

ESF Support for Institutional and Administrative Capacity Building in 2007-2013

Łukasz Wardyn

DG Employment Social Affairs & Inclusion
Unit E1 ESF Legislation and Policy, Social Affairs and Inclusion

03.03.2011



Outline

- ✓ State of play – physical and financial implementation
- ✓ Issues identified
- ✓ Implementation: some examples
- ✓ Other actions taken by the Commission



ESF Regulation Art. 3.2(b) provisions

- 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.

Allocation for capacity building

ESF = € 3,3 bn

**ESF Allocations
to ACB (category 81)
€ 1,9 billion**

**ESF Allocations
to ACB (other
categories related)
€ 1,4 billion**

National = € 0,9 bn

**National allocations
to ACB (category 81)
€ 0,5 billion**

**National allocations
to ACB (other
categories related)
€ 0,4 billion**

€ 4,1 billion



Institutional capacity within the ESF OPs

- **Dedicated OP:** Hungary, Greece, Romania and Bulgaria;
- **Priority axis:** Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Czech Republic, Poland, Estonia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Wales and Italy;
- **“Measure”** within a priority: Cyprus;
- **Some activities** foreseen in: Spain and France.

ESF Funds allocation for capacity building II

- Member States allocate between 0.1% (Spain) and 16.5% (Lithuania) of ESF budget to Institutional Capacity actions
- The amounts vary from EUR 5 million in Cyprus to nearly EUR 520 million in Poland



State of play since January 2007

In terms of physical implementation:

➤ over 180 (↑115) calls for proposals launched by the Managing Authorities:

- ✓ 2511 (↑1248) projects have already been selected;
- ✓ 1715 (↑1110) are currently implemented;
- ✓ 504 (↑134) are finalised.

The financial allocation for ACB



Country	OP or Priority	ESF allocation in billion EUR	Category 81 in million EUR	% of the Category 81 to ESF allocation
Bulgaria	OP	1	111	11
Czech Republic	Priority	3,7	313	8
Estonia	Priority	0,4	20	5
Hungary	OP	3,6	147	4
Latvia	Priority	0,55	69	12
Lithuania	Priority	0,9	169	18
Poland	Priority	9,7	519	5
Romania	OP	3,7	199	5
Slovakia	Priority	0,9	85	9
Slovenia	Priority	0,7	16	2

Contracting and payments for ACB



Bulgaria	55	52	≈	8	28	↑
Czech Republic	53	35	↓	10	0	↓
Estonia	53	36	↓	11	11	≈
Hungary	38	36	≈	15	15	≈
Latvia	61	13	↓	15	1	↓
Lithuania	41	37	↓	14	3	↓
Poland	41	32	↓	14	10	↓
Romania	46	19	↓	1	1	↑
Slovakia	61	67	↑	14	4	↓
Slovenia	42	52	↑	10	18	↑
Total	45	35	↓	11	7	↓


European Social Fund

Issues identified

- **ACB PR/OP changes;**
- **No reform strategy and no political commitment;**
- **Relevance of operations;**
- **Lack of qualified staff;**
- **Long and complex procedures and slow implementation.**



Actions with support of the Commission

- Transnational ESF supported network “Facing the challenge – how to effectively support public administration reforms by ESF (PL, BG, EL, LT, RO & CZ)
- Support for the EPSA 2009 and 2011



Actions taken by the Commission

- Network of ACB Evaluators;
- Study to assess ACB interventions and future needs in the context of the ESF.



1. Introduction: Aims of the study

1. Analyse the relevance of ESF interventions in administrative and institutional capacity building (ACB);
2. Analyse the efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of those interventions;
3. Elaborate recommendations on how this priority could work for the ESF in the future.

2. Evidence base emerging from:

- Individual interviews carried out : **104**;
- Involved in focus groups: **65**;
- Literature/documentary review and qualitative research;
- Analysis at 3 different levels: EU, country and case study;
- In-depth analysis of 10 selected countries (BG, EL, HU, LT, PL, PT, RO, SL, ES and UK Wales);
- Central validation workshop in Brussels 09.09.2010



3. Relevance of ESF interventions in ACB

- Overall, ESF responds well to the domains of ACB – with some exceptions (e.g. need for political leadership, support to staffing);
- Links with the Lisbon Agenda are often indirect and difficult to measure; Category 81 interventions tend to be general and horizontal; links are more direct in case of ‘vertical’ actions; earmarking has led to some unintended effects;
- Concerns relate to the usefulness and soundness of the PAR strategies as a frame for action; strong reliance on outside experts.

7. Success factors at project level

1. Being embedded in broader cultural and organisational change processes;
2. Involve civil society and/or social partners;
3. A clear methodological and technical approach;
4. Political commitment;
5. Clear definition of responsibilities;
6. Involvement in exchange of best practices at EU level;
7. Monitoring and Evaluation techniques introduced;
8. Continuity and stability in the project environment.





9. Outline for a future ACB

Three options to be considered:

- **Option 0: Discontinuing ACB support;**
- **Option 1: Continuation and optimisation (revision of to support the Europe 2020 strategy;, attention to M&E, increased learning, implementation at least at level of Priority Axis);**
- **Option 2: A focused and conditional/voluntary ACB (extended beyond Convergence regions; stronger focus on economic/employment needs, alignment with PAR frameworks, inclusions of local and regional actors, partnership with civil society and active participation in EU-networking.**

10. Recommendations I

1. Continued support to ACB should be based on a comprehensive PAR-strategy;
2. The division of responsibilities for PAR should be prevented;
3. There should be more focus on user needs and be based on: structures, human resources and systems and tools;
4. Interventions should be related to Europe 2020 Guidelines and include performance indicators;
5. Involvement of senior civil servants, leaders and managers in the skills development;



10. Recommendations II

6. Involvement of NGO's in the policy cycle (formulation, implementation and evaluation);
7. A real needs assessments as a precondition of any support and evaluation prior the finalisation;
8. For any assessments measures are to be built in to guarantee the follow-up of activities;
9. The financed actions evaluated based on objectives, rather than by input;
10. Exchange of knowledge and best practice at national and EU level



Thank you for your attention !

More information:

www.ec.europa.eu/esf

www.ec.europa.eu/employment_social/esf/fields/public_en.htm

www.ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/index_en.htm