



## EUROPEAN NETWORKS CONFERENCE

### Practical Aspects of Mobility

22-24 FEBRUARY 2011:

### FINAL REPORT

1. Background
2. Programme and Conduct of the Conference
3. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Workshops
4. Evaluation of the Conference
5. Appendices

#### 1.- Background

The proposal to hold a conference of the European networks that are involved with the mobility of citizens and workers came from the EURES Spain Information and Synergies workgroup and was included in the EURES Spain 2010-2011 Activity Plan, which was approved by the European Commission.

The **aims** of this conference, which were included in the proposal document, were:

- **General Aim:** To create an environment of systematic cooperation between the European networks and other players involved in mobility, especially the universities and the labour offices of the Spanish embassies, in order to set specific objectives for this cooperation and to create specific products that can be used by the networks.
- **Specific Objectives:**
  - To get to know the work done by the different networks that were taking part and to share good practices.



- To identify the practical obstacles to mobility, to share experiences and to propose initiatives to overcome them.
- To draw up a final document containing the conclusions and to submit it to the European Commission.

In line with these objectives, a list was drawn up of the networks that should take part in the Conference and a methodology defined to ensure its success:

- **Participating European networks:** From the many networks directly or indirectly promoted by the European Union, an attempt was made to involve those that work directly with the Freedom of Movement and/or whose duties include giving information and guidance to the public on the different aspects of this topic: EUROPE-DIRECT, SOLVIT, CITIZENS SIGNPOST SERVICE (*Your Europe Advice*), ENIC-NARIC and EURES.
- **Other participants:** It was considered to be of great interest to have the participation of some key players in EURES' activities: on the one hand, the universities, as privileged customers of EURES' services, and bodies that have experience with the mobility that is linked to European programmes such as Leonardo and Erasmus and, on the other hand, the labour offices of the Spanish embassies in other European countries. The labour offices offer services on a variety of social and labour topics to Spanish citizens abroad and serve as extremely useful contact and information points for the network of EURES counsellors in Spain.
- **Methodology:** The proposal document set up the following work system: *"Papers + workshops: Various papers will be given by experts on the practical aspects of free circulation and the attendees will discuss their experiences and practical cases relating to mobility in the workshops. Active participation. Questions will be sent to the participants in advance so that they can prepare the topics for discussion. When the networks are contacted, they will be asked*



- *to select people with experience in these matters.*” The materials used in the workshops will be included in the Appendix.

The **papers** selected all had to do with the theme of the conference: “Practical Aspects of Mobility”, “A Presentation of the Networks and Their Services”, “Social Security Benefits from the Viewpoint of Mobility”, “The European 2020 Strategy”, “The Role of the Universities in Graduate Mobility”, “The Services to Mobility of the Spanish Embassy Labour Offices” and “The Effects of the So-Called Services Directive”.

In an attempt to create a balance that would allow the members from the different networks and countries to take part in the planned workshops, the make-up of the **workshops** was decided according to the interests listed by the participants in a pre-conference questionnaire.

Workshops were scheduled on the following topics:

- **Workshop A:** European networks: duties and responsibilities.
- **Workshop B:** Freedom of Movement in practice: case studies.
- **Workshop C:** Mobility among graduates and practical work experience.
- **Workshop D:** Social Security.

The workshop dynamics were designed to encourage the participation of all the attendees and based on case studies, to be able to:

- a) Identify the current situation
- b) Consider the challenges of putting freedom of movement into practice
- c) Make recommendations that can be taken into consideration in the future to simplify the exercise of this right.



Each workshop had a moderator appointed by the organisers and a spokesperson elected by the participants who would present the conclusions of the workshop at the plenary session.

- **European dimension:** The participation of the networks had to be transnational, with the active participation of members of the networks from the different European countries.

**Place and date:** The Generalitat of Valencia (The government of the Autonomous Community of Valencia) through SERVEF (The Valencian Employment and Training Service) offered to host the conference and made the necessary arrangements for a suitable venue for the event, as well as providing invaluable help with the logistics of the conference.

The dates finally set for the European Networks Conference were 22 to 24 February, 2011.

## **2.- Programme and Conduct of the Conference (Papers).**

### **1<sup>st</sup> Session (Tuesday 22-2-2011)**

#### **ROUND TABLE: PRESENTATION OF THE NETWORKS TAKING PART**

The conference was opened at 16:00 hours on 22<sup>nd</sup> February by Mr. Luis Lobón, the Director General of SERVEF, Mr. Vicente Castelló, representing the Spanish National Public Employment Service, Marta Múgica, communications, partnership and networks manager for the European Commission's Representation Office in Spain, and María José Arias, EURES manager, Spain.

After this, the European networks taking part in the conference were presented by:



- Ana Río-Quintana: Europe Direct.
- Isabel Barrios and Juan Carlos Parodi: ENIC-NARIC
- Javier Pascual: SOLVIT
- José Ramón Devesa: Citizen Signpost Service (Your Europe Advice)
- María José Arias: EURES.

The presentations highlighted the types of services provided by each network, the public they are oriented, how their activities contribute to the freedom of movement of citizens and their service strategies.

## **2nd Session (Wednesday 23-2-2011)**

### **FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT-RELATED ASPECTS OF SOCIAL SECURITY**

The second session began with a panel of papers on the aspects of Social Security that are related to freedom of movement, with two speakers presenting the following topics:

- The coordination of Social Security systems by the EU member states (Regulations 883/2004 and 987/09), by Derek Coulthard, European Commission consultant and advisor.
- The practical application of European Social Security regulations, by Francisco Ros Gimeno of the Spanish National Social Security Institute.

## **3rd Session ( Wednesday afternoon, 23-2-2011)**

### **THE 2020 STRATEGY AND THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION IN EUROPE**

The afternoon session opened with a talk on the employment situation and the European 2020 Strategy by Marco Ferri of the European Commission Employment and



Labour Mobility Services Unit (DG for Employment, Social Policy and Equal Opportunities). He presented the mobility-related programmes promoted by the Commission within the 2020 Strategy and the role of the European networks in their implementation.

#### **4th Session (Thursday, 24-2-2011):**

### **THE UNIVERSITIES AND MOBILITY**

The final session opened with a paper by Mr. Roberto Revuelta, from the Employment Committee of RUNAE (University Student Affairs Network), on the universities and the role of the network of university employment services.

### **THE ROLE OF THE SPANISH EMBASSY LABOUR OFFICES IN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES**

José Ignacio González Marqués, of the Spanish Embassy Labour Office in the Netherlands, explained the duties of these offices, their position about the radical changes that have occurred in the Spanish job market in recent years and their views on freedom of movement of citizens and workers into the EU.

### **THE SERVICES DIRECTIVE AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE FREE CIRCULATION OF WORKERS AND PROFESSIONALS**

The next paper, on the practical aspects of adapting the Services Directive to the internal market, was given by Isabel Sanchís of the Department of Justice and Public Administration of the Government of Valencia. A conference on free circulation cannot neglect to mention the effects of the so-called Service Directive on the European job market and on the mobility of companies and the self-employed when this is strengthened by a more flexible regulatory framework.



After the presentation of the conclusions of the workshops, the conference was closed by María José Arias, the EURES Manager, Spain, and Arlette Mora Gallart, the EURES Coordinator for the Valencian Community, on behalf of the host organisation, SERVEF.

### 3.- Conclusions and Recommendations from the Workshops

Four workshops were held during the sessions of the conference. The methodology used in the conference workshops responded to several objectives:

- To generate active, dynamic participation among the attendees.
- To produce real contacts that could lead to future synergies in the everyday work of the networks.
- To create a space in which ideas or platforms could be developed that would involve the activities of various networks, with the ultimate aim of improving the assistance offered to European citizens who wish to exercise their right to live and work in another European country.
- To produce a final, tangible result or output (current situation/challenges/proposals-recommendations) that could be of use to the European Commission, offering the viewpoint of professionals who are involved in mobility on a daily basis.

The topics of the workshops were the following:

- Workshop A: European networks: their duties and responsibilities.
- Workshop B: Freedom of movement in practice.
- Workshop C: Mobility among graduates and practical work experience.



- Workshop D: Social Security.

Each workshop produced a set of conclusions based on a common structure:

- Identification of the situation
- Challenges
- Recommendations for making the free movement of workers more effective.

In the second half of the closing session, the spokespersons for the four workshops presented their conclusions, which are summarised below:

#### **Workshop A: European networks: their duties and responsibilities**

- **Assessment:**
  - The networks in many countries are being **overwhelmed** by the increasing interest in mobility among workers with few qualifications, who consider this option to be a final resort when faced with an untenable personal financial situation.
  - **A lack of shared knowledge** among the European networks at the geographical level. Contacts and cooperation are frequent, but in the vast majority of cases the contacts are more personal than institutional, so that examples were given of how merely replacing the personnel in charge of the services can affect the exchange of information and cooperation between organisations. The employment services are also characterised by a high worker replacement rate, which makes it difficult to keep a network effective without constant efforts to provide training and refresher courses.
  - In addition, the attempts to make such relationships official or institutional through written agreements (Service Level Agreements) have at times led to negative results rather than positive ones





- (excessive bureaucratisation, the legalistic nature of the agreements, long-term commitments that are difficult to meet, etc.)
- Possible duplication of tasks or responses. In spite of not being part of the intrinsic duties of some organisations, the different services have adapted to the needs of the public that they serve, which may lead to overlapping duties and sources of information. When the information is offered in a coordinated manner, there should not be a problem; indeed, this should be of benefit to the public, as they will have more resources from which to get a reply to their questions.
- Different processes for cooperation and contact between the networks in different countries: lack of a relationship covering the whole of Europe.
- A lack of connection with the immediate local realities on the part of the central services (national offices, European Commission, etc.). The real situation of the European networks, like the information that we provide to the public, is at times very different from the theoretical framework for professional mobility defined by the Commission, starting with cultural and linguistic differences, education programmes, the length of education, professional recognition processes, the procedures required in order to live and work in another country, etc. We deal with people who have a much simpler idea of what freedom of movement means, and who end up getting lost under a pile of paperwork and procedures that they must sort out in the next few months in order to be able to go and work in another country. Other networks, such as Solvit, have as their specific mission to try to resolve the incorrect application of Community law, so it is normal for the public to feel that nothing is as easy as at times it is touted to be.
- Isolation at the local level: Normally, the professionals in the European network work alone, even if they are part of larger organisations. The



- level of integration of their particular service with the other services offered by their departments varies considerably and depends on the type of service and the country, but, in general, it can be said that the level of integration continues to be inadequate.

**Challenges – opportunities:**

- Excessive workload, lack of personnel.
- Personnel changes, instability.
- Excessive bureaucracy.
- No formal guidelines for cooperation between networks at the national or international level.
- Separation of the financing and management programmes: lack of resources.
- High expectations of the resources involved.

● **Recommendations:**

- Exchange links between the web sites of the different European networks. Interlink them at the national and European levels. Improve mutual visibility.
- Create better opportunities for networking that involve several networks transversally on topics of common interest.
- Invitations to and participation in events held by other networks. Exchange information on these activities.
- Exchange and distribute informational material among the networks.
- Take advantage of the opportunities offered by social networking tools.
- Publicise the conclusions of the conference among other national networks with which we have (or could have) a relationship.



## Workshop B: Free circulation of workers.

### Case Studies:

- A) Registration procedures on entry to a country.**
- B) Professional recognition**
- C) Integration**

- **Assessment:**

- Different situations and procedures, on which there is generally no clear information. The registration procedures tend to be more complex than shown in the information leaflets on these topics. People who move also carry with them the administrative traditions of their home country and it is difficult for them to understand and be understood by services that are stretching themselves to attend to public matters over telephone support services.
- The long waiting times to obtain professional recognition mean that in the meantime the workers are unemployed or must accept work below their qualification level. In some countries, the employment offices do not even recognise the education level of job seekers from other European countries until the professional recognition or similar process has ended.
- Some professions are regulated in one country but not in others: regulation is, sometimes, a barrier in itself.
- The great importance of linguistic barriers.
- Language training for immigrants from third countries that excludes people from other EU countries (negative application of the principle of equal treatment).
- The difficulties of the cultural change arising from mobility are underestimated. It is necessary for those who are moving to live and/or work in another European country to be better informed about the cultural aspects of this change (laws and social customs, etc.).



- **Challenges – opportunities:**

- Strong rise in the demand for information.
- Many questions asked by non-Community nationals.
- Need to improve the language abilities of European citizens.
- Need to take into account the cultural aspects of mobility.

- **Recommendations:**

- Post clearer information on national registration procedures on the EURES portal.
- It is necessary to improve the training of the public employees who manage this paperwork from the perspective of free circulation.
- The administrative documents for these procedures must be comprehensible, not written in administrative jargon.
- Possibility of creating a common, inter-network platform on which to exchange information and good practices for offering support/assistance with this type of procedure to European citizens.
- Coordinate several administrative departments in order to make the registration procedures easier (Good practices: Social Security registration and affiliation for casual agricultural workers during the strawberry harvest in Huelva, Spain, and the *International Citizen Service* in Denmark).
- Publicise the use of existing tools, such as the IMI ((Internal Market Information) web site, among the networks.
- Increase cooperation in order to organise projects designed for specific groups. Examples of good practices: recruiting European doctors for Denmark, hiring Bulgarian doctors for the Finnish “Gateway Project”.
- Include training or counselling in languages and relevant cultural topics in large recruitment processes.
- Simplify the professional recognition process to the maximum and reduce the number of regulated professions by expanding the principle



- that whoever is authorised to carry out an activity in one European country can do so in another.

### **Workshop C:** Mobility among graduates and practical work experience.

- **Assessment:**

- There are many examples of good practices in graduate mobility: employment fairs, visits and workshops at universities, etc. The formulae used up to now have been shown to be more or less effective when providing information to a large number of people and to help job placement. However, the models change and increasingly need to adapt to technological advances and new forms of communication.
- There are scholarships and/or national programmes to promote mobility to almost all the member states. However, the national resources earmarked for this purpose tend to be insufficient (they do not meet the demand).
- The EURES portal does not offer sufficient information on the different aspects of professional recognition and it raises false expectations among many professionals who apply directly for jobs without checking or completely understanding the requirements of the position.
- The job market is organised by occupations and skills, while the universities are organised by diplomas and degrees. These are not similar concepts and young graduates have a great deal of difficulty in seeing this difference. Also, they have a simplistic view of the Bologna Process and some groups presume that the Bologna Plan will end the differences in the European education systems, standardisation processes and professional recognition.
- Difficulty in finding or providing clear information on, for example, local companies that offer practical work experience placements. There are also different legal frameworks in the different European countries governing practical work experience or stages.



- **Challenges – opportunities:**

- Linguistic and cultural barriers.
- Increase in the percentage of graduates who have experience with mobility to other countries.
- Ambivalent role of local professional organisations: promoting/limiting. On the one hand, they encourage their own professional members to take advantage of the possibilities of the free provision of services but, on the other hand, at times they produce unforeseen requirements (a language requirement, for example) for allowing professionals from other countries to join the association.
- In practice, Bologna does not solve the problem of professional recognition.
- Great differences in the regulation of practical work experience.
- Resistance to change / bureaucracy.

- **Recommendations:**

- More information is needed on the EURES portal on professional recognition and regulated professions. This information must be posted if the EURES portal is intended to be the online '*one stop shop*' for European mobility.
- Standardisation at the European level of the legal framework for in-company practical work experience.
- Simplification of administrative procedures, especially the paperwork for professional recognition.
- Continuing training for EURES counsellors, public employees involved in this topic and technicians in the universities who offer the first-level information on the on-going changes to Community regulations



- (directives on mobility, services, national changes in the degree recognition process, etc.).
- Hold preparatory sessions at the universities with a proactive focus (good practice: EURES information meetings for the ERASMUS programme at the University of Castellón).

#### Workshop D: Social Security.

- **Assessment:**

- Different processes and requirements for obtaining a Social Security registration number. Also, difficulties especially in the systems in which this number means access to social benefits regardless of whether contributions have been made. Other difficulties related to the system for obtaining a registration number, such as interviews and telephone support centres, because of communication problems, etc.
- Different systems and rights based at times on previous contributions and at other times on residence. It is difficult for the public to understand situations that differ from those in their home country. For example: unemployment benefits linked to voluntary registration or the management of health benefits through private agencies.
- Lack of knowledge on the part of the public of their mobility-related social security rights, including the existence of the European health insurance card, which is well known to the participants, who are members of the European networks, but not to the public.
- With regard to the European insurance health card, it has been found that in some countries students “in movement” because of European scholarships or programmes are not able to obtain it.
- Lack of training for Social Security service employees on mobility-related social security rights, procedures and forms.



- In some member countries, benefits are considered to be in kind, when they are not, in order to prevent them from being exportable to other member states.

- **Challenges – opportunities:**

- Language barriers: affect telephone support centres and local forms (non-European ones).
- A need for clear, up-to-date information on European health and social security systems. Not only the rules for coordination but also the coverage in each country, to prevent incorrect expectations.
- The new *EESSI (Electronic Exchange of Social Security Information)*: different implementation of the system during the transition period. Countries that are outside the process: EEA countries will continue to apply E documents. This means that there will be two systems.
- Difficulties in some cases in knowing which department in the country has the authority.
- Lack of information on self-employed workers who move and are performing services in a country other than their home country.

- **Recommendations:**

- Good practice: Denmark and Finland have one single information point, a "one-stop shop" for foreigners.
- Better promotion of the Commission's informational web sites. It is proposed to put a link to these sites on the web sites of the public bodies of the member states.
- Need for step-by-step information on Social Security procedures and the first steps to take when arriving in the destination country, with a focus on the EURES portal on the user's needs.
- A good practice to avoid contradictory information and the loss of information: EURES Spain's database of solved questions.





- Offer translation services to the public.
- Eliminate the need for official translations of procedures related to European Social Security regulations.
- Combine the national Social Security number and European Health Card into one single document, a single Social Security card. (Good practice in Germany).
- Give more publicity to the specialised manuals published by the European Commission on Social Security regulation-related topics: healthcare, pensions, unemployment, etc.
- Publish local Social Security forms not only in that member state's official languages but also in several European languages (e.g., the most common).
- Improve cooperation between the European networks on the exchange of information, barriers to mobility and good practices: permanent contact at the local and European levels.



#### 4.- Evaluation of the Conference by the Participants

The results of the evaluation questionnaires that were filled out by the attendees on the content and development of the conference are shown in the following chart, as well as the suggestions and ideas offered by the participants. In short, the evaluations were very positive, although it was noted that some aspects of the presentations and the length of some of the workshops could be improved, and there was a need for more international participation. The most valued aspect was making contacts with participants from other networks, whose very existence was in some cases unknown. The generation of synergies was the main aim of the conference.

### EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

*The Spanish Eures Network would greatly appreciate your filling out this evaluation questionnaire so that we can learn from the experiences in planning future activities. We would like you to participate in a final evaluation by answering the questions below. Please cross the most appropriate answer to each of the questions using the code given, which reflects the extent to which you either agree or disagree with the statements (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3= Neither disagree nor agree; 4= Agree; 5= Strongly agree).*

**I was given sufficient information on the objectives of the Conference before my arrival**  
**The Conference encouraged exchange of information and expression of ideas successfully.**  
**The Conference covered the topics I needed to learn about**

**The objectives of the Conference were achieved.**

1	2	3	4	5
		4	7	10
		1	9	11
		3	1 0	8
		2	5	14

I feel that the Conference programme took into account what participants considered important to discuss

The Conference fostered teamwork and cooperation among participants.

Speakers had sufficient knowledge of the subjects and good communication skills

The methodology based in workshops is the best to achieve objectives

We had enough time to fulfil the workshops' tasks

We had enough breaks and pauses to relax and interact with other participants

		1	8	11
			4	17
		2	7	12
		4	6	11
		4	8	9
			5	16

## WORKSHOPS EVALUATION

Please, indicate the names of the workshops you have participated in and

Workshop A: .....

Workshop B: .....

The duration of the workshops was sufficient to achieve the goals

The number of participants was reasonable

The participants in the workshops belonged to different networks and countries

The Conference covered the topics I needed to learn about

1	2	3	4	5
		3	6	12
		2	2	17
		3	3	15
		1	8	12

Which part of the Conference did you enjoy most? (Can you say why?)

-Difficult to identify just one topic or day. The 3 days and presentations and workshops were very interesting

- workshops and breaks – exchange of experience

- informal networking. Contacts during the cofeebreaks and workshops

- I liked the presentations and workshops both because first you get information and second to get opinions of other people at other level



- The workshop of the freedom of movement because SOLVIT can bring solutions to problems encountered by other networks
- The workshops because you obtain more information from different sources with clear examples
  - The presentation of the networks, because it was the way to know what the networks do.
  - I enjoyed the most the dinners, of course, but I enjoyed all the conference; speeches (very interesting) workshops (very practical although the beginning was a little slow, not very fluent, but I think is normal) and the tourist visit to Valencia
  - The freedom of movement workshop. Why? Good mix of networks and countries gave a good insight into some of the realities of “freedom of movement”
  - The workshops because we were able to discuss the relevant topics from different perspectives
  - The contact with professional from other networks and countries, that contacts will be very useful in my daily work.
  - The workshops were very good as they allowed experiences and ideas to be exchanged among the participants.
  - Social Security, benefits and allowances (due to the high level of the speakers and the information provided) and the networking aspect.



- The part in which the labour counsellors took part. We had direct information from them on solving topics related to Social Security benefits.
- Presentation of Mr.Coulthard on European Social security: good and clear introduction to new EU social security legislation.
- Workshops, because you acquire important knowledge and task from the other networks. Moreover, working all of us together set up relevant brainstorming of cases-load and enquiries to manage in the next future.
- Panel session “Social security, benefits and allowances”. Informative and very useful in my daily work
- I’ve found the two workshops very useful for exchanging ideas, learning good practices and trying to find ways to cope with very difficult multinational issues.
- Speakers: Most of the topics covered in the conference were new to my network. I enjoyed also the debates that followed right after. Interaction with other networks during the breaks and pauses is very important for me in this kind of conferences, to develop a partnership.
- Workshops, because it gave us the opportunity to exchange information and best practices and to network.

Which part of the Conference did you enjoy least? (Can you say why?)

- I cannot attend the second dinner
- Very specific presentations on universities where the input of SOLVIT are less feasible
- The first workshop (European networks) it was too long for the subject
- May be the beginning of the first workshop, because we didn’t know each other so much, but I was ok
- The mobility of graduates. The mix of countries and networks was not so good
- The lecturers of Thursday morning (24). Too detailed and not so relevant for my work



- Did not really dislike any part of the conference but perhaps some of the panel sessions could have benefited from a break to allow participants time to discuss among themselves about the subjects that have just been discussed.
- I enjoyed all part of the conference. The issues discussed are of great importance in my daily work, although I believe that 3 days are too much due to our work back home.
- I enjoyed all of them.
- The three opening presentations on Thursday. Not relevant for my daily work (except for the Services Directive perhaps). No clear link between the 3 presentations and very unclear translation.
- I think the schedule of the conference has been appropriated. The topic that does not have so much to do with my daily work was the presentation of the Runae.
- The fact that I could attend only two of the workshops, I would have like to attend the 4 of them.
- Workshop n2: Social Security. Very broad topic, difficult to understand, especially since all countries have different way in dealing with the problem.
- The presentation, because they were (some of them) too theoretical + in Spanish and the interpretation was not very good.

How will the Conference be of use to you in your future work?

- Helps to improve our services
- “maybe “organize a similar event
- I got to know persons from different networks/institutions so that I’ll know where to get the information from
- Very useful to enhance contacts between networks, to know how other networks works and to find synergies
- To advice people



- Good presentations of other networks and physical contacts in different countries
- I know a bit more about the specific work carried out by other networks
- To get in touch with other networks. To know more about the question of mobility in Europe
- Now I know more about Naric about RUNAE and other EURES partners
- Developed relationships within and outside EURES
- I will be able to refer clients to the other networks knowing what they do
- I have extended my network and have got contact persons in different networks and organizations that might be useful in the future
- There are a lot of new contacts and the most of them very useful in the next future for my work.
- Greater knowledge of other European networks and their functions.
- More networking; know and better use the other networks; access to more information; to continue to exchange best practices in our daily work.
- Getting to know the existing networks in order to indirectly make job seeking easier for workers. The “public” goes to Social Security thinking that we are one department and it helps us to redirect them and give them useful advice.
- Renew contact with Eures in Belgium, better idea of the Eures network in general. Recommendations can serve as a basis for farther cooperation between the different networks to solve issues.
- In my next future the most important aspect is the contacts with Europe direct and Universities representants. I have learned a lot about the different networks. Networking.
- New contacts created in various countries. More information about the LM in Spain. New knowledge about specific issues acquired. The format of the conference is new to me, I would like to attend more conferences like this one.



- I learned of the existence of other networks did not know they existed and I got to know some networks such EURES and Solvit a little better. I will have more detailed answers for my clients in the future.
- I will be able to council clients more efficiently, to give the most comprehensive information and in complex cases, I will know whom to contact (other networks, your europe) for the consultation. Hopefully, some of the recommendations from the workshops will be implemented practically.

Please write briefly any suggestions or recommendations for improvements:

- To do more conference like this one. At least one per year
- May be try to invite more countries to have a broader audience and increase the positive effects of a networks meeting. But the rest of the workshop was a great success and it was a great iniciative.
- Thanks for a well organized conference and a very friendly reception by the spanish eures. The guided tour of Valencia was great.
- No specific suggestions. It has been a very well prepared and organized conference with well functioning services and great meals. The sight-seeing in the city was also very much appreciated.
- Increase the international scope, less focussed in the Spanish situation and more participants from other EU countries and networks.
- Perhaps having more opportunities for workshop/breakout sessions to allow further networking opportunities with other participants. Although this may have not been practical in the tight schedule.
- It was a shame that the bus tour did not go past the city of arts and science, especially as it was so close to the hotel.





- Congratulations for the high level of the speakers, organization facilities, tourist guide and expertise. Recom: concentrate the conference in an intensive 2 day event. Keep on organising such events; very useful!!
- I don't have any more than those mentioned in the workshop.
- Better balance in participants, perhaps more other networks would have been interesting.
- Of course, the more participants of other networks the better results. In my opinion a general recommendation should be the increase in the workshops duration.
- No recommendations for improvements, may be it would be useful to see the questions to be discussed during the workshops before coming here and hot to be preselected for the workshops. Also: organize and attend more events with this format. Thanks a lot for inviting us!
- The groups at the workshops where a bit to big, not all the participants were actively involved. Maybe it would be more efficient to have workshop goals/topics better structured/more specified. Thank you, Spanish Team, for organizing this event! Hopefully it will become a tradition 😊



## 5.- Appendices:

- European Networks Conference programme.
- Pre-conference questionnaire sent to the participants.
- List of participants, with the country and network to which they belong.
- Summary of the papers (.ppt format and audio).
- Summary of the conclusions of the workshops.
- Evaluation questionnaire form.