



### 1. Title

NeMESI project Experts workshop (Taller de expertos del proyecto NeMESI)

### 2. Organiser(s) and facilitators

Organiser: Confederación de Empresarios de Aragón (CREA)

Facilitators:

Name and Surname	Organisation	Role in the organisation
Jorge Alonso	CREA	Head of the International Relations Department

### 3. Objectives

- Getting a deep and a first hand knowledge of the situation of the skills shortage in ICT and green jobs sectors.
- Encouraging dialogue among participants to exchange ideas and knowledge about the labour market in ICT and green economy sectors.
- Analysing trends on the training offer and companies' skills demands.
- Identifying good practices and solutions to correct the skills shortage.

### 4. About participants

Number of participants: 13 (although 2 participants weren't able to attend at the last minute)

Number of feedback forms received: 9

Participants at the workshop described their job role(s) as follows:

Job role	Number of participants and percentage <sup>1</sup>
María Vicente – Strategic Projects	
Carlos Franco – Strategic Projects	
Félix Gil – General Manager	
Javier Sánchez – General Manager	

<sup>1</sup> Percentages are in relation to the number of feedback forms received.



Javier Val – Director of Entrepreneurial Service	
José Antonio Campos – General Manager	
José Miguel González - Director	
Luis Solsona – Commercial Manager	
Jorge Alonso – Head of the International Relations Department	
Olivia del Amo – Technician at the International Relations Department	
Manuel Pérez – General Manager	
Total	

## 5. Discussion: key points and main recommendations from participants

### Key points from discussion

- General overview of the ICT and green economy labour market. Most demanded job positions. Changes in the labour market.
- Situation of the training sector. Training programmes. Communication between training sector and companies.
- Skills shortage. Reasons and consequences.
- Identification of mechanisms to solve the skill shortage in both sectors.

### Main recommendations from participants

- Improving and reinforcing communication between companies and the training sector. It is necessary to design better communication channels between both sectors. Changes in labour market are happening very fast and training sector is not always able to adapt it to them. Quick and flexible communication channels.
- Promoting public-private collaboration to increase employment in some subsectors. There are employment niches identified in some subsectors of the ICT and green jobs, but the public policies are not keeping them in mind. Therefore job positions and, therefore, skills, are being lost.
- Improving public employment systems.
- Promoting lifelong training among workers. Designing training programmes adapted to workers' skill needs, also flexible, because the market changes so fast. It is a way to keep talent, to answer clients needs and to be more competitive.
- Languages skills are the most important skill identified, not only for the project sectors, but also in general. Specially English is basic for business, and many



- Spanish companies are losing opportunities abroad because of their low level of English. This affects consequently to job creation.
- Languages, teamwork and learning skills are the skills identified as very relevant by workshop participants in both sectors.

## **5. Possible follow-up**

## **6. Annexes**

- I. List of participants (name and surname, organisation, role in the organisation, e mail address and signature)
- II. The flipcharts or posters of the scenarios produced by the individual interest groups.
- III. The flipcharts or posters from the thematic groups.
- IV. The process report (see Toolkit - paragraph II.2)
- V. Evaluation questionnaires (see Toolkit - paragraph II.3) (copies of the questionnaires filled in by participants)
- VI. A master plan including activities and responsibilities for the future. This master plan is not a necessity but an option depending on the willingness and possibilities of the participants.



## **Annex I – List of participants**

See attachment: Annex I. Attendance list\_workshop\_NeMESI



## Annex IV - The process report

### Section 1. Input to the process

#### 1. Participants

María Vicente Carlos Franco	<b>SARGA</b> Public company of the Government of Aragon that implements a wide range of agri-environmental projects and services addressed to improve the rural affairs and the environment in Aragon region	Aragon region
Clara Presa (NOT POSSIBLE TO ATTEND)	<b>ZINNAE</b> Urban Cluster for the Efficient Use of Water	Aragon region
Félix Gil	<b>EFOR</b> ICT company	Aragon region
Javier Sánchez	<b>FEUZ</b> Institution for the training and promotion of company internships of graduates and undergraduates from the Zaragoza University.	Zaragoza province
Javier Val	<b>CEZ</b> Zaragoza Business Association (Self-employment service)	Zaragoza province
Olivia del Amo Jorge Alonso	<b>CREA</b> Business association	Aragon region
José Antonio Calvo (NOT POSSIBLE TO ATTEND)	<b>QUALITAS</b> Training organization	Aragon region
José Antonio Campos	<b>FASE</b> Training organization (ICT experts)	Aragon region and other regions
José Miguel González	<b>UNIVERSA</b> Zaragoza University (Guidance and Employment Service)	Aragon region
Luis Solsona	<b>INNOTEC</b> ICT SME	Located in Aragon region, but works in Spain and in some Latinoamerican countries



Manuel Pérez	<b>TECNARA</b> ICT Cluster	Aragon region
--------------	-------------------------------	---------------

1.2 What groups are represented? Note the absence of any relevant groups that could be considered stakeholders.

There were represented all kind of stakeholders.

1.3 Were all potential stakeholders aware of the workshop, and given the opportunity to attend? Please justify.

Yes, we have contacted all potential stakeholders. Nevertheless, SMEs from both sectors find very difficult to attend the workshop due to the length of it.

1.4 Who was involved in setting the agenda? Was there participant help?

Agenda was set by CREA according to the coordinator toolkit.

Section 2. Description of the process

Describe the process of the scenario development, the drawing up of the themes and the planning of further steps. Report the participants´ points of view and the dynamics of the discussions). In reporting the process, please also answer to the following questions:

- Does any group participant appear to be pushing one particular viewpoint? If so, to what extent is the conversation free from bias?

No, participants were very opened minded.

- Does any participant appear to be pushing an agenda as opposed to engaging in collective solutions? If so, to what extent is collective thinking apparent?

No.

- To what extent do participants explain why they are for or against any particular proposal? Proposals cannot simply be dismissed or accepted without a ‘rational’ reason.

All participants explained their reason when talking about any proposal.

- To what extent do participants ask questions, request clarification, explanation, and supporting reasons from any and all members of the group?

The discussion was very dynamic and questions to other participants were normal.

- To what extent are participants polite and discuss opinions and ideas?

Politeness ruled the discussion. Participants were very respectful with other opinions and ideas.

- To what extent do participants appear comfortable sharing their ideas, opinions, experiences and feelings?

They felt very comfortable during the workshop and that was they expressed after the session, not only on the evaluation questionnaire, but also directly to CREA.



- To what extent is knowledge variety presented? Knowledge variety implies that participants are thinking creatively, presenting positions, and supporting their arguments. It can also indicate that the participants are considering all aspects of the problem, sharing their 'expertise' with others.

Each participant comes from different sectors and backgrounds, so the knowledge exchange was very rich and varied.

- What is the level of understanding of participants information provided before and during the process? Do they look confused during group sessions?

CREA contacted all participants by phone and with a direct visit explaining them the objectives of the workshop and the development of the session. The same day, they had more information within the folder provided to them. They did not look confused at any time.

- Do people using discipline specific language clarify it for others?

Nobody used any jargon at the workshop.

#### *Description of the process:*

The process started weeks before to the workshop when contacting potential stakeholders by phone and with direct visits. CREA presented NeMESI project, the role of stakeholders and the objective of the workshop. Then, stakeholders were invited to participate in it.

One week before the workshop, CREA contacted again to participants via email to remind the date and send a paper version of NeMESI introduction.

The 25<sup>th</sup> March, the workshop started with a introduction session by CREA, where the project NeMESI was presented again and then, participants presented themselves. One of the participants, SARGA institution presented also a project they were working in last year (*New skills for green jobs*) that is related to NeMESI project. That project was co-funded by the European Commission, in the framework of the PROGRESS programme and it aims at promoting an adequate skills base to support the transition towards a green economy (<http://www.newskillsforgreenjobs.eu/>).

After that, the facilitator opened the discussion with different questions about the situation of the labour market in both sectors to encourage the debate in a plenary session. Different positive scenarios were developed by participants. Participants talked in a base of freedom and respecting all point of views and everyone's turn to speak.

The plenary session was followed by a group session. There were two thematic groups: one for ICT and another to green economy. The objective was to find



means of action to achieve the scenarios developed at the previous stage.

This stage finished with a plenary session where the results were presented to the other group. Participants share opinions and point of views, and also feeded and completed the solutions achieved in the other group.

The workshop finished with a round of conclusions. With the ideas arisen in the workshop and with everyone's previous knowledge, participants suggested future steps to develop.

### Section 3. Output to the Process

1 – None; 2 – Somewhat; 3 – A fair bit; 4 – A lot; 5 – Completely

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
Participants were engaged in creating new discourses					X
Networks and/or coalitions appeared to be forming between participants during the workshop				x	
Workshop outcomes may influence participants organizations				X	
Workshop outcomes may influence policy				X	
Participants appeared to be empowered at the end of the workshop					X

Report the results of the feedback round of the participants at the end of the workshop:

- Promoting public and private alliances
- Better communication between university and companies. Find ways of collaboration and communication.
- Improving lifelong learning. Companies must be flexible to allow their employees to train themselves. Now it is expected that the employees train themselves in their free time. This discourages training.
- Improving English language skills from early years at schools.
- Improving public guidance services.
- Strategic vision of the politicians. See the reality of the situation and establish solutions at medium and long-term. Do not cut training budget: it is affecting languages learning, etc.



- Adapting job offer to the real company needs to avoid overqualification. Sometimes they ask for a knowledge (languages, degree, etc.) that is not going to be applied to the workplace. They do it “just in case”.
- Reaching a better definition of skills for each sector or areas of expertise.



## **Annex V - Evaluation questionnaires**

See attachment: Evaluation questionnaires\_NeMESI