

# **Analysis of practices regarding multi-level cooperation in relation to principles 1 and 5 of the EPSR**

Final Report

Contract Nr CCI 2016CE160GT004

Written by KARL-FILIP COENEGRACHTS, expert  
*June 2019*

## Table of Contents

1	Introduction .....	3
2	Multi-level governance (MLG) .....	5
3	Collected practices .....	8
3.1	Subsidiarity and Proportionality: legal competences on jobs and skills .....	9
3.2	Operational and institutionalised cooperation in drawing up and implementing Principles 1 and 5 .....	10
4	Strengths of MLG in the collected practices .....	13
5	Challenges and pitfalls related to MLG in the collected practices .....	14
5.1	Principle 1 .....	14
5.2	Principle 5 .....	15
6	Possible solutions and recommendations .....	17
6.1	General recommendations .....	18
6.2	Principle 1 .....	20
6.3	Principle 5 .....	21
	<b>ANNEX 1: AIMS AND TARGET GROUPS OF THE COLLECTED PRACTICES .....</b>	<b>23</b>
	Principle 1 .....	23
	Principle 5 .....	24
	<b>ANNEX 2: FACILITATING AND IMPEDING FACTORS, CHALLENGES IN THE COLLECTED PRACTICES .....</b>	<b>26</b>
	Principle 1 .....	26
	Principle 5 .....	28
	<b>ANNEX 3: MULTI-LEVEL COOPERATION IN COLLECTED PRACTICES .....</b>	<b>32</b>
	Principle 1 .....	32
	Principle 5 .....	33
	<b>ANNEX 4: QUESTIONNAIRE .....</b>	<b>35</b>

## 1 Introduction

In 2016, during the Dutch Presidency of the European Union, Ministers responsible for Urban Matters adopted the Pact of Amsterdam. This pact established the Urban Agenda for the EU, recognising the importance of effective urban policy and the benefits of incorporating cities in the policymaking and implementation processes.

The Urban Agenda for the EU was created to ensure that the urban dimension is reflected in EU legislation. The Urban Agenda is composed of several priority themes which are imperative for the sustainable development of urban areas. Each theme has a dedicated Partnership, which brings together urban authorities, member states and EU institutions to propose feasible measures for EU legislation, funding and knowledge sharing. One of these Partnerships is the **Partnership 'Jobs and Skills in the Local Economy'**. As urban areas are the key players in the creation of the conditions for sustainable economic development, a strengthened EU agenda on Jobs and Skills is crucial for the future of Europe.

The Partnership 'Jobs and Skills in the Local Economy' consists of 17 members representing EU member states, regions, urban authorities, stakeholder organisations and the European Commission. More specifically, members are:

- 3 member states: Romania, Italy and Greece
- 8 urban authorities: Berlin, Rotterdam, Jelgava, Torino, Porto, Ghent, Kielce, Miskolc
- 4 stakeholder organisations: European Investment Bank (EIB), URBACT, EUROCITIES, Council of European Municipalities and Regions (CEMR)
- European Commission: DG for Regional and Urban Policy (DG REGIO), and DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion (DG EMPL)
- Also, OECD participated in the Partnership

The coordinators of the Partnership are Romania, the city of Rotterdam and the city of Jelgava.

The Action Plan of the Jobs and Skills in the Local Economy Partnership was finalised in October 2018 and identified **three priority areas**:

- Skills - Next Economy, Education and Skills
- Capital investments - Valorisation of R&D and Business Locations
- Governance - Public Services and Effective Local Governance

The Action Plan contains ten Actions to improve legislation, funding instruments and knowledge sharing to contribute towards the Union's long-term objectives of sustainable growth and social, economic and territorial cohesion.

This report is giving execution to **Action 3** of the Action Plan. According to the Action Plan it is indispensable to involve the local level to succeed in the effective implementation of the

EPSR. Therefore, Action 3 focuses on better knowledge through multi-level cooperation. The Action is led by Ghent with Berlin, EURO CITIES and CEMR as contributors, with the support of DG Employment.

Action 3 uses the European Pillar on Social Rights (EPSR) as framework for the reconversion towards a sustainable economy in urban areas, and targets “education, training and life-long learning” (Principle 1) and “Secure and adaptable employment” (Principle 5).

The European Pillar of Social Rights (EPSR) (17/11/2017) –in keeping with Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 8 on *Decent work and economic growth*– sets out 20 key principles and rights “to support fair and well-functioning labour markets and welfare systems”<sup>1</sup>. Moreover, the EPSR is a policy objective for a more social Europe in the proposed regulation regarding several funds post 2020<sup>2</sup>.

#### Principle 1 EPSR

“Everyone has the right to quality and inclusive education, training and life-long learning in order to maintain and acquire skills that enable them to participate fully in society and manage successfully transitions in the labour market.”

#### Principle 5 EPSR

“Regardless of the type and duration of the employment relationship, workers have the right to fair and equal treatment regarding working conditions, access to social protection and training. The transition towards open-ended forms of employment shall be fostered. In accordance with legislation and collective agreements, the necessary flexibility for employers to adapt swiftly to changes in the economic context shall be ensured. Innovative forms of work that ensure quality working conditions shall be fostered. Entrepreneurship and self-employment shall be encouraged. Occupational mobility shall be facilitated. Employment relationships that lead to precarious working conditions shall be prevented, including by prohibiting abuse of atypical contracts. Any probation period should be of reasonable duration.”

The focus of this analysis is to look at the **strengths, pitfalls, challenges and possible solutions regarding multi-level governance (MLG)** in the implementation of Principles 1 and 5 of the EPSR.

---

<sup>1</sup> EC, (24/10/2017:1), IP/17/4068, p.1: [http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release\\_IP-17-4068\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-17-4068_en.htm)

<sup>2</sup> EC, (29/5/2018), COM (2018) 375 final: [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:26b02a36-6376-11e8-ab9c-01aa75ed71a1.0003.02/DOC\\_3&format=PDF](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:26b02a36-6376-11e8-ab9c-01aa75ed71a1.0003.02/DOC_3&format=PDF)

## 2 Multi-level governance (MLG)

There are many interpretations and variations to be found in literature of the concept of MLG. For the purpose of this analysis we use the definition of the Committee of the Regions' (CoR) Whitepaper on Multi-level Governance of 2009<sup>3</sup> and the 2014 Charter for Multi-level governance in Europe<sup>4</sup> :

“Multi-Level Governance means coordinated action by the European Union, the Member States and Local and Regional authorities, according to the principles of **subsidiarity** and **proportionality** and in **partnership**, taking the form of **operational and institutionalised cooperation** in the drawing-up and implementation of the European Union's policies”<sup>5</sup>

In relation to the **subsidiarity and proportionality principles**, it is important to clarify that MLG-arrangements can only be optimal if subsidiarity and proportionality are fully respected. Once the responsibilities of each level of government are clearly delineated, MLG can contribute to the development of a shared vision, greater coordination, information sharing, structural dialogues and joint-implementation agreements amongst all partners. Given the increasing interdependence between all levels of government, MLG helps match and complement different actions. “In other words: MLG ensures that the various actors involved work closely together like cogs in a wheel.”<sup>6</sup>

MLG asks for interaction and joint coordination of relations between the various levels of government without clear dominance of one level. This means that vertical venues are needed where governments from different levels jointly engage in meaningful policy coordination. These might involve forums or networks in which organisations from different government levels meet.

MGL is thought to be most effective when the idea of there being different government levels shifts to the background, or in other words, when in terms of power a degree of “levelling” takes place between the different government levels. In terms of policy frames, MLG is likely to engender some convergence between policy frames at different levels, produced and sustained by their mutual interaction.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> CoR, (2009), The Committee of the Regions' Whitepaper on Multilevel Governance:  
<https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/3cba79fd-2fcd-4fc4-94b9-677bbc53916b/language-en>

<sup>4</sup> CoR, (2014), Charter for Multilevel Governance in Europe:  
<https://portal.cor.europa.eu/mlgcharter/Pages/MLG-charter.aspx>

<sup>5</sup> CoR, (2012), Building a European Culture of Multilevel Governance, p. 2:  
<https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/ed2f312b-23cb-4650-ac97-9d3e9a03e7d2/language-en>

<sup>6</sup> Van den Brande, L., (2014), Multilevel Governance and Partnership. The Van den Brande Report. Prepared at the request of the Commissioner for Regional and Urban Policy Johannes Hahn, p. 12

<sup>7</sup> Scholten P., Penninx R., (2016), The Multilevel Governance of Migration and Integration. In: Garcés-Masareñas B., Penninx R. (eds) Integration Processes and Policies in Europe. IMISCOE Research Series. Springer, Cham

MLG and **partnership** go hand in hand, and lead to responsibility being shared between the different tiers of government. Partnership implies **close cooperation** between public authorities, economic and social partners and bodies representing civil society at national, regional and local levels throughout the whole programme cycle consisting of preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

The Partnership Principle, that was already long-established in the implementation of the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF), was strengthened in the 2014-2020 Cohesion Policy by introducing MLG in the Principles of Union Support for the ESIF. By making the involvement of the partners clear in the preparation of the Partnership Agreements, progress reports and throughout the preparation and implementation of programmes an obligation, the specific role of regional and local authorities is recognised (Article 5 of Regulation 1303/2013<sup>8</sup>).

The Delegated Act (DA) on the European Code of conduct on Partnership (ECCP)<sup>9</sup> defines the objectives and criteria to allow member states to implement the MLG and partnership principles, but it leaves for the necessary flexibility for the practical modalities of implementation in accordance with the specific institutional structure of each member state. This leads to an **implementation of the partnership principle that is very different across the member states**, with the level and type of partner involvement often depending on national administrative structures and the existence of different cultures. The efficient implementation of the partnership principle is also dependent on the technical and financial capacity of the partners.<sup>10</sup>

Two dimensions of MLG can be distinguished:

1. The vertical dimension of MLG refers to the links between higher and lower levels of government, including their institutional, financial, and informational aspects. Local capacity building and incentives for effectiveness of sub national levels of government are crucial for improving the quality and coherence of public policy.

---

<sup>8</sup> Regulation (EU) 1303/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 on laying down common provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the Cohesion Fund, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund and laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the Cohesion Fund and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006, OJ L 347, 20.12.2013, p. 341

<sup>9</sup> Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 240/2014 of 7 January 2014 on the European code of conduct on partnership in the framework of the European Structural and Investment Funds, OJ L 74, 14.3.2014, p. 1–7

<sup>10</sup> EC, (2016), Implementation of the partnership principle and multi-level governance in 2014-2020 ESI Funds. Final Report:

[https://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/policy/how/studies\\_integration/impl\\_partner\\_report\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/policy/how/studies_integration/impl_partner_report_en.pdf)



2. The horizontal dimension refers to cooperation arrangements between regions or between municipalities. These agreements are increasingly common as a means by which to improve the effectiveness of local public service delivery and implementation of development strategies. The horizontal dimension of the implementation of MLG partnerships also includes cooperation with socio-economic partners and NGOs.

### 3 Collected practices

The starting point of this analysis are the practices of cities on the implementation of Principles 1 and 5 of the European Pillar of Social Rights that were collected between March and May 2019. The survey resulted in a total of 12 practices sent in by 7 cities from 6 EU member states: Berlin (D), Graz (A), Zaragoza (SP), Ghent (BE), Kielce (PL), Aarhus (DE) and Gdansk (PL).

Out of these 12 practices, 8 are related to the implementation of Principle 1 of the EPSR (education, training and life-long learning) and 4 are related to the implementation of Principle 5 of the EPSR (secure and adaptable employment).

PRACTICES PRINCIPLE 1	PRACTICES PRINCIPLE 5
<u>Berlin</u> Programme for Training Places (Berliner Ausbildungsplatzprogramm, BAPP)	<u>Berlin</u> Counselling Center for Migration and Decent Work (BEMA)
<u>Berlin</u> Employment Trainer (Beschäftigungstrainer)	<u>Aarhus</u> Long term unemployed take the lead
Programme Mentoring by the Land of <u>Berlin</u>	Local program of supporting the creation of workplaces in <u>Kielce</u>
<u>Berlin</u> Qualification before Employment (QbE)	<u>Gdansk</u> So Stay Hotel
<u>Graz</u> Fund for Promotion and Development (GraFo)	
<u>Zaragoza</u> La Colaboradora	
<u>Ghent</u> MetaalMatch	
Vocational Training Centre in <u>Kielce</u> - CK Technik	

Because of the relatively small amount of practices that were sent in we have also studied other practices from cities in EU member states. Those cases have been identified and



described either within the framework of a EUROCITIES report<sup>11</sup> or have been recognised as an URBACT good practice<sup>12</sup>.

PRACTICES PRINCIPLE 1	PRACTICES PRINCIPLE 5
<u>Equal Gothenburg</u>	<u>Lille Métropole Territoires Zéro Chômeur de Longue Durée</u>
<u>Barcelona Activa</u>	<u>Bari Spazio 13</u>
BRIDGE project <u>Rotterdam</u>	<u>Madrid Neighbourhood Employment Plans</u>

### 3.1 Subsidiarity and Proportionality: legal competences on jobs and skills

To effectively examine and identify the strengths, pitfalls, challenges and solutions regarding MLG the question which level of government in a specific EU member state has the competences in the field of jobs and skills is important to answer.

The “Structures and Competences” publication of CEMR<sup>13</sup> and the EUROCITIES report on the “European Pillar of Social Rights. Cities Delivering Social Rights”<sup>14</sup> show clearly that the legal competences of cities and municipalities in the fields of education, training and employment are shared with regional and national governments in very different ways in the different EU member states.

#### Findings on the legal competences of cities in the practices regarding Principle 1

Several cities in this survey mention that even though there are shared competences on education, the responsibilities that fall on cities in terms of education are taken up by the cities’ education department, while vocational training and adult learning typically fall under cities’ departments for employment, requiring close coordination between the two departments (Berlin<sup>15</sup>, Graz, Ghent).

According to EUROCITIES<sup>16</sup> the trend in recent years is that cities are doing more than what they are legally responsible for in order to meet the need for inclusive education for their ever more diverse populations.

<sup>11</sup> EUROCITIES, (2019), European Pillar of Social Rights. Cities delivering social rights. Equal opportunities and access to the labour market in cities in Europe. EUROCITIES, Brussels

<sup>12</sup> URBACT, website: <https://urbact.eu/good-practices/home>

<sup>13</sup> CEMR, (2016), Structures and Competences. Local and Regional Governments in Europe. CEMR, Brussels: [https://www.ccre.org/img/uploads/piecesjointe/filename/CEMR\\_structures\\_and\\_competences\\_2016\\_EN.pdf](https://www.ccre.org/img/uploads/piecesjointe/filename/CEMR_structures_and_competences_2016_EN.pdf)

<sup>14</sup> EUROCITIES, (2019), id.

<sup>15</sup> Berlin is both a city and a Land in the federal state, which means that it has special competencies in the field of educational policy.

<sup>16</sup> EUROCITIES, (2019), id.

The focus on specific target groups in the collected practices in this survey seem to point to the same conclusion, namely that even beyond their legal competences, cities find ways to set up initiatives in education and training for their local priority groups: long-term unemployed people, young people, refugees and migrants.

### Findings on the legal competences of cities in the practices regarding Principle 5

In most EU member states cities and municipalities have some competences regarding employment, shared with national or regional employment agencies.

In France (Lille) and Belgium (Ghent) for instance, local authorities have only limited responsibilities, complementing national or regional policies by using their competences in other fields, such as local social economy in Flanders Region or local economic development or social inclusion in France.

A conclusion similar to the one for Principle 1 practices can be drawn when looking at the collected practices implementing Principle 5: the cities provide active support for inclusion on the labour market of the people furthest away from the labour market with a specific focus to disadvantaged groups, such as long-term unemployed, refugees and migrants, youth and older people, and people living in deprived areas.

### 3.2 Operational and institutionalised cooperation in drawing up and implementing Principles 1 and 5

The questionnaire (ANNEX 4) that was sent to the cities did not explicitly ask for their multi-level cooperation arrangements in implementing Principles 1 and 5.

From the answers to the questions related to the identification of the stakeholders of the initiatives and the involvement of the regional or national government or the European Commission, it becomes clear that the vertical multi-level cooperation perspective is very limited in both the practices implementing Principle 1 and Principle 5.

On the other hand, the cities are mainly mentioning horizontal MLG arrangements, between local authorities and education providers, companies, employers, socio-economic organisations and NGOs.

### Vertical MLG

PRINCIPLE 1	PRINCIPLE 5
ESF Funding (Berlin)	partner in UnionMigrantNet (a network of trade union and union-related advice centers for immigrants originally funded by the European Commission) and in the currently funded projects Eurodetachment and TIDEPower (Berlin)
Regional Employment Agency (Ghent)	ESF Funding (Gdansk)
Marshal's Office of the Świętokrzyskie Voivodship, Managing Authority of the Regional Program of the Świętokrzyskie Voivodship (Kielce)	

Interesting to note is that several cities also mention the recognition as URBACT good practice as a form of involvement of the EU in their initiatives.

### Horizontal MLG

PRINCIPLE 1	PRINCIPLE 5
Cooperation with companies and providers of education and training (Berlin)	Cooperation with trade Unions/ German Trade Union Confederation, Berlin Adult Education Centres, Migrant self-organisations, Migration and Integration Counselling Centres, labour and social authorities (Berlin)
Cooperation with educational Institutions in Graz, NPOs/NGOs, Public Organisations, Social Welfare Office City of Graz (Graz)	Cooperation with the City's Jobcenter, the University of Aarhus, Social Development centre SUS (Aarhus)
Cooperation with citizens and civil society (Zaragoza)	Cooperation with employers active in Kielce, schools (teachers) and universities (Kielce)
Cooperation with the Regional Employment agency, social economy companies, adult training institutions (East Flanders)	Cooperation with employers (Gdansk)
Cooperation with vocational schools, teachers and students (Kielce)	

Collaboration between city departments and local public agencies responsible for (the execution of) education, employment and social policies is also identified as a strength in



several practices (Berlin, Graz, Aarhus, Kielce). A good example of horizontal MLG is given by the Polish city of Kielce that adopted a city council resolution and started a programme to coordinate the initiatives taken by all city departments and employers in the city to support job creation and creating friendly conditions for the development of employers and employees in Kielce.

In line with the conclusions of the EUROCITIES survey<sup>17</sup> it is clear that in the implementation of the EPSR's Principles on education and employment, local authorities play a crucial role in joining the forces of (public) employment services, training and education providers, local employers and companies, social partners, local communities and NGOs.

---

<sup>17</sup> EUROCITIES (2019), id.

## 4 Strengths of MLG in the collected practices

A clear strength of MLG that is identified in the city practices is the positive effect of local coordination of jobs and skills initiatives by setting up **horizontal MLG arrangements** between city departments and with training and education providers, companies, employers, social partners, local communities, socio-economic organisations and NGOs.

Furthermore, the measures that are being taken by cities implementing the Principles are complementing and specifying regional, national and EU policies and measures by focusing on the **specific local situation** and **specific target groups**, such as refugees and migrants (Berlin), long term unemployed (Graz, Berlin), young people (Berlin, East Flanders, Kielce, Gdansk), people from low-income families (Berlin, Graz, Aarhus).

The supportive measures regarding Principle 1 are focused on counselling and mentoring, vocational guidance, second chance programmes, apprenticeships and developing specific skills that are relevant for local employers and **adapted to the local labour market**. Funding for the measures and initiatives is usually provided for by the **local budgets** and complemented by **ESF funding** (Berlin), **regional and national budgets** (Berlin, Lille, Kielce) or **private funding** (Ghent, Zaragoza).

The city initiatives implementing Principle 5 are especially reaching out to the **target groups that have the most difficulties to enter the labour market**: the long-term unemployed, young people not in education, employment or training (NEETs), migrants and refugees and people who are supported by social welfare benefits. Counselling and guidance towards supportive services are offered by the initiatives to assist people from these target groups to (re-)integrate them into the labour market. **Funding** is provided by the **cities**, complemented with ESF (Gdansk) and **private** funds (Gdansk, Aarhus).

The EUROCIITIES survey<sup>18</sup> confirms that, in their initiatives regarding employment, cities are prioritising the needs of specific target groups. The report showcases some examples of cities like Barcelona, Lille, Nantes and Amsterdam, where local strategic plans and programmes have been set up focusing on supporting employment at the local level.

---

<sup>18</sup> EUROCIITIES (2019), id.

## 5 Challenges and pitfalls related to MLG in the collected practices

According to OECD, there are seven dominant gaps that challenge MLG: information, capacity, fiscal/funding, policy, administrative, objective and accountability.<sup>19</sup>

- The **information gap** is characterised by information asymmetries between levels of government when designing, implementing and delivering public policies;
- The **capacity challenge**: there is a lack of human, knowledge (skill-based and ‘know-how’) or infrastructural resources available to carry out tasks, regardless of the level of government;
- The **funding gap** is represented by the difference between the revenues and the required expenditures for local authorities to meet their responsibilities and implement appropriate development strategies. This also includes the mismatch between budget practices and policy needs and indicates a direct dependence on other levels of government;
- The **policy challenge** results when national sectorial departments take a purely vertical approach to be territorially implemented, while local authorities are best placed to customise complementarities between policy fields and concretise cross-sectoral approaches;
- The **administrative gap**: when the administrative scale for policy making, in terms of spending as well as strategic planning, is not in line with functional relevant areas;
- The **objective gap**: national and local policymakers have different rationalities (also ideologically) which create obstacles for adopting convergent strategies;
- The **accountability challenge** results from the difficulty to ensure the transparency of practices across different constituencies and levels of government.

Examples related to most of the gaps can be found by looking at the reported challenges in the collected practices and by studying other examples (Barcelona, Lille, EUROCITIES report<sup>20</sup>). The reported practices are mainly reporting challenges related to the information, capacity, funding and policy gaps regarding MLG.

### 5.1 Principle 1

Examples related to the **funding gap** and the **capacity gap** are the most cited challenges in the practices implementing the education, training and life-long learning principle.

The **shortage of qualified teachers, trainers and mentors** (Berlin, Kielce) is one of the main problems to successfully provide quality and inclusive education, training and life-long learning options for everyone. Teachers and trainers need to be better equipped and

<sup>19</sup> Charbit, C. (2011), Governance of Public Policies in Decentralised Contexts: The Multi-level Approach, OECD Regional Development Working Papers, No. 2011/04, OECD Publishing, Paris,

<https://doi.org/10.1787/5kg883pkxkhc-en>

<sup>20</sup> EUROCITIES, (2019), id.

supported to deal with the specific needs of the very diverse target groups in their city context. The fact that several cities point out that it is also a challenge to convince their target groups to participate in the initiatives (Berlin, East Flanders, Kielce) or that companies are not always willing to participate because the individuals of the target group have multiple other problems next to a lack of skills (Berlin, East Flanders), shows that there is a **need for support to teachers and trainers from other non-educational disciplines**, such as social workers, language teachers and psychologists.

Most of the city initiatives rely on **funding from municipal budgets**. In one example (Berlin) the project is part of the ESF regional operational programme and the funding is complemented by federal budgets. This project is reported to be very successful in terms of results. **Insufficient funding from regional or national governments** for aspects that are beyond the power of the local authorities, such as resources for projects that result from the initiative (Zaragoza), support to teachers, trainers and learners in their socio-economic and psychological situation and investments in education and training infrastructure are clear challenges in every reported practice on the local level.

Challenges related to the **policy gap** and the **information gap** in MLG are indirectly mentioned in the answers to the questionnaire that was sent to the cities in the framework of this action. On the policy gap the EUROCIITIES survey<sup>21</sup> concludes that the **lack of integrated approaches to equal opportunities and the lack of a transversal policy** are major drawbacks to inclusive education. Coordination can be an issue if there is **no effective exchange between social and education services** to identify and guide students who are at risk of dropout.

Finally, **monitoring data on education is lacking at local level**. The data is often not comparable between EU cities and cannot be used for learning and transferring successful practices. Given the shared competences in education, no support measure can be successful without proper coordination between municipal and national authorities in **sharing data and working together to provide support tailored to each city's local needs**.

## 5.2 Principle 5

The main challenges in the implementation of measures to support employment are similar to those related to Principle 1. Again, the effects of the **funding** and **capacity gaps** are at the top of the list of challenges.

Cities are especially reaching out to those target groups that are most disadvantaged and are searching for and trying out tailor-made approaches that are putting a **strain on the available capacity on the local level**. Practically every city is mentioning a **lack of resources** as the major obstacle to be fully successful or to sustain the effects of the initiative. Experimentation with new ways of support seem to attract sufficient funding in the pilot

---

<sup>21</sup> EUROCIITIES, (2019), id.

phase but there is uncertainty or a lack of knowledge on possible business models to guarantee **financial sustainability** after this phase has ended (Aarhus, Gdansk).

Challenges regarding the **information** and **policy gaps** are explicitly mentioned. Changes in (national) **legislation**, growing complexity of (national) legislation, existing barriers to access labour and social jurisdiction, a lack of inspection of working conditions, dependencies between the enforcement of social rights and the right of residence, cause or facilitate exploitative employment relationships and financially unstable short-term employment contract and prevent law enforcement (Berlin, Kielce).

To ensure adequate support, **close and active cooperation between different authorities and non-governmental organisations** is needed. There is also a lack of understanding of the ties between different actors active on local labour market (Kielce). A lack of shared approaches, data exchange, interoperability and clarity of roles are seen as major barriers to effective coordination of active labour market policies.

Such coordination is needed both vertically between local, regional and national authorities and their respective public employment services as well as horizontally through partnerships between public agencies, the private sector, training providers and civil society. Fragmentation of actions is also a matter of internal coherence among the different services for education, employment and social services, **requiring a more integrated plan and delivery**.



## 6 Possible solutions and recommendations

There is a clear link between the definition of MLG and the dominant gaps that challenge MLG. The capacity and the funding gap relate to the subsidiarity and proportionality principles, the information and policy gaps to operational and institutionalised cooperation.

The diagnosis tool for coordination and capacity challenges in MLG by Charbit<sup>22</sup> describes the type of instruments that are needed to tackle the specific gaps. In the table below we only mention the challenges and instruments related to the gaps that are identified in the collected practices.

GAP	CHALLENGE	INSTRUMENT
Information gap	Asymmetries of information (quantity, quality, type) between different stakeholders, either voluntary or not	Need for instruments for revealing & sharing information
Capacity gap	Insufficient scientific, technical, infrastructural capacity of local actors, in particular for designing appropriate strategies	Need for instruments to build local capacity
Funding gap	Unstable or insufficient revenues undermining effective implementation of responsibilities at sub-national level or for crossing policies	Need for shared financing mechanisms
Policy gap	Sectoral fragmentation across ministries and agencies.	Need for mechanisms to create multidimensional/systemic approaches at the sub national level, and to exercise political leadership and commitment.

OECD found in their research many examples of instruments that are being applied in OECD member states to bridge the gaps. In general, all these instruments have in common that they are **incentives** that influence stakeholders in the MLG relationship towards more effective sharing of information and objectives as well as reinforcement of their individual and collective capacity.

<sup>22</sup> Charbit, id.

Used mechanisms range from legal instruments that are aimed at clarifying or redefining legal competences between the different levels of government or setting standards and regulations to binding and less binding coordination instruments such as evaluation and performance indicators, strategic planning requirements, grants and co-funding agreements and contracts between different levels of government.

The limited number of collected practices in this survey makes it difficult to draw very clear conclusions on MLG practices in implementing Principles 1 and 5 of the EPSR. The horizontal dimension of MLG, cooperation on the local level between city departments and cooperation between local authorities and societal stakeholders and socio-economic partners, is much better represented in the city initiatives than the vertical dimension. However, the reported impeding factors and challenges ask for cooperation and partnership arrangements between different levels of government.

MLG arrangements are not emerging in a spontaneous manner, but are usually initiated by a stakeholder or triggered by an event or crisis. We can derive different factors that could initiate new MLG arrangements from the collected practices:

- Shared vision among stakeholders (Berlin, Zaragoza)
- Funding (Kielce, Gdansk, Aarhus)
- Regulatory compliance (Berlin, Kielce)
- Political awareness (Kielce)
- Addressing specific local needs (Ghent, Berlin, Graz).

MLG processes can be initiated top-down or bottom-up. The government levels that initiate the process seem to differ between policy fields, and this seems to be closely related to the legal competences and institutional structures. In social inclusion policies, local and regional stakeholders mainly initiate the processes. The rationale for this difference lies in the extent to which these policies and their impacts are linked to higher administrative levels. Pure 'bottom-up' approaches seem to be rare.<sup>23</sup> This might offer some explanation why the number of reported vertical MLG arrangements in this survey is limited. Awareness about the need for cooperation between governments, awareness and knowledge about the possible instruments and initiating leadership are needed to successfully tackle identified suboptimal situations in every phase of the policy process.

## 6.1 General recommendations

1. The strengthening of MLG and the partnership principle in the legislative framework for the 2014-2020 ESI Funds has had positive effects on the involvement of local authorities at all stages in the implementation of Partnership Agreements and

---

<sup>23</sup> EC, (2015), Local and Regional Partners Contributing to Europe 2020. Multi-level Governance in Support of Europe 2020: [https://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/en/information/publications/studies/2015/local-and-regional-partners-contributing-to-europe-2020-multi-level-governance-in-support-of-europe-2020](https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/information/publications/studies/2015/local-and-regional-partners-contributing-to-europe-2020-multi-level-governance-in-support-of-europe-2020)

programmes. However, **involvement** is defined and implemented differently throughout the EU and depends on institutional arrangements and governance culture in the specific EU member state. To effectively tackle the local challenges with regards to education, training, life-long learning and support to employment, local authorities should be considered **full partners** in setting the priorities for the **ESF+ and ERDF Operational Programmes**.

2. Worth mentioning in the category of contractual instruments that could be exemplary for vertical cooperation in the implementation of the EPSR principles are the **City Deals**<sup>24</sup> that have been initiated under the framework of the Dutch Urban Agenda (Agenda Stad), and also the City Deals in Australia<sup>25</sup>. This type of contract addresses the challenges related to the policy gap and offers a solution in **setting up operational and institutionalised cooperation**.

The Australian City Deals are commitments between the three levels of government (national, state and local) and the community to work towards a shared vision for productive and liveable cities. The City Deals work to align the planning, investment and governance necessary to accelerate growth and job creation, stimulate urban renewal and drive economic reforms. The Australian City Deals focus on leveraging cities' unique strengths and responding to their specific needs. Instead of national and state policies and programmes delivered locally by different departments, working with local governments and stakeholders produces a unified deal that addresses a city's priorities.

The Dutch City Deals are aimed at finding and implementing innovative solutions to societal challenges and/or measures to strengthen the urban economic ecosystems. They are based on commitments to collaborate between cities, the national government, other levels of government, business and civil society. The participating cities decide on the specific challenges that are addressed, based on the local needs.

3. The role of national **associations of cities and municipalities** in arrangements and instruments to bridge the policy, capacity and information gaps should also be taken into account when looking for solutions.

Regardless of the reason why MLG processes are initiated, existing structures with experience in MLG help, not in the least because of the need to develop trust between the stakeholders. Previous and established coordination experience often

---

<sup>24</sup> Agenda Stad, website: <https://agendastad.nl/city-deals/>

<sup>25</sup> Australian Government, Cities Division, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development, website: <https://citydeals.infrastructure.gov.au/>

makes it easier to deepen policy cooperation, whereas the inclusion of further levels or sector policies may be more time consuming.<sup>26</sup>

National associations such as VNG in the Netherlands, VVSG in Flanders (Belgium), Deutscher Städtetag in Germany or AFCCRE in France are playing an important role in bridging different gaps and thus **facilitate operational and institutionalised cooperation**. Regarding the information gap for instance they provide the platform to share information among their members and between their members and other levels of government. They also provide training for their members and facilitate policy discussions between the local level and other levels of government. The EU, the member states and the local authorities could look for the best practices in supporting vertical MLG among the associations and document them to be used in other member states.

4. **A shared vision, objective or strategic plan** between all the implicated stakeholders of a certain policy is an instrument that can create ownership among partners and guide, maintain, or reinforce MLG arrangements. The mutual development of the shared strategy or vision creates ownership among the participants of the MLG arrangement. Monitoring the implementation of the shared objectives together adds to this ownership.

What follows are specific recommendations related to MLG in the implementation of Principle 1 and 5 EPSR:

## 6.2 Principle 1

1. **Information gap**: Cities report a gap in monitoring data related to access to education and achievement gaps in education, on specific targets groups and on the local situation.  
-> The EU, in collaboration with the national governments, could **improve its monitoring** of the implementation of Principle 1 of the EPSR through the **European Semester**. To better capture the situation on the ground, the social scoreboard indicators, such as the rate of early school leavers, could add a **level of monitoring at local level**. Furthermore, the data could be disaggregated by target groups to capture the gaps in access to education and achievement. This would help monitor progress in EPSR implementation at local level.
2. **Capacity gap**: Addressing the shortage of teachers, trainers and mentors, as well as the need for support to teachers and trainers from other non-educational disciplines, is identified by the cities as the biggest priority. There is a **need to increase investment in recruiting and preparing teachers** to deal with the challenges of inclusive education. Teachers need to be provided with the skills required to work in

<sup>26</sup> EC, (2015), Local and Regional Partners Contributing to Europe 2020. Multi-level Governance in Support of Europe 2020, id

increasingly super-diverse urban contexts. The legal competences in this field are very differently shared between the levels of government in EU member states while the challenges seem to be shared throughout the EU.

-> This asks for a **joint strategy** by the EU, the members states and the local authorities, also in improving the image of vocational education and the attractiveness of the teaching profession.

3. Funding gap: The shortage of skilled teachers and supporting staff is also related to a lack of funding on the local level.

-> The EU and the member states should enable cities to have **easier access** to and **make better use of ESF, ERDF and Erasmus+ funds** to promote equity and respond to the specific challenges of rising educational inequalities in urban areas by supporting the participation of disadvantaged target groups.

4. Policy gap: Local authorities are best placed to know the **specific needs** of the people in their cities and to reach the most vulnerable. From this perspective it is only logical that they are **involved in designing and monitoring education policy**.

-> The EU and the member states should allow cities to take part in the working groups of the strategic **framework for European cooperation in education and training** ("ET 2020")<sup>27</sup>.

Collaboration and information sharing between schools, local and national authorities and **coordination with other departments**, such as employment and social services are necessary steps in a better transversal policy that effectively tackles the barriers to inclusive education.

-> Cities need to be involved by the EU and the member states in **setting the priorities** for the **ESF+ and ERDF Operational Programmes** to reflect the challenges at local level.

### 6.3 Principle 5

1. Information gap: Cities and **their local partners** report difficulties with changes in **legislation**, growing dependencies between legislations and law enforcement and a growing complexity of (national) legislation. This complexity has negative effects on the success of local practices and could lead to undesired or suboptimal results.

-> **Vertical venues**, where local governments and their local partners meet with other levels of government, are a first institutionalised step in a better interpretation of the regulations and regulatory simplification. These venues can also be facilitated by associations of cities and municipalities.

---

<sup>27</sup> EC, European Policy Cooperation (ET2020 framework): [https://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/european-policy-cooperation/et2020-framework\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/european-policy-cooperation/et2020-framework_en)

2. Capacity gap: Cities ask for the allocation of more resources at local level for tailored support to labour market activation of vulnerable groups at risk of exclusion.  
-> To reach out, identify and provide tailor-made support to those furthest away from the labour market, cities need **extra resources for staff and funding**. The resources can boost integrated support for training, job coaching, counselling and job search.
  
3. Funding gap: To ensure no group is left behind from ESF+ support, and that support is extended from job insertion to support for keeping and staying in the job, **cities need to be involved** in defining targets, indicators and criteria.  
-> Cities need to be involved by the EU and the member states in defining the **priorities** and the **target groups** for the **ESF+ Operational Programmes** to reflect the challenges at local level. New groups at risk of social exclusion are emerging, such as the working poor, the under-qualified, the digital illiterate and those living in deprived urban areas with low incomes.
  
4. Policy gap: Regardless of the level of government that has the legal competences, there is a need for closer cooperation between municipal and regional and national public employment services through the exchange of information and **shared and integrated strategies and action plans**. National and regional governments should follow the **principle of subsidiarity** and empower cities to act where they are best able to support effective local labour markets. Cities are most aware of the changes in the local economy. They are best placed to match the demand and offer on the local labour markets. Cities can provide tailored and localised measures to tackle unemployment and support the activation of people furthest away from the labour market.  
-> The EU and the member states should support close coordination between the **public employment services** and the local authorities.

## ANNEX 1: AIMS AND TARGET GROUPS OF THE COLLECTED PRACTICES

### Principle 1

PRACTICE	Aim	Target Groups
<u>Berlin</u> Programme for Training Places (Berliner Ausbildungsplatzprogramm, BAPP)	To place young people (under 25) who are disadvantaged in the training place market with apprenticeship places	Young people (under 25 years) without vocational training place
<u>Berlin</u> Employment Trainer (Beschäftigungstrainer)	Strengthening of skills necessary for employment	Long-term unemployed
Programme Mentoring by the Land of <u>Berlin</u>	Reducing the numbers of premature termination of training contracts by stabilizing apprentices through mentoring	Apprentices who need support during their apprenticeship
<u>Berlin</u> Qualification before Employment (QbE)	To improve the vocational qualification, the general educational level and the employability of the participants.	Unemployed persons, in particular long-term unemployed receiving social welfare. These include migrants, refugees and young people.
<u>Graz</u> Fund for Promotion and Development (GraFo)	To provide better employment and income opportunities for people threatened by poverty through investment in education. The programme offers qualifying measures for the working poor in the provincial capital city Graz by	Women and men aged (18-64) who are employed, have been living in Graz for at least twelve months and have a household income below the official poverty threshold (according to EU-SILC criteria).

	providing up to EUR 2.500,- per person for individual education and training with the goal of improving their employment situation.	
<u>Zaragoza</u> La Colaboradora	Stimulating the development of entrepreneurial projects from a collaborative perspective.	Entrepreneurs who develop a business project, creative or social, In any of the phases of entrepreneurship: Idea, development and growth.
<u>East Flanders</u> MetaalMatch	Training of young people with an interest for welding/metal sector – for rapid recruitment	Unemployed young people.
Vocational Training Centre in <u>Kielce</u> - CK Technik	<p>Increasing access to vocational education and developing educational potential of the City of Kielce and the Kielce Functional Area by creating a modern infrastructure for vocational education and continuing education for a group of 500 students and listeners up to 2023.</p> <p>Improving the attractiveness and the quality of vocational education through the access for students to a modern facility equipped with the latest modern devices in line with the needs of the local labour market;</p> <p>Improving the situation on the Świętokrzyskie labor market in terms of the availability of qualified personnel in deficit professions through cooperation with enterprises focused around smart regional specializations.</p>	Youth people and adults – up to 500 students and more



PRACTICE	Aim	Target Groups
<u>Berlin</u> Counselling Center for Migration and Decent Work (BEMA)	To support migrants and mobile workers in realising their labour and social rights. The aim is to treat all people in Berlin equally, regardless of their origin and residence status, especially with regard to their rights on the labour market and in the area of social protection.	Immigrants and refugees, EU citizens entitled to freedom of movement.
<u>Aarhus</u> Long term unemployed take the lead	To create an experiment with self-budgeting in employment activities	Long term unemployed citizens in the municipality of Aarhus
Local program of supporting the creation of workplaces in <u>Kielce</u>	Gathering in one initiative different actions that were planned and carried-out by different institutions in the city	Employers, entrepreneurs, schools and pupils, citizens of Kielce
<u>Gdansk</u> So Stay Hotel	To increase opportunities of social and professional development of youth persons – wards – living in Homes for Children and providing innovative educational programme in social company So Stay Hotel	A group of wards living in Homes for Children who are preparing to leave the Homes for Children or have already left the Home and are without work now. Their situation is very difficult. After leaving the Home they do not have a domicile or family support with no or low qualifications wards have little chance of finding a job.

## ANNEX 2: FACILITATING AND IMPEDING FACTORS, CHALLENGES IN THE COLLECTED PRACTICES

### Principle 1

PRACTICE	Facilitating factors	Impeding factors	Challenges
<u>Berlin</u> Programme for Training Places (Berliner Ausbildungsplatzprogramm, BAPP)	Cooperation with companies and providers of education and training	Many young people who are disadvantaged in the training place market have multiple problems. Therefore, less companies are willing to cooperate	
<u>Berlin</u> Employment Trainer (Beschäftigungstrainer)	Advanced diagnosis of the available soft skills before, during and at the end of the training; monitoring	Few experiences with the approach and the description of the applicable methods	Implementation of the trainers within the interfaces to other supporting instances like Job coaches and others
Programme Mentoring by the Land of <u>Berlin</u>		Missing willingness or fear to admit the need for support	Finding appropriate mentors
<u>Berlin</u> Qualification before Employment (QbE)	Increased motivation of the participants through the principle of voluntariness	Obligatory offers for the target group within the framework of activation and vocational qualification by the job centres according to Social Code III. Lower payment of the educational institutions by standard unit cost rate compared to the rates per hour of the legal measures of the job centres.	The continuous acquisition of sufficient participants to run the courses with 15-20 participants per course by the educational institutions in cooperation with the job centres.
<u>Graz</u> Fund for Promotion	A team of experts offers low-threshold	Lack of time to visit and successfully	To reach educationally

<p>and Development (GraFo)</p>	<p>qualification counselling, the possibility to make use of a wide range of qualification measures, and a clear and simple application procedure. Course fees are borne in advance, no pre-financing by the applicant is required. If needed, individual counselling and assistance are provided for filing the application.</p>	<p>complete a training course while working a full time job. Inability to cover the remaining fees of qualification measures costing over 2,500 Euro or other additional expenses (i.e. for travel, childcare, accommodation etc.).</p>	<p>disadvantaged groups.</p>
<p><u>Zaragoza</u> La Colaboradora</p>	<p>Project that is part of an entrepreneurial ecosystem related to other similar initiatives. Co-management of La Colaboradora between City Council and community. Active and participatory community that proposes and is actively involved. It generates a sense of identity and belonging to the community that favours collaboration and the enrichment of the projects. Real participation of the user in a municipal program. The citizen stops being a passive recipient of a service to be part of the service itself. Limited coworking space, does not respond to all professional profiles.</p>	<p>Start-up of similar resources or for the same population in the city. Limitation for space to a certain type of enterprise. Shortness of municipal staff</p>	<p>Help in financing projects; Make more visible all projects</p>

<u>Ghent</u> MetaalMatch	Extra support of candidates with language course or soft skills when necessary (case per case)	Influx of candidates, language barrier, soft skills	
Vocational Training Centre in <u>Kielce</u> - CK Technik	High demand of qualified employees in the regional labour market; lack of modern infrastructure for practical vocational training; vocational education reform aimed at increasing the quality of practical education and increasing the scope of practical education	Insufficient promotion of vocational education; lack of interest of young people in vocational education; lack of qualified teaching staff for the high quality of the teaching process	Convincing young people that vocational training is a path of good choice; gain qualified teachers of the profession as instructors of practical vocational training in CK Technik; continuous development and improvement of the quality of vocational education offer in accordance with the needs of the regional labour market

### Principle 5

PRACTICE	Facilitating factors	Impeding factors	Challenges
<u>Berlin</u> Counselling Center for Migration and Decent Work (BEMA)	An active network of counselling centres and other social institutions as well as trade unions and authorities - even beyond Berlin and Germany - is indispensable for BEMA's success. In this way, on the one hand, people with a corresponding need for information gain knowledge about BEMA's activities. On the other hand, BEMA	Factors that make it more challenging to achieve BEMA's goals include: existing barriers to access labour and social jurisdiction, a lack of inspection of working conditions, dependencies between the enforcement of social rights and the right of residence,	

	<p>can, if necessary, refer people to other structures. Sustainable support for people in existential need can only be achieved through cooperation between different institutions. The exchange with other institutions at home and abroad is also a great benefit for the concrete work and development of structures. Access to equal rights for all people in Berlin is a long-term goal. Sometimes dependencies are strengthened or triggered by residence law or other migration-related factors. To this end, it is also necessary to review and, if necessary, improve existing legal situations or interpretations which, despite the knowledge of rights, make it difficult or impossible to enforce the law. BEMA participates in these processes. Breaking through these interdependencies and thus ensuring de facto equal treatment of all people in Berlin is a major common task for politicians, public administration, interest groups and civil society actors such as BEMA.</p>	<p>an expanding legislation and practice aimed at excluding more and more EU citizens from countries other than Germany from access to social security systems. These factors cause or facilitate exploitative employment relationships and prevent law enforcement. In particular, enforcement for victims of forced labour remains a major challenge. To ensure adequate support, close and active cooperation between different authorities and non-governmental organisations is needed.</p>	
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

<p><u>Aarhus</u> Long term unemployed take the lead</p>	<p>It was difficult but also a great inspiration for the employees to work with self-budgeting. It was also a facilitating factor that the philosophy of the project is aligned with a general shift in the public opinion about what motivates unemployed citizens</p>	<p>Finding funding for such a creative experiment was a huge challenge. To create administrative processes that allows the municipality to donate the money to the citizens.</p>	<p>We still struggle with the implementation of the project as it doesn't fit into the usual practice. The plan now is to ask the city council for permanent funding.</p>
<p>Local program of supporting the creation of workplaces in <u>Kielce</u></p>	<p>Identification of the "owner" of the idea; <b>willingness to cooperate</b> between municipal institutions (including schools led by City of Kielce); maintaining external financing of activities planned for implementation in the program</p>	<p>Lack of cooperation; lack of understanding the ties between different actors active on local labour market; changes in law</p>	<p>The temptation to achieve goals using "short-cuts" (e.g. financing unstable, short-term employment); changes in decisions accepted by municipal decision makers during the time of program realisation</p>
<p><u>Gdansk</u> So Stay Hotel</p>	<p>The grant from The Velux Foundations for the renovation works and equipment in the building of So Stay Hotel. Partnership with Gdansk Municipality and local companies. The possibility of learning from experts of hospitality and gastronomy industry in the field of running hotel and restaurant. Knowledge about the target group connected with the direct experience of work with children and young people from Homes for Children run by our Foundation.</p>	<p>The lack of knowledge about the investment process. The lack of money for equipment.</p>	<p>The biggest challenge was how to run and sell our social company after project ending to ensure durability and financial stability without external financial support. We managed it. We run our hotel without any external financial support. We run business enterprise which realizes our social aims.</p>



## ANNEX 3: MULTI-LEVEL COOPERATION IN COLLECTED PRACTICES

### Principle 1

PRACTICE	Owner	Executor	Stakeholders	Involvement
<u>Berlin</u> Programme for Training Places (Berliner Ausbildungsplatzprogramm, BAPP)	Senate Department for Integration, Labour and Social Services	Providers of education and training and companies	Employment Agency, competent bodies of the Vocational Training Act (BBiG) , economic and social partners	no
<u>Berlin</u> Employment Trainer (Beschäftigungstrainer)	Senate Department for Integration, Labour and Social Services	Service provider zgs-consult GmbH	Senate Department for Integration, Labour and Social Services	no
Programme Mentoring by the Land of <u>Berlin</u>	Senate Department for Integration, Labour and Social Services	Service provider zgs-consult GmbH		no
<u>Berlin</u> Qualification before Employment (QbE)	Senate Department for Integration, Labour and Social Services	Service provider zgs-consult GmbH	Job Centers, Job Coaches, Educational institutions, Senate Department for Education	ESF funding
<u>Graz</u> Fund for Promotion and Development (GraFo)	the Work and Employment Unit of the Social Welfare Office in the City of Graz	ÖSB Consulting GmbH	Educational Institutions in Graz, NPOs/NGOs, Public Organisations, Social Welfare Office City of Graz	no
<u>Zaragoza</u> La Colaboradora	City council of Zaragoza	Zaragoza Activa	Citizens	URBACT good practice
<u>Ghent</u> MetaalMatch	TOFAM East Flanders	CVO Kisp, Compaan vzw,	TOFAM, CVO Kisp, VDAB,	No



		employers	Compaan vzw, employers	
Vocational Training Centre in <u>Kielce</u> - CK Technik	Kielce Commune	Kielce Commune, Vocational Training Centre in Kielce as an organizational unit of the City Hall	Marshal's Office of the Świętokrzyskie Voivodship, Managing Authority of the Regional Program of the Świętokrzyskie Voivodship (Board of the Świętokrzyskie Voivodship, Marshal's Office of the Świętokrzyskie Voivodship), Kielce Commune, in training project – two vocational schools, its teachers and students as well	Marshal's Office

### Principle 5

PRACTICE	Owner	Executor	Stakeholders	Involvement
<u>Berlin</u> Counselling Center for Migration and Decent Work (BEMA)	Senate Department for Integration, Labour and Social Services of the federal State of Berlin and ARBEIT UND LEBEN - DGB/VHS Berlin-Brandenburg e.V.	ARBEIT UND LEBEN - DGB/VHS Berlin-Brandenburg e.V.	Trade Unions/ German Trade Union Confederation, Berlin Adult Education Centres, Migrant self-organisations, Migration and Integration Counselling Centres, labour and social authorities.	Partner in UnionMigrantNet (a network of trade union and union-related advice centers for immigrants originally funded by the European

				Commission) and in the currently funded projects Eurodetachment and TIDEPower.
<u>Aarhus</u> Long term unemployed take the lead	Municipality of Aarhus	Jobcenter – Aarhus	City of Aarhus. (Jobcenter), University of Aarhus, Social Development centre SUS, VELUX Foundations	URBACT good practice
Local program of supporting the creation of workplaces in <u>Kielce</u>	City of Kielce	Municipal Unemployment Office in Kielce	employers active in Kielce, schools (teachers) and universities, City Council	no
<u>Gdansk</u> So Stay Hotel	Foundation of Social Innovation	Foundation of Social Innovation	Gdansk Municipality, The Velux Foundations, local companies	Regional: Gdansk Municipality was a partner of project. EU: Outside the project we use the consultancy support financed by ESF.

## ANNEX 4: QUESTIONNAIRE

Action 3: European Pillar of Social Rights as a framework for the reconversion towards a sustainable economy

Local initiatives concerning “education, training and life-long learning” and “Secure and adaptable employment”

---

<b>Name of the initiative</b>	
<b>The initiative relates to:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Principle 1 EPSR: Education, training and life-long learning <input type="checkbox"/> Principle 5 EPSR: Secure and adaptable employment
<b>Aim of the initiative</b>	
<b>Target group of the initiative</b>	
<b>Owner/ responsible of the initiative</b>	
<b>Executor(s) of the initiative</b>	
<b>Number of fulltime equivalent</b>	
<b>Stakeholder(s) of the initiative</b>	
<b>Start of the initiative</b>	
<b>Duration of the initiative</b>	
<b>Budget of the initiative</b>	
<b>Involvement of the regional government</b>	
<b>Involvement of the national government</b>	
<b>Involvement European</b>	

<b>Commission</b>	
<b>Short description of the initiative</b>	
<b>Current results of the initiative</b>	
<b>Expected results of the initiative</b>	
<b>Facilitating factors regarding the achievement of the initiative's aims</b>	
<b>Impeding factors regarding the achievement of the initiative's aims</b>	
<b>Challenges regarding the implementation of the initiative</b>	
<b>Extra information of the initiative (documents/ webpage)</b>	
<b>Remarks</b>	
<b>Contact details of the responsible for the initiative</b>	