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Summary

Investing in children to break the cycle of disadvantage is the focal point of the Nordic welfare model. Unsurprisingly, the Danish system therefore matches the approach in the Recommendation of February 2013. Denmark has a system of universal, tax-financed social investment, combined with social protection for all and extensive policies for disadvantaged groups.

Hence, policy developments since February 2013 are less about establishing institutions and policy paradigms than about adjusting existing institutions and policies in light of new evidence and changing political situations. Denmark holds the world record in childcare coverage. A “make work pay” strategy has reduced benefits for many groups.

There is an integrated, comprehensive policy package supporting early childhood development, with Denmark spending five times more on children than the average for the EU-28. Child family allowances are particularly generous for single parents, parents with multiple children, and parents in education. However, Denmark stands apart by spending more money on services than on cash benefits. Most social and education services are locally provided, and health services are regionally delivered, leading to some differences across the country.

By EU standards, there is exceptionally little child poverty and social exclusion in Denmark. Available, affordable and good-quality childcare supports parents to reconcile work and family life. This is probably the single most important reason for the comparatively low poverty and social exclusion figures. Indeed, Denmark can be used as a model country, having established many of the policies promoted in the Recommendation of 2013.

Many social security benefits that address poverty, social exclusion and labour market participation have been changed back and forth by the last four governments. The current government has (re)introduced a lower social assistance called Start Help for new entrants into the country; a work requirement for a household to remain eligible for two specific social assistance benefits; and a benefit ceiling. Each element may reduce work disincentives, but it may also increase poverty in some families with children. Hence, poverty and social exclusion figures are likely to go up in years to come.

Of relevance to the Recommendation is the fact that the government’s proposal of 27 April 2017 for childcare reform includes social norms for childcare, i.e. more staff allocated to institutions with many children from low-income families.

Children participate in a wide range of sports, cultural and political activities that receive public subsidies. In the educational policy track, there is an institutionalised procedure for including children in decision making, though this is less the case in sports and culture. There are a number of interest organisations and non-governmental organisations run for and by children that are often consulted on policy matters. None of these organisations and consultative procedures can be directly ascribed to the Recommendation, but they do follow its approach. As part of the childcare reform proposal, the government envisages more dialogue with the parents of small children.

There is no sign of the Recommendation of 2013 having played a role in the European Semester. Since the two country-specific recommendations made in 2014, Denmark has not received any recommendations.

Since the Recommendation of 2013, Denmark has not received any assistance from EU financial instruments that have a strategic role to play in investing in children.
If a recommendation should follow from this country report, it would be to pay close attention to the relationship between benefit reductions, permanent housing and social investments. A stable housing situation is a prerequisite for successful social investments. An uncertain housing situation adversely affects both parental capacities and the ability to learn and work. Recent benefit reductions have made it difficult for some families to find permanent appropriate housing, thus jeopardising interventions made under the social investment strategy.
1 Overall situation with regard to child poverty and social exclusion

The Nordic countries and Luxembourg have the smallest shares of children (0–17 years) at risk of poverty, suffering severe material deprivation and living in jobless households. This is the case both when the problems of poverty and social exclusion are considered individually, and when the problems are taken together, i.e. when they intersect.

In 2015, 15.7% of children in Denmark had one or more problems, compared to 26.9% in the EU-27 (see Frazer and Marlier, 2017). Some 0.3% of children in Denmark suffer from all three problems, compared to 2.5% in the EU-27; 9.7% of children in Denmark suffer from one of the problems, compared to 16.8% in the EU-27.

The share of children at risk of poverty but not severely materially deprived and not living in a (quasi-)jobless household is 6.1% in Denmark, as against 11.6% for the EU-27. Similarly, the share of children whose only problem is that of being severely materially deprived or of living in a quasi-jobless household is, respectively, 0.6% and 3.0%.

Figure 1 shows that about 1 million persons in Denmark are captured by the indicator of those at risk of poverty or social exclusion (AROPE). Most of those live below the at-risk-of-poverty line. A smaller number of people suffer severe material deprivation. Denmark’s official 2020 goal is to reduce the number of persons living in quasi-jobless households by 20% from the 2010 figure. Instead, there has been an 8.5% increase – from 433,000 in 2010 to 470,000 in 2015.

Figure 1. Trends in number of people (whole population) at risk of poverty or social exclusion, thousands, 2008-2015, Denmark

Source: EU-SILC, Statistical annex to ESPN Synthesis Report (Frazer, H. and Marlier, E. (2017))

1 The AROPE indicator is a poor indicator of poverty in Denmark, as it mainly captures old-age pensioners and students. Old-age pensioners have access to free healthcare and heavily subsidised old-age care, while students have access to free education and Europe’s most generous study grant. For this reason, Denmark rightly opposes the AROPE indicator as a good measure of its problems of poverty and exclusion; but there is great disagreement between the red and the blue sides of parliament about how then to define and measure poverty (see Kvist, earlier country profile reports).
The number of children living at risk of poverty or social exclusion increased after the onset of the economic crisis in 2008 to peak in 2011. Since then, it has fluctuated at between 171,000 and 182,000 children (Figure 2). The three constitutive indicators follow this general development.

**Figure 2. Trends in number of children aged 0-17 at risk of poverty or social exclusion, thousands, 2008-2015, Denmark**

However, a cautionary note should be sounded, as the number and share of persons and children at risk of poverty and suffering severe material deprivation are very likely to increase from 2016 onwards, due to recent benefit reductions (see next section). However, the increases may be less pronounced for families with children than for other groups, with the major exception being families with children that are refugees or that have not been living in Denmark for at least seven out of the last eight years. These groups are eligible for Start Help, which is a minimum income set at a lower level than the ordinary social assistance.

## 2 Assessment of overall approach and governance

The primary aim of the Nordic welfare model is to enable all to realise their potential, irrespective of where or when they are born and who their parents are (Kvist et al., 2012). Through social investment, the aim is to develop, maintain and restore the level of functional capacity of people – and thus their autonomy. This is regarded as beneficial both to the individuals and to society at large (Kvist, 2016). For this purpose, Denmark and the other Nordic countries have over decades constructed a welfare model that relies heavily on social investment, i.e. social services, health services, education and active labour market policies. Most social and educational services are organised and financed at the local level, while healthcare and active labour market policies are dealt with at the regional

---

2 The only exception is a 35% drop in quasi-jobless households from 2011 to 2012 and a similar increase the year after – probably due to data error rather than to real-world developments.
level. Services are staffed by professionals, who in most cases deliver good-quality services. Services are heavily subsidised, if not free of charge, and are tax financed. There is a relatively good balance between universal policies and policies with a particular focus on the situation of disadvantaged groups, including children in disadvantaged families. There is also a relatively good balance between benefits in cash and services. In general, policies reflect respect for children’s rights and attention to certain vulnerable groups (such as persons with a disability), although benefit cuts have adversely affected children in refugee families. The approach taken by Denmark and the other Nordic countries is thus closely aligned to the approach and overall model of governance in the Recommendation of 2013.

Not surprisingly, Denmark is one of five EU countries where benefits in kind make up a larger share than cash benefits (Eurostat, 2017e). Expenditure on children and families makes up 11.22% of total social benefits, compared to an EU-28 average of 8.55% (Eurostat, 2017a). In 2014, expenditure per inhabitant amounted to EUR 1,668, surpassed only by the figure for Luxembourg. On average in the EU, expenditure on family/child benefits amounted to EUR 651 per inhabitant.

The Danish model is in a process of continuous transformation. Developments since 2013 follow some tracks laid down earlier and disrupt others, thus bringing it closer to or further from the Recommendation. The “make work pay” strategy since 2014 may be seen as a move away from the approach in the Recommendation, as may those piecemeal austerity reforms that have challenged services at the local and the regional level.

The trend towards more evidence-based policy-making continues and is in line with the Recommendation. Concretely, this means that the ministries and their national boards finance, collect and disseminate information about good practice through meta-reviews, pilot projects and evaluations.

Most importantly, on 27 April 2017 the government proposed a reform to increase the flexibility and free choice of childcare; to improve learning and well-being through better quality and easier transitions from childcare to schools; and to improve quality through better staff competences and better management. The proposals are based in part on evaluations and recommendations made by the Council for Children’s Learning (Rådet for Børns Læring) (Rådet for Børns Læring, 2014, 2016).

Of particular relevance to the follow-up on the 2013 Recommendation are two proposals. The first suggests introducing social norms: that is, taking on more professional child minders in childcare centres with many children in exposed positions (Flere pædagoger til institutioner med mange børn i udsatte positioner) – i.e. institutions where the parents of more than 30% of the children receive a subsidy of at least 80% of the cost of a place. This is the case for about 100 childcare institutions (Børne- og Socialministeriet, 2017). The second suggests improving the transition from childcare to primary school, as this does not always work particularly well.

With more money for staff education, more staff and other initiatives, the government reform proposal has been received positively by the trade unions of child minders and is also likely to receive support from the majority in parliament.

Another example of the general move towards better documentation of policies and best practices in line with the Recommendation is the Satspuljeaftale for 2017. The Satspulje is a fund made up by the proceeds from rounding down all social security cash benefits that are used for measures benefiting social security claimants and decided upon by a majority of the parliamentary political parties. It allocates EUR 24.5 million to investment in three types of measures for vulnerable children and youth along these lines. First, investments are made in preventive measures, i.e. hiring more people for the municipalities’ Pedagogical Psychological Support (Pædagogisk Psykologisk Rådgivning, PPR). Also the municipalities are to work with the National Board of Social Services (Socialstyrelsen) on improving the quality of the PPRs’ preventive work. The aim is to reduce the number of children and youth in need of help later in life.
Secondly, the *Satspulje* supports the extension of the new Socio-Economic Model (*Socio-Økonomisk Model, SØM*) to encompass target groups and measures for youth and children. The aim is to give municipalities and organisations a tool to visualise the expected economic potential of implementing new and effective measures. Thirdly, support is given to increase and document the mental skills of vulnerable youth and children.

Another part of the *Satspuljeaftale* for 2017 reserves means to improve the quality of aftercare for children who have been placed outside their homes, as they have greater challenges in making the transition from being young people into leading independent adult lives (for evaluation of different types of aftercare that have informed these initiatives, see Karmsteen et al., 2016; Skårhøj et al., 2016).

However, the children of families on social assistance, as well as asylum seekers and migrant/refugee children, have witnessed a deterioration in their situation. Not only has the introduction of a modern benefit ceiling in October 2016 reduced work disincentives among social assistance claimants: it has also impoverished children in those families that have not been able to get work.

For children of asylum seekers, probably the most important changes are the extended period before the process of family reunification can start and the temporary status of residence permits that have been put in place. The extended period means one or both parents have to remain longer in their home country than before which adds to the uncertainty. The children of migrants and refugees have seen a marked income drop of around 50%, as a new benefit – *Start Help* (*Starthjælp*) – has replaced social assistance for people coming to the country.

### 3 Pillar 1 – Access to resources

The general support for parents with children is quite strong, both for parents in general and for parents in disadvantaged families in particular. Compared to other countries, parents get extensive general support to participate in the labour market. In particular, universal, subsidised childcare and extensive long-term care support the labour market participation of parents with children and of people of working age with care-dependent relatives, respectively.

The coverage of formal childcare is unparalleled in the EU-28. In 2015, 23% of children aged below 3 years and 3% of those aged from 3 years to the minimum school age were not covered by formal childcare, compared to 70% and 17%, respectively, for the EU-27 (see Annex 2). Children also have more hours in formal childcare than in other countries: 70% of those aged below 3 years and 88% of those over 3 years spend more than 30 hours a week in formal childcare. The economic crisis led to unemployment among parents, too, and this could explain the increase in the number of children not in childcare from 2008 to 2012; but coverage rates have now returned to levels that exceed those of the pre-crisis period (see Annex 2).

However, even a fully universal childcare system does not cover those most in need. Some of the children not attending formal childcare have a social background that does not allow for the cognitive stimuli, social norms and language needed to meet the requirements for later learning. This probably requires compulsory childcare or conditional cash transfers, both of which concepts are alien to the liberal tenets of the Danish model.

Denmark has the most extensive active labour market policies in the world, when measured by expenditure. In 2015, the country spent 3.3% of gross domestic product on active labour market policies, compared to 2.9% in Finland and 1.8% in Sweden (Eurostat, 2017c). Social security clients – i.e. claimants of social assistance and unemployment benefits – are encouraged to take up activation and job offers. Linking benefits to obligations, social security with active labour market policies dates back to the early 1990s, but it has gradually been extended from social assistance and unemployment insurance to sickness benefits and disability pensions. Parents are subject to the same type of policies as everybody else, although regard is taken of family responsibilities.
Vocational training and other educational programmes are generally offered free of charge. An educational grant or some other such subsidy provides resources to people pursuing a course of study, including parents.

Families with children get family allowances and various child allowances. By and large, allowances are financed through general taxation, are tax-free and are paid quarterly. There are six types of child allowance. First, the size of the universal child family allowance (børnefamiliedydelser) depends on family status and on the age and number of the children. The child family allowance became income-tested on 1 January 2014: allowances were reduced by 2% of the earnings that each person in a single or (married) couple household had above EUR 96,999 (2015 figure). Second, the multiple child allowance (fierbørnstilskud) is paid for multiple children who are born or adopted at the same time. Third, the single-parent’s child allowance (børnetilskud) consists of an ordinary child allowance and an extra child allowance that single parents can get if they receive the ordinary child allowance and if the child lives with them. Fourth, the special child allowance (særligt børnetilskud) is for families where one or both parents are absent. Fifth, the studying parent’s child allowance is an income-tested child allowance paid per child for parents undertaking education. Sixth, the supplementary child allowance is for a parent who is in a traineeship or is studying, a single parent, and a parent living with a partner who is also studying.

Parental leave schemes underpin the reconciliation of family and work life, although these schemes are not as generous as in neighbouring Sweden. Between them, parents can claim up to 52 weeks of leave with maternity benefits: the mother is entitled to 4 weeks’ leave prior to the birth and 2 weeks after the birth, followed by 12 weeks that are forgone if the mother does not take them. The father (or the second parent of the child) is entitled to 2 weeks of paternity leave in the 14 weeks following the child’s birth. This paternity leave is flexible, in the sense that it can be used to take as little as 1 hour per week over a series of consecutive weeks within the 14-week period following the child’s birth. After the 14 weeks of the mother’s maternity leave, both parents may take parental leave. This parental leave amounts to 32 weeks in total and can be shared by the parents. There are two possibilities for extending the parental leave period. The first is to extend the period by 8 or 14 weeks, which results in a corresponding reduction in the amount received across the benefit period that remains when the decision is taken to extend the leave. The second possibility is to return to work on reduced hours. If, for example, a parent returns to work on half the normal working hours for 8 of the 32 weeks of parental leave, this results in an 8-week extension of the leave on half-time. Similarly, parents may use the number of hours from a period of the parental leave to make a smaller reduction in the working hours over a longer period, e.g. 4 weeks of parental leave equates to 21 weeks with 30 hours of work, compared to the normal 37 hours. The amount of maternity benefit that is paid during maternity leave, paternity leave and parental leave varies according to the number of hours worked and the wage, with a maximum benefit of EUR 570 per week. However, most wage earners are covered by a collective agreement that may entitle them to full wages during part of the leave.

4 Pillar 2 – Access to affordable quality services

Affordability is central for the take-up of childcare. Although not as cheap as in Sweden, early childhood education and care (ECEC) is cheap in Denmark by international standards. Municipalities decide how much parents must pay for having children in day care, but they cannot ask for more than 25% of the cost of running childcare. The fee is highest for youngest children aged 0–2 years and lower for children aged 3–5 years (see Annex 3). Fees have increased gradually from 2008 to 2017 (see Annex 3). The fees vary from one municipality to another, in part due to differences in services like the child-to-staff ratio.

Importantly, many parents do not pay the full fee: parents with more children in day care get a sibling discount, and parents on low income pay a reduced fee (or nothing at all).
Both the sibling discount and the extra reduced fee are important for low-income families and are thus in line with the Recommendation.

Unfortunately, historically the income-testing of childcare fees has contributed to unemployment traps. If parents found work, the free or heavily subsidised childcare was withdrawn, together with social assistance and the housing allowances, thus creating de facto high marginal effective tax rates of 80–100%. The 2016 social assistance reform introduced a “modern benefit ceiling” that withholds housing allowances and supplements that exceed the ceiling and pays these out again once parents replace their social assistance with earnings (see Kvist, 2016 for details). However, parents who do not find work are impoverished by the modern benefit ceiling.

Other social, educational and health services are generally universal, free and tax financed.

The quality of childcare is key to a social investment strategy for breaking intergenerational risk transmission. The lack of up-to-date cross-national data prevents international comparison, but in 2012 the child-to-staff ratio placed Denmark high on this dimension (European Commission, 2013a).

The education of childminders is another indicator of quality of childcare. Danish childcare staff are made up of professionals who have undergone either a shorter course of training (paedagogmedhjælper) or a longer one (paedagog) (Kvist, 2015a). Temporary workers with no specific child pedagogical education make up a third group of staff – typically young people on a gap year between secondary and tertiary education.

When measured by the education of welfare professionals, quality is relatively high in the social, educational and health services. Indeed, a large share of the labour force is educated and employed in jobs in these sectors (Kvist, 2015a).

The system of public schooling was reformed in 2014 to encourage all students to reach their full potential; to reduce the adverse impact of socio-economic background; and to increase the well-being of pupils. The reform implies a longer and more varied school day.

Although the price of services has not gone up, their quality may have been weakened by budget constraints locally or regionally.

5 Pillar 3 – Children’s right to participate

It is generally assumed that organisations for youth in sports, culture or political affairs all give their members and participants some general democratic norms and skills that can be used to participate in other contexts. On this basis, the large proportion of children and youth who are active in sports associations, culture activities and political organisations is a very positive thing. However, a recent Danish study found that, although young people in all types of organisation want some say, there are differences in the weight that those young people themselves attribute to being heard (Ibsen and Levinsen, 2016). Youth organisations are financed in part by subsidies and in part by membership fees.

The Faroe Islands and Greenland, which enjoy a degree of autonomy from Denmark, took an important step towards improving children’s rights when they signed the UN protocol on child trafficking, child prostitution and child pornography on 10 October 2016. However, although part of Denmark, those territories are not part of the European Union and their move cannot be ascribed to the Recommendation.

As part of its childcare reform proposal of spring 2017, the government suggests improving the dialogue between parents and welfare professionals. The Council for Children’s Learning earlier recommended the same sort of measures (Rådet for Børns Læring, 2016).

Youth participate less and less in negative lifestyle activities. Youth criminality has gone down since 2013, though there was a small increase among boys in certain age groups between 2015 and 2016 (Kyvsgaard, 2017). However, although it involves only a few people, there is an important problem of radicalisation and gang membership within a (partly overlapping) group of mostly ethnic-minority boys from disadvantaged
backgrounds. The National Board of Social Services and the Crime Prevention Council give advice to municipalities on how to use effective tools, methods and measures to prevent recruitment into gangs and radicalisation.

When children have a say in legal decision making in areas that affect their lives, they are mostly represented by their parents – for example, on boards of early childhood and care institutions, schools, sports organisations and other associations. In the education system, there is an elaborate framework of representative democracy, with representatives from all classes/education in institutional organisations, from primary school to higher education.

All organisations for youth receive state subsidies per member. The Danish Youth Council (Dansk Ungdoms Fællesråd, DUF) is an umbrella organisation for more than 70 children’s and youth organisations – ranging from political youth organisations, voluntary social organisations and environmental organisations to organisations for youth with disabilities and many more. DUF promotes youth participation broadly and its voice is sometimes heard in parliamentary questions. For example, the chair of DUF, Kasper Sand Kjær, has been appointed to the government’s Disruption Council, created in April 2017.

The Joint Council for Child Issues (Børnesagens Fællesråd) is an umbrella organisation for 20 national member groups in Denmark working with children and children’s rights, including organisations for professionals and institutions working with children and organisations for disadvantaged families and their children. It focuses on children’s rights, child poverty, youth criminality and prevention, and children placed outside the family.

The National Council for Children (Børnerådet) works to safeguard the rights of children and young people and has two panels of children. The first consists of around 2,500 children (aged approximately 13) from across the country, who voice their opinions on a variety of subjects taken up by the Council. The second consists of approximately 1,000 children aged 4–6 years, who provide unique insights into the opinions, perspectives and experiences of pre-school children.

The organisations and procedures for involving children more in policy processes various pre-dates 2013 and can thus not be ascribed to the Recommendation.

6    Addressing child poverty and social exclusion and child well-being in the European Semester

Breaking the cycle of disadvantage has been high on the agenda of Danish governments, although those governments differ in their choice of the means by which the goals are to be achieved. Whatever their differences, governments are more likely to look to the neighbouring countries of Germany, the Netherlands and the UK for answers to problems, rather than to Brussels. The implementation of the Recommendation on “Investing in children” has thus not featured in European Semester discussions.

Denmark has twice received a country-specific recommendation on families and children, both in 2014. The recommendations were to “Improve educational outcomes, in particular for young people with a migrant background, and the effectiveness of vocational training. Facilitate the transition from education to the labour market, including through a wider use of work-based training and apprenticeships.” Reforms of vocational training and a more work-based approach in training and apprenticeships have since been achieved and are supported through tripartite negotiations between the social partners and the government.

7    Mobilising relevant EU financial instruments

By March 2017, Denmark had fulfilled all the ex ante conditionalities affecting European Social Fund (ESF) investments that she chose to include in the Partnership Agreement. The ex ante conditionalities concerned self-employment, active labour market policies, equal opportunities and employability, and vocational education and training (VET) apprenticeships. There were no conditionalities on young people not in education,
employment or training (NEET) and marginal youth, marginalised communities and the Roma, access to health and services, or access to tertiary education. In other words, ex ante conditionalities were only marginally of relevance to the implementation of the Recommendation on “Investing in children”. Because the measures to be implemented in the Recommendation are very much in line with current policies and thinking about welfare policy in Denmark, as described above, this may come as no surprise. Measures since 2013 have mainly focused on reforming existing policies and institutions.

Denmark receives EU financial support as part of the ESF, including in the areas of employment (Thematic objective (TO) 8), social inclusion (TO 9) and education (TO 10). The investment priorities (IP) of the ESF that potentially relate to the implementation of social investments focus on active inclusion (IP 9.1) and the improvement of labour market relevance of education and training systems (IP 10.4). Absorption of funding to date differs within these investment priorities.

Some of the initiatives described earlier are part of the *Satspuljeaftale*, which means that it is not EU money from the 2014–2020 ESF and European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (ERBD) programming that is financing the initiatives, but rather national money.
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## Annex

### Summary Table – Progress since February 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy area or approach</th>
<th>Overall have policies/approaches been strengthened, stayed much the same or been weakened since February 2013 (in the light of the EU Recommendation)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-dimensional strategy with synergies between policies</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s rights approach &amp; effective mainstreaming of children’s policy and rights</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based approach</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of relevant stakeholders (including children)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ participation in the labour market</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child &amp; family income support</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECEC</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing &amp; living environment</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family support &amp; alternative care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children’s right to participate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in play, recreation, sport &amp; cultural activities</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in decision making</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addressing child poverty and social exclusion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the European Semester</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobilising relevant EU financial instruments</strong></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 2: Table – Formal childcare coverage

**Table 1. Formal childcare coverage according to age group, EU-27 and Denmark, 2008, 2012 and 2015, percentage of age group.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EU-27</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>DK</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero hours</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-29 hours</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 hours or over</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years to minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 hours</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-29 hours</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 hours or over</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Annex 3: Table – Yearly fees for early childhood education and care

**Table 2. Yearly fees for early childhood education and care, 2008–2017, running prices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day care 0–2 years</td>
<td>3164</td>
<td>3358</td>
<td>3534</td>
<td>3613</td>
<td>3702</td>
<td>3793</td>
<td>3834</td>
<td>3924</td>
<td>4007</td>
<td>4037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery 0–2 years</td>
<td>4272</td>
<td>4506</td>
<td>4746</td>
<td>4371</td>
<td>4416</td>
<td>4507</td>
<td>4494</td>
<td>4516</td>
<td>4639</td>
<td>4775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare 3–5 years</td>
<td>2251</td>
<td>2367</td>
<td>2568</td>
<td>2398</td>
<td>2440</td>
<td>2562</td>
<td>2589</td>
<td>2612</td>
<td>2672</td>
<td>2751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afterschool scheme 6–9 years</td>
<td>2156</td>
<td>2329</td>
<td>2441</td>
<td>2478</td>
<td>2549</td>
<td>2578</td>
<td>2589</td>
<td>2285</td>
<td>2293</td>
<td>2375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
