

# 5<sup>TH</sup> MEETING CPR PARTNERS

## ESF+ feedback on monitoring committees



Funded by  
the European Union

*Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Commission. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.*



# WHAT ARE WORK INTEGRATION SOCIAL ENTERPRISES – WISES ?



**Enterprises whose social objective is social integration and citizenship**

**Enterprises at the core of the economic system**



**Enterprises with a strong pedagogical dimension**



[#BuyResponsible](#)

The logo for 'ensie' features the word in a stylized, lowercase font. The letters are in shades of purple and blue. Above the letters are several colorful stars in red, blue, and purple.

# PARTNERS CONSULTED FOR THE FEEDBACK



Extensive feedbacks from a national Social Economy network from East Europe



#BuyResponsible



# PARTNERS CONSULTED FOR THE FEEDBACK



## The Goal

Bridge the gap between social services in accessing and using EU funds but also aims to support Managing Authorities to use EU funds to finance quality interventions in the field of social services

## How ?

1. Capacity building and awareness raising about ESF+, ERDF
2. Facilitate and simplify the use of and access to EU funds for social services.
3. Facilitate exchange and cooperation between Managing Authorities, social services, and the European Commission



#BuyResponsible



# PARTNERS CONSULTED FOR THE FEEDBACK



## Feedbacks from:

- 1 Survey shared in Italy
- **1 National Event gathering views regarding funding needs with Managing Authorities and Social Service Providers**



#BuyResponsible



# 3 QUESTIONS:

## Involvement

1. Procedures – are you meaningfully involved by managing authorities in the process? Are your inputs taken into consideration and is feedback given to you if not?

## Problem and solutions ?

2. Problems – what are the most common problems? and how could they be solved?

## Institutional capacity

3. do you have any issues with institutional capacity hindering your work in the Committees – if yes, what support would you need and where are the bottlenecks?



#BuyResponsible



# NOT ENOUGH INVOLVED BY THE MANAGING AUTHORITIES

- **1. Procedures – are you meaningfully involved by managing authorities in the process? Are your inputs taken into consideration and is feedback given to you if not?**

## ESF+ monitoring committee:

- Participation described as “Formal”. Impossibility to pass the vote due to a majority of members are part of central or local authorities.
- Authority argument raised as: “The program should follow the frame approved by the European Commission”



#BuyResponsible



# NOT ENOUGH INVOLVED BY THE MANAGING AUTHORITIES

- **1. Procedures – are you meaningfully involved by managing authorities in the process? Are your inputs taken into consideration and is feedback given to you if not?**

**ERDF monitoring committee at the Nord-Est Region of Romania:**

- More flexibility and a series of proposals have even been taken up, including that social enterprises should have in evaluation process 3 additional points on the call dedicated to the development of SMEs.



#BuyResponsible





# NOT ENOUGH INVOLVED BY THE MANAGING AUTHORITIES

- **1. Procedures – are you meaningfully involved by managing authorities in the process? Are your inputs taken into consideration and is feedback given to you if not?**

From the Helpdesk perspective: A Survey on satisfaction levels with communication from European grant providers in Italy indicating room for improvement

42% find it sufficient

38% responded  
"rather not"



#BuyResponsible



# NOT ENOUGH INVOLVED BY THE MANAGING AUTHORITIES

- **1. Procedures – are you meaningfully involved by managing authorities in the process? Are your inputs taken into consideration and is feedback given to you if not?**

From the Helpdesk perspective: Insights from the National Gathering Forum

Desire for greater involvement in consultation processes

Perceived distance between proactive calls for proposals and the real needs of the territories



#BuyResponsible



# PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

## ■ 2. Problems – what are the most common problems? and how could they be solved?

### PROBLEMS:

- 1. Rigidity:** Committees hardly approve proposals that concretely support social service providers or social enterprises;
- 2. Uneven playing field:** Consulting firms have stronger resources for the design of some financing guides, which gives them an advantage in the evaluation;
- 3. Lack of awareness:** Committee members are not trained and informed about the beneficiaries challenges (e.g. in the field of social services and socio-professional insertion of vulnerable groups)
- 4. Administrative and monitoring burden:**
  - Changing the eligibility rules and the content of the guides immediately after the launch.
  - Extension of project submission deadlines.
  - Lack of predictability as time to evaluate / contract approved projects.



#BuyResponsible



# PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

- 2. Problems – what are the most common problems? and how could they be solved?

From the Helpdesk perspective: Insights from the National Gathering Forum

**86% have not encountered changes in requirements or rules during project implementation.**

- **Unclear initial indications**
- **Audit controls “as formal” and not enough qualitative**



#BuyResponsible



# PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

## ■ 2. Solutions – how could they be solved?

### ■ SOLUTIONS:

#### 1. More exchanges:

- **Development of trainings** for members on the sector and targeted groups related to the financing program;
- **Study visits** for committee members to private providers of social services and social economy;
- **Knowledge sharing** with other monitoring committees from EU countries;
- **Inviting program beneficiaries** to committee meetings to receive feedback;

#### 2. Better use of evaluations:

- *Even taking feedback from the program evaluations made on other programming cycles;*
- **From Helpdesk insights:** a clearer communication and a more qualitative approach for auditing



#BuyResponsible



# INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY

- **3. do you have any issues with institutional capacity hindering your work in the Committees – if yes, what support would you need and where are the bottlenecks?**

## **1. Time consuming**

Organizations must allow themselves to allocate costs related to the time dedicated by a person to participate in the Monitoring Committees and digest the documentation, **at least 15-20 hours/quarter**

- **Support: Financial compensation for involvement and travel**

## **2. Involvement should be paired with knowledge sharing**

Additional training is needed to understand European funding mechanisms and expectations related to decision-making in the monitoring committee

## **3. Active involvement at each stage of the process**

Members from the civil society sector could also be involved in the drafting of the documents and not only for analysis and final vote.



#BuyResponsible



# Contact:

## Address:

Rue du Commerce, 72  
1040 Brussels  
[www.ensie.org](http://www.ensie.org)

ENSIE : Baptiste Vasseur  
Policy Officer  
[baptiste.vasseur@ensie.org](mailto:baptiste.vasseur@ensie.org)

Helpdesk: Lilith Alink  
Policy and Project Officer at EASPD  
[lilith.alink@easpd.eu](mailto:lilith.alink@easpd.eu)

ADV Romania : Angela Achiței  
President  
[angela.achitei@alaturidevoi.ro](mailto:angela.achitei@alaturidevoi.ro)

## *Thanks for your attention*



Funded by  
the European Union

*Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Commission. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.*

