



Mutual Learning Programme

DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion

Peer Country Comments Paper – Lithuania

How to find the golden mean in the ALMP (de)centralisation?

**Peer Review on 'Strategies for Employment Policy
reform. Implementation challenges in decentralised
countries'**

Madrid (Spain), 5-6 October 2015



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion

Unit C1

Contact: Emilio Castrillejo

E-mail: EMPL-C1-UNIT@ec.europa.eu

Web site: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/mlp>

European Commission

B-1049 Brussels

Mutual Learning Programme

DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion

Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion

Peer Review on "Strategies for Employment Policy reform. Implementation challenges
in decentralised countries"

Madrid (Spain), 5-6 October 2015

**Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers
to your questions about the European Union.**

Freephone number (*):

00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11

(*) The information given is free, as are most calls (though some operators, phone boxes or hotels may charge you).

LEGAL NOTICE

The information contained in this publication does not necessarily reflect the official position of the European Commission

This document has received financial support from the European Union Programme for Employment and Social Innovation "EaSI" (2014-2020). For further information please consult:
<http://ec.europa.eu/social/easi>

© European Union, **2015**

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

Table of Contents

1	Labour market situation in the peer country	1
2	Assessment of the policy measure.....	2
3	Assessment of the success factors and transferability	5
4	Questions	7
5	Annex 1: Summary table	8
6	Annex 2: Tables.....	9

1 Labour market situation in the peer country

This paper has been prepared for a Peer Review within the framework of the Mutual Learning Programme. It provides information on Lithuania's comments on the policy example of the Host Country for the Peer Review. For information on the policy example, please refer to the Host Country Discussion Paper.

Employment, unemployment and long-term unemployment in Lithuania

Although the economic crisis hit the Lithuanian economy and the labour market very hard, the economic recovery in Lithuania was more rapid than in many other Member States, including Spain (Tables 1-2). After a huge blow to the labour market at the beginning of the economic recession (in 2010, the unemployment level in Lithuania peaked at 18.1%, being almost twice as high as the EU-28 average (9.7%), the employment rate fell to 57.6% (compared to 65% in 2007)), already in 2011 the country's labour market started recovering. This trend was characteristic across all age groups – younger, middle-aged and older employees of the country (Tables 3-4).

However, just like in Spain, the labour market's recovery was least felt for long-term unemployment in Lithuania. Although in the recent years the long-term unemployment has been lower in Lithuania than in Spain or the EU-28, this indicator, once increased after the crisis, keeps staying well above its pre-crisis level. Also like in Spain, the long-term unemployment problem is mainly relevant to older unemployed people of pre-retirement age (Tables 5-6).

Active labour market policy in Lithuania

Although the latest data (2012-2013) on LMP expenditure in the EU-28 is not available from Eurostat, Lithuania's expenditure for LMP seems to be considerably below the levels in other Member States (Tables 7-8). For example, in 2011 ALMP expenditure as a percentage of the gross domestic product (GDP) accounted for only 0.24% in Lithuania, as compared to 0.69% in the EU or even 0.81% in Spain. It is important to note that Lithuania's expenditure for passive LMP (i.e. out-of-work income maintenance and support) was even more lower, standing at as few as 0.24% of GDP (!), compared with the EU's average of 1.14% of GDP in 2011 and even 3.03% of GDP in Spain in 2012.

Analysis of ALMP expenditure by individual measures shows that the majority of funds was spent on employment incentives, labour market services and direct job creation in Lithuania (0.07%, 0.06% and 0.04% of GDP, respectively, in 2013). In Spain, the majority of spending on ALMP went to employment incentives, training and start-up incentives (0.22%, 0.15% and 0.11% of GDP, respectively, in 2012) (Table 8).

Supported employment and rehabilitation, as well as job creation, are leading measures in Lithuania by the number of ALMP participants (Table 9). The number of training participants increased in 2013 when a new targeted system for vocational training of the unemployed (introduced in 2012) started functioning fully (for more details see the next chapter). It should be also noted in this context that with unemployment peaking at almost triple its pre-crisis levels, both spending on ALMP and the number of participants in ALMP actually remained the same (or even shrank in some individual cases) due to the public budget deficit in Lithuania.

2 Assessment of the policy measure

2.1. Actions to improve the coordination and modernization of activation activities

Common objectives, but different actions and measures. Lithuania is a relatively small country. Therefore, it is natural that, unlike in Spain, the implementation of labour market policies is usually coordinated quite strictly across the country, leaving rather little independence for the local PES.

According to Article 8 of the Law on Support for Employment (LSE), in Lithuania the employment support policy is implemented by the Lithuanian Labour Exchange (LLE) functioning under the Ministry of Social Security and Labour (MSSL) and territorial (local) labour exchanges (TLEs). Although TLEs are legal entities with their bank accounts, seals and logotypes, their activities are nonetheless quite strictly regulated and coordinated by the LLE.

According to the valid legislation, the Lithuanian Labour Exchange shall:

- organise activities of TLEs,
- control their implementation of employment support measures and delivery of labour market services;
- carry out labour market monitoring in the country;
- evaluate the situation in the labour market and consider measures aimed at solving employment problems;
- organise and coordinate the provision of vocational rehabilitation services to the disabled;
- organise the implementation of vocational guidance measures;
- after coordination with the MSSL, found, liquidate or reorganise TLEs, as well as coordinate, control and give methodological instructions concerning their activities;
- perform functions established by other legal acts.

Accordingly, TLEs implement employment support measures and provide labour market services defined in the LSE (information, counselling, employment intermediation, planning of individual employment activities); monitor labour markets and the quality of vocational training in the territories attributed to them; develop and implement unemployment prevention measures laid down in the LSE; perform other functions attributed to them by other legal acts.

Both LLE and its TLEs subordinates act in compliance with the employment policy objectives and aims laid down in the LSE. The aim of the Lithuanian employment support system is to seek full employment of the population, to reduce their social exclusion and to strengthen social cohesion. The main tasks of the employment support system are: 1) to align labour supply with demand seeking to maintain balance in the labour market; 2) to increase employment opportunities for jobseekers of working age.

The following employment support measures and labour market services are used in order to achieve the goals:

- employment support measures – active labour market policy measures, employment support programmes and voluntary practices;
- labour market services – information, consultation and employment intermediation.

ALMPMs implemented in Lithuania include:

- vocational training of the unemployed and of the employees who have been given a notice of dismissal;
- supported employment (subsidised employment, support for the acquisition of professional skills, agreement of the acquisition of professional skills, job rotation, public works);
- support for job creation (subsidies for job creation (adaptation), implementation of projects of local initiatives for employment, support for self-employment);
- support for territorial mobility of the unemployed.

Outcome-based reallocation of funds. Lithuania has in place the approved methodology for evaluating the efficiency of ALMPM. The methodology sets the evaluation indicators and their calculation procedures. These indicators are used to evaluate the impact of implemented ALMPM on the persons covered and the labour market in terms of efficiency and effectiveness.

The efficiency of ALMPM is evaluated on the basis of:

- direct and indirect benefit indicators for labour market integration (for the purpose of these indicators, it is usually assessed whether ALMPM participants were in employment after a certain time period following their participation in ALMPM);
- repeated registration at TLEs;
- cost-effectiveness ratio (financial costs of ALMPM participation and taxes/contributions to the budget paid by the participants after getting employed).

Although evaluations of the efficiency of ALMPM are in place in Lithuania and outcomes thereof could be used as a basis for evaluating the efficiency of TLE performance, this is not taken into account when allocating resources to TLEs.

Instead, in Lithuania, ALMP is funded from the Employment Fund. The LLE allocates the resources for TLEs having assessed the need for such resources. The need is assessed solely on the basis of the last year's unemployment situation, the number of the unemployed in the TLE and the composition/structure of the unemployed. The need for next year's ALMPM expenditure is discussed at the Tripartite Council of the Republic of Lithuania at the end of a current year and, after being approved at the Tripartite Council, forwarded for approval to the MSSL. We may presume that the needs based allocation of funds does not encourage the TLEs to work in the most efficient way.

Programme of best-practice sharing. Although Lithuania does not have a best-practice sharing programme for PES similar to Spain, there is a regular exchange of good practices between the LLE and TLEs. General meetings of all TLEs' directors are held on a monthly basis to discuss the challenges faced in PES operations and possible solutions. There are also various qualification improvement and best-practice sharing events regularly held for the lower ranking LLE and TLE officers. The LLE issues publications and publishes information on its website, including the best-practice examples.

2.2. Actions to improve the Quality of ALMPs

New model of training. Like in Spain, a new training system of unemployed, with the aim of ensuring an adequate training for workers as well as linking more strongly company needs with training was created and implemented in Lithuania since 2012.

The system was shaped to activate cooperation between the state, employers and unemployed people to seek a specific goal – to train a person for a specific job in a particular workplace and to get him or her employed there. Not only registered unemployed individuals but also those notified of a pending dismissal are eligible to the

targeted vocational training programme. A trilateral agreement is signed between an unemployed person, TLE and employer.

Unemployed people can also be sent into training under vocational training programmes which graduation would allow them getting future jobs identified during labour market forecasts conducted by the LLE or engaging in individual economic activities. In the latter case, they sign bilateral agreements with TLEs. In all cases the unemployed individual can choose the place of training himself.

We may say that the introduction of a new system of training proved itself as being much more efficient, e.g. according to the evaluation of efficiency of training, done by the LLE, in 2011 as much as 53% of participants of training programmes were employed 6 months after participation in ALMPM, whereas since 2012 when the new training system was implemented and onwards this share is close to 90%.

In addition, evaluations and forecasting of labour market needs have been in place in Lithuania since 1995 consisting of the following tools: a National forecast, a Job opportunity barometer and an Occupations map. These tools are based on employer interviews, LLE's expert opinions, and the analysis of labour demand and its dynamics. The forecasts cover rather many indicators such as employment, unemployment, establishment/liquidation of jobs and professions, projections of participants in ALMPM, employment dynamics by the types of economic activities and groups of professions, etc. However, the main shortage of these forecasts is that they cover only a short period of time – one year.

Collaboration with private employment agencies (PEA). In Lithuania, unlike in Spain, there is no real collaboration between the public and private employment agencies. In compliance with the valid Lithuanian legislation, private employment agencies are required to provide information to the LLE on their status, activities and employment intermediation services rendered to natural persons. The LLE summarises the provided information and places it on its website on a quarterly basis, however this information is not further used by the LLE in any way.

A Single Job Portal. As Lithuania has rather centralised labour market services, there is a uniform procedure for the registration and accounting of jobseekers. Information on job vacancies and jobseekers all over Lithuania is available on the LLE's website, in sections Job Search or Job Supply.

According to the procedure valid in Lithuania, TLEs register unemployed persons residing in the territory they provide services in. TLEs accept necessary documents, gather all relevant information about jobseekers (periods of insurance, insured income, individual economic activities, training, and other data), and provide the relevant labour market services.

The single system of jobseekers' registration is generally viewed positively by the key stakeholders?. Firstly, it enables the monitoring of labour market developments both at the national level and by individual regions, as well as analysing the labour supply and demand by different aspects. Secondly, the system allows the systematic monitoring of changes at the individual level, too (registration, participation in the ALMPM, employment of individuals).

In order to facilitate the territorial mobility of employees and to encourage them to look for jobs further from their place of residence, a new ALMPM – support for territorial mobility of the unemployed within Lithuania – was introduced in Lithuania in 2009. Although the measure has not yet attained a larger-scale application, certain incentives are planned in the future to promote jobseekers to take job vacancies further from their homes under apprenticeship agreements, through participation in supported employment measures, etc.

3 Assessment of the success factors and transferability

3.1. Actions to improve the coordination and modernization of activation activities

Common objectives, but different actions and measures. It should be noted that, in principle, actions to improve the coordination and certain centralisation of PES activities are not relevant in Lithuania – the LLE already holds a dominant position and actions to improve the coordination do not seem reasonable. Even on the contrary, it could be more appropriate for Lithuania to consider a wider autonomy for local PES based on Spanish experience, i.e. by setting common objectives, but empowering each TLE to decide what actions and measures to take and to what extent. The currently valid system apparently allows a certain degree of autonomy for TLEs, but the fact of making annual expenditure estimates by individual ALMPMs already implies a certain rigidity of the system.

Outcome-based reallocation of funds. It is difficult to evaluate the Spanish outcome-based reallocation of funds based on the set of indicators without knowing all the indicators applied. In fact, it can only be said that such a drastic linking of PES funding (it is planned that in 2016 even 70% of the funds allocated to local PES/ALMPM will be subject to the results achieved, compared to 15% in 2013) with the achieved results measured on the basis of the set of indicators raises certain doubts. Such a rapid and drastic shift in the principles of funding requires a high level of appropriateness of the indicators chosen for efficiency evaluation and their adequacy for the employment and labour market policy objectives sought. Otherwise, this may threaten not only the system of ALMP funding and its sustainability, but also the employment/unemployment situation in the country.

As regards the Lithuanian situation, the Spanish experience would be very useful for Lithuania in this context. It is highly welcome that the implementation of the system for the evaluation of results significantly improved the activities of local PES; they started performing better not only because of the linking of resources with the results achieved, but also in order to raise their prestige. Lithuania would benefit by taking over this experience, moreover that the current ALMP evaluation system, after making relevant amendments in legal acts, could be used to improve the efficiency of local PES performance and linking their funding not only with the number of unemployed persons and envisaged ALMPM, but also with the real results achieved.

A programme of best-practice sharing. Although, as mentioned above, there is a certain experience exchange among TLEs taking place in Lithuania on a regular basis, its organisation in a form of the Best-Practice Programme for PES introduced in Spain in 2014 would be really effective. An organisation of annual or bi-annual best-practice sharing seminars would encourage all local PES not only to review their performance methods, but also to look for and share more effective problem solving opportunities.

3.2. Actions to improve the Quality of ALMPs

A new model of training. As already mentioned, Lithuania is implementing (since January 2012) a new training model for unemployed and persons warned about dismissals. Similar to Spain, the model in one or another form incorporates/covers actions to anticipate skill needs, actions giving companies higher weight in training initiatives, actions to develop a better control and sanctions as well as continuously updated catalogue of training specialities and state registry of training providers.

However, if the training system for unemployed persons introduced in Spain proves itself as an effective, it would probably be useful for Lithuania to take over the Spanish experience in applying a training account that each worker have to accredit his/her training history (this account is linked to the worker's social security number and contains full details of training undertaken, thereby facilitating accreditation of knowledge and skills). Introduction of such accounts would improve the effectiveness of

the existing training system, allowing for a broader and more efficient use of experience gained in training.

Collaboration with private employment agencies (PEA). Establishment and development of collaboration between the PES and PEA represent an unused opportunity and a major niche for improvement in the Lithuanian labour market policy. As it has been mentioned, there are actually no contacts between PES and PEA in Lithuania (except that PEAs provide information about their activities to the PES in a statutory form).

According to the information provided by the PES, at the end of 2014 there were a total of 114 providers of employment intermediation services ("intermediaries") in Lithuania. In 2014, intermediaries employed a total of 5,843 persons (for comparison LLE during 2014 employed 177,800 persons, so the share of persons employed via PEA is close to 3% of all persons employed via PES and PEA during 2014), of which 3,052 (52%) were employed in Lithuania and 2,791 (48%) – in foreign countries (mainly in the UK, the Netherlands, Norway and Denmark). Persons from 25 to 49 accounted for the biggest share of those employed (55%) and youth under 24 accounted for 37%.

It is clear that intermediaries have certain experience in the area of placement and, under favourable conditions, could significantly contribute to reducing the unemployment problem in Lithuania.

A Single Job Portal. In fact, a single job portal is already in place in Lithuania. However, TLEs as a rule work only with unemployed persons registered in their respective territories and keep contacts mainly with undertakings/employers operating there. Nevertheless, if there is a job suitable for the unemployed in another region of the country and if unemployed person is willing to work there, a so called territorial mobility measure might be provided for him (this measure to some extent reimburses costs of travelling and living in another region). Nevertheless, it should be noted, that although the measure of support for territorial mobility of the unemployed was introduced in Lithuania a number of years ago, it has been used so far by less than 0.5% of the total number of persons participating in ALMPM.

4 Questions

- In order to better understand the efficiency of outcome-based reallocation of funds, it would be very interesting to see at least 10 out of the 26 indicators used for the evaluation.
- Was there any evaluation of ALMPM efficiency in Spain before the establishment of the set of 26 indicators? Please explain how this was undertaken. What, if ever, were the results of the evaluation used for?
- Are local PES in the position of funding only the particular ALMPM defined by legal acts or they can take up completely new initiatives too?
- In 2013 only 15% of funding for local PES depended on the efficiency of their performance. What about the rest of the funding – how was this allocated?
- Please describe the collaboration between PES and PEA in more detail. How independent are the latter? What rules do they have to follow in order to participate in the programme of collaborating with PES?

5 Annex 1: Summary table

Labour market situation in the Peer Country

- After a huge blow to the labour market at the beginning of the economic recession, already in 2011 the Lithuanian labour market started recovering
- However, like in Spain, the labour market's recovery was least felt on long-term unemployment in Lithuania
- Lithuania's expenditure for ALMP (0.24% of GDP) is considerably below the levels in other MS (EU average 0.69% of GDP) and Spain (0.81% of GDP)
- Lithuania's expenditure for passive LMP (0.24% of GDP) was even more lower compared with the EU's average (1.14% of GDP) and Spain (3.03% of GDP)

Assessment of the policy measure

- Implementation of the LMP in Lithuania is usually coordinated quite strictly across the country, leaving rather little independence for the local PES
- Though Lithuania has in place the approved methodology for evaluating the efficiency of ALMPM, the evaluation's outcomes are not taken into account when allocating resources to TLEs
- There is a regular exchange of good practices between LLE and TLEs; Lithuania has a training system of unemployed and single job portal similar to Spain
- There is no real collaboration between public and private employment agencies in Lithuania, unlike in Spain

Assessment of success factors and transferability

- Actions to improve the coordination and centralisation of PES activities are not relevant in Lithuania – the LLE already holds a dominant position
- Spanish experience in the evaluation of the PES results and outcome-based reallocation of funds would be very useful for Lithuania; however the establishment of the "right" set of indicators is crucial in this context
- Establishment and development of collaboration between PES and PEA represent a major niche for improvement in the Lithuanian labour market policy
- Application of some elements of the Spanish LMP (experience exchange among TLEs in a form of the Best-Practice Programme, introduction of training account linked to the worker's social security number and containing full details of training undertaken) would increase quality and efficiency of the Lithuanian LMP

Questions

- List of 26 indicators used for the evaluation of ALMPM of regional PES in Spain
- Was there any evaluation of ALMPM efficiency in Spain before the establishment of the set of 26 indicators?
- Are the local PES in the position of funding only particular ALMPM defined by legal acts or they can take up completely new initiatives too?
- In 2013 only 15% of funding for local PES depended on the efficiency of their performance. What about the rest of the funding?
- Please describe the collaboration between PES and PEA in more detail

6 Annex 2: Tables

Table 1. Employment rate in Lithuania, Spain and EU-28 in 2000 – 2014 (in the age group 15-64) (%)

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
EU-28	:	:	62.3	62.6	62.7	63.4	64.3	65.2	65.7	64.5	64.1	64.2	64.1	64.1	64.8
ES	56.1	57.7	59.0	60.1	61.1	63.6	65.0	65.8	64.5	60.0	58.8	58.0	55.8	54.8	56.0
LT	59.6	58.1	60.6	62.8	61.8	62.9	63.6	65.0	64.4	59.9	57.6	60.2	62.0	63.7	65.7

Source: Eurostat

Table 2. Unemployment rate in Lithuania, Spain and EU-28 in 2000 – 2014 (in the age group 15-64) (%)

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
EU-28	:	:	9.1	9.1	9.3	9.0	8.3	7.2	7.1	9.0	9.7	9.7	10.6	11.0	10.4
ES	13.9	10.4	11.2	11.3	11.1	9.2	8.5	8.3	11.3	18.0	20.0	21.5	24.9	26.2	24.6
LT	16.3	17.1	13.2	13.0	10.8	8.4	5.8	4.3	5.9	14.0	18.1	15.7	13.6	12.0	10.9

Source: Eurostat

Table 3. Employment rate in Lithuania, Spain and EU-28 in 2000 – 2014 in different age groups (%)

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
15-24															
EU-28	:	:	36.6	35.9	35.6	35.9	36.4	37.2	37.3	34.8	33.8	33.3	32.5	32.1	32.4
ES	32.2	33.6	34.3	34.5	34.8	38.5	39.6	39.2	36.0	28.0	25.0	22.0	18.4	16.8	16.7
LT	26.7	22.6	25.2	23.6	20.6	21.2	23.7	24.8	26.0	20.6	18.3	19.0	21.5	24.6	27.6
25-54															
EU-28	:	:	76.1	76.4	76.5	77.0	78.1	79.0	79.4	78.0	77.7	77.7	77.3	76.9	77.4
ES	68.4	69.4	70.7	71.7	72.8	74.8	76.1	77.1	75.6	71.0	70.0	69.1	66.7	65.8	67.4
LT	75.6	75.3	77.2	80.5	80.1	80.9	81.1	82.2	80.9	75.9	73.6	76.9	78.5	79.6	80.8
55-64															
EU-28	:	:	38.1	39.8	40.4	42.2	43.3	44.5	45.5	45.9	46.2	47.2	48.7	50.1	51.8
ES	36.8	39.1	39.9	40.9	41.0	43.1	44.1	44.5	45.5	44.0	43.5	44.5	43.9	43.2	44.3
LT	41.2	38.5	43.0	47.0	46.7	49.6	49.7	53.2	53.0	51.2	48.3	50.2	51.7	53.4	56.2

Source: Eurostat

Table 4. Unemployment rate in Lithuania, Spain and EU-28 in 2000 – 2014 in different age groups (%)

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
--	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

15-24															
EU-28	:	:	18.1	18.3	18.7	18.7	17.4	15.5	15.6	19.9	21.0	21.7	23.2	23.6	22.2
ES	25.3	20.7	21.5	22.3	22.5	19.6	17.9	18.1	24.5	37.7	41.5	46.2	52.9	55.5	53.2
LT	28.6	31.6	20.4	26.9	20.3	15.8	10.0	8.4	13.3	29.6	35.7	32.6	26.7	21.9	19.3
25-54															
EU-28	:	:	8.0	8.1	8.2	7.9	7.2	6.2	6.1	7.9	8.6	8.6	9.5	10.0	9.4
ES	12.3	9.1	10.0	10.1	9.9	8.0	7.5	7.2	10.1	16.3	18.4	19.9	23.3	24.5	22.8
LT	15.4	15.6	12.8	11.1	9.8	7.9	5.4	4.0	5.2	12.7	16.7	14.3	12.6	11.0	9.9
55-64															
EU-28	:	:	6.3	6.5	6.8	6.4	6.1	5.4	5.1	6.2	6.8	6.8	7.3	7.7	7.4
ES	9.8	6.3	7.1	6.8	7.5	6.3	5.8	6.0	7.4	12.1	14.2	15.1	18.0	20.0	20.0
LT	9.6	14.7	9.8	14.0	11.0	6.9	6.1	3.7	4.4	10.5	14.4	13.4	11.9	11.2	10.7

Source: Eurostat

Table 5. Long-term unemployment (12 months or more) as a percentage of the total unemployment in Lithuania, Spain and EU-28 in 2000 – 2014 (in the age group 15-64) (%)

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
EU-28	:	:	45.3	45.8	45.0	46.2	46.0	42.9	37.1	33.3	40.0	42.9	44.5	47.3	49.6
ES	42.4	36.5	33.4	33.5	32.5	24.4	21.6	20.4	17.9	23.8	36.6	41.6	44.3	49.7	52.8
LT	50.4	56.0	56.6	44.4	53.1	52.9	45.2	32.4	21.6	23.7	41.7	52.1	49.2	42.9	44.6

Source: Eurostat

Table 6. Long-term unemployment (12 months or more) as a percentage of the total unemployment in Lithuania, Spain and EU-28 in 2000 – 2014 in different age groups (%)

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
15-24															
EU-28	:	:	33.8	33.3	31.2	30.9	30.0	26.4	23.0	23.3	28.6	30.1	32.5	34.1	35.6
ES	30.1	24.5	22.2	22.9	23.7	13.4	11.8	10.1	10.4	18.2	29.2	32.4	35.7	39.4	40.5
LT	44.1	45.3	34.5	20.8	37.6	:	:	:	:	17.6	30.3	34.2	25.4	19.9	22.6
25-54															
EU-28	:	:	48.0	48.7	48.0	49.7	49.6	46.2	39.8	34.9	41.9	45.3	46.3	49.5	51.7
ES	45.4	39.8	35.7	36.0	34.0	25.9	22.5	21.2	18.3	23.4	36.6	41.8	44.3	49.7	52.8
LT	52.0	57.2	60.1	49.7	55.7	57.0	48.1	33.0	22.6	24.0	43.7	55.2	52.7	45.7	46.9
55-64															
EU-28	:	:	59.6	58.7	59.5	62.9	63.5	63.4	56.7	48.4	54.1	57.5	58.6	60.5	63.2
ES	59.6	53.8	54.1	48.3	48.9	49.9	48.2	46.8	40.1	43.3	54.7	60.2	60.9	66.0	70.7
LT	50.9	69.1	65.3	54.4	57.3	69.4	:	:	:	33.8	46.7	59.6	60.4	55.0	57.1

Source: Eurostat

Table 7. LMP expenditure as percentage of GDP in Lithuania, Spain and EU-28 in 2003 – 2013 (%)

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
EU-28	:	:	2.01	1.81	1.59	1.60	2.15	2.14	1.88	:	:
ES	:	2.13	2.14	2.16	2.18	2.60	3.79	4.01	3.69	3.70	:
LT	0.35	0.30	0.34	0.39	0.41	0.39	0.91	0.78	0.56	0.47	0.45

Source: Eurostat

Table 8. LMP expenditure as percentage of GDP by measures in Lithuania, Spain and EU-28 in 2003 – 2013 (%)

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Lithuania											
Labour market services	0.04	0.04	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.10	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.06
Training	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.04
Employment incentives	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.07
Supported employment and rehabilitation	:	:	0.00	0.01	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.03

Direct job creation	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04
Start-up incentives	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
Out-of-work income maintenance and support	0.11	0.07	0.10	0.12	0.11	0.15	0.61	0.48	0.29	0.24	0.22
Spain											
Labour market services	:	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.13	0.13	0.11	0.08	:
Training	0.11	0.12	0.15	0.15	0.14	0.15	0.18	0.18	0.19	0.15	:
Employment incentives	0.28	0.28	0.30	0.32	0.28	0.23	0.23	0.27	0.26	0.22	:
Supported employment and rehabilitation	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.04	:
Direct job creation	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.03	:
Start-up incentives	0.04	0.03	0.05	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.12	0.11	0.11	:
Out-of-work income maintenance and support	1.43	1.46	1.42	1.39	1.40	1.82	2.94	3.12	2.84	3.03	:
EU-28											
Labour market services	:	:	0.22	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.24	0.25	0.21	:	:
Training	:	:	0.22	0.20	0.19	0.19	0.23	0.21	0.20	:	:
Employment incentives	:	:	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.10	0.12	0.13	0.11	:	:
Supported employment and rehabilitation	:	:	0.10	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.08	:	:
Direct job creation	:	:	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.05	:	:
Start-up incentives	:	:	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.04	:	:
Out-of-work income maintenance and support	:	:	1.15	1.01	0.84	0.86	1.30	1.28	1.14	:	:

Source: Eurostat

Table 9. Participants by LMP intervention in Lithuania in 2003 – 2013

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Labour market services	1,116	1,180	568	397	172	122	72	70	323	314	395
Training	6,098	5,618	5,427	6,861	7,795	3,945	5,357	3,619	1,497	962	1,998
Supported employment and rehabilitation	:	:	4	1,104	6,356	4,493	3,609	4,651	4,068	5,152	3,622
Direct job creation	9,494	6,351	6,664	6,513	3,741	2,419	2,692	6,002	5,752	4,689	3,451
Start-up incentives	163	159	124	184	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
Out-of-work income maintenance and support	19,519	14,886	15,425	15,532	18,036	23,367	70,362	56,376	35,653	35,007	:
Early retirement	13,095	12,001	6,771	1,773	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
Total LMP measures (not included out-of-work income maintenance and early retirement)	16,767	13,047	:	17,054	20,242	14,032	15,273	17,484	:	17,653	:
Total LMP supports (included only out-of-work income maintenance and early retirement)	32,614	26,887	22,196	17,305	18,036	23,367	70,362	56,376	35,653	35,007	:

Source: Eurostat

