Evaluation of the support to promoting social inclusion, combatting poverty and any discrimination by the European Social Fund.

Introduction

The European Social Fund (ESF) is the European Union’s main instrument available in EU countries for promoting social inclusion, combating poverty and any discrimination, also referred as thematic Objective nine (TO9). TO9 is organised in the following six so-called investment priorities:

1. Active inclusion, including with a view to promoting equal opportunities and active participation, and improving employability;
2. Socio-economic integration of marginalized communities such as the Roma;
3. Combating all forms of discrimination and promoting equal opportunities;
4. Enhancing access to affordable, sustainable and high-quality services, including health care and social services of general interest;
5. Promoting social entrepreneurship and vocational integration in social enterprises and the social and solidarity economy in order to facilitate access to employment;

This public consultation is an integral part of the evaluation of ESF support to promote social inclusion, combat poverty and any discrimination (Thematic Objective 9). It seeks feedback from all stakeholders of the ESF in the EU countries, as well as from the wider public. The evaluation and the present consultation deal with the ESF support provided under all above listed investment priorities. For more information on this evaluation, follow the link below: https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/initiatives/ares-2018-6547571_en

The ESF’s mission also covers promoting sustainable and quality employment and supporting labour mobility, investing in education, training and vocational skills and life-long learning and enhancing institutional capacity of public authorities and stakeholders. For more information on the ESF, please follow the link below:
https://ec.europa.eu/esf/home.jsp?langId=en

Why this consultation?

The purpose of the evaluation is twofold. On the one hand, it aims at taking stock of the results of ESF operations for the period 2014-2018, thus contributing to the final stages of the current European Social Fund programmes dedicated to promoting social inclusion, combating poverty and any discrimination. On
the other hand, the results of the evaluation should feed into the next programming period, starting in 2021, by providing lessons on how and when the support proved to be more effective. The results of this public consultation will be analysed and summarised in a synopsis report which will be published on the website of DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion. The results will also be presented in the Staff Working Document of the evaluation of ESF support to promote social inclusion, combat poverty and any discrimination.

Who is invited to contribute to this consultation?
All citizens and organisations are invited to contribute to this consultation. Contributions are particularly sought from:

- Citizens whether or not they are receiving or have received support from the European Social Fund to promote social inclusion, combat poverty or any discrimination;
- Organisations involved in the delivery of European Social Fund such as managing authorities, intermediate bodies, project implementers, members of Monitoring Committees, etc…
- Any organization or citizen having a particular expertise in the area of social inclusion, poverty or discrimination.

About you

- Language of my contribution
  - Bulgarian
  - Croatian
  - Czech
  - Danish
  - Dutch
  - English
  - Estonian
  - Finnish
  - French
  - Gaelic
  - German
  - Greek
  - Hungarian
  - Italian
  - Latvian
  - Lithuanian
  - Maltese
  - Polish
  - Portuguese
  - Romanian
  - Slovak
  - Slovenian
  - Spanish
  - Swedish

- I am giving my contribution as
 Academic/research institution
 Business association
 Company/business organisation
 Consumer organisation
 EU citizen
 Environmental organisation
 Non-EU citizen
 Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
 Public authority
 Trade union
 Other

 **A: My age**
 - 24 years old or less
 - 25 to 54 years old
 - 55 to 64 years old
 - 65 years old or more

 **B: My gender**
 - Male
 - Female
 - Other
 - I do not want to answer

 **Publication privacy settings**

 The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

 - **Anonymous**
   Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

 - **Public**
   Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

 - I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

 **First name**

 Vania

 **Surname**

 Putatti

 **Email (this won't be published)**
v.putatti@eurohealthnet.eu

- **Organisation name**
  
  255 character(s) maximum

  EuroHealthNet

- **Organisation size**
  - Micro (1 to 9 employees)
  - Small (10 to 49 employees)
  - Medium (50 to 249 employees)
  - Large (250 or more)

**Transparency register number**

  255 character(s) maximum

  Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

  48562122691-12

- **Country of origin**
  
  Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

  - Afghanistan
  - Åland Islands
  - Albania
  - Algeria
  - American Samoa
  - Andorra
  - Angola
  - Anguilla
  - Antarctica
  - Antigua and Barbuda
  - Argentina
  - Armenia
  - Aruba
  - Australia
  - Austria
  - Djibouti
  - Dominica
  - Dominican Republic
  - Ecuador
  - Egypt
  - El Salvador
  - Equatorial Guinea
  - Eritrea
  - Estonia
  - Eswatini
  - Ethiopia
  - Falkland Islands
  - Fiji
  - Finland
  - Libya
  - Liechtenstein
  - Lithuania
  - Luxembourg
  - Macau
  - Madagascar
  - Malawi
  - Malaysia
  - Maldives
  - Mali
  - Malta
  - Marshall Islands
  - Martinique
  - Mauritania
  - Mauritius
  - Saint Martin
  - Saint Pierre and Miquelon
  - Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
  - Samoa
  - San Marino
  - São Tomé and Príncipe
  - Saudi Arabia
  - Senegal
  - Serbia
  - Seychelles
  - Sierra Leone
  - Singapore
  - Sint Maarten
  - Slovakia
  - Slovenia
• F: What is your organisation's field of work or expertise?
  □ Management of EU funds
  □ Information and awareness raising campaigns
  □ Advocacy groups
  □ Training or education
  □ Health care
  □ Social entreprises
  □ Community strengthening projects
  □ Labour market inclusion
  □ Social inclusion
  □ Other

F-1: If other, could you please describe?

1000 character(s) maximum
G: What is your role in the delivery of the European Social Fund?

- Managing Authority or Intermediate Body
- EU Funds Coordinating body
- Certifying or Audit Authority
- Member of an ESF Monitoring Committee
- Beneficiary - organisation or entity receiving ESF funding for the implementation of a project
- Civil society organisation or advocacy group
- Non-beneficiary entity receiving support from ESF actions
- No role

H: How familiar are you with the European Social Fund?

- I had never heard of it before this survey
- I have only a general idea of its scope and goal, and I do not know of any specific activity funded
- I have an idea of the goal and scope and I know at least one activity funded by the European Social Fund
- I am familiar with the European Social Fund
- I do not wish to answer

II-1: Your organisation knows about the ESF but does not play an active role in its delivery. What is the main reason for this?

- We are an institution or organisation that does not implement such projects
- We applied but did not receive any funding
- We do not have the capacity to implement ESF projects
- The call for projects were not relevant to our institution or organisation
- We did so in the past but feel it is too cumbersome or risky
- Other

II-2: What kind of support should be provided with ESF support to promote social inclusion, combat poverty and any discrimination?

- Actions aiming at placing a person in a job (including self-employment)
- Actions aiming at helping a person perform better in an existing job
Actions aiming at supporting and enabling participation in society (e.g. debt counselling, language training, soft skills, …)

Actions aiming at improving service delivery

Information and awareness raising campaigns (e.g. health issues, discrimination…)

Other

II-2-1: Could you please specify which other types of actions you would recommend?

Although it is difficult to quantify its results, the European Social Fund has played an important role in fostering employability across the EU. However, persistent disparities within and between countries/regions and certain groups, as well as high and rising in-work poverty rates suggest that the EU policy actions on employment need to be reviewed. Single focus on fragmented labour market policies and skills development are not enough to stabilise work and life conditions for all. To build a productive and resilient society, capable to adapt and withstand economic fluctuations, the ESF should be rooted in holistic approaches that integrate employment with other social inclusion policies, ensuring that no vulnerable groups are left behind. (Un)employment initiatives that reach out towards health and social protection services with an aim to improve health and well-being of people, give them equal opportunities to contribute to a society life-long are good investments.

II-3: Do you think these actions are being provided?

- Yes
- No
- I do not know / I do not wish to answer

II-4: Which target groups should be prioritized?

- Unemployed for 12 months or more
- Unemployed for less than 12 months
- Unemployed and not looking for a job
- People with low skills or low qualifications
- Part-time employed
- Self-employed
- Recipients of minimum income schemes
- Roma or other minorities
- People with a migrant or foreign background
- People with a disability
- People having a chronic health problem
- People requiring long-term care
- Single parents
- Other group(s)

II-4-1: Could you please specify which other target group(s) you have in mind?

Although it is difficult to quantify its results, the European Social Fund has played an important role in fostering employability across the EU. However, persistent disparities within and between countries/regions and certain groups, as well as high and rising in-work poverty rates suggest that the EU policy actions on employment need to be reviewed. Single focus on fragmented labour market policies and skills development are not enough to stabilise work and life conditions for all. To build a productive and resilient society, capable to adapt and withstand economic fluctuations, the ESF should be rooted in holistic approaches that integrate employment with other social inclusion policies, ensuring that no vulnerable groups are left behind. (Un)employment initiatives that reach out towards health and social protection services with an aim to improve health and well-being of people, give them equal opportunities to contribute to a society life-long are good investments.
Studies have shown that socio-economic inequalities are strongly linked to inequalities in opportunities for a healthy and prosperous life, having a detrimental impact on individual and population-wide health outcomes. Prolonged unemployment, ethnic minority or migrant background, being a single parent, chronically ill, disabled or in need of/providing long-term care, all lower one’s chances for good quality jobs, with a consequential lower resources to invest in health and wellbeing of yourself and your family. This may lead to further viscous cycle of poor health and poverty. Sub-optimal productivity and employability levels are thus widespread, all across the social gradient, with particularly high impact on the lowest socio-economic groups. This means that when addressing societal challenges, approaches should be horizontal, holistic and progressive within the society. Particular attention should certainly be given to vulnerable groups, as indicated above.

• II-5: Do you think these target groups are being reached?
  ○ Yes
  ○ No
  ○ I do not know / I do not wish to answer

II-6: In your opinion how effective are the following actions in promoting social inclusion and in combating poverty and discrimination?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Very useful</th>
<th>Mostly useful</th>
<th>Mostly useless</th>
<th>Not useful at all</th>
<th>I do not know / I do not wish to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information, guidance, tutoring in the search for a job</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives for employers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the job guidance and tutoring</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills assessment and recognition</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships, traineeships to learn a trade</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second chance education</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and education (including vocational training)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic skills training (e.g. social skills, IT, language)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to overcome barriers to job search actions (e.g. transport or childcare)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling (e.g. debt or health)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with care obligations (e.g. childcare, long-term care)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to people with disabilities (e.g. promotion of community-based care)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II-7: If we define cost-effectiveness as the fact that the resources invested were proportionate to the results achieved, to what extent do you agree or disagree that the following activities implemented with the European Social Fund are cost-effective?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>I strongly agree</th>
<th>I agree</th>
<th>I disagree</th>
<th>I strongly disagree</th>
<th>I do not know / I do not wish to answer</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in a situation of crisis (e.g. shelters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help in setting up a business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness raising and information campaigns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies and evaluations of existing institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural support for strengthening institutional capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information, guidance, tutoring in the search for a job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives for employers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the job guidance and tutoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills assessment and recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships, traineeships to learn a trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second chance education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and education (including vocational training)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic skills training (e.g. social skills, IT, language)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to overcome barriers to job search actions (f.i. transport, childcare)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling (e.g. debt, health).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with care obligations (e.g. childcare, long-term care)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to people with disabilities (e.g. promotion of community-based care)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in a situation of crisis (e.g. shelters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help in setting up a business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness raising and information campaigns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies and evaluations of existing institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural support for strengthening institutional capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II-8: Please explain briefly your answers to the question above**

*1000 character(s) maximum*

To Q-II6: Quality education is fundamental to build a cohesive society. Education has a positive life-long effect on health through increased employment opportunities and income, better living conditions and (digital /health) literacy. People with lower educational attainment have disproportionately higher rates of premature mortality, morbidity, and functional and cognitive limitations, making healthy and active ageing a difficult goal to achieve. Conversely, people with less and low-quality schooling are more likely to experience employment difficulties, (in-work) poverty and social exclusion, and receive insufficient and inadequate health support. Care obligations represent serious barriers to employability, and often increase gender inequalities. For instance, lack of or poor childcare services would hamper the likeliness to find a job or opportunity of career of parents as well as the quality of children development in early childhood and later stages of life.

**II-9: Is there anything you wish to add regarding the efficiency of the measures implemented by the European Social Fund to promote social inclusion, to combat poverty and to combat any discrimination?**

*1000 character(s) maximum*

While it is true that education and training are key for the personal development of individuals, these measures need to be part of a wider systemic integrated approach to enhance all their potential. Many other measures, such as availability of affordable housing and food, that are not listed above should be addressed to tackle poverty challenges via a holistic/integrated approach instead of focusing on specific labour market-oriented elements. In addition to this, just increasing employment rates does not mean reduction of poverty, as show by the high and increasing in-work poverty rate in Europe. More focus on quality jobs, psychosocial factors and jobs rights need to be done to reverse this trend.
II-10: Is there any good practice, example or experience regarding the efficiency of operations to promote social inclusion, or combat poverty or combat discrimination that you would like to share with the Commission?

**1000 character(s) maximum**

The Riga City Council carried out ‘We are for a healthy Riga!’, a 3.5 million euro European Social Fund programme. The main priority areas for the project were heart and cancer diseases, mental health, and the health of children starting from the perinatal periods – as ways of investing in health and wellbeing of local population that drives the economic and social development at the municipality level. As part of the project, Riga City Council Welfare Department implements large number of initiatives, providing citizens with an opportunity to visit around 600 free health promoting activities each month and reaching 3000 people monthly. The main target groups of the project are children, persons over 54, people with disabilities, unemployed people, and people from social groups at high risk. All activities are designed and delivered within community settings.

II-11: In your opinion, to what extent are European Social Fund actions promoting social inclusion combating poverty or combating discrimination coherent with other schemes?

![Table showing options for coherence](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>They complement or reinforce each other</th>
<th>They do the same</th>
<th>They are contradictory</th>
<th>They hinder each other</th>
<th>I do not know/I do not wish to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEAD</strong></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ERDF/CF</strong></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Erasmus+</strong></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>European Solidarity Corps</strong></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National, regional or local programmes</strong></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II-12: Please explain briefly your answers to the question above

**500 character(s) maximum**
II-13: Do you know of any other EU or national/regional scheme which is or should be coherent with EU support to promote social inclusion, or combat poverty or combat discrimination? If so, could you explain which one and how?

1000 character(s) maximum

EU School Fruit, Vegetables and Milk Scheme: subsidised fruit and vegetables, and diary products to schoolchildren should be offered across the social gradient with an attention given to regional/local inequalities, poverty and social exclusion indicators. By investing in healthy diets of children of school age, but also in Early Childhood Education and Care settings, lifelong health outcomes may be improved, leading to better educational and ultimately employment/wellbeing outcomes.

II-14 What is the benefit of having ESF interventions?

- More can be done than with national or local resources only
- New issues can be covered
- New ways of delivering services can be tested
- None. It do not think it really makes a difference
- Others
- I do not wish to answer / I do not know

Would you like to add any comments concerning ESF support to promote social inclusion, combat poverty and any discrimination?

1000 character(s) maximum
Evidence shows that at EU level countries allocate on average 25.6% of ESF funding to social inclusion (exceeding an earmarked 20% threshold). It seems, however, that such ‘social inclusion’ projects are still very much employment-focused (boost employment rates) rather than incorporating a broader inclusion approach. Beyond introducing focus on homelessness or transition to community-based care, not all Active Inclusion Recommendations have been explored in full. This should be mitigated to ensure that spending under certain earmarked percentage has an effective impact on individuals and communities in terms of reducing poverty and delivering social inclusion as contributing to better health, health equity and wellbeing. This would also ensure a substantiated support for a move to a holistic approach towards sustainable and resilient societies in Europe. It will be also essential in a context of a new EU Green Deal and design of a Just Transition Fund with most vulnerable in mind.

If you wish you may upload a file here:
(please make sure that no unintended personal information about yourself or others is included in the document, notably if you have opted for anonymity in your replies)

The maximum file size is 1 MB
Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

Thank you for your contribution

Contact
EMALE-G4-UNIT@ec.europa.eu