



COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels, 22.12.2000  
COM(2000) 863 final

**REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION**

**Final Report on the Implementation of the First Phase of the Community Action  
Programme Leonardo da Vinci (1995-1999)**

## **Table of Contents**

|            |                                                                           |
|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>1.</b>  | <b>LEONARDO DA VINCI AS THE INSTRUMENT FOR A EUROPEAN TRAINING POLICY</b> |
| <b>1.1</b> | <b>The policy context</b>                                                 |
| <b>1.2</b> | <b>Appraisal of the programme as a policy instrument</b>                  |
| <b>1.3</b> | <b>A new start under difficult conditions</b>                             |
| <b>1.4</b> | <b>New challenges</b>                                                     |
| <b>2.</b>  | <b>PROGRAMME DESIGN</b>                                                   |
| <b>2.1</b> | <b>Context</b>                                                            |
| <b>2.2</b> | <b>Assessment of programme design</b>                                     |
| <b>2.3</b> | <b>Action</b>                                                             |
| <b>3.</b>  | <b>COMPLEMENTARITY</b>                                                    |
| <b>3.1</b> | <b>Context</b>                                                            |
| <b>3.2</b> | <b>Assessment of programme complementarity</b>                            |
| <b>3.3</b> | <b>Action</b>                                                             |
| <b>4.</b>  | <b>MANAGEMENT</b>                                                         |
| <b>4.1</b> | <b>Context</b>                                                            |
| <b>4.2</b> | <b>Assessment of the programme management</b>                             |
| <b>4.3</b> | <b>Action</b>                                                             |
| <b>5.</b>  | <b>INPUTS/OUTPUTS AND DISSEMINATION</b>                                   |
| <b>5.1</b> | <b>Context</b>                                                            |
| <b>5.2</b> | <b>Assessment of inputs/outputs and dissemination</b>                     |
| <b>5.3</b> | <b>Action</b>                                                             |
| <b>6.</b>  | <b>IMPACT</b>                                                             |
| <b>6.1</b> | <b>Context</b>                                                            |
| <b>6.2</b> | <b>Assessment of impact</b>                                               |
| <b>6.3</b> | <b>Action</b>                                                             |
| <b>7.</b>  | <b>CONCLUSION</b>                                                         |
|            | <b>Annexes</b>                                                            |

## REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION

### Final Report on the Implementation of the First Phase of the Community Action Programme Leonardo da Vinci (1995-1999)

The legal base for this report is Article 10 § 4 of the Council Decision of 1994 (94/819/CE of 6 December 1994, see Official Journal No. L 340 of 29 December 1994)) - hereafter: the Decision. In this final report, the Commission puts forward a political appraisal of the programme and of the actions required to improve its delivery structured around the most salient thematic aspects. The assessments are based on a) the external evaluation report by the consulting firm Deloitte & Touche, b) the national reports of the Member States and the other countries participating in the programme, and c) the final reports from the Social Partners at European level (list of reports see annex I). This report is presented with a delay of some six months after the date indicated in the Decision because a majority of these external reports were themselves delayed.

## 1 LEONARDO DA VINCI AS THE INSTRUMENT FOR A EUROPEAN TRAINING POLICY

### 1.1 The policy context

The Leonardo da Vinci programme should be assessed in the context of the Community's vocational training policy. In the 1990's, the profile of vocational training was raised significantly as a crucial means of responding to accelerating economic and social change and promoting employment, social cohesion and competitiveness. The dynamic evolution of training policy was strongly influenced by the Commission's White Papers on "Growth, Competitiveness, Employment" (1993) and "Teaching and Learning - towards the learning society" (1995). Similarly, there was an increasing recognition of the importance of Lifelong Learning for knowledge, skills and competence, e.g. in the European Year of Lifelong Learning 1996, and of the key role of vocational training in improving employability and adaptability, as part of the developing European Employment Strategy.

This development of vocational training at Community level has been supported by successive policy initiatives. These have encouraged debate, co-operation and exchanges of experience on issues common to Member States which have acted as an important reference point for their vocational training policies. However, a practical base of transnational co-operation, innovation and exchange, was required to underpin this policy development. The Leonardo da Vinci programme (1995-1999) was adopted as and became the **principal instrument** for implementing a European training policy.

### 1.2 Appraisal of the programme as a policy instrument

An amalgam of several predecessor programmes, Leonardo da Vinci was the first integrated Community action programme for vocational training. The programme was adopted by the Council under Article 127 of the "Maastricht Treaty" which established that the Community shall implement a vocational training policy whilst excluding any harmonisation of the laws and regulations of the Member States.

In particular, one of the main characteristics and advantages of the programme has been its **transnationality**. Every project has had to encompass partners from at least two different

Member States. It is through this feature that the programme has had its greatest impact on training practice in Europe. In the course of its duration, the programme brought together over **77 000 partners** to work jointly on a common project idea. These partnerships have created the potential for stable networks of transnational co-operation and exchange of good practice.

The programme has gained a wide reputation for the promotion of transnational **mobility** allowing participants to gain a working or learning experience abroad. It has supported exchanges and placements for close to **127 000 people in training**. These experiences assisted young people in their personal development helping them to gain self-esteem, to improve their language skills, and to understand different cultures, work techniques and organisations. Evidence shows that their periods abroad also positively influenced their employability. In addition, the Council Decision on the “**Europass training**” instrument, a record of the professional experiences gained through a stay abroad, was directly based on results from Leonardo da Vinci projects. Similarly, the Green Paper on Mobility and other initiatives for improving opportunities in Europe for students and people in vocational training, largely grew out of Leonardo da Vinci exchanges.

The programme also became a “**laboratory of innovation and experimentation**”, for which pilot projects were the major instruments, helping project partners to work together across borders on a common idea and test it in practical terms. **Over 2 500 innovative, transnational pilot projects** produced a wealth of different products in form of new curricula, training modules, information material, handbooks, learning and working tools. One of the major challenges ahead is to disseminate the innovation encapsulated in these products. However, an even greater impact may have come from the ability of project partners to learn through transnational processes. This intercultural learning in the field of vocational training is a major step towards developing the framework of a “**Citizen’s Europe**”, where exchange of experiences and the pursuit of shared ideas will be commonplace.

The future **enlargement** of the European Union became another integral aspect of the programme. From 1997 on, pre-accession countries could participate under decisions of the respective Association Councils. By the end of 1999, 15 Member States, 3 EFTA countries of the European Economic Area and 11 pre-accession countries were participating in the programme, in all a total of 29 countries. There was a large demand for the programme on the part of the pre-accession states, and it is clear that the programme has been very valuable in helping these countries to prepare their vocational systems for accession.

The implementation of the programme has been the source of controversy and considerable criticism. Undoubtedly, the **complexity** of the programme's decision-making and management procedures, compounded by **difficulties** with the Technical Assistance Office (TAO), seriously hampered its implementation and the achievement of its objectives. Furthermore, this report has been prepared only one year after the first phase when the results of the projects are not yet fully available (particularly for the years 1998 and 1999). However, despite the constraints, there is already evidence that the programme has had a **wide impact** on vocational training throughout the Union.

Globally, therefore, Leonardo da Vinci has already contributed significantly to the overall development of vocational training policy and the definition of its priorities, particularly for the themes of mobility, transparency of qualifications, study and training periods, the promotion of employability and the use of information and communication technologies. This contribution will intensify with continuous disseminating of and capitalising on the results of completed projects.

### 1.3 A new start under difficult conditions

The first phase of the programme was marked by the temporary interruption of programme implementation in 1999. This occurred because the Commission did not renew its contract with the **Technical Assistance Office** (TAO) owing to its dissatisfaction with the latter's implementation of the contract. This was a difficult but necessary decision, which the Commission had to take in order to protect the credibility of the whole programme. All necessary steps were taken to ensure the completion of the projects concerned, and the Commission was successful in carrying through the programme procedures required for 1999.

During this period, it was decided by the legislative authority to establish a second programme phase. The discussions which formed part of the legal process confirmed that the programme was very important for the development of training policies at European level and in the Member States.

The establishment of the second phase is a major new opportunity to learn from past experiences. The programme's indicative financial envelope was increased from 620 million (for five years) to 1.15 billion (for seven years) with a greater emphasis on mobility. The duration was extended from 5 to 7 years in order to improve the programme's impact. The design was simplified by reducing the number of objectives from 19 to 3 and the measures from 23 to 5. The management function was rationalised by a larger degree of decentralisation and by a clearer definition of roles between the Commission and the national agencies. The Commission's co-ordinating and content-related policy responsibilities were thus strengthened while most of the project management will be performed at decentralised level. The Commission's own management procedures are now being simplified and in a drive to make the relevant processes and documentation more user-friendly and transparent.

### 1.4 New challenges

The conclusions of the **European Council of Lisbon** in March 2000 have given education and training a new impetus. The development of the Learning Society is now recognised as the means to achieve the strategic goal of a competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy which combines employment, economic growth and social cohesion.

Education and training systems are called upon to adapt both to the demands of the knowledge society and to the need for an improved level and quality of employment. The Lisbon conclusions set a series of targets and call for action in several themes relating to a European training policy, for example in relation to the development of e-Learning, local learning centres, new basic skills, and transparency of qualifications. In all of these fields, Leonardo da Vinci has an important role to play. The objectives for the second phase of the programme fully accord with the pillars of the Employment Strategy and thus the programme can contribute concretely to the promotion of employability, adaptability, entrepreneurship and equal opportunities. By concentrating on priority issues of common interest, the programme will complement the new open method of co-ordination foreseen by the Lisbon conclusions as the means of sharing best practice and helping Member States to improve their own policies.

On the basis of the Lisbon conclusions, the major challenge of European training policy is to contribute to the implementation of a comprehensive strategy of **Lifelong Learning** and the Commission is developing an overall framework for the future of education and training in Europe.

Through the experience and methods developed during the first phase of the programme, Leonardo da Vinci may now serve as a major instrument – working in co-operation with the Socrates programme, the Youth for Europe programme, and the European Social Fund – for the development and implementation of Lifelong Learning throughout the Union.

## **2. PROGRAMME DESIGN**

### **2.1 Context**

The first phase of Leonardo da Vinci (1995-1999) had specific predecessor programmes, which shaped its design:

- Comett I (1986-1989) and II (1990-1994) - promoting co-operation between universities and industry,
- Eurotecnet (1990-1994) - promoting innovation in training,
- Force (1991-1994) - developing continuing training,
- Petra I (1987-1991) and II (1990-1994) - for vocational training of young people,
- Lingua (1990-1994) - promoting language competence.

One of the challenges when shaping Leonardo da Vinci was to integrate these different programmes into one coherent frame in order to provide a better focus for the development of European training policy.

The programme pursued a range of **19 objectives**. These included the promotion of quality and innovation in national training systems, as well as the promotion of lifelong learning, training for disadvantaged target groups, access to training, language learning, equal opportunities in training, transparency of qualifications, open and distance learning, vocational guidance and co-operation between universities and industry.

From 1996 onwards, the Commission identified five political priorities in its annual call for proposals. This was intended to structure and focus the existing range of 19 objectives for the benefit of users and to direct the programme strategically towards political priority areas. These five priorities were based on the five main areas of action identified in the Commission white paper “Teaching and Learning – towards the learning society“ (1995). However, this attempt at restructuring was complicated by the fact that Member States could, in accordance with the Decision, issue their own national priorities for the decentralised programme measures, as was the case with the mobility actions.

The programme provided for **4 strands along with 23 different measures** (see annex II). The distribution of the total programme budget across the main measures was as follows (for more details see annex III):

| Types of measures                                   | Per cent of<br>Total programme budget |
|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Pilot projects (strands I and II)                   | 43                                    |
| Mobility (strands I, II and III)                    | 35                                    |
| Other (including strand III projects and strand IV) | 22                                    |

The programme pursued a “bottom-up-approach” by encouraging practitioners in the field to submit their project ideas following annual calls for proposals. An exception to that general practice was the measure “exchange of comparable data”, where the Commission followed a “top-down approach” to implement a statistical work programme. Applicants for funding had to be institutions/organisations (private individuals were not eligible) and were very broadly defined to include the various actors involved in vocational training. For transnational pilot projects, the Decision provided for a Community contribution in the form of co-financing up to 75 % of the total eligible cost for a duration of three years, with a maximum of 100 000 € per year and per project. For transnational mobility projects the maximum Community contribution was limited to 5 000 € per beneficiary and per exchange/placement.

The Decision provided for three selection procedures, two of which were under the responsibility of the Commission. **Under procedure I**, proposals were submitted to the participating states and evaluated by national experts and the Commission. **Under procedure II**, proposals were submitted to the Commission and evaluated with the help of external experts, and by the participating state. The proposals were selected in accordance with commonly established selection criteria. The Commission then adopted the final selection list, following bilateral discussions with each Member State and the opinion of the Leonardo da Vinci Committee. These procedures took up to seven months from the deadline for project proposal presentation (normally the end of March) to the establishment of the final selection list (normally in November). **The third procedure** applied to the decentralised mobility measures (I.1.2.a-c) for which the participating states were responsible.

For the first two procedures, the process of issuing contracts started after the selection. In many cases, particularly in the programme’s early years, this involved adapting the project’s original plan owing to the desire of Member States for a high number of projects. This necessitated reductions in individual project budgets which resulted in lower Community contributions to projects than foreseen by the applicants. Following completion of this process, a contract under private Belgian law was signed directly between each promoter and the Commission. The payments to these projects were executed by the Commission on approval of the interim and final „evaluation reports“ by the project promoters. For the decentralised mobility measures, contracting, payment and follow-up of the projects was carried out by the National Co-ordination Units in accordance with criteria established at Community level.

## 2.2 Assessment of programme design

From the external evaluation, national and Social Partner reports, it emerges that whereas the programme’s strengths lie in its broadness (in terms of objectives) and openness (to participation), the **complex design** is a clear impediment to its smooth implementation at project level. For many countries, the programme objectives were very **relevant to national**

**training policies**, strategies or adaptation needs. Some report that the calls for proposals were distinctly more open to participation than in comparable training-related programmes. It is said that many key players in the world of training have been attracted to participating as project partners. The visibility of the programme in the training world is generally considered satisfactory.

Many national reports consider the consolidation of the many predecessor programmes into one single programme a success although claiming that one consequence was a greater degree of complexity, which made implementation difficult. The external evaluators found that the potential promoters had difficulty in identifying the appropriate measures, strands or procedures for their projects, and concluded that the programme's design and intervention logic **lacked a user-focus**. Some reports, notably the external evaluation report, point to a lack of programme direction and an unclear ranking of objectives and priorities, which made implementation problematic.

The Commission, in its interim report of July 1997 (COM(97) 399 final), identified the advantages and disadvantages of the complex programme design as rooted in the Council Decision. On the positive side, the Decision reflected the diversity of training policies and practices in Europe, thereby generating greater interest and visibility in the training world. However, **the complexity of different priorities, strands, measures, and objectives resulted in difficulties for users and inhibited its potential to realise its original intentions**.

## 2.3 Action

**Simplification** of the programme delivery is one of the main principles underlying the logic of the new phase (2000-2006). The number of objectives has already been reduced from 19 to 3. Thus, the objectives and needs of vocational training in Europe are still the basis of the programme, but are now given a sharper focus. The programme measures have been reduced from 23 to 5, making it easier for project promoters to find the appropriate measure for their project idea. In order to offer more flexibility for pilot projects, the maximum Community contribution has been increased from 100 000 € to between 200 000 and 300 000 € per year and per project. **Flexibility has been enhanced** through introducing the possibility to grant Community funding of up to 100% for certain types of projects, allowing for a more targeted support. Also, examples of the types of organisations which may participate in the programme are now specifically mentioned in the Decision providing greater clarity for potential promoters. Hence, the programme has been optimised so that the advantages (broadness and openness) persist but the disadvantages (complexity) are reduced.

In future, the Commission will continue to improve the user-friendliness of the programme. Although the Commission originally proposed two different selection procedures for the second phase, the Council decided to keep all three procedures. The Commission will, within the limits of the Council decision, take steps to reduce the complexity of the selection and contracting procedures. Measures will continue to be taken to **limit the administrative burden** on the project partners, for example simplifying the application forms, the guides and the reporting requirements. To ensure easier participation, the Commission will launch a study based on a systematic analysis of the needs of special target groups, particularly enterprises and the Social Partners. Moreover, the Commission will continue to set political priorities in order to focus the programme objectives on the evolving needs of European training policy and the development of an overall framework for lifelong learning.



### 3. COMPLEMENTARITY

#### 3.1 Context

Leonardo da Vinci is the only integrated Community programme wholly dedicated to vocational training, although other Community and national programmes operate in the field of training from their particular perspectives. For example, the European Social Fund taking an employment perspective and the Socrates programme taking an education perspective, offer opportunities for mutual synergies with Leonardo da Vinci. During the first programme phase, Directorate-General XXII (Education, Training and Youth) consulted those Directorate-Generals in charge of associated training programmes on the final decision list of the Leonardo da Vinci, with the exception of the decentralised mobility projects. This consultation aimed to avoid double funding and to identify synergies between the selected projects of different programmes.

Obligatory transnationality was one of the main features distinguishing this programme from most of the actions under the European Social Fund. Another defining feature was that the programme did not support training provision, as such, except for experimental applications in the context of project development. Supporting mobility and innovation in the field of vocational training were also important characteristics of the programme.

**Complementarity between training-related programmes was impeded by the different levels at which these programmes are implemented.** For example, the European Social Fund is primarily managed at national/regional level, whereas the strand II mobility and pilot projects of Leonardo da Vinci were managed at central level. In some countries, the responsibility for training is shared between labour and education ministries, in others it is shared between the federal level and the regional level. Thus, achieving successful complementarity requires close interaction between the different levels.

#### 3.2 Assessment of programme complementarity

The external evaluator criticised the absence of a well planned and thoughtful approach to a complementary European-level contribution to policy-making. He concluded that implementing complementarity with other training-related Community and/or national programmes posed difficulties and that opportunities for synergies were lost. It was found that the different training-related EU programmes tend to operate in parallel rather than in an integrated fashion. At the European level, and in terms of strategic relationships between the human resource development programmes, internal Commission structures, time pressures on officials and the sheer administrative weight of managing the programmes reduced the capacity to engage in interdepartmental collaboration.

Moreover, the external evaluator also stressed the lack of complementarity at national level. Some national reports concluded that the extent of complementarity with other provisions (EU or national) appears generally limited, and opportunities may have been missed for achieving greater linkages between programmes.

However, many reports mention that there was **no evidence of a significant overlap** between individual projects. This suggests that, despite inadequate synergies on a programme level, project promoters were quite sophisticated in selecting appropriate funding mechanisms for their project idea. This accords with the finding reported by some countries that double funding is largely avoided at project level.

The Commission recognises that despite its concern to strengthen complementarity, implementation of this principle remained difficult. Different programmes, measures, initiatives and, in particular project selection, take place at different levels under different responsibilities and using a variety of mechanisms. The resulting lack of complementarity therefore reflects the difficult interaction between these levels. The Commission welcomes those cases where synergies could be triggered for both national and Community levels, e.g. the linking of the Leonardo da Vinci mobility measure with the Danish national mobility programme.

### 3.3 Action

The Commission will continue to develop appropriate ways and means to enhance complementarity both on a policy and on a practical level. From a policy point of view, the second programme phase will assist the evolution of a “Europe of Knowledge” through closer co-operation with the Community education and youth programmes, Socrates and Youth for Europe. On a practical level, the **joint actions** between these programmes, as foreseen in the Decision, will contribute to the accomplishment of that goal. On the political plane again, complementarity with the 5<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme for Research will seek to build on this programme’s efforts to improve the knowledge base in Europe. Moreover, the three objectives for the second phase of Leonardo da Vinci focus on the **link between training and employment**, highlighting the co-operation between European training policy and employment strategy. In practical terms, synergies could be fostered between Leonardo da Vinci pilot and mobility projects, and those projects funded under new the objective 3 of the European Social Fund.

**The multiplicity of different training provisions in many Community programmes demands a more strategic approach** in order to make efficient use of public funds. The Commission is committed to developing a comprehensive policy framework based on Lifelong Learning for the principal Community training initiatives at all levels. In addition, the setting of priorities, the selection of projects and the dissemination of innovation and best practice will be **co-ordinated using practical measures** to avoid duplication, provide promoters with a coherent package of Community support, and, most importantly, to allow an effective accumulation of the effects of several programmes.

## 4. MANAGEMENT

### 4.1 Context

#### *Programme Management at National Level*

The decentralised parts of the programme were managed at a national level by National Co-ordination Units (NCUs). Beyond managing the projects under the decentralised mobility measure (about ca. 20 % of the budgetary funds), and organising the evaluation of proposals for projects under the other measures, the NCUs also provided information for the wider public and advice for all projects selected. They were established within the participating countries by the competent national authorities, i.e. in most cases the national education and/or labour ministries. Their status varied from private or semi-private organisations to ministries or interministerial units. Single NCUs existed only in 7 Member States and in most of the pre-accession countries, while other countries had several NCUs - some according to functional responsibility by strand, others according to geographical areas. A few NCUs managed several Community programmes. Although the NCUs were selected by the

competent national authorities, the contractual relationship was directly between the NCUs and the Commission. Community co-funding for the NCUs was initially between 30% and 60 % depending on the country and finally converged around 50 %. The NCUs (EUR-18) received ca. 47.2 Mio. € of Community contribution..

### *Programme Management at Community Level*

At Community level, the programme was managed by the Commission, (Directorate-General XXII :Education, Training and Youth). As the contractual follow-up of most of the projects (close to 80 % of the budgetary funds) had to be managed at centralised level, the Commission's policy was to externalise certain technical assistance functions.

#### The Technical Assistance Office

Following an open call for tender, the Commission selected **Agenor**, a private company registered under Belgian law, to be the "Technical Assistance Office" (TAO) for the programme. The major shareholder of Agenor was the French organisation CESI, acting through its associates SECOF and RESOURCES SA. The other shareholders were: DIHT (Deutscher Industrie- und Handelstag) of Germany, AIFPI (Association Interentreprise pour la Formation Professionnelle Industrielle) of Greece (until 1997), FPE (Fondo de promocion de empleo-sector construccion naval) of Spain, Sistemi Formativi Confindustria of Italy and LO Danish Confederation of Trade Unions (from 1997).

The Commission and the TAO signed a five-year service contract (01/06/1995 to 31/05/2001) renewable annually. The cost of the contract was 9.1 Mio. € for 1995/1996, decreasing gradually each year to 5.9 Mio. € for 1998/1999. In all 30.3 Mio. € was spent for the TAO from administrative appropriations (part A of the Community budget). **The Commission decided not to renew the contract in early 1999 because of unsatisfactory management, organisation and control in the TAO.** As a result, the support tasks were taken over by the Commission. A "Cellule Leonardo da Vinci (CLEO)" with a staff of ca. 65, (mostly from the former TAO and some delegated from the Member States plus some new staff), was established and organisationally attached to a unit of DG XXII.

In the external evaluation, national and Social Partner reports, the **TAO received generally unsatisfactory remarks**. Some of the project promoters surveyed felt that the TAO did not give adequate support to the implementation of their projects, but acted instead as a control body. Other promoters criticised the TAO for excessive bureaucracy and centralisation, lack of clarity in management, lack of support for projects, and lack of clarity in the quality criteria for analysing proposals. For the external evaluator, much of the TAO's dysfunction resulted from restrictive requirements in the Commission's general contracting and externalisation policy: "In response to a need to adhere closely to initial requirements, defined before full knowledge of the situation was possible, external contractors are not able to be as flexible as necessary in the execution of contract. This situation is not in any way unique to the Leonardo TAO, but does illustrate a contradiction in attempting to gain additional flexibility by externalising work, but then constraining it such that the potential is lost. The initial mandate of the TAO also reflects **a certain lack of clarity in terms of boundaries of responsibility between the Commission and the TAO**, particularly as concerns the policy aspect of the programme". In addition, the external evaluator judged the contractual management fee of 100 000 € per annum for Agenor as small and highly unusual in the world of private business considering that the TAO had to manage ca. 100 Mio. € per year.

The discontinuation of the TAO caused delays in processing current project contracts. From

February to October 1999, crucial information on projects was unavailable to the Commission because it was under the control of the Belgian judicial authorities. To put the payment delays into perspective, however, it should be noted that the advance payments were generally executed swiftly and the delays only concerned the second and final payments of projects selected from 1995 to 1997. Nevertheless, DG XXII took all necessary steps to ensure the continuation of the projects (namely the creation of the CLEO) and to ensure that the programme could be properly completed.

The Decision provided for a Leonardo da Vinci Committee chaired by the Commission and composed of two representatives from each Member State, normally government officials from federal or regional ministries. Representatives from the Social Partners participated as observers. The function of the Committee was to assist the Commission in implementing the programme, occasionally with the help of subcommittees. The Committee was an advisory body delivering opinions on measures to be taken by the Commission and, at the same time, in accordance with the Decision, a management Committee with voting power.

## **4.2 Assessment of the programme management**

### *Programme Management at National Level*

According to almost all national reports, programme management performed by the National Co-ordination Units (NCUs) was considered satisfactory. The external evaluators found an adequate level of satisfaction with the support provided by the NCUs among the sampled project promoters. Project promoters generally judged their national **NCU as fast, efficient and helpful**. However, some revealed certain difficulties: in Germany, although the co-operation between the several national NCUs and the projects functioned well, a concentration of three or four instead of seven NCUs would have been more helpful. The Spanish agency received a good assessment from promoters but is more strongly criticised by the national programme authorities and experts, who, for example, believe that the NCU took on functions beyond their remit.

The Commission considers that programme management at national level was generally efficient. The NCUs, on the whole, fulfilled their tasks vis-à-vis the projects and their contractual obligations vis-à-vis the Commission. The proximity of the NCUs to the promoters contributed to this positive performance. On a less positive note, national reports were not always submitted in time, for example the national evaluation reports on which the present Commission report is based. Also some NCUs, especially in the first programme years, had difficulties in implementing the mobility activities. In summary however, good working relations existed between the NCUs, the national authorities and the Commission. The Commission welcomes the fact that, after the closure of the TAO, several countries pre-financed projects and offered their assistance to the central management.

### *Programme Management at Community Level*

The external evaluation and many of the national and Social Partner reports criticise an **excessive bureaucracy at the European level**. The most commonly mentioned complaints of project participants focused on the volume of paperwork required. Some reports mention the frequent changes in requirements introduced by the Commission, sometimes announcing them after long delays, and sometimes not communicating them at all. The external evaluator concluded that the programme objectives were lost from sight, and were substituted by an

over-emphasis on procedures and the administrative process. The gravest concern amongst all programme stakeholders was aroused by the delay in payment to the projects. Payment requests from projects had to be dealt with by three separate entities: first by the TAO (later by the CLEO), then by the financial services in DG XXII and finally by DG Financial Control. This process, as the external evaluator concluded, was extremely long, even without the additional delays caused by the investigations into the TAO.

The Commission is aware of the difficulties with the programme management at European level. The complex internal and external procedures, as well as the paperwork required arise from the role that the Commission plays in the management and control of European funds. In contrast to the criticisms of bureaucratisation mentioned above, the other European institutions (Parliament, Council, Court of Auditors), the Member States (finance ministries and audit bodies), and, not least, **public opinion, call upon the Commission to impose even stricter controls in order to reduce any risk of improper use of European public money.** These control, evaluation and monitoring functions of the Commission required, in particular, a certain amount of paperwork from the projects. On the other hand, the Commission acknowledges that the sound use of public money has to be seen not only in terms of strict control mechanisms but also in terms of achieving programme objectives. The balance between the need for control and for the effective achievement of programme objectives may not have been optimal during the first programme phase.

It should also be noted that the external evaluation judged the performance of the Leonardo da Vinci Committee as weak: "We encounter much criticism of the Committee for its narrow focus on the issue of distribution of programme resources between the Member States, rather than playing a useful role in guiding the programme in terms of thematic focus, linkages with other activities and so on".

The Commission considers that the Committee may have focussed overly on administrative and financial matters. The Committee, with its government representatives as members and Social Partner as observers, has the potential to play a wider role, in particular through contributing expert input to programme implementation. Some discussion on the objectives and strategy of programme implementation did take place, but it was difficult to find room on the agenda of the Committee because of the number of administrative and financial questions to be discussed.

### **4.3 Action**

#### *Programme Management at National Level*

On the initiative of the Commission, many of the programme management functions have been decentralised to national agencies for the second programme phase. The Commission's concern has been to bring these functions closer to the actors and practitioners of training in the field. Around 80 % of the programme funds are now managed by the national agencies. The different responsibilities between these agencies and the Commission have been defined in a new standard contract. Consequently, the responsibility of the decentralised level for administering and following-up projects has been strengthened whilst the overall political responsibility clearly remains with the Community. In addition, the Commission has reminded Member States to submit the necessary national reports in a more timely manner.

#### *Programme management at Community level*

For the second programme phase, the Commission has taken several measures to improve the delivery of the programme at the central level. **The general principles of these improvements are simplification, user-friendliness and transparency.** Based on the experiences from the first programme phase, the Commission developed, in particular, an administrative and financial handbook to assist the project promoters of Leonardo da Vinci in making their applications and to guide them through the life of their projects. Transparency has been enhanced by presenting all relevant documentation for project promoters on a multilingual Commission web site, before the launch of the second phase.

The circumstances surrounding the discontinuation of the Leonardo da Vinci TAO had an effect on the Commission's policy to externalise assistance functions. New guidelines for externalisation have been developed, which take into account a clearer definition of the tasks and responsibilities of external assistance organisations.

In the second programme phase, only ca. 20 % of the total budget is managed centrally. This will enable the Commission to make better use of the available management resources. For example, the Commission will devise and implement permanent monitoring mechanisms for the second phase. In order to strike an optimal balance between control, management and content-related functions, the Commission has established a clearer definition of its role and responsibilities vis-à-vis Member States and the national agencies.

## **5. INPUTS/OUTPUTS AND DISSEMINATION**

### **5.1 Context**

#### *Inputs*

**Community funds:** The overall appropriations for the programme under part B of the Community budget (line B3-1021) totalled around 727 Mio. € for the five years, including the contribution for the three participating EFTA-EEA countries.

In addition to this 727 Mio. € from budget line B3-1021, the following should be added:

- 30.3 Mio. € for the TAO (part A of the Community budget),
- 30.5 Mio. € as operational costs for the participation of pre-accession countries coming from the Phare programme (including 2.7 Mio. € Community contribution for the NCUs in the these countries),
- 6.0 Mio. € for the study visits (strand III.3.b, which is funded by the Cedefop agency through its subsidy from the Commission),

In total, therefore, Community funds for the programme amounted to 793.8 Mio. €.

In this context, three aspects are worth noting. Firstly, the programme received a higher allocation than the 620 Mio. € foreseen in the Decision because the Budgetary Authority granted higher annual appropriations for the programme than this indicative figure, which highlights the importance attached to European vocational training. Secondly, with ca. 794 Mio. € Leonardo da Vinci was a medium size Community programme, compared, for example, to the European Social Fund (57 191 Mio. € for 1994-1999). Thirdly, the overall Community contribution to programme management, information and networking services provided by the management structures amounted to 80.2 Mio. € (47.2 Mio. € for the NCUs

in the EUR-18, ca. 2.7 Mio. € for the NCUs in the pre-accession countries, and 30.3 Mio. € for the TAO), which, compared with the total Community contribution of 793.8 Mio. €, represents about 10 %.

**National and project partner funds:** In order to have the full picture on the inputs, other sources of funding must be added to the above Community contribution, namely

- own funds of the Member States (EUR-18) allocated to the NCUs, estimated at 47.2 Mio. € (because of 50 % co-funding),
- operational costs for the participation of pre-accession countries coming from their national budgets and attributed to the Community amounting to some 22.6 Mio. €,
- own contractual funds of project partners from all participating countries amounting to 283 Mio. € (not included measures I.1.2.a-c, III.3.b and strand IV).

In total, national and project partner funds are estimated at ca. 353 Mio. €.

For more details on the budgetary input see annexes III and IV.

### Outputs

The majority of the budget allocation went to transnational mobility and pilot projects:

#### Transnational mobility:

| Type of mobility<br>(strand – level of management)<br>type of beneficiaries                                                                                                                                               | Number of<br>Projects | Number of<br>Beneficiaries                               | EC<br>Financing<br>(in Mio. €) |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Initial &amp; continuing vocational training</b><br>(strands I.1.2.a-c – managed by the NCU)<br>young people in initial training<br><br>young workers/young people on the labour market<br><br>Instructors or trainers | <b>6 516*</b>         | <b>83 300*</b><br><br>51 000<br><br>21 500<br><br>10 800 | <b>162.5</b>                   |
| <b>Universities/enterprise</b><br>(strand II.1.2.a-c – managed by the Commission)<br>young people in university training – young graduates – university or enterprise staff – staff in Social Partner organisations       | <b>845</b>            | <b>40 600</b>                                            | <b>105.1</b>                   |
| <b>Linguistic mobility</b><br>(strand III.1.b – managed by the Commission)<br>language instructors or tutors in enterprises and language institutes                                                                       | <b>13</b>             | <b>200</b>                                               | <b>1.0</b>                     |
| <b>Study visits</b><br>(strand III.3.b – managed by Cedefop)<br>training specialists from trade unions, employer organisations, research and training institutions as well as public services                             | Not<br>Applicable     | <b>3 200</b>                                             | <b>6.0</b>                     |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                              | <b>7 351</b>          | <b>127 300</b>                                           | <b>274.6</b>                   |

Source: calculations by DG Education and Culture based on figures from the contracts with project promoters.

\* For 1995 & 1996: based on the final reports, for 1997 & 1998: based on the interim reports, for 1999: estimations based on the operational plans

**Transnational pilot projects:** The programme supported **2 569 transnational pilot projects**. All of these projects were “product-oriented”, i.e. the intention was to produce tangible results in the form of innovation and quality oriented curricula, training modules, web-sites, CD-ROMs, etc., so at least an equal number of concrete results or products is available or will be available when the projects end.

**Other Outputs:** In addition, the programme supported

- **194 pilot projects in language training** (strand III.1.a),
- **175 surveys and analyses projects** (strand III.2.a),
- **20 statistical projects** intended to developing the exchange of comparable data on training (strand III.2.b) and
- **282 multiplier-effect projects** specifically intended for the dissemination of innovation in training (strand III.3.a).

The Community also supported a large number of accompanying measures related to the programme (strand IV). Besides funding the National Co-ordination Units, the Community supported the National Resource Centres for Vocational Guidance and Orientation, information activities (several hundred conferences, seminars, workshops, videos, two product fairs, the annual Contact and Information Days with over a thousand participants, a number of programme brochures, project compendia, and data bases) as well as evaluation and monitoring activities (e.g. the mid-term and final programme evaluation reports, the capitalisation and active monitoring activities).

All strands taken together, an estimated **77 000 partner organisations** have been involved in the various transnational projects supported by the programme. The **rate of acceptance** of proposals was, all strands and years taken together, around 30 % of all projects submitted. In this sense, the demand for the programme was consistently higher than the offer.

It must be noted that, at the time this report was adopted by the Commission, a large number of projects had not been concluded. This is mainly due to the fact that many 18 –24 month pilot projects selected in 1998 and 1999 will not finish before mid to end 2001. Therefore, a final description of all the outputs cannot be presented at this point in time. (For more details on outputs by strands and countries see annexes V to VI.)

### *Dissemination of Outputs*

The Commission launched several initiatives to disseminate results: for example, the annual publication of a compendium (catalogue of projects) in print and electronic formats for 1995/96/97, the two “Training 2000” product fairs of 1996 and 1998, the 16 active monitoring seminars organised between 1997 and 1999, the setting up of a “multimedia centre” in the Technical Assistance Office and the “capitalisation” exercise. Moreover, the Commission allocated 32.3 Mio € to 282 “multiplier effect” projects of strand III.3.a. aimed at transferring the results of initial projects into new products. In 1998, the Commission started the development of a more strategic approach in co-operation with the National Co-ordination Units.



## 5.2 Assessment of Inputs/Outputs and Dissemination

The external evaluation, national and Social Partner reports all consider dissemination of the programme outputs to be a crucial issue. At programme level, the distribution of results outside of the projects is a prerequisite for ensuring and measuring impact. At project level, dissemination obliges the partners to go beyond their projects and think in terms of the wider training environment.

However, it is generally felt that **dissemination should have been given more attention in the planning and implementation of the programme at different levels**. Many reports point out that the lack of development of a coherent strategy at Community level posed difficulties. Nevertheless, the Commission dissemination initiatives received a positive assessment in some reports.

At national level, the assessment of the dissemination activities differ. For example, in Spain, despite some NCU initiatives, dissemination is said to be poor and inefficient because of a lack of technical capacity, interest, and a national strategy. On the other hand, two thirds of the Austrian promoters surveyed regard dissemination at national level as having been successful. The German NCUs are said to have identified the need, launched some initiatives, but never developed a systematic approach.

At project level, dissemination is said to have been limited for several reasons: no interest in sharing results with competitors, results difficult to transfer to a general format, no experience with media, dissemination budget often inadequate, lack of motivation once the project is finalised.

The Commission stresses the importance of dissemination and **acknowledges that dissemination efforts at all levels need to be reinforced**. The Commission points to the constraints on dissemination in the first programme phase. For example, final results of the many three-year projects that started in early 1996 (1995 call for proposal) were only available in early 1999. Moreover, access to interim project results could have been improved and the discontinuation of the TAO made access to product data impossible for some time.

As regards the national level, a lack of continuity prevented dissemination from being really successful. The “capitalisation” exercise, launched by the Commission in 1998 and due to finish in 2000, was irregularly followed up by the NCUs responsible for its organisation and did not bring the expected results. At project level, the Commission recognises that dissemination should have been compulsory rather than merely recommended to promoters on a voluntary basis.

## 5.3 Action

For the second phase, a fresh start has been made. The Commission has presented a dissemination and capitalisation action plan for 2000, in co-operation with the national agencies, which was approved by the Leonardo da Vinci Committee. In the future, **the Commission will devise and implement a coherent strategy in partnership with the participating states**. The main elements of this strategy will be: knowledge management, product quality, criteria for identifying innovation and best practice as well as support for dissemination networks. Cedefop and the European Training Foundation will be asked to assist in the dissemination activities.

The Commission will also develop instruments, together with the national agencies, to follow-up the evolution of projects. This follow-up will avoid imposing additional bureaucratic demands on the projects. The aim is to ensure quality, improve dissemination and capitalise on results from the first project phase onwards.

Finally, the Commission will develop a product database on the Internet which reflects the interests and needs of various user categories (experts, projects, beneficiaries, public). The Commission will also develop a database of good quality innovative products in education and training, resulting from an impact analysis of the programme. This data base will be the first step towards a more systematic observation of innovation in vocational training at Community level.

## **6. IMPACT**

### **6.1 Context**

Impact here is defined as the longer-term effects of the outputs on various groups and areas in vocational training. What did the programme achieve in terms of its own general and specific goals? The answer to this question is a necessary pre-requisite for decision-makers and programme managers to optimise the delivery and continuation of the programme.

However, the constraints of an analysis of impact are obvious. As regards many of the longer-term effects, it may be too early to assess the accomplishments of the programme, especially in the field of training where developments accelerated considerably in recent years with the advent of new technologies and global challenges. Measuring accomplishments in terms of meeting objectives is also difficult when, as in the case of the first phase of Leonardo da Vinci, the objectives are numerous, overlapping or not quantifiable. Finally, the question of accomplishment relates to the available budgetary means which quite naturally limits the scope of impact.

### **6.2 Assessment of impact**

#### *Impact on the Internationalisation of Training Institutions and Practices*

**According to the external evaluation, and the national and Social Partner reports, the largest and most valuable impact of the first programme phase was generated among participants and organisations directly involved in the programme and on the immediate surroundings of these projects.** This impact mainly concerns the internationalisation of training institutions, which also helped to raise the profile of vocational training institutions. The concept of innovation was understood by many project promoters as adding a European dimension or transnational co-operation to vocational training. Trade union project participants found that the programme contributed to their learning from other countries in terms of innovation and quality. The impact on learning in terms of processes, such as developing transnational co-operation into networks and partnerships, is particularly mentioned as a positive impact by many reports. At the level of the content of vocational training, the programme had an impact on modularization, on language learning and on using new technologies in training.

The mobility strands are assessed as having the highest impact of all measures and as having a very positive impact on the individual beneficiaries. Almost all reports see the impact of transnational mobility in delivering new social and intercultural skills, improving personal self-esteem, entering the labour market and becoming familiar with new ways of working.

There are numerous examples of the positive working and learning experiences of people who received a Leonardo da Vinci grant for a stay abroad. Some reports mention a very valuable longer-term positive impact of mobility on the quality of training through the experiences gained by participants, thus increasing the demand for mobility.

The Commission welcomes such strong evidence of the valuable impact of the programme on projects, training practices and, especially, participants in mobility projects. In these respects the programme was evidently successful. Clearly, the programme was able to add a European dimension to those directly involved in the projects and to the environment of these projects.

**Participating in pilot projects had an impact on learning in transnational co-operation processes, whilst participating in mobility projects generated intercultural learning and working experiences for young Europeans.** This success stems from the consistent approach to transnationality which the programme pursued. These areas of impact show that the programme contributed to the development of European citizenship.

#### *Impact on National Training Systems*

The reports from Member States generally find that, for the most part, it is **too early** to ascertain the programme's impact on national training systems. It is reported that little or no reference is yet made to the programme in government publications, that it had low visible, direct influence on government measures, policy, statements, law or regulations. This is attributed to the fact that many projects are not yet finished or their products not yet disseminated. This view is also shared by the external evaluator, for whom an impact on the systems level is not yet discernible. For some countries, the impact on the domestic training system has been low as yet, because the programme budget was too small, the programme objectives too exaggerated and dissemination of outputs unsatisfactory.

However, **for the pre-accession countries a clear impact at system level was visible.** In their reports, they generally described the programme as making an impact, especially on the modernisation of their training systems, and as a valuable contribution, even of prime importance, in helping in their accession process. In Romania, for example, the programme was explicitly associated with the reform of initial vocational training and with recent draft legislation on continuing training. In the same context, the external evaluator termed the programme a **"catalyst for change"** in the transformation of their economic systems.

The Commission is aware that the impact of the programme on the development of training systems in Member States cannot be fully evaluated at this point in time. This is due to the short time period between the end of the programme and this final report. Also, the fact that the Community has only a supporting role vis-à-vis Member States' often very complex training systems made the impact at that level difficult to achieve. Finally, the question could be raised whether or not the aim of systems change may have been too ambitious for the programme budget. However, the Commission welcomes the relatively high impact on training systems in pre-accession countries. In addition to the programme activities themselves, the exposure of authorities and decision-makers in these countries to the programme, to which the European Training Foundation also contributed, had an effect on the training systems still in transformation, in particular by underscoring the importance of the European dimension in training and introducing the programme's objectives to the national agendas.

### *Impact on Improving Employment Opportunities*

This area of impact corresponds to priority 1 of the annual calls for proposals. Many of the external evaluation, national and Social Partner reports state that the programme's impact on this priority has been notable. The German report makes reference to surveys undertaken among participants of 1995 Leonardo mobility programmes in Germany: the ratio of non-employed to employed was 31:69 before and improved to 10:90 after the exchange. In Denmark, 70 % of organisations arranging placements for young workers stated that job prospects were considerably improved.

The Commission welcomes the evidence of a notable impact on accomplishing the goals of priority 1, in particular the **positive effect on improving the employability of participants in mobility projects**. Furthermore, the Council decision establishing the "Europass" record of stay abroad was based on experiences from Leonardo da Vinci projects. The database for the European Network of National Resource Centres for Vocational Guidance and Orientation also originated from a Leonardo da Vinci pilot project. This impact in the area of improving employability is especially useful for developing further synergies with the Employment Strategy and the European Social Fund.

### *Impact on Linking Training and Enterprises More Closely*

This area of impact corresponds to priority 2 of the annual calls for proposals. The European employers conclude that, with the exception of an initial phase, the programme fundamentally failed to address companies, both public and private. Enterprises, especially SMEs, are said to have been deterred by the high administrative burden and the complexity of the programme. On the other hand, the European employers also conclude that the programme made it possible to experiment, often in several regions, with new partnership arrangements between employers, training and retraining structures: "the quest for innovation remains an important function for which the programme is virtually a unique ambassador".

The Commission recognises that participation of enterprises, especially SMEs, outside the world of training needs to be improved. However, the mobility measure already allow a large number of enterprises and training institutions to co-operate more closely in the organisation of transnational placements.

### *Impact on Combating Exclusion, Investing in Human Capital, and Access to Lifelong Learning*

These areas of impact correspond to priorities 3, 4 and 5 of the annual call for proposals. In the reports, the impact on these three areas is assessed as low. The number of projects submitted under these priorities were, over the years, consistently the lowest of the five priorities. When there was impact, it was through the quality of individual projects.

One of the reasons for this low impact may have been that the programme was in competition with other Community and national programmes or initiatives, which were more specifically targeted at these themes. The Commission regrets that the emphasis on the themes of investment in human resources and of lifelong learning, which have become focal points in the development of training in Europe, did not generate the expected number of projects.

### *Impact on the Social Dialogue*

The European trade unions report that only half of the experts and project promoters from trade unions who were surveyed responded that the results, products or outcome of projects

were subject to dialogue between the Social Partners at the national level. Moreover, the European trade unions report that the degree and nature of trade union involvement in the programme procedures was mostly inadequate, because “in most of the NCUs, the Social Partners had no full possibilities of co-management. In most cases decisions were made within the structures of national governments, where only weak consultation possibilities existed”. This is seen by the European trade unions as **evidence of a generally weak impact of the programme on the Social Dialogue**.

However, through its political and financial support for Social Dialogue the Commission has provided a useful platform for developing the Social Partner involvement in the programme. Likewise, the participation of Social Partner observers in the Leonardo da Vinci Committee has been positive for all programme stakeholders. However, the Commission would welcome a stronger involvement of Social Partners in the programme delivery at national level.

#### *Impact on Equal Opportunities*

The external evaluation states that the impact on equal opportunities was impossible to establish because the **number of specific pilot projects was very low**. However, some national reports find that the participation of women in mobility projects was slightly above 50 %.

#### *Impact on Developing Knowledge in Vocational Training*

The external evaluation concludes that the results of the strand “exchange of comparable data” (III.2.b) are **“impressive and useful” for only a modest financial outlay**. A key player in European statistics is cited as saying: “most of the data available now is there because of Leonardo’s contribution”. This measure was fully managed at Community level (following a call for tenders) on the basis of a detailed work programme agreed with the Leonardo da Vinci Committee.

### **6.3 Action**

These assessments on the impact of the programme demand a multifaceted approach to optimise the successes and reduce the weaknesses. In order to build on the successful impact on the internationalisation of training institutions and practices as well as on participants in mobility actions, the second phase Decision foresees an enhanced budget for pilot projects and mobility. The simplification in the programme design and delivery will help to concentrate and exploit the advantages of transnationality. Indeed, **for the second phase, the obligation of transnationality has been strengthened** such that now a minimum of three (instead of two) foreign partners are necessary for a pilot project. This heightened transnationality requires more assistance to the projects, which will be delivered by the national agencies, who are closer to the players in the field, and by the Commission, whose co-ordinating functions will be enhanced.

In order to improve the impact on a systems level, **the Commission has started to build upon the programme results and to make them available to national decision-makers**. For the second programme phase, improving the impact on systems level will be developed within the framework of structured and strategic dissemination activities.

With a view to capitalising on the results that have been achieved, the Commission will prepare a document entitled “Building on and developing the products of Leonardo da Vinci I”. In this document, best products will be identified and analysed in relation to their potential

for development and exploitation within contexts which are as broad and varied as possible. The Commission proposes to label a certain percentage of them as “**model products**”, endowing them with a quality guarantee. The document will put forward recommendations and concrete proposals to implement the experiences drawn from the developments within different vocational training systems, the practices of enterprises and other organisations, and wider society.

To facilitate the analysis of the achievement of objectives, the Commission will consider the development of quantifiable programme objectives for the implementation of the second programme phase. This development would have to take into account the experimental character of the programme.

The varied assessment on the different areas of programme activity has clearly shown the **necessity to focus the programme as a whole on a comprehensive framework**. Such a framework will be provided for the delivery of the second phase and beyond by the development of a European lifelong learning strategy. Consequently, the Commission will prioritise the specific programme objectives in future calls for proposals within an overall training policy framework provided by this strategy. This focus should also help to increase the overall impact of the programme.

## 7. CONCLUSION

The Leonardo da Vinci programme has been **invaluable in the promotion of transnational initiatives** and the internationalisation of best practices in the field of vocational training, in terms of the quality and content of learning, innovation and the addition of a European dimension. Its particular strengths have been the enhancement of mobility and employability of participants in the projects. It has thereby benefited not only the participants from Member States and EFTA-EEA, but also those from the applicant countries where the Leonardo da Vinci projects have assisted in the preparation of national training systems for accession. These successes are the foundation upon which the second phase of the programme is being built.

However, it is not only the strengths but also the **weaknesses of the first phase** which must be addressed to create a solid foundation for the second phase of the programme. The problems experienced in the implementation of the first phase relate not only to the unsatisfactory performance of the contracted technical assistance office, but also to complexities within management at the central level, and to the lack of complementarity with other training-related programmes. The Commission has ensured that the **lessons learnt from these experiences are put into practice** in the second phase through the simplification of procedures and further decentralisation of the programme management. It also anticipates a clear dissemination strategy for the products and outcomes of the many transnational pilot projects of the first phase.

The Leonardo da Vinci programme stands to become **a key instrument in the drive to implement lifelong learning** strategies which offer synergies between the European policies for education, training and employment. Furthermore, the second phase will seek to involve some players more fully in transnational vocational training particularly the social partners and SMEs. This strategy reflects the Commission's policy of promoting complementarity between related programmes which receives a strong focus in the second phase. The Leonardo da Vinci programme is a cornerstone of the Commission's policy to promote active citizenship across the Union and to draw closer to the vision of a « Citizen's Europe ».

## **ANNEX I**

### **List of sources used in this report**

#### **1. Reports from the countries/regions participating in Leonardo da Vinci, the “national reports” (according to Article 10 § 3 of the Decision):**

abbreviation – participating country/region – date of report

##### *“EUR-18”:*

|         |                           |                     |
|---------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| B-vla - | België-Vlaanderen         | 21.02.00            |
| B-wal - | Belgique/Belgien-Wallonie | no report available |
| DK -    | Danmark                   | 13.04.00            |
| D -     | Deutschland               | 08.05.00            |
| EL -    | Ellas                     | no report available |
| E -     | España                    | 30.12.99            |
| F -     | France                    | Mars 2000           |
| IRL -   | Ireland/Éire              | April 00            |
| I -     | Italia                    | no report available |
| L -     | Luxembourg                | 04.02.00            |
| NL -    | Nederland                 | 30.03.00            |
| A -     | Österreich                | 27.12.99            |
| P -     | Portugal                  | December 1999       |
| FIN -   | Suomi/Finland             | 10.01.00            |
| S -     | Sverige                   | 22.12.99            |
| UK -    | United Kingdom            | 23.12.99            |
| IS -    | Ísland                    | 10.04.00            |
| FL -    | Liechtenstein             | 17.01.00            |
| N -     | Norge                     | July 2000           |

##### *“Pre-accession countries”:*

|      |                                                                               |                     |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| BG - | Bългария (not asked to provide a report because participation began in 1999)  |                     |
| CZ - | Česká Republika                                                               | 02.02.00            |
| CY - | Kypros                                                                        | July 2000           |
| EE - | Eesti                                                                         | no report available |
| LA - | Latvija                                                                       | no report available |
| LT - | Lietuva                                                                       | 16.6.00             |
| HU - | Magyarország                                                                  | no report available |
| MT - | Malta                                                                         | no report available |
| PL - | Polska                                                                        | 10.03.00            |
| RO - | România                                                                       | 30.12.99            |
| SI - | Slovenija (not asked to provide a report because participation began in 1999) |                     |
| SV - | Slovenská Republika                                                           | no report available |

#### **2. Reports from the Social Partners at European level:**

abbreviation – organisation – date of report

ETUC: European Trade Union Congress – 31 March 00

UNICE-UEAPME-CEEP: Union of Industrial and Employer’s Confederations of Europe – 29 June 00

#### **3. External evaluation report according to Article 10 § 2 of the Decision:**

abbreviation – organisation

D&T: Deloitte & Touche (B-1831 Diegem)

Please note that these reports will be made available together with this Commission report on the Leonardo da Vinci website (<http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/leonardo.html>).

## **ANNEX II**

### **Strands and Measures of the Programme Leonardo da Vinci (1995-1999)**

#### **Strand I. Support for the improvement of vocational training systems and arrangements in the Member States**

##### Measures

###### *I.1.1 Transnational pilot projects*

I.1.1.a – improving the quality of initial training and the transition of young people to working life

I.1.1.b – improving the quality of the Member States continuing training arrangements

I.1.1.c – vocational information and guidance

I.1.1.d – the promotion of equal opportunities for men and women in training

I.1.1.e – improving the quality of training arrangements for persons disadvantaged on the labour market

###### *I.1.2 Transnational placement and exchange programmes*

I.1.2.a - transnational placement programmes for young people undergoing initial training

I.1.2.b - transnational placement programmes for young workers

I.1.2.c – transnational exchange programmes for instructors

#### **Strand II. Support for the improvement of vocational training measures including university/industry co-operation, concerning undertakings and workers**

##### Measures

###### *II.1.1 Transnational pilot projects*

II.1.1.a – innovation in training

II.1.1.b – investment in continuing training for workers

II.1.1.c – transfer of technological innovation in the context of co-operation between undertakings and universities in continuing training

II.1.1.d – promotion of equal opportunities for men and women in vocational training through projects

###### *II.1.2 Transnational placement and exchange programmes*

II.1.2.a – transnational programmes of placements in undertakings for people in university training and for graduates

II.1.2.b – transnational programmes of exchanges between undertakings and universities and/or training bodies

II.1.2.c – transnational programmes for exchanges of people in charge of training

#### **Strand III. Support for the development of language skills, knowledge and the dissemination of innovation in the field of vocational training**

##### Measures

###### *III.1 Co-operation with a view to improving language skills*

III.1.a – transnational pilot projects

III.1.b – transnational exchange programmes

###### *III.2 Development of knowledge in vocational training*

III.2.a – surveys and analysis in the field of training

III.2.b – exchange of comparable data in the field of training

###### *III.3 Development of the dissemination of innovation in the field of vocational training*

III.3.a – multiplier projects

III.3.b – transnational exchange programmes (study visits)

#### **Strand IV. Support measures**

##### Measures

IV.1 Co-operation network between the Member States

IV.2 Information, monitoring and assessment measures



### ANNEX III

#### EUR-18, Community Commitments 1995-1999 under Budget Line B3-1021, in Mio. €

|                                                                               | EX-<br>POST<br>1995 | EX-<br>POST<br>1996 | EX-<br>POST<br>1997 | EX-<br>POST<br>1998 | EX-<br>POST<br>1999 | Total<br>1995-<br>1999 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| <b>PILOT PROJECTS</b>                                                         | <b>66.97</b>        | <b>77.94</b>        | <b>62.47</b>        | <b>66.63</b>        | <b>36.05</b>        | <b>310.06</b>          |
| <i><b>Strand I</b></i>                                                        | 25.73               | 33.48               | 28.75               | 34.38               | 20.93               | 143.27                 |
| I.1.1.a – quality of initial training and transition to working life          | 10.90               | 11.84               | 10.22               | 12.64               | 8.82                | 54.42                  |
| I.1.1.b – quality of continuing vocational training arrangements              | 6.55                | 9.24                | 7.60                | 9.07                | 5.24                | 37.71                  |
| I.1.1.c – vocational information and guidance                                 | 2.02                | 2.47                | 2.89                | 3.34                | 1.74                | 12.46                  |
| I.1.1.d – equal opportunities for men and women in training                   | 1.99                | 2.09                | 1.80                | 2.47                | 0.67                | 9.03                   |
| I.1.1.e – training for disadvantaged people in the labour market              | 4.26                | 7.83                | 6.25                | 6.86                | 4.45                | 29.66                  |
| <i><b>Strand II</b></i>                                                       | 34.84               | 44.46               | 33.72               | 32.25               | 15.12               | 160.39                 |
| II.1.1.a – innovation in training                                             | 14.31               | 14.90               | 11.94               | 11.66               | 4.58                | 57.39                  |
| II.1.1.b – investment in continuing training for workers                      | 9.72                | 16.67               | 13.00               | 11.79               | 6.21                | 57.38                  |
| II.1.1.c – transfer of technological innovation for undertakings/universities | 8.49                | 10.13               | 7.07                | 6.60                | 3.20                | 35.49                  |
| II.1.1.d – equal opportunities for men and women in training                  | 2.33                | 2.74                | 1.71                | 2.20                | 1.14                | 10.12                  |
| <i><b>Transitory measures</b></i>                                             | 6.40                |                     |                     |                     |                     | 6.40                   |
|                                                                               |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                        |
| <b>MOBILITY</b>                                                               | <b>45.70</b>        | <b>50.81</b>        | <b>54.00</b>        | <b>45.08</b>        | <b>60.51</b>        | <b>256.10</b>          |
| <i><b>Strand I</b></i>                                                        | 28.63               | 29.36               | 29.37               | 27.79               | 35.89               | 151.04                 |
| I.1.2.a – placements for young people in initial training                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                        |
| I.1.2.b – placements for young workers                                        |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                        |
| I.1.2.c – exchanges for instructors                                           |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                        |
| <i><b>Strand II</b></i>                                                       | 14.23               | 21.42               | 24.30               | 17.28               | 24.52               | 101.75                 |
| II.1.2.a – placements in undertakings for universities/graduates              | 13.75               | 20.59               | 23.11               | 16.59               | 23.58               | 97.62                  |
| II.1.2.b – exchanges undertakings - universities/training bodies              | 0.38                | 0.37                | 0.74                | 0.27                | 0.63                | 2.39                   |
| II.1.2.c – exchanges of people in charge of training                          | 0.10                | 0.46                | 0.45                | 0.43                | 0.31                | 1.75                   |
| <i><b>Strand III</b></i>                                                      |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                        |
| III.1.b – exchanges to improve language skills                                | 0.10                | 0.03                | 0.32                | 0.00                | 0.10                | 0.56                   |
| <i><b>Transitory measures</b></i>                                             | 2.75                |                     |                     |                     |                     | 2.75                   |
|                                                                               |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                        |
| <b>OTHER</b>                                                                  | <b>27.00</b>        | <b>25.50</b>        | <b>33.23</b>        | <b>29.73</b>        | <b>45.07</b>        | <b>160.53</b>          |
| <i><b>Strand III</b></i>                                                      |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                        |
| III.1.a – pilot projects to improve language skills                           | 5.05                | 4.39                | 5.79                | 5.59                | 2.63                | 23.44                  |
| III.2.a - Surveys and analyses                                                | 6.85                | 6.03                | 7.86                | 5.42                | 0.00                | 26.16                  |
| III.2.b – exchange of comparable data ("statistics")                          |                     | 1.30                | 2.15                | 1.12                | 1.00                | 5.57                   |
| III.3.a – multiplier - effect projects                                        | 2.86                | 2.34                | 4.54                | 4.19                | 18.37               | 32.30                  |
| <i><b>Strand IV.1</b></i>                                                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                        |
| IV.1.a – NCUs,<br>National Resource Centres for Guidance                      | 7.71<br>0.96        | 8.10<br>0.65        | 8.45<br>0.87        | 8.98<br>0.98        | 13.95<br>0.95       | 47.20<br>4.41          |
| IV.1.b – setting up of transnational partnerships                             | 0.00                | 0.01                | 0.00                | 0.00                | 0.00                | 0.01                   |
| IV.1.c – openness, dissemination and transfer                                 |                     |                     | 0.02                | 0.11                | 0.05                | 0.18                   |
| <i><b>Strand IV.2</b></i>                                                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                        |
| IV.2.a – information, telematic links and data banks                          | 3.16                | 1.62                | 2.92                | 2.78                | 3.82                | 14.29                  |
| IV.2.b – monitoring and assessment                                            | 0.41                | 1.08                | 0.63                | 0.55                | 4.30                | 6.97                   |
|                                                                               |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                        |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                                                  | <b>139.67</b>       | <b>154.25</b>       | <b>149.70</b>       | <b>141.44</b>       | <b>141.63</b>       | <b>726.69</b>          |

Please note that these commitments only apply to the EUR-18 states.

## ANNEX IV

### Leonardo da Vinci, Distribution of EC-Funds by Country (in Mio. €), 1995-1999

| Country              | Decentralised mobility measures (I.1.2a-c)<br>(commitments for national block grants 1995-1999) | All other measures, except III.3.b (study visits) and strand IV (accompanying measures) |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| B                    | 3.983                                                                                           | 17.968                                                                                  |
| DK                   | 2.503                                                                                           | 11.226                                                                                  |
| D                    | 27.962                                                                                          | 74.000                                                                                  |
| EL                   | 5.419                                                                                           | 21.620                                                                                  |
| E                    | 17.704                                                                                          | 49.582                                                                                  |
| F                    | 20.489                                                                                          | 64.712                                                                                  |
| IRL                  | 2.168                                                                                           | 14.396                                                                                  |
| I                    | 22.892                                                                                          | 62.275                                                                                  |
| L                    | 0.752                                                                                           | 5.405                                                                                   |
| NL                   | 6.098                                                                                           | 19.502                                                                                  |
| A                    | 3.561                                                                                           | 16.047                                                                                  |
| P                    | 5.135                                                                                           | 17.651                                                                                  |
| FIN                  | 2.639                                                                                           | 14.533                                                                                  |
| S                    | 3.833                                                                                           | 13.950                                                                                  |
| UK                   | 22.424                                                                                          | 66.186                                                                                  |
| (EUR)*               | ---                                                                                             | 9.660                                                                                   |
| IS                   | 0.801                                                                                           | 3.248                                                                                   |
| FL                   | 0.327                                                                                           | 0.794                                                                                   |
| N                    | 2.285                                                                                           | 9.231                                                                                   |
| <b>EUR-18</b>        | <b>150.975</b>                                                                                  | <b>491.986</b>                                                                          |
|                      |                                                                                                 |                                                                                         |
| BG                   | ---                                                                                             | 1.120                                                                                   |
| CY                   | 0.145                                                                                           | 1.310                                                                                   |
| CZ                   | 1.148                                                                                           | 3.996                                                                                   |
| EE                   | 0.345                                                                                           | 0.764                                                                                   |
| HU                   | 1.326                                                                                           | 5.364                                                                                   |
| LT                   | 0.591                                                                                           | 1.584                                                                                   |
| LA                   | 0.676                                                                                           | 1.144                                                                                   |
| PL                   | 3.855                                                                                           | 5.648                                                                                   |
| RO                   | 2.528                                                                                           | 5.982                                                                                   |
| SI                   | ---                                                                                             | 0.534                                                                                   |
| SV                   | 0.909                                                                                           | 3.394                                                                                   |
| <b>Pre-accession</b> | <b>11.523</b>                                                                                   | <b>30.840</b>                                                                           |
|                      |                                                                                                 |                                                                                         |
| <b>TOTAL</b>         | <b>162.498</b>                                                                                  | <b>522.826</b>                                                                          |

Source: calculation by DG Education and Culture

\* EUR = projects submitted by European organisations, i.e. Social Partner at Community level, European employers' and trade unions' federations in specific sectors, or bodies and organisations with a European status and scope

## ANNEX V

### Number of Contracted Leonardo da Vinci Pilot Projects of Strands I and II by Country, 1995-1999

| Country of<br>project<br>Promoter | Pilot projects strand I |            |            |           |            | Pilot projects strand II |            |            |           | Total       |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|--------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|-------------|
|                                   | I.1.1.a                 | I.1.1.b    | I.1.1.c    | I.1.1.d   | I.1.1.e    | II.1.1.a                 | II.1.1.b   | II.1.1.c   | II.1.1.d  |             |
| B                                 | 15                      | 15         | 2          | 1         | 13         | 17                       | 15         | 5          | ---       | 83          |
| DK                                | 14                      | 7          | 1          | ---       | 8          | 16                       | 11         | 2          | 1         | 60          |
| D                                 | 64                      | 26         | 9          | 9         | 21         | 55                       | 56         | 45         | 13        | 298         |
| EL                                | 17                      | 22         | 5          | 3         | 12         | 28                       | 17         | 19         | 3         | 126         |
| E                                 | 51                      | 33         | 14         | 9         | 33         | 38                       | 38         | 34         | 8         | 258         |
| F                                 | 58                      | 28         | 21         | 10        | 34         | 72                       | 59         | 43         | 8         | 333         |
| IRL                               | 5                       | 7          | 4          | 4         | 7          | 15                       | 8          | 8          | 2         | 60          |
| I                                 | 55                      | 35         | 18         | 18        | 33         | 54                       | 55         | 40         | 10        | 318         |
| L                                 | 4                       | 3          | 1          | 3         | 3          | 2                        | 7          | 1          | ---       | 24          |
| NL                                | 19                      | 10         | 2          | ---       | 7          | 16                       | 16         | 6          | 4         | 80          |
| A                                 | 11                      | 16         | 3          | 1         | 3          | 8                        | 9          | 11         | ---       | 62          |
| P                                 | 16                      | 18         | 4          | 1         | 10         | 20                       | 11         | 9          | 4         | 93          |
| FIN                               | 15                      | 7          | 2          | ---       | 6          | 12                       | 10         | 13         | 3         | 68          |
| S                                 | 23                      | 6          | 2          | 2         | 5          | 13                       | 15         | 2          | 6         | 74          |
| UK                                | 48                      | 37         | 13         | 9         | 30         | 54                       | 65         | 34         | 18        | 308         |
| (EUR)*                            | ---                     | ---        | ---        | ---       | ---        | 25                       | 24         | 2          | 4         | 55          |
| IS                                | 3                       | 4          | 1          | ---       | 3          | 3                        | ---        | 3          | ---       | 17          |
| FL                                | ---                     | ---        | 1          | ---       | ---        | 3                        | 1          | 1          | ---       | 6           |
| N                                 | 8                       | 9          | 1          | 1         | 7          | 9                        | 7          | 4          | ---       | 46          |
| <b>EUR-18</b>                     | <b>426</b>              | <b>283</b> | <b>104</b> | <b>71</b> | <b>235</b> | <b>460</b>               | <b>424</b> | <b>282</b> | <b>84</b> | <b>2369</b> |
|                                   |                         |            |            |           |            |                          |            |            |           |             |
| BG                                | ---                     | 1          | 2          | ---       | 1          | 2                        | ---        | 1          | ---       | 7           |
| CY                                | ---                     | ---        | ---        | ---       | 2          | 2                        | 3          | 1          | 1         | 9           |
| CZ                                | 4                       | 10         | 3          | ---       | 3          | 5                        | 1          | 4          | ---       | 30          |
| EE                                | 3                       | 1          | ---        | ---       | 1          | ---                      | ---        | 1          | ---       | 6           |
| HU                                | 11                      | 5          | 2          | 1         | 4          | 3                        | 3          | ---        | ---       | 29          |
| LT                                | 5                       | 2          | ---        | ---       | 2          | 1                        | 1          | ---        | ---       | 11          |
| LA                                | 4                       | 1          | ---        | ---       | ---        | ---                      | ---        | 1          | ---       | 6           |
| PL                                | 14                      | 7          | ---        | 1         | 1          | 4                        | 3          | 4          | ---       | 34          |
| RO                                | 3                       | 11         | 5          | 2         | 3          | 3                        | 3          | 8          | 1         | 39          |
| SI                                | 1                       | 1          | ---        | ---       | ---        | ---                      | 2          | ---        | 1         | 5           |
| SV                                | 4                       | 6          | 1          | 1         | 2          | 1                        | 4          | 5          | ---       | 24          |
| <b>Pre-accession</b>              | <b>49</b>               | <b>45</b>  | <b>13</b>  | <b>5</b>  | <b>19</b>  | <b>21</b>                | <b>20</b>  | <b>25</b>  | <b>3</b>  | <b>200</b>  |
|                                   |                         |            |            |           |            |                          |            |            |           |             |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                      | <b>475</b>              | <b>328</b> | <b>117</b> | <b>76</b> | <b>254</b> | <b>481</b>               | <b>444</b> | <b>307</b> | <b>87</b> | <b>2569</b> |

Source: calculations by DG Education and Culture

\* EUR = projects submitted by European organisations, i.e. Social Partner at Community level, European employers' and trade unions' federations in specific sectors, or bodies and organisations with a European status and scope

## ANNEX VI

### Number of Contracted Leonardo da Vinci Projects under Several Measures by Country, 1995-1999

| Country of<br>project<br>Promoter | Linguistic pilot<br>projects | Surveys<br>and analysis | Comparable data<br>("statistics") | Multiplier-effect<br>projects |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
|                                   | III.1.a                      | III.2.a                 | III.2.b                           | III.3.a                       |
| B                                 | 8                            | 6                       | 2                                 | 11                            |
| DK                                | 4                            | 5                       | 1                                 | 5                             |
| D                                 | 49                           | 18                      | ---                               | 30                            |
| EL                                | 6                            | 9                       | ---                               | 8                             |
| E                                 | 8                            | 16                      | ---                               | 33                            |
| F                                 | 23                           | 16                      | 1                                 | 40                            |
| IRL                               | 4                            | 5                       | ---                               | 13                            |
| I                                 | 29                           | 29                      | ---                               | 29                            |
| L                                 | 1                            | 3                       | ---                               | 5                             |
| NL                                | 3                            | 7                       | 2                                 | 13                            |
| A                                 | 2                            | 7                       | ---                               | 18                            |
| P                                 | 4                            | 6                       | 1                                 | 7                             |
| FIN                               | 6                            | 2                       | 1                                 | 5                             |
| S                                 | 2                            | 2                       | 1                                 | 6                             |
| UK                                | 24                           | 29                      | 5                                 | 42                            |
| (EUR)*                            | 3                            | 8                       | ---                               | 1                             |
| IS                                | 1                            | 1                       | ---                               | 2                             |
| FL                                | ---                          | ---                     | ---                               | ---                           |
| N                                 | 2                            | 3                       | 1                                 | 5                             |
| <b>EUR-18</b>                     | <b>179</b>                   | <b>172</b>              | <b>15</b>                         | <b>273</b>                    |
|                                   |                              |                         |                                   |                               |
| BG                                | 1                            | ---                     | 1                                 | 1                             |
| CY                                | 1                            | ---                     | ---                               | ---                           |
| CZ                                | 4                            | 1                       | 1                                 | ---                           |
| EE                                | ---                          | ---                     | ---                               | ---                           |
| HU                                | 3                            | ---                     | ---                               | 4                             |
| LT                                | 1                            | ---                     | ---                               | ---                           |
| LA                                | ---                          | ---                     | 1                                 | 1                             |
| PL                                | 1                            | 2                       | 1                                 | 1                             |
| RO                                | 1                            | ---                     | ---                               | 2                             |
| SI                                | ---                          | ---                     | 1                                 | ---                           |
| SV                                | 3                            | ---                     | ---                               | ---                           |
| <b>Pre-accession</b>              | <b>15</b>                    | <b>3</b>                | <b>5</b>                          | <b>9</b>                      |
|                                   |                              |                         |                                   |                               |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                      | <b>194</b>                   | <b>175</b>              | <b>20</b>                         | <b>282</b>                    |

Source: calculations by DG Education and Culture

\* EUR = projects submitted by European organisations, i.e. Social Partner at Community level, European employers' and trade unions' federations in specific sectors, or bodies and organisations with a European status and scope