

Synopsis of Consultations

An EGF Consultation Strategy was put together to guide the way in which consultation was undertaken in the mid-term evaluation. The strategy states that, "In order to ensure that the general public interest of the Union - as opposed to special interests of a narrow range of stakeholder groups - is well reflected in the future design of the EGF, the Commission regards it as a duty to conduct stakeholder consultations, and wishes to consult as widely as possible."¹

This presented an opportunity for the evaluation to include open consultation, allowing a wider range of stakeholders to play a part in the evaluation and contribute their views. The evaluation was still also required to carry out targeted consultation, considering the views of those involved in the design, delivery, and participation in 29 cases that were approved in 2014 and 2015. The following sections describe the open and targeted consultation that took place in this evaluation.

1.1 Open Public Consultation

Open consultation presented a good opportunity to involve a wider range of stakeholders in the evaluation than had previously been possible in evaluations of EGF. In order to encourage as many relevant stakeholders to participate as possible, it was agreed that consultation and piloting of the questions and consultation format should be undertaken. This was done through ISG discussion and through using an EGF networking event to discuss the draft OPC questions,

1.1.1 A networking seminar was held with stakeholders to develop OPC

EGF Networking Seminars are usually held semi-annually in order to provide a platform for the EGF Contact Persons and representatives from organisations that deliver EGF measures or similar support to unemployed persons in Member States to meet and discuss issues of common interest.

The seminar held on 2 March 2016 and used specifically for the purposes of providing information and obtaining input to the Mid-term Evaluation of EGF and to inform the content and workplan for the Open Public Consultation (OPC) to be carried out as part of this evaluation.

The seminar provided an opportunity to discuss the OPC draft questions and workplan. A report of the EGF Networking Seminar with full details is available here:

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=326&eventsId=1128&furtHerEvents=yes>

The result of the exercise was an improved set of questions for the OPC, with raised awareness of the process and role in the evaluation among attendees.

1.1.2 Process of the Open Public Consultation

Consultation undertaken for the OPC

The purpose of the OPC was to enable a wide range of stakeholders to provide opinion and evidence to inform the evaluation. As described in the preceding section targeted consultation with those delivering EGF cases was undertaken, the OPC enabled a wider range of stakeholders to provide opinion and evidence

¹ European Commission Stakeholder Consultation Strategy EGF mid-term evaluation. p.2. Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=326&langId=en>

to inform the evaluation. The OPC took the form of an online questionnaire placed on the European Commission website. The questionnaire contained questions related to each of the evaluation themes (effectiveness, sustainability, efficiency, relevance, coherence, and added value of EGF).

In order to develop the specific questions for the OPC an EGF Networking Seminar² held on 02 March 2016 was used specifically for the purpose of obtaining input from EGF national Contact Persons on a set of draft questions and the means of disseminating the OPC.

The workplan for dissemination of the OPC followed the following process: firstly, an email was sent out to target organisations by the European Commission. This communication explained the purpose of the OPC with a link to the online survey. For the ten Member States included in the 29 cases that were part of this evaluation, ICF promoted participating in the OPC. This was done through national Contact Persons, requesting that they promote this to their networks. Typically this resulted in the details of the OPC being placed on websites.

The stakeholder consultation was planned for a 12 week period, planned to run from May - August 2016. The Commission monitored the responses received, as a result of a low response rate it was decided that the OPC should be extended by 1 month to allow more responses to be submitted following the summer break. The OPC closed on 19 September 2016.

The table below provide a breakdown of the responses received.

Table A6.1 Breakdown of OPC responses by Member State and nature of organisation

Member State	Organisations	Individuals
Austria	1	
Germany	10	2
Greece	4	54
Hungary	1	
Ireland	2	
Latvia	1	
Malta	2	
Belgium	3	1
Netherlands	1	
Spain	1	1
Sweden	1	
UK	1	1
The entire EU	2	2

² EGF Networking Seminars are held biannually in order to provide a platform for EGF national Contact Persons and representatives from organisations that deliver EGF measures or similar support to unemployed persons in Member States to meet and discuss issues of common interest

Czech Republic	1
Finland	3
Cyprus	1
France	1

There were 97 responses to the OPC, 34 of which were provided on behalf of organisations, and 63 were submitted on behalf of individuals. Of those responding on behalf of their organisation, a quarter responded on behalf of their national ministry. Almost half of respondents indicated they had never been directly involved in the EGF. A similar number had been involved in the EGF in the last 12 month. Only few had been involved in previous iterations of the EGF.

1.2 Targeted Consultation: Case Research

Targeted case research was undertaken to assess the effectiveness, sustainability, efficiency, coherence, relevance, and added Value in 29 cases approved in 2014 and 2015. This process started with discussion with European Commission officials and then proceeded in by following a consistent approach for each of the case studies. These steps are described below.

1.2.1 Interviews with EGF team case handlers.

ICF case researchers met with the European Commission EGF team staff responsible for the case studies included in this evaluation. Interviews were conducted with Isabelle Prondzynski, Bistra Valchanova, Marta Alvarez-Marquina, Peter Besselmann, and Christian Aagaard in the last two weeks of April 2016.

This comprised short meetings to discuss the following issues:

- the background to the case – when it was first brought to the EGF team’s attention, was it the Member State that first suggested the case be put forward;
- whether there any particular issues in developing and processing the application – whether the Member State able to provide necessary detail;
- in this respect is the scope of the EGF fund well understood by the Member State – or was assistance required to develop the application within the scope of the Regulation (No 1309/2013);
- how the measures included in the application developed and whether they involved any specific assistance from the EGF team;
- whether delivery commenced at the planned time and if it was on schedule or behind schedule;
- if there currently any issues in the delivery of the case and if so, what factors have helped / hindered delivery of the case; and
- whether there is anything to be learned from this case regarding the factors which assist / prevent Member States from applying for EGF funding.

1.2.2 Case study research

The table below provides an outline of each of the research tasks completed for the 29 cases included in this evaluation.

Table A6.2 Case Study research activities

Research Task	Timing	Activities
Task 2.5: Case study briefing	May 2016 – October 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation for conducting case research followed an identical process a written briefing note and verbal discussion with case researchers. • Written briefing note provided policy background; aims and objectives for the evaluation; briefing on the OPC; description of key case researcher tasks and deadlines; topic guides for interviews; and, the case report template. • A face-to-face or skype briefing was undertaken to ensure common understanding of the tasks and discuss any issues raised by case researchers. • This was part of a process of ongoing communication between the Project Manager and case researchers, started upon commencement of the contract.
Task 2.6: EGF case study research	May 2016 – October 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consists of a range of research tasks in order to complete case research (further detail on the interviews and beneficiary consultation is outlined below): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review of background documentation - Interviews with national EGF contact persons - Interviews with EGF case coordinators - Interviews with delivery partners - Consultations with beneficiaries - Consultations with national labour market experts - Case-level review of national level documentation and data
Task 2.7: Case Study reporting		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each of 29 EGF cases, a separate case report has being produced. • Case reports submitted have been sent to national Contact Persons.

1.2.3 Beneficiary survey

Understanding the extent to which outcomes achieved can be understood to be the result of EGF is also an issue in understanding the effectiveness of the measures provided to beneficiaries. In order to establish the causality between outcomes observed and the support provided an online beneficiary survey was conducted. The survey achieved a 5 % response rate with a total of 1 116

assisted workers submitting a response out of a total of 22 264. A table of responses by case is detailed below

Table A6.3 Beneficiary survey returns

Case reference	Case name	Number of respondents
EGF/2014/011	BE Caterpillar	49
EGF/2014/004	ES Comunidad Valenciana metal	23
EGF/2014/008	FI STX Rauma	102
EGF/2015/001	FI Broadcom	141
EGF/2015/005	FI Computer programming	400
EGF/2014/005	FR GAD	3
EGF/2014/012	BE ArcelorMittal	47
EGF/2014/013	EL Odyssefs Fokas	49
EGF/2015/003	BE Ford Genk	187
EGF/2015/007	BE Hainaut-Namur Glass	28
EGF/2015/012	BE Hainaut Machinery	79
EGF/2014/014	DE Aleo Solar	8
Grand Total		1116

1.2.4 Interviews with national EGF contact persons

ICF case researchers contacted the relevant national EGF contact persons and arranged interviews with officials responsible for the EGF cases examined in this Mid-term Evaluation. An important part of this interview process was to understand what data is held on beneficiary outcomes and what method will be possible for beneficiary consultation. At least one case coordinators were consulted in all 29 of the EGF cases.

1.2.5 Interviews with delivery partners

In addition, partners involved in the implementation of EGF funded measures have / will be interviewed. These can be representatives from the trade unions, employer organisations, local or regional government representatives, PES officials and others. The list of such partners will be determined through contacts with the national EGF contact person and the EGF case coordinator. At least one delivery partner were consulted in all 29 of the EGF cases.

A full table of consultees included in the targeted consultation is provided below.

Table A6.4 Types of stakeholders consulted during case research

Case name	Type of stakeholder	Organisation
BE ArcelorMittal	Case coordinators	EGF case coordination unit at Le FOREM Arcelor Mittal reconversion unit LE FOREM
	Delivery partners	Wallonia CSC Wallonia FGTB University of Liege HEC
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	-
BE Caterpillar	Case coordinators	Caterpillar reconversion unit Le FOREM Walloon Le FOREM
	Delivery partners	Wallonia CSC Wallonia FGTB
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	-
BE Ford Genk	Case coordinators	VDAB
	Delivery partners	ESF Vlaanderen
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	-
BE Hainaut Machinery	Case coordinators	Caterpillar and Carwall reconversion unit Le Forem Doosan reconversion unit Le Forem Walloon Le FOREM
	Delivery partners	Social councillor Doosan Wallonia CSC Wallonia FGTB
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	-
BE Hainaut-Namur Glass	Case coordinators	Saint Gobain reconversion unit LE FOREM AGC Glass reconversion unit LE FOREM Walloon Le FOREM
	Delivery partners	Wallonia CSC Wallonia FGTB University of Liege HEC
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	-
DE Adam Opel	Case coordinators	Organisations to be listed
	Delivery partners	Organisations to be listed
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	-
DE Aleo Solar	Case coordinators	Organisations to be listed
	Delivery partners	Organisations to be listed

	Dismissed workers / NEETs	-
EL Attica Broadcasting	Case coordinators	Case coordination unit, University of Athens Vice Rector at the University of Athens Ministry of Employment
	Delivery partners	job counsellor (the EGF case)
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	1 beneficiary
EL Attica Publishing Services	Case coordinators	EEDE Ministry of Employment
	Delivery partners	
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	(beneficiary interviews planned but cancelled on the day)
EL Nutriart	Case coordinators	INE-GSEE Ministry of Employment
	Delivery partners	EEDE
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	-
EL Odyssefs Fokas	Case coordinators	Institute of Commerce and Services (INEMY-ESEE) Ministry of Employment
	Delivery partners	Coordinating guidance counsellor
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	-
EL Sprider Stores	Case coordinators	Case coordination, Association of Industrial Employers of Northern Greece (SBBE) Analysis unit, Association of Industrial Employers of Northern Greece (SBBE) Ministry of Employment
	Delivery partners	Guidance counsellor
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	3 beneficiaries
EL Supermarket Larissa	Case coordinators	No case coordinator appointed yet Ministry of Employment
	Delivery partners	No partners appointed yet
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	No beneficiaries supported yet
ES Aragon	Case coordinators	Aragón regional employment service EGF national contact point (2 interviewees)
	Delivery partners	Aragón CCOO (Comisiones Obreras) trade union Aragón UGT (Unión General de Trabajadores) trade union Aragón CREA (Confederación regional de empresarios de Aragón)

		employers' representative Aragón CEPYME (Confederación española de pequeñas y medianas empresas) Eurofound expert
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	-
ES Comunidad Valenciana metal	Case coordinators	Valencian regional PES
	Delivery partners	Valencia-CCOO (Comisiones Obreras) trade union Valencia-UGT (Unión General de Trabajadores) trade union FEMEVAL (Federación Empresarial Metalúrgica Valenciana)
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	-
FI Broadcom	Case coordinators	The Northern Ostrobothnia TE Centre
	Delivery partners	Union of Professional Engineers in Finland The Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment for North Ostrobothnia The Employment and Economic Development Office for Uusimaa The Employment and Economic Development Office for Pirkanmaa The Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment for Southwest Finland The Ministry of Employment and the Economy Academic Engineers and Architects in Finland
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	-
FI Computer programming	Case coordinators	The Northern Ostrobothnia TE Centre The Ministry of Employment and the Economy
	Delivery partners	Union of Professional Engineers in Finland The Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment for North Ostrobothnia The Employment and Economic Development Office for Uusimaa BusinessOulu The Employment and Economic Development Office for Pirkanmaa The Employment and Economic Development Office for Southwest

		Finland The Ministry of Employment and the Economy
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	-
FI STX Rauma	Case coordinators	City of Rauma Ministry of Employment and the Economy (EGF coordination)
	Delivery partners	Trade Union Pro The Ministry of Employment and the Economy The Employment and Economic Development Office for Satakunta Region TK-Eval (evaluators) Academic Engineers and Architects in Finland
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	-
FR GAD	Case coordinators	POLE EMPLOI
	Delivery partners	FO delegate (Force Ouvrière, Trade-union DIRECCTE ALTEDIA (main placement agency)
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	-
FR Mory-Ducros	Case coordinators	DGEFP, Mission Fonds National de l'Emploi (2 interviewees)
	Delivery partners	BPI Group (one of the three contractor selected to guide and assist the redundant workers) (2 interviewees)
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	-
FR MoryGlobal	Case coordinators	Case coordination unit
	Delivery partners	DGEFP, Mission Fonds National de l'Emploi (3) BPI Group (2 interviewees) SFERIC solution (liquidator) Sodie
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	-
FR PSA	Case coordinators	PSA
	Delivery partners	Sodie
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	-
IE Andersen Ireland	Case coordinators	EGF Coordination Unit, SOLAS
	Delivery partners	Department of Social Protection Limerick and Clare Education and Training Board SOLAS

		Optima Training Pitman Training
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	5 dismissed workers, 1 NEET
IE Lufthansa Technik	Case coordinators	EGF Coordination Unit, SOLAS
	Delivery partners	Department of Social Protection City of Dublin Education and Training Board, SOLAS, CPM Coaching Aertrain, Airport Driving School iSmart
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	6 dismissed workers, 1 NEET
IE PWAI International	Case coordinators	EGF Coordination Unit, SOLAS
	Delivery partners	Department of Social Protection City of Dublin Education and Training Board, SOLAS, CPM Coaching Aertrain, Airport Driving School iSmart
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	2 dismissed workers
IT Alitalia	Case coordinators	Adecco (3 interviewees) Ministero del Lavoro e delle Politiche Sociali
	Delivery partners	Regione Lazio – Regional Directorate for Labour
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	-
IT Whirlpool	Case coordinators	Con.Solida
	Delivery partners	Department of Labour, Economy and Development of the Autonomous Province of Trento Trento University
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	4 beneficiaries
NL Gelderland and Overijssel	Case coordinators	Ministerie van Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid
	Delivery partners	Agentschap SZW (Labour Inspectorate) BMC consultancy
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	-
SE Volvo Trucks	Case coordinators	Arbetsförmedlingen (5 interviewees) Ministry of Employment
	Delivery partners	Umeå Kommun Antenn Startkraft University of Gothenburg
	Dismissed workers / NEETs	6 beneficiaries

1.3 Lessons from the consultations undertaken

From the consultations undertaken for this mid-term evaluation a few lessons can be identified for future evaluations.

1. The OPC does not provide coverage of all Member States, nor does it cover all of the Member States that are included in the 29 cases covered in this evaluation, despite significant effort to achieve this. This result demonstrates that it is difficult to achieve a high response rate. A general lack of awareness regarding specific details of EGF may have resulted in a reluctance of some potential respondents to take part in the consultation.

2. Beneficiary surveys were possible in most Member States, it is therefore encouraging that most member States hold beneficiary email addresses. The more beneficiaries that are contactable by email, the richer the data for evaluation has the potential to be.

3. Most Member States were able to participate in the evaluation and provide contact details for delivery organisations. This was less straightforward in member States that had used external organisations to organise delivery of EGF measures. Participation in evaluation should form part of the agreement between Member States and such delivery organisations.