

## Draft 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
<b>Austria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Even though Austria's unemployment rate for youth is relatively low compared to the overall EU level, a youth unemployment rate of 9.2% is a call to action (young men 8.9%, young women 9.4%).</li> <li>▪ A relatively small fraction of students leave the school system without successful graduation certificates for compulsory schooling (around 4%); additionally, around 7% of pupils stop their educational careers at the end of compulsory education.</li> <li>▪ Of all students continuing education, the majority attend upper secondary vocational education and training (VET).</li> <li>▪ Early school leaving is strongly connected with social and ethnic background and is more prevalent in urban centres.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Austrian Youth Guarantee – formally introduced in 2013 – has grown structurally and consists of a variety of measures, some of which have already been in practice for several years.</li> <li>▪ While more emphasis was put upon apprenticeships/apprentices at the beginning, the current policies and interventions are multi-faceted and include a broad set of activities and aims. More focus has been put upon the prevention of drop-outs.</li> <li>▪ Key elements are “Training Guarantee” (“Ausbildungsgarantie”, introduced 2008), Youth Coaching and Ready for Education and Training (“AusbildungsFit”).</li> <li>▪ At the moment the introduction of mandatory education (“Ausbildungspflicht”) up to the age of 18 years is being heavily debated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ At a broader level the holistic approach seems to be more developed in Finland than in Austria.</li> <li>▪ Another aspect which seems worth considering in closer detail for Austria is the cross-sectional co-operation which has been developed and should be even more expanded in Finland.</li> <li>▪ Finland seems to put more emphasis on the question of how on-the-job learning could be more integrated in the systems, which may be of interest also for Austria.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What exactly does “flexible education paths for young people” (p. 9) mean?</li> <li>▪ Is practical work experience re-valued in the educational system?</li> <li>▪ Is special consideration given to youth with diverse cultural, ethnical and/or social backgrounds? If so, which?</li> <li>▪ What factors encourage the involvement of municipalities and cross-sectional co-operation?</li> </ul>
<b>Belgium</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The employment rate of young people (15-24 years) is low compared to the European average. The main reason is that education is compulsory until the age of 18.</li> <li>▪ Employment levels display big differences across different skill</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In line with the heterogeneous labour market and the institutional framework, the Belgian national Youth Guarantee Implementation Plan (YGIP) is structured according to four separate YGIPs (Flanders, Wallonia, Brussels and the German Speaking community). Cross-regional</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In contrast to Finland there is no overall legal framework concerning youth policy and tackling youth unemployment. The legal situation can better be described as a patchwork of laws/decrees, agreements and institutions. As a consequence, legal barriers hamper the extent to which public</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How the mutual obligation principle is reconciled with the Guarantee principle?</li> <li>▪ Which features of the Finnish education system ensure a smooth transition from school to work?</li> <li>▪ Which policy measures are taken</li> </ul>

## Draft 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>levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Large unemployment and employment differences can be identified across the three regions. The situation is the most precarious in the Brussels Region. In Flanders youth unemployment mainly manifests itself in the cities.</li> <li>▪ Early school leaving, inappropriate education, high minimum wages, protection of insiders, the prevalence of temporary and temp-agency jobs and the mismatch between education and the labour market are the main factors contributing to youth unemployment in Belgium.</li> </ul>	<p>coordination is ensured by Synerjob.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There is a common focus on the PES (Public Employment Service) actions. The PES at the regional level is in charge of the implementation of the YGIP and takes up the conductor role in which they build structural partnerships with relevant stakeholders.</li> <li>▪ Despite regional differences between the different YGIPs, common features are providing and accessing labour market information, preventing early drop out, offering second chance programmes and youth targeted counselling.</li> <li>▪ Regional UGIPs are primarily embedded in already existing policies directed towards youth. Flanders is perceived as the most advanced region in terms of establishing a youth guarantee.</li> <li>▪ Professional integration allowances to young school leavers who do not have any work experience is a strong incentive for young school leavers to automatically register as jobseekers.</li> </ul>	<p>employment services can provide tailored offers to young people younger than 18 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The holistic and integrated Finnish model of public-private people partnerships may serve as an inspiration for public employment services, which try to involve stakeholders of different policy levels and policy fields in the implementation of the Youth Guarantee.</li> <li>▪ Involving local policy levels may increase the effectiveness of outreach and the youth guarantee trajectories. The Brussels Capital Region recently established a Youth Guarantee office, bringing together expertise around youth matters.</li> <li>▪ As in Finland, the Flanders Youth Guarantee plan is not based on separately funded budget lines, but rather embedded in existing policies, increasing effectiveness in the longer term.</li> <li>▪ The main concern in the Belgian YGIPs is the involvement of the education sector.</li> </ul>	<p>in Finland to cope with the problem of unequal access to offers due to varieties in policy and implementation between municipalities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How the Youth Guarantee implemented in 2013 makes a difference compared with the previous versions of 2005 and/or 1996?</li> <li>▪ What scientific evidence is available on the previous Youth Guarantee schemes implemented in 2005 and/or 1996?</li> </ul>
<b>Estonia</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The youth unemployment rate was 18.7 % in 2013 in Estonia.</li> <li>▪ The economy is recovering from the crisis. However, due to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Estonia does not currently have any comprehensive labour market policies specifically targeting young people. Instead, young people can apply for all services provided by the PES. The</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>The Youth Guarantee in Finland</b> is a comprehensive measure to deal with the specific needs of young people.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How is the work of the National Youth Guarantee Working Group organised?</li> <li>▪ How is the work of local working</li> </ul>

## Draft 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>Estonia being an open and small economy, it highly reliant on external factors. The youth employment rate is still lower and the youth unemployment rate higher than before the crisis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Youth unemployment is especially high among non-Estonians, reaching 25.7% in 2013.</li> <li>▪ In 2013 nearly 30% of the age group 25-34 years lacked vocational training.</li> <li>▪ The dropout rate from vocational schools is very high, at around 18-20%.</li> </ul>	<p>national action plan for the implementation of the Youth Guarantee Scheme 2014-17 submitted to Parliament in April 2014 might change the situation since the Youth Guarantee is directed at young people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The most similar services to Finland's Youth Guarantee policy measures are career counselling, work practice and wage subsidies.</li> <li>▪ Key similarities that exist between Estonian and Finnish measures are that they: 1) enable young people to gain valuable work experience and provide them with the opportunity to apply their theoretical knowledge in practice; 2) lower employers' potential screening and training costs associated with hiring a person without, or with limited, experience.</li> <li>▪ Key differences are 1) shorter duration of measures (the work practice measure is limited to a maximum of 4 months and wage subsidies to 6 months); 2) considerably less generous grants for employers; 3) the Host Country's measure combines training and the job placement/wage subsidy, which are addressed as separate measures in Estonia. One of the planned Youth Guarantee activities in Estonia for the following ESF period (2014-2020) is</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Estonia may draw two important and beneficial lessons from Finland's Youth Guarantee: first, the practical organisation of the <b>cooperation among national and local authorities, business sector and non-governmental organizations</b> in the implementation of the Youth Guarantee; second, <b>the delivery of a comprehensive information strategy</b> on the Youth Guarantee programme in Finland.</li> <li>▪ The political contexts in Estonia and in Finland for implementing the Youth Guarantee are quite different. In contrast to Finland, there is a lack of a strong political impetus in Estonia to tackle the issue of youth unemployment and roll out the Youth Guarantee.</li> </ul>	<p>groups organised? Please describe the procedure.</p>

## Draft 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>the <b>first job measure</b>, which is targeted at young unemployed people aged 17-29 with little or no work experience and no specialised training. The measure includes a wage subsidy paid to the employer and a reimbursement of the employer's training costs.</p>		
<p><b>France</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ France has a low youth employment rate (15-24), oscillating around 30% for the last 20 years. In 2013, this employment rate is 13 percentage points lower than in Finland.</li> <li>▪ Youth unemployment rate (15-24) reached 23.9% in 2012 and is equal to 23.4 in March 2014. The rate is 2.5 higher than the overall unemployment rate.</li> <li>▪ 37.6% of young people with no qualification were unemployed in France, compared to 31.3% in Finland</li> <li>▪ France and Finland are comparable in terms of youth unemployment ratio. In 2012, around 9% of the all class of young people in FR and 10% in FI were in unemployment.</li> <li>▪ French NEET rate (15-24) is equal to 12% in 2012,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ An overall package of measures presented in the Youth Guarantee National Plan (Plan national Garantie Jeunesse)</li> <li>▪ This plan includes a specific, experimental Youth Guarantee (Garantie Jeunes) was launched as an experimental scheme in October 2013, under the form of ten “pilot” projects in ten territories (départements) only.</li> <li>▪ The Youth Guarantee is composed of two elements:</li> <li>▪ First, a guarantee to a first professional experience, which means offering the young people a pathway composed of work experiences and training opportunities. It is based on a one-year contract signed between the Public Employment Service and the young person. The accompaniment is based on the “work first” principle, that is to say offering a plurality of professional experiences, that can be completed by training opportunities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The inclusion of a means-tested monetary allowance is very specific to France (also when compared with other national experiences).</li> <li>▪ The French Youth Guarantee is very recent and still experimental and applies for 10 départements only (out of 101), while the Finnish measure has existed under different forms for a decade.</li> <li>▪ The French experimental scheme is based on a one-year contract</li> <li>▪ It relies on a “work first” model, emphasising the role of “immersion” into companies, whereas the Finnish approach has made the choice of emphasising education (through the Education Guarantee) and training (through the Skills Programme).</li> <li>▪ In both countries, there is a same holistic approach in the implementation of the measure.</li> <li>▪ The role of local agencies for young people (Missions locales in FR) or</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There is no figure at all in the Host country paper, in particular about the number of entrants, the typology of solutions offered to them, the comparison between the renewed Youth Guarantee and the former experience, etc. A quantitative appraisal of the measure would really be of great interest in the context of this Peer Review.</li> <li>▪ Are there any obstacles faced by the operators of the measure in their relation with the training and educational system? One can imagine that it is not always simple to launch a training plan and to find the appropriate provider in less than three months: how does the PES proceed in practice?</li> <li>▪ What happens when the training, education or job proposed in the context of the Youth Guarantee terminates? Does the Guarantee still prevail, which would mean</li> </ul>

## Draft 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>compared to 8.6% in Finland.</p>	<p>Each young beneficiary is followed by a personal counsellor in Missions locales who engages to answer any request from her or him and to regularly propose job opportunities. The accompaniment starts with a 6-week collective support and guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Second a financial resource. It is a means-tested monthly allowance of 433.75€ that can be combined with wages up to 300€ and which is then decreasing beyond that amount</li> <li>▪ Access to the Youth Guarantee is not automatic. The young people's situation is assessed by a "multi-actors" local commission</li> <li>▪ In order to place young people into work experiences, personal counsellors rely on already existing measures or schemes such as subsidised employment programmes for instance</li> </ul>	<p>municipal one-stop shops in Finland is equally central.</p>	<p>that the young people can benefit from another job or training opportunity? Is the young people included then in a specific programme?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Can more be said about the evolution of the PES towards more customer-orientated services? How do employers have reacted to these new services?</li> <li>▪ Regarding the training and education proposed, are some occupations targeted, for instance where there are job vacancies? Do social partners play a role here?</li> </ul>
<b>Germany</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Youth unemployment rates in Germany are low and decreasing since 2005</li> <li>▪ Youth unemployment was less affected by the years of crisis</li> <li>▪ Low qualified school leaver are most affected by unemployment</li> <li>▪ Social class background and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Structural improvement instead of a new special program</li> <li>▪ Early vocational orientation and guidance at school</li> <li>▪ Guidance and counselling of candidates for vocational training at enterprises (apprenticeship training) and vocational schools</li> <li>▪ Pre-training schemes (like BvB or</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Underlying macro factors as business cycle and demographic change limit recommendations for transferability</li> <li>▪ Apprenticeship training is smoothening the transition from school to work in Germany, however its closely connected to the business cycle and requires itself a voluminous number of schemes to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To which extent the current level of youth unemployment rate in Finland is caused by the crisis or by structural factors affecting school graduates' job search, labour market entry and first years within the labour market?</li> <li>▪ How is the cooperation of YG relevant actors organised in Finland at the national, the</li> </ul>

## Draft 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>migration background are core factors for lower school performance</p>	<p>EQ), to qualify young school leavers, not qualified for vocational training, and to improve the access probability for qualified young school leavers, who failed to get access to vocational training</p>	<p>support especially weaker school graduates to get access to firm based training</p>	<p>regional, and the local level with regard to coordination, goal achievement, or allocation of resources? From an individual perspective, are there specific institutions and persons within institutions which take care for a coordinated, concise and long lasting support of individuals transitions from school to work?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To which extent the social and migration background affect labour market prospects of young people in Finland and how these factors are addressed by the Finnish YG?</li> <li>▪ What is done in Finland to identify young people with mental health problems and how this group is addressed by the Finnish YG?</li> <li>▪ To what extent young people from Finland seek education or employment opportunities abroad?</li> </ul>
<b>Ireland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Youth unemployment rates peaked in Ireland in Ireland in 2013 at 33% but have fallen to a current rate of 25%</li> <li>▪ The duration of unemployment for young people has increased, with 41% of young unemployed being long-term</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Youth Guarantee in Ireland is at a much earlier stage of implementation than Finland and will be rolled out nationally in Autumn 2014. Lessons emerging from a one-year Youth Guarantee Pilot Project (Ballymun) will be taken into account in the national implementation process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Broad partnership structures, and specific additional resources for engagement with employers, youth organisations and other relevant NGOs appear to be a critical success factor and should equally be an integral part of Youth Guarantee strategy implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How are Youth Workshops structured in Finland; what training and supports are provided in the workshops and in what sectors?</li> <li>▪ What is the scope and nature of Vocational Rehabilitation element of the Youth Guarantee</li> </ul>

## Draft 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 in 2013.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unemployment rates are higher for young males (28%) compared with 20% for young females; rates are also higher for young people with lower levels of qualification (50% unemployment rate for those aged 18-24 with no more than lower secondary education).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Youth Guarantee strategy is built on the existing government Pathways to work Programme and initiatives, but with a specific focus on early activation.</li> <li>The initial target group are young registered unemployed persons judged to be at highest risk of long-term unemployment. This group will be guaranteed an offer within 4 months of first interview.</li> <li>Some primary legislation has been required to implement aspects of the youth Guarantee in Ireland.</li> </ul>	<p>at local level in Ireland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Centralised guidance services on implementation processes from a national steering committee are beneficial to implementation at local level.</li> <li>Independent formal monitoring and evaluation is important to indicate the effectiveness of the approach in meeting objectives</li> </ul>	<p>in Finland?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What strategies have been most effective in ensuring Partnership at Municipal level?</li> </ul>
<b>Latvia</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the 10 years, Latvia has experienced dramatic changes in its economic development – growth, decline and stabilization. Since 2011, the economic situation has become more stable.</li> <li>In 2013, the unemployment rate of total population was 11.9%, that of young people aged 15-24 was 23.2%, for young people aged 25-29 it stood at 11.3%.</li> <li>In 2013, the NEET rate among young people aged 15–24 was 13.0%, while among those aged 25–29 it was 19.7%.</li> <li>Less than one third NEETs are</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In 2013, a noticeable change occurred in the way the challenge of youth unemployment and inactivity was conceptualised and addressed in Latvia. This new understanding of the NEET challenge and a strategy of expanded and coordinated support was articulated in the National Youth Guarantee Implementation Plan 2014-2020 (YGIP).</li> <li>Both the general objective of ensuring and improving the training and employment opportunities for young people after basic education and the target group of the Youth Guarantee in Latvia are almost the same to those defined in the Finnish Youth Guarantee. Main target group is young people aged 15-24; in 2014,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Since the main principles, policy measures and involved partners in the national youth guarantee schemes are the same in Latvia and Finland, Latvia is interested in obtaining more practical guidance in organising inter-institutional cooperation, establishing instruments that ensure that provided training matches labour market needs, and developing youth outreach work.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What instruments are used to establish good cooperation among all actors involved in the implementation of the Youth Guarantee scheme?</li> <li>Which instruments are used to ensure that the training delivered to young people match labour market needs? Is there any instrument that allows to measure whether the young people taking part in such training have subsequently found a job?</li> <li>How are employment and/or education services organized in less populated regions of</li> </ul>

## Draft 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
	reached by current policy measures.	<p>several services will become available for young people aged 25-29 years and 13-15 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The main difference is observed in activation measures targeting NEETs– Latvia has no youth outreach work experience.</li> </ul>		<p>Finland?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How is youth outreach work organized? What are the ways NEETs are found? How they are motivated to take part in a programme or measure? How long does a mentor work with each young person? What educational and professional background do mentors who work with NEETs have? What other information channels are used for the activation of NEETs?</li> </ul>
<b>Lithuania</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over the past decade, Lithuania faced extremely sharp economic fluctuations, followed by severe fluctuations in unemployment rates.</li> <li>Education attainment of young people is high, unfortunately often it does not guarantee better employment prospects.</li> <li>Migration is seen as an option for those who are unable to find a job or receive low wages.</li> <li>Having previous work experience is one of the main reasons helping youth to be employed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Youth Employment Increasing Plan was developed and launched in 2012 and the Youth Guarantee Implementation Plan was adopted in Lithuania in 2013.</li> <li>Implementation of the YG in Lithuania facilitated the effectiveness of PES services and created opportunities to provide complex services to young job searchers.</li> <li>There emerged a completely new trend of work with youth: a kind of 'outreach' work with young NEETs, not registered at the PES.</li> <li>Although the main elements of the YG Initiative are similar in Finland and Lithuania, there are some material differences, related to the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In order to implement the comprehensive Finnish model, there is no need for new institutions or structures on national or local levels in Lithuania – it would be enough to include some new actors and initiate closer cooperation between institutions and actors.</li> <li>In order to improve the existing funding system for youth employment promotion measures, it is first of all necessary to carry out an objective assessment of the existing situation and only then take relevant decisions.</li> <li>It is necessary to carry out consistent and independent studies and evaluations of policy and measures implemented in order to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To provide for the implementation of the youth guarantee in Finland, a total of EUR 60 million per year has been added to the state budget. What is the mechanism for the distribution of these funds?</li> <li>The number of vocational study places for young people was increased in the autumn of 2012 in Finland. How was it done? How was this number "increased" in practice? Were these new study places related to the labour market needs and how?</li> <li>What are the possibilities for young unemployed persons to acquire vocational qualification in Finland? What are the</li> </ul>

## Draft 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
		comprehensive and far reaching partnership arrangements, role of the education component, continuous assessment and evaluation of measures.	improve their effectiveness and efficiency.	<p>differences (in terms of scholarships, tuition fees, etc.)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Do young people receive scholarships during apprenticeship training? If they do, in what amounts and from what sources?</li> <li>▪ Who are eligible for the Skills Programme?</li> <li>▪ Who are eligible for the Sanssi-card?</li> <li>▪ What are the main indicators used in Finland in evaluating the effectiveness of the YG programme?</li> </ul>
<b>Luxembourg</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Luxembourg's labour market is characterized by a large proportion of cross-border workers, as well as the antagonism of employment creation in some sectors and still rising unemployment rates.</li> <li>▪ Youth unemployment is related to skills mismatches and to a negative impact of the financial and economic crisis.</li> <li>▪ Youth unemployment is placed in the broader context of a body of reforms (professional training, education, etc.).</li> <li>▪ Luxembourg and Finland share</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The implementation of the Youth Guarantee in Luxembourg is focused on three pillars managed centrally by three administrations sharing expertise: employment, education, and activation.</li> <li>▪ The structure of the Youth Guarantee is designed to accentuate individual support, is transversal, pro-active, as well as centered on four phases of action.</li> <li>▪ Existing labour market measures for young job seekers are mobilised.</li> <li>▪ At the heart of the Youth Guarantee is a mutually binding agreement between the young jobseeker and the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Factors of size and short consensus-seeking management processes go in tandem with the adaptability of the budget to the evolution of youth unemployment and a clearly defined implementation structure.</li> <li>▪ The Maison de l'Orientation (Orientation House) is identified as a success factor providing guidance and documentation.</li> <li>▪ The general visibility of the Youth Guarantee through the Orientation House is enhanced by a single contact point.</li> <li>▪ The out-reaching procedure related</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does the memorandum in Finland not create a conflict between the government and the young participant, if the promise of a job or training is not fulfilled?</li> <li>▪ Which existing labour market instruments are incorporated into the Finnish Youth Guarantee and which elements are new?</li> <li>▪ Which changes in the implementation are conducted in the context of the evaluation? How have the identified obstacles been addressed?</li> </ul>

## Draft 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
	similar youth unemployment levels.	administration in charge. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Youth Guarantee will be evaluated and indicators are developed.</li> </ul>	to NEETs is singled out as a best practice, as NEETs require particular attention.	
<b>Netherlands</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Youth unemployment in the Netherlands has been low in comparison to other EU countries, but after the crisis of 2008 the relative position of the Netherlands has deteriorated somewhat in this respect.</li> <li>As in most other countries, the youth unemployment rate in the Netherlands is consistently (over time) about twice as high as the 'general' unemployment rate.</li> <li>The number of young people who are neither in employment nor in education or training is consistently low (less than half the EU average) in the Netherlands.</li> <li>Youth unemployment is higher and more problematic for young people from migrant groups and for young people without a 'starting qualification'.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finland has set up a comprehensive set of measures explicitly geared towards young people and labelled in one package.</li> <li>The policy measure is implemented and executed at various levels of government</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It seems important that the Youth Guarantee package in Finland is specifically geared towards young people. This may contribute to better cooperation between actors at the national, regional and local level.</li> <li>In general the Finnish PES spends much more on training than their Dutch counterpart. An increase in the training budget could benefit young people without a 'starting qualification' in the Netherlands.</li> <li>Attractive characteristics of the Finnish system could be transferred to the Netherlands, but would not necessarily lead to (even) better outcomes in the Netherlands in general.</li> <li>It may be worthwhile to increase the training budget at the Dutch PES in order to better help young people reaching the 'starting qualification' level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the fact that the Youth Guarantee is targeted specifically at young people have beneficial effects when it comes to different layers of government working together?</li> <li>Will the evaluation result in an assessment of the 'net-effect' of the Youth Guarantee?</li> <li>How does the Finnish government deal with young people who need assistance, but nevertheless do not ask for it?</li> </ul>
<b>Poland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dynamic changes of the unemployment rate of youth on the labour market – from 30.6%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Four main target groups are targeted by the Youth Guarantee – early school leavers (15-17), NEETs (18-</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some of the features of the Host country policy example already exist in the Polish labour market policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could you please clarify the rules of participation of young people (and/or their representatives) in</li> </ul>

## Draft 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>in 2004, to 12.0% in 2008, to 18.9% in 2013.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Significantly lower employment rates of youth 15-29 (especially women) and activity rates in Poland than in Finland, partly due to conscious prolongation of the educational cycle.</li> <li>▪ Outstanding drive towards higher education in Poland from the beginning of transformation, resulting in higher levels of educational attainment (7.8% for ISCED lvls 5 and 6).</li> <li>▪ Very low rate of early leavers from education and training in Poland (5.6%) – especially for younger age groups, but a growing size of NEET population and regional differentiation of NEET population.</li> <li>▪ Growing average time of finding a job by young people (8.4 months in 2013), but still relatively shorter than for average unemployed (12.2).</li> </ul>	<p>24), young registered unemployed (18-25), unemployed youth and graduates supported through business start-up incentives (18-29).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Implementation of the Youth Guarantee divided between specialized institutions according to target groups: Voluntary Labour Corps - OHP (for early school leavers and NEETs), local labour offices (for young registered unemployed), Bank of National Economy (for start-up loans for young unemployed and graduates).</li> <li>▪ Timescale of intervention under Youth Guarantee in Poland of 4 months from becoming unemployed or finishing formal education.</li> <li>▪ Differentiated sources of funding – national resources (Labour Fund, Labour Minister's reserve) as well as EU funding (YEI and ESF funds),</li> <li>▪ Wide dissemination of information on Youth Guarantee planned in Poland.</li> </ul>	<p>framework, as a consequence of long tradition of measures aimed at youth unemployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The scale of the problem is much larger and more complicated in Poland, due to number of youth unemployed, their regional differentiation, different starting points in relation to NEET group.</li> <li>▪ Polish Youth Guarantee measures focused primarily on employment activation of youth, not educational activation</li> <li>▪ On the basis of Host country experiences further development of the cooperation going beyond public employment services should be fostered in Poland</li> <li>▪ Sustainability of the measures – a good example to be followed.</li> </ul>	<p>creation of services addressed to them? Is it conducted through youth organisations or more individually by the commitment of people participating in the programs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What is the structure of organisations engaged in implementation of Youth Guarantee in Finland? Are they large/nationwide organisations or local? What is their influence on the supportive measures offered under YG?</li> <li>▪ How do you support and achieve a common standard of services throughout the country (by other means than the presented guidebook)?</li> <li>▪ How is the implementation of the YG monitored in Finland? Is the monitoring system compatible with European Commission proposal (under general guidelines formulated in YEI)?</li> </ul>
Sweden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Youth unemployment has been on the agenda for a long time.</li> <li>▪ Youth unemployment has increased and at present almost every fourth individual</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The youth guarantee is one of several measures targeted towards youth.</li> <li>▪ Municipalities are responsible for the completion of secondary school for youths below 20 years of age.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The holistic, integrated and comprehensive approach for implementing and running the youth guarantee involves almost all stakeholders and makes it harder that someone in need of support is</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does for example each municipality have its own version of the measure or is there some type of mainstreaming and coordination from the</li> </ul>

## Draft 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>between the age of 15 to 24 of the labour force is unemployed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The financial crisis hit youths hard.</li> <li>▪ The number of youths that entered the youth guarantee increased by more than 500% between 2008 and 2010.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There is co-ordination of efforts directed towards youths with multiple problems.</li> <li>▪ The Swedish and the Finnish systems have large similarities.</li> </ul>	<p>left out of treatment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A non-project driven organisation is one way of guaranteeing persistence.</li> <li>▪ Thinking about monitoring and evaluation before implementation will make it possible to get more precise and less costly knowledge of impacts.</li> </ul>	<p>government?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are the activities within a certain municipality financed by the municipality, the nation or a combination?</li> <li>▪ How can one guarantee that youths from different parts of Finland will have the same opportunities – or is this not an issue?</li> <li>▪ Does the National Youth Working Group have a responsibility for knowledge transfer?</li> <li>▪ Is there a lot of pilots done where the results from impact evaluations serve as a driving force in the development of youth oriented sub-programmes?</li> <li>▪ In evaluation, how is the control group constructed if all unemployed youths are eligible for support?</li> <li>▪ What is considered to be a successful outcome of participating?</li> <li>▪ In practice, are there problems giving individual support?</li> </ul>