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Preliminary note

This report describes the outcomes of the BUILD UP Skills EU exchange meeting that took place in Brussels on 12 November 2014. The event focused on BUILD UP Skills’ Pillar II objectives: supporting qualification and training schemes in EU member states.

In attendance were representatives from BUILD UP Skills Pillar II ongoing projects representing 21 countries. Project representatives from four countries not yet at the Pillar II stage were also in attendance (see participant list for full details).

The day began with introductions by Vincent Berruto, Head of Unit at EASME and Didier Gambier, Head of Dept LIFE and H2020 Energy, Environment & Resources at EASME. Berruto spoke about recent policy developments related to energy and the building sector—the July communication on energy efficiency and the European Council’s recent decision on revised 2030 targets—and BUILD UP Skills’ importance in achieving these goals. Gambier gave an overview of EASME, its programmes, and the agency’s continued support for BUILD UP Skills, which began in 2011.

An update on the BUILD UP Skills initiative and future plans were presented by Zoé Wildiers and Alessandro Proia of EASME. Of the 30 countries that have completed Pillar I activities—EU28 plus MK and NO—most have identified skills shortages, with more than 3 million workers requiring up-skilling in energy efficiency or renewable energy sources by 2020. Cross-trade knowledge was also reportedly in need of improvement in most countries.

Wildiers and Proia also gave a quick review of the BUILD UP Skills Pillar II projects started in October 2013 (in AT, CY, DE, EE, ES, FI, IE, LV, NL, RO) and the 12 BUILD UP Skills Pillar II projects started in September 2014 (in BG, EL, HR, HU, IT, LT, LU, MK, PT, SE, SK).

Two upcoming tenders were announced. The objective of the first is to develop a methodology to evaluate the impacts of the BUS PI projects and offer recommendations for future market uptake activities within H2020. The second is for the design and organisation of upcoming EU Exchange meetings and Technical Working Groups on specific topics of interest for the BUS PII coordinators.

ConClip was also presented, a project supported under the Lifelong Learning Programme that produces multi-lingual video clips for the construction of passive houses for craftsmen and site supervisors.

Peter Wouters of the International Network for Information on Ventilation and Energy Performance and Horia Petran of INCD URBAN-INCERC then gave an overview of QUALICHeCK, a project that works to strengthen compliance with quality standards in the building sector. Nine countries—Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Estonia, France, Greece, Romania, Spain and Sweden—have so far participated in the project. Other countries were encouraged to take part.

A mapping exercise then followed in which participants were asked to list their country codes under relevant sector issues. These were:
Images of the results of that exercise are below.

1.1 Tradesman: Building fabric
1.2 Tradesman: Building services
1.3 Tradesman: Energy sources
2.1 Types of training
2.2 Training methodology
3.1 Training recognition
3.2 Certification and accreditation
4.1 Sources of finance
5.1 Stimulating demand
6.2 Exchange activities
2.1 TYPE OF TRAINING

ON SITE
- LU
- LY
- AT
- MK
- EE
- RO
- IT

OFF SITE
- e.g. classroom
- IT
- RO
- SE
- DE
- UK
- AT
- SI
- LT
- MK
- NL
- FI
- GR
- ES
- HR
- SK
- CL
- EL
- SI
- IT

EXTENDED TRAINING
- Virtual reality
- Total immersion

2.2 TRAINING METHODOLOGY

PRACTICAL
- LU
- RO
- DE
- CY
- NL
- HU

THEORETICAL CONCEPTS
- SE
- RO
- CY
- NL
- HU

UPGRADING EXISTING EDUCATION
- ES
- NL
- BG
- UK
- HR
- AT
- NL
- IT
- HU

HIGHLIGHTING FREQUENT ERRORS
- HR
- AT
- NL
- IT
- HU

TESTS/EXAMS
- CY
- LT
- RO
- NL
- SF
- HU
- HU
- HU
- HU

BEST PRACTICE EXAMPLES
- NL
- FR
- EL
- BE
- IT
- EE
- IT
- RO

3.1 TRAINING RECOGNITION

NATIONAL REGISTER OF QUALIFICATIONS
- LY
- NL
- SE
- EL
- IT
- MK
- IT
- FI

TRADES ASSOCIATION REGISTER
- LT
- RO
- NL
- BE
- HU
- IT

MUTUAL RECOGNITION BY COUNTRIES
- LY
- BG
- ES
- RO
- IT
- BE
- SK
- HR
- IT

COMPANY/INDUSTRY RECOGNITION
- LT
- NL
- TE
- FI
- HR
- SI
- ES
- RO
- AT
- HU
- MK
- IT
- EL
- IT
- RO

HABILITATION
- HU!
3.2 Certification & Accreditation

- Accreditation of trainers: MK, HR, ES, IT, IE, HR
- Certification of qualification schemes: CY, BE, EL, HR, SE
- Company-based quality labels: BE, HU, SI
- Individual worker certification: LT, IE, SK, ES, RO
- Trades association membership conditions: EL, MK, LV, HR, IT
- Combination of all: IT, NL, HU, EE, FI

4.1 Sources of Finance

- Individual worker: EL, HU
- Employer: UK, LU, SK, SE, LV, HU, SI
- EU funds (e.g., social funds): LU, LT, HR, RO, BE, SI
- National funds: ES, MK, IT, HU
- Trade associations: AT, IT, HU
- Product suppliers: LV, IT, HU, RO, SI
- Combination of all: IE, UK, HR, IT, RO, FI, PE, SK, CY, BG, BE, EE
## Agenda
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<td>Cocktail</td>
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Morning session

Parallel session on training recognition

Facilitators: Risto Ivanov (FYROM), Horia Petran (RO), Seamus Hoyne (IE), Alessandro Proia (EASME)

Background

Training which constructions workers undertake can be given recognition in a number of ways, including:

- Formal Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) procedures
- Formal accreditation of training programmes in line with the European Framework of Qualifications (EFQ) and relevant National Frameworks of Qualification (NFQ)
- Systems which acknowledge on-site or other training, but do not provide a formal recognition/accreditation
- Etc.

The majority of Pillar II projects include some or all of the above elements.
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Employer
- Quality Marks - Market Competitiveness
- Efficiency - Reduced Cost - Reduced Risk
- Public Procurement - Best Practice Scheme
- Higher Revenues - Improved Profit

Employee
- Respect / Image / Recognition
- Collective Purchasing
- Better Employment
- Salary Improvement
- Mutual Recognition

Building Case
- Guidelines - Private Sector in Particular
- Better Value for Money
- Improved Competit.
- Reduced Risk / Cost / Insurance
- Funding Criteria

Market Recognition
- Involvement
- Value of TRS for each
- Bottom-up Approaches
Objectives of this session

The aim of this session was to offer fuller picture of the necessary steps and procedures needed for the recognition of the training schemes at National and EU level as well as exploring the issue of market acceptance and training recognition by the building industry.

The following key issues were addressed:
- Topic 1: Recognition of Prior Learning – key success factors
- Topic 2: Formal Training Systems – from pilot to National Implementation
- Topic 3: Market Recognition

These topics were discussed in parallel in three different groups each of them chaired by a facilitator. All participants switched group for three times and therefore contributed to all discussions.

Topic 1: The scope and the approach in "large scale" training recognition and its key success factors.
Facilitator: Risto Ivanov (MK)

The discussions focused on the validation of non-formal and informal learning which according to EU council recommendations (2012/C 398/01) depends on four elements: Identification, Documentation, Assessment and Certification (linked with formal educational standards) with aim of providing an answer to the following questions:

- Can the scope be developed only for first three elements to provide validation of the learning outcomes that will concern occupational standards or certification should be seen as a mandatory step for recognition?
- Could we use only formative approach in assessment instead of the summative approach (certification of the qualification according to formal education standards)?

Main findings:
- Validation of non-formal and informal education (recognition of prior learning) can play an important role for the employability and mobility of construction workers. It is recommended by European Council to the EU Member States, to have in place a system of recognition of prior learning, not later than 2018 in accordance with national circumstances and specificities.
- CEDEFOP guidelines on recognition of prior learning provide direction in implementation of validation of non formal and informal education for "large scale" training schemes and comparability on EU level regarding to principles, approaches, processes, tools, learning inputs and learning outcomes.
- 7 out of 22 Build UP Skills Pillar II projects foresees to implement recognition of prior learning as steps towards provision of huge number of required skilled workers for Energy Efficiency measures.
- Formative approach (identification, documentation and validation) seems more applicable for validation than prior learning, giving opportunities for establishing trade and industry registers for Energy Efficiency workers. Establishing national registers could slow down the process which included assessment/certification in compliance with formal education standards.

Conclusions:
- Validation of non-formal and informal education(recognition of prior learning) can be a useful tool within BUILD UP Skills Pillar II projects for provision of required number of skilled workers for Energy Efficiency through market acceptance by trades and industries;
- "Large scale" training recognition is focused on validation of learning outcomes and competences that could be comparable at the BUILD UP Skills projects level as well at the EU level.
- Formative approach using portfolio of competences can provide mutual recognition of skills and competences among projects while summative approach (certification) will lead towards mutual recognition among EU countries.

Topic 2: Developing a National Training Programme – Key Success Factors
Facilitator: Horia Petran (RO)
Most of the BUILD UP Skills Pillar II projects are funded to implement formal training programmes (validated against the relevant National Framework of Qualifications) at a pilot scale. Discussions in this topic focused on the following questions:

- What approaches are being taken to scale these projects to a National level?
- What are specific challenges to ensure compatibility with the National Qualification System?
- Are relevant National Qualifications Standards Authorities engaging?
- What are the industry expectations?
- How the duration of a national training programme influences its recognition?
How can the link with ESCO\(^2\) be further exploited?

**Main findings:**

- Representatives of 14 countries participated in the workshop (BG, CY, EL, ES, FI, HU, IR, IT, LT, LV, PT, RO, SE, SI) of which 13 are currently implementing Pillar II projects.

- Scaling to national level the qualification schemes developed within BUILD UP Skills projects is directly linked to the body which ensures the recognition of trainings (e.g. by approval of curricula/ training programmes, authorisation of training providers and/or managing occupations registers) at national level. This body represents different stakeholders in different countries, namely the building industry (LT), the education system (BG, EL, FI, HU, LV, RO), a joint body from industry + employment (labour) + education system (ES, IT, PT), the employment (labour) system (CY, SI) or joint industry sector and education system (IR, SE).

- The main challenges to ensure compatibility with the National Qualification System relate to the relatively long and complicated procedure of updating the national catalogue of qualifications. A good compatibility of a newly developed qualification scheme is easier to be ensured when the qualification framework is well defined for at sector level or for an occupational area and having well defined set of modular competences. In most countries, after the finalisation of a qualification programme the certification is given ‘for life’; this leads to the need for definition of specialisation courses to ensure an effective updating of certified competences according to technological developments and market evolution.

- Engagement of National Qualifications Standards Authorities is very good in the participant Pillar II projects, either directly as project partner (7 of 13 countries) or as member of consultation/advisory/steering committee (4 of 13 countries), while in two countries input from the project to the relevant authorities is taken into consideration.

- Acknowledging and meeting industry expectations are needed to ensure actual training recognition. An effective way in this direction could be the establishment of a registry of contractors as a voluntary system (IR) or the implementation of the Construction Professional Card (TPC) endorsing training on safety and health, professional qualification and experience in the construction sector (ES). Other key issues for the training recognition by the industry are: reducing bureaucracy, reducing the duration of training programmes, quality recognition in tendering process.

- Training duration could be a potential problem (claimed by many construction companies) in ensuring the recognition of training schemes. Possible solutions to this problem could be the apprenticeship system and the implementation of on-site training programs. Moreover, the correct sizing of training programs based on competences analysis is preferred in order to reduce minimum durations imposed by the national qualification system.

- The ESCO (European Classification of Skills/Competences, Qualifications and Occupations) portal is not very well known among the participants, thus its usefulness for the development of national qualification schemes is uncertain at his moment.

---

\(^2\) ESCO is the European Classification of Skills/Competences, Qualifications and Occupations, system available at https://ec.europa.eu/esco/home
Conclusions:
- Ensuring compatibility with the national qualification system and meeting industry expectations are crucial aspects for the recognition of training programs developed under Pillar II of BUILD UP Skills;
- Direct involvement of National Qualifications Standards Authorities in the process of developing new qualification schemes targeted at national level is very important, especially if the national qualification system is under revision or updating process;
- The improvement of ESCO structure could be useful to increase mutual recognition of skills; this could be further explored in the BUS exchange activities.

Topic 3: Market recognition of the new training schemes
Facilitator: Seamus Hoyne (IE)

Discussions focused on the direct experiences of BUILD UP Skills projects with consideration of implications for the wider construction sector in terms of industry recognition of the new training schemes. The facilitator introduced his own experience in this respect which regards the setting up of a register for construction workers to allow the recording all their trainings (formal and informal).

The session sought to consider the ‘value’ which is placed on training from the view point of the worker (employee); employer/construction company and the building owner/client. The following conclusions were raised under each heading and should be used to influence the engagement of the market in using workers who have undergone relevant training.

Employer/construction company
- The use of highly trained and skill staff to deliver high quality building projects could be used to differentiate their company from others and support them in gaining greater market share.
- In particular for public buildings, where procurement processes could include conditions in relation to use of trained workers companies would use and support workers to engaging in training could have an advantage in the competitive market
- There is potential for greater efficiency for the company if their workers are trained. This could also reduce risk and potential cost overruns due to re-working etc. and therefore protect the companies margins

Employee/Worker
- The provision of training should support the worker in gaining great employment security, potentially result in increased wages and improve their potential for gaining employment in different companies and organisations
- The training should add value to the workers overall skills and knowledge and in some cases present them with progression opportunities in their respective field/craft
- The issue of recognition of the workers skills through training and training registers was felt as important as such registers provide a physical record of the training profile of the worker and all them to present their credentials within the market place

Client/Building Owner
- The client or building owner should be encouraged to utilise workers, crafts people and companies who met the relevant standards. One way of achieving this is by proving that the workers have the relevant training completed.
- Public procurement provides an opportunity to influence this through the inclusion of stipulations and conditions that require proof of training and Continuous Professional Development (CPD) processes to be in place e.g. https://ciri.ie
- Private sector procurement is not as easily influenced but through communications campaigns to building owners and potential clients on the value of focusing on quality and utilising trained workers this can be influenced.
- The potential for development of a workers card which demonstrates skills, competencies and training levels was deemed to an opportunity worth further development

Barometer: success factors in validating non-formal and informal learning
Facilitator: Risto Ivanov (MK)

Discussions focused on the success factors in validating non-formal and informal learning identified by CEDEFOP\(^3\) with the aim of determining whether some of these factors can be considered more important than others. Some of these factors are the following: partnership and coordination among stakeholders, quality assurance system, clear learning outcomes, capacity of staff, validation methodology, lack of buy-in to the validation process from companies etc.

A majority of participants identified three factors as the most important and three as the least important. Based on the participants' votes, three most important factors for "large scale" training recognition were identified: quality assurance system; clear reference points for occupational and qualification standards and private sector acceptance. The three least important factors identified during the session were: employer's fear for higher salary; private sector unwillingness to share experience and low personal expectations.

Participants identified the points that are more important for mutual recognition of training. QAS can facilitate process of recognition of educational/training standards; referent point can provide visibility of qualification levels as criteria for recognition and private sector acceptance will be consider as indicator for reaching occupational standards with "large scale" training schemes.

General conclusions

- Reaching of large number of skilled workers within BUILD UP Skills Pillar II projects is linked with three main types of action: validation of non-formal and informal education (recognition of prior learning), national training programs groups underpin by formal education standards and involvement of construction industry in training by recognition of skills for blue-collar occupations.
- Validation of non-formal and informal education is the fastest way to reach large number of qualified builders and it depends on partnerships with all stakeholders.
- Mutual recognition has to meet four groups of criteria: occupational standards; qualification levels; educational/training standards and assessment standards. Having in mind that occupational standards are harmonised among EU Member States by ESCO, qualification levels with EQF, the main focused of the projects have to be on assessment standards related to learning outcomes.

---

\(^3\) European guidelines for validating non-formal and informal learning, CEDEFOP 2009, p 20
Recommendations for a future session on the same topic
Next topics should refer to:

- Visibility of skills and competences within the projects,
- Assessment of learning outcomes and links with types of training,
- Training methodology for practical trainings,
- Apprenticeship programs and on-site trainings to meet industry expectations,
- Usefulness of ESCO facility to support the definition of skills and development of training programs at national and to improve mutual recognition between BUILD UP Skills Pillar II projects.
- Public Procurement requirements as a means to stimulate demand for trained workers
Parallel session on incentives

Facilitators: Ursel Weissleder (DE), Gábor Csirszka (HU) and Janna Schönfeld (EASME)

This session aimed to offer a fuller picture of existing incentives for workers to seek out training and for landlords to seek skilled workers. Groups discussed the three topics outlined below.

Background

Pillar I of the BUILD UP Skills initiative aimed to set up national qualification platforms and roadmaps to successfully train the building workforce in order to meet the energy targets for 2020 and beyond. At this stage all the Pillar I projects have come to an end and 21 countries have an ongoing Pillar II project.

Objectives of this session

This session aimed to offer a fuller picture of the existing incentives to stimulate the demand encouraging workers to participate in the training and landlords to choose skilled workers.

Organisation of the session

After a short introduction/presentation of the topics the facilitators explained how the session would be organised. (World Café method). Than the participants split in 3 groups and decided each one a
"table host". The ideas raised during the discussion were written down into the flipcharts. At the end the group leader presented for the whole team the result/main points of the outcome of the discussions. The sessions closed with questions and answers and sum up by the facilitators.

**Topic 1**

**Existing incentives to stimulate the demand in trainings**

- The issue is, as in markets where there are already lots of training courses in the field of energy performance of buildings, the participation of craftsmen to the training can be increased. This can be done by regulatory measures or through voluntary incentive systems. At the beginning of the workshop, measures were introduced for this purpose from the German BUILD UP Skills Project. The following points are related to the topic treated in the context of the on-going project: early recognition systems of future qualifications and skills needs (workshop - discussion on existing systems in other countries)
- strengthen support structures for the lifelong qualification of employees; development and implementation of career concepts within the HR development of SMEs in the building sector (e.g. to strengthen the attractiveness of the building trades)
- develop concepts for the CVET consulting and development of a main CVET database in the building sector
  - databases and also apps exist in several countries that allow workers to easily find courses that match their professional training needs
  - in larger training markets there could be a need to merge and standardize trainings (create market "brands")
- The "Master system" in Germany creates training needs (craft workers can only become self-employed with a master degree – which they receive after joining an extensive training course and passing a state-approved exam).
- HR support: some bigger building companies have upscaling programmes, but not relevant in small and medium sized crafts companies
- Some consultancy in the chamber of crafts for the vocational education training and also for further education training but sometimes not as structured and specific for the target group as it could be
- Obligations to hire certified workers /energy consultancies (e.g. for receiving subsidies)
- voluntary agreements in the construction industry to further educate their staff
- ESCO/EPC: these arrangements encourage quality—and in some cases also upskilling—since payment depends on cost savings that are generated through real energy improvements
- Sometimes there's a lack of incentive to train workers for fear of losing them to the job market after they've gained skills
- But - sometimes it is also an incentive for employees when the company provides further trainings and shows further career paths (compare CSR concepts that also exists in some crafts companies)

- Questions for further reflection:
- Which kind of incentives exist in your country?
• E.g. regulations, financial incentives, qualification campaigns
• Does (advanced) educational trainings are obligatory or voluntary for energetic renovations?
  • Is there any system for the early recognition of future qualification and skills needs?
  • How is the situation of HR development of SMEs in the building sector/crafts sector?
    • Are there supporting structures?

**Topic 3 was: Existing incentives to choose skilled workers/ How to encourage home owners to choose skilled workers.**

The importance of this topic was to try to find out how the results of the projects could be extended after the end of the project. The aim was to set up a kind of benchmarking activity or else sharing best practices to collect ideas from the different countries and to generate new ideas on the basis of the existing practices. The three main questions which were discussed were as follows:

i. Why should home owners choose skilled workers / energy efficient improvements?

ii. What was the financial advantage of the improvements performed by skilled workers?

iii. With what tools could the demand be stimulated/homeowners could be reached?

For the above questions the below comments, opinions, practices might be highlighted as the most interesting, important ones which came out during the debate:

• Compulsory regulation could be a very effective tool to orient homeowners to the required direction. However in the UK, worker qualification standards for government building projects have grown too broad/permitive—many different routes to earn/justify qualifications. Original requirement then became vacuous.

• In Germany there is a mandatory consultation of a building energy consultant for homeowners if they wish to apply for funding for energy efficiency of buildings. The consultation will be provided by engineers, architects or skilled master craftsmen.

• Layers of sub-contracting can become a problem: ‘you lose track of who is doing the job’.

• Health and safety of final construction might act as incentive for choosing skilled workers.

• In certain countries people choose between contractors: online reviews (crowd recommendations) vs. certified lists.

• Ideology and ‘prestige factor’ as a driving force for choosing skilled workers/seeking energy efficient construction; however that was a common understanding that this ‘state of mind’ only held by a smaller part of population.

• Another possible incentive was the worst case scenario: show cost or danger of doing wrong.

• Demographics should be considered when talking about incentives; different business cases depending on profile of property owners. (i.e. Some owners could afford but would invest.)

• Getting the building community itself to promote benefits would be a huge step forward.
• Very different opinions on financial advantage: Did renovations increase value of real estate? In BE and UK it’s questionable—widespread apathy. In Sweden and Germany, equipped houses could and did sell for more.
• Comfort—more so than money savings—reason for energy efficiency improvements.
• UK feed-in tariff and Green Deal: shortcomings discussed.
•ESCO/EPC: these arrangements encourage quality since payment depends on cost savings that are generated through real energy improvements
• In some countries, experts in local authorities could also be very important – as advisers.
• Summary of the answers for the question “How to reach homeowners?” (In no particular order): financial benefit, comfort, health & safety, smart building systems, checklist, ideals/philosophy.
• The answers for the question “The tools with which the homeowners could be reached?” were; net, word of mouth, experts of the local authorities, energy consultants, the business/ producers and building companies.

It was not surprising that the legislative frameworks are different in the countries. Based on the group discussion it became very clear that the existing incentive practices are also very different in the various countries. What works in one country does not work or is unknown in another. Nevertheless there were a lot of ideas which were new for some of the participants. It gave us the impression that the discussion was very useful hence the mentioned new ideas might be implemented, copied in those countries, areas where that were unknown.
Incentives to choose skilled manual home workers:
- Compulsory regulations
- Related to the work
- Quality
- Ideology
- Ignorance
- I have the cost of doing wrong
- Strategies

What tools to reach home how?
- Financial benefit
- Billing system
- Comfort
- Health & safety
- Smart building system
- Checklist
- Idea/hypothesis

Tools:
- Business cases for building companies
- Experts in local authorities

Which competences do craftsmen need for every renovation?
Who do we have to train further?
- Organization of the training market
- Cross-craft training -> also involve architects + engineers
- Competences of training providers

Existing incentives to stimulate the demand in training
- Training funded by construction companies
- Certificate companies for EE/RE
- Trained people have company

HR Development of SME

=> Standardising Development Programmes
=> Free Consultancy
=> Green Skills Advisers
- Comfort
- Real estate can increase in some markets
- National subsidies—mixed effort
Parallel session on cross-craft understanding

Facilitators: Anna Moreno (IT), Gerhard Bittersmann (AT) and Zoé Wildiers (EASME)

This session explored ways to enhance communication and understanding between different professions on construction sites.

Background

Nearly zero energy buildings are highly complex regarding the design but also the implementation of the various techniques. Even if there are only highly qualified professionals engaged at the construction site many problems still occur at the intersections of the different work areas. In many cases the craftsmen do not know about the needs of other professionals and so difficulties or even faults may occur. Examples of such problems are:

1) Thermal bridges
2) Permeations of air-tight envelope and of thermal insulation
3) moisture proofing at the plinth
4) installation of windows
5) installation of steam break

Objectives

The objectives were to exchange on the questions mentioned below. These exchanges were done in two small groups, who, at the end of the session, put their findings together.
Main findings

The main findings for each question are detailed below.

**How can craftsmen from one profession know the needs of other professions (and the needs for the whole construction/refurbishment) for a specific construction site?**

- Obligation on the quality of results to be shared among all the workers.
- Training on performance and quality control of other professions to be ready for nearly zero-energy buildings (NZEB).
- “Market driven”, it means that training in cross craft skills should be compulsory for all the workers for accessing incentives (French model).
- Higher educated building construction workers should promote this cross-craft understanding.
- Strengthen the responsibility for each craftsman in performing his work at high level.

**How can the communication between the different professions be enhanced at the construction site?**

- Soft skill training should be always included.
- Opportunities and time for craftsmen to get to know each other and their needs should be given, e.g. having common coffee break in order to facilitate communication.
- Building information modeling could be the basis for improvement of communication.
- There is the need not only for communication but also for change of culture i.e. to move, for instance, from the number of bricks laid in one hour to the quality of the construction.
- Higher educated technicians should motivate the other workers.

**How can VET address cross-craft understanding?**

- The knowledge and the consequences of badly performed work for other workers should be part of the training.
- The responsibility of the training should lit with the quality manager of the building site.
- Training the trainers should be extensively promoted even if it is very difficult to change the training system. So the idea is to train the trainers to improve the motivation for being trained.

**How can educations (trainings) other than VET address cross-craft understanding? Are dedicated trainings on cross-craft understanding a possible solution or should cross-craft understanding be part of any training for professionals in the building sector?**

- There should be a split between soft and technical skills.
- It is important to have clear responsibilities of site manager for providing cross-craft understanding (if there is a site manager).
- There is the need to approach the problem in a different way for big and small construction sites.
• Need use more modern tools like YouTube, apps, full virtual immersion.
• There is an example of compulsory training if involved in the refurbishment of social house in France and this training is free but compulsory before the works start.
• To train workers on the consequences of work not performed in a correct way.
• There is a need not only for cross-craft competences but also for “border competences” which could be better addressed if using BIM.

What is needed for SMEs working in the construction field to demonstrate they have the right skills and thorough cross-craft understanding?

• The motivation for SMEs could come from the compulsory requirement for cross-craft skills from the market.
• In some countries enterprises are obliged to devote funds for training workers. These funds could be used for the cross-craft training.
• Training should be more oriented to technology and not product specific.
• Training should be oriented to know why it has to be done in a certain way more than simply describing the technique.
• The training should contain building performance theories plus modular training for specific situations and this should be recognized for NZEB workers.
• In France the RGE system is market driven by incentives for developers and investors.
• The skills EU passport could be another important key to promote a wider acceptance of this cross-craft skills training.

---

4 E.g. an installer of photovoltaic panels also needs to know the requirements for installing solar panels or a roof insulation in order to avoid problems when working on the roof of an apartment. This is also the case for electric and hydraulic installations in an apartment. By the use of Building Information Modelling (BIM), it is possible to simulate the different installations in order to understand the different requirements in the design phase and avoid any problem while installing.

5 From 1 September 2014 onwards, energy efficient refurbishments in buildings can benefit from public financial incentives if the works are being performed by companies having the RGE label (“Reconnu Garant de l’Environnement”). Since the implementation of this measure, there has been a significant increase in the participation in trainings on energy efficiency in buildings.
How can craftsmen from one profession know the needs of other professions (and the need for the whole construction/refurbishment) for a specific construction site?

Soft skills - Training
Learning from each other
Knowledge about the consequences of the own work for others
Responsibility
Quality Management
Training of higher educated technicians → Motivation of workers

How can VET address cross-craft understanding?

Train the trainer
How can education (trainings) other than VET address cross-craft understanding?

Motivation

How can the communication between the different professions be enhanced at the construction site?

Soft skills - Time for communication BIM

How can VET address cross-craft understanding?

Training should be more oriented to technology and not only on specific products
Training should be oriented to overview → to know "why" an Envelope this
Performance in traditional training + modular training for specific situations

Specific training for need with recognition

How can education (trainings) other than VET address cross-craft understanding?
How can the communication between the different professions be enhanced at the construction site?

- Clear responsibilities of site manager & 'chefs' of craftsmanship
- Common meeting for operational coordination on-site
- Specific training with craftsmen using social media & YouTube records or programs
- Central role of building site manager
- Border skills

Are dedicated trainings on cross-craft understanding a possible solution or should cross-craft understanding be part of any training for professionals in the building sector?

Example: BIM - RGE system = market driven by incentives for developers/builders

What is needed for SMEs working in the construction field to demonstrate they have the right skills and thorough cross-craft understanding?

Skills passport (EC)
How can craftsmen from one profession know the needs of other professions (and the needs for the whole construction/refurbishment) for a specific construction site?

- TO KNOW THE PERFORMANCE OF RESULTS
- TRAINING ON PERFORMANCE AND QUALITY CONTROL OF OTHER PROFESSIONS TO GET READY TO NEED
- "obligation of result" (shared)
- Market driven with compulsory training for all
- Object & company hierarchy has to be involved (top-down)
- GENERAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE BUILDING PROCESS WITH REFERENCE TO THE CROSS POINT WITH DIFFERENT PROFESSIONS
- INVEST IN INFORMATICS TOGETHER TRAINING

Are dedicated trainings on cross-craft understanding a possible solution or should cross-craft understanding be part of any training for professionals in the building sector?

split between soft skills and tech-skills
Afternoon sessions

Parallel session on innovative training methods

Facilitators: Javier Gonzalez (Spain), Charalampos Malamatenios (Greece), Irmeli Mikkonen (Finland, BUILD UP Skills BEEP) and Antonio Aguilo (EASME)

Background

During the BUILD UP Skills EU Exchange meeting 3, Nov 2012, BUILD UP Skills Pillar I national projects exchanged on "Innovative training methods for the construction sector". The discussions highlighted that new and innovative approaches to training and up-skilling of workers are necessary. The following was concluded:

- Priority should be given on one hand to cross-professional training and on the other to develop specific CVET programmes targeted to the professions involved.
- The «multimedia / (web-based) self-learning in combination with real life/hands-on training» option was ranked as high priority.
- The need to train the trainers (and foremen) was highlighted.
- The cooperation between VET schools and companies, e.g. school building as training site, is a matter that should be promoted.
With this background in mind, Pillar II projects are likely to be taking these and other recommendations on board, and can act as a lever to foster a change in the teaching-learning process.

**Objectives of the session**

The session was designed to allow participants to exchange concrete experiences and to share best practices and examples of approaches to the design and delivery of trainings. The following topics were explored during the discussions with the participants:

- **Topic 1**: Motivational drivers that a training method should have to attract adult trainees.
- **Topic 2**: Pedagogical aspects that a training method should include to facilitate the teaching-learning process.
- **Topic 3**: Best practices and examples:
  - Hands-on training - innovative methods.
  - Innovative training resources based on ICT.

In the session two BUILD UP Skills II projects present their examples in detail:

1. BUILD UP Skills Construye2020 will present an example on the use of multimedia simulators for the training of construction workers and
2. BUILD UP Skills BEEP will illustrate their on-site training approach using a mentorship scheme

A total of circa 25 people attended the discussions.

**Summary of the session**

The first half of the discussions was spent on topics 1 and 2. These topics were discussed in parallel in two groups. Before splitting into two groups, an introduction was made as described below.

**Introduction to topics 1 and 2**

The group tried to analyze the influence of two important factors in vocational training, aspects that sometimes are not considered in depth when professionals design courses despite their core relevance to guarantee the success of the learning-teaching process, specially taking into account that the target group are adults:

- motivational drivers that a training method should have to attract adult trainees
- pedagogical aspects that a training method should include to facilitate the teaching-learning process
Several aspects were identified as key ones to provide an effective training (see figure below):

People are motivated by internal and external drivers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal drivers</th>
<th>External drivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional career</td>
<td>More money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal development</td>
<td>Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of your job</td>
<td>Social status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change of job</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GROUP 1 - Conclusions:**
A good practice to attract workers to trainings could be to foster common decisions between “boss-employees” regarding training, in order to facilitate a mutual benefit.

A good way to improve the recruitment of people for trainings would be to design information material applicable to each target group.

When the training course provides an accreditation the motivation to attend the course is higher.

It is necessary to focus our efforts on attracting those workers who are not interested in being trained.

There is a generational problem in VET because trainings are participated at the same time by young and older workers, and sometimes the older ones feel uncomfortable because their education took place long time ago and the methods were very different to those of today and consider that they won’t be able to follow the learning process in the way the younger ones do.

Finally, a good way to attract people to trainings is to provide training as real as possible to reality (on an authentic building site or at a training centre with workshops)

**GROUP 2 - Conclusions:**
Regarding the “internal drivers”, it was made possible – following the suggestions of the participants in this 2nd group - to identify some more (in addition to those already prescribed), namely the achievement of better and more specific knowledge in the area of interest, the refreshment of the existing knowledge, as well as the attitude of the worker to be well informed (e.g. about recent advances) in his field of activity; also, the more general mode of the worker’s “green thinking” was mentioned as a motivating driver for the participation of workers in the trainings foreseen for them.

Apart from the already defined “external motivational drivers” (see above), some more were listed as being critical, namely the provision of tools to remain competitive (stay in the market), the liability that is inhered in the “new” training/certification schemes, as well as the “certified” by the schemes improved quality of services.
Another motivational driver mentioned, which can be equally considered as being internal or external, is the general attitude of people – especially in southern Europe – to “show” (to their clients, family, friends) that they “hold a diploma”.

Last, but not least, special reference was made to the effect of existence (and display) of concrete examples of “successful stories”. As such, a Leonardo Da Vinci Programme funded project was mentioned, in the frame of which 600 workers from Ireland were trained and specialized in order to work in the construction of passive houses in Germany; this project had a great visibility and impact. The need to collect and prepare a database (being available to every interested person) of such “good practices” was highlighted.

**Topic 2: Pedagogical aspects**

Several aspects were identified as key ones to provide an effective training (see figure below):

**GROUP 1 - Conclusions:**

Design of the training: It should contain at least:
- General objectives
- Specific objectives
- Contents
- Timetable of the contents
- Methodology
- Training resources
- Assessment

Trainers
- The training of trainers should take into account the specificities of the group they usually train.
- It is absolutely necessary to motivate trainers.
• Important data to bear in mind: 65% of trainers are not able to teach using new ICT material

Training method
• All participants agreed that the training should follow a practical and hands-on method. Alternatively, the trainer should use while teaching demonstrative, investigative and/or imitative method.

Training resources
• Training resources (information, material, manuals, ICT, etc.) should be designed following a visual approach. Also, training resources should focus on practical examples.

Classroom and workshops
• The seating plan in classroom trainings should be in a U shape rather than classical one, in order to facilitate interaction between the trainees and thus foster useful and fruitful discussions.

• The workshops and on-site trainings should simulate as close as possible to the reality of a building site.

GROUP 2 - Conclusions:
In the 2nd group, each one of the 5 topics forming the overall picture of pedagogical aspects was discussed separately, and the conclusions are the following:

✔ Regarding the design of training, a very good idea mentioned was that the design should be relied on the opinion of the potential trainees themselves (i.e. the target groups of trainings), and this could be achieved through the circulation to as many of them as possible of a properly designed questionnaire.

✔ For the trainers, what was highlighted is that this group of experts should pass from the traditional form of very specific training for one profession per time to a new approach that has to address cross-craft issues; and for this purpose a relevant training of trainers is necessary (as an example, the case of Germany was mentioned, in which the “train-the-trainers” is done through a 1 day in-classroom course, that focuses on cross-craft issues, and the special issues for the respective profession are provided to them through e-learning).

✔ As regards the training method, all participants in the group agreed that the “investigative” procedure is the most suitable one, while all also agreed that the best combination is: In-classroom training +
Practical training (e.g. in a workshop / laboratory) + On-site practising (the only “problem” being to find the optimum share between them).

✔ In the case of training resources, the opinion of the participants was that the knowledge should be easily accessible to everybody and from everywhere, and this can be achieved through the use of “new technologies” (ICT); also, the possibility to create visual materials, such as videos, that “tell the story” was highlighted.

✔ Finally, regarding the settlements of the training, and as regards the in-classroom part of the training, it was mentioned that the general rule is to have no more than 25 trainees in a classroom at the same time (although from some of the participants this was considered as too high – e.g. in the case of restricted establishments, while by others it was considered as too low, in case that thousands of workers need to be trained in restricted time periods); regarding the practical part of the training, it was considered that the existence of a “mobile lab / workshop” (something like a bus that today will be here and tomorrow in a completely different town or even suburb of a city) is a very good option for fulfilling this task.

### Topic 3: Best practices and examples

Following the discussions above, and in the frame of Topic 3 “Best practices and examples”, concrete examples on training methods were presented from Spain and Finland.

**Example 1: BUILD UP Skills Construye2020 – Build a greener and a more sustainable 2020**

1. **Target group of the training**

The target group of the training that Construye 2020 project is addressing, it is shown on the next picture:
2. **Didactic design of the training** (skills map, objectives, contents, practical activities and assessment)

2.1. Experts

Construye 2020 training has been designed by experts in all the fields considered in the initiative in order to get training contents really adapted to target groups:

2.2. Elements

The training design has taken into account three important elements:

The skills map has been the basis to develop the didactic structure: General data, objectives, contents, activities, schedule and assessment.

2.3. Training resources

Specific training resources have been associated to each training actions in order to support the teaching learning process:
Trainers guide is a manual that will help teachers to provide the training properly and the same way in all over Spain.

Students guide is a manual that will help trainees to follow easily the ongoing course.

Didactic manual is a contents document with the most important aspects that trainees should know regarding the training course concerned. This manual will be supported by images, graphs, etc.,

The training courses will have some ICT resources available to aid trainees learning.

3. **Didactic method / Setting of the training**

The didactic method will combine theory and practice activities, 40% and 60% of the available time respectively. Theory will be based on an active teaching-learning method (interrogative approach) whilst practice activities will follow a hands-on one (demonstrative + imitative strategy). It is noteworthy that assessment will have a core importance in these training activities.

4. **Innovative training resources**
As for ICT resources, the training courses will have available two simulators that will hone students learning:

- **Training simulator on energy rehabilitation**: This tool allows students to simulate the energy rehabilitation of a building. Based on three different building models the trainee starts selecting a Spanish province in order to launch a specific simulation. Afterward, the students can decide on different refurbishment solutions that, under the criteria of comfort, price and energy saving, can be applied to different parts of the building, namely:
  - Envelope
  - Ventilation
  - Solar panels installation
  - Air conditioning and heating

Users can access the simulator by clicking on the following link:

http://multimediafundacionlaboral.com/archivos/Simuladores/Eficiencia/

*Usuario (user): invitado*

*Contraseña (password): invitado*

- **Training simulator on good practices in renovation of buildings**: This tool is under development, being its aim to show building workers concerned, good practices related to different activities in a building under renovation:
  - Aluminum carpentry
  - Insulation
  - Renewable Energy Systems
  - Energy Efficiency
  - Efficient installations
It should be noted that this tool will be available as an APP for mobile devices on Google Play and Apple Store, probably by the end of January 2015.

Example 2: BUILD UP Skills BEEP – Best Energy Efficient construction Practices

“Innovative Twist to Conventional Training”

1. Target group of the training and trainers’ qualification
   
   i. Training the trainers
      
      • Survey of competence of trainers
      
      - Competence gaps, most critical topics for updates

      • Training scheme development
      
      - Based on survey results, Status Quo analysis and current needs (new building codes, nZEB, etc.)

      • Pilot trainings
      
      - new training methods applied
ii. **On-site training of workers**
   - Training scheme development
     - Classroom training
     - Hands-on training
   - Training of change agents
     - Experienced, trusted workers
   - Train, mentor, encourage co-workers
     - Substance training
     - Attitude building, professional pride
   - Pilot trainings

iii. **On-site training ambassador**
   - Support to change agents
   - Promotion of the scheme to construction companies

2. **Didactic design of the training (skills map, objectives, contents, practical activities and assessment)**

i. Development of new training materials – Training schemes development – Pilot trainings – Further development of training schemes – Uptake of training schemes by relevant bodies
   - New training materials to meet the current and future needs:
     - ppt-slides, booklet of slides, instruction cards, video clips
     - illustrative, descriptive
     - 5 languages FI-SE-EN-EE-RU
     - accessible on-line, on-site (break rooms)
       - in electronic and printed format

ii. Illustrative ppt slides for training sessions
   - 12 topics with 15-20 slides each
iii. Instruction cards in comic strip format (see example below)
   • Illustrations with descriptive texts of most critical work phases
iv. 10 topics Educational videos for self-learning
   • Silent video clips: 4-6 topics, each about 5 minutes, subtitles in 5 languages, critical phases of construction
Example of instruction cards in comic strip format
3. **Didactic method / Setting of the training**

   i. **Training the trainer**
      - Up-take and use of activating training methods is emphasised. The length of the courses is intentionally short (2 days per each pilot training) to best match the challenges (e.g. time schedules) of the working life. Teacher trainees for pilot training are to be selected from different training organisations to maximise the distribution of the scheme. Altogether 20+20 construction sector trainers will be selected.
      - Training programme will take into account the results of the teacher survey carried out to find out the competence gaps. In addition to substance training also communication and attitude building will be included in the training plan.

   ii. **Training of change agents**
      - Training methods will be developed on learners' terms. Training will be divided to two parts: a theory part and a practical part at the construction site. The new material can be adapted into short efficient packages of the most important topics. The video clips will also play an important role in the pilot training.
      - Interaction between trainers and trainees will be emphasized to ensure best suited training methods and process

      Assessment of training schemes will be executed along the process by direct feedback of trainees through an assessment questionnaire after each specific training session. Also the feedback from the trainers/teachers and the on-site training ambassador will be asked after the trainings.

4. **Innovative training resources**

   i. **On-site training of change agents**
   
   ii. **Change agents to mentor co-workers**
   
   iii. **On-site training ambassador**
   - Promotion of the on-site training scheme
   - Support to change agents

   iv. **Versatile training material**
   - Adaptable to training of different target groups
   - Usable in several situations (classroom, on-site, break rooms, self-learning)
   - 5 language options
Parallel session on financing

**Facilitators:** Christiane Conrady (LU), Agris Kamenders (LV), Dragomir Tzanev (BG)

**Background**

Pillar I of the BUILD UP Skills initiative identified a clear need to improve the training of workers in the construction of nearly zero energy buildings. One of the key issues for Pillar II of BUILD UP Skills is how to finance this training. Looking forward, this question becomes relevant to the wider construction industry as we approach 2020. The question of financing touches on important related issues: who pays, and what incentive do they have to pay.
**Objectives of this session**

This session aimed to address these broad questions:

- What kind of financing can we get hold of?
- How much money is required?
- What are the consequences of these choices?

The discussions focused on the direct experiences of the BUILD UP Skills projects, with consideration of the implications for the wider construction sector.

**Organisation of the session**

We started with a plenary session in which the facilitators briefly explained how the session would be organised. Participants then all split into the three sub-topics for discussion, each with one facilitator. Each group discussed their topic for 20-30 minutes, then the groups rotated with the facilitator remaining on the topic. The facilitator briefly summarised the previous group’s discussions and the new group took this forward. Facilitators gathered to draw up flipcharts summarising conclusions on the three topics which were reported back to the participants in a plenary session.

The discussions were based around three topics:

**Topic 1: Attracting public money**

Facilitator: Dragomir Tzanev

The discussion was designed to analyse the options and approaches to finance the trainings which are planned to be delivered on the BUS projects in the second pillar of the initiative through public sources. It was envisaged that during this discussion, principle solutions for financing of training courses would also come to the fore. The most important conclusions were as follows:

- There are very limited number of agreements reached for financing of the trainings planned on BUS Pillar II project, as only the team in Netherlands has declared specific activities already undertaken to reach agreement with national Social Fund managing authorities;
- In general, there are two distinct approaches to financing of the trainings: through support from the EU Structural Funds and through engagement of industry and other market players;
- During the discussions, it was agreed that integrated approach would be the most useful one, covering all sources – EU programmes, support through national operational programmes and other national resources, involvement of the construction industry (including suppliers of building products, components and technologies), self-financing;
- All public support should trigger market deployment of the training schemes; all actions should involving public money target sustainability, improved market position and added value of the trainings for both employers and employees;
- An important source for financing are the programmes for qualification for the unemployed. Further efforts for cooperation with the responsible national actors should be exerted.
- Additional efforts should be put in the continuing qualification for elderly employees in the construction sector, as well as for the improvement of the qualification of young workers, who are entering the labour market; these approaches could be supported by responsible national authorities;
- The clearly outlined demand for cross-craft trainings, also triggered by the requirements of the RESD, EPBD and EED for specific trainings, could reflect in increased public support for training schemes developed on BUS projects;
- An opportunity which could be explored is cooperation with regional (or local) authorities, not only for financing but also for delivery of trainings. In some countries, regional training centres operate and collaborate with BUS partners;
- Some support for trainings could be provided through projects under Horizon 2020 projects, as except the specifically targeted topic EE-04, there could be other opportunities for limited amount of training activities, for example under EE-05 or EE-02;
- Significantly more options are available under Erasmus+ programme, which has opened its first submission procedures in October. Under this programme, there are opportunities for training of trainers and for activities supporting mutual recognition of acquired qualification;
- Another option for financing of trainings to be delivered on BUS projects are the Partiarian funds, which exist and operate in several European countries.

**Topic 2: Working with industry**

Facilitator: Christiane Conrady

1. *Who is “the industry”?*
   - Producers
   - Product suppliers, traders
   - Companies, employers

Producers are the most active group in terms of financing training programs. Training on specific products is a marketing instrument. Of course these training programs have some disadvantages:

- training program according to a specific product
- **exclusivity**: the craftsman handles only one specific product and depends on this product
- **no neutrality**: general “know how” is less a concern

2. **How could these training programs be organised with the financial support of the producer and - in the same time- how could these programs be more neutral and less exclusive?**

There are interesting examples in the Netherlands and in Austria, which were presented by the participants of these two countries. Based on the examples the following scenario has been developed:

- Combination of a “neutral” training part and a practical training part on specific products of preferably all producers operating on the national market.
Part I  Strengthen the neutrality  Part II  minimise the exclusivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“neutral training”</th>
<th>“practical training”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Recognise mistakes and find the solutions!</td>
<td>- implement the know-how of part I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview on typical mistakes **common to all products**
Overview on typical solutions, how to avoid typical mistakes

In **one course** practical training on material and products of different producers
Preferably of all producers selling their products on the national market

Financed by e.g. training funds
Up to 1/3 of the training costs

Financed by the industry
up to 2/3 of the costs

3. **Who can be interested to finance the “practical” part by providing “training material” such as heat pumps, ventilation systems, isolations material etc.? Whom to address?**

The traders and suppliers have been identified as the most interested group to address to for co-financing of a training program. Producers often operate in whole Europe and are far away from the problems companies operating on local level have to face.

For the traders this offer represents a Win-win situation:

- traders are confronted with mistakes and complaints
- the training helps to avoid mistakes
- traders are in direct contact with the companies
- if the business rival participates in the program, he has to participate as well
**Topic 3: Individual workers**

Facilitator: Agris Kamenders

During discussion financing options and possibilities to attract money from workers was discussed. Several options were evaluated and advantage/ disadvantage over other analysed:

1. **Workers pays** – worker attending trainings voluntary and paying for that. Due different reasons (economic situation, dependence from employer, lack of motivation etc.) most of the participants from different countries admitted that it would be hard or even impossible to based financing model on workers willingness to pay for trainings offered. It was agreed that maybe it could work in highly competitive market and for same part of workers that should be trained. Small part of the specialized workers or self-employed specialists like installers of boilers or ventilation systems could be interested in such training and would interested even to invest money. However probably a majority would be not ready to fully pay for their training if there is no clear short term benefits or demands.

   However it was also mentioned that training shouldn’t be offered totally for free as it could reduce credibility of trainings, engagement and possible feedback from workers on training quality.

2. **Compulsory training** – during meeting possibilities to introduce compulsory training also were discussed. Regarding compulsory training it was mentioned that in this case there is a risks that trainings will become very formal and ineffective. As well participants of the discussion didn’t see this as best way how to motivate workers to gain new knowledge and skills required.
3. Cost sharing between employer and employee. During discussion it was argued that it is possible to introduce trainings if costs are shared. Otherwise if only workers should pay it will create one more additional barrier to engage workers to trainings. If costs are shared and both parties are contributing it would allow them to demand better quality of trainings. It would also increase feedback and active participation from workers and employer side.
**WORKERS**

- Workers pays
  - in general (°) (only if there is benefit)
  - self-employed / small business specific incentives

**Compulsory training**

- 0
- if there is some fund for training, in form of tax

- Cost sharing: maybe good idea
  - good motivation
  - value of training
  - high barrier

**Financing training with industry**

- producers
- product suppliers, traders
- companies, employers
- training according to their products
- exclusivity
- no neutrality

EU-LEVEL

- Product
- Doctor A
- Company 1

NATIONAL

- Trader A
- Company 2

LOCAL

- Trader B
- Company 3

- Trader C
- Company 4

Neutral training

- mistakes -> solutions

Practical training

- material from Trader A, B, C
Parallel session on mutual recognition

Facilitator: Frantisek Doktor (Slovakia)

The following countries took part in the break-out session:

- Countries participating in the initiative led by Croatia in achieving mutual recognition of certificates (Croatia, Slovakia, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, ...);
- Italy, Luxembourg proposing to develop a wider initiative that would lead to establishing a system for mutual recognition of learning outcomes from further education and training of craftsmen and on-site workers in the sector of buildings.

The further steps of the initiative led by Croatia were discussed. It was stressed that the countries involved in this initiative should meet soon to discuss the mechanism on which the mutual recognition of certificates could be based. The different options were preliminary discussed, further discussion and exchange of information on the national qualification frameworks - specifically the qualification standards systems - and the progress achieved in the relevant countries is needed. This would facilitate the discussion on how to achieve the mutual recognition:

- From administrative point of view (for example, through acceptance of the qualification standards, setting minimum requirement for accepting learning outcomes etc.);
- From the point of view of achieving effective recognition by employers (involving employers in the system, ensuring ownership of the system);
• From the point of view of concerting the specific actions of the projects in the respective countries.

Italy and Luxembourg proposed further discussion on wider system of mutual recognition of learning outcomes. This suggestion was supported by Slovakia (Ireland was not participating, but presented a similar proposal in the presentation during the workshop of Concerted Action on 13 November 2014).

This mutual recognition could be based on:

• European qualification standards that would set minimum requirements for ensuring mutual recognition of the learning outcomes;
• Mutual recognition of specific learning outcomes based on existing models of mutual recognition;
• Developing a new system of mutual recognition that would take inspiration from existing systems in Europe, for example, the system of European driver’s license.

Italy, Luxembourg and Slovakia will develop a proposal for further considerations of other Member States.
Closing session

For the closing session of the day all participants gathered together to share the outcomes of each of the parallel sessions.
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<td>BUILD UP Skills STAVEDU</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georg</td>
<td>Trnka</td>
<td>Austrian Energy Agency</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills Crosscraft</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Vercruysen</td>
<td>BBR</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills Crosscraft</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariana</td>
<td>Štancic Zavrli</td>
<td>Building and Civil Engineering Institute</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills Crosscraft</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stilian</td>
<td>Ivanov</td>
<td>Bulgarian Construction Chamber</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills EnerPro</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charalampis</td>
<td>Malamatenios</td>
<td>Centre for Renewable Energy Sources and Saving (CRES)</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills UPSWING</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Bayless</td>
<td>Construction Industry Training Board</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills EnerPro</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristina</td>
<td>Fleischer</td>
<td>Croatian Employment Service</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills CROSKILLS II</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthi</td>
<td>Charalambous</td>
<td>Cyprus Energy Agency</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills WE-Qualify</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>O’Leary</td>
<td>Dublin Institute of Technology</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills Qualibuild</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alessandro</td>
<td>Proia</td>
<td>EASME, European Commission</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills Qualibuild</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio</td>
<td>Aguilo Kullan</td>
<td>EASME, European Commission</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills Qualibuild</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didier</td>
<td>Gambier</td>
<td>EASME, European Commission</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills Qualibuild</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td>EASME, European Commission</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills Qualibuild</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippe</td>
<td>Moseley</td>
<td>EASME, European Commission</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills Qualibuild</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td>Berruto</td>
<td>EASME, European Commission</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills Qualibuild</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoli</td>
<td>Wilders</td>
<td>EASME, European Commission</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills Qualibuild</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jovanka</td>
<td>Arizankovska</td>
<td>Economic Chamber of Macedonia</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills BEET</td>
<td>FYROM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gébor</td>
<td>Couzie</td>
<td>EMI Non-profit Limited Liability Company for Quality Control and Innovation in Building</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills TRAINBUD</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragomir</td>
<td>Tzanov</td>
<td>EntEffect Group</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills EnerPro</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per-Johan</td>
<td>Wik</td>
<td>Energy Agencies of Sweden</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills SWEBUILD</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henri</td>
<td>Le Marois</td>
<td>Espace Inter-Initiatives</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills SWEBUILD</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maarja</td>
<td>Katin Kerem</td>
<td>Estonian Qualifications Authority</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills BUILEDST II</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol</td>
<td>Goetzinger</td>
<td>Fédération des artisans</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills LuxBuild</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni</td>
<td>Carapella</td>
<td>FORMEDIL - Ente Nazionale per la Formazione e l'Addestramento Professionale nell'Edilizia</td>
<td>BUILD UP SKILLS J-TOWN</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katin</td>
<td>Rasch</td>
<td>Foundation for the Advancement of the Re-search Institute for Vocational Education and Training in the Crafts Sector at the University of Oulu</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills Qualtrain</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristof</td>
<td>Van Roy</td>
<td>Hub-B, Hub-T</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills Qualtrain</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursel</td>
<td>Weissleder</td>
<td>German Confederation of Skilled Crafts e.V</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills Qualtrain</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attila</td>
<td>Zoltan</td>
<td>Hungarian Coordination Association for Building Engineering</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills TRAINBUD</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Moreno</td>
<td>Italian National agency for new technologies, Energy and sustainable economic development (ENEA)</td>
<td>BUILD UP SKILLS BRICKS</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Family Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier</td>
<td>González López</td>
<td>Labour Foundation for Construction</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills Construye2020</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamus</td>
<td>Hoyne</td>
<td>Limerick Institute of Technology</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills Qualibuild</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalius</td>
<td>Gedvilas</td>
<td>Lithuanian Builders Association</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills ENERGOTRAIN</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irmieli</td>
<td>Mikkonen</td>
<td>Motiva Services Oy</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills BEEP</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christiane</td>
<td>Conrado</td>
<td>myenergy</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills LuBuild</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horie</td>
<td>Petran</td>
<td>National Institute for Research and Development in Construction, Urban Planning and Sustainable Spatial Development</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills QualiShell</td>
<td>Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helder</td>
<td>Goncalves</td>
<td>National Laboratory of Energy and Geology</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills FORESEE</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Antonio</td>
<td>Tenorio</td>
<td>National Research Council</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills Construye2020</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haris</td>
<td>Doukas</td>
<td>National Technical University of Athens</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills UPSWING</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Cromwijk</td>
<td>OTIB</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills Netherlands At Work</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diogo</td>
<td>Bemio</td>
<td>Portuguese Energy Agency (ADENE)</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills FORESEE</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantas</td>
<td>Jonauskas</td>
<td>Regional Innovation Management Centre</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills ENERGOTRAIN</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnis</td>
<td>Kamunders</td>
<td>Riga Planning Region</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills FORCE</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Cattabriga</td>
<td>Sinergie Società Consortile a Responsabilità Limitata</td>
<td>BUILD UP SKILLS I-TOWN</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni</td>
<td>Pede</td>
<td>Sinergie Società Consortile a Responsabilità Limitata</td>
<td>BUILD UP SKILLS I-TOWN</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Magyar</td>
<td>Slovak Innovation and Energy Agency</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills STADEVU</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruud</td>
<td>Gerafinas</td>
<td>Stöcking SBR</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills Netherlands At Work</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerhard</td>
<td>Bittersmann</td>
<td>Swisian Energy Agency</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills Crosscraft</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uma</td>
<td>Hennings</td>
<td>Tallinn University of Technology</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills BUILDEST II</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaakko</td>
<td>Sorri</td>
<td>Tampere University of Technology</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills BEEP</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Widell</td>
<td>Technological Institute Sweden</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills SWEBUILD</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ligia</td>
<td>Flores</td>
<td>The Ownership of Producers for Thermo-Insulating Carpentry</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills QualiShell</td>
<td>Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivana</td>
<td>Banjad Počur</td>
<td>University of Zagreb Faculty of Civil Engineering</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills CROSKILLS II</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aija</td>
<td>Ruse</td>
<td>Vidzere Planning Region</td>
<td>BUILD UP Skills FORCE</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-attended:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Family Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>De Bono</td>
<td>EICC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panayiotis</td>
<td>Kastanias</td>
<td>Cyprus Energy Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katerina</td>
<td>Vigniani</td>
<td>EASME, European Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registered on-site:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Family Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Horvath</td>
<td>DG ENTR, European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Wouters</td>
<td>INVE EEIG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>