

Summary Table of Peer Country Comments

	Labour market situation in the Peer Country	Assessment of the policy measure	Assessment of success factors and transferability	Questions
Croatia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Croatia has low activity, low employment and high unemployment rates. ▪ The youth unemployment rate (45.5 percent in 2014, 41 percent in 3rd quarter 2015) is one of the highest in the EU. ▪ In comparison to other EU countries, the NEET rate in Croatia is also high, but most of the population is registered as unemployed. ▪ The most important problem is low labour market demand (due to the prolonged effects of deep economic crisis). ▪ The consequences are a large share of youth unemployment without prior work experience and large share of long-term unemployment in youth cohorts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Most of the NEET in Croatia registered as unemployed, are eligible for the ALMP package Young and Creative. ▪ Most ALMP measures provide financial benefit either to participants and/or to the employers. ▪ Current counselling practices include collective and individual approaches, but not integrated within a specific measure. Such an approach could be used in the future within the Project Social innovation in the activation of young persons. ▪ The Croatian Employment Service exchanges data with Centres for Social Welfare, but no specific measures oriented towards increasing the employability of the recipients of social benefits system scheme have been developed so far. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identification of the vulnerable target group as defined by the French measure would be difficult, due to the fact that means-testing and/or income-testing is not readily available in Croatia. ▪ Perceptions of fairness might be questionable in the case of ad-hoc local committees. ▪ Providing motivation for employers might be challenging in the situation with excess labour supply on the market. ▪ Institutional setting for the implementation is well developed in Croatia. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How to motivate employers to participate. In the situation of long recession (such as in Croatia), the overall demand for labour is suppressed accompanied by high unemployment. So, even if the employers participated in ALMPs, they are more likely to use the same measure to different persons, sending the participants back to the unemployment register after the measure has ended. ▪ More information on the experience of counsellors working in pairs would be welcomed. ▪ The issue of immersion, or short spells of employment by different employers should also be additionally discussed.
Estonia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ After youth unemployment rates rocketed during the crisis, Estonia has recovered fast and the youth unemployment rate is 15% in Estonia vs 22.2% in the EU-28 in 2014 ▪ Long-term unemployment is still a serious problem: in 2013, two out of five unemployed young persons in Estonia had been 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Youth Guarantee Scheme 2014-17 has changed the situation of the youth policy approach since there were no comprehensive labour market policies specifically targeting young people before. ▪ The most similar services to France's Guarantee for Youth measure are career counselling, work practice which are open to all unemployed; and in the framework of the Youth Guarantee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Estonia may draw from France's experience on how to create the maximum added-value from cooperation among national and local authorities, the business sector and non-governmental organizations in the implementation of the Youth Guarantee. ▪ Combined individual and collective accompaniment might potentially work as a strong motivator to stay in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How is the work of local Missions locales organised in relation to other institutions providing services to unemployed youth in region? ▪ How does the central/local government motivate members of the local service provides to cooperate and exchange the information (for instance contacts with employers etc)?

Summary Table of Peer Country Comments

	Labour market situation in the Peer Country	Assessment of the policy measure	Assessment of success factors and transferability	Questions
	<p>unemployed for more than a year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One in four recent school leavers can be characterized as NEET, approximately the same as the EU average. 	<p>special initiatives targeted to youth, career workshops, "My first job" and Tugila (Support) project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similarly, local centres having previous experience with youth (in case of Estonia, Youth Centres) are involved in making contact with NEETs. Similarly, work practice offers opportunities for youth (and other unemployed) to gain practical experiences. Differently from the host country measure, no substantial direct financial support is given to youth. Also no predefined schedule is planned with individual and collective accompaniment, it is more tailor made for each young person in Estonia. 	<p>the measure and proceed towards the labour market. In addition to development of key competencies, those collective workshops stimulate exchanges and relationships among peers and a more individual emotional attachment with counsellors and group of young people.</p>	
Finland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unemployment, youth unemployment and NEET rates are about EU 27 average at the moment, but deteriorating. Finland has a very skewed age structure – big aged cohorts leaving the work force, and young cohorts only half the size of these, and very low immigration and foreign population (despite the ongoing refugee upsurge). So efficient mobilisation of the entire workforce, in all age groups, is relevant for Finland. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main points of the French measure – localised, multi-actor, multi-professional, tailored service, with low workload and using a mix of personal and peer group methods – all make sense also in the Finnish context Finland does not have as much a 'work first' and vulnerable group focus as the French measure, but building good 'spaces of experience and connection to work' to enhance the pathway to employment is relevant for Finland 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The French pilot has already identified many success factors: local, tailored network delivery etc. and also that the counsellors should not have too hard a workload, lest compromise the individualised, tailored way of working with vulnerable groups. In addition, the contacts with workplaces, and providing them (especially SMEs) with help in recruitment and arranging the work experiences is an important success factor. Overall, the philosophy and delivery mechanism of the French initiative serves to reassert, 'mutatis mutandis', 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How can it be secured, that the best practices and 'social capital' developed in Guarantee for Youth, of the Mission locales, and their networks, will be mainstreamed to normal structures and practices, as (also in Finnish experience), the mainstream tends to remain in status quo while the pilot is running, and it is difficult to 'sell' the practice after the pilot has ended? How do you intend to keep the best newly recruited Guarantee for Youth counsellors available after the pilot – or will they disappear? How do you secure that the

Summary Table of Peer Country Comments

	Labour market situation in the Peer Country	Assessment of the policy measure	Assessment of success factors and transferability	Questions
			<p>many ideas and practices relevant for Finland, and challenges Finland to develop 'learning and contact spaces to work', and take a careful look at the most vulnerable groups, and to provide real work experiences.</p>	<p>counsellors keep having a reasonable workload, and don't burn out?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How do you intend to secure further development of coordination on the local and regional levels? ▪ How do you intend to secure national level commitment to both Guarantee for Youth, and the Youth Guarantee?
Germany	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Germany is a country with a federal system. ▪ While in the past, there was a lack of apprenticeship places, the situation is now characterized by mismatch. ▪ Youth unemployment is a low-skill problem. ▪ Young people with a migrant background face a higher risk of being early school leavers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In Germany, measures targeted at disadvantaged or socially vulnerable young people aim in the first place to build bridges to vocational education. The work-first approach is less in the focus. ▪ The pre-vocational support schemes links vocational orientation, individual guidance, training of life skills and basic skills as well as in-company work trials in order to gain workplace related vocational skills. In-company training modules can, however, not always be provided. ▪ The internship scheme Entrance Qualification promoted by the PES in the context of the pre-vocational training schemes provides young people in-company internships where they can already gain basic vocational skills. Curricula have been established by the relevant institutions. However, quality of vocational training and its modularised 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From a German perspective the strength of the French approach lies in the local partnership approach. ▪ Success factors consist also in the intensive individual follow-up (both in France and Germany). The combination of collective and individual guidance could be transferred. However, it would be provided by external contractors in the case of Germany. ▪ A high qualification level and professional approach of counsellors (in-house or external) seems to be a crucial success factor in Germany and France. ▪ Granting means-tested benefits in case of participation in a programme could have a stronger motivational effect than the sanctioning of non-participation. ▪ One important success factor of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the average length of an "immersion" in companies? In how many companies on average will the young person be in touch? What type of sectors and jobs? Is it known how important the probability to be employed or get an apprenticeship by these companies is, after completion of the programme? ▪ What type of training component is offered to young people? How is the quality of training controlled for? Is it possible to get some training elements certified? ▪ Is the collective accompaniment organised in-house with PES staff? If yes, why are they not externalised to specialised providers? ▪ What is the contractual relationship with the employer? Do minimum

Summary Table of Peer Country Comments

	Labour market situation in the Peer Country	Assessment of the policy measure	Assessment of success factors and transferability	Questions
		<p>recognition cannot always be assured. Nevertheless, the success of the German approach rests on its link with the dual vocational training system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A more intense guidance for young people and employers for dual vocational training of socially vulnerable young people and those with learning disabilities is a new approach (assisted training - assistierte Ausbildung). This measure can be a follow-up measure of prevocational training measures. It shows the strong orientation towards integration young people via the dual vocational training system. 	<p>German approach is that it allows for the majority of participants to be taken over by the companies as apprentices. The advantage for the company lies in the fact that they can get to know the young people. The success factor of the German approach relies in the combination of work practice and acquiring basic vocational skills.</p>	<p>wages need to be paid? How exactly does the workfare element of the scheme works?</p>
Ireland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The rates of both unemployment and youth unemployment are falling steadily in Ireland. There has been an increase in education participation since the onset of the economic crisis. ▪ As elsewhere, unemployment is higher among those with the lowest levels of education. There are some minor regional variations. ▪ It is estimated that job-seeking NEETs constitute only 3% of the youth population. ▪ Ireland has a universal means-tested unemployment payment for persons aged over 18 years and the vast majority of young 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participation in education in Ireland is very high and unqualified youth are at particular disadvantage vis-à-vis the labour market. ▪ The Irish Youth Guarantee is a general measure and is an enhanced version of the existing activation process. The Garantie Jeunes is more ambitious but is itself a high intensity measure within a wider package of actions. ▪ There is nothing at a systemic level in Ireland that correlates with the Missions Locales in terms of experience working with unemployed youth, professional competences or ability to build and sustain partnerships. ▪ Initial outcomes give rise to optimism but there is not yet sufficient robust data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A strong commitment by Government and national (and regional) authorities is essential to the success of the Youth Guarantee. ▪ Effective partnerships are crucial to the delivery of the multi-layered response necessary to deliver the Guarantee for Youth to vulnerable youth. ▪ The engagement of employers in providing a learning environment as well as work placement is highly significant and the MLs are uniquely placed to mobilise this resource. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If the Garantie Jeunes for Youth works with structural NEETs, what measures are in place to address the situation of the rest? ▪ How do MLs reach, select and hold the more distant (from integration into the labour market) youth? ▪ What protections for clients are in place regarding the quality of work placement and safeguarding against exploitation? ▪ What work is taking place on measurement of impact, evaluation and appropriate metrics?

Summary Table of Peer Country Comments

	Labour market situation in the Peer Country	Assessment of the policy measure	Assessment of success factors and transferability	Questions
	NEETs are registered with the benefits/employment service.	on which to evaluate the effectiveness of the measures in Ireland or France.		
Latvia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In Latvia, the majority of NEETs are aged between 20 and 29 years old. ▪ Female NEETs are more likely to be inactive than unemployed, and the most common reasons for this include pregnancy or child care responsibilities. Male NEETs are more likely to be unemployed. Among inactive male NEETs, more than a quarter are reported to suffer from poor health or a disability. ▪ The YG successfully deals with the 'traditional' causes of youth unemployment providing training and first work experience programmes. It is less successful in supporting young people who face health-related obstacles to employment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Definition of the target group in the Latvian YG is broader in terms of age (15-29 years) and vulnerability criteria. ▪ Latvia has a different intervention logic compared to France. Instead of the French 'work first' approach, the Latvian YG entails a set of services placing training ahead of work experience. ▪ The collective dimension of support provided under the French Guarantee for Youth would be successful and transferable in Latvia. ▪ In Latvia, financial support provided to young people is part of a particular measure as opposed to means-tested ▪ Although the specialisation of counsellors in youth work is recognised as important in both countries, it is better developed in France as counsellors there have lower caseloads compared to Latvian counsellors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Similarly to France, Latvia has already developed a strong national commitment to helping young people under scope of the YG. However, Latvia has established its own framework for administering the programme. ▪ Latvia is particularly interested in real life examples of how French authorities have built partnerships with local employers and developed outreach work, especially for the activation of disabled young people. ▪ The French experimental YG approach contains some novelties which would be recommendable to transfer to Latvia; e.g. collective support and means-tested support for the most vulnerable groups. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How is youth outreach work organized? What is the process for identifying NEETs? How to motivate them to take part in a programme or measure? How are young people with disabilities activated? ▪ Do you launch any social campaigns to increase awareness of the Guarantee for Youth? Which types of media have been used? ▪ To what extent are financial incentives important to get French employers to participate in the Guarantee for Youth? Are there any other important (non-financial) incentives? ▪ What is the main reason for choosing the 'work first' principle? How are young people encouraged to obtain proper qualification themselves?
Poland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Poland is a country with persistent structural problems on the labour market. ▪ Young people struggle with high insecurity on the labour market. ▪ The NEETs rate is higher among the population aged 25-29 than 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Polish "Your career, your choice" measure has several commonalities, which could be effectively compared to the French Guarantee for Youth measure ▪ In a contrast to the French case, there are five forms of support, so called 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In general the transferability of the French measure is possible, but there are several details which should be considered with caution due to different expectations of the young people ▪ The idea of gaining plurality of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How many "immersions" does an individual undertake during the one year on average? ▪ How long does each "immersion" last on average? ▪ Does the measure address the problem of high insecurity of young

Summary Table of Peer Country Comments

	Labour market situation in the Peer Country	Assessment of the policy measure	Assessment of success factors and transferability	Questions
	<p>among the younger population (aged 15-24).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recent legislative changes extended the YGP to the age group 25-29 in Poland. 	<p>“immersions”, which can be chosen by the individual.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Young people can choose up to five forms of support with relatively huge level of autonomy. The Polish measure seems to be more supportive of the provision of sustainable and long-lasting employment, than the French case. 	<p>professional experiences, while original, might be perceived as a measure that does not increase the chances of gaining stable long-lasting employment to young people. Therefore, while transferable, the measure might not attract enough attention to the young Poles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In both countries there is a strong emphasis on the active involvement of companies in the accompaniment process. While Polish employers complain about the rigid requirements regarding the duration of the contract with young people, some flexibility in this respect transferred from the French case, might increase the effectiveness of Polish measure. Financial support introduced in the French Guarantee for Youth in the form of means-tested monthly allowance is perceived as a valuable tool to reach young people and to give them the autonomy, when exploring labour market possibilities, especially for the most vulnerable groups, exposed at the risk of poverty and exclusion for Poland. 	<p>people on the labour market? How does it try to combat it?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the value added for companies of such “immersions”? What is the role of the employer in the accompaniment process?
Portugal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Youth unemployment in Portugal (2015: 32%) is substantially higher than in France and in the EU28, but the relation between the general unemployment rate and the youth unemployment rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The French Guarantee for Youth consists of a specific type of measure developed and implemented as a specific activity that is not identical with other already existing ALMP-measures 	<p>Success factors embedded in the design of the French Guarantee for Youth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creation of a specific approach with its own methods and tools and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordination of the network of ML work: Systematic exchange? Capacitation of ML for “active mediation” between companies and YG-beneficiaries

Summary Table of Peer Country Comments

	Labour market situation in the Peer Country	Assessment of the policy measure	Assessment of success factors and transferability	Questions
	<p>is almost identical.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On the other hand, the NEETs-rate in Portugal (and France) (2014: 15.2%) is more than one pp lower than the EU28-average. As in France, low-qualified young people are particularly vulnerable to unemployment and to the NEET-phenomenon, but there is also growing unemployment amongst better qualified Portuguese youngsters. The crisis resulted in Portugal in an increase of LTU amongst young people by 40%, much higher than the older age groups where it rose by 10% to 16%. 	<p>for young people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The French Guarantee for Youth includes important innovative elements in relation to traditional ALMPs (e.g. collective workshops and intense local cooperation). In comparison with the Portuguese Guarantee for Youth, the French one is much more ambitious in relation to the effective implementation of new principles and new tools in the combat for the reduction of youth unemployment and of the NEET-rate. 	<p>institutional set up;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodical preparation of its implementation via pilot projects and the gradual stepwise extension of the network of participating operators; Systematic analysis of results of the measure by the coordinating body aiming at the improvement of methods, tools and activities; <p>Transferability to Portugal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National commitment to help young vulnerable people is possible. Central administration is capable to respond to the challenge. Well-performing local partnerships – there were / are positive experiences. Capacity to build lasting partnerships with local employers: Probably the most important and difficult challenge (for ALMP in general). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the costs of the measure an issue in the political debate? Collective workshops: users and providers satisfied?
Slovakia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Slovakia early school leaving remains under the EU average. Education offers young people protection from unemployment relatively well until the age of 25. Transitions from school to work after 25 appear more problematic. The situation on the labour market is characterised by an 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The French Guarantee for Youth scheme is characterised by refined and elaborated implementation practices, which are very demanding in terms of public employment service infrastructure. The Graduate practice might be an interesting example for the host country to follow, but the implementation procedures as well as the infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intensified counselling combining group and individual counselling may lead to positive effects for measures targeting young people. Structures providing basic public employment services and social benefits are in place in Slovakia as well. Like in France, Slovakia has regional employment councils deciding about the provision of the support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slovak policy makers could benefit from learning more about the experience of establishing a network of Guarantee for Youth counsellors. How did France re-allocate resources for this? What were the costs? To what extent were the pre-Youth guarantee PES resources employed?

Summary Table of Peer Country Comments

	Labour market situation in the Peer Country	Assessment of the policy measure	Assessment of success factors and transferability	Questions
	<p>oversupply of labour. Graduates, many of whom lack practical work experience, thus constitute one of the main disadvantaged groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Slovak active labour market measures under the Youth Guarantee framework focus on supporting demand for labour through financial support to employers. ▪ One classical “on the job training” measure (Graduate practice) is provided under the YG in Slovakia. This measure predates the YG. 	<p>under this measure are not as well-developed as in the Host country.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Where the French Guarantee for Youth programme attempts to provide beneficiaries with as many placements in as many employing organisations as possible, the Slovak example tries to provide focused work experience in one placement, applying administrative restrictions to link placements to education attainment levels. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The transferability of the French model to Slovakia would run into problems due to limited capacity of Slovak PES to provide intensified counselling. ▪ The lack of resources and expertise necessary to improve existing PES capacity might present further limitation to the transferability of the French model. 	
Spain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The youth unemployment rate, at 36.7 per cent (and almost at 50 per cent for the 15-24 age group alone), is much higher than in most EU countries. ▪ In 2014, over 20 per cent of young people were neither in employment nor in education or training (NEET). The vast majority of NEETs are unemployed rather than inactive. Also, 70 per cent of all NEETs are registered with the Public Employment Services (PES) in Spain. ▪ Despite progress in recent years, early school leaving remains a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From a systemic perspective the main difference with the French Youth Guarantee National Plan is that the Spanish YG relies on decentralisation to the regional governments –whereas the French system is managed centrally (though implemented locally along the principle of “deconcentration”). ▪ There are also differences regarding targeting. The French Guarantee for Youth is targeted at vulnerable groups, with the degree of vulnerability defined by the Missions Locales according to broad criteria. By contrast, a key feature of the Spanish YG is the principle of voluntary participation among NEETs. This is reflected by a single “entry point”, i.e. an online web portal where 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The French system of individual-based financial incentives could prove a helpful device. The transferability of such a system to Spain, however, depends on its proper targeting —with a focus for example on the low-skilled or the long-term unemployed only. Also, a more detailed evaluation of the French system would shed light on the desirable design features of those financial incentives. ▪ In terms of institutional set-up, the role of the Missions Locales in identifying, supporting and engaging with youths at-risk may prove to be a source of inspiration for the YG in Spain. A similar structure to a “one stop shop” for youths exists Spain. The INJUVE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The French Guarantee for Youth is part of a broader youth strategy – the so-called Youth Guarantee. In essence, what are the elements of the Youth Guarantee which are not presently covered by the Guarantee for Youth? ▪ Promoting participation in the Guarantee for Youth among vulnerable groups is a key policy goal against which the programme’s success will be assessed. In this context, what justifies the establishment of a local commission (with the Préfet and others) to assess requests already validated by the Missions Locales? And how to reduce the risk of

Summary Table of Peer Country Comments

	Labour market situation in the Peer Country	Assessment of the policy measure	Assessment of success factors and transferability	Questions
	<p>major problem. Almost one in five young persons have achieved no more than secondary education.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Young people who have a job face significant precariousness. Over 52 per cent of young salaried workers have a temporary contract, significantly above the EU average. 	<p>participants register (Law No 18/2014, operational since July 2014).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The French Guarantee for Youth includes financial incentives centred on the individuals. Instead, the Spanish Youth Guarantee includes incentives geared towards enterprises to boost demand -mainly through reductions in social security contributions to promote youth recruitment and employability. As with the French case, the Spanish YG combines individual guidance and follow-up with collective workshops. In Spain, an agreement was signed with the Chambers of Commerce to implement a “Comprehensive qualification and employment programme” (PICE). The added value of this partnership can be translated in terms of “employer-ability”. The experience of the Missions Locales is similar to that of the Gijón pilot project “Youth Employment and Activation Agency” (YEAA). The relative success of the Spanish initiative reflects the efforts made to overcome the challenge of identifying and reaching out to at-risk groups thanks to the work of “street counsellors” (dinamizadores de barrio) and through the creation of an innovative communication tool, i.e. a specific label called “Companies with our Youth”. 	<p>already takes part in the YG through a MoU aimed at promoting registration and disseminating information on the programme. But there is scope to strengthen the role of the INJUVE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The experience gathered under the Guarantee for Youth arising from the training of counsellors to deal with specific youth profiles and the practice of counselling in tandem targeting unemployed and inactive youths would be a major asset if transferred to the Spanish YG. The French Ministry of Employment has defined specific tools for the Missions Locales to use that would help and inspire the Spanish Ministry to develop its own toolkit. As there is still uncertainty as to whether the Central government or the Autonomous Communities will enhance the capacity of the PES so that more and better trained counsellors can deal with young NEETs, an experimental scheme similar to the French one targeting vulnerable NEETs could be designed based on the results and evidence gathered so far. 	<p>“clientelism” at the local level?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since January 2016, young people are eligible for the reformed Prime d'activité. However there may be cases where young people will also be eligible for the monthly allowance available under the Guarantee for Youth. What is the interaction between these two financial incentives? More fundamentally, is there a risk that such in-work benefits could lock young people into low-paid jobs? Evidence suggests that the success of active labour market programmes depends crucially on the availability of adequate human resources in PES. What is the current staff-client ratio at the Missions Locales? More generally, what justifies the coexistence of Pole Emploi with the Missions Locales –rather than a single network, with potentially large efficiency gains and better staff-client ratios?