 internal training programmes. A similar level of intervention was planned also for the year 2012. In addition, professional site visits for employees were implemented.

This is the first example of such partnership cooperation in the region. Partners discovered that investments in human resources in times of crisis are very important as only companies with competent employees can gain competitive advantage in the market. In addition, competent employees can also help companies to overcome the crisis in as short time as possible.

Raising level of knowledge and adaptability of employees (SK)
The project “Raising the level of knowledge and adaptability of employees of the “BARDEJOVKÉ KÚPELE a.s. (Bardejov Spa)” company” is regarded as good practice. In order to create and maintain the jobs, the project supported the adaptability of the company and developed the skills and capabilities of employees through general training activities (vocational training of medical staff subject to needs of respective job positions, language training, training on enhancement management, communication and administration skills). The main indicator of success is that the project results sustain after the end of the project. The training activities had been implemented in accordance with the Quality Policy subject to the ISO norm and this has contributed to the sustainability of results. The follow-up training activities will be funded by the company. The training activities will be focused on the repeated re-education of medical staff. The results of training provided and implementation of the project itself oriented the company towards information society trends, contributed to an increase in share of economically active population in lifelong learning and mainly supported development of training activities focused on the direct professional needs of the company and its employees.
6 Enhancing access to employment

6.1 ESF scope

The second action set out under the framework ‘Convergence and Regional Competitiveness and Employment’ is: “enhancing access to employment and the sustainable inclusion in the labour market of job seekers and inactive people, preventing unemployment, in particular long-term and youth unemployment, encouraging active ageing and longer working lives, and increasing participation in the labour market, in particular by promoting:

- (i) the modernisation and strengthening of labour market institutions, in particular employment services and other relevant initiatives in the context of the strategies of the European Union and the Member States for full employment;
- (ii) the implementation of active and preventive measures ensuring the early identification of needs with individual action plans and personalised support, such as tailored training, job search, outplacement and mobility, self-employment and business creation, including cooperative enterprises, incentives to encourage participation in the labour market, flexible measures to keep older workers in employment longer, and measures to reconcile work and private life, such as facilitating access to childcare and care for dependent persons;
- (iii) mainstreaming and specific action to improve access to employment, increase the sustainable participation and progress of women in employment and reduce gender based segregation in the labour market, including by addressing the root causes, direct and indirect, of gender pay gaps;
- (iv) specific action to increase the participation of migrants in employment and thereby strengthen their social integration and to facilitate geographic and occupational mobility of workers and integration of cross-border labour markets, including through guidance, language training and validation of competences and acquired skills”.

6.2 Types of intervention

Access to Employment (A2E) accounts for a significant proportion of all ESF activity. Given this, it is not surprising to find evidence in the country reports of a wide range of interventions. In broad terms, these can be grouped into three categories.

**Enhancing recipient employability**

Increasingly there is evidence of A2E interventions fitting into a coherent Employability Pathway which includes the following interventions.

- Initial assessment work with recipients to identify what supports they need in order to move them towards and into employment, which they can subsequently sustain.
- Providing information, advice and guidance to recipients to help them make the right decision and take advantage of the right interventions.
- Helping with the personal development of recipients, in terms of raising confidence and aspirations and generally trying to make people more resilient.
- Addressing basic and employability skills. Basic skills typically include literacy, numeracy, IT and basic language skills particularly for migrants. Employability skills
include the things that employers generally demand such as reliability in attendance, capability for working in teams, etc.

- Creating new or upgraded vocational skills are a traditional feature of the ESF and remain a significant component of A2E within the ESF. The economic recession appears to have given a stimulus to this with substantial redundancies in jobs and skills generating a significant demand for re-training.

- Another common intervention is work experience/internships. They help generate the employability skills and general workplace awareness discussed above. They provide an experience which can feature on a CV in relation to job search. They offer a direct opportunity to impress an employer and so secure a temporary contract or permanent employment. Graduate internships and work experience interventions more generally have been a major response to the rapidly deteriorating youth employment situation across Europe.

- Support for enhanced skills in job search, job application and interview processes.

- Post job entry support, sometimes called aftercare. The rationales for this generally relate to the following issues:
  - Particularly in a context of labour market depression, jobs available are often on a short term and temporary basis. Recipients of A2E interventions who succeed in finding a job may also need help in keeping the job or moving quickly to another job.
  - Particularly for recipients who fall into the most disadvantaged categories and confront Social Exclusion, they may have a higher degree of fragility in the early stages of a new job and both the recipient and their employer can benefit from aftercare services.

**Supporting creation and retention of employment**

- ESF A2E resources in a number of member states are committed to helping unemployed individuals into self-employment and enterprise start up.

- The ESF is also deployed in a number of member states to incentivise employers to recruit and/or skill target groups of recipients, such as young unemployed.

- Particularly in areas of severe labour market depression and for groups who are very long term unemployed and multiply disadvantaged, ESF A2E support is being provided in a number of member states for the creation of transitional employment or supported employment.

**Capacity building**

- In some of the member states newer to the EU, ESF A2E money has been committed to building the capacity of public employment and training services, including the creation of more effective systems and processes. The relevance of ESF investment here is that it raises the return on the investment of ESF A2E money in basic skills, training and other interventions as the public employment service will often then be tasked with finding employment for the recipients.
6.3 Analysis of outputs

Total outputs
As a reflection of the high priority given to A2E, particularly with the onset of the global economic recession, it is not surprising to find that the total number of participations is over 19.6 million (Table 6) to end December 2012.

Within this total:

- Over 13.6 million participations involved the unemployed and of these over 3.7 million were long term unemployed.
- Over 2.9 million participations involved the inactive, and over 545,000 of these were in education or training.
- Over 1.8 million participations involved the employed, with over 138,000 of these self-employed.

Outputs by participant characteristics
Outputs are also broken down to identify some priority groups.

- Over 10.5 million of participations involve women, 54% of total participations.
- In terms of age, the main category is those aged 25-54. However, nearly 5.6 million (29%) participations involved young people and nearly 1.2 million (6%) older people.
- A2E interventions also reach significant numbers from more disadvantaged groups with nearly 2.1 million (11%) participations for migrants, over 1.1 million (6%) ethnic minorities and over 1.2 million (6%) disabled people.
- In terms of the education background of participants most have a lower or upper secondary education, although over 2.1 million (11%) participations involve people with a tertiary education.
### Table 6. Access to employment outputs to end December 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of participations</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Of which self-employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Inactive</th>
<th>Of which long-term unemployed</th>
<th>Young people (15-24)</th>
<th>Older people (55-64)</th>
<th>Migrants</th>
<th>Minorities</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Primary or lower education</th>
<th>Upper secondary education</th>
<th>Post-secondary non tertiary education</th>
<th>Tertiary education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>462,520</td>
<td>210,521</td>
<td>93,017</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>365,878</td>
<td>173,138</td>
<td>3,625</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>113,419</td>
<td>15,454</td>
<td>135,394</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28,838</td>
<td>219,264</td>
<td>152,320</td>
<td>208,981</td>
<td>38,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>103,847</td>
<td>52,663</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103,172</td>
<td>24,775</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>17,525</td>
<td>22,602</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11,321</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>38,140</td>
<td>38,893</td>
<td>13,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>10,910</td>
<td>5,282</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>7,658</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2,330</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>7,066</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>5,755</td>
<td>1,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>274,006</td>
<td>152,462</td>
<td>25,746</td>
<td>2,906</td>
<td>230,213</td>
<td>119,656</td>
<td>18,047</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>10,839</td>
<td>5,818</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>6,039</td>
<td>12,863</td>
<td>14,316</td>
<td>30,908</td>
<td>1,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE**</td>
<td>1,443,683</td>
<td>724,711</td>
<td>107,115</td>
<td>9,270</td>
<td>1,002,614</td>
<td>623,055</td>
<td>333,654</td>
<td>48,656</td>
<td>519,238</td>
<td>105,903</td>
<td>437,365</td>
<td>9,225</td>
<td>58,923</td>
<td>107,968</td>
<td>854,421</td>
<td>342,890</td>
<td>31,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>25,668</td>
<td>12,774</td>
<td>6,523</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>3,204</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>15,941</td>
<td>15,211</td>
<td>15,374</td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td>2,852</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,895</td>
<td>4,913</td>
<td>2,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>175,887</td>
<td>98,277</td>
<td>28,560</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>139,446</td>
<td>68,590</td>
<td>7,881</td>
<td>2,318</td>
<td>28,551</td>
<td>20,253</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>56,264</td>
<td>14,950</td>
<td>21,919</td>
<td>33,147</td>
<td>59,738</td>
<td>36,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>5,778,019</td>
<td>3,602,830</td>
<td>450,235</td>
<td>33,254</td>
<td>5,215,134</td>
<td>483,332</td>
<td>130,134</td>
<td>70,816</td>
<td>1,324,682</td>
<td>376,802</td>
<td>1,099,364</td>
<td>8,662</td>
<td>79,649</td>
<td>94,501</td>
<td>2,969,610</td>
<td>1,244,844</td>
<td>149,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>114,285</td>
<td>60,622</td>
<td>36,422</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>55,084</td>
<td>17,488</td>
<td>22,779</td>
<td>17,812</td>
<td>34,611</td>
<td>10,905</td>
<td>12,614</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>3,327</td>
<td>7,683</td>
<td>40,483</td>
<td>40,680</td>
<td>7,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>2,233,809</td>
<td>1,234,961</td>
<td>179,387</td>
<td>12,089</td>
<td>1,614,022</td>
<td>475,016</td>
<td>440,400</td>
<td>148,748</td>
<td>1,123,074</td>
<td>65,456</td>
<td>164,338</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>60,288</td>
<td>172,743</td>
<td>1,126,461</td>
<td>658,397</td>
<td>297,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>347,155</td>
<td>222,013</td>
<td>97,965</td>
<td>37,039</td>
<td>244,600</td>
<td>57,211</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>20,678</td>
<td>6,898</td>
<td>3,851</td>
<td>1,807</td>
<td>3,110</td>
<td>14,502</td>
<td>83,716</td>
<td>168,323</td>
<td>25,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>169,372</td>
<td>88,236</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>157,263</td>
<td>50,724</td>
<td>9,519</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>44,077</td>
<td>11,526</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>15,858</td>
<td>11,253</td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>50,664</td>
<td>91,135</td>
<td>12,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>186,251</td>
<td>79,794</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>152,612</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>216,667</td>
<td>677,233</td>
<td>27,379</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>112,368</td>
<td>24,731</td>
<td>76,920</td>
<td>55,488</td>
<td>84,970</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>24,742</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>45,165</td>
<td>54,904</td>
<td>139,980</td>
<td>48,902</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>5,189</td>
<td>2,039</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>2,920</td>
<td>2,916</td>
<td>3,452</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>4,089</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>336,975</td>
<td>201,419</td>
<td>58,928</td>
<td>3,110</td>
<td>268,182</td>
<td>117,794</td>
<td>9,865</td>
<td>6,033</td>
<td>34,084</td>
<td>53,067</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>98,448</td>
<td>14,543</td>
<td>204,890</td>
<td>62,584</td>
<td>183,848</td>
<td>20,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 Self-employed is a sub-group of employed.
31 Long term unemployed is a sub-group of unemployed.
32 In education/training is a sub-group of inactive.
33 Educational attainment on entering.
34 Relates to Priority Axis C – Access to Employment
35 No data for participants 'entering' in CR. As the first three Policy Fields in Lithuania are contained in the Priority Axis 1 (“Quality Employment and Social Inclusion”) and the outputs according to Annex XXIII data are provided in terms of Priority Axis and not sub-priorities, it is not possible to provide detailed information on the outputs of Priority Field "Enhancing access to employment".
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total number of participations</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Of which self-employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Of which LTI</th>
<th>Inactive</th>
<th>Of which in education (young 15-24)</th>
<th>Young people (15-24)</th>
<th>Older people (55-64)</th>
<th>Migrants</th>
<th>Minorities</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Primary or lower education</th>
<th>Upper secondary education</th>
<th>Post-secondary non tertiary education</th>
<th>Tertiary education</th>
<th>Primary or lower education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>184,373</td>
<td>78,889</td>
<td>71,338</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>53,874</td>
<td>36,111</td>
<td>59,161</td>
<td>20,831</td>
<td>93,211</td>
<td>24,787</td>
<td>55,95</td>
<td>59,265</td>
<td>19,436</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,993</td>
<td>23,616</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>1,110,000</td>
<td>634,300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>119,998</td>
<td>75,607</td>
<td>15,664</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>104,319</td>
<td>21,755</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,398</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,162</td>
<td>9,472</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23,435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>368,469</td>
<td>221,654</td>
<td>77,303</td>
<td>9,366</td>
<td>195,935</td>
<td>70,002</td>
<td>95,231</td>
<td>13,365</td>
<td>94,775</td>
<td>22,330</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>31,082</td>
<td>2,681</td>
<td>120,906</td>
<td>150,097</td>
<td>116,950</td>
<td>14,268</td>
<td>82,186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>94,737</td>
<td>44,186</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>1,162,571</td>
<td>468,537</td>
<td>109,696</td>
<td>20,854</td>
<td>963,852</td>
<td>305,985</td>
<td>92,723</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>328,673</td>
<td>117,162</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>55,079</td>
<td>353,764</td>
<td>502,667</td>
<td>196,796</td>
<td>43,826</td>
<td>66,382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>4,512,245</td>
<td>1,582,806</td>
<td>458,120</td>
<td>2,147</td>
<td>2,540,712</td>
<td>1,004,885</td>
<td>1,513,413</td>
<td>139,714</td>
<td>1,625,032</td>
<td>280,105</td>
<td>92,995</td>
<td>835,007</td>
<td>832,928</td>
<td>721,928</td>
<td>1,123,658</td>
<td>1,522,414</td>
<td>14,316</td>
<td>223,058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19,606,446</td>
<td>10,586,295</td>
<td>1,860,025</td>
<td>138,507</td>
<td>13,652,934</td>
<td>3,734,432</td>
<td>2,921,032</td>
<td>545,555</td>
<td>5,595,101</td>
<td>1,173,212</td>
<td>2,065,661</td>
<td>1,131,875</td>
<td>1,242,638</td>
<td>2,241,433</td>
<td>7,547,424</td>
<td>5,066,660</td>
<td>719,588</td>
<td>2,112,348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36 Available data for total and women only.
37 Annex XXIII data from SFC is not allocated to specific Policy Fields in SI Country Report.
38 Number of participants in programmes aiming to increase employment. Approximate.
39 Data from the Annex XXIII minus estimates made in relation to policy field 'increasing adaptability'.
40 Data from the Annex XXIII minus estimates made in relation to policy field 'increasing adaptability'.
41 Data from the Annex XXIII minus estimates made in relation to policy field 'increasing adaptability'.
42 Data from the Annex XXIII minus estimates made in relation to policy field 'increasing adaptability'.
43 Data from the Annex XXIII minus estimates made in relation to policy field 'increasing adaptability'.
44 Data from the Annex XXIII minus estimates made in relation to policy field 'increasing adaptability'.
6.4 Analysis of results

Overview
The analysis here is again based on the 27 country reports. The country experts were required to present an analysis based largely on 2012 AIRs (i.e. results to end December 2012).

Table A4 in the Appendix sets out the results for a selection of indicators across the 27 member states. It is disappointing that for such an important policy field relatively few aggregate results by member state can be reported. Additionally, in some member states, results are captured as percentages which cannot be aggregated to provide a single figure estimate in absolute or percentage terms for the member state. Finally, in some member states it proved impossible to break down results by policy field and therefore the results reported below will be underestimates. Bearing in mind the above caveats, the key findings are as follows:

- The major category of results for A2E is job entry. Just over 3.3 million job entries have been achieved.
- Over 497,000 qualifications have been achieved in this policy field.
- Nearly 133,000 progressions into education and training have resulted from A2E activities.
- Nearly 42,000 have moved into self-employment.
- Within the other category it is important to note results including nearly 24,000 women achieving a better work family balance (GR). Within the UK, over 387,000 young people in the NEET category are reported as being in education, employment or training on leaving their ESF intervention.

Analysis of country experts
The discussion here is based on the key points raised by the experts discussing the results for their own countries. In addition to the AIRs, evaluations were also used, where available, including those published in 2013

Broad conclusions
A small number of broad points emerged.

- A2E is primarily about supporting people into employment or self-employment, although many of the interventions are at the early stages of preparing people for job entry. However, given the close connectedness to the labour market it is clear that the impact of the global recession from 2008 made the implementation of ESF supported A2E interventions very challenging across all member states, and for those affected most severely by the later banking and public expenditure crises – particularly CY, ES, GR and PT the impacts of labour market depression have been more prolonged.
- Country reports are full of references to the dual effects of the crisis on A2E interventions: demand for A2E services from final recipients has risen significantly and the proportion of final recipients able to enter and sustain employment has declined – but with some recovery from 2012 onwards.
Again in broad terms, the following points can be made.

- A number of evaluations (AT and BE) highlight the 'soft' results associated with A2E interventions, including such things as more independent and effective job search, greater self-confidence, higher level of motivation towards work and more social integration generally.
- Notwithstanding the above, job entry rates are typically below 50% although this varies according to the period at which these are measured following completion of a specific activity. In a number of member states (EE, IE, LV, MT, PT, SE and UK) job entry rates are typically around 1 in 3 or less.
- The picture on job sustainability, however, is very mixed with apparently very high rates close to 90% in NL but as low as a third in EE.
- In some member states (IE, IT, LV and PL) entry to self-employment is a relatively high proportion of the total employment/self-employment result. In LV and PL, for example, this is close to 30%. In the UK, the percentage going into self-employment is very low.
- Although counterfactual evaluation evidence (BE, IT) tends to show a significant net benefit from participation in A2E activities, some more negative evidence (AT, BE) suggests that for young people participation in A2E measures has a net negative impact on the grounds that they would have been better off searching more intensively for and finding work rather than joining an A2E programme.

### Results for interventions

There is some evaluation material which provides guidance on specific interventions which are more or less successful.

- On the demand side, there is limited evidence of significant activity on the part of enterprises to change the work environment or their recruitment practices to facilitate more employment opportunities for more disadvantaged groups or to promote gender equality (EE, ES, LV).
- Wage subsidies have been deployed extensively since the global recession to incentivise employers to recruit the unemployed and other groups with specific disadvantages. Some evaluation evidence (EE, SI) suggests that significant percentages of the final recipients subsequently return to unemployment.
- Public works and other temporary job creative measures have a poor record in terms of the percentages moving on subsequently to employment (LT, LV).
- Stronger results are evident for training which is vocationally specific and for traineeships and work placements (BE, EE, IE, IT, PT, UK). Some counterfactual evaluation evidence also suggests that training makes a significant difference to the subsequent labour market careers of participants (IT).
- In SK, interventions to provide work placements for disadvantaged unemployed people and measures to support self-employment have been most successful in sustaining employment beyond the end of ESF support, with training of unemployed, in-work training for graduates and employing individuals in public works less successful.
- Inadequate literacy and numeracy skills are frequently cited as barriers to employment for more disadvantaged groups. ESF supported literacy and numeracy interventions have been shown to make a significant net positive impact on job entry in IE.
Results for specific groups

There is some evidence on variations across different groups in the results of A2E interventions.

- Older and/or disabled people tend to have significantly lower job entry rates within the same projects and programmes (BE, EE, FR, UK).
- More disadvantaged groups of unemployed people generally do less well in terms of job entry (PL, UK).
- Young participants from disadvantaged communities (FR) and the residents of areas in need of regeneration (IE) also tend to underperform in relation to the results achieved from A2E interventions.

6.5 Analysis of effectiveness

Overview

Despite the A2E policy field accounting for a substantial proportion of ESF expenditure and activity, most country experts were hampered by a lack of robust impact evaluations. This is disappointing because there is more clarity in this policy field about the impacts to be achieved which basically revolve around good results for entry to employment and self-employment and strong sustainability for these results – with positive consequential impacts upon rates of employment, unemployment and inactivity. Nonetheless at the member state level:

- Where robust evaluations have been conducted (for example, BE, FI, UK) significant net differences in terms of employment and unemployment are associated with the ESF activity.
- The worsening labour market conditions from 2008, and the most recent improvements in the labour market, are clearly influencing results (IE).

Findings

A small number of more specific findings are worth recording:

- There is only limited evaluation evidence of A2E actions trying to bring about changes in employer attitudes and behaviours in relation to groups which are discriminated against and are generally more disadvantaged – with little evidence that this has happened to much effect (CZ, HU).
- In member states where evaluations have compared PES activity with ESF funded additional activity for the same client group (FI, UK) positive effects have been found to result from the ESF-supported intervention packages which are essentially providing a more intensive and higher quality service to unemployed people.
- The added value of ESF interventions compared to PES interventions has been shown in the UK to be much greater for more disadvantaged unemployed people, in this case people on inactive benefits due to health-related issues.
- There is some evidence (IE, IT) that, where different types of intervention are combined for the participants, employment results are achieved more cost-effectively. For IT, this works through the employability pathway approach.
- Training interventions are normally associated with significant net benefits (IE, IT, PT) – and the benefits are greater where the training is closely tuned to the needs of employers (PT) or designed with the assistance of employers (PT).
- There is no clear evidence on the added value of longer training. This produces additional benefits in IT but the opposite results are reported for IE and PL.
a difficulty in so far as shorter ESF-funded training tends to involve younger people who generally have higher job entry rates, other things being equal.

- Evaluation evidence suggests that work experience and internships produce good employment results in a number of member states (IT, PL, PT).
- Although there is only one example (PL), a very interesting finding is that where the participants make a voluntary decision to take part in ESF-funded activity – as opposed to being referred by PES or encouraged by other agencies – they are much more likely to achieve a job entry, other things being equal.

### 6.6 Good practice

**Overview**

Based on an assessment of the identification of good practice study material in the country reports, 12 of the country experts were unable to identify evidence-based good practice, or could provide only sketchy descriptions of the good practice. From the rest, a number of good practice examples are described for a mix of member states and types of intervention.

**Experience Certificate (BE)**

BE has introduced an ‘Experience Certificate’ which certifies that an individual has the necessary skills to practise a given profession, even when they have not obtained a formal degree or certificate in the educational system. It enabled work experience to be officially recognised by the Flemish Government and provides Flemish employers with an indication of a candidate’s abilities. The use of the Experience Certificate has been growing steadily each year, both in terms of professional experience tests being validated as well as in terms of the number of participants.

**Innovative itinerary with families (ES)**

The project implements personalised journeys with all the members of the family who are of working age through an employability and socio-economic analysis. It uses a competence model so that all the activities contribute to the improvement of the family ‘system’ and the adaptation of the organised social life from a working perspective. This includes specific work on co-responsibility in the family, especially in household tasks, in order to support the member of the family with more possibilities of accessing employment in the short term.

It uses a systemic methodology that looks in depth at each member of the family and the relationships established between them. The search for employment is not focused on only one person but on the whole family. This methodology also permits the detection of cases of gender-based violence, as well as mediating inter-generational relationships. This methodology is the reason why the project is regarded as good practice.

85 participants (52 women) took part with a job entry rate of 41% (46% women). This was a direct consequence of the project in 48% of the cases.

**Multiple provider model (IE)**

The LMAF 2010 Evaluation found that the multiple provider model facilitated provision of tailored, responsive and market-focused interventions.

In relation to actions implemented, the mix of core and specific industry and occupationally focused skills, the inclusion of a work placement aspect, the provision of wider forms of support addressed to needs of individual participants and the
emphasis on progression rather than education and training courses per se were identified as key characteristics of success. This approach reflects a holistic approach to supporting progression towards employment by unemployed people.

The success factors to bring unemployed back into employment are identified as follows: developing education and training provision to match job-seekers skills to market and specific industry needs and job opportunities in new sectors (e.g. sustainable energy, ICT), and direct links to employment opportunities (structured work experience and placement programmes).

A key focus was direct engagement with employers to establish skills needed by them and to stimulate future demand for participants’ skills. This was the case, for example, in a Higher Diploma in computing project offered by an Institute of Technology (third level educational institution) where employers in the sector had considerable input to identifying skills in demand. This approach was particularly important in projects involving industry-focused up-skilling or re-skilling where immediate employment was often a primary goal.

The LMAF 2010 recognised that there was a continued need to focus on the development of softer skills, particularly for those participants who experienced either long-term unemployment or where previous working experience had been concentrated within a specific skill or employment sector (e.g. on a construction site or in basic manufacturing). However, it also recognised that such core skills development must be linked to a complete intervention pathway to support progression into sustainable employment.

The evaluation report states that benefits of incorporating a work placement into the training programme were maximised when there was a clear project goal with specific timelines and clear results to be achieved. This approach provided both the participants and employers with an understanding of the purpose, benefits, duration and conditions of the placement and brought participants into a real employment situation.

Cross-sectoral collaboration (IE)

The LMAF 2010 evaluation draws attention to the benefits of and provides examples of cross-sectoral cooperation. Collaboration was a defining characteristic of many of the projects. This involved collaboration to ensure that: potential participants were aware of opportunities (e.g. the social welfare offices, local voluntary organisations); participants could receive the support required to engage (e.g. via community childcare initiatives or agencies working with marginalised groups); the education and training necessary for progression onto or from the LMAF programme was available (e.g. core skills development by a Vocational Educational Committee that would allow participants to access higher level vocation-focused courses); the skills produced via the LMAF intervention reflected the needs of employers in the area (e.g. by engaging with major local employers, Chambers of Commerce and business associations, industry networks, etc.).

In order to reflect these needs, the evaluation identified three types of approaches across projects.

1. Formal collaboration in the project proposal / design stage. This occurred where a number of stakeholders were involved in delivering different aspects of the project based on their respective remits and expertise. For example: (a) the Shannon Consortium, involving the University of Limerick, Limerick Institute of Technology, Mary Immaculate College and Institute of Technology Tralee (higher educational
providers) applied for support in association with City of Limerick VEC and County Clare VEC (further and adult education providers); (b) the Digital Skills Academy worked in partnership with four colleges of further education as well as with the Chambers of Commerce in Cork, Galway, Limerick and Dublin, to deliver the Web Activate programme; (c) the Sustainable Ireland Cooperative Society (trading as Cultivate) worked with a training provider to deliver a programme on sustainability and the green economy. Cultivate brought their expertise and network in sustainable issues as well as their wider network of industry partners, such as Business in the Community and the Irish Green Building Council (IGBC) and professional organisations, such as the Royal Institute of Architects of Ireland, the Chartered Institute of Building Services Engineers and the Institute of Planners Ireland. This broad range of organisational expertise helped to build the business case for sustainability and a platform to work effectively with entrepreneurs.

(2) Other project providers focused on a collaborative approach by linking in with organisations to ensure access and support during delivery. For example: The Shannon Consortium used two Downtown Resource Centres in Limerick City and Ennis to access and support participants. They delivered a Foundation Certificate in partnership with Limerick VEC, supporting subsequent progression into higher level (FETAC Level 6-7) courses offered by the higher education institutions. The Institute of Technology in Tralee established strong links with a local network of partners, including the local employment services (LES), social welfare offices, the County Enterprise Board and Shannon Development (regional development agency) and leveraged that network for the planning and roll-out of the project.

(3) Most project providers collaborated in the identification and assessment of need. Significant consultation and partnership working was undertaken in the preparation of the proposals and in the design of the actions. An example of targeting to needs and market opportunities included an assessment and guidance programme provided to over 1,000 unemployed persons around the country. The primary purpose was to use this as a basis for meeting individualised and person-centred education and training needs. This also involved matching jobseekers skills, experience and interests with market opportunities.

Approaches often built upon previous experience of delivery, adding new forms of support or innovative aspects to facilitate access (e.g. the First Step project built on its track record of offering funding to unemployed people to start their own businesses by offering intensive training and mentoring support that decreased the loan rejection rate from 70% to 7% and facilitated activation). The LMAF also identified the importance of building capability for self-employment and business start-up including links to provision of appropriate supports in order to set up in business.

The identification of success factors and examples of good practice are relevant in the context of current reforms and strengthening activation policy in Ireland including the roll-out of a new model (Intreo) in local employment / social protection offices.

**Extraordinary Employment Plan (IT)**

The Extraordinary Employment Plan activated by Liguria OP in 2009 to implement the Government-Regions-Social Parts Agreement for combating economic crisis had a 2 year duration and mobilized €50.000.000,00 financing (not fully ESF). The Plan implemented both demand side measures (supporting companies in contrasting specific crisis situations, e.g. through the definition of training or restructuring plans and favouring their access to training opportunities) and supply side measures (supporting the employed at risk of unemployment or the unemployed, both through active and passive labour market interventions: information, training, counselling but
also unemployment subsidies whose distribution is conditional on service participation).

This general scheme is not peculiar of Liguria OP but it was common to all Region/AA.PP. plans or programs tackling the economic crisis. What makes it good practice are the following elements (indicated in the Intermediate OP Evaluation report):

- The Plan development was carried out through a deep and wide partnership and participative process that involved all the local social and economic partners.
- The Plan implementation produced positive results such as: a strengthening of inter-institutional relationship among the actors involved; the definition of shared instruments and devices for the electronic information management; the support for the PES regional system to play a crucial role in employment services specifically targeted to cope with crisis situations; and the development of personalised and individualised intervention models.
- The Plan experimented with process and result innovations: a) the integration among different measures (training, counselling, guidance, delivered face-to-face but also at distance); b) the implementation of interventions aimed at converting non-standard/atypical contracts into standard open-ended ones.

As for the transferability, only the partnership model on which the Plan design and management were based is considered as transferable in other contexts.

**Young Employment Support Plan (IT)**

Implemented by the Emilia-Romagna OP, the plan has a total financial value of €46 million to support the subsidised employment of young through the activation of different measures:

- Hiring and/or employment-stabilisation interventions.
- Apprenticeship.
- Job-oriented training and employment subsidies.
- Self-employment and start-up support (services and financing).
- Specific actions for 30-34 years olds (excluded by any other national employment measure).

All the interventions are based on targeted skill/labour demand analysis and/or demand expressed by companies or SMEs, as well as a business opportunities survey. Training courses had to be designed in coherence with the regional qualification system (to certify learning outcomes) and be 300-500 hours length; in addition, at least 80% of training hours had to be on-the-job. Also, access to training through vouchers has been implemented, giving the recipients the possibility to choose which course to attend from a regional catalogue.

The Plan is viewed as good practice for the following reasons:

- The integrated financing is based not only on the ESF but also on other regional instruments.
- The involvement in the Plan implementation of all the organisations locally responsible for supporting employment.
- The provision of a wide range of measures and instruments, making it possible for any person to design his/her individual pathway to employment.
The inclusion in the Plan of recipients generally not covered by specific measures and for this reason particularly exposed to unemployment in the economic crisis.

The absolute priority given to the activation of personalized or individualised interventions based on explicit and formalised local skill needs or demand.

In general, the Plan structure and design seem to be quite transferable in other contexts but the very positive local economic and institutional conditions existing in Emilia-Romagna (which are a decisive component of the Plan, especially for its implementation) are not common elsewhere in Italy.

**Support for employment and mobility (LT)**

It is seen as one of the most successful and useful projects for tackling unemployment, improving the competitive opportunities of those looking for jobs and helping establish them in the labour market or finding temporary employment. The project has supported several types of activities, including:

- **Vocational training** – achieving qualifications or acquiring competences necessary to become employed. The participants were paid training scholarships, and travel, accommodation and health examination expenses were covered.
- **Job rotation** – aimed at giving an opportunity for those searching for a job to become temporarily employed by replacing those who are on vacation or in collective work contracts. The employers organising job rotation were paid subsidies for salaries.
- **Employment through subsidies** – paid to employers to recruit those registered in labour exchanges to establish themselves in the labour market or become temporarily employed.
- **Support for geographical mobility of unemployed** – to encourage unemployed persons to find employment in places distant from their homes when the labour exchange cannot offer them other work. The unemployed supported under this measure were granted compensation for their travel and accommodation costs.

This project is a good practice example because the support it provided was well adapted and relevant to the needs of different groups of unemployed persons in Lithuania. As a consequence, it was one of the most successful measures in tackling the problem of unemployment. It involved 18,928 participants (from 14,516 planned), 95.7% of those involved in training programmes acquired professional qualifications (from 85% planned), 56.6% were permanently employed after project activities (from planned 41%).

Limited information is provided on the transferability of this good practice example to other countries. However, bearing in mind the variety of measures aimed at increasing the employability of the target group, it is assumed that the project could be at least partially successfully adapted to other national contexts with high unemployment rates.

**‘Work with stipend’ and ‘Temporary subsidised jobs’ (LV)**

The “Work with stipend” and its successor “Temporary subsidised jobs” programmes can be considered as one consolidated measure and represent a clear example of good practice. The key factors are as follows.

- **Eligibility:** all registered unemployed not receiving unemployment benefit for any reason.
 Monthly stipend amount: €142 net of tax, or 80% of the net minimum wage in 2009; equivalent to less than 60% of the value of the minimum consumer basket of prices. Since July 2011, it was €114, or 55% of the net minimum wage (46% of the value of minimum consumer basket).

 Targeting mechanism: self-targeting. Local authorities used the programme as a pre-condition for able-bodied unemployed individuals to receive social assistance as an evidence of commitment to work.

 Order of selection: first come, first served.

 Limited duration: at least two weeks but no more than six months of work during a year.

 The jobs should have a social value (e.g. garbage collection, cleaning road sides and old graveyards, preparing firewood, building small infrastructure in national parks, helping elderly people and people with disabilities, etc.).

 To prevent substitution of existing or potential jobs, only non-profit organisations (municipalities and their partners such as NGOs and permitted government institutions) could participate in the programme, and the jobs should be newly created, with no one performing similar tasks during the four previous months.

 From January 2012 the “Temporary subsidised jobs” programme introduced the following changes:

 The target group became mainly long-term unemployed who have turned to the social services for assistance.

 Duration: up to 4 months.

 Contains an element of skill upgrading since participants are expected also to participate in State Employment Agency short courses.

 Positive incentives for finding a job with two days a month allowed for job search and job interviews.

 It can be cited as good practice for a number of reasons.

 The practice was chosen to present in the European Employment Observatory’s Mutual Learning Programme in April 2012. This programme gives countries an opportunity to showcase what they believe to be interesting and innovative practices.

 The measure was a creative attempt to address a catastrophic surge in unemployment in the second half of 2009 and in 2010, and provided both income support and work for people who had exhausted unemployment benefit entitlement.

 It has proved to be adaptable to changing circumstances: i.e. it has adapted to address long-term unemployment; and to the need to provide skills enhancement as well as income support.

 **Green Line Service – PES Information Centre (Zielona Linia) (PL)**

 The goal of the project is to modernise and improve the accessibility to the services of labour offices by enhancing the pace and facilitating access to information via the Internet and phone. The instrument is directed primarily to the unemployed, providing them with information about vacancies, as well as training and education possibilities. Zielona Linia Centre is an innovative system of providing support to the customers of Polish labour offices, first created in the Podlasie region. In 2000 the labour offices located in that region decided to introduce an innovative approach to the problem of
the high rate of unemployment that was worsened by a low degree of urbanisation. The solution was either employing additional staff to serve the customers or to introduce a complete change to the way they were handled. After the analysis of available technology, a new system of customer relationship management was introduced, based on an information line and the Internet. This was called the 24/7 System. It was difficult to implement because no one ever had done it on such a large scale.

The Centre focuses on questions concerning: labour market policy and law, benefits and different forms of support offered by district labour offices, and provides information relating to issues of the Labour Code. This 24/7 system collects and provides information about: current job offers (in Poland and abroad); professional licenses; sources of business financing; possibilities of vocational training and retraining; trial periods, vocational training at the workplace, public works etc.; recruitment of new employees; benefits from district labour offices; databases of: Public Employment Services, Employment Agencies, Centres for Information and Career Planning and other institutions.

This measure was recognised as a good practice and introduced on the national scale, mostly because of its comprehensive and multidimensional support (training, vacancies, counselling etc.), as well as accessibility 24 hours/7 days throughout Poland.

**Supporting employment of jobseekers (SK)**
The project ‘Supporting employment of job seekers’ aims to motivate employers to create new jobs or maintain existing jobs (especially low paid jobs) to support self-employment, to create new jobs for disadvantaged job seekers and to support employment by providing travel or removal costs. The project created 32,352 new jobs (40% for women). The project supported regional competitiveness and sustainable growth by improving the employability of job seekers and disadvantaged groups in the labour market.

The success of the project is attributed to creating the conditions and environment for the employment of job seekers with low employability (disadvantaged, marginalised, with low salary, unemployed for longer period of time, etc.). The systematic approach to providing funding under this active labour market policy measure (supported by the law) helped the most vulnerable job seekers to return to the labour market by giving them the chance to form and sustain working habits and skills. Officers of the network of Labour Offices actively worked with the project target groups and established a very solid base for continuing activities under this labour market policy measure.

**Engaging hard to reach groups (UK)**
Priority One in OP West Wales and the Valleys is targeted at young people and an evaluation of this PA (Thematic Evaluation of ESF Convergence Priority One in OP West Wales and the Valleys) found that many projects needed to develop innovative methods to engage young people. These included:

- Outreach activities and use of non-mainstream settings to meet with young people.
- Building effective referral pathways from services that young people are currently engaging with.
- Making a broad range of activities available to ensure that provision appeals to a wide range of individuals.
- Recognising that building relationships would take time and require a flexible approach.
The Amlwch Skills project is highlighted as being good practice in recruitment and engagement. There were two strands to its approach:

- Working with those partners it already had a strong working relationship with and who were working with young people (including Careers Wales and schools). The role of these partners was to identify those young people at risk of becoming NEET (not in employment, education or training) and to provide them with information on the options for future learning.

- Undertaking targeted outreach to reach those young people that had not been identified by other partners, for example, those who did not appear to be at risk of NEET as they had a post-school place (for example, on a college course) but had subsequently dropped out.

There are two elements to the good practice here:

- Adopting a range of approaches is necessary to ensure that as many young people are identified and reached as possible.
- Amlwch had been operating in the area prior to ESF-funding and their reputation and credibility helped them to work with partners to reach this client group.

**Use of soft outcome measurement tools (UK)**

For individuals further from the labour market, soft outcomes (such as increased self-confidence and motivation) can be important milestones in their journey towards and into work. Although, soft outcomes are difficult to measure a number of measurement tools have been developed to help providers capture data on progress against these outcomes. The Thematic Evaluation of ESF Convergence Priority One in OP West Wales and the Valleys found that the use of these tools was mixed – with some projects effectively integrating these tools into project delivery (for example, using them as assessment tools to identify client needs and help develop individual action plans) whilst others lacked effective systems and processes. Building the Future Together (BTFT) is highlighted as good practice in relation to the use of soft outcomes measurement tools. BTFT:

- Developed a booklet for key workers that provided guidance on using soft outcome measurement tools. This helped ensure a consistent approach to measuring soft outcomes – and that this was done to a high quality (as key workers had a good understanding of the process).
- In addition, the booklet contained contact details for all partners. This was important as the project involved a large number of partners and each young person accessed services from a number of agencies.
- Initially many partners within this project adopted existing soft measurement tools – but over time they developed their own tools.

This is considered good practice for two reasons:

- As many partners were involved, having clear guidance not only ensured that key workers knew how to use the soft outcome measurement tools but that there was a common approach to using these tools across partners.
- The use of soft measurement tools enabled schools, project staff and the young people to see progress that is being made.
7 Reinforcing social inclusion

7.1 ESF scope

The Social Inclusion policy field involves: “reinforcing the social inclusion of disadvantaged people with a view to their sustainable integration in employment and combating all forms of discrimination in the labour market, in particular by promoting:

- (i) pathways to integration and re-entry into employment for disadvantaged people, such as people experiencing social exclusion, early school leavers, minorities, people with disabilities and people providing care for dependent persons, through employability measures, including in the field of the social economy, access to vocational education and training, and accompanying actions and relevant support, community and care services that improve employment opportunities;
- (ii) acceptance of diversity in the workplace and the combating of discrimination in accessing and progressing in the labour market, including through awareness raising, the involvement of local communities and enterprises and the promotion of local employment initiatives”.

7.2 Types of intervention

This chapter looks in detail at intervention types and target groups for ESF-supported Social Inclusion activity across the member states.

Prevention
A significant effort has been mounted in a number of countries to deliver interventions that reduce the likelihood of individuals becoming socially excluded. These activities tend to sit at two ends of the integrated pathway.

- Prevention of early school leaving, as this is associated with failure to achieve educational qualifications and subsequently poor labour market careers.
- Working with employers to change their attitudes towards recruitment of some multiply disadvantaged groups, principally minority ethnic groups, migrant groups and disabled people.

Supportive services
Socially excluded individuals can confront obstacles to becoming more included in communities due to serious constraints such as the cost of travel to centres of population and employment and the cost and commitment involved in caring for dependents.

- ESF-supported Social Inclusion interventions to provide assistance with caring for dependents are relatively common across member states. ESF support in this area often complements more mainstream member state programmes to assist socially excluded people.
- Support with transportation costs is less common but is clearly more prevalent in rural communities where the need is greater.
Services for specific disadvantaged groups
There are a wide range of examples tackling the needs of groups with specific disadvantages.

- In relation to individuals with mental health issues, ESF-supported interventions include such things as one-to-one counselling services to help individuals to develop coping strategies.
- For individuals with physical disabilities, there is support both for them and potential employers to create employment opportunities that maximise their productivity in the workplace.
- There is a significant effort across member states using ESF funding to improve the prospects for prisoners (including young offenders) when they come to re-enter the community in relation to educational opportunities and vocational training, as well as dealing with other issues prevalent in the prison population such as addictions and mental health issues.

Tackling issues confronted by discriminated against minorities
Many member states are delivering ESF-supported interventions to tackle quite deeply rooted problems of social exclusion experienced by minority groups, and migrant populations.

- Social integration for Roma communities is a common intervention in those member states with a significant Roma population. The interventions tend to be wide-ranging dealing with families as well as individuals, and focusing also on education, vocational training and the development of employability skills.
- There are many examples of interventions to support migrant groups that have built up in recent years in a number of member states, including language training, as well as awareness-raising about how key institutions operate.

Providing supported employment
Some groups of multiply disadvantaged individuals are keen to work and may have the appropriate skills, but would find it difficult to settle quickly into conventional employment. This may reflect their individual circumstances (e.g. mental health issues) or family situations (e.g. major caring responsibilities for dependents). A number of member states promote supported employment within social enterprises as a means of providing a stepping stone between inactivity and conventional employment.

A2E measures
A2E interventions were discussed at length in the previous section.

Integrated pathways
It is common across member states to find references to integrated pathways. These are central to what is required to tackle social exclusion in a meaningful and sustainable way. The notion here is that individuals facing multiple disadvantages will need access to a number of different interventions and these must be delivered in a coordinated and integrated way for maximum effectiveness.
7.3 Analysis of outputs

Total outputs
The total number of participations to end December 2012 is almost 4.7 million (Table 7). This number appears quite low but in a number of member states social inclusion overlaps significantly with A2E, and is a horizontal theme in some member states.

Within this total:

- Over 2.4 million (52%) participations involved the unemployed and of these over 1.1 million were long term unemployed.
- Almost 1.5 million (32%) participations involved the inactive, and almost 470,000 of these were in education or training.
- Over 750,000 (16%) participations involved employed people, with just under 55,000 of these self-employed.

Outputs by participant characteristics
Outputs are also broken down to identify some priority groups.

- Almost 2.5 million of participations involved women, 53% of total participations.
- In terms of age, the main category is those aged 25-54. However, over 1.1 million (24%) participations involved young people and over 287,000 (6%) older people.
- Interventions also reach significant numbers from more disadvantaged groups with almost 318,000 (7%) participations involving migrants, just under 572,000 (12%) from ethnic minorities and over 637,000 (14%) disabled people.
- In terms of the education background of participations 45% (over 2 million) involve people with primary or lower secondary education, and a further 821,000 (18%) have upper secondary education.
Table 7. Social inclusion outputs to end December 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total number of participations</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Of which self-employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Of which LTU</th>
<th>Inactive</th>
<th>Of which in education/training</th>
<th>Young people (15-24)</th>
<th>Other people (35-64)</th>
<th>Migrants</th>
<th>Minorities</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Primary or lower education</th>
<th>Upper secondary education</th>
<th>Post-secondary education</th>
<th>Tertiary education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>111,947</td>
<td>45,283</td>
<td>8,977</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38,532</td>
<td>5,354</td>
<td>64,438</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>74,084</td>
<td>10,060</td>
<td>8,809</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>92,466</td>
<td>12,191</td>
<td>9,069</td>
<td>4,266</td>
<td>2,318</td>
<td>2,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>245,848</td>
<td>120,071</td>
<td>15,868</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>193,150</td>
<td>97,670</td>
<td>36,830</td>
<td>11,442</td>
<td>57,989</td>
<td>8,799</td>
<td>74,034</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,476</td>
<td>23,460</td>
<td>103,145</td>
<td>55,853</td>
<td>4,951</td>
<td>19,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>78,718</td>
<td>49,317</td>
<td>15,765</td>
<td>2,448</td>
<td>6,603</td>
<td>2,816</td>
<td>56,350</td>
<td>9,914</td>
<td>11,043</td>
<td>8,339</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>7,263</td>
<td>36,631</td>
<td>10,487</td>
<td>27,123</td>
<td>20,088</td>
<td>8,260</td>
<td>11,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>313,503</td>
<td>186,556</td>
<td>144,622</td>
<td>14,363</td>
<td>91,773</td>
<td>46,738</td>
<td>77,108</td>
<td>14,254</td>
<td>14,119</td>
<td>3,460</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>8,739</td>
<td>23,861</td>
<td>14,064</td>
<td>39,574</td>
<td>2,809</td>
<td>16,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>710,003</td>
<td>335,147</td>
<td>75,483</td>
<td>3,987</td>
<td>560,603</td>
<td>188,126</td>
<td>56,433</td>
<td>28,563</td>
<td>139,876</td>
<td>65,942</td>
<td>100,708</td>
<td>167,642</td>
<td>50,191</td>
<td>253,101</td>
<td>438,370</td>
<td>111,488</td>
<td>19,818</td>
<td>42,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1,302,004</td>
<td>631,030</td>
<td>97,959</td>
<td>17,511</td>
<td>834,138</td>
<td>439,142</td>
<td>374,005</td>
<td>87,921</td>
<td>320,940</td>
<td>53,347</td>
<td>79,955</td>
<td>6,739</td>
<td>72,912</td>
<td>427,129</td>
<td>773,258</td>
<td>312,632</td>
<td>136,231</td>
<td>52,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>9,063</td>
<td>6,667</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,003</td>
<td>2,788</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>6,208</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>2,216</td>
<td>5,537</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>15,449</td>
<td>4,243</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45 Self-employed is a sub-group of employed.
46 Long term unemployed is a sub-group of unemployed.
47 In education/training is a sub-group of inactive.
48 Educational attainment on entering.
49 No data on priority groups in CR under this policy field. In CY, the data for 'enhancing access to employment' and ‘reinforcing social inclusion’ are covered by on Priority Axis and cannot be disaggregated.
50 Priority Axes do not fully correspond to policy field but have been allocated on ‘best fit’ basis.
51 No data on ‘reinforcing social inclusion’ in CR.
52 The findings for the policy area “Reinforcing social inclusion” cannot directly be identified in the SFC data, as the data for Priority 2 according the ESF 2007-2013 programming refers to both enhancing access to employment and reinforcing social inclusion.
53 No data available.
54 The Finnish OP combines Enhancing access to employment and Reinforcing social inclusion under its PA 2. The participant data for Reinforcing social inclusion cannot be represented separately from the participant data for Enhancing access to employment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of participations</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Of which self-employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Of which LTV</th>
<th>Inactive</th>
<th>Of which in education/training</th>
<th>Young people (&lt;15-24y)</th>
<th>Older people (≥65y)</th>
<th>Migrants</th>
<th>Minorities</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Primary or lower secondary education</th>
<th>Upper secondary education</th>
<th>Post-secondary education</th>
<th>Tertiary education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>216,667</td>
<td>97,147</td>
<td>27,379</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>112,368</td>
<td>24,731</td>
<td>76,920</td>
<td>55,488</td>
<td>84,970</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>24,742</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>45,165</td>
<td>54,904</td>
<td>139,980</td>
<td>48,902</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>13,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU57</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>6,146</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>8,768</td>
<td>5,659</td>
<td>8,912</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>8,732</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>1,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL58</td>
<td>88,750</td>
<td>27,937</td>
<td>8,538</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>79,872</td>
<td>49,453</td>
<td>50,503</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>10,496</td>
<td>24,792</td>
<td>3,759</td>
<td>88,750</td>
<td>14,139</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL59</td>
<td>680,000</td>
<td>486,000</td>
<td>162,785</td>
<td>4,545</td>
<td>271,463</td>
<td>139,470</td>
<td>245,794</td>
<td>100,088</td>
<td>167,706</td>
<td>60,304</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>117,635</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>225,504</td>
<td>76,503</td>
<td>116,374</td>
<td>261,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>234,974</td>
<td>124,522</td>
<td>13,827</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>38,442</td>
<td>16,389</td>
<td>182,705</td>
<td>10,561</td>
<td>20,609</td>
<td>3,386</td>
<td>8,137</td>
<td>98,990</td>
<td>146,039</td>
<td>24,004</td>
<td>5,579</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>76,289</td>
<td>38,361</td>
<td>19,347</td>
<td>1,909</td>
<td>15,813</td>
<td>7,417</td>
<td>41,129</td>
<td>4,712</td>
<td>20,971</td>
<td>3,507</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25,372</td>
<td>13,756</td>
<td>29,208</td>
<td>39,310</td>
<td>14,979</td>
<td>2,285</td>
<td>14,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>245,820</td>
<td>109,006</td>
<td>28,356</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>144,634</td>
<td>120,626</td>
<td>72,830</td>
<td>20,235</td>
<td>48,678</td>
<td>31,471</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>184,440</td>
<td>10,948</td>
<td>35,035</td>
<td>183,979</td>
<td>23,350</td>
<td>2,707</td>
<td>3,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,678,820</td>
<td>2,471,738</td>
<td>751,833</td>
<td>54,571</td>
<td>2,414,578</td>
<td>1,120,278</td>
<td>1,143,678</td>
<td>469,764</td>
<td>1,131,361</td>
<td>287,309</td>
<td>317,795</td>
<td>637,250</td>
<td>1,087,230</td>
<td>2,094,714</td>
<td>820,979</td>
<td>317,798</td>
<td>479,567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annex XXIII data extracted from SFC (31.10.13) – as reported in country reports under this policy field.

55 Defined by country expert as 'low estimate'. Country report also included data for 'high estimate' (435,055) but as the country report notes that “the additional activities included to produce the ‘high estimate’ are primarily classified under ‘Enhancing Human Capital’”, these have not been included here.

56 No data for participants ‘entering’ in CR. As the first three Policy Fields in Lithuania are contained in the Priority Axis 1 (“Quality Employment and Social Inclusion”) and the outputs according to Annex XXIII data are provided in terms of Priority Axis and not sub-priorities, it is not possible to provide detailed information on the outputs of Priority Field “Reinforcing social inclusion”.

57 Country expert notes that difficult to differentiate between Access to employment and Social inclusion because both PF are contained in one PA (1). The data presented here relates to projects under Code 71 as this is considered the measures focusing on people with great distance to the labour market.

58 Repeat of data presented under ‘enhancing access to employment’.

59 Relates to PA2. Overlaps with A2E.

60 Based on the structure of the Swedish OP, data on this Policy Field is included under ‘increasing adaptability’.

61 Annex XXIII data from SFC is not allocated to specific Policy Fields in SI Country Report.

62 No PAs within the UK OPs have been allocated to the policy field ‘reinforcing social inclusion’. As outlined in Chapter 1, PAs allocated to other policy fields may include activities that enhance social inclusion but these cannot be separated out within the AIR 2012 (SFC) data.
7.4 Analysis of results

Overview
Table A5 in the Appendix summarises the information on different results indicators across the 27 member states to the end of December 2012. As Social Inclusion covers a wide range of interventions it is not surprising that the coverage for any one result is fairly limited across all member states. Additionally, in many member states, results are captured as percentages which cannot be aggregated to provide a single figure estimate in absolute or percentage terms for the member state. Finally, in some member states it proved impossible to break down results by policy field and therefore the results reported below will be underestimates. Taking account of these caveats the following points can be highlighted.

- The first point to note is that results of ESF supported Social Inclusion activities are available for only a few member states. This is unfortunate given the rising incidence of Social Inclusion across the EU as a result of the global economic recession. The additional complication that Social Inclusion is a horizontal theme in many member states raising challenges about the effective capture of results data.
- Job entry numbers are 164,808.
- The numbers gaining a qualification is the most typical result and reflects the fact that actions to promote social inclusion typically include final recipients going on a journey towards social integration and potentially employment but where this can be lengthy and require many steps. Nearly 148,000 qualification results were delivered.
- For 8 member states there are a range of ‘other’ results which cannot be aggregated. A number of these again tie into the ‘distance travelled’ associated with Social Inclusion activity. As an example, in SI, over 3,200 jobs have been created for vulnerable groups and in RO nearly 5,000 jobs have been created within social economy organisations.

Analysis of country experts
This section is based on the sections of the country reports where the experts review the results for their own countries. As well as the AIRs 2012, this also includes material from evaluation base, including evaluations published in 2013.

Broad conclusions
Some broad observations are as follows:

- The horizontal nature of Social Inclusion in many member states makes it difficult to extract results information in a straightforward fashion.
- The Social Inclusion policy field is interpreted in many different ways across the member states. For many it is about supporting people into work (BE, CY, DK, ES, NL, PL, UK), but for others there is a stronger emphasis on social integration (AT, BG, IT). Given this it is difficult to establish patterns.
- Given the complexity of the problem of social exclusion, it is not surprising to find a great diversity of interventions to promote social inclusion.
- In many member states there is a very close overlap with A2E with the differences mainly around the focus within Social Inclusion within some member states on some highly disadvantaged groups such as ex-offenders, addicts, homeless people, etc.
Again because of the complexity of Social Inclusion in a number of member states (CZ, IT, RO), there is a strong emphasis on working through social economy organisations both to provide jobs and to deliver services to the socially excluded. These organisations are seen to have a better reach into socially excluded groups and have missions that lead them to serve these groups effectively.

Results for interventions
In terms of more specific findings in relation to results a number of more specific points are highlighted below.

- Although it is commonly argued that preventative expenditure is particularly cost effective for the socially excluded, only for AT is there an example where the costs and benefits are calculated to demonstrate the case in relation to a set of interventions for the multiply disadvantaged.
- There is some evidence that intervening at much younger ages (PT) and also providing second-chance learning opportunities (FR, IE) are particularly effective. The intervention at the school level has significant value by reducing early school leaving.
- Although community-based interventions are also favoured in working with the socially excluded, there is some evidence (IE) that community based training is not cost effective due to very high drop-out rates.
- Social firms (FR) also are relatively unsuccessful as measured by subsequent job entry although care has to be taken as these tend to cater for the most disadvantaged groups.

Results for specific groups
In relation to the results for different groups, there is very limited evidence. However, the comments below relate to a comprehensive statement in the UK country report. Social Inclusion is a horizontal theme in the UK.

- Across all policy fields, typically more disadvantaged groups do less well on job entry and qualifications indicators for each specific intervention.
- This finding is particularly pronounced for disabled people and the finding is strongest for A2E activities.
- The exceptional area is lone parents who appear to benefit from ESF participation.

7.5 Analysis of effectiveness

Overview
In part due to the horizontal nature of the Social Inclusion policy field but also as a consequence of the complex nature of outputs, results and impacts in relation to Social Inclusion interventions, country experts had problems commenting on effectiveness due to the lack of sound evaluation studies. Some general points can be made at the outset.

- With the onset of the global recession, problems of social exclusion and poverty have risen across the EU. This has posed challenges for those charged with implementing the ESF effectively in the Social Inclusion policy field.
- The demand for ESF funded services has grown significantly, but at the same time the capacity to achieve good results particularly in terms of training and employment has been diminished. These problems are deepened as, with the
recession, less disadvantaged groups of final recipients have been engaged in Social Inclusion interventions (FR, IE, LT).

Findings
A number of specific findings are highlighted below.

- In some country reports considerable weight is placed on the ESF as a key foundation stone for sophisticated and complex local delivery institutions and networks (AT, FR). These are seen to be critically important in particular for tackling Social Inclusion and the rationale is expressed well in the FR country report where these local structures are seen to provide: “imaginative and flexible solutions ... implemented through place-based service delivery, close to needs”.

- Given the diversity of socially excluded participants, the most effective ESF supported services are those which are designed very specifically around the needs of particular groups.

- Training appears to be a very effective measure for migrants (AT, IT). One evaluation study for IT finds that training closes the employment gap between the migrant and local populations.

- Access to ESF funded services is an issue for the more socially excluded. A valuable study (IE) has shown that people with literacy and/or numeracy issues find it hard to access training programmes – but once they do access these programmes their subsequent job entry rates are above average.

- As a lesson for the way forward, a stronger focus on prevention (AT, PT) may be required for the socially excluded where the effort begins with young people well before school leaving age with a view to building their autonomy and capacity.

7.6 Good practice

Overview
An analysis of the 27 country reports found that almost a half identified no or very thin examples of good practice.

Integrating support for jobseekers (BE)
The ‘M.I.R.A.C.L.E. project’ addresses the problem that pathways leading indirectly and directly to work often lack coherence, for example, with different providers not knowing who is doing what. Making use of job coaches, who co-ordinate the support provided by partners and ensure the support addresses labour market needs, helps improve the efficiency of the support and achieve more sustainable outcomes. This integrated process and increased synergy assist the participant in receiving more information, having a better overview of their pathway, and aligning different goals, so the probability of sustainable employment is increased.

Supporting female entrepreneurship (BE)
A number of projects in the Walloon OP and OP Convergence Hainaut focus on gender equality between men and women, with good practice identified in the AIRs in relation to female entrepreneurship. The project ‘House of Design’ organises activities specifically for women, such as training ‘Women in Business’ which informs women about and strengthens female entrepreneurship, including addressing topics such as the conciliation of private and professional life. In the Walloon OP, ‘L’Agence de Stimulation Economique’ (ASE) makes systematic use of the testimonials of female ambassadors for entrepreneurship and ‘JOB’IN’ also uses female role models to convince and educate their target group.
**Training programme for disadvantaged people (HU)**

The programme regarded as good practice is delivered by the local authority of Márókpapi. The key elements of the approach include:

- Improving the labour market chance of participants.
- Strengthening the acceptance of diversity.
- Acquiring marketable professions.
- Creating a complex training programme.
- Individual support, group development.
- Improving the labour market chances of the target group.
- Strengthening the autonomy and personal competences of the participants to remain active members of the labour market.

This approach is considered good practice because:

- 36 of the 40 participants successfully completed the training.
- They were employed for 6 months in the territory of the local government.
- Personal competences and motivation of the involved people were strengthened.
- Their autonomy and personal competences were strengthened not only to remain active members of the labour market during the programme but also when the support gradually decreased.
- Coordination and cooperation was promoted between existing services to improve the support package, and to make it complex and cost-effective.

The transferability of this practice is realistic, especially in cooperation with the relevant project stakeholders. However, the potential transfer would require some further analysis and guidance to describe the methods to be applied.

**Good practice approaches for learning and training interventions (IE)**

In terms of teaching methods and design, many course providers were aware that traditional approaches to teaching would not be effective for specific groups, because of distance from the labour market and the length of time since participants had been in an educational setting. A range of approaches to delivery were adopted by providers, including the following.

Utilisation of the “moodle portal http://moodle.org/”. This is a Course Management System (CMS) or a Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) that can be used to create effective online learning sites. Several providers placed course material onto the site and used discussion forums as a means of communicating with participants. Other providers filmed teaching and placed it on the moodle portal to enable participants to revisit teaching sessions. One scheme offered a laptop loan scheme to enable participants that did not have computer access to complete their FETAC assignments electronically. The availability of telephone support was important for delivery of such courses. A further tool used by project promoters was to use guest speakers, site visits and work placements during the courses. The rationale for these components was to bring real world, relevant context to participants and cement the idea of progression routes from the courses.

Foundation level further education (including literacy/numeracy) to bring adults with low education to the level of upper second level education (ISCED3-4) and/or qualification level FETAC3-6 are important in bringing groups at risk of poverty and
social exclusion into interventions. Starting at this basic level can act as a platform to progression, building up qualifications over time.

Core skills development and access to further education were identified as a key bridging stage along the progression pathway to employment. Programmes delivered by the Vocational Educational Committees (further education for those with low educational qualifications) and community and voluntary sector providers focused on building capacity followed by specific skills building. This could lead on to continuing education and training opportunities and eventually employment. This is achieved through improved levels of qualification and “soft” results such as improved motivation and self-esteem.

**Jeremie Fund (IT)**

The fund was aimed at social and employment production cooperatives employing disadvantaged and disabled workers, and helping these cooperatives keep or improve employment effectiveness for disadvantaged and/or disabled people. The capitalisation is supported through the delivery of micro-credits (that is generally small amount of funding granted at very favourable conditions) to cooperatives’ members.

The fund was established in 2008 and Lombardy Region assigned its management to the regional financing company. The total financial amount of the fund is 20 million Euros, 50% deriving from the ESF and the rest coming from credit system (the banks involved were selected through public calls). From the beginning of its operation until 2011, the fund:

- Delivered 4,630 credits for a total amount of 18.2 MEuro.
- Capitalised 311 cooperatives: 273 social cooperatives and 38 employment-production cooperatives.
- Reached 2,341 final recipients: 1,470 women and 871 men.

This intervention is considered good practice because:

- The fund was able to attract private resources to integrate ESF funding.
- The idea of reinforcing cooperatives by supporting members with access to credit and consequently strengthening employment is interesting and largely innovative.
- Involving disadvantaged and disabled cooperatives’ members in getting credit for supporting the cooperatives where they are employed is an important form of activation and, partially, empowerment.
- The implementation of such a new and complex intervention generated benefits in terms of increased capacity building at the different institutional levels involved in fund design and management.

**Towards employment – development of intermediation services of employment of persons with hearing disability (LT)**

The project is considered a good practice example because:

- It was prepared while taking into account the real needs to find employment of persons with a hearing disability in Lithuania.
- The targets were set realistically and therefore achieved. The planned employment targets were achieved 150%, whereas the project funds were used 100%. Overall, there were 665 project participants. There were 445 persons with hearing disability employed (the planned number was 300), and 165 new potential employers were
found. The unemployment rate in the community of persons with hearing disability has consequently decreased from 40% to 15%.

During the implementation of project professional employment mediators were prepared. They finished 5 training programmes developed specially for them and worked on probation in the Netherlands and Germany. Employment agencies were established in the community of persons with hearing disability in all the major towns of Lithuania, as well as in the Technological Training and Rehabilitation Centre in Vilnius. Based on EU experience, a modern system for effective employment of persons with disability through mediation was developed. The essence of this model is the service provided by trained staff – employment mediators - for the person looking for work. The employment mediator helps the person to decide on the desired workplace, helps to find such a workplace, helps to prepare for the work interview, consults the employers over the employment of a person with disability, helps to prepare all the necessary employment documents and represents the interests of the persons with disability in the negotiation over the workplace. After the employment of the disabled person, the mediator also supervises that person and helps solve any arising problems.

During the project implementation four video clips were created and broadcasted on various Lithuanians TV channels and on the internet to shape positive attitudes in society towards the people with hearing disability.

This good-practice example could be successfully transferred to a country, where, as in the case of Lithuania, there was a lack of knowledge and/or consistent employment strategy for people with a hearing disability.

**The EAP aid scheme (MT)**

The aid scheme (EAP) is specifically and directly targeted at disadvantaged and disabled persons. The key elements of the scheme include the following:

- There is an incentive to employers to take on labour from vulnerable, disadvantaged and disabled groups. The incentive is a subsidy of 50% of their wages for 52 weeks or 75% of wages over a three year period in the case of a person with disabilities being recruited.
- The final arbiter in taking on members from this group is the employer who will be engaging them. The employer will apply for the grant on behalf of the individual participant.
- The scheme departs from normal approaches in filling vacancies in the employment sector. It discriminates in favour of the vulnerable.
- It is demand-driven scheme and therefore no calls for projects are published.

The scheme is considered good practice because:

- The success rate of more than 85% of those finishing their placement on the scheme being retained can be considered as a significant social contribution which could be applied in member states with high unemployment.
- The schemes enhance the employability and productivity of persons with low employment rates.
- It facilitates access to employment and upgrades the skills of those furthest from the labour market.
It contributes to increasing the country’s labour supply and achieving greater social cohesion.

Take-up in this area is one of the highest when compared to other types of intervention targeting vulnerable persons. Outputs and results from interventions leading directly to employment through direct assistance to employers (EAP) emerged as most attractive to vulnerable groups.

The scheme has been highly effective and popular. It was substantially overcommitted by the end of 2012, but has been extended until December 2014. The allocation for the EAP amounting to €12.2 million was overcommitted as at end 2012 by up to €16.7 million. The number of participants who entered employment through the EAP were large enough to have had a direct and substantive effect on the overall increase in employment during the years 2009-2010.

**Escolhas (PT)**

Evaluation evidence suggests that this is unique. It did not undergo many structural changes over the years it was run by the High Commissioner's Office for Immigration and Inter-cultural Dialogue.

- It counts on professionals who have been involved in the programme for a long time.
- It maintains the same territorial areas of intervention across time.
- It has positive self-assessments, as well as positive national and international evaluations.

Additionally, the programme had precise guidance through its axis of intervention; control of implementation through the AGIL platform (a software tool for online monitoring and assessment) that was tuned over time; continuous training for the project coordinators; systematic self-assessment; and an external evaluation for each of its four different generations of implementation.

Within the scope of the fourth phase of Escolhas, it has been possible to develop and consolidate a model of intervention (i.e. the format and contents for intervention developed, assessed and consolidated since 2001). A publication, structuring the basic reference model and 32 tools resulting from the project’s intervention practices was produced.

It has a bottom-up approach and the development of four fundamental dimensions.

- The promotion of positive interaction.
- The development of personal, social, cognitive and moral skills.
- Favouring success.
- Granting opportunities for the construction of a positive identity.

These dimensions intertwine in a context of social interactions and relations to arouse the interest of the young in their world, aiming to provide know-how regarding how to interact with it and fostering conditions for seizing the opportunities for the fulfilment of life projects and for young people’s inclusion.

---
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The 32 tools have practical and pedagogic concrete objectives and are intended to be disseminated in similar contexts. They also aim to serve as points of reference for those intervening in the same areas.

**Instruments supporting harmonisation of family and working life (SK)**
Delivered by the non-governmental organisation protecting mothers and unborn children, this project aimed to support equal opportunities by increasing employability and integrating parents and persons with family duties and women of ethnic minorities in the labour market. Key interventions included counselling and helping participants obtain new, specific, transferable and vocational capabilities. The project was implemented in the city of Banská Štiavnica and region of Banská Bystrica, locations affected by high unemployment, leading to an outflow of citizens seeking jobs in other regions of Slovakia or abroad. This situation had started to threaten the city's future. Through the reintegration of socially excluded persons in the labour market, the project contributed to the stabilisation of their social and economic conditions. The implementation of the project mainly facilitated women and persons with family duties in obtaining computer literacy and communication skills needed for the labour market, in starting the self-employment, and in social services. The target group was composed of 120 unemployed persons with family duties, including persons from marginalised Roma communities. The project activities were carefully adjusted to the specific needs of families, their members and individuals, and to their needs for improving their position in the labour market. The project successfully improved the target group’s living conditions and quality of life. It harmonised the family and professional life of involved persons, increased their self-confidence and activity in seeking jobs and even increased their chances in obtaining new jobs. The project created the basis for attracting vulnerable groups to lifelong learning, forming labour habits and acquiring experience.

**Košice – Jungle (SK)**
The project ‘Košice – Jungle’ aimed at improving the social situation of the socially excluded Roma community. The project supported the meaningful use of leisure time and the school attendance of children living in disadvantaged social conditions. The project focused on helping Roma by developing housekeeping skills and by enhancing the healthy nutrition of family members. The key component of the project was the introduction of social workers that not only provided supporting services to the target community, but also actively communicated with the relevant local authorities.

**Activ8 (UK)**
The Activ8 project operated by Connexions Staffordshire works with young people (pre- and post-16) that are at risk of becoming NEET (not in employment, education or training). Within this, its ‘Fresh Starts’ strands works with those with the most severe barriers including care leavers, young offenders and teenage mothers. The project takes a nine step approach:

- Recruitment.
- Induction.
- Initial assessment.
- Learning plans.
- Engagement/learning activity.
- Progress reviews.
- Transition planning.
- Transition activity.
- Progression.
Within this overall structure, the package of support is tailored to the needs of individuals, with the individual elements of support being tailored to the needs of each participant. In addition, participation is not time bound, and this again enables a more flexible approach to be taken. Delivery involves a wide range of partners – Connexions Staffordshire (statutory careers service provider and lead partner), Stoke-on-Trent and Staffordshire Councils, the local education-business partnership, the Youth Offending Service, YMCA (a third sector organisation), the Association of Staffordshire College Principals and the Staffordshire Provider Association.

This project is considered good practice for the following reasons:

- The flexible and personalised approach allows the project to work with the most disadvantaged young people in a way that works for them. This is demonstrated through high retention and progression rates – with these exceeding the targets set. It should be noted that ESF funding is seen as critical in enabling this more tailored approach to be delivered – with mainstream approaches unable to offer this level of support.
- The project has changed the practices of partners – with greater recognition that ‘one size does not fit all’ and a greater willingness to work together to deliver a package of support for young people.
8 Enhancing human capital

8.1 ESF scope

The fourth action set out under the framework 'Convergence and Regional competitiveness and employment' is: “enhancing human capital, in particular by promoting:

- (i) the design and introduction of reforms in education and training systems in order to develop employability, the improvement of the labour market relevance of initial and vocational education and training and the continual updating of the skills of training personnel with a view to innovation and a knowledge-based economy;
- (ii) networking activities between higher education institutions, research and technological centres and enterprises”.

In addition, the first action set out under the framework of 'Convergence' is: “expanding and improving investment in human capital, in particular by promoting:

- (i) the implementation of reforms in education and training systems, especially with a view to raising people’s responsiveness to the needs of a knowledge based society and lifelong learning;
- (ii) increased participation in education and training throughout the life-cycle, including through actions aiming to achieve a reduction in early school leaving and in gender-based segregation of subjects and increased access to and quality of initial, vocational and tertiary education and training;
- (iii) the development of human potential in research and innovation, notably through post-graduate studies and the training of researchers”.

8.2 Types of intervention

Enhancing Human Capital has been delivered across member states through a range of different types of intervention. These can be broken down into 5 main groupings.

Improving education provision
A number of member states have used ESF funds to invest in improving the quality of education on offer. This has included:

- Analysis of training needs of educational staff.
- Training for teachers and youth workers.
- Introduction of educational strategies.
- Developing national curriculum and materials to deliver curriculum.
- Introducing ICT into teaching practices.
- Modernising qualification structures.
- Implementation of new systems of management or quality control.
- Analysing employment and skills supply and demand, and putting in place mechanisms to address skills shortages.
Supporting young people to make good transitions from school to work
There is a growing body of evidence that the transition from school to work is critical in underpinning future employment and earnings prospects – as well as a number of other social outcomes (such as health). However, the economic crisis has led to a sharp increase in the rate of youth unemployment across the EU. As such, a key focus under this policy field has been on ensuring activities are in place to enable young people to make good transitions into the labour market. These have included:

- Re-engaging those young people who have dropped out or are at risk of dropping out from school.
- Providing alternative programmes of education for students with physical disabilities or learning difficulties.
- Providing advice and guidance to young people on careers, training and education options.
- Promoting internships and apprenticeships.

Providing training opportunities for adults
As well as improving the skills of young people entering the labour market for the first time, this policy field has also been involved in the provision of skills adults including:

- Training for those currently in work to develop their competencies.
- Training for workless individuals to help them access employment. This includes adult basic education (numeracy, literacy, IT), vocational training and language training for migrants.

Improving research base
The final strand of this policy field relates to the development of the research base within member states. Innovation is critical to productivity and competitiveness of member states and interventions here seek to ensure that the human resources are available to underpin this. Activities have included:

- Increasing number of young people studying at university – and supporting them to complete their studies.
- Encouraging more students to study science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) subjects.
- Building networks between universities and enterprises.
- Strengthening capabilities for innovation including transnational measures to learn from approaches taken to innovation and knowledge transfer in other countries.

Tackling health issues
Whilst interventions under this policy field are mainly focused on improving the skills and competences of the workforce, some member states have also funded activities under this policy field to improve the health of their population. As well as facilitating participation in social and cultural life, having a healthy population also contributes towards their ability to access employment and be productive employees. Interventions have included:

- Health promotion activities to change the behaviour of individuals (such as reducing smoking and encouraging participation in sports).
- Preventative measures (including during pregnancy).
- Using therapy (including arts therapy) to engage and progress disadvantaged groups, especially those with mental health issues.
- Development of structures and processes in the health sector (for example, developing accreditation system or introducing monitoring).
- Development of skills and competences of health staff through training and development.

8.3 Analysis of outputs

Total outputs
Table 8 summarises the outputs flowing from the interventions within the Enhancing Human Capital policy field, broken down by member state. As with other policy fields, the lack of common indicators on ‘entities’ is a key data limitation. In total, there have been almost 25.9 million participations to end December 2012. Of these:

- Over 6.4 million involved the employed, of whom just over 365,000 are self-employed.
- Over 2.5 million involved the unemployed, of whom over 631,000 are long term unemployed.
- Over 16.3 million involved the inactive, of whom over 13.3 million are in education or training.

Outputs by participant characteristics
Outputs are also broken down to identify some priority groups.

- Just under 13.9 million participations involved women - 54% of all participations.
- Over 10.3 million participations (40%) are young people aged 15-24. This reflects the high proportion in education and training with many of these young people still in school or university. In contrast, just under 915,000 participations involved older people aged 55-64.
- A smaller proportion of participations came from disadvantaged groups with nearly 758,000 migrants, nearly 752,000 minorities, around 970,000 disabled – with almost 913,000 involving other disadvantaged groups.
- In terms of education, reflecting partly the large proportion of participations involving young people still in school, over 12.1 million were educated to primary or lower secondary level (47% of total participations). Nearly 4.7 million were educated to upper secondary level, around 546,000 to post-secondary non-tertiary level and over 3.2 million to tertiary level. This final group includes those pursuing PhDs under this policy field, and teaching staff.
### Table 8. Enhancing human capital outputs to end December 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of participants</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Of which self-employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Of which LTR</th>
<th>Inactive</th>
<th>Of which in education/training</th>
<th>Young people (IS-20)</th>
<th>Older people (55-64)</th>
<th>Migrants</th>
<th>Minorities</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Primary or lower secondary education</th>
<th>Upper secondary education</th>
<th>Post-secondary non tertiary education</th>
<th>Tertiary education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>159,136</td>
<td>90,301</td>
<td>86,317</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>8,834</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>63,985</td>
<td>35,987</td>
<td>73,134</td>
<td>23,598</td>
<td>46,511</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>4,004</td>
<td>64,107</td>
<td>35,979</td>
<td>2,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>537,468</td>
<td>255,892</td>
<td>114,236</td>
<td>6,226</td>
<td>244,042</td>
<td>68,002</td>
<td>179,190</td>
<td>136,839</td>
<td>250,131</td>
<td>16,553</td>
<td>51,687</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>185,318</td>
<td>177,382</td>
<td>3,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>694,382</td>
<td>381,378</td>
<td>50,123</td>
<td>2,494</td>
<td>3,611</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>640,648</td>
<td>613,099</td>
<td>248,393</td>
<td>4,459</td>
<td>2,024</td>
<td>88,712</td>
<td>8,672</td>
<td>12,129</td>
<td>334,588</td>
<td>104,130</td>
<td>4,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>9,406</td>
<td>5,493</td>
<td>8,290</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>3,826,706</td>
<td>1,968,946</td>
<td>470,506</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3,356,111</td>
<td>3,355,909</td>
<td>1,384,264</td>
<td>99,296</td>
<td>140,930</td>
<td>431,400</td>
<td>800,958</td>
<td>6,592</td>
<td>1,952,068</td>
<td>463,179</td>
<td>48,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>2,216,821</td>
<td>891,401</td>
<td>587,843</td>
<td>15,907</td>
<td>129,890</td>
<td>45,870</td>
<td>1,499,088</td>
<td>816,372</td>
<td>1,846,539</td>
<td>18,011</td>
<td>307,676</td>
<td>4,656</td>
<td>14,025</td>
<td>22,642</td>
<td>1,639,536</td>
<td>192,602</td>
<td>16,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>543,889</td>
<td>351,920</td>
<td>260,474</td>
<td>3,810</td>
<td>9,342</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>274,073</td>
<td>249,369</td>
<td>241,600</td>
<td>43,058</td>
<td>2,722</td>
<td>34,091</td>
<td>2,491</td>
<td>5,482</td>
<td>203,312</td>
<td>66,678</td>
<td>48,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>2,441,547</td>
<td>1,190,378</td>
<td>531,746</td>
<td>28,298</td>
<td>418,981</td>
<td>49,916</td>
<td>1,490,820</td>
<td>1,010,909</td>
<td>1,772,194</td>
<td>140,173</td>
<td>131,504</td>
<td>96,913</td>
<td>55,645</td>
<td>485,650</td>
<td>726,808</td>
<td>1,238,548</td>
<td>79,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>109,090</td>
<td>67,887</td>
<td>90,117</td>
<td>5,793</td>
<td>3,698</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>15,275</td>
<td>12,681</td>
<td>13,843</td>
<td>14,802</td>
<td>2,908</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>8,653</td>
<td>31,844</td>
<td>14,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>183,363</td>
<td>121,644</td>
<td>42,890</td>
<td>9,948</td>
<td>41,371</td>
<td>5,417</td>
<td>111,266</td>
<td>37,002</td>
<td>28,726</td>
<td>8,733</td>
<td>1,791</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7,203</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>7,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>1,964,550</td>
<td>1,092,903</td>
<td>354,004</td>
<td>55,763</td>
<td>92,998</td>
<td>30,804</td>
<td>1,517,548</td>
<td>901,956</td>
<td>414,729</td>
<td>41,857</td>
<td>34,101</td>
<td>5,942</td>
<td>4,387</td>
<td>37,152</td>
<td>1,194,523</td>
<td>365,732</td>
<td>62,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>1,407,971</td>
<td>789,984</td>
<td>446,680</td>
<td>26,918</td>
<td>31,964</td>
<td>6,666</td>
<td>929,328</td>
<td>761,943</td>
<td>549,372</td>
<td>97,886</td>
<td>1,414</td>
<td>34,476</td>
<td>17,343</td>
<td>75,011</td>
<td>385,799</td>
<td>263,106</td>
<td>85,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>627,832</td>
<td>373,101</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>3,855,276</td>
<td>2,154,868</td>
<td>576,499</td>
<td>17,753</td>
<td>193,864</td>
<td>12,053</td>
<td>3,084,913</td>
<td>2,899,195</td>
<td>1,360,923</td>
<td>145,127</td>
<td>33,036</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>27,078</td>
<td>58,523</td>
<td>2,030,233</td>
<td>730,051</td>
<td>8,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>239,020</td>
<td>162,883</td>
<td>99,313</td>
<td>8,582</td>
<td>1,492</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>138,211</td>
<td>135,708</td>
<td>80,006</td>
<td>12,372</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>6,485</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>9,644</td>
<td>104,037</td>
<td>17,675</td>
<td>6,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>6,283</td>
<td>3,545</td>
<td>5,942</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,532</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>3,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>178,301</td>
<td>110,253</td>
<td>76,028</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>101,718</td>
<td>69,487</td>
<td>82,750</td>
<td>11,632</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>8,795</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>93,165</td>
<td>84,276</td>
<td>13,940</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

65 Self-employed is sub-group of employed.
66 Long term unemployed is sub-group of unemployed.
67 In education/training is sub-group of inactive.
68 Educational attainment on entering.
69 Educational attainment on entering.
70 Educational attainment on entering.
71 Educational attainment on entering.
72 Priority Axes do not fully correspond to policy field but have been allocated on ‘best fit’ basis.
73 Not possible to attribute SFC data to this Policy Field. See data on ‘Increasing adaptability’.
74 No breakdown by priority group given in Country Report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of participations</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Of which self-employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Of which LTU</th>
<th>Inactive</th>
<th>Of which in education/training 75</th>
<th>Young people (15-24)</th>
<th>Older people (55-64)</th>
<th>Migrants</th>
<th>Minorities</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Primary or lower secondary</th>
<th>Upper secondary</th>
<th>Post-secondary non-tertiary</th>
<th>Tertiary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>16,956</td>
<td>11,036</td>
<td>13,842</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>2,334</td>
<td>2,171</td>
<td>3,729</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2,581</td>
<td>2,667</td>
<td>2,468</td>
<td>9,240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL 76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>4,010,031</td>
<td>2,298,146</td>
<td>1,987,499</td>
<td>167,231</td>
<td>1,270,448</td>
<td>385,007</td>
<td>752,084</td>
<td>235,661</td>
<td>551,450</td>
<td>176,001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,788,481</td>
<td>176,700</td>
<td>92,139</td>
<td>297,991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>250,635</td>
<td>152,591</td>
<td>76,206</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>173,669</td>
<td>90,018</td>
<td>93,905</td>
<td>7,830</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18,756</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>98,919</td>
<td>90,126</td>
<td>71,261</td>
<td>3,206</td>
<td>76,168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 77</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>198,698</td>
<td>128,603</td>
<td>114,090</td>
<td>1,879</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>84,172</td>
<td>79,770</td>
<td>46,761</td>
<td>13,368</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12,735</td>
<td>2,722</td>
<td>5,498</td>
<td>55,783</td>
<td>23,767</td>
<td>6,423</td>
<td>84,362</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>36,492</td>
<td>19,804</td>
<td>10,029</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8,186</td>
<td>6,258</td>
<td>18,277</td>
<td>3,015</td>
<td>8,143</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>2,844</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32,881</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25,869,164</td>
<td>13,891,976</td>
<td>6,401,338</td>
<td>365,202</td>
<td>2,516,040</td>
<td>631,057</td>
<td>16,336,119</td>
<td>13,301,832</td>
<td>10,327,414</td>
<td>914,748</td>
<td>757,664</td>
<td>751,704</td>
<td>970,140</td>
<td>912,949</td>
<td>12,164,152</td>
<td>4,676,412</td>
<td>546,093</td>
<td>3,204,982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

75 No data as overlaps with Policy Fields ‘Increasing adaptability’ and ‘Reinforcing social inclusion’.
76 Based on the structure of the Swedish OP, data on this Policy Field is included under ‘Increasing adaptability’.
77 Annex XXIII data from SFC is not allocated to specific Policy Fields in SI Country Report.
8.4 Analysis of results

Overview
The analysis is based upon the 27 country reports, where the experts have drawn together their discussion of results based largely on 2012 AIRs.

Table A6 in the Appendix summarises the information on different indicators of results across the 27 member states to the end of December 2012. As Enhancing Human Capital covers a wide range of interventions, the types of results recorded vary. For example, in relation to workless individuals, the key result is to help them move into employment (with qualifications often an additional result achieved) whilst for school students the key result may be to progress into further education or training. In many member states, results are captured as percentages. This means that they cannot be aggregated to provide a total figure for the member state. Finally, in some member states it proved impossible to break down results by policy field and therefore the results reported below will be underestimates. Bearing in mind these issues, the following results can be noted:

- Reflecting the focus in some member states on young people, over 696,000 participants progressed into further education or training on leaving. However, ES accounts for over 95% of these results.
- Given that this policy field is focused on enhancing human capital, it is unsurprising that a common result is participants gaining qualifications on leaving. Over 262,000 participants achieved this result.
- In addition, almost 236,000 participants have secured a job entry and over 60,000 participants had moved into self-employment. This suggests that the investment in skills and capacity of participants being delivered by ESF funded activities is having benefits in terms of how they are perceived by employers.
- A number of ‘other’ results were reported which cannot easily be aggregated. These included product innovations (CZ), network development (DE), nearly 28,000 internships (ES) and over 45,000 children educated in an integrated school environment (HU).

Analysis of country experts
This section draws on the country experts analysis of the results presented in the evaluation literature in relation to the Enhancing Human Capital policy field. In addition to the AIRs, evaluation evidence was also utilised (including evaluations published during 2013).

Broad conclusions
Some broad conclusions around the results associated with the implementation of this policy field emerged from the country reports.

- A number of evaluations have highlighted that it is not always clear what issues the measures under policy field are designed to tackle – making it difficult to assess whether or not they have been successful. Linked to this, indicators to measure progress have not always been set, or where they have been set, lack clarity or focus primarily on activities (EE, FI, LT, SI).
- There is a strong emphasis within this policy field on helping individuals (whether they are school pupils, unemployed individuals or professionals working within the
educational system) gain qualifications and as a result this is a commonly recorded result (AT, EE, IE, IT, LT, PT).

- More generally, activities under this policy theme are often focused on raising skills and competencies. However, not all types of training and personal development result in qualifications – making comparison across different types of provision difficult (AT, IE).

Results for interventions

Some positive feedback appears in the country reports around particular types of intervention.

- Improving access to and quality of early education (pre-school) appears to be successful in educational achievement of pupils – especially those from more disadvantaged groups (BG, PL).

- A range of approaches to support young people that have either dropped out of school or are at risk of doing so are on offer. Successful approaches to working with this group include careers advice, individual coaching and guidance, activities to prepare them for employment and grants (stipends). In addition, involving parents and other services also appear to be critical to success (DE, ES, MT).

- Efforts to improve the quality of educational provision appear to have positive impacts on both increasing achievement and reducing drop-out rates (PT).

- A range of different types of training for workless adults are provided across the member states (e.g. basic education, vocational training, language for immigrants, etc.). However there is no clear pattern across member states about which of these have the best results (AT, IE, FR, IT).

- Training or education specifically targeted at the needs of employers appears to be most successful in getting individuals back into work or helping young people make good transitions from school into work (IE, MT, PL). This is because the skills being developed are closely tied to employer needs.

- The skills of the existing workforce are also important and the ESF has been effectively used in some member states to either raise the competencies of those in work or to put in place mechanisms to recognise existing competencies (DK, ES).

- Interventions to support PhDs, postgraduate student and early stage researchers appear to be successful in raising the numbers completing study, publishing articles and participating in international studies, whilst networking between universities/research institutes and enterprises appears to be successful in encouraging businesses to invest in R&D/innovation (BG, ES).

Less positive evaluation results have been recorded in the following situations.

- Approaches to re-engage young people that have dropped out of school appear to have low levels of success (BG).

- Training vouchers do not appear to be successful (IT).

- The results of training for researchers appear to be mixed in terms of whether it developed their competencies or improved the quality of the research being undertaken. However, grants for research do appear to have been effective in sustaining the employment of researchers (IT, LT).

- Success is limited in getting university level students to continue in education and complete qualifications (EE).

- Similarly, there is mixed evidence that training for teachers has developed their competencies. Low levels of achievement are partly due to the training focusing on
the wrong (or not sufficiently advanced) topics. However, many teachers noted that they had applied the learning so the training may be of more use than initially indicated (LT).

- Only a few member states had interventions targeting health issues. There is some evidence that efforts have focused mainly on changing the behaviour of individuals and less on creating an environment or building capacity locally that supports healthy lifestyles. There is also some evidence that those areas that already had better health outcomes were more likely to access funding (HU).

Results for specific groups
Only limited evidence is available on the results for specific groups. The key results that are presented include the following.

- Migrants appear to be a group that benefits significantly from activities under this policy theme. In particular, there appears to be strong uptake of adult training amongst migrants in some member states and this group appear to benefit disproportionately from this provision. Similarly, young people who are the children of immigrants appear to benefit most from early-years support and support within schools. Whilst a wide range of types of intervention appear to benefit migrants, learning the language of the member state can be particularly important in helping them access other training (AT, BG, EE, IE).
- There is mixed evidence on whether training benefits women or men more (DK, IE, NL, RO). One possibility is that this depends on the baseline position, with women benefiting more in those countries that are less gender equal.
- Getting older people to participate in training can be challenging (FR).
- There is mixed evidence on which groups benefit most from training and upskilling – with the evidence from some member states suggesting that it benefits those with low skills/qualifications most whilst others showing that this group benefits least (IE, IT).

8.5 Analysis of effectiveness

Overview
The country experts struggled to find robust evaluation evidence on the contribution the ESF has made to delivering significant and sustainable differences in relation to the this policy field. Some key findings are captured below.

- Basic education and opportunity to ‘catch up’ on secondary level qualifications were effective in helping disadvantaged people gain basic qualifications (AT, IE).
- There is mixed evidence on the effectiveness of vocational training in terms of developing skills (AT, FR).
- Where competencies of existing employees have been developed, these are seen as useful in the workplace, especially the development of interpersonal skills (DK).
- A lack of common systems to identify training or education needs (especially literacy and numeracy) makes it difficult to get individuals into appropriate training or education provision (IE).
- Strategies to prevent school drop-out (such as diversifying provision) appear to be successful both at reducing drop-out and increasing academic achievement (PT).
Findings
Some more specific findings are worth highlighting.

- The ESF has helped reduce widen participation in training and education – especially in relation to migrants and those with low qualifications. This is particularly important in those member states where training has traditionally been highly selective (AT, IE).
- However, in terms of progressing into further education or training after participating in ESF funded activities, it has been noted in a few member states that the economic crisis and high unemployment have increased demand and competition for places in further and higher education and encouraged more young people to stay on at school. This increased competition for places can disadvantage those further from the labour market (ES, IE).
- Public sector spending cuts have reduced employment within the education system and in research with knock-on impacts on the ability for staff to engage in training or other development activities, or to apply any lessons learnt (LV).
- Within member states, achievement (e.g. in terms of completion, drop-outs, etc.) by different providers varies significantly (AT).

8.6 Good practice

Overview
For 20 member states there was either no good practice available, or the evidence was too slight to merit reporting. Where good practice has been reported, a range of different examples are described below.

E-learning quality label (BE)
In the context of the ESF project “Coupole e-learning” the AWT (Agence wallonne des Télécommunications) has implemented an e-learning quality label with the aim of incentivising in a non-prescriptive way providers and users of e-learning. It seeks to inform users and providers about best practices, support quality in e-learning, establish trust between users and providers, and trigger a multiplier effect in the supply of online course. For the learner the label is a guarantee that the courses offer them the information needed to complete their training, that there are varied methods of learning and that courses promote exchanges and interaction with other learners (groupware). On the other hand they know that the courses and coaches comply with the objectives specified, the teaching methods used and the proposed evaluation. The label plays a regulatory role as since the start in 2009, many applications have been validated but also refused in those cases were quality criteria were not met. The approach developed by the AWT has attracted various partners, notably from the European Federation for Quality in eLearning (EFQUEL - European Federation for the Quality in E-Learning), so it inspired an international initiative (www.epprobate.com) that is about to emerge.

Good practice in supporting disadvantaged young people (CY)
Zones of Educational Priority are an innovative educational approach in Cyprus. With problems related to student attendance in a number of deprived areas, ZEPs are selected clusters of schools (at this stage kindergartens, primary and secondary schools) in which there is a high rate of early school leaving (in particular related to lower secondary) and academic failure, as well as a high number of non-Greek mother-tongue students. Today there are eight such ZEPs in four urban centres in Cyprus and four information centres which offer psychosocial support operating on a pilot basis. In the future, the implementation of the programme will be expanded also
to high schools and technical schools. According to the on-going evaluation report (Progress Evaluation Report on the implementation of the OP EHCSC), the evaluation conducted in the past on ZEPs showed that the approach is considered as an appropriate solution to the problems of school dropouts, illiteracy and rapid growth in the number of non-Greek mother tongue pupils who are at risk of social exclusion.

Increasing research critical mass in health field (ES)

This provides highly specialised research staff in the biomedical sector, which is considered one of the strategic sectors for the economy and society of Navarra. The knowledge and competences of these researchers are being developed in the Biomedical Research Centre of Navarra.

It is considered a good practice for several reasons:

- Broad dissemination among participants, potential participants and the general public.
- The innovative elements of the research procedures and issues.
- The added value of the ESF to the project, especially in terms of volume effect.
- The contributions to future economic activities with a high grow potential.
- Its high level of coverage of the population of Navarra.
- The inclusion of equal opportunities and sustainability throughout its development.
- Its complementarity with the IV Technological Plan of Navarra and the Strategic Plan for Bio-medical Research in Navarra.

Tailoring training to meet employer demand (FR)

In the Poitou-Charentes region, the ESF has supported the launch of a new training centre for renewable energies in the city of Montmorillon. This is just the fourth centre in France to offer training in the field of wind energies and offers an international certificate (BZEE - a German training centre for renewable energy, recognized by the European Wind Energy Association) after 18 weeks including 8 weeks on the job, as a ‘wind farm technician’. The training centre includes a training tower 30 metres high, a working space and a teaching room suitable for groups of 12 trainees. Since the introduction of the programme, all trainees have found a job directly after qualifying. This is a good example of where working with employers to design training that specifically meets their needs can lead to strong employment results.

Development of diagnostic measures for disadvantaged students (HU)

Developed through the University of Szeged, the key elements of the approach include:

- Evaluation and differentiated development of disadvantaged students with the development of diagnostic tests.
- Research and development work carried out in parallel with the longitudinal programme responsible for developing teaching methods to help resolve some of the well-known problems of Hungarian public education, piloting and analysing of their effectiveness.
- Development of content framework model for diagnostic measurements (reading comprehension, maths and science).
- Development of task banks of tried tasks on the server of the assessment centre.
- Foundation of electronic testing.
- Individual development intervention based on diagnostic information.
Exploration of diagnostic evaluation of additional cognitive and affective skills, developing a framework for the evaluation content.

- Training of the governors, leaders and teachers of public schools.
- Secondary analysis of national and international test results.
- Development for pupils with special educational needs.

This approach is considered good practice because:

- As a result students can gain a qualification or enter secondary school, or even move up to higher education, or find a job according to their qualification successfully.
- Motivational learning management methods are applied.
- The motivation of students is developed.
- Positive attitudes about schools are developed.
- Attractive learning situations and activities are created.
- Methods to help to fill the gaps are developed.
- Researchers and teachers work together.

The transferability of this practice is realistic, especially in cooperation with the relevant project stakeholders. However, the potential transfer would require some further analysis and guidance to describe the methods to be applied.

**Making training provision easier to identify and assess (IT)**

The Umbria OP Regional Catalogue/Directory of Individual Access Training Courses contains a description of all training courses within the region targeted at the employed, unemployed adults and young people. Training bodies interested in inserting a course in the catalogue must apply to the Region (Active Labour Market Policies Department) and then pass through a verification and ex-ante validation process managed by the Region itself. This verification is based on the compliance of each training proposal with a number of qualitative standards. By April 2013, there were 1,296 training courses in the catalogue, representing 95 training organisations. Courses are classified in 14 thematic areas which represent sectoral areas. The themes with the largest number of courses are: administration, finance and control; information technology and ICT; and foreign languages.

This is considered good practice as:

- It includes all the regional training supply accessible through individual vouchers (paid by the ESF).
- All training within the catalogue is ‘quality guaranteed’ by the Region in terms of content, final certification, and compliance with professional standards.
- It aims to improve access to information about training on offer, supporting the principle of individuals being able to choose from the different training options.

**Increasing use of ICT in the classroom (LT)**

The Evaluation of Quality and Efficiency of Training financed by the ESF identified the ICT training project for teachers as a good practice example. This focused on the use of ICT and innovative teaching methods in primary and specialised schools by developing the ICT competences of primary school teachers and specialised schools educators. Some teachers indicated that the knowledge gained during the training helped them to create education materials, to use ICT during the classes and to share...
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experience with colleagues. Other training participants acknowledged that after the training the classes have become more interesting for the students and they have become more motivated. Some teachers have also highlighted the methods of trainings, which they found innovative, effective and useful as an example in organising seminars and classes. Thus, overall this project should be considered a good practice example because a lot of attention was paid to the selection of the right target group: each applicant to the training had to submit a form and a signed letter of the head of education institution with a clear indication that in case of the award, the proper conditions for an employee to participate in the trainings and other project activities will be provided. An applicant also had to provide his/her motivation to participate in the training. The applicants with the highest scores were selected to participate in the training. Such selection criteria helped to recruit the most motivated persons.

Improving educational quality and internationalisation (LT)
The project STUGER delivered through Alytus college seeks to achieve improved education quality and internationalisation in the context of the changing labour market. The principal aim of this project was to reduce the gap between the profile of specialists prepared in Alytus college and the requirements raised by employers, as well as to strengthen the practical skills of students. In order to improve the quality of education, Alytus college adopted a modular structure, in its education process, as well as innovative education methods oriented towards individual student learning and increased its internationalisation. During the project, three flexible study programmes based on a modular structure and corresponding to market needs were renewed. To renew these programmes, high-level scientists, foreign experts and experience of business associations were used. This is a good practice example because: study programmes were provided with easily accessible material, teachers were trained to adopt innovative teaching forms and methods, which encourage active learning, self-support, proactive behaviour, critical thinking and creativity. After the renewal of study programmes to make them compatible with similar programmes, preparation of modules and material in English, the college’s internationalisation in the context of the Bologna process was strengthened. During the project 73 students were trained through formal education programmes and 51 teachers were trained through informal education programmes. This good practice example could be transferred to other countries with higher education institutions that require modernisation of their programmes and increased internationalisation.

Updating the curriculum to meet needs of employers (PL)
Development of core curricula as a key to the modernisation of vocational education (noted in AIR 2012) is a project implemented by National Centre for Supporting Vocational and Continuing Education (KOWEZIU). The main objective of the project is to improve and adjust the vocational education system, especially core curricula, to labour market needs. Improvement of the core curricula focuses on its updating as well as on the correlation between the vocational education system and the labour market. This project is identified as good practice as:

- It helps ensure young people develop the skills needed by employers and helps these young people make a good transition into the labour market.
- The changes simplify the acquisition of vocational education and enable completion of the selected qualifications.
- Additionally, the new education reform introduces the possibility of obtaining separate qualifications required in specific occupations, which was not possible before.
Retaining young people in rural areas and developing their skills (SI)
20 municipalities from the Dolenjska region of South-Eastern Slovenia have participated in a regional scholarship scheme. The regional Novo Mesto Centre manages the scholarship scheme to align the pupils’ and students’ career choices with employer needs. Scholarships enable employment with local employers and helps raise the education level of the region. A key objective is to ensure that the education level does not fall behind that of other Slovene areas. The scholarship is financed partly by the ESF (50%) and partly by company. The company and recipient of the scholarship agree that the person will be employed in the same company for at least as long as he/she received the scholarship. Municipalities also co-finance part of the scholarship. The first stage is for employers to discuss their needs with the Centre. Then, in September of each year, an open call is published and pupils and students can apply for scholarships. Employers choose those who will receive the scholarship from the applicants received.

This is considered good practice as:

- It helps to retain young people in the region.
- It helps improve the competitiveness of small family businesses, and many have used it to help facilitate inter-generational transfer of the business

Larger businesses have not been as keen to participate. This is thought to be because they offer their own scholarships.
9 Promoting partnerships

9.1 ESF scope

The fifth action set out under the framework ‘Convergence and Regional competitiveness and employment’ is: “promoting partnerships, pacts and initiatives through networking of relevant stakeholders, such as the social partners and non-governmental organisations, at the transnational, national, regional and local levels in order to mobilise for reforms in the field of employment and labour market inclusiveness.”

There are two issues to note in relation to this policy field.

- Partnership working is a common approach across member states in the delivery of the ESF. However, most of this activity is encompassed within the other policy fields – and it is only those with specific partnership activities ‘mapped’ to this policy field that are discussed in this chapter.

- Linked to this, some of the outputs and results reported in this chapter relate to the partnerships themselves (for example, partners having benefited from training in data analysis) whilst other relate to the beneficiaries of these partnerships (for example, school pupils who have benefited from the development of partnerships between schools and employers).

9.2 Types of intervention

Promoting Partnerships has been delivered across member states through a range of different types of intervention.

**Promoting, establishing and sustaining partnerships**

The key challenges being addressed by the ESF are complex and multi-faceted. Bringing together a range of actors from across the public, private and non-governmental sectors can lead to more effective approaches being developed to tackling these challenges. In addition, working in co-operation can help maximise the impact for resources. As such, there is a need both to promote partnership working and to provide practical support to partnerships. This can include:

- Encouraging and enabling social partners and non-governmental organisations to participate in partnerships.
- Building the capacity of partners, especially those new to partnership working.
- Technical support to enable partners to reach informed policy decisions.
- Promoting dialogue between partners.

Partners can include local, regional and national governments, other public sector bodies, schools and universities, enterprises and non-governmental organisations/civil society organisations.

One specific type of partnership supported under this policy field is Territorial Employment Pacts. These aim to improve the connection between employment and other policies.
Strengthening local support structures and policies
Interventions are often most effective when they are designed and implemented at the local level. This is because local needs and opportunities are taken into account—leading to more accurate targeting of resources. In a number of member states, interventions to strengthen local support structures and policies have been put in place. Many of the activities outlined under ‘promoting, establishing and sustaining partnerships’ are used here as well with others including:

- Encouraging consultation with partners and society as a whole.
- Training and development to help enable groups to participate in policy making.

Promoting transnational partnerships
Transnationality is a horizontal theme of the ESF and a key intervention is the promotion and development of transnational partnerships. These allow key actors across member states to:

- Share knowledge on challenges faced – and expertise in terms of potential solutions and ‘what works’.
- Collaborate on areas of common interest.

9.3 Analysis of outputs

Total outputs
Table 9 presents the outputs for the Promoting Partnerships policy field to end December 2012, broken down by member state. As with earlier policy field, the lack of common indicators to capture data on the number of ‘entities’ supported by the ESF within this policy field is a major limitation as the focus on encouraging partnerships, pacts and networks means that enterprises, social partners and non-governmental organisations are a key target groups for this policy field.

In total, there have been over 136,000 participations. The majority of these are in just 5 member states (CZ, DE, HU, IT and RO).

- Over 68,000 (50%) are employees – reflecting the focus on enterprises, social partners and non-governmental organisations. Within this, almost 6,000 are self-employed.
- Almost 31,000 (23%) involve the unemployed, of whom over 10,900 are long term unemployed.
- Over 37,000 (27%) involve the inactive, of whom over 24,000 are in education or training.
### Table 9. Promoting partnerships outputs to end December 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of participations</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Of which self-employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Of which in education/training</th>
<th>Young people (15-24)</th>
<th>Migrants</th>
<th>Minorities</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Primary or lower secondary education</th>
<th>Post-secondary non-tertiary education</th>
<th>Tertiary education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ81</td>
<td>26,025</td>
<td>17,822</td>
<td>17,485</td>
<td>1,988</td>
<td>4,351</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>4,189</td>
<td>2,029</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>7,074</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>6,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE82</td>
<td>21,310</td>
<td>10,713</td>
<td>5,414</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>10,898</td>
<td>5,294</td>
<td>4,998</td>
<td>3,797</td>
<td>13,472</td>
<td>3,373</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>9,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK83</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES85</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR87</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR88</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

78 Self-employed is sub-group of employed.
79 Long term unemployed is sub-group of unemployed.
80 In education/training is sub-group of inactive.
81 Educational attainment on entering.
82 No data available.
83 No data available.
84 The OP EHSCC does not contain specific interventions under the policy field on partnerships as described by the ESF code 80.
85 Priority Axes do not fully correspond to policy field but have been allocated on 'best fit' basis.
86 Relates to PA E – Transnational activities.
87 No possible to attribute SFC data to this Policy Field. See data on 'Increasing adaptability'.
88 No priority axis, specific measures and expenditures are dedicated to this policy field.
89 'Partnerships’ is not a separate Priority in the Finnish OP and has not been monitored separately (as a PA) in the AIR. Therefore there are no data available.
90 ESF OP of mainland France has merged this ESF Policy Field with its Priority Axis on ‘Development of human resources, innovation and transnational co-operation’, but the SFC data could not be disaggregated to show distinct outputs for the different Policy Fields. The ESF Policy Field on ‘Promoting Partnerships’ is only identifiable under the OP of French Guiana which has a dedicated Priority Axis on ‘Partnerships and Governance’.
Partnerships are promoted throughout the implementation of the ESF interventions in Greece. However, the operations containing support to partnerships (mainly local partnerships for employment and social inclusion) fall within the scope of other Policy Fields. It is therefore impossible to clearly isolate outputs from specific actions aiming at the promotion of partnerships.

There are no activities categorised under this Policy Field.

The Lithuanian OPs did not include any Priority Axes or sub-priorities focusing on Promoting Partnerships – so no data available.

Not relevant for Luxembourg.

There are no activities corresponding to this Policy Field.

No data available.

Dutch OP does not cover this Policy Field.

Since both Priorities/Measures under this Policy Field overlap with two other Policy Fields there is no possibility to present any reliable data.

There are no operations in Portugal under PF ‘Promoting Partnerships’.

Not relevant for Sweden.

Annex XXIII data from SFC is not allocated to specific Policy Fields in SI Country Report.

No PAs within the UK OPs have been allocated to the policy field ‘Promoting Partnerships’.

Source: Annex XXIII data extracted from SFC (31.10.13) – as reported in country reports under this policy field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of participations</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>of which self-employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Of which LowIT92</th>
<th>Inactive</th>
<th>Of which in education/training93</th>
<th>Young people (15–24)</th>
<th>Older people (55–64)</th>
<th>Migrants</th>
<th>Minorities</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Prim ary or lower secondary education</th>
<th>Upper secondary education</th>
<th>Post-secondary non tertiary education</th>
<th>Tertiary education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>44,742</td>
<td>28,130</td>
<td>19,497</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>9,243</td>
<td>4,316</td>
<td>16,003</td>
<td>10,722</td>
<td>13,463</td>
<td>3,023</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6,314</td>
<td>1,449</td>
<td>10,101</td>
<td>15,285</td>
<td>11,627</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>5,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE92</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>22,234</td>
<td>12,653</td>
<td>5,202</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>5,875</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>11,157</td>
<td>7,682</td>
<td>12,557</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>7,315</td>
<td>8,268</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV94</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV93</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL96</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT99</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>21,024</td>
<td>10,676</td>
<td>20,465</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5,881</td>
<td>2,891</td>
<td>3,938</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>12,661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE100</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI101</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK102</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>136,247</td>
<td>80,580</td>
<td>68,599</td>
<td>5,936</td>
<td>30,807</td>
<td>36,842</td>
<td>24,370</td>
<td>43,208</td>
<td>7,549</td>
<td>11,128</td>
<td>6,924</td>
<td>3,172</td>
<td>10,915</td>
<td>20,521</td>
<td>41,394</td>
<td>38,494</td>
<td>6,024</td>
<td>35,208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Outputs by participant characteristics**

Outputs are also broken down by priority groups.

- Over 80,000 participations involve women. This is 59% of the total.
- Young people accounted for over 43,000 participations, 32% of the total. In contrast, the figure for older people (aged 55-64) was only just over 7,500, 6% of the total.
- Disadvantaged groups participated in activities under this policy field – but they are not a substantial component, with just over 11,000 (8%) involving migrants, 6,900 (5%) minorities, 3,200 (2%) individuals with a disability and 20,500 (15%) other disadvantaged groups.
- Over 35,200 participations (26%) involved people educated to tertiary level. This is likely to reflect the fact that many activities under this policy field involve the staff of enterprises, social partners and non-governmental organisations. The other substantial categories are primary or lower secondary education (41,400 – 30%) and upper secondary education (38,500 – 28%).

### 9.4 Analysis of results

**Overview**

As in previous chapters, the analysis here is based upon the 27 country reports, where the experts have drawn together their discussion of results based largely on 2012 AIRs.

Table A7 in the Appendix summarises the information on different results indicators across the 27 member states to end December 2012. Whilst results indicators have been set for this policy field within individual OPs, these are not consistent. This, combined with the nature of the policy field – focusing on structures rather than service delivery – has meant that only 2 member states were able to identify headline results (BG and RO).

- BG achieves over 59,000 participations involving the award of a qualification.
- RO note that over 1,200 social partners and non-governmental organisations have been supported to provide services to the community.

**Analysis of country experts**

This section is based on the country reports – namely the sections reviewing the results within the evaluation literature (including evaluations published in 2013) in relation to Promoting Partnerships.

**Results for interventions**

Some positive feedback appears in the country reports around particular types of intervention.

- Where the ESF had supported the establishment of partnerships, these were producing a range of results.
  - By improving partnerships between schools and employers partnerships could lead to more pupils securing employment on leaving (CZ, IT).
  - Ensuring a wider range of results have been achieved than would have been possible if organisations had been working in isolation (CZ).
  - Helping organisations to share knowledge (DK).
Support for local structures has led to decision making (in relation to what activities are funded) shifting to the local level (DE).

Training for staff (for example, on data analysis) within social partners has been successful in helping them develop effective policies and respond to government legislation (MT).

Training is also critically important in helping develop the values and ethics within social partner organisations (MT).

Outreach to groups (e.g. employers) not normally involved in policy making has helped engage them in the policy making process and/or enable them to respond more effectively to policy changes (MT).

Territorial Employment Pacts have helped open up provision to new target groups (AT).

Territorial Employment Pacts have also allowed member states to try out innovative measures and facilitated learning and exchange of good practice to occur (AT).

However, some factors were identified that limited the results achieved.

- In some member states, participation by civil society organisations in partnerships has been more limited than anticipated. This is particularly an issue in member states where civil society organisations are fragmented and/or lack resources to effectively participate (MT).
- Partnerships are sometimes artificial, having come together solely to secure funding. These result in limited additional benefits being secured (PL).
- Territorial Employment Pacts that are top-down have generally failed due to a lack of motivation and identification with the TEP by partners (AT).
- Finding suitable transnational partners can be difficult especially for those that have no previous experience of participating in transnational partnerships (MT).

**Results for specific groups**

Reflecting the nature of this policy field (focusing on structures), there are no results for specific groups.

### 9.5 Analysis of effectiveness

**Overview**

As with other policy fields, the country experts struggled to find robust evaluation evidence on effectiveness. However, some were able to identify factors that had helped underpin effective development of partnerships, pacts and networks. These included:

- Regular networking – both within and outwith the formal partnership structures (AT).
- Financial incentives to assist non-governmental organisations to participate in capacity building (SI).
- Recognising that capacity building is a time consuming process (SI).
- Setting assessment criteria for partnership working can help ensure that projects being proposed include partnerships (MT).
In addition, a number of evaluations identified ways in which partnerships encouraged and developed through this policy field had helped improve the effectiveness of the ESF more generally.

- Partnerships help raise effectiveness by enabling partners with local knowledge and expertise to participate. This results in more appropriate interventions being developed (DK).
- Partnerships have improved the connection between national strategies or policies and action on the ground. As a result, when the economic crisis occurred, the partnerships enabled the ESF to respond quickly and effectively to these changing circumstances (FI).

More negatively, it was suggested that the administrative structures used to manage Territorial Employment Pacts were time consuming and complex, limiting their ability to deliver real change (AT).

**Findings**
Some more specific findings are worth highlighting.

- Partnership approaches are seen as critical in many member states to delivering ESF activities, as they enable more to be delivered than would otherwise have been the case and/or delivery to more effectively meet needs (CZ, FI).
- It has been argued that the ESF has led to a ‘systematic effect’ where collaboration, partnership and networks have been embedded as the way of working. It is felt that this will help ensure that the lesson learnt from ESF 2007-2013 will be embedded and sustained going forward (FI).

**9.6 Good practice**

**Overview**
For 24 member states there was either no good practice available, or the evidence was too slight to merit reporting. Where good practice has been reported, a range of different examples are described below.

**Territorial Employment Pacts (AT)**
The Austrian Territorial Employment Pacts (TEPs) are considered good practice not only within AT but within the EU. The TEPs are regional partnerships that aim to link employment policy more effectively with other policies to make a more substantial impact on the employment situation at the regional and local levels. The Austrian TEPs combine resources, implement different programmes and put strategies and horizontal labour market targets into practice on a regional level. In addition, they contribute to improving information exchange between local, regional and national stakeholders, coordinating instruments of different stakeholders and avoiding duplication of measures and activities. As a result of the TEPs:

- Greater effectiveness and efficiency in the use of resources has been achieved.
- There is improved support for some target groups.
- Jobs have been saved and new jobs created.
- Regions have secured subsidies.
In addition, according to the AT TEP Coordination Unit, the TEPs:

- Increased the involvement of actors in labour market and employment policy.
- Successfully linked policy areas.
- Contributed to improved effectiveness, efficiency and transparency of policies.
- Operated in an open, flexible and dynamic way.

In particular, the structure of the TEPs – principally the fact that they involve a range of regional actors – was found particularly to be advantageous for reaching more disadvantaged target groups. This is critical as the multiple disadvantages these target groups face tend to require the involvement of more than one institution.

**Partnership as a mechanism to improve results for disabled clients (HU)**

The employment rehabilitation model developed and adopted in the county of Fejér is considered good practice. This project supported 60 people with disabilities, providing key competence training for 48 of them and resulted in the employment of 24 participants for at least 12 months. The project involved the government, civil society and private-sector organisation with their cooperation seen as key to its success. The key elements of the project included:

- Building co-operation between government, civil society and private-sector organisation.
- Partners working jointly to create jobs for disabled people.
- Providing professional services to employers to help them recruit individuals with disabilities.
- Demonstrating the feasibility of employing individuals with disabilities to employers.
- Disseminating good practices in terms of supporting individuals with disabilities.

This approach is considered as good practice as:

- The number of workplaces in the region open to individuals with disabilities increased.
- The motivation of employers to recruit from this group was strengthened – with significantly increased demand for employees with disabilities.
- The quality and quantity of professional services available increased.
- Participants were highly motivated because they were prepared for the job and their professional skills had improved.
- The support services provided (including training for different groups, individual counselling, professional training, re-training, personal development) had added value.

**Improving judicial processes (IT)**

In IT, the OP in the Autonomous Province of Trento has adopted best practice, originally developed by the OP in the Province of Bolzano, to improve the performance of the Courts of Justice and District Attorney Offices. This has focused on improving internal processes and communication, both internal and external. The intervention has involved Trento’s Public Prosecutor’s Office and Rovereto’s (the second largest town in the Province) Court of Justice and Public Prosecutor’s Office. The process innovations have included:
Establishing a website.
Undertaking a customer satisfaction survey.
Working to acquire UNI-EN ISO 9001:2008 certification.
Reorganisation of units/offices.
Replacing of paper forms with on-line forms.
Training administrative personnel in key computer applications.
Implementing a system of electronic document transmission.

These innovations led to a range of other innovations (beyond the initial ESF financed intervention) and were rolled out to other local Justice Offices.

**Improving social dialogue (SI)**
The Slovenian confederation of unions (PERGAM) implemented a project to stimulate social dialogue in Slovenia. The goals of this project were to promote sustainable development, equal opportunities and the social inclusion of vulnerable target groups, and to promote the principles of democracy, transnationality, innovation and partnership building. Activities included the following:

- An international conference on collective negotiations was organised in cooperation with the International Union network UNI-EUROPA.
- Seminars for union representatives.
- Training courses for mentors for study clubs which were organised in different work settings.
- An awareness raising campaign to promote social dialogue and the role of social partners.
- A roundtable on social dialogue

The AIR 2011 reported that this project improved existing structures of social dialogue at different levels (international, national, regional, industry and company) and promoted bilateral and trilateral cooperation between the private, public and non-governmental sector.
10 Strengthening administrative capacity

10.1 ESF scope

The policy field ‘Strengthening administrative capacity’ only concerns the ‘Convergence’ objective and has the aim of: “strengthening institutional capacity and the efficiency of public administrations and public services at national, regional and local level and, where relevant, of the social partners and non-governmental organisations, with a view to reforms, better regulation and good governance especially in the economic, employment, education, social, environmental and judicial fields, in particular by promoting:

- (i) mechanisms to improve good policy and programme design, monitoring and evaluation, including through studies, statistics and expert advice, support for interdepartmental coordination and dialogue between relevant public and private bodies;
- (ii) capacity building in the delivery of policies and programmes in the relevant fields, including with regard to the enforcement of legislation, especially through continuous managerial and staff training and specific support to key services, inspectorates and socio-economic actors including social and environmental partners, relevant non-governmental organisations and representative professional organisations.”

10.2 Types of intervention

Strengthening Administrative Capacity has been delivered across member states through a range of different types of interventions.

Improving organisation of public administration

Having good systems in place to manage the work of public services is critical to be able to achieve policy goals and meet the needs of beneficiaries. ESF funds have been used in a number of member states to improve the systems in place.

- A key first step is to review procedures and processes currently in place. This has then been used as the basis for introducing new procedures and processes (e.g. monitoring systems).
- In particular, new management systems (financial, operational, human resources, quality and document management) are often required.
- In addition, some member states have worked to introduce e-government (online) services.
- Support to develop plans and report processes has also been important in improving the organisation of public services.

Upskilling staff of public administration

The skills of public administration staff are a key determinant of the quality of public services. A number of member states have used ESF funds to upskill the employees of their public administration services. Key activities have included:

- Analysis of training demand.
- Preparation of training materials and programmes.
- Undertaking training with management and staff.
- Secondments to enable staff to learn from the approaches taken elsewhere.

**Changing service delivery**

Public services should work for the communities they serve. However, they often do not. As a result, reform of public services becomes necessary.

- A range of reforms of public services have been taken forward under this policy field including decentralisation of services, simplification of legislation, reduction of administrative burden on businesses and reforms to reduce of duration of legal proceedings.
- In addition, processes have been introduced to ensure that future policies meet the needs of the communities they serve (for example, introducing impact assessment of legislative or policy changes or introducing a service to support individuals during disputes with public administration).

### 10.3 Analysis of outputs

**Total outputs**

Table 10 presents the outputs for the Strengthening Administrative Capacity policy field to end December 2012, broken down by member state. As much of the activity within this policy field relates to ‘entities’ (in this case, public services), the lack of common indicators to capture data on entities is a major limitation. In total, there have been over 913,000 participations, across 11 member states.

- Nearly 891,000 (98%) involve employees. This reflects the fact that this policy field primarily supports the employees of public administrations, public services and social partners. Within this, over 11,000 are self-employed.
- 9,500 (1%) involved unemployed, of whom nearly 2,000 are long term unemployed.
- Over 13,000 (1%) are inactive, of whom almost 6,800 are in education or training.

**Outputs by participant characteristics**

Outputs are also broken down by priority groups.

- Over 580,000 (64%) participations involve women. This reflects the composition of the public workforce – with women more likely to be employed in public service or non-governmental jobs than men.
- Neither young people (15-24 years old) nor older people (55-64 years old) are particularly common – with over 36,000 (4%) and nearly 90,000 (10%) respectively.
- Only a small proportion of participations came from more disadvantaged groups – with just over 100 migrants, 10,000 minorities, 4,800 disabled and 2,600 from other disadvantaged groups.
- 56% of participations (almost 511,000) involved people educated to tertiary level. Again, this is indicative of most participants being employees of public administrations or non-governmental organisations. Nearly 21,000 had primary or lower secondary education, nearly 105,000 had upper secondary education and nearly 66,000 had post-secondary education.
Table 10. Administrative capacity outputs to end December 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of participations</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Of which self-employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Of which LTT</th>
<th>Inactive</th>
<th>Of which in education/training</th>
<th>Young people (15-24)</th>
<th>Older people (55-64)</th>
<th>Migrants</th>
<th>Minorities</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Primary or lower secondary education</th>
<th>Upper secondary education</th>
<th>Post secondary non tertiary education</th>
<th>Tertiary education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>101,732</td>
<td>62,025</td>
<td>94,877</td>
<td>5,939</td>
<td>3,122</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>3,733</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>8,602</td>
<td>15,181</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5,291</td>
<td>2,926</td>
<td>66,251</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>62,991</td>
<td>43,352</td>
<td>62,991</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>37,066</td>
<td>25,797</td>
<td>37,066</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>5,861</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>5,624</td>
<td>4,993</td>
<td>25,848</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>110,083</td>
<td>71,218</td>
<td>106,453</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,630</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>14,033</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3,027</td>
<td>26,358</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>77,728</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>155,305</td>
<td>89,201</td>
<td>155,029</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>3,483</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>1,968</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>13,437</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

103 Self-employed is sub-group of employed.
104 Long term unemployed is sub-group of unemployed.
105 In education/training is sub-group of inactive.
106 Educational attainment on entering.
107 Not applicable to Austria.
108 No priority axes were mapped to this policy field.
109 No data on the policy field.
110 No data for DE in relation to this Policy Field.
111 No activities under this Policy Field in DK.
112 Not relevant for ES.
113 No activities under this Policy Field in FI.
114 No information available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of participations</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Of which self-employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Inactive</th>
<th>Of which in education/training</th>
<th>Young people (15-24)</th>
<th>Older people (55-64)</th>
<th>Migrants</th>
<th>Minorities</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Primary or lower secondary education</th>
<th>Upper secondary education</th>
<th>Post secondary non tertiary education</th>
<th>Tertiary education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IE\textsuperscript{115}</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>57,380</td>
<td>37,570</td>
<td>55,132</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2,087</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td>3,950</td>
<td>7,585</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td>2,373</td>
<td>51,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU\textsuperscript{116}</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>33,321</td>
<td>23,626</td>
<td>31,566</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>2,979</td>
<td>4,388</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>31,998</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>3,822</td>
<td>1,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>10,572</td>
<td>3,978</td>
<td>10,496</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2,421</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>1,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL\textsuperscript{117}</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>262,973</td>
<td>179,484</td>
<td>255,784</td>
<td>1,869</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>5,308</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>11,175</td>
<td>26,802</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>27,604</td>
<td>35,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT\textsuperscript{118}</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>45,719</td>
<td>28,420</td>
<td>45,719</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,577</td>
<td>4,983</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,687</td>
<td>1,647</td>
<td>36,385</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE\textsuperscript{119}</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI\textsuperscript{120}</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>35,031</td>
<td>17,493</td>
<td>34,474</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2,153</td>
<td>5,885</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>4,873</td>
<td>8,901</td>
<td>1,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>913,437</td>
<td>582,904</td>
<td>890,851</td>
<td>11,296</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>13,086</td>
<td>6,789</td>
<td>36,561</td>
<td>89,748</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>10,060</td>
<td>4,801</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>20,788</td>
<td>104,616</td>
<td>65,951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annex XXIII data extracted from SFC (31.10.13) – as reported in country reports under this policy field.

\textsuperscript{115} Not applicable.
\textsuperscript{116} Not relevant for LU.
\textsuperscript{117} Netherlands is not a Convergence Region so this Policy Field is not applicable.
\textsuperscript{118} PA covers both ‘Promoting Partnerships’ and ‘Strengthening Administrative Capacity’ . Not possible to disaggregate results.
\textsuperscript{119} Not relevant for SE.
\textsuperscript{120} Annex XXIII data from SFC is not allocated to specific Policy Fields in SI Country Report.
10.4 Analysis of results

Overview
As in previous chapters, the analysis here is based upon the 27 country reports, where the experts have drawn together their discussion of results based largely on 2012 AIRs. Table A8 in the Appendix summarises the information on different indicators of results across the 27 member states to end December 2012. Overall very limited results are presented.

- The main result is the numbers gaining a qualification – most commonly the employees of public services (including PES). Over 157,000 qualifications were achieved but this is based on only 5 member states (CY, GR, HU, MT and RO). GR, HU and RO generated 94% of the total results.
- GR notes 46 participants who entered education or training upon leaving.
- For 2 member states (RO and UK) there are a range of ‘other’ results which were reported including structures established or reorganised, partnerships established and secondments undertaken.

Analysis of country experts
This section draws on the review of evaluation evidence for Strengthening Administrative Capacity undertaken by the country experts in the country reports.

Broad conclusions
In general, there is limited evidence available on the results achieved under this policy field.

- A number of member states flag up a lack of progress in taking forward this policy field (BG, CY). One important reason for this is that indicators in relation to this policy field appear to have been poorly defined making it difficult to assess what progress has been made (BG, CZ, RO).
- The key result noted across a number of country reports is the proportion of public administration staff completing training and/or gaining qualifications.
- However, some evidence suggests that employees may not always be able to apply this learning within the workplace (LT).
- In CZ, the targets set for this policy field proved over-ambitious with lower demand from the target group than initially anticipated.

Results for interventions
There is limited evidence on results for different types of intervention under this policy field. However, a small number of interventions with positive results are flagged up in the country reports.

- E-government activities are highlighted as improving the quality and effectiveness of public services with a key benefit being that they reduce the time for processes (e.g. applications) to be completed (CZ, SI).
- Establishing a one-stop shop approach has been effective in reducing the number of days required to establish a new business (SI).
- As outlined above, training for public servants has been used in a number of member states and generally there has been good uptake of this, with many staff gaining qualifications (EE, LT).
Results for specific groups
Reflecting the nature of this policy field, there are no results for specific groups.

10.5 Analysis of effectiveness

Overview
As with other policy fields, the country experts struggled to find robust evaluation evidence on effectiveness. However, some were able to identify factors that influenced the effectiveness (or lack of effectiveness) of interventions under this policy field.

- Whilst training is seen as an effective mechanism for raising the skills of public administration staff and in turn the quality of services on offer, this is thought to be limited if it undertaken on an ad hoc basis. A systematic approach to training is thought to be more effective (EE, LT).
- Similarly, a key factor is the quality and appropriateness of training. If, for example, the training is considered to be out-of-date, lacking quality or organised at a time that is difficult for staff to access, its effectiveness is less assured (LT).
- A careful balance is needed – with some evaluations criticising a duplication of efforts (for example with similar but separate programmes of training for employers and trade unions) whilst other arguing that a lack of customisation to the needs of different institutions meant training had limited results (EE, RO).
- There is mixed evidence on whether changes meet the needs of final recipients – with some findings on this positive whilst others negative. Even where improvements in public services were identified, these did not necessarily feed through into improved customer satisfaction. (BG, CZ, SI).

Findings
Some more specific findings are worth highlighting.

- The impact of some forms of employee training takes time to come through – and some evaluations have been conducted too soon to be able to capture these benefits (LT).
- Member states are often dependent on external contractors to deliver training or consultancy to help them deliver the changes under this policy field. This means their effectiveness depends on the quality of available providers. Where there is a lack of capacity or skills within the external sector, this has a knock-on impact on the delivery of these changes within public administration (LT).
- A key challenge for this policy field is to ensure that ESF funds are targeted at interventions that would not have happened anyway (EE).
- Having a strategy for public sector reform (or elements underpinning it, such as skills) is critical – and member states that have undertaken reform without a strategy have found the effects to have been limited (LT, PL).
10.6 Good practice

Overview
For 24 member states there was either no good practice reported, or the evidence was insufficiently detailed. A range of examples are described below.

Increasing transparency and openness (GR)
The OP Administrative Reform is the main programme supporting actions with the objective of strengthening administrative capacity and modernising the public administration in Greece. An action which has already shown good results is the creation of an open government network, through the implementation of the programme Cl@rity. The Cl@rity programme covers all public institutions, regulatory authorities and local government and is an initiative of the Ministry of the Interior, Decentralization and e-Government. Through this project, citizens can now access all government and legislative decisions online – as well as being able to participate in public consultations online. This extends to all decisions by institutions exercising public authority. The programme is extended and now includes 3,458 institutions, with 32,025 public sector employees receiving specialised training for the management of the programme’s web platform. This is considered to be good practice in that it contributes substantially to the creation of a more transparent relationship between the citizens and the state, leading to greater responsibility and accountability.

Use of internet to increase openness (HU)
Public sector procurement has been reformed in HU and these reforms are considered to be good practice. There are three elements to this:

- Open calls for public sector procurement have been introduced.
- Public sector organisations are obliged to publish results online.
- The adoption of objective evaluation criteria as good practice.

The key element of the approach is that all projects must be documented on the websites of both the beneficiary organisation and on etudasportal.gov.hu.

This approach is considered good practice because:

- Publishing results has led to positive effects.
- Having materials available helps local government staff when preparing to implement similar projects.

However, limited information is available on the transferability of this practice.

Implementing monitoring and evaluation to improve delivery (LT)
The Evaluation of the Human Resources Development Operational Programme Priority 4 has identified the VORT project as a good practice example. This involved the introduction of new monitoring and evaluation criteria and budget programme evaluation provisions. In addition, a new methodology for evaluation design and application was approved. The next stage is to approve a new methodology for budget programme evaluation. This project is considered good practice as it:
• Contributed to a decrease in the duplication of functions between different institutions and/or within institutions;
• Enabled further reform of public services. During the project, proposals were submitted on how to improve the system of public administration and these helped the Office of Prime Minister to implement and manage the reforms in state governance.

There is limited evidence on the transferability of this good practice example to other countries. Transferability would depend on the country’s specific situation in the area of public administration performance management – i.e. whether similar reforms in evaluation methodology, strategic planning, etc. are needed.

**Developing skills and competences of public servants (LT)**
The development of the qualifications of Lithuanian public servants is considered to be good practice. Three groups were supported:

• Those considered to be potential future chairs of working groups within the EU Council, and their assistants and heads of EU coordinative subdivisions.
• Other representatives participating in the work of EU institutions and the Lithuanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
• Individuals that participate in the preparation of the positions of Lithuania (including those who work in the EU coordinative subdivisions).

Training focused on Lithuania’s European policy formation and priorities, evaluation of the impact of EU legal acts, EU decision making, politics, impact assessment and bargaining. Since 2010, 1,664 individuals from across these three groups have increased their qualification level through this project.

This good practice example has potential to be transferred, especially to other EU-12 (and Croatia) countries, which have less administrative experience in the representation of its interests within the EU.

**Reducing the administrative burden on businesses (SI)**
A project to measure the administrative costs and burdens in Slovene regulations provided a holistic and transparent overview of the demands imposed by legislation. This was used to identify and implement concrete measures to simplify procedures and eliminate unnecessary obstacles in the administration processes. A single database was established that enabled a clear and accessible overview of legislative changes and offers the possibility to assess the effects of changes on different aspects of administrative costs. In addition, public employees were trained to use the database and tool to enable them to estimate the effects on the economy of the proposals they are working on. This is good practice as better regulations and simplification of existing procedures lower administrative burdens, bringing savings for the economy, citizens and the public sector. This can have a positive effect on economic growth, the number and value of investments, new employment opportunities through competent and efficient public administration which is more client-oriented.

**Reducing trauma on children of testifying in legal cases (SI)**
A project to provide all regional courts with equipment to enable the implementation of remote hearings and video-conferencing for children affected by violence or in divorce hearings has reducing the stress connected with children testifying in courts. In each judicial region, Centres for Social Affairs were equipped with child-friendly
rooms and video conferencing equipment. The recordings are sufficient for the prosecution to start the judicial process. For children this approach offers the least traumatic experience possible. If it is needed, the court can summon the child to testify one more time. He or she is questioned by a court-appointed professional, who can also testify about the child’s non-verbal communication. This is used in extreme cases and represents the last option. All further appeal courts deal only with recordings. This is considered good practice as it significantly reduces the stress involved in testifying for children.
11 Community Added Value

11.1 Capturing Community Added Value

The discussion of Community Added Value (CAV) is based on the set of country reports, many of which have been able to base judgements on evaluation evidence, or failing this, AIRs. Evidence based on more anecdotal sources has not been used in this report.

The four forms of CAV are described below, and the subsequent discussion is organised around these four headings.

- **Volume effects** – ESF funding adds to existing actions, either by supporting national action in general or specific areas of national policy. On the downside, there may be examples of ESF programmes overlapping with or displacing other interventions not co-financed by the ESF.
- **Scope effects** – ESF action broadens existing action by supporting groups or policy areas that would not otherwise receive support.
- **Role effects** – ESF action supports local/regional innovations that are taken up at national level or national innovative actions that are then ‘mainstreamed’.
- **Process effects** – ESF action influences member state administrations and organisations involved in the programmes.

The material included in this section was selected on the following basis.

- There appeared to be some evaluation underpinning the assessments.
- A mix of different types of CAV was captured.
- CAV from a broad range of member states was felt appropriate.

11.2 Volume effects

Of the 27 country reports:

- 20 reported positive volume effects.
- 2 (BE and LV) indicated some potentially negative displacement effects. BE also reported positive CAV effects.
- 6 were unable to provide any evidence based on robust sources.

Some examples are described below.

**General boosting of activities**

**Austria**

Evaluation evidence notes that project promoters and trainers stated that their projects would not have been conceived or implemented without ESF support through PA5.
Bulgaria
The ESF in Bulgaria has strong volume effects in measures under Enhancing A2E. Almost all of the current activities of the Employment Agency, and especially after the beginning of the economic crisis, are funded under OP HRD. In total, ESF accounts for 72.3% of the funding for active labour market policies.

Hungary
The ESF has provided a major volume effect in terms of enabling the implementation of a range of measures in Hungary. Due to the financial crisis and its budgetary consequences, the financial contribution of the ESF became even more important. However, in spite of the profound reorganisation process in terms of employment, education and training, social inclusion and health the low level of quantification of results does not allow a precise assessment of the volume effect.

Ireland
The volume effects from ESF financing are substantial and of greater national importance than under the previous EU funding round when the Irish exchequer was in a position of strength. The ESF contribution in 2007-2013 is more important than was anticipated at the planning and initiation stages of the HCI OP, given the economic collapse and deterioration in the public finances. This has become more evident over the years of the economic crisis, highlighted in the recent revision of the OP involving a significant reduction of the national funding contribution and an increase in the ESF grant rate to 50 percent.

Portugal
In the 2007-2010 period, the ESF support for measures around ‘Initial qualifications’ represented about 30% of the total, reflecting the high priority and added value of these interventions for the ESF in Portugal. The contribution of the ESF is therefore considered central to the effort developed by the systems of education and training, allowing for an increase in the offer of vocational pathways and the diversification of ways to conclude secondary schooling.

Slovenia
Approximately 65% of the budget of the Active Employment Policy is covered by the ESF. In addition, it supported anti-crisis measures which helped to retain more than 20,000 employment positions (through the education and training of workers temporarily waiting for employment). Some programmes would be implemented in any case, but to a much lesser extent.

Slovakia
In Slovakia, the ESF is a major source of funding of national policies in the field of employment, social inclusion and education. ESF funds are the key resource which helps to enhance public policies and interventions. These contribute not only to national, but also to EU objectives with the availability of financial resources allowing the continuation of public policies and boosting implementation of interventions.

United Kingdom
The European Social Fund Operational Programme 2007-2013: Synthesis of Evidence from the First Half of the Programme reviews the evidence on how OP England and Gibraltar has added value. The volume effects identified include:

- Increasing and complementing mainstream employment and training provision, including providing earlier access than would otherwise be the case.
Increasing the number of unemployed claimants that are able to access support (e.g. to cater for individuals not eligible for mainstream provision).

- Getting more claimants into employment and increasing the qualifications and skills of claimants and the existing workforce.

A key element of the volume effects was the ability of the ESF to boost provision in relation to changing needs, with a substantial increase in support for shorter term unemployed people who became unemployed at the onset of the recession.

**Boosting support for priority groups**

**Austria**
In the 2007-2013 programming period, the ESF contributes approximately €47 million to the integration of people furthest from the labour market in Austria. With national co-financing (of approximately €55 million) this reaches a total of €102 million which represents a financial impetus for projects in the field of social inclusion.

**Czech Republic**
Evaluation evidence shows that without ESF support, the situation of the target groups would worsen significantly. Without the availability of the ESF support it would not have been possible to provide the target groups with the same volume of services and support.

**Malta**
In 2005, prior to the implementation of OPII, the early school leaving rate was high while the participation rate of 20-24 year olds achieving upper secondary education and lifelong learning ratios were low when compared to EU averages. The government invested in adult basic and further education and training through a number of entities. These provided training courses for basic skills and offered numerous subsidised courses in a variety of areas and at different levels while having full-time courses open also to adult learners. The national efforts in enhancing human capital and increasing lifelong learning were complemented and boosted by OPII.

**Negative consequences**

**Latvia**
There are concerns that the structural funds have replaced, at least in part, expenditures that would have been made anyway, i.e. that they have ‘crowded out’ both private and public expenditures. In 2013 the Finance Ministry published a study which suggested that on average 44% of fund expenditures would have been made anyway.

**11.3 Scope effects**

Of the 27 country reports:

- 22 reported scope effects.
- 5 were unable to identify any scope effects.
Tackling gender equality

Poland
The gender mainstreaming horizontal issue, which is obligatory in all ESF programmes, is judged to have contributed to the implementation of gender equality in Poland. The introduction of the Minimum Standard widely disseminated the concept.

Portugal
Evaluation evidence highlights the consensus regarding the contribution of structural funds to gender equality, and argues that, at the very least, stagnation of public policies for equality would have set in. Without the ESF, in a context of austerity, the state would have not been able to develop many of its policies of awareness-raising and dissemination regarding gender equality, especially regarding the prevention of gender violence and victim protection.

Focussing on target groups

Austria
The ESF monies and eligibility criteria broadened the range of target groups addressed by employment and social policy in Austria. Employees were not a target group of PES measures before, and nor were people unregistered with the PES. Given that the projects had to be innovative and were not measured by traditional forms of ’success’ (i.e. labour market integration), the funding also allowed scope effects in that new approaches to the integration of the target group were developed. The absence of quantitative success criteria also helped avoid “creaming” effects as there is no pressure to take the best participants to achieve an employment result\(^\text{121}\).

France
Without the ESF guidelines, the target groups of older people (50+) and ethnic minorities would not have been specifically targeted and would have remained less supported.

Germany
ESF support in Germany has in a number of cases led to additional interventions for specific groups otherwise receiving limited services. These include prisoners and ex-offenders, people with mental health issues and asylum seekers.

Poland
Scope effects are clear in relation to prisoners, Roma people and young people from approved schools and the youth shelters. There is also a significant investment in OHP (Voluntary Labour Corps) to work with youth threatened by exclusion.

Integration of minorities

Belgium
In 2011, an innovative project started which supported the integration of Roma people. This is a relatively new target group which is not easy to work with and in most cases could not have been addressed without the support of the ESF.

Bulgaria
The measures under OP HRD for the integration and social inclusion of minorities – especially Roma people – have been implemented by following a new innovative

\(^\text{121}\) Ongoing Evaluation of the ESF 2007-2013, PA 3b: Integration of people furthest from the labour market, p. 89
approach. INTEGRA was started to build upon a scheme to supply modern social homes for people from vulnerable and minority groups. The main objective of INTEGRA is to promote sustainable desegregation and social inclusion. INTEGRA is the first scheme combining measures from several priority axes. It covers activities in four areas: access to employment, access to education, social inclusion and measures for sustainable desegregation.

**More services, greater service intensity and quality**

**Estonia**
The ESF was a very important instrument to tackle the economic crisis. According to different evaluation reports, without the additional funding important measures would not have been developed and the mitigation of the crisis would not have been possible. Among the measures were:

- Different innovative measures to increase the flexibility of labour (different training courses for extended target groups, possibilities to continue disrupted studies, etc.), increase entrepreneurship (including counselling and training of people belonging to at risk groups), services helping persons belonging to at risk groups (specific measures for disabled persons and more personal approach of designing active labour market measures), but also measures to enhance the competitiveness of the Estonian business environment (new training courses, implementation of specific activities in the case of start-ups and for business expansion, fostering research and development activities in the company around encouraging and supporting exporting).
- Newly designed and/or redesigned services offered to specific target groups which involved a more personal approach to services were assessed positively by recipients, service providers and partners.
- Broadening the range of target groups eligible for the various active labour market services.

These changes were not just responses to the crisis but also contribute to the long-run restructuring of the Estonian economy.

**France**
One ESF final recipient out of two in the case of State services, and one out of four in the case of local and regional government services, goes to the usual desk to get social or labour market advice and support, but receives broader services thanks to the ESF. ESF support follows mainstream delivery by adding substantial resources to local delivery mechanisms, mostly at regional and sub-regional (Département) level.

**Hungary**
The impact of employment and human capital development projects depends to a great degree on the regional and local context. Recognising this, the design and implementation of Hungarian ESF-supported interventions happened at the local level. As a result of detailed guidance and dedicated resources for local coordination, it was possible to expand the range of interventions managed at this level from infrastructure to also include human capital development and social assistance. In particular, a key area of expansion was to concentrate on the most disadvantaged, applying complex packages of assistance. This has been possible, in part, due to a recognition that hard results cannot be achieved for this group from standalone projects but require support from a range of local providers.
Italy
For Social Inclusion interventions and, in particular, measures targeting populations benefiting from social or other public assistance or care services, the ESF made it possible to specifically stress the employment-orientation of intervention. This is mainly the case for offenders/ex-offenders, people with disabilities, drug addicted and formerly drug-addicted people and individuals or families in poverty. For such groups, the spending cuts in public social assistance and services in recent years narrowed the range of available opportunities and, in general, reduced the assistance to basic issues with significant reductions of employment-oriented services.

Netherlands
The evaluation of interventions funded to support practical training (PRO) and secondary special education (VSO) reported that, for schools, one of the most important benefits of the ESF is the professionalism that they are now able to give to their programmes for employment support. This refers to the equipment, machinery and materials that could be purchased to create realistic working environments for students. The transition from education to employment is made easier in a realistic working environment. At the same time, the professionalism is reflected in the industry-specific courses – made possible by the ESF – that ensure students acquire knowledge in a context that is focused on the labour market. The above shows that the ESF has facilitated the development of high-quality employment support in the participating schools.

United Kingdom
Scope effects have been identified in a number of evaluations. One example given is outreach support to access unemployed claimants who do not typically engage with the PES or the Careers Service. Other scope effects include:

- Filling gaps in mainstream provision. For example, the ESF supports the offer of more intensive support, not available through the mainstream, to young people not in employment, education or training (NEET). This more intensive support helps increase the effectiveness of provision for this group.
- Enabling different forms of provision to be provided. For example, through the ESF the National Offenders Management Service (NOMS) has been able to develop one-to-one support tailored to the needs of this particularly hard-to-help group.

The AIR 2012 for OP England and Gibraltar argues that ESF funding is broadening the scope of provision by:

- Targeting groups that are not eligible for mainstream provision – or are eligible but currently have low levels of take-up.
- Broadening the range of activities and interventions available.
- Providing more intensive support to those individuals with the most severe barriers.
- Providing ongoing support to enable individuals to sustain employment.

For example, ESF funding to the Skills Funding Agency has enabled them to offer a range of flexible, tailored services to meet the needs of the recently unemployed, those at threat of redundancy, 14-19 year olds not in education, employment or training and those in employment but with low skills.
11.4 Role effects

Of the 27 country reports:

- 13 reported evidence of role effects.
- 14 could find no or little evidence.

Recognising and making use of good practice

Belgium
The MA has established a transnational exchange project to identify effective labour market interventions. They have used these to develop a series of tools and models that can be mainstreamed by companies and organisations to respond to labour market issues as and when they emerge.

Bulgaria
Role effects have been identified in relation to community-based social services. Where locally established community-based social service are recognised as a good models for delivery, they are added to the national list of community-based social services that can be supported by the Social Assistance Agency.

Mainstreaming ESF approaches into national delivery

Ireland
The experience of the Labour Market Activation Fund (LMAF), co-financed by the ESF, is being rolled out more widely in current and new active labour market interventions:

- The initiative, Springboard, delivered by the Higher Education sector for unemployed people is modelled on projects supported under the LMAF.
- The new activity, Momentum, is modelled as a continuation of the LMAF.
- The pathways approach in the LMAF informed the government’s new Pathways to Work initiative (2011 onwards), targeted on long-term unemployed people.

Italy
A number of innovative approaches have been mainstreamed including:

- Services aimed at addressing work-life balance issues (mainly targeted on women).
- Approaches that combined employment subsidies and work experiences with short, focused training courses with these based on effective interventions developed in the Liguria, Umbria and Piedmont OPs.
- The requirement for individuals to participate in active measures to receive welfare payments.

Malta
The TAF aid scheme tackles the issue of the formal education system being slow to respond to a changing economic environment and technological changes. In these circumstances, enterprises are often better placed than the education system to identify changes and specify what training is required in response. By subsidising training for employees, TAF enables a more responsive system where employers can access the training they need to develop and avoid skills gaps. This approach has been mainstreamed through reforms in education institutions such as upper secondary schools, MCAST (Malta College for Arts, Science and Technology) and the University.
Changing organisational structures

**Sweden**
A key shift compared to the previous programming period is that there are fewer projects (2,116 compared to over 40,000). The purpose of this shift is that larger projects are thought to have a greater impact and have greater role effects. In particular, support structures and thematic groups are financed by the ESF to disseminate results and experiences from the implementation of the programme. This has led to informal changes at the organisational level in terms of delivering project outcomes and (although to a lesser extent) new strategies and procedures for working with target groups being mainstreamed into permanent organisational routines.

**Innovation**

**Austria**
Evaluation evidence suggests that ESF support allowed activities to be conceived, designed and implemented which would not otherwise have existed without ESF financial support.

**Slovakia**
Despite the ESF strongly promoting innovation and innovative approaches to enhance the design, management and implementation of policies and action, the role effects of the ESF in Slovakia have been very limited. The mechanisms for facilitating innovation and mainstreaming of innovation under the ESF are under-developed. Consequently, knowledge and experience from projects with innovative elements are not being effectively utilised.

### 11.5 Process effects

Of the 27 country reports:

- 20 generated evidence of process effects.
- 7 could find no or only limited evidence.

**Making services more client-centred**

**Belgium**
The Experts in Poverty and Social Exclusion project aims to assist the federal administration to develop an effective strategy in the fight against poverty by employing people who have experienced poverty and social exclusion first hand. An evaluation has concluded that the project has contributed to making this part of the federal administration more client-centred and accessible. The function of experts has been embedded within the federal administration (having initially been set up as a temporary structure). Similarly, the Accompanying Article 60 § 7 project aims to generate collaboration between welfare recipients and regional employment services.

**Netherlands**
One evaluation study identified that the added value of the ESF is not only in the content of the programmes, but also in their organisation. For example, schools became more aware of the objective of employment support, allowing them to work...
more purposefully. The programmes are structured better because what was being done by whom and the main results needed to be accurately recorded.

**Encouraging greater use of monitoring and evaluation**

**France**  
The ESF encourages evaluation to a greater degree than domestic practice, resulting in significant resources being put into the development of monitoring and evaluation tools and the development of skills to use these tools. This has helped influence views within the national administration about the benefits of evaluation (as a learning exercise) and has led to its more widespread use.

**Greece**  
Through the ESF, improvements can be observed in the collection of statistical data (baseline and results). In addition, there is a clear acknowledgement of the need to reform the institutional and administrative framework and introduce cost-effective management.

**Ireland**  
Process effects are identified in the evaluation evidence. In particular, it is reported that ESF co-financing is seen to ensure a level of planning, objective and target setting, management, monitoring and reporting discipline that few stakeholders consider would exist in its absence.

**Lithuania**  
A good example of impact on processes is the project Development of Result Oriented Management (VORT) which succeeded in improving the monitoring of the strategic and operational plan, establishing an impact evaluation system and project management system for process changes. A survey of government ministries found that 2 felt that the VORT project had significant positive impact on their overall functioning and a further 4 felt that VORT contributed to improving the effectiveness of their organisations.

**Slovakia**  
Process effects are observed primarily in the institutions responsible for management and implementation of ESF funding in the Slovak Republic. Requirements for the management of the ESF have a direct influence on national authorities in the way in which they elaborate policies (operational programmes) and implement and manage interventions. Processes such as monitoring and evaluation were not an integral part of domestic policies prior to the ESF.

**Influencing administrative reform**

**Denmark**  
The ESF 2007-2013 programming period coincides with the change in the Danish administrative system, which established new regions in 2007. Given the close links between ESF 2007-2013 and the regional business development strategies, the structure and design of ESF 2007-2013 has influenced the newly emerging administration and structures.

**Strengthening networks and partnerships**

**Austria**  
The TEP structure has helped create a forum which addresses the labour market and social policy requirements of those furthest from the labour market. The fact that this
engages all relevant labour market actors is central to the successful implementation of activities for this group.

Spain
The Study on the Relevance and Effectiveness of the Network Model Co-funded by the ESF and the Results of the Participation in Them in the Current Programming Period 2007-2013 contains some findings and conclusions that can be considered examples of these process effects defined under the CAV. These include:

- Strengthening of formal links between members of networks.
- Improving the competences and skills network members.
- Improving links with policy makers and lobby groups.
- Improving the communication of issues – in particular, the ability to position them within political terms.

Increasing focus on equality and diversity

Poland
The implementation of equality process into the management system in all institutions involved in the OP Human Capital has led to this being mainstreamed as a tool to measure equality in management. In addition, it has led to the development and introduction of the Diversity Index.

Strong strategic effects but weaker operational effects

Hungary
At the strategic level, the ESF in Hungary has helped ensure clear objectives are set, success is systematically measured against a set of indicators and project management techniques are used. These lead to improvements in the management of the mainstream activities as well as ESF-funded activities. However, at the operational level, administrative processes were bureaucratic, with reporting requirements diverting efforts away from supporting participants. This was compounded by the lack of use of innovative processes such as flat rate or grant schemes. In this respect, both the EU institutions and the local organisations report significant unexploited potential
12 Overall conclusions from country reports

Overview
This section draws together some of the main common conclusions prepared by the country experts to complete the analysis within their country reports. They were asked to produce some key findings on the overall achievements of the ESF within their member states. These are grouped below under a number of headings.

Progress on delivery
Most experts argued that progress on delivery was on-track in relation to expenditure, output and results targets – where these existed. In a small number of member states (for example, CY, GR) progress was less well advanced due to the massive disruption caused by crisis in their public finances.

Responding to changing circumstances
In most cases the ESF was seen to have responded flexibly and quickly to the onset of the economic crisis. There were three principal elements to this, evident in a number of member states:

- Changes in intervention rates where member state public finances had been seriously damaged by, in particular, banking crises (IE).
- The reallocation of resource principally into interventions to support A2E and enterprise starts – important investment areas in a recession/recovery context.
- Support for measures to facilitate the restructuring of member state economies, including collaborative work around redundancies (SI).
- Reprioritisation of priority groups with a stronger weight given to resources to help younger people as the group most severely impacted by the recession.

A few member states (e.g. CY) however felt that the changes had been more at the strategic or policy level with limited follow-through to resource and implementation.

Supporting mainstream provision
A key benefit of the ESF has been the support provided to national government agencies by ESF resource. The best example here is the PES in various member states.

- In some of the newer members of the EU, but not exclusively these member states (e.g. FI), ESF resource had helped increase the administrative capacity and capabilities of the PES. At a time of rapidly rising unemployment, which places extreme demands on the PES, this constitutes a major contribution.
- In other member states (AT, UK), the contribution of the ESF has focused more on providing services which enhance the basic PES offer to unemployed people. This impacts upon the intensity and quality of the service on offer and involves such additions as outreach service for more disadvantaged clients.

Variable effectiveness across policy fields
There was a high level of consistency in terms of the feedback from the experts.

- In broad terms progress and results in relation to Increasing Adaptability, A2E and Human Capital were felt to be good. Additionally, some examples of significant net benefit based on robust evaluations were available.
The analysis around Social Inclusion was less consistent. Limited evidence around results and little by way of evaluation evidence led typically to an assessment that the ESF resource deployed around Social Inclusion was being used less coherently and with limited effectiveness (BG). However, this was in a context where the potential commitment to Social Inclusion appeared to be variable across member states.

Promoting Partnerships and Strengthening Administrative Capacity are less common policy fields across member states and there is limited evidence on results for them. However, evaluations tend to be positive about the contribution they have made to public services.

Enhanced focus on priority groups
There are some conflicting findings in relation to priority groups.

It is clear that the prioritisation of gender equality across the EU, reflected within the ESF, has been important in ensuring that the design and implementation of ESF activities within OPs leads to high participation by women both in terms of outputs and results achieved. Similar effects are associated with the high priority placed on specific groups such as migrants and minorities, particularly the Roma community. Some country reports (ES, GR) suggest that for groups such as the disabled ESF-supported interventions have been less successful than hoped in terms of engaging people from these groups, and helping them progress once engaged.

Identifying most effective interventions
Country experts used the opportunity to highlight what they regarded as the most effective ESF-supported interventions. These included:

- Services to support SMEs (FI).
- Support for apprenticeships, business starts and labour market activation – but also ESF-underpinned local partnership delivery of integrated pathways for Social Inclusion (FR).
- Training (IE, IT) particularly where this was tied closely to employer and labour market demands (HU, IE).
- Early intervention in schools (PT).
- Supporting enhanced PES activity for people on inactive health-related benefits (UK).

Getting better at monitoring and evaluation
Most experts criticised the existing effort in relation to monitoring and evaluation.

- Criticisms of the appropriateness of indicators were common.
- There were concerns that the monitoring of outputs and results was not sufficiently robust.
- Too few evaluations had been carried out, not enough were robust and some were too late to help change constructively ESF implementation.
- Limited robust work had been undertaken on CAV.
13 Overall conclusions and issues raised

Context is key
1 ESF 2007-2013 was launched at a time of growing employment and prosperity across most of the EU. Labour market problems were increasingly shifting from too much unemployment to too many unfilled vacancies, although significant inequalities between groups, regions and member states still applied. The plans for the 2007-2013 programming period, however, received a major shock with the onset of the global recession. This has led to substantial increases in unemployment and social exclusion. At the same time many member states have entered a period of significant public sector expenditure reduction, raising problems in terms of co-finance for the ESF. Many of the interventions funded by the ESF are focused on employment returns which are harder to achieve in depressed labour markets. All this means that ESF implementation over the 2007-2013 programming period has been extremely challenging.

Improving the evidence base
2 Although comprehensive data are available on outputs for each of the member states, the position for results is much less favourable. Even for three key results – job entry, qualifications achieved and self-employment – it was not possible to obtain the absolute numbers on a consistent basis for a number of member states. In the absence of absolute numbers it is not possible to generate aggregate figures across member states for the results associated with ESF supported interventions.

3 Fortunately, the Guidance Document on monitoring and evaluation for the ESF programming period 2014-2020 sets out a requirement for all OPs to gather data on a set of common ESF indicators. The rationale the collection of these is to “make available and aggregate data from Member States in order to report achievements at the EU level”. The common intermediate results indicators to be reported annually from 2016 and the common longer-term results indicators to be reported in AIR 2019 cover the kinds of results this synthesis report has tried to assemble.

4 There remains the issue of measuring the impact of ESF interventions in a robust way which genuinely demonstrates what difference the ESF has made to the final recipients of interventions. The country reports were generally unable to present a significant amount of compelling evaluation evidence in relation to this issue at a broad level, never mind the more detailed findings around specific interventions that would provide guidance on what works for which groups of final recipients.

5 The concept of CAV captures the overall contribution of the ESF to the member states engaged and the EU as a whole. However, to date, there have been very few robust assessments of CAV within member states. To some extent, this reflects the feeling expressed in many country reports that the evaluations carried out in most member states are “too little, too late” to educate the ongoing development of ESF 2007-2013 and to demonstrate convincingly in a consistent fashion that significant value is indeed being added.

Responding to the challenges
6 The country reports taken in aggregate show that the ESF has generated substantial achievements in terms of the volume of co-financed activity to end December 2012.

- The reach has been massive with over 68 million individual participations. Even allowing for some double-counting this equates to a substantial number of individuals assisted.
Women have been involved in over 35.2 million (52%) of participations, young people in over 20.9 million (31%), the unemployed in over 22.1 million (32%) and those with low levels of educational achievement (primary or lower secondary education) nearly 26.7 million (39%).

The results have also been impressive with over 5.7 million job entries and almost 8.6 million qualifications gained. Good results have also been achieved in relation to new enterprises started and people going into self-employment in some member states, with almost 550,000 achievements in this respect.

Results for Social Inclusion interventions are harder to measure as these often entail progress towards job outcomes. However, in some member states there are significant results in relation to young people staying in education, as well as young people and adults progressing into further education and training.

The effects have mostly been significant and sizeable in the limited number of robust evaluation studies which considered some specific ESF interventions and programmes. These show, for example, that individuals in ESF-supported interventions are more likely to find employment than control groups – with some evidence that this effect is more marked for more disadvantaged groups of people.

Planned expenditure for ESF 2007-2013 is €116.0 billion, with €76.7 billion from the EC, €35.6 billion from national public authorities and €3.7 billion from national private sources. By end December 2012, nearly €55 billion of expenditure had been certified by the member states. This is 47.4% of allocated funds.

It has been possible to bring through this major contribution because in many member states the ESF has proved adaptable and flexible, allowing more resources to flow towards those activities, such as promoting A2E and supporting new enterprise starts, which can make the most significant contribution to the recovery in these member states. Similarly, many member states, in responding to the dramatic rise in youth unemployment, have been able to redirect ESF resources towards interventions to young people.

The ESF has made this contribution in the main by working alongside and adding value to mainstream member state provision. In some instances, ESF funds have allowed mainstream provision to be maintained and increased to meet the high demands placed upon it by the recession but in many other instances the ESF has helped enhance the intensity and quality of mainstream provision.

At a lower level of territorial governance, the ESF has been a key investor in supporting the development and maintaining the service delivery of local partnership-based service delivery particularly in relation to A2E and Social Inclusion. In so doing, the ESF has contributed significantly to the development of substantial and sustainable local partnership delivery capacity and capability.

By setting strong prioritisation for groups such as women, migrants and minorities the ESF has helped secure a higher focus on the need to do better and the need to perform more effectively for these groups across the key policy fields – both in terms of securing higher output levels but also greater results.

In most country reports, the assessment of the Social Inclusion policy field proved to be the least positive. One element within this is the often relatively poor targeting of disabled people and those with mental health issues, and the generally poorer results once engaged in ESF funded activity. Admittedly there is great diversity of perspective across member states in terms of policy commitment to social inclusion, and to the groups that should be prioritised, given scarce resources. This raises significant challenges in terms of designing out an effective role for the ESF in relation to this deeply embedded socio-economic problem, and one which continues to grow.
Looking forward

The nature and scale of the results show the potential of the ESF to contribute towards meeting some of the headline targets for the EU 2020 Strategy. For example, the role of the ESF in achieving over 5.7 million job entries, as well as supporting new enterprise starts and sustaining the employment of those at risk of losing employment, all play into pushing up the employment rate to at least 75%.
Appendix 1: Key results tables

Table A1: Results sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Job entries</th>
<th>Participants gained qualification on leaving</th>
<th>Participants in self-employment/ new enterprise starts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Results estimated by expert - based on % reported in AIR</td>
<td>Other – Provided by Managing Authority</td>
<td>No results reported in AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>Results estimated by expert – based on numbers reported in AIR. No data available for OP Brussels, German or Federal.</td>
<td>No results reported in AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>Results estimated by expert – based on % job entry of unemployed x no. of unemployed participants</td>
<td>No results reported in AIR – closest is ‘number gaining employment experiences and received training’</td>
<td>No results reported in AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>Unable to estimate results – Result is aggregation of employment and further education 6 months after leaving (Managing Authority has confirmed that job entries are not monitored)</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>No results reported in AIR (Managing Authority has confirmed that self-employment is not monitored)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR – but severely limited (with, for example, limited result data available for 2 largest Länder – Saxony SN and North Rhine Westfalia NW – and no data available for Saxony-Anhalt and Thuringia). Where % provided unable to convert due to lack of denominator.</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR – but severely limited (with, for example, limited result data available for 2 largest Länder – Saxony SN and North Rhine Westfalia NW – and no data available for Saxony-Anhalt and Thuringia). Where % provided unable to convert due to lack of denominator.</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR – but severely limited (with, for example, limited result data available for 2 largest Länder – Saxony SN and North Rhine Westfalia NW – and no data available for Saxony-Anhalt and Thuringia). Where % provided unable to convert due to lack of denominator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Unable to estimate results – Result is aggregation of entering employment/come closer to employment/has increased competence level</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR – but relate to Type A results only so likely to be an underestimate</td>
<td>Unable to estimate results – Result is aggregation of entering employment/self-employment/have improved their entrepreneurial competences and come closer to labour market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Unable to estimate results due to lack of denominator to convert % into absolute numbers</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>No results reported in AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR (access to temporary or subsidised work, access to subsidised work and access to sustainable work)</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR (people supported in skilled training and certified training (Mainland France); trained workers (Martinique); and students/unemployed entering education; in apprenticeship; certified; or scholarship students)</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR (business creation and social economy micro-projects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Other – Provided by Managing Authority (National</td>
<td>Other – Provided by Managing Authority (National</td>
<td>Other – Provided by Managing Authority (National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Job entries</td>
<td>Participants gained qualification on leaving</td>
<td>Participants in self-employment/ new enterprise starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Unable to estimate results – Result is aggregation of employment, further education and training</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Results estimated by expert – based on employment rates (12 months after job entries) of unemployed participants leavers (except Tuscany and Emilia-Romagna where unemployed participant entrants used). No data for 3 National OPs or 8 Regional OPs (i.e. data is partial)</td>
<td>Results estimated by expert – equal to all inactive participants involved in training and education interventions across all policy fields</td>
<td>Results estimated by expert – based on % of total number leaving unemployed that were self-employed after 12 months multiplied by number leaving unemployed (selected OPs only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>Other – Data provided by LT ESF Implementation Agency (Note: Most recent data available (not end 2012))</td>
<td>Other – Data provided by LT ESF Implementation Agency (Note: Most recent data available (not end 2012))</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>Results estimated by TERU (expert hospitalised) – based on AIR data presented in CR</td>
<td>No results reported in AIR</td>
<td>No results reported in AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>Results estimated by expert – Number of participants in modular training x job entry rate after 6 months plus number of participants in community jobs x entry rate into employment</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Unable to estimate results – Result is aggregation of employment and further study 6 months after receiving training</td>
<td>Other – Provided by Managing Authority</td>
<td>No results reported in AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>Unable to estimate results – Result is aggregation of employment contract, appointment in public service or entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Results estimated by expert – based on number of leavers (or if leavers not available, entrants) and job entry rate (6 months). Does not include existing jobs sustained.</td>
<td>Results estimated by expert – based on sum of PA and sub-priorities (some absolute numbers taken from AIR and some calculated by expert).</td>
<td>Results provided by Head of Evaluation Unit, ESF Department, Ministry of Infrastructure and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Results (153) obtained from AIR Others results are % - Unable to estimate results due to lack of denominator to convert % into absolute numbers</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>Unable to estimate results due to lack of denominator to convert % into absolute numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Results estimated by expert – based on 103,779 participants in PA2 (at mid-June 2013) and job entry rate of 22% reported in AIR 2012</td>
<td>No result as according to expert „this measure does not apply to the Swedish OP”</td>
<td>No results reported in AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>No results reported in AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>Results obtained from AIR</td>
<td>No results reported in AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Job entries</td>
<td>Participants gained qualification on leaving</td>
<td>Participants in self-employment/ new enterprise starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>In employment 3 months after leaving</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>Persons working after training/ pathway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Participants in self-employment/ new enterprise starts</td>
<td>Persons successfully completing training in entrepreneurship</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>Successful course graduates</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Job entries/workplaces sustained</td>
<td>Having gained qualification on leaving</td>
<td>Participants in self-employment[126]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

122 Job entries are defined differently ranging from entry to employment on leaving ESF activities through to job entries sustained for 12 months.
123 Includes 'Participants in proofs of learning', and 'number of workers in training programmes' (OP Flanders); 'individuals leaving training during course of the year' (OP Wallonia); and 'individuals entering training' (OP Convergence Hainaut). Data not available for OPs Brussels, German and Federal. Rough estimates and may be under-estimated.
124 Various definitions - persons who found work; started work in social economy sector; transferred from social economy sector to real labour market as result of integrated social services; started work after care services in family environment for children/relatives.
125 Various definitions - Acquired/upgraded vocational qualification; acquired key competences; employees successfully completing training; teachers/trainers completed programmes for upgrading of qualifications; teachers/trainers successfully completed programmes for intercultural education and work in multi-cultural environment; persons received evaluator’s certificate (in sphere of educational system); pupils/students successfully completed internships; PhD students, postgraduate students and young scientists completed programmes for development of scientific potential; Roma children completed programmes for multicultural education; completed training upon receipt of certificate.
126 A detailed explanation of the data for Germany is in the separate Excel file: BS_COM_DE_AIR-Indicators_WORKFILE_2014-02-06.xlsx provided to the Commission.
127 Various definitions - Adults successfully completing work-related training or training that targets the acquisition of the key competences for lifelong learning and acquired a certificate at the end of course; people whose qualifications are updated by modernised requirements; number of youth workers who successfully finished training and acquired certificate; non-ethnic Estonians who completed the trainings which increased their competitiveness in labour market and acquired certificate at end of course; participants successfully completed e-courses of higher education and acquired certificate.
128 Various definitions – People who accessed the labour market; unemployed people participating in ALM measures who accessed employment; migrant people hired; number of participants who obtained a job 180 days after their participation; job entries; number of unemployed people trained in innovation and information society who found a job; number of researchers or assistant staff who were hired by companies.
129 Various definitions – People who increased competitiveness and adaptation to the market and improved their labour conditions or job; people in continuous training who maintain their job or have promoted; new qualifications and/or professional certifications; people through competences acquired through experience were officially recognised.
130 Various definitions – Companies created; number of entrepreneurial projects started because of the assistance.
131 No definition provided.
### Employment results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Job entries</th>
<th>Participants gained qualification on leaving</th>
<th>Participants in self-employment/ new enterprise starts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Participants in entrepreneurship development moved into early stage entrepreneurship -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>New workplaces created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Re-certified healthcare professionals</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Gaining a qualification/certification after receiving training (PA 1, 2, 3 and 4)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Employment results</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Job entries</td>
<td>Participants gained qualification on leaving</td>
<td>Participants in self-employment/ new enterprise starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Job entries of young people on conclusion of plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Persons from rural areas in integrated training programmes who got a job on leaving</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Participants in self-employment training who set up a business before leaving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Participants who are working 90 days after conclusion of project</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>In employment 12 months after project completion</td>
<td>Persons acquired National Vocational Qualification</td>
<td>Gross jobs in self-employment on the basis of supported activities, 12 months after the project completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

education, pre-university diploma or secondary vocational education diploma Level 2 or higher); participants who raised their education qualification level to Level 3 or 4; participants who attained an accreditation of prior learning; participants who attained/earned a qualification by following an accredited educational programme other than those specified in the Central Register of VET Qualifications; participants who completed cross-sector education/training (projects to increase mobility between sectors).

150 Estimated by PL country expert. PA2 and PA8 not included as not possible to separate out jobs sustained from job entries. Country expert notes likely to be an overestimate as estimated using number entering provision.

151 Estimated by PL country expert. Country expert notes likely to be an under-estimate.

152 148 700 persons supported by the ESF by grants for self-employment in Poland till the end of 2012. Results provided by Head of Evaluation Unit, ESF Department, Ministry of Infrastructure and Development.

153 Various definitions – Recipients from vulnerable groups obtained a diploma of double certification; number of young people having gained an adequate qualification regarding productive fabric.

154 Also, 12,539 participants in transition from school to active life who got a job or entered education on leaving (cannot separate out job entries).

155 Various definitions – Participants in CVT who gained a qualification; PES staff participating in training who got a certification; participants from vulnerable groups on training programmes who gained a qualification on leaving; specialists in social inclusion participating in training in social inclusion having gained a qualification; staff in education and training who gained a qualification upon leaving; doctoral candidates who got PhD; adults who finished school early graduating second chance school. Also, participants who received certification on leaving but not deemed qualification by National Qualifications Standard.

156 Estimated by SE country expert – based on 103,779 participants in PA2 and a 22% job entry figure.

157 No definition provided.

158 No indication given by country expert of source and/or how estimated.

159 Various definitions.

160 Various definitions.
Table A3. Increasing adaptability results to end December 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Job entries</th>
<th>Participants having gained a qualification upon leaving</th>
<th>Participants in self-employment</th>
<th>Participants entering education/training upon leaving</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70,612 persons with a positive exit(^{161})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td></td>
<td>181,070 people(^{162})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>852 VSE and SMEs completed all stages of programme(^{163})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>821,507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>1,520(^{164})</td>
<td>34,738</td>
<td>2,566</td>
<td></td>
<td>365 enterprises implemented measures on reconciliation/active agency/healthcare</td>
<td>1,478 network activities implemented/enterprises involved in networks</td>
<td>1,460 prepared/ready to start-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>6,272(^{165})</td>
<td>861,057(^{166})</td>
<td>63,983(^{167})</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,993 participants with temporary contract or self-employed hired on permanent contract</td>
<td>13,670 companies started tools/business project for which they received assistance</td>
<td>12,372 companies started risk prevention schemes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{161}\) 2007-2012
\(^{162}\) Including 102,920 women
\(^{163}\) Programme includes specialised guidance, advisory services and training.
\(^{164}\) Job entries/workplaces created
\(^{165}\) Defined as 'number of people who accessed the labour market'.
\(^{166}\) Defined as 'people who increased competitiveness and adaptation to the market and improved their labour conditions or job' and 'people in continuous training who maintain their job or have promoted'.
\(^{167}\) Defined as 'companies created' and 'number of entrepreneurial projects started because of assistance'.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Job entries</th>
<th>Participants having gained a qualification upon leaving</th>
<th>Participants in self-employment</th>
<th>Participants entering education/training upon leaving</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>94,032</td>
<td>572(^{168})</td>
<td>26,476</td>
<td>8,456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1% of employees and self-employed participating in training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td></td>
<td>70,414</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,185 enterprises involved in training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,315</td>
<td>751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td></td>
<td>818,640</td>
<td></td>
<td>31,282 in employment or further study 6 months after receiving training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,253 entities receiving grants to invest in their human resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td></td>
<td>818,640</td>
<td></td>
<td>672,735 completed procedures(^{169}) and implementation plans delivered(^{170})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>203,844 participants in Action D were in paid work 6 months after completion (mainly low skilled workers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,699</td>
<td>3,832</td>
<td>59,829 trainees</td>
<td>171 enterprises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{168}\) Part of qualification - 585

\(^{169}\) Procedure: procedures under Action D may consist of: Vocational education (leading to a qualification) at levels 1 to 4, APL procedures, cross-sector education or an accredited education programme other than those identified in CREBO (Central Register of VET Qualifications). Completed procedure: a procedure that the participant has followed under the ESF project and from which the participant does not discontinue participation prematurely.

\(^{170}\) Implementation plan: the plans to arrive at implementation of the intended social innovation activities within the organisations in question.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Job entries</th>
<th>Participants having gained a qualification upon leaving</th>
<th>Participants in self-employment</th>
<th>Participants entering education/training upon leaving</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>certified in organisational management or improving general competencies (upgrading and improvement of skills)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>providing CVT(^{171}) for their employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,862 employees sustained in jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td>635</td>
<td>435,475</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>120,289 gained basic skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107,345</td>
<td>3,418,151</td>
<td>97,608</td>
<td>10375</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{171}\) Continuous vocational training
### Table A4. Access to employment results to end December 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Job entries</th>
<th>Participants having gained a qualification upon leaving</th>
<th>Participants in self-employment</th>
<th>Participants entering education/training upon leaving</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>19,279 participants to a positive output (employment, activation contract, training)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>76,635&lt;sup&gt;173&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>77,537&lt;sup&gt;174&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>14,210&lt;sup&gt;175&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19,279 participants to a positive output (employment, activation contract, training)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>76,635&lt;sup&gt;173&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>77,537&lt;sup&gt;174&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>14,210&lt;sup&gt;175&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19,279 participants to a positive output (employment, activation contract, training)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>73 182 newly created jobs</td>
<td>73 182 newly created jobs</td>
<td>73 182 newly created jobs</td>
<td>73 182 newly created jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>1,747&lt;sup&gt;176&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>189,094</td>
<td>189,094</td>
<td>189,094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>744&lt;sup&gt;177&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>105 enterprises implemented measures on reconciliation/active agency/healthcare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>120 companies implemented conciliation</td>
<td>120 companies implemented conciliation</td>
<td>120 companies implemented conciliation</td>
<td>120 companies implemented conciliation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>2,506,849&lt;sup&gt;178&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10,287&lt;sup&gt;179&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10,287&lt;sup&gt;179&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10,287&lt;sup&gt;179&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>3,406 companies introduced</td>
<td>3,406 companies introduced</td>
<td>3,406 companies introduced</td>
<td>3,406 companies introduced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28,628 people benefited by children or</td>
<td>28,628 people benefited by children or</td>
<td>28,628 people benefited by children or</td>
<td>28,628 people benefited by children or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

172 2007-2012; Brussels
173 Including 18,913 'persons who found work' and 57,722 'persons included in employment after completion of training'
174 Including 37,148 women and 2,363 Roma
175 Including 7,581 women
176 Relates to OP 2007CY052PO001, PA2.1 'Increasing labour force and employment of women’. Defined as 'Inactive female population remains in labour market six months'.
177 Job entries/workplaces created
178 Various definitions - 'number of unemployed people participants in ALM measures who accessed employment', 'number of migrant people hired’ and ‘number of participants who obtained a job 180 days after their participation’.
179 Defined as 'number of companies created by men or women'. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Job entries</th>
<th>Participants having gained a qualification upon leaving</th>
<th>Participants in self-employment</th>
<th>Participants entering education/training upon leaving</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>31,313</td>
<td>1,293&lt;sup&gt;180&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>13,164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>1,048&lt;sup&gt;181&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>29,196</td>
<td>16,322</td>
<td>23,634 women benefiting from supporting measures to fight against gender inequality at the workplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,629</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>462</td>
<td>367 in employment or further study 6 months after receiving training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>31,124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36,408</td>
<td>47,972 completed re-integration pathways to employment&lt;sup&gt;182&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>180</sup> Part qualification – 1,474

<sup>181</sup> Defined as ‘found a job as a direct result of participation’.

<sup>182</sup> Re-integration pathways to employment: a re-integration procedure may include education, training and counselling. Completed re-integration procedure: a procedure that the participant has followed under the ESF project and from which the participant does not discontinue participation prematurely.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Job entries</th>
<th>Participants having gained a qualification upon leaving</th>
<th>Participants in self-employment</th>
<th>Participants entering education/training upon leaving</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>35,801 participants to integrated training programmes who got a certification upon leaving&lt;sup&gt;184&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>61 PES providing “self-service” to its clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>1,506</td>
<td>17,385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>13,908</td>
<td>30,479</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>10,229</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>52,991</td>
<td>48,520 unemployed participants gained employment status and left the unemployment register</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>607,403</td>
<td>110,351</td>
<td>52,359 74,261 gained other positive outcomes</td>
<td>387,256 NEET in education, employment or training on leaving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,335,650</td>
<td>497,046</td>
<td>41,894 132,637</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>183</sup> 2010-2013
<sup>184</sup> Not attributed to participants having gained a qualification upon leaving as the certification provided is not a qualification according to National Qualification Standards
<sup>185</sup> Defined as ‘number of participants who are working 90 days after conclusion of project’.
<sup>186</sup> Defined as ‘number of beneficiaries in employment 12 months after project completion’.
<sup>187</sup> Various definitions.
### Table A5. Social inclusion results to end December 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Job entries</th>
<th>Participants having gained a qualification upon leaving</th>
<th>Participants in self-employment</th>
<th>Participants entering education/training upon leaving</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>18,994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>119,840 persons with a positive exit(^{188})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>2,527(^{189})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60,735 benefitting from different types of social services(^{190})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>109,541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,881 newly created jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,183 network activities implemented/enterprises involved in networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>139,377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>8,527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>5,436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,716</td>
<td>21,502 participating children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,571 trained professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>2,693</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,000 in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{188}\) 2007-2012  
\(^{189}\) Including 1,627 women  
\(^{190}\) Including 37,543 women  
\(^{191}\) No results available.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Job entries</th>
<th>Participants having gained a qualification upon leaving</th>
<th>Participants in self-employment</th>
<th>Participants entering education/training upon leaving</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>4,387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>employment or further study 6 months after receiving training</td>
<td>9,573 completed procedures&lt;sup&gt;192&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>1,325&lt;sup&gt;193&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>18,179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,684 jobs created in social economy structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,246 gross jobs created (vulnerable groups)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>145 unemployed participants gained employment status and left the unemployment register</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>164,808</strong></td>
<td><strong>147,651</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,716</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>192</sup> **Procedure**: procedure under Action B consisting of individual procedure counselling, of which education may also be a part. **Completed procedure**: a procedure that the participant has followed under the ESF project and from which the participant does not discontinue participation prematurely.

<sup>193</sup> 2007-2012
### Table A6. Enhancing human capital results to end December 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Job entries</th>
<th>Participants having gained a qualification upon leaving</th>
<th>Participants in self-employment</th>
<th>Participants entering education/training upon leaving</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td></td>
<td>300,930 persons with a positive exit&lt;sup&gt;104&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>50,832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>38,195</td>
<td>6,686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY&lt;sup&gt;105&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 newly created/innovated products with nationwide impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>13,119&lt;sup&gt;106&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>126,031</td>
<td>763 network activities implemented/enterprises involved in networks</td>
<td>196 networks of enterprises and universities established</td>
<td>93 new modules developed for professional education</td>
<td>5,072 participants in transnational or intercultural activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>62,086&lt;sup&gt;107&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5,781&lt;sup&gt;108&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>666,624&lt;sup&gt;109&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>74,523 participants whose competences, acquired</td>
<td>27,976 participants undertook internships in</td>
<td>11,545,513 training hours in-company</td>
<td>1,752 networks or collaborative projects between</td>
<td>722 research projects implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>104</sup> 2007-2012
<sup>105</sup> No results available.
<sup>106</sup> Defined as 'number of unemployed people trained in innovation and information society who found a job' and 'number of researchers or assistant staff who were hired by companies.'
<sup>107</sup> Defined as 'number of people who increased their competitiveness and adaptation to the market and improved their labour conditions or their job' and 'number of new qualifications and/or professional certifications'.
<sup>108</sup> Defined as 'number of pupils who received reinforced orientation and support actions, who are still in the academic system and achieved the Compulsory Secondary Education'.
<sup>109</sup> Defined as 'number of unemployed people trained in innovation and information society who found a job' and 'number of researchers or assistant staff who were hired by companies.'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Job entries</th>
<th>Participants having gained a qualification upon leaving</th>
<th>Participants in self-employment</th>
<th>Participants entering education/training upon leaving</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>68,408</td>
<td>464&lt;sup&gt;200&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4,812</td>
<td>through experience, were officially recognised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>companies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>21,504</td>
<td>43,489</td>
<td>55,763</td>
<td>companies and centres of higher education/technological centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,253</td>
<td>45,037 children educated in an integrated (socially mixed) school environment</td>
<td>309 patents submitted</td>
<td>11,169 publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>7,361</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,686</td>
<td>20,452 completed procedures&lt;sup&gt;201&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,593&lt;sup&gt;202&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>12,539</td>
<td>30,200</td>
<td>12,539</td>
<td>1,496 schools and universities supported were</td>
<td>1 training providers supported</td>
<td>137 participants graduating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>200</sup> Part qualification - 466

<sup>201</sup> Procedure: procedures under Action C may consist of: labour technical exam (see above for explanation), student workplaces, sector-oriented courses and follow-up. Completed procedure: a procedure that the participant has followed under the ESF project and from which the participant does not discontinue participation prematurely.

<sup>202</sup> 2007-2012
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Job entries</th>
<th>Participants having gained a qualification upon leaving</th>
<th>Participants in self-employment</th>
<th>Participants entering education/training upon leaving</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>certified according to the new quality standards</td>
<td>for certification which were certified according to the new quality standards</td>
<td>“second chance” education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>33,651</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 235,849, 262,136, 60,575, 696,535, - , - , - , -

---

203 Represents participants to second chance type of education – for adults who left school early and did finish a certain level

204 % of trainers participating gaining partial or full qualification.
Table A7. Promoting partnerships results to end December 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Job entries</th>
<th>Participants having gained a qualification upon leaving</th>
<th>Participants in self-employment</th>
<th>Participants entering education/training upon leaving</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1,223 social partners and NGOs supported through SOP HRD projects (directly or indirectly), which provide services to the community after the end of the project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Job entries</th>
<th>Participants having gained a qualification upon leaving</th>
<th>Participants in self-employment</th>
<th>Participants entering education/training upon leaving</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59,189</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A8. Administrative capacity results to end December 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Job entries</th>
<th>Participants having gained a qualification upon leaving</th>
<th>Participants in self-employment</th>
<th>Participants entering education/training upon leaving</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

205 No results available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Job entries</th>
<th>Participants having gained a qualification upon leaving</th>
<th>Participants in self-employment</th>
<th>Participants entering education/training upon leaving</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 collaborative agreements between public service bodies</td>
<td>169 public service managers completed courses (including 94 female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>157,277</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>