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PREFACE

This paper forms the second part of a more comprehensive work on the assessment of the administration of Community funds. It is mainly concerned with the structural funds relating to social policy. Specific studies in the areas of regional policy (Part I: Regional policy expenditure - W-18 in the regional policy series) and agricultural policy (W-35 in the agriculture-fisheries-forestry series) are already available.

DG IV has prepared this study for and at the request of the Committee on Budgets as the basis of a project which the European Parliament's STOA group will complete at the end of 1997.
SUMMARY

The European social fund - structure and further development of the monitoring and evaluation procedure

The European Union supports economically weaker regions and groups of people by an active cohesion policy implemented by means of various structural funds.

The European Social Fund (ESF) is intended mainly to finance the fight against unemployment (Objective 3) and adapting to technological change (Objective 4). As with the other structural funds, in implementing the interventions the principles of partnership, complementarity and additionality must be observed. The ESF is administered at Community level in the form of programmes, while individual projects are administered by the Member States in the framework of these programmes.

Individual programmes are jointly worked out by the Commission and the Member States on the basis of a plan drawn up by the Member State in question. They contain, inter alia, precise instructions as to the form which the monitoring and evaluation are to take (standard clauses). These stipulate that a monitoring committee made up of representatives of the Member State and the Commission must be set up for each programme planned. The Member State must also allow representatives of regional or local authorities and the two sides of industry to be on the monitoring committee.

The monitoring committees organize monitoring and evaluation. As part of the monitoring process the monitoring committee examines the data collected in parallel with the implementation of the individual measures. These might be, for example, financial indicators such as the planning, commitment and disbursement of the ESF resources, or operational indicators such as numbers of participants, project numbers and development reports. If things are seen to have gone wrong, the monitoring committees can adjust or reorient the programmes.

Independent assessors are called in for the evaluation. The monitoring committees choose the assessors and decide what form the assessment should take.

Evaluation of measures to combat unemployment is difficult since the interventions interfere in the running of the markets.

An important aspect of the work of evaluation has become that of observing the extent to which the resources provided are concentrated on the target groups. Interim evaluations are currently being drawn up for Objective 3, which will be presented in April 1997.

The measures supported by the ESF vary greatly from one Member State to another. Evaluations of them can therefore be uniform only to a very limited extent. The problems of creating a uniform evaluation structure already begin with the definitions of the various target groups.

This report looks at more detail at the structures in Germany. Evaluation there takes place at the micro-economic level using the following indicators: participation coefficient, locality coefficient, success coefficient, transition coefficient and stability coefficient.
In the Commission DG V is responsible for implementation of the ESF. A section has been set up with in the DG for evaluation, which has constituted a technical working party made up of experts from the Member States and the Commission. Here the methodological approaches to evaluation are discussed and proposals for improving the work of evaluation are made.

Electronic data-processing systems are used for administration and information in the implementation of intervention. The ARINCO system is a pure information data base which gives an overview of the financial planning and implementation of the programmes and measures. ARINCO is installed in the Commission secretariat. The ORACLE system is located in the Commission's DG V, where it is used to process electronically delivered applications for financing from the Social Fund. In the case of both systems it is currently being discussed whether indicators to monitor or evaluate interventions could be incorporated. The Member States have various different data-processing systems to administer the intervention.

The European Parliament (EP) is not involved in the implementation of intervention, but the Commission is required to deliver annual reports. There are close contacts between the EP's Committee on Employment and Social Affairs and the Commission in the form of a working party, in which Members are kept up to date regarding the latest developments. This enables to monitor the work of the Social Funds critically.
INTRODUCTION

In order to improve economic and social cohesion the Community supports weaker regions and groups of people through an active structural policy. The funds used for this purpose have their legal basis in Council regulations. In 1993 all the structural fund regulations were revised.

1. Development of evaluation of the structural funds

During the 1989-1993 programme planning period the handling of funds and monitoring of measures was criticized by several institutions.

The European Parliament in particular, in its resolution of 9 March 1993, called among other things for better evaluation.* Assistance should only be given where prior assessment shows that the medium-term economic and social benefit is in proportion to expenditure. The Court of Auditors also, inter alia in its Annual Report concerning the financial year 1992, has criticized the monitoring of Social Fund resources and called for better evaluation.'

The amended Structural Fund regulations provide for a clear distinction of roles between appraisal, monitoring and evaluation of the programmes. The regulations contain provisions regarding the indicators to be used as a basis and strengthen the role of the monitoring committees.'

2. Content of the report

This report gives an overview of the structures for evaluation of the European Social Fund for the 1994 to 1999 programme period at the levels of the European Commission and the Member States. In view of the short time available for its drafting, only the basic structure can be described and, in the section relating to the Member States, only one State can be taken as an example for detailed analysis.

The report will look at Objectives 3 (combating long-term unemployment') and 4 (facilitating the adaptation of workers to industrial changes), which are supported by the Community exclusively from ESF funds. The Community initiatives BESCHÄFTIGUNG and ADAPT are essentially run

5 See in particular the Social Affairs Committee report of 18 February 1993 (A3-0057/93), point 7.
6 OJ C 309, 16.11.1993, Chapter 7, especially 7.8 (on-going assessment) and 7.9 (ex-post assessment).
8 For a more thoroughgoing treatment of the technical aspects of evaluation, see the report: Das derzeitige regionalpolitische Evaluierungssystem und dessen Weiterentwicklung, Roman Noetzel, Bonn 1996, which also contains suggestions for further reading.
9 Under the new 1993 regulation the old Objectives 3 and 4 are subsumed by Objective 3.
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The social policy assessment system according to the same procedure as the Member State programmes, and so will not be described in detail here. If a region comes within Objectives 1, 2 or 5b, Objectives 3 and 4 are also pursued there by the Social Fund, but the support is planned and implemented in the framework of interinstitutional cooperation together with interventions from the other funds. The evaluation of Social Fund intervention in these areas is not described here, owing to its complex institutional structure.⁹

3. Structure of the report

The report will first outline the main underlying principles of interventions by the European Social Fund and the fundamental concepts contained in the regulations (II). Then the legal bases and their general application in evaluating Objectives 3 and 4 is described (III), followed by the practical course of Objective 3 interventions in the case of a particular Member State, with particular emphasis on the evaluation procedure (IV). Next comes an account of current use of data-processing equipment and ways in which it might be developed further (V). Finally we attempt to give a sketch of ways in which evaluation of Social Fund interventions might actually develop, with reference to the political framework conditions (VI).

II. Principles and basic concepts

A description of the following principles and basic concepts is necessary for an understanding of the regulations:

1. Partnership

The principle of partnership means that throughout the entire process of Structural Fund intervention there should be close consultation between the Commission, the Member State concerned, the competent authorities and bodies appointed by the latter, and the economic and social partners. The partnership is, however, conducted in full compliance with the respective institutional, legal and financial powers of each partner."⁸

2. Complementarity

The principle of complementarity implies that Community operations may only complement or contribute to corresponding national operations. This means in practice that a maximum of 50% of the total cost may be financed from Community funds."

---

⁸ See Clarke, Guide to the EU Structural Funds, p. 46 ff.
⁹ The report Das derzeitige regionalpolitische Evaluierungssystem ... (see footnote 6) also deals with the European Social Fund where it is active in the framework of regional policy, i.e. of Objectives 1, 2, 5b and 6 (47.6% of Social Fund resources are used for Objective 1).
¹⁰ Article 4(1) Regulation 2052/88, amended version.
¹¹ Article 13(3), Regulation 2052/88, amended version.
3. Additionality

The principle of additionality is intended to ensure that sums from the Structural Fund should not take the place of structural expenditure by the Member State in question. Technically, this is achieved by means of the requirement that the Member State must maintain its structural expenditure at least at the same level as during the foregoing period of intervention.12

4. Programme promotion

The 1994-1999 planning period for the Social Fund is geared to promoting programmes. This is made particularly clear in Article 2(1) of Regulation 4255/88, amended version, whereby Social Fund assistance is to be defined and agreed at the programming stage, and in Article 5(1) of the same Regulation, which omits co-financing of projects from its list of possible forms of assistance.

The result of the provisions being given this form is that the Commission is only entitled to participate on a basis of partnership in the context of programme planning, while the Member States must decide internally on the authorization of individual projects. This approach should be seen in particular against the background of the political emphasis being given to the subsidiarity principle.13

III. Legal bases and structure of evaluation for Objectives 3 and 4

1. Framework regulation

The framework Regulation sets out the obligation of the Commission and Member States to

- monitor Community operations on an ongoing basis" and
- submit them to prior appraisal, monitoring and ex post evaluation in order to gauge their effectiveness and their effects on specific structural problems.16

Under the terms of the Regulation the European Parliament plays no active part in the administration, supervision or evaluation of the Structural Funds.11 The Commission must, however, keep the European Parliament periodically informed as to the implementation of operations"; in addition, a report on the implementation of the framework Regulation during the preceding year must be

---

12 Article 4(1), Regulation 2052/88, amended version.
13 For a critical assessment, see in particular: report by the EP Regional Affairs Committee (Teverson) on the sixth annual report on the 1994 Structural Fund, A4-0211/96, pp. 13, 14 and 18.
15 Article 6(1), Regulation 2052/88, amended version.
16 Article 6(2), Regulation 2052/88, amended version.
17 Cf. also report by the EP Regional Affairs Committee (Teverson) on the sixth annual report on the 1994 Structural Fund, A4-0211/96, p. 17.
18 Article 6(1), Regulation 2052/88, amended version.
submitted to Parliament by 1 November of each year, finally, a report must be submitted at three-yearly intervals on the progress made towards economic and social cohesion and the contribution thereto made by the Funds.

2. Coordination" and Social Fund regulations

The coordination Regulation sets out the implementing procedures for the framework Regulation. These provide that the Commission and Member States shall be jointly responsible for effective monitoring at the level of overall planning for the Member State and at the level of the specific programmes.

The Social Fund Regulation takes the general provisions of the framework and coordination Regulations and tailors them specifically to the needs of the Social Fund.

(a) Procedure for implementation of the Social Fund

(i) Legal situation

The procedure for implementation of the various structural funds stipulates that the Member States should first draw up plans. In drawing up the plans, aspects of the employment market and Community policy must be taken into account and quantified using the available data and bearing in mind the results of the evaluation, particularly the expected contribution of the measures concerned to the promotion of equal opportunities for men and women on the employment market. On the basis of these plans the 'Community support frameworks' are drawn up in a joint consultation process with the Commission. The Social Fund regulation gives the framework for possible support plans for Objectives 3 and 4.

Financial assistance under the Social Fund is possible in principle in the form of part-financing of operational programmes, global grants and funding for pilot and demonstration projects. The predominant form is intended to be a limited number of operational programmes.
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The final decision on the authorization of a Community support framework is taken by the Commission. In the context of these Community support frameworks the Member States apply for support from the Fund for specific operations (operational programme, global grant, technical assistance, etc.). These applications must again include the results of a prior appraisal of the operation with regard to the medium-term economic and social benefit in relation to the expenditure.

When the plan, the Community support framework and the planned operational programmes are submitted by the Member State to the Commission and voted on in one procedural step, this is referred to as a single programming document. The particulars required by the Regulations for evaluation, monitoring and appraisal purposes are the same as in the case of the Community support programmes.

(2) Implementation

The practical implementation of the amended Regulations with regard to Objectives 3 and 4 turned out to be relatively time-consuming. After the new legal bases had been established, the individual States drew up proposals regarding the individual Objectives, which were adopted after negotiations with the relevant Commission department (DG V) were complete.

In the case of support under Objective 3 five States decided in favour of a Community support framework, while four submitted the data for a single programming document. For support under Objective 4 a Community support framework was adopted only in the case of Belgium, while for the other seven States a single programming document was drawn up. For the new Member States of Finland, Austria and Sweden the support frameworks were not adopted until 1995. In its 1994 annual report on the structural funds the Commission rates the single programming document a success, since the concentrated decision-making procedure means that less time is needed overall.

The first Community support framework was adopted for Objective 3 in Luxembourg in June 1994; the other decisions on Objective 3 were almost all made in August 1994, with the one for Belgium being taken in November 1994.

None of the Objective 4 plans were adopted until December 1994. This late adoption of the plans is the main reason for the underuse of Social Fund resources in 1995: the funds applied for for the end of 1994 only in fact became available in 1995, so that fewer funds were applied for in 1995.30

In the case of support under Objectives 3 and 4 the Commission took care to ensure that the economic and social partners were involved in the negotiations on the Community support frameworks.31 In Germany, France and the Netherlands attempts were made, particularly in the case of Objective 4, to involve social and economic partners having ties with commercial firms and small businesses (SMEs). In some Member States, particularly the United Kingdom, there is little or no involvement of the social partners in relation to administrative practices.32

---

31 Commission of the European Communities, Sixth Annual report on the 1994 Structural Funds, COM(95)583 final, p. 151.
32 See Commission of the European Communities, Community structural assistance and employment, COM(96)109 final, p. 39 ff.
Content of the documents

Each of the documents just mentioned (Community support frameworks and single programming documents) contains the following main items of information:

- a statement of the priorities and objectives of the operation,
- an outline of the operational programmes,
- indicative financing plans for the programmes,
- data for verifying complementarity,
- data for verifying additionality,
- information on the means available for technical assistance operations,
- the standard clauses for monitoring and evaluation.

This information can be transmitted to the European Parliament for information on request (see Article 10(2), regulation 4253/88, amended version), but are in any case regularly published in the Official Journal. Community support frameworks are legally binding agreements between the Commission and the Member States, without compliance with which Social Fund monies cannot be disbursed. The actual content of such documents is shown below through the example of the Community support framework for Objective 3 for Germany (IV).

Individual applications for payment of subsidies from the Social Fund are made by the Member States using a computerized form. This electronic application system is a uniform one used throughout the Community under the name of ORACLE (see V.1.b).

It should, however, be pointed out here that widely differing programmes and projects are running in the Member States under the uniform descriptions in the structural fund Regulations. According to the programme documents, for example, the target group in Objective 3 priority task 3 (persons exposed to exclusion from the labour market) consists in Germany mainly of handicapped people, refugees, former prisoners and the homeless long-term unemployed, whereas in Spain, for example, according to Commission officials, whole populations of remote rural areas are supported under this priority task.

The Operational Programmes are administered at Member State level without any input by the Commission. In some cases committees are set up for this purpose along the lines of the monitoring committees for the overall programmes, with business, social and regional partners again able to take part.

b) Monitoring and interim evaluation procedure

(i) Legal situation

Community operations must be monitored constantly (Article 6, Regulation 2052/88, revised version). This is intended to ensure, firstly, that the operations really do serve the prescribed purposes and, where necessary, to reorganize them along different lines. The monitoring process is also intended to provide the data needed for the evaluation of operations. The monitoring must be carried out at the level of the Community support frameworks and at that of specific operations (programmes, etc.). It must be based on physical and financial indicators specified by the
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Commission. These indicators must show the stage reached in the operation and the progress achieved on the management side.\(^\text{33}\)

Monitoring committees are set up within the framework of the partnership, by agreement between the Member State concerned and the Commission.\(^\text{34}\) The monitoring committees may, if necessary, adjust the procedure for granting assistance and the financing plan.\(^\text{35}\)

The Community support frameworks (like the single planning document) contains the 'standard clauses', in which the principles and rules of monitoring are laid down in a legally binding form.\(^\text{36}\)

Although the Commission has issued a more precise guide to the standard clauses,\(^\text{36}\) the proposals it contains are not legally binding and are interpreted differently in different Member States.

(2) Implementation

On the basis of these guidelines the monitoring committees are responsible for the practicalities of the monitoring and evaluation systems, since they are better placed to react to national and regional situations. The monitoring committee usually consists of representatives of the Commission, the Member State and the other responsible bodies appointed by it, with the economic and social partners being represented in accordance with the usual practice of the Member State in question. The monitoring committee draws up its own rules of procedure, which among other things regulate the area of competence, the appointment of members and experts, the question of the chairmanship and secretariat, working methods and the decision-making process.

The actual monitoring consists in the collection and verification of data on the financial, physical and effectiveness indicators. The exact specification of the indicators is decided by the Commission together with the monitoring committees. The indicators are tailored to the individual programmes and therefore vary from programme to programme.

In Germany the monitoring committees for the Social Fund interventions have agreed on the following indicators, which are gathered for all the operative programmes: financial indicators, operational indicators, status reports and additional reports on present practice and planned improvements\(^\text{37}\).

In the same way the other Member States have reached data collection agreements geared to their structures. The data is collected by the administrative bodies responsible for the measure and presented to the monitoring committee. Using this data, the monitoring committee can tell at an early stage whether the programmes are in line with expectations and, if necessary, make any changes required.

\(^{33}\) Article 25, Regulation 4253/88, revised version.

\(^{34}\) Article 25(3), Regulation 4253, revised version.

\(^{35}\) Article 25(5), Regulation 4253, revised version.


\(^{37}\) For further details see IV.3.
Another part of the monitoring process is the interim evaluations, with which the data collected in the monitoring process are critically analysed. These interim evaluations should be carried out by independent assessors.

According to Commission officials, there are differences of opinion between the Commission and some Member States about the number of interim evaluations to be carried out and the question of ensuring that assessor are independent. No clear rulings on either point are given in the standard clauses. Germany, for example, takes the view that one interim evaluation in 1996 is enough, whereas the Commission considers that a further interim evaluation would be desirable.

c) Prior appraisal and ex-post evaluation

Before the legal bases for appraisal and evaluation are described, a short explanation of the aim and purpose of these procedures should be given in view of the differing traditions in the various Member States.38

Prior appraisal is the term used to denote an analysis and examination to be carried out before the adoption of the operation in order to determine whether the operation is in keeping with the specific priority tasks and other Community policies, the appropriate structures are available for its implementation and the potential benefits are likely to correspond to the resources invested. As well as giving the possibility of improving the operation being assessed, it aims to check the quality of the measures applied for.

Ex-post evaluation, on the other hand, aims to gather information as to the usefulness of the measure after its completion, with a view to introducing improvements into future measures. Evaluation of the measures thus serves no verificatory purpose, but must be seen as a tool. According to Commission officials, even Member States which were previously somewhat sceptical about evaluation are now prepared to step up their efforts on this basis.

1) Legal situation

The appraisal and evaluation of operations, like monitoring, is carried out in cooperative partnership between the Member States and the Commission. The principles and details of evaluation have to be set out in more detail in Community Support Frameworks.39

Appraisal and evaluation should be carried out in relation to aims and general economic and sectoral indicators on the basis of regional and national statistics, data taken from descriptive reports and qualitative analyses.

---

38 In some Member States evaluation was introduced only relatively recently, see Das deneitige regionalpolitische Evaluierungssystem und dessen Weiterentwicklung, Roman Noetzel, Bonn 1996, p. 7 f.
39 Article 8(3) and Article 26(1) and (4), Regulation 4253/88, revised version.
(2) Implementation

(a) Appraisal

The plans, which were already subject to regular internal assessment by the Member States, were submitted to an independent prior appraisal by experts appointed by the Commission. These prior appraisals were then discussed in the negotiations with the Member States on the Community Support Frameworks, in order to improve the frameworks. It is reported that these appraisals have led in particular to the aims of the projects being more precisely defined.

(b) Evaluation

The Commission's DG V, which is responsible for the Social Fund, has set up a special section within Directorate B, which deals with political development and assessment, to supervise and monitor the functioning of the European Social Fund (GD V/B/4). Interventions under Objectives 3 and 4 are handled under the sole responsibility of DG V. Evaluation of Social Fund interventions in the framework of Objectives 1, 2, 5b and 6, on the other hand, is carried out, as mentioned above, in collaboration with DGs VI, XIV and XVI.

i) Finalizing assessment of the planning period 1989-1993

Following the revision of the 1993 Structural Fund regulations, the final reports on the measures implemented during the first planning period must comply with the new rules. To this end the Commission has drawn up a common frame of reference, which lays down the following criteria for assessment:

- effectiveness and efficiency of the co-funded measures for reintegration into the employment market;
- implementation of the measures;
- specific targets groups which have been effectively helped by the programmes;
- net effects of the measures for these target groups;
- greater use of programmes co-financed by the Social Fund in comparison with national programmes;
- economic framework conditions for the implementation of the measures.

The individual Member States then carried out evaluations of the former Objectives 3 and 4, with financial support from the Commission. The evaluations produced clearcut results when they could be carried out on the basis of objective figures, for example the number of participants in the programmes. In its interim synopsis of the national evaluation reports the Commission ascertains, inter alia, that the actual target groups, i.e. the groups of people with the greatest difficulties, are underrepresented in the measures in relation to their share in overall unemployment. The evaluation of effectiveness revealed that the measures could not be assessed only on the basis of rate of placement, since indirect social and psychological effects (renewed self-confidence, social contact,
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reestablishment of working rhythms) were also important, although they could scarcely be quantified. It is recommended that rates of placement should be assessed, not after an isolated training measure, but at the end of a more complex integration process.

**ii) Assessment of the 1994-1999 planning period**

The work on the final assessments of Objective 3 for the current support period cannot begin until the end of 1999. Experience with the interim evaluations will be of decisive importance in designing the assessments to be made then. The work currently being done in preparation for the final assessment is described in detail in section VI.

In several Member States (Belgium, Denmark, France and Luxembourg) three-year support programmes have been adopted for Objective 4, which will be completed at the end of 1996. Final assessments will be made in these cases. However, a combination of special circumstances will make these Objective 4 assessments particularly difficult. For example, the programmes have relatively low funding, were unable really to begin until 1995 (adoption of the programmes in December 1994) and deal with a new objective definition of which there has so far been no experience.

The Commission therefore began by issuing a provisional description and assessment of the various national measures under Objective 4. The analysis carried out in this paper ranges from the context of the national political fields over the development of training systems, the horizontal approach and the basic principles of complementarity and partnership to specific questions of evaluation and monitoring.

It is ascertained in the final analysis that an extraordinarily wide range of measures exists in the Member States, particularly those aimed at prior assessment of the employment market and the need for vocational qualifications (priority task 1).

The purpose of the Objective 4 assessment is to give a preliminary overview of the way in which this new objective is being implemented in the Member States. At the evaluation meeting, which dealt with Objective 4 last June, two important tendencies became apparent:

- there is wide variation among the Member States with regard to both the interpretation and programming of Objective 4 in relation to national contexts (anticipation, continuing vocational training) and to the policies adopted by the Member States in the area of public intervention;
- partly as a result of these variations, the evaluation priorities differ widely from Member State to Member State: the interpretation of the concept of industrial change and its effects on businesses; the plan for workers threatened with unemployment and safeguarding unemployment (by improved employability).

Precise information on priority themes for evaluation in the Member States enables us to establish a 'lowest common denominator' of content for the interim assessment and also to refine country classification on the basis of the themes chosen.

---

**Commission of the European Communities, Sixth Annual Report on the Structural Fund, 1994, COM(95)53 final, p. 180.**

Participation of SMEs in Objective 4 and examination of the plan for workers threatened with unemployment, both from the methodological point of view and that of the effectiveness with which it is incorporated/interpreted in the programmes are two of the subjects suggested for the interim assessment.

3. Cooperation between the Commission and Parliament

Article 16 of Regulation 2052/88, revised version, requires the Commission to report to Parliament annually on the implementation of the Funds. In addition to this, however, independent communication structures have developed.

For example, there is close contact between the Commission and the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs in the form of a committee working party, which is currently made up of nine Members of the European Parliament. The working party has set itself the task of monitoring and assessing Social Fund interventions. At present the working party considers that the financial utilization of the Social Fund gives cause for concern. One focus of activity is the development of prospects for the development of the Social Fund after 1999. The working party holds regular meetings with the appropriate Commission officials, at which it is also given detailed information on recent developments.

II. Monitoring and evaluation of Objective 3 interventions in Germany

A Community Support Framework has been adopted for Objective 3, containing the standard clauses on prior appraisal, monitoring, interim assessment and ex-post evaluation.

In Germany, because of its federal structure, both the Federation and the Länder are active in employment policy. Social Fund Objective 3 resources are split between the Federation and the Länder in a ratio of 51% to 49%. The Länder must, of course, draw up monitoring and evaluation plans for use of the resources allocated to them in their own right. The framework applies to the whole of the 1994-1999 planning period. 12 Operational Programmes were authorized for its implementation, 11 of them at Land level and 1 at federal level.

1. Framework

In the 1994-1999 Community Support Framework for Objective 3 adopted for Germany, the general framework conditions are first set out. The central element of employment market policy in Germany is the activities of the Federal Labour Office, which are based on the Employment Promotion Law (Arbeitsförderungsgesetz). These are mainly long-term measures and not programmes drawn up for the short term. Alongside this national employment policy the Länder also pursue the aim of

---

45 These reports must be submitted each year by 1 November. The latest such report was: Commission of the European Communities, Sixth Annual Report on the Structural Funds, 1994, COM(95)583, final.

46 Cf. also the opinion of the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs in: European Parliament, Committee on Regional Policy (Teverson), report on the Sixth Annual report on the Structural Funds, 1994, A 4-0211/96, p. 31.

41 The information in this section is based in particular on an extensive interview with Mr Kurt Bruck, German Federal Ministry for Employment and Social Affairs, Section VII a 3.
extending what is offered by the Employment Promotion Law in either qualitative or quantitative terms in those areas where they see the greatest gaps in the framework of their political priorities.

Having described the political framework into which the Social Fund interventions must fit, we shall look briefly at the results of the last support period. These show that while achievements in employment promotion amount to DM 69 billion in the old Länder (the target area for the purely Objective 3 operations), the European Social Fund intervened between 1990 and 1993 to the tune of ECU 933 million (some DM 1.8 billion). These interventions produced a total programme of ECU 2,230 million (some DM 4.4 billion), the results of which are described as very satisfactory: only 20% of participants abandoned the measures early, and 60% were placed in regular employment.48

Against this background the strategy and contribution of the Social Fund in 1994–1999 is described: at federal level the main aim is to make possible measures not provided for in the Employment Promotion Law. At Land level different priority tasks are set depending on what is set out in the Operational Programme.

The evaluation must be made on the basis of stated objectives and indicators. As quantitative aims for each operational programme broken down into priority tasks, the following are stated:

- total cost;
- ESF contribution;
- number of people covered by the programme.

The indicators for the whole support framework are described as follows:

- numbers in employment (total);
- numbers in employment (annual variation);
- unemployment (total/broken down by sex/age/duration of unemployment/nationality/level of qualification);
- disabled;
- expenditure on promoting employment (social budget);
- expenditure for active employment policies;
- promotion of further vocational training (participation in measures/number of participants).

Further indicators of practical relevance to the measures in question are set out in the context of the operational programmes.

2. Organization

The steering body for the Community Support Frameworks is, as explained above, the monitoring committee. For the recently presented Objective 3 framework for Germany a monitoring committee was set up. The members of the monitoring committee are the Federal Employment and Finance Ministries, the employment ministries of the relevant Länder, the Federal Labour Office, DG V of the Commission, the Federal Union of Employers' Associations and the German Trade Unions' Federation. Other economic and social partners can apply for membership of the committee. Welfare

---

48 Cf., on the other hand, the verdict of a 'defeat' in: European Parliament, Committee on Regional Policy (Teverson), report on the Sixth Annual report on the Structural Funds, 1994, A4-0211/96, p. 16.
associations and professional participants in measures are not admitted, since the committee must retain its ability to work.

Only the administrators of the Fund (so not the economic and social partners) may take part in the committee's decision-making process. Officials from the German Employment Ministry said on this subject that decisions should be made only by those bodies which also bear the legal and financial responsibility.

A subgroup of the monitoring committee has been formed (known as the 'technical committee'), in which the representatives of four federal Länder, the Federal Employment Ministry and the Commission take part. The group is mainly responsible for preparing technical decisions. The rules of procedure of the monitoring Committee apply, mutatis mutandis. In view of the committee's task, the social partners are not included.

There are no monitoring committees for the individual operational programmes. The different programmes are organized along uniform lines. The federation's Operational Programme, for example, is carried out under the responsibility of the Federal Labour Office. In the individual Länder sometimes the ministerial administration is responsible, sometimes subordinate administrations.

3. Monitoring

The monitoring committee has agreed on a uniform framework of monitoring data, which are gathered within all the Operational Programmes. These monitoring data correspond to the requirements for the annual reports.

They are:
- financial indicators: planning, approval and disbursement per year; planning, approval and disbursement overall;

- operational indicators: for each Operational Programme (or Single Programming Document) and measure:
  A. Entry and final figures for further vocational training measures for the employed, with indication of numbers successfully completing training;
  B. Entry and final figures for training towards qualifications with breakdown of outcome into: uncompleted, taking up employment, completion, the latter broken down into situation (after six months): employed, unemployed, entry into other training;
  C. Number of persons granted employment aid, with indication of average amount of aid, duration of aid and percentage of individuals still in employment after six months;
  D. Total number of projects approved, broken down into projects with fewer than 20 participants, 21-100 participants and more than 100 participants; also, number of projects with sandwich training, projects ending in membership of a trade association and projects in operator groups;

- status report: important developments relating to measures during the implementation of programmes, such as development of cooperation structures in the institutional background to the

---

For the view of the Commission 388: Commission Communication, Community structural assistance and employment, COM(96)109 final, p. 42 f.
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- project (businesses, trade associations, employment exchanges); changes in the social-economic background (employment market situation); acceptance of projects by potential beneficiaries; particularly successful projects;

- also, for Objective 3: reports on current practice; changes relative to the previous support period; planned improvements for the future; each to be given for the following aspects: 1) ensuring that the assisted projects contribute to covering local and regional needs for trained employees; 2) ensuring that there is as close as possible a link between projects and businesses in the wider labour market; 3) providing the best possible training and recognized qualifications; 4) promoting cooperation between training bodies.

The Operative Programmes are usually administered by committees set up by the Land employment ministries. The economic and social partners are also involved. Annual reports are drawn up on the Operative Programmes and submitted to the monitoring committee. The monitoring committee draws up annual implementation reports on the Objective 3 Community Support Framework on the basis of these.

4. Interim assessment

A synoptic interim assessment is currently being drawn up for assistance under the Objective 3 Community Support Framework in Germany.

A public invitation to tender was issued for the production of the interim assessment. The tender documents described the task as follows:

The assessor will have the job of ensuring comparability of the interim reports on the different sections of the programme drawn up by the Länder and the federation in accordance with a structure still to be determined and of drawing up a synoptic evaluation of the Community Support Framework. In order to ensure that resources are used economically, the assessor should not, if possible, carry out any primary collection of data. The data and information contained in the reports drawn up by the Länder and the federation should form the basis of his work.

The assessment should include the following:

- description of the problems and reasons for the aim/resource combinations;
- checks on the efficiency of the measures from cost/benefit points of view; analysis of the economic information and transaction costs; comparison of these costs with the benefits of the volume of promotion;
- data quality checks;
- checks on conformity of aims;
- checks on achievement of aims. ...

An assessor has now been appointed following the call for tenders. The monitoring committee decided on the assessor.

Interim assessments of the twelve Operational Programmes are also being drawn up. Some of them were advertised publicly, others were commissioned on the open market. The federal Operational Programme, for example, was carried out by the research unit of the Federal Labour Office.
monitoring committee drew up a binding assessment framework for these jobs, which is applied throughout (see 5).

The work is carried out in close cooperation between the assessors of the synoptic report and the individual reports. The work is coordinated by the technical committee of the monitoring committee and the federal ministry of employment. The interim assessment will be submitted to the Commission by April 1997 at the latest.

5. Assessment method

For the interim assessment of Objective 3 in Germany the monitoring committee has agreed, as far as we are able to tell with expert assistance from the relevant section of the federal employment ministry, on the following assessment method:

The basis of the assessments is the monitoring data presented in the interim reports on the Operational Programmes. The approach is a microeconomic one; the focus of attention is not, therefore, rises or falls in unemployment figures, but the particular target groups of the priority tasks, or the people who have received assistance themselves. The following indicators are therefore used as the basis for the assessment:

- Participation coefficient: the number and makeup of participants in projects is compared with planning data. This shows whether, and which, projects are accepted by target groups.
- Completion coefficient: the number of participants who complete the project is compared with those who break off early. This, when broken down according to reasons for breaking off, shows whether the measures themselves need adjustment, whether certain groups need special preparation and what stabilization techniques, e.g. psychological ones, are needed.
- Success coefficient: how many participants completed the programme successfully and with what qualifications, out of the total number of beneficiaries of the programme?
- Transition coefficient: how many participants were able to move directly into employment? It must also be determined whether there is a causal link between acceptance for employment and the measure funded.
- Stability coefficient: how many participants are still in employment after six months and how many are taking part in another training programme?

Assessment is made considerably more difficult by the low quality of the monitoring systems. Great efforts were made when the reform took place in 1993, but no real result was achieved. The monitoring systems are often of a purely financial nature and give little information about the implementation of the measures. The indicators provided are usually a very unsuitable basis for assessment. The assessors often find themselves constrained to gather the data they need retrospectively for themselves. This is a time-consuming business, with data often being only partially available, or not at all. The assessments are thus based on restricted data, and intervention can be judged only on the basis of imperfect evidence.
V. Use of data-processing systems

Targeted control of the Community's structural investments is dependent inter alia on a high-quality information structure, making it possible to determine where and for what purposes structural resources are spent.

1. Systems at European level

a) ARINCO

In the Commission secretariat there is a publicly accessible data-base called ARINCO, which will, in its final form, contain a complete collection of data on all the Community's structural funds.

Data from three main sources is fed into ARINCO: data from the DGs responsible for implementing the structural funds, i.e. first, DGs V, VI, XIV and XVI, particularly the current indicative financial plans for the Operational Programmes and the individual assistance plans of the adjusted programme measures. Secondly, data from the Commission's book-keeping system (SINCOM), which is a reliable source of information on the outward movement of the structural funds. Thirdly, statistical data and methods are taken from the EUROSTAT systems.

ARINCO is not fed new data via an on-line system, but regularly updated by the DGs. It is, however, ensured quite adequately for statistical purposes that the information supplied is up to date.

The system offers all the financial data relating to the structural funds in a user-friendly Windows form, which can be displayed or manipulated by year or intervention target, at the level of individual programmes by year, or by measure. Parliament's DG IV at present only has the less up-to-date CAA version of ARINCO, which can, however, be used to call up basically the same data.

According to Commission officials, the data for Objectives 3 and 4 is in an acceptable state, with regard both to completeness and being up to date. The reason for this is that DG V can process the data from the Member States more easily, because it already receives basic material in a computerized state as a result of the compulsory use of electronic forms for applications for assistance. This rule in the Social Fund Regulation has thus proved useful, and should also be considered for the other structural funds. The officials concerned do, however, have reservations about the quality of the data (see b).

Some of the data on the other Objectives is incomplete. This is attributed mainly to technical problems, stemming from the fact that the data processing systems in the different Directorates-General at the Commission are incompatible. Efforts are not even made in the case of new developments to ensure that the Commission has a uniform data-processing structure. However, compatibility of the systems used in the Commission with ARINCO is to be ensured in future.

The ARINCO data-base would also be technically capable of accepting qualitative indicators, thus providing an assessment of structural assistance. However, the content aspect of these qualitative
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51 The information in this chapter is based largely on a demonstration of ARINCO and a conversation with officials from Section C 4 of the Commission secretariat.

52 Article 5(4), Regulation 4255188, revised version.
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indicators' is a problem. Technical studies are currently being carried out to test the possibility of introducing assessment indicators as data-base material.

According to the Commission officials concerned, the greatest problem lies in the fact that the data which might be used as indicators is gathered in different ways in the Member States and also differently defined. There is, for example, no single Community-wide definition of the notion of a 'beneficiary', although this term is used as the name of a section in the application form for assistance from the Social Fund. Commission officials have said that they believe that the individual Member States would gain no particular benefit from the introduction of uniform qualitative indicators in ARINCO and would not support the work in connection with them. Requested data, for example, was not provided, or States refused to give information about the exact way in which data was gathered.

The question must be asked, on the other hand, whether it is even possible to give a uniform definition of assessment indicators without robbing the indicators of all significance by making them excessively similar. As mentioned above, conditions in the Community vary enormously from region to region, which causes a great many problems when it comes to statistical processing. A simple relationship between resources used and numbers of participants for the purpose of a comparative assessment of intervention benefits, for example, would be impossible because of the differences in price levels in the Member States alone.

Giving individual macroeconomic indicators would also only be useful if the effects of structural assistance could be worked out statistically in isolation. As it is, this cannot be done with any clarity because of the many linked effects using present statistical methods. In the case of Germany, for example, Social Fund assistance amounts to only 3% of the expenditure of the national social budget. A macroeconomic approach to the assessment indicators is hardly possible in conditions such as these. But even with a microeconomic approach there is still the problem of making the indicators so uniform that they take account of the many differences between the Member States and yet remain significant. The differences in the composition of target groups, which make a comparative study even more difficult, have already been pointed out (cf. III.2.a).

b) ORACLE

The ORACLE data-processing programme is a programme developed by DG V on a UNIX basis. It is used mainly for the electronic processing of applications for assistance, programme changes and payments of remaining sums from the Social Fund. The programme thus provides a relatively comprehensive picture of the financial state of progress of Social Fund assistance. Over and above possible financial data, qualitative data are also requested, which should in theory make assessment possible.

However, the problems with this data are essentially much the same as those encountered with the introduction of qualitative data in ARINCO. In addition to this, according to Commission officials, some of this data is gathered or entered in a haphazard way, so that it is not reliable.

53 Cf. also: Commission of the European Communities: Community structural assistance and employment, COM(96)109 final, p. 17.
54 Article 5(4), Regulation 4255/88, revised version.
The fact that each Member State has its own system of internal data collection and that there is thus no single procedure for the definition and collection of data also plays a role here.

In practical terms ORACLE is at present developing in such a way that the Member States have set up ORACLE system stations in the places appointed by them to coordinate assistance. Where States had difficulty with this extensive help was given, according to Commission officials; in at least one Member State the necessary hardware was installed at the expense of the Commission.

The Member States feed the necessary data into the system and transmit it to the Commission.

The Commission has discussed the possibility of setting up a working party to make the ORACLE system usable for assessment purposes. The time frame under discussion was ten years.

Officials at the German employment ministry have commented that the work with ORACLE created considerable administrative difficulties, particularly in the early stages. The templates for entering data, for example, were frequently changed, and in addition were in a mixture of English and French which was hard to understand and had to be translated at the ministry’s own expense. Telephone bills for data transfer had also reached critical levels. The assessment by data base experiment was not considered to have any future.

2. Systems at national level

At federal level a system based on standard software in the MS-DOS operating system is used to manage national projects. Because of the difference in operating systems this software and the ORACLE software are incompatible. Projects can be managed down to the level of individual project operators. The system contains financial data, participant data and other information on individual projects. Some of the Länder use the same software, others have developed their own management programmes.

VI. Development of better assessment methods

The main Commission DGs concerned with structurally policy (DG V (employment), DG VI (agriculture), DG XIV (fisheries) and DG XVI (regional policy) are endeavouring to improve evaluation methods, both at the working level and by commissioning studies from experts. Apart from monitoring the work of the current interim assessments, their efforts are directed towards the final evaluations in 1999.

Apart from various working documents, the main thing to be mentioned here is the series of MEANS reports, particularly the MEANS handbooks Nos. 3 (Measuring the Employment Effects of Community Structural Interventions) and 4 (Applying the Multi-criteria Method to the Evaluation

---

55 Source: interview with Mr Kurt Brüss, Federal Ministry for Labour and Social Affairs, Germany, Section VII a 3.
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of Structural Programmes*), as well as the 'State of the Art Report: Evaluation of Employment Effects of Structural Policies' At present the main project under the MEANS programme is the preparation of a recommendation on the assessment of Objective 4 activities.

Apart from these activities in the research field, the Commission's assessment section is engaged in the work of standardizing to a minimum level the terms used in assessment. The following has been proposed, for example, in a working paper: a uniform typology of measures (e.g. training measures, employment subsidies, placement and follow-up, technical assistance) and target groups (e.g. the long-term unemployed, unemployed young people, women, those threatened with exclusion, those threatened with unemployment, other special categories), in order to be able to categorize applications for assistance and process them for statistical purposes. These approaches, the purely technical difficulties of which must not, however, be underestimated, could then lead to a common framework of indicators.

It has been reported from several quarters that problems have arisen among the various Commission Directorates-General in settling on appropriate methods for evaluating Social Fund assistance. These communication problems are particularly unjustifiable because the different competences often come together again at the level of the Operational Programmes in the Member States. The executive level of the monitoring and evaluation operation should be able to work on a consistent methodological basis.

The Member States are also trying to improve the method of assessment. In Germany, for example, the Institute for Labour Market and Vocational Research at the Federal Labour Office is particularly concerned with research into assessment. Since this institution is also responsible for evaluating the federal Operational Programme, it is able to test its proposals in practice. On the other hand, the fact of being practice-based means that these approaches are geared specifically to conditions and target groups in Germany.

The following effects have been unanimously identified as the main problems in evaluating assistance in fighting unemployment, which cause assessment on the basis of basic figures to be distorted:
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- dead-weight loss effect: measures benefit people who would have found work even without the measure;
- substitution effect: the measure helps the beneficiaries to find work, preventing other people from doing so;
- displacement effect: jobs are created in one area as a result of the measures, while being lost or not created in others.

These effects can only be clearly quantified if it is possible by observing an identical control group to determine the behaviour of participants and the market without the influence of interventions.

Putting together such control groups is difficult, however. As well as regional differences, selection and self-selection processes come into play, so that groups of beneficiaries of measures and groups of non-beneficiaries are fundamentally different. And for some categories of measures there are no control groups since everyone in a category is potentially covered by the programme.

The officials involved at the Commission and in the Member State where the question was asked, Germany, see further developments, in summarized form, as follows: at the moment there is not uniform evaluation Community-wide. This is mainly a result of the variations in the measures actually implemented and the target groups and of differing national approaches and administrative structures. The methodology for assessing measures to help combat unemployment must, however, be developed further; cooperation at Community level is definitely to be welcomed.

However, the Commission and the Member States are not in complete agreement as to the approaches to be adopted. The Commission points to insufficient cooperation and compliance with Community rules on the part of the Member States, while the Member States asked criticized the over-theoretical bias of the approach adopted by the Commission.

At the suggestion of the Commission's assessment section, a working party on assessment has, however, been set up; in it representatives of the Member States and the Commission exchange views on methods and problems of evaluation. The solutions found in this working party can be directly discussed and tested by the Member States. The work of the group was described by the Commission as very successful.

---

VII. Conclusions

The following comments can be made in conclusion:

The Member States, which in the context of the regions discussed here under Objectives 3 and 4 bear well over 50% of the costs, are at pains to use and manage the funds overall, and hence those from the Social Fund, in a high-quality way. Evaluation of these efforts is also welcome in the Member States provided that it leads to new insights and thus to genuine improvements. The development of Community-wide standardized definitions, for example in the form of the tables suggested by the Commission, would certainly help in comparing experiences Community-wide.

Uniform assessment throughout the Community, which would enable success rates in the Member States to be compared and a ranking of the most successful States to be established, is not in the interests of the Member States. Efforts in this direction must therefore be viewed critically; added to this, there are problems of technical feasibility and doubt about the need for this information. Seen against this background, the collection of indicators in databases, quite apart from the methodological difficulties involved, does not seem to bring any additional advantages in the organization of programmes.

This does not, however, preclude the idea of standardizing evaluation methods as an aim in itself; the Commission's assessment section is endeavouring to improve assessment of the Social Fund. The overarching view naturally leads to a comparative approach. The Member States are involved in this through the technical committee. From this synthesis of different experiences a theoretically high-quality evaluation system will emerge. Efforts are therefore being directed towards a common Community-wide approach, i.e. the implementation of this newly developed method. This standardization should not, however, be seen as an objective in its own right, but as a result of methodological progress. The introduction of new types of evaluation method, for example work with control groups, is dependent less on political will than on finding a convincing technical solution to the problems.
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