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Block I

Welcome

David Škorňa, chair the meeting, welcomed participants and Vladimír Kváča, the Network expert for the meeting, presented the agenda of the 1st and 2nd day.

Tour de table – introduction of participants

Due to the large number of participants and the limited time, instead of the usual tour de table, Vladimir introduced the new concept of “Country meetings”, serving both necessities - meeting and welcoming new faces and getting informed about current issues in the MS.

VK invited the participants to chat in pairs with someone they don’t know and share hot issues and state of art in PA in their countries. Reporting on behalf of the European Commission, Florian Hauser explained how takes several initiatives to support PA in MS. It has become a priority issue as all policies are implemented by different DGs and then – by MS administration and. A working group, established across the DGs is searching for tools and ideas for better coordinate EC support to administration.

One participant per country/ area reported in brief for the plenary. Below are the issues reported in punch lines on the next page:
**Czech Rep** – Elections in one month will test the Civil Service Act and will show if it will be respected in the case of a shift of government. Strategic Management is deployed in the PA with new trainings and smart support to all stakeholders.

**Latvia** – Public administration reform plan in progress, revising also the budget and HR management. Ex ante regulation discussed for its influence on NGO. “Whistle Blowers” legal act is already in the Parliament.

**Finland** – Big reform in social care services. High urbanization rate in the country has made the reform more difficult, keeping it on going for 10 years. Private sector involvement in social care is a big debate.

**Slovakia** – couple of initiatives, from the point of view of the citizen. The “Value for money” reform of budgeting continues, a vast municipal reform is also expected to start.


**Slovenia** – Major Digital Transformation: HR IT system, own governmental cloud, open data portal, business intelligence and data driven decision making. Government adopted M by Objectives and CAF external assessment continues.

**Croatia** – The administration is strengthening Quality Management and HR management. Focus on designing and implementing new e-services, as is the “e-baby” service.

**Romania** – Strategic management and budgeting continues to be a government priority. The project, supported by the World Bank is still on going.

**Bulgaria** – Bold reform in Administration (“Cut all Ques”), working with the World Bank on priority issues, including HR, IT and quality management.

**Greece** – “Continuous reforms for the last years, a few quite hot and strategic. The “DIAVGEIA” programme as well as the “OPEN DATA” framework force all government institutions to upload on the web public documents and datasets. According to the “ONLY ONCE” principle, the documents transferred through KEP are replaced by their digital forms reducing the administrative burdens for citizens and businesses.”
Vladimír Kváča (VK) reminded how the Conference Call that occurred in June 2017 gathered founding parents of the Network discussing the future of the Network. He summarized the conclusions as follows:

- Participants consider the network as valuable, due to the quality of the content, the free discussions, the informal culture. Despite the high diversity of participants, a common ground still exists and side events could address additional topics interesting only to some members. Also, longer term members could brief the newcomers before each meetings.
- The poster created for the Transnationality Conference in June may serve as a first-aid tool, depicting the paradigm shift in Public Administration.
- Scope of the Network: Areas selected still relevant. Many individual additional areas were identified, as a focus on long-term change, the role of ESIF for public administration reforms in 2020+, the issue of staff assessment. Topics can be discussed within the framework of paradigm shifts. V.Kvaca emphasized that developing a focus on long–term changes will distinguish the PAGN from other similar Networks.
- Participants were interested in what is going on in different member states, suggesting to have “one-slide” report.
- More consultative setting of agendas is welcomed, suggesting new ideas for network management and flow of information.
VK concluded that the Conference Call worked well and will be used in the future. Also, meetings can be combined with side-events dedicated to more focused issues or tools (HRM, future of EU support to PA).

Read Conference Call Conclusions at https://ec.europa.eu/esf/transnationality/content/conclusions-conference-call-founding-parents-network-29-june-2017

VK informed about changes in the forthcoming events of the Network:
The In-depth discussion on Strategic Management is planned for November 28-29, pending to confirm location (Prague or Brussels). Sufficient number of participants have expressed interest to participate.

Finland study visit on the education reform is planned for January – February 2018. Invitation with more information will be sent.

Concluding the Network business, VK announced a request made by the EC regarding the wider publicity of the Minutes of the meetings, beyond the members of the Network. It was agreed that minutes will be prepared, circulated among members and approved (no reply = consent), before published.
VK referred to the poster prepared for Transnationality Conference as a tool, especially for the newcomers to be guided through the shift of paradigm in PA and he offered slightly expanded presentation based on the poster.

Introducing the concept of *wicked problems*, he explained how NOT dealing with these problems is condemning the PA to become part of the problem.

Realities today, framed in the concept of VUCA and D.Snowden’s framework, also related to the purpose of the Public Administration which is human development (Amartya Sens Capability Approach,) are changing the perception from the point of view of politicians to the point of view of the citizen.

Public services are often managed in a product manufacturing style, while they are services and are, in-fact, co-produced with the users, which creates enormous variety. Therefore – need to be managed in a different way.

Also, the nature of the organisation needs to change, going from simple tasks entities to entities supporting complex tasks. It is a fact that Hierarchical public organisations are complex and closed systems, while self-steering organisations are better equipped to cope with VUCA. Change is needed also in the dominant Perceiption of HR motivation, where external motivation has lead to stress and demotivation. Research showed that the motivation is more effective when internalized, providing people autonomy, mastery and meaning related it to a higher purpose, permitting people to get in mental and emotional “Flow”, the more effective is motivation.
VK explained how destructive is the current “Accountability overload”, where not a single thing that can be done with no rule. The idea is to change from accountability overload coming from trying to be honest & fair and lean & purposeful to “accountability of learning”. Accountability aspects are also contradictory and a dynamic balance is needed. Reframing all these values by introducing the accountability of learning is the right way. Finally, we need a shift from copy-pasting “good practices” to rethinking the way we think of solutions. Meta-governance or “governance of governance” again needs a balance, a smart governance mixtures of the three governance approaches - hierarchy, market governance, network governance.

Benedict Wauters added that the way we discuss and analyze a wicked problem, the framework or paradigm where we put it, is determining the end outcome. The shift will not happen overnight, he noted, but, at least, knowing the existence of the two paradigms is a start.


---

**Block II**

**Public Sector Innovation in Estonia and Finland**

Presentations: 03_day1_innovatsiooniprogramm_en.ppt  
02_day1_superministry_sa1_20170925.pptx

**Introduction**

Merilin Truuväärt started by reminding the definition of public sector innovation, based on a few articles. Three contexts have influenced the notion of innovation in the public sector:

- The New Public Governance and search for more efficiency has focused on process innovation
- The fiscal austerity and crisis
- The progress in ICT and its possibilities creating opportunities and rolled in the Public sector

In terms of types of innovation four groups are identified – process, service, governance and conceptual innovation.

There are a few factors that influenced innovation (media pressure, lack of resources, leadership styles, risk aversion and complexity, employee autonomy. Other factors constrained innovation in PA (the transfer of USA & anglo-centric approach, copying practices from manufacturing, the mix-up of
continuous improvement and dis-continuous change. Three cases were presented as examples of PA innovation.

**Case 1: Estonian Superministry (Silver Salla, Member of the Task Force designing the transition ,EE Ministry of Justice)**

Started 12 years ago as a real estate issue for solving the accommodation problem of several Ministries, but ended up a lot more. The establishment of 4 Ministries within the same building evolved gradually with the last 5th Ministry of Education joining in the last year. The title of “Superministry” was first introduced by the media, but was adapted by the organizational team. Co-inhabitants soon discovered the added value of co-existing in the same venue, of taking the opportunity to synchronize activities. They took steps to consolidate back office services and to attempt synergic action. Savings in facility management and energy savings were just the first wave of benefits.

Human resistance, stemming from the pre-existing institutional silos and legal issues are gradually reduced, as the project progresses. Non-work related communication is evolving from the “us and them” to “we all”. The little things, like meeting face-to-face in corridors, sharing the printing room and being able to see the other Ministry’s calendar, was reported to have made an enormous difference in the government interoperability. For the future, 4 possible scenarios are under consideration ranging from staying independent and just sharing infrastructures and basic services & IT to merging all co-existing entities in one single Ministry.

**Discussion**

Florian Hauser asked about potential or occurring mobility of staff across the different Ministries and the speaker replied that it is possible, but not very frequent so far. Still, knowledge is flowing and people could follow as well.

Radoslav Milanov asked about the distribution of work for management posts and how it was affected. S. Salla replied that, because of the difficult timing of the change (summer vacations,
Estonian 2017 Presidency etc) the operational setting has not been changed yet, trying to ease up for people the stress of adaptation. The speaker clarified that prior to the re-settlement, people were given the choice to select to stay at the same position or to move to a position in the newly established Joint Department.

**Case 2: Innovation programme in the Ministry of Interior (Lauri Lugna, Secretary General of the Ministry of Interior, EE ministry of Interior)**

Lauri Lugna (LL) presented the structure of the Ministry of Interior (MoI), that includes all internal affair services, as well as several entities ranging from police, emergence response, Foundation of Civil Society to the Academy of Security Sciences etc. He shared that although invited initially in the “Superministry” project, the Min. of Interior soon stepped out having second thoughts for the security of the building, but later, after the building was secured, was again attracted by this solution due to budgetary cuts.

The innovation programme was introduced in the Ministry only recently. The main goal, as reports was “mostly for learning”, but also practicing new solutions, as well as having the opportunity of change on government level. Bringing people out of their administrative boxes, he explained, helped in building trans-departmental teams and in re-designing the services to citizen.

Assisted by the National Design Center, the Estonian MoI re-thinked the services, as viewed from the user’s needs and following the human centered design methodology for prototyping and testing. The first problem solved was the “voter’s card”- looking for a paperless solution in implementing an obligation of notifying the voter for upcoming elections. From behavioral science, teams learnt how to better motivate people to choose the non-paper option.

A simple reference in the e-mail, sent to all citizen, stating “Keep in mind that 16 percent of citizen already do it”, increased significantly the number of people that opted for the paperless notification.

Another solution, designed through this process, was the incorporation of the existing building operational maps in the IT system guiding the rescue teams in emergencies.

Ending the presentation, LL stressed the fact that cost-benefit analysis is not well developed in the working place, although present in everyone’s private decision making. He also underlined the need of strengthening user –centric approach among people that produce legal acts, some of which have not walked in the streets of their own rulings.
The speaker mentioned also as an example the GoHELPaBit initiative: This initiative is addressing the fact that workflows vary from week to week in a department, while capacity stays the same. The initiative is offering flexibility in capacity and is introducing a solution to help each other when there is available time.

Talking about the future, LL confessed that his dream was to have more people knowing how to bring about change, since “we are all in a change business”.

**Discussion**

Mina asked how people were affected by this contact with creative methodology. LL described how a positive eco-system grew along with the progress of the workshops.

Radoslav Milanov requested more information on the role of the Design Center and how it was engaged and what was the involvement of the managers? LL: The Design Center (publicly owned) provided 24 hours of training on methodology blended with practice, then advising and involved in the re-design. Managers were indirectly involved during the process, staff members were coordinated directly by the General Secretary.

Petros Gavalakis asked if the method for workflow mapping came from the Design Center. LL replied that it was not based on any software, just on logic and intuition.

Vladimir Kvaca added that the method is based on user-centric design and HCD, which was introduced to the network last summer. VK mentioned similar examples in Check Republic (Brno Library). BW underlined that the first stage of identifying the challenge is very important and a lot of “Whys” need to be asked.

**Case 3: Experimental government (Mikko Annala, Head of Governance Innovation Demos Helsinki, FIN)**

Demos Helsinki is a NGO with no political affiliation, specialized in strategic experiments, working with public and private organisations. Partnering with many organisations and focusing on problems of the present and the emerging future,
Demos has created a cutting edge approach to PA experimentation. It helped the Finish government, to realize that experimentation cannot be just a tool, but a holistic approach to problem solving. After a short overview of history of the concept of “experimentation”, Mikko Annala shared a list of insights from DEMOS action and expertise so far:

- It is a fact that public sector experimentation is not something new, there is only a new way to practice it. Policies are looking more on behavioral sciences and systematically check the experiment. Interesting actors like OECD Observatory, MindLab etc. are working already in this field.
- Finland was not originally aiming at experimentation; it came as a bi-product of different policy.
- Every experiment must prove that there is a substantial benefit, in order to become policy recommendation. Experimentation is able to take an issue up in the government agenda and initiate a policy measure.
- The Finnish Government has moved from “having a model” to “adopting a systemic approach to Experimentation”, establishing also a digital platform for crowdsourcing, Systemic and holistic approach means that there are all three preconditions present: Set ambitious objectives, develop capabilities, measure outcomes. Using the example of the J. F. Kennedy speech on Space Race, MA explained how giving an ambitious purpose, motivates people, even if they are losing.
- The big question of today is “How governments can reach the full potential of experimentation?”

The speaker presented and shared insights from the most popular Finnish Experimentation the “Nation Wide Basic Income Experiment”, sharing insights. He also presented a number of examples of public sector experimentation (Art& Culture goes to Social & Health Systems, etc)

**Discussion**

Mina Shoylekova asked how the design of the experiment will provide all necessary information for policy design. Reply was that there are two levels of information that will be collected and elaborated to extract conclusions. Lauri Lugna shared that two things were achieved together with the “Basic
Income” experiment – simplifying the way unemployment was treated and changing the perception of what a benefit means. Vladimir Kvaca, added to that that, in practice, when you define an experiment, it helps you to also define what the related policy is all about.

Mikko Annala summarized the challenges related to PS Experimentation, although most of the were raised and discussed by the participants. Need of new capabilities, running everyday business at the same time, collaboration between several actors, transforming results into optimal policies, solving ethical issues etc.

Participants asked for more information on how the experiment settled legal and ethical issues, how the stakeholders reacted (Jörg Mirtl shared a Financial Times article, where a Finnish official was criticizing the experiment). M. replied that ethical issues are always relevant and taken into consideration, informed that a special Law has been adopted for the experiment to happen and a formal process must always exist, and agreed that there are always risks, for the success of experimentation is depended on political stability and political will.

He ended with positive numbers, sharing a survey showing substantial benefits from public sector experimentation (savings from failing before scaling, end-users deciding if a policy is good, etc).


Block III

Discussion of a New Project on Public Administration – EC, Hertie School of Governance, EIPA (Mina Shoylekova, Gerhard Hammerschmid)

Mina Shoylekova presented the state of play in the project of a pan-European study mapping the PA with its basic characteristics. The study which was first announced to the Network in Sofia and is entering now its second stage. Within the first stage, existing data and knowledge was gathered and a synthesis report was drafted.

Prof. Gerhard Hammerschmid presented the idea of the study – to map the key characteristics, similarities and differences in all the 28 MS, so we will be able to have the big picture at European level. The implementation of EU policies is struggling at the level of PA, where measures are implemented, but no sufficient data on PA’s state of play exist.

He explained that the mapping of PA key-characteristics is based on 6 quantitative and qualitative indicators, while numbers are collected from national sources and interpreted through a comprehensive narrative.
The full report will be published at the end of the year. Reporting on findings, Prof. GH underlined that Weberian logic is still very present in most MS, civil service status is widely variable with (in many cases) major differences between civil servants and public employees. The indicator based assessment provided a basis for comparison, based on 6 dimensions of governance – transparency & accountability.

Discussion

Several comments were collected regarding the performance measuring methodology or methodology on the size of government, which is different in every country, the availability of data etc. More detailed information on the method of data collection were also requested.

The speakers made clear that the Study is not an assessment, just a data collection experiment. They analyzed how the phases are structured and emphasized on the second and the third Study task – understanding the reform dynamics and the role of external support within the country. They explained how the Commission was requested to go for benchmarking, but early stressed attention that if there is a cross-country comparison, it should be done carefully. Furthermore, the Commission is analyzing countries, but so far with no framework and this Report is an experiment, which we hope will add value.

As Mina underlined, the idea is to provide a clear picture to the Commission and to help its services that currently have no full data set on PA in MS and no overview of all the projects that were funded by the SF in the Public Administration. Florian Hauser also suggested to include an iterative process before publishing the study and asked if participants would be interested in taking part in a workshop in Brussels, to which people responded positively. Mina invited for feedback with comments and suggestions to the study experts via email to mina.shoyylekova@ec.europa.eu.

Vladimir thanked and invited all participants to dinner.
Day 2
Tuesday, Sep 26th 2017

Block 3

ICT and its role in Public Sector Innovation.

Benedict Wauters presented the main points of the newest World Bank report on Digital Dividends combined with Vanguard method insights into ICT use. Starting the presentation, he stressed the attention to the logic of the WB towards ICT. He explained how ICT is viewed as a solution for the following purposes:

- **Tackling information asymmetries**, overcoming barriers for citizens (open data, tele-services). Commented that there are some overlooked conditionalities, like good core administration systems, vibrant private sector and a potential for demand and profitability.
- **Streamlining processes** (reducing errors and time, e-procurement, e-tax & e-payments)
- **Receiving feedbacks** (citizen monitoring, complains). Again, pre-existing conditions are necessary, since citizen must be willing to feedback on something they use often, be able to pinpoint the failure, should be likely to respond — actionable, clear responsibility, prioritizing and tracking,
- **Using it for better monitoring** within government itself. BW commented that it can be used to counter absenteeism, but not for improving performance, only in isolated areas where the routine tasks prevail.

If you are not good at what you do, ICT will not fix it.

As the World Bank report states, the big conclusion is that many governmental IT projects are unsuccessful for reasons not related with the ICT, but due to weaknesses in the rest of the system. BW underlined the fact that the WB Report is empirical and should be cautiously used for conclusions and recommendations. Also, he commented that the criteria used “based on routine task Y/N” is creating a false notion that a delivery may be defined by its nature, while it is the designer that
develops it as a routine task or more complex one, according to the variety that the task is dealing with. Participants disagreed with the observation that “ICT are poorly used for citizen feedback in police sector”, mentioning a number of cases in EU MS, manifesting the opposite.

Turning to Vanguard experience with “digital by default”, Benedict Wauters referred again to the shift in paradigm, that started with the machine view of work (Ford, Taylor, Sloan), separating the decision-making from execution, supporting the idea that ICT can be the starting point for service improvement. To explain how this is applied, BW shared a case from emergency room. Another case presented was the Youth Service in Amsterdam, where the ICT had standardized and monitored every step in the service provision, but in practice it failed, creating duplication of the service, isolation of the case child without looking at other children in the family etc.

“Mind the Managing by IT and the IT by default” was the main message that stand out of the Vanguard experience. Digitalizing a service without caring for variety might increase the actual cost. “Only people can absorb variety, but only if they are delegated authority and expertise.”

Concluding his presentation, BW, shared that the big lesson is that we need to move from “digital by default” to “human by default (putting expertise at the front and putting technology to work). A fantastic example from USA was presented – “Watson for Oncology”, an artificial intelligence system called “Watson”, helping oncology experts to keep up with scientific progress.

BW finished stating that we might think we know what citizen want, but if so, it is only because we told them what to think.”

**Discussion**

Karmen Kern informed that IT machines like Watson exist, but they all compare big data recorded with a specific case, augmenting the capacity of humans to analyze, supporting them, not replacing them. IT is only a tool. Other IT applications were also numbered, like the “Informed voting”, helping citizen to get more engaged, providing voting advice, voting at corrupt politicians etc. At the same time, there are negative elements, like mis-information and manipulation of information to citizen. IT failures like the major 8 Mln pounds investment were used to stress on an important lesson, that a service needs to be understood and improved, then digitized and sometimes, the lack of skills and understanding of how IT works in a specific framework is the root cause for an ill application.
Benedict Wauters emphasized that it is not that users are of services are always right. We need to teach them to look at it from the point of view of the citizen, then combine it with their own expertise.


The Vanguard Method and Digital [edition_three_-_vanguard_periodical.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/esf/transnationality/content/network-meeting-tallinn-september-25-26-2017). Available at:


Case 1 – Development and Application of Innovative Services in the Directorate of Transport and Communications, Crete (Dr. Nikolaos Raptakis, Dr. Kyriakos Kotsoglou – Region of Crete, and Manos Kalaitzakis - Institute of Computer Science, GR)

Dr Nikos Raptakis (NR) described the goals and process of digitalizing the Transport and Communication Directorate, one of the most corrupted in the administration, failing also in many other dimensions. The digitalisation followed a holistic change of the system: all processes, the venue, organizational and structural arrangements, staff motivation and culture. The new system is already fully established with significant benefits, but the improvement process is continuous. Dr Raptakis emphasized that this case is the first in Greece, where change stems from the regional authorities in a country, where all public service design and regulation is highly centralized.

Life is autopoietic system, although a complex one. The service provision in the Directorate was a complex one because of the high rate and high variety of social interaction with the technical part of the system. The speaker stated that the most difficult challenge was to make people share the vision and take ownership of the project. Half of the project staff, came from an ESF funded project for creating short-term employment, but the project culture raised their commitment. The risk of going “from Chaos to e-Chaos” was avoided with a significant process redesign, starting with a lot of “whys” and questioning all assumptions. NR by the principle ”Quality is fitness for use”.

Deepening on the issue of resistance to change, NR, used an empirical typology, where people supporting from the start are the “followers”, the believers are the “missioners”, the straight opponents are people manifesting their views, but also other groups – the “Emigrants” - people transit
in the change area, curious about the end result, the “Indifferent” are people avoiding any involvement, and the hidden opponents, pretending support and ready to hit – the “guerillas”, are considered the most dangerous of all.

Emm. Kalaitzakis (E.K.), a computer scientists from the Human – Computer interaction Laboratory (Technological Institute) served as a technical coordinator for the Crete project. He noted that this project is a product of a long collaboration between the Region and the University of Crete.

E.K. numbered the future applications planned to enrich the system, providing more options and facilitation to the users and strengthening the providers and management. The system is configured according to the traffic and is adapted to demand.

Mr Kalatzakis explained how the IT part of the system was designed in participatory manner, engaging actively all stakeholder groups, iteratively cycling design-testing-improvement. The front gate of the system (website, call center, appointment app etc) absorbed a lot of attention and effort at the initial phase. E.R. shared some of the main performance markers, where significant improvement occurred. Lessons Learnt: Feedback is automatic and collecting assessments and using them for further improvement.

Discussion

Participants asked for clarification on the administrative burden that was cut and speakers explained how it was tackled and where their actions took inspiration from.


Case 2 — Big data – Big challenge for public administration – Experiences of pilot project in Ministry of Public Administration, SI (Dr. Karmen Kern Pipan, Ministry of Public Administration, Slovenia)

Dr Karmen Kern Pipan (KKP) started by introducing the concept of “big data” and explaining how it affects or lives and public services. In Slovenia, the Big Data initiative started in order to make use of all data available in the public administration. After buying a cloud and up taking all public data there, the Slovenian Govt tried to apply Big Data tools and learn from it, improving efficiency for HRM and
public procurement. The pilot team was composed by EMC DELL experts and experts from PA- legal Dept, public procurement, HR, IT, service providers etc, a team composition that occurred for first time in the Slovenian PA.

The speaker shared a short story of how they dealt with Personal Data Protection and Re-establishing trust with data source owners. The former they met with argumentation and full detailed description of all data that will be used, the latter they developed through workshops and positive communication, visualizing the benefits. KKP emphasized that a big part of effort was invested in data preparation and communicating results. Summing up what the implementers learnt from this exercise:

- Everyone has a part in a change story
- The use of big data is shaping the future of PA
- Collaboration with other stakeholders and entities like the University of Liubliana, OECD etc is beneficial
- The horizon is open for further applications – Business Intelligent is already in the plans.
- It is hard to persuade and engage without using a showcase.

Discussion

Radoslav Milanov asked if the Slovenian government use Big Data for any policy making.

KKP: Yes, although the system is not designed to be a Big Brother of the Government, positive measures are taken already based on findings, for example – the arrangement of use of energy consuming buildings according to previous trends in usage.

Presentation 1

The IT applications in the Estonian Tax service was the first case presented by a representative of the Ministry of Finance.
Presentation 2

The Manager of the E-Estonia Show room, Mr Indrek Onnik, presented the past and present of digitalization of governmental services, reaching almost 99% of all services to citizen. He explained the time-line of the process, a series of success and limited number of failures that created the current image of the country as a pioneer in e-governance, reaching excellence on important ratings in EU.

He shared pitfalls and key factors for this success and discussed with Network members how this evolution was met by the population, the private sector and communities, how it changed everyday life. Practical issues, raised by participants were also discussed.
Network Business

Vladimir Kvaca resumed the conclusions of the Network meeting and invited participants to feedback, using SLIDO application. Positive reactions were recorded. He reminded of the upcoming events and informed about a publication expected to be available soon on the Integrated Services.

The “Co-production Dossier” initiative is looking for interesting cases of co-production.

VK informed also the Network members about the successful side-event that occurred on September 25th before the start of the meeting, that reached an agreement on coordinated transnational call between GR and BG, with possible participation of HR partners.

There will be two areas of focus for the Call: “De-bureaucratization of Admin Procedures: Service Directive” and the implementation of a competencies framework in the PA (AdminCompetencies1st). The partners agreed that a letter of intent, which will clearly state that all parties commit to jointly elaborate the Coordinated Call and coordinated project proposal will be signed by October 30th 2017 by the relevant Authorities in Bulgaria and Greece (relevant Ministries and the Managing Authorities). The letter will also state that the project proposals will be further developed on the basis of the concept, general timetable and expected results as proposed by the GR side and amended at the side event meeting.
Note: The next meeting, if confirmed will be in Crete, Greece in May 2018, while the focus of the Meeting – motivation and leadership - will be finalized by January 2018.

The In-depth discussion on Strategic Management is planned for November 28 (Prague).

Vladimír Kváča, Benedict Wauters and David Škorňa thanked the participants wishing them safe return.

END OF MEETING

ANNEXES TO MINUTES

List of Participants:

All above documents are uploaded at https://ec.europa.eu/esf/transnationality/content/network-meeting-tallinn-september-25-26-2017
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