



# Youth employment policies in Belgium

EXCEPT working paper no. 30  
June 2018

Robert Plasman  
Maxime Fontaine

[www.except-project.eu](http://www.except-project.eu)  
[twitter.com/except\\_eu](https://twitter.com/except_eu)  
[www.facebook.com/excepteu](https://www.facebook.com/excepteu)

This project has received funding from the European  
Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation  
programme under grant agreement No 649496





**EXCEPT Working Papers** are peer-reviewed outputs from the <http://www.except-project.eu/> project. The series is edited by the project coordinator Dr. Marge Unt and by the project co-coordinator Prof. Michael Gebel. These working papers are intended to meet the European Commission's expected impact from the project:

- i. to advance the knowledge base that underpins the formulation and implementation of relevant policies in Europe with the aim of enhancing the employment of young people and improving the social situation of young people who face labour market insecurities, and
- ii. to engage with relevant communities, stakeholders and practitioners in the research with a view to supporting relevant policies in Europe. Contributions to a dialogue about these results can be made through the project website <http://www.except-project.eu/>, or by following us on twitter @except\_eu.

**To cite this report:**

---

Plasman, R. & Fontaine, M. (2018). *Youth employment policies in Belgium*, EXCEPT Working Papers, WP No 30. Tallinn University, Tallinn. <http://www.except-project.eu/working-papers/>

---

© Author

ISSN 2504-7159

ISBN 978-9949-29-399-5 (pdf)

Responsibility for all conclusions drawn from the data lies entirely with the author.



## Contents

The key risk groups in the labour market in Belgium .....	4
Youth employment policies: a general overview .....	6
Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions.....	9
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures .....	11
Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives .....	28
Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion.....	29
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures .....	29
References .....	34



## The key risk groups in the labour market in Belgium

Table 1 “Risk group” construction<sup>1</sup>

Potential risk groups	Importance by actors		
	Public opinion/ Media*	Mainstream policy	Academic research
All young people	5	4	5
Young unemployed	5	5	5
Early school leavers	3	4	3
Young people with low skills	3	4	4
Young people with outdated qualifications	1	3	1
Young people without qualifications	5	5	5
NEET	3	4	3
Higher education graduates	2	4	2
Migrants/Ethnic minorities	2	1	3
Teenage/single parents	2	1	1
Young people from workless families	1	1	1
Young people from remote/disadvantaged areas	2	1	3
Young people with a disability	1	1	1

### Comments on table 1

Issues relating to employment (and well-being in general) of young people are very present in the media. Policies also place an emphasis on youth issues, with a primary focus on employment and training. Although the issue of NEETs is relatively uncommon in the media and public opinion, political decision-makers place particular emphasis on the problem.

Issues about migrants are rarely approached from a “young” angle in media and almost never in policies. In general, issues relating young people and teenage/single parents, workless families, disadvantaged areas and disabilities characteristics are not (or not much) analysed in media and policies.

Issues relating to employment (and well-being in general) of young people are very present in the media. Policies also place an emphasis on youth issues, with a primary focus on employment and training. Although the issue of NEETs is relatively uncommon in the media and public opinion, political decision-makers place particular emphasis on the problem.

Issues about migrants are rarely approached from a “young” angle in media and almost never in policies. In general, issues relating young people and teenage/single parents, workless families, disadvantaged areas and disabilities characteristics are not (or not much) analysed in media and policies.

<sup>1</sup> 1=no significant role to 5=very important



For “mainstream policy”, here are some documents that we used:

- [https://www.leforem.be/MungoBlobs/831/999/20160805\\_Fiches\\_Jeunes\\_et\\_le\\_MDE\\_mise\\_a\\_jour\\_annee2015.pdf](https://www.leforem.be/MungoBlobs/831/999/20160805_Fiches_Jeunes_et_le_MDE_mise_a_jour_annee2015.pdf)
- <http://www.didiergosuin.brussels/fr/news/emploi/la-garantie-pour-la-jeunesse-donnons-une-chance-aux-jeunes>
- <http://pouvoirs-locaux.brussels/fichiers/accord-de-majorite-reg-fr.pdf>
- [https://www.leforem.be/MungoBlobs/658/951/201510\\_garantie\\_jeunesse\\_2015\\_Final.pdf](https://www.leforem.be/MungoBlobs/658/951/201510_garantie_jeunesse_2015_Final.pdf)
- <http://madrane.be/plus-de-360-millions-pour-booster-la-formation-et-lenseignement-a-bruxelles/>
- <http://www.cdh-wallonie.be/notre-action-au-pw/questions-ecrites/le-nombre-preoccupant-de-jeunes-wallons-sans-formation-ni-emploi/?searchterm=au>
- [http://www.bruxellesformation.be/rp\\_2015\\_final\\_light.pdf](http://www.bruxellesformation.be/rp_2015_final_light.pdf)

Youth risk groups especially not adequately addressed by national policies:

- Young people with outdated qualifications;
- Higher education graduates;
- Migrants/Ethnic minorities;
- Teenage/single parents;
- Young people from workless families;
- Young people from remote/disadvantaged areas;
- Young people with a disability.



## Youth employment policies: a general overview

Table 2 An overview of active labour market programmes at national level (2005-2015) \*

	Indicator	Year	2005	2010	2015
1	Total number of active labour market programmes		55	73	78
1.1	including youth-targeted		31	46	48
2	Number of participants (stock) in active labour market programmes:				
2.1	Total number		188 128	298 751	343 564
2.2	% of the labour force (15-64)		4,1%	6,2%	7,0%
3	Number of youth participants (up to 29 years old) in active labour market programmes:				
3.1	Total number		25 701	63 534	70 441
3.2	% of the labour force (15-24)		5,8%	14,8%	17,8%
3.3	% of the total number of participants (stock)		13,7%	21,3%	20,5%
4	Expenditures on active labour market programmes:				
4.1	Total amount (millions EUR)		1 468,10	2 047,97	2 147,94
4.2	% of GDP		0,47%	0,56%	0,53%
5.	Expenditures on all active labour market programmes for youth participants:				
5.1	Total amount (EUR)		nd	nd	nd
5.2	% of GDP		nd	nd	nd
6	Expenditures on youth-targeted active labour market programmes:				
6.1	Total amount (EUR)		nd	nd	nd
6.2	% of GDP		nd	nd	nd
6.3	% of the total expenditures on active labour market programmes		nd	nd	nd

Source: Eurostat

*Notes:*

Data related to 15-29 are not available in the database, so we use data related to 15-24 instead. Data related to expenditures are not disaggregated by age, so we cannot find results.

Eurostat indicates that data related to 2005 and 2010 are considered with low reliability.

Data related to total expenditures in 2005 don't appear in Eurostat. We had to make aggregations of all measures expenditures



Table 3 Overview of types of measures and schemas against youth unemployment in the last years (both running and finished ones; time horizon – last 5-6 years, 2011-2017)?

Type of measure	Importance <sup>2</sup>	Preventive /reactive <sup>3</sup>	Youth specific	Main source of funding <sup>4</sup>	Linked to EU initiatives <sup>5</sup>	Main actors of delivery <sup>6</sup>	Evaluation present	Youth/participant feedback used to improve the delivery
(Re-)orientation courses, preparation for training or employment	2	1	Partly	3	1, 2	2, 7	Partly	Partly
Vocational guidance, career counselling	2	1	Partly	3	1, 2	2, 7	Partly	Partly
Training (with certificates)	3	3	Partly	3	1, 2	2, 7	Partly	Partly
Training (without certificates)	3	1	Partly	3	1, 2	2, 4, 7	Partly	Partly
Employment incentives, subsidies for employer	3	3	Partly	2, 3	1, 2	1, 2, 3	Yes	Partly
Direct job creation	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Start-up incentives, self-employment programmes	3	2	Yes	3	1	2	Partly	Partly

**Comments on table 3**

If (re-)orientation courses, preparation for training or employment and vocational guidance and career counselling stay important for coverage and expenditures among the different measures, recent initiatives are concerning mostly training, employment incentives and start-up incentives (even this last one is still less important regarding expenditures).

Untargeted direct job creation remains the main measure used by Belgian governments to tackle (young) unemployment. Most of past evaluations show however

<sup>2</sup> Importance depends on the comparative scale of the program (coverage & expenditure) -> Does not exist = 0; Not relevant = 1; Quite important = 2; Very important = 3

<sup>3</sup> To what extent do policies focus on preventative measures or are purely reactive to manifest problems preventive = 1; reactive = 2; both=3.

<sup>4</sup> EU = 1; national = 2, regional = 3, local = 4; other -5

<sup>5</sup> Youth Guarantee =1; Youth Employment Initiative =2; Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship =3; Eures =4; Support to youth entrepreneurship =5; Other - 6

<sup>6</sup> state = 1, region = 2, municipality = 3, church = 4, foundations, NGOs = 5, private sector = 6, educational institutions=7 Other, please specify=8 If several, please list all



that this kind of measure cannot be described as “good practice” because of low rate of sustainable job creation. We choose therefore to focus our evaluation on other types of measures (training, job incentives mainly). This element explains that no measures are relevant for direct job creation.

Most of the interventions are designed for all unemployed people but have a focus on young people. Belgium has known an important decentralisation process in 2014 and regions (Brussels-Capital Region, Wallonia and Flanders) are now competent for a large part of employment policies.

There are no evaluation and participant feedback in the Walloon Region and are very rare in the Brussels-Capital Region. At the opposite, there is a real determination to provide assessment/monitoring in Flanders and to include the different actors. This element explains the answers “partly” in two last columns. Flanders measures are most of the time well evaluated and different actors (as young people) are involved to improve the initiatives. On the other side, Walloon Region provides very few evaluations and doesn’t use participant feedback.

*Table 4 Strengths and weaknesses of the overall policy approach*

Effectiveness of the overall policy approach towards tackling youth unemployment and social exclusion	
Strengths	Weaknesses
Real determination to provide assessment/monitoring in Flanders and to include the different actors (young people, enterprises, etc.) but that is not enough.	Too global and general measures not targeted enough: the different regions prefer to try to reach all young people rather than aiming at risk groups for example.
In some extent, decentralisation of measures by regions that allows to fit different labour markets. Labour markets are therefore very different between regions and this may justify differentiated policies.	Lack of transparency and assessment in Flanders, Brussels-Capital Region and particularly in Walloon Region: scientific evaluations are extremely rare. In the case of employment policies targeting young people, there are very few valid evaluations. In the best case, a monitoring is done. This is, however, very insufficient to determine the effectiveness of a policy.
Important number of programs. The Brussels-Capitale Region is very proactive in measures targeting young people and works in close collaboration with the EU and the Youth Guarantee.	



## Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions

Table 5 A brief overview of selected youth employment interventions

No	Name	Level	Main target group <sup>7</sup>	Type <sup>8</sup>	Starting year	Funding source	Part of EU initiatives	Evaluation	“Good practice” <sup>9</sup> example	Impact of policy measures on youth inclusion <sup>10</sup>	Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people <sup>11</sup>
1	FIRST JOB CONVENTION	Regional	a.	4	2014	EU, regional	YG	No	Partially	NA	NA
2	WAITING PERIOD BEFORE INTITLEMENT TO UI BENEFITS	National	a.	4	2012	NA	No	Yes, negative	No	2	4 (3)
3	YOUTH WORK PLAN	Regional	a.	1,2	2009	NA	YG	Yes, negative	No	1	4

### Comments on table 5

Belgium is experiencing problems in terms of its employment policies and in particular its employment policies for young people. Bruno Van Der Linden, director of research at the FNRS (Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique – Fund for Scientific Research), professor at the Catholic University of Louvain and recognized academic expert in the

<sup>7</sup> a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group

<sup>8</sup> (re-)orientation courses, preparation for training or employment = 1; vocational guidance, career counselling = 2; training (with or without certificates) = 3; Employment incentives, subsidies for employer = 4, direct job creation = 5, and start-up incentives, self-employment programmes =6

<sup>9</sup> EU Database of national labour market ‘good practices’ definition: “A specific policy or measure that has proven to be effective and sustainable in the field of employment, demonstrated by evaluation evidence and/or monitoring and assessment methods using process data and showing the potential for replication. It can cover both the formulation and the implementation of the policy or measure, which has led to positive labour market outcomes over an extended period of time.”

<sup>10</sup> 1 - very weak; 2 - weak; 3 - medium; 4 - strong; 5 - very strong; N/A - not applicable. Please provide a brief explanation of the ratings, incl. references if relevant.

<sup>11</sup> 1 - Significant improvement; 2 - Improvement; 3 - No change; 4 - Deterioration; 5 - Significant deterioration; N/A – not applicable. Please provide a brief explanation of the ratings, incl. references if relevant.



field of scientific evaluation made the observation in 2014 during an interview with Le Soir: “We have very few serious evaluations of previous plans. When policies are designed, the tools to evaluate them are not planned. There is a lack of data. It is therefore hazardous to say whether it works or not”<sup>12</sup>.

While public policy evaluation techniques are steadily improving, Belgium continues to make little use of them in comparison with other European countries<sup>13</sup>. In 2006 already, economists were giving their advice in terms of evaluation of the “Marshall Plan”, a public policy with very important means designed to redevelop the Walloon Region. They also noted the lack of evaluation of employment policies at that moment. They explained that “in terms of employment policies, it is rare to find measures that have been the subject of an evaluation that really allows deciding on the effectiveness of the device. It is still common for indicators such as the number of people or the number of jobs receiving public support to be used as indicators of the policy's success”<sup>14</sup>. This method of evaluation, criticized by economists for its non-scientific nature, is still practiced in the Brussels Employment Observatory, which evaluates employment policies in the Brussels-Capital Region<sup>15</sup>. This observation is shared by Benoît Bayenet, Professor of Public Policy and Public Finance at the ULB and First Vice-President of the Management Committee of SOGEPA (Walloon Society for Management and Investments with the merger, an economic tool of the Walloon Region): “the lack of evaluation of public policies (and employment in general) is striking”.

These findings are shared by many institutions, particularly with respect to internal evaluation. Thus, the Cour des comptes (Court of Auditors), in charge of external auditing of the budgetary, accounting and financial operations of the different entities of Belgium, reported in one of the last reports submitted to the Walloon Parliament that “the Cour des comptes has found that the Walloon administration has no control over evaluation indicators for approved missions conducted by LFSs, OPI and the Mire (different Walloon public institutions)”<sup>16</sup>. Similarly, the Conseil supérieur de l’emploi (Higher Employment Council), which monitors employment policies in Belgium and links them to employment issues at European level, notes in its latest report that “as [it] has always recommended, a systematic monitoring and evaluation of public policies is essential in order to control their effectiveness in relation to the objectives and in terms of economy of the budgetary means used. This evaluation culture is not yet sufficiently

---

<sup>12</sup> Van Der Linden B. (2014), *Chômage des jeunes. On a très peu d'évaluations sérieuses des plans précédents*, Le soir, p.1 and p.4 : [Link here](#).

<sup>13</sup> Parenté, W. (2016), *Mesurer l'effet des politiques publiques : l'essor des évaluations aléatoires*, Regards économiques de l'IRES, n°124 : [Link here](#).

<sup>14</sup> Dejemeppe M. et Van Der Linden, B. (2006), *Actions du Plan Marshall sur le marché du travail wallon*, Regards économiques de l'IRES, n°40, p.19 : [Link here](#).

<sup>15</sup> Observatoire bruxellois de l'emploi (2017), *Inventaire des mesures d'aide à l'emploi en 2015* : [Link here](#)

<sup>16</sup> Cour des comptes (2017), *Entreprises de formation par le travail, organismes d'insertion socioprofessionnelle, missions régionales pour l'emploi : financement par la Région wallonne et par le Forem*, p.3 : [Link here](#).



present in our country. It must be based on a scientific approach guaranteeing its reliability and independence”<sup>17</sup>. If Flanders shows more willingness in evaluation, it remains below scientific expectations and must continue to be improved<sup>18</sup>.

In 2016, an important study on youth unemployment and active labor market policies in Europe used only one Belgian scientific evaluation<sup>19</sup>.

### Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	CONVENTION DE PREMIER EMPLOI (CPE)/ STARTBAANOVEREENKOMST FIRST JOB CONVENTION
Short description	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b></p> <p>The main objective of this measure is to enable young unemployed jobseekers under the age of 26 to enter the labor market by offering them a first-time employment contract for a period of one year in an organization of public interest (OPI). The aim is therefore to increase the chances of young people with low qualifications to find a job at the end of their contract.</p> <p>This measure is part of a broader federal government's 1999 obligation that obliges (under certain conditions) employers in the private and public sectors to hire young people under the age of 26.</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b></p> <p>Jobs are prefinanced by Actiris (Brussels PES). In return, the OPI are committed to accompany and train the young person for a minimum of 30% of his working time. This first professional experience allows them to acquire the professional skills necessary to be hired, at the end of their CPE, in the same OPI or to facilitate their engagement in another organization or another company.</p> <p><b>Target groups and eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b></p> <p>The target audience for this measure is young NEETs validly registered with Actiris, resident in the Brussels-Capital Region, under 25, and having a maximum of a high school diploma,</p>

<sup>17</sup> Conseil supérieur de l'emploi (2017), *Rapport 2017 : Allongement et qualité des carrières professionnelles*, p.15 : [Link here](#).

<sup>18</sup> Bollens, J. (2012), *Within reach? On the use of administrative data for conducting labour market policy evaluations in Belgium*, Mutual Learning Programme 2012, European Commission: [Link here](#).

<sup>19</sup> Caliendo M. and Schmidl R. (2016), *Youth unemployment and active labor market policies in Europe*, IZA Journal of Labor Policy, 5:1.



	<p>within the first 6 months of their enrollment after studying at Actiris.</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b> The type of ALMP is a subsidies for employer.</p> <p><b>Level:</b> The measure is the result of cooperation between the Brussels-Capital Region and the Federal State provided for in a cooperation agreement (25 October 2000 and 17 April 2001). After the institutional reform of 2014, the Brussels Capital Region became fully competent for this measure. Since 2013, part of the measure is financed under the Youth Guarantee.</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b> 2000 - 2013 (Federal) 2014 - ... (Region of Brussels-Capital)</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/ implementation of this measure?</b> Yes, an agreement between Actiris and the project's IOP is drafted in order to set the conditions for the realization and financing of the CPE.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b> The administrative and financial management (payments, job offers, information, accounts, receivables, etc.) of this measure is provided by the Actiris Employment Programs Department. In order to assist the OPI in the implementation of these hires, a pre-selection of candidates is carried out by Actiris services based on both the defined job profiles and the professional project negotiated between the young job-seeker and his advisor as part of his Individualized Support Plan (IPA). The final selection is carried out by the company.</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b> For the year 2017, a budget of 12,886,000 euros was planned. Most of this amount was financed by the Brussels-Capital Region. The European Union also finances part of the measure under the Youth Guarantee.</p>
Achieved results	<p><b>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled</u> and <u>who</u></b></p>



	<p><b><u>actually take part</u></b>/ number of young people who have found a job.</p> <p>In 2016, 415 young people were beneficiaries of the measure. Of these, 312 were men and 103 were women.</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b></p> <p>Total expenditure in 2016 was 12,679,337.18 euros.</p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</b></p> <p>Total expenses per beneficiary amounted to 30,552.62 euros in 2016. These expenses cover the payment of wages and social insurance contributions.</p>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b></p> <p>The target audience for this measure is young NEETs living in the Brussels-Capital Region under the age of 26 and having at most a high school diploma.</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b></p> <p>Yes, the beneficiaries must be young people under 26 years old. In practice, young people take part in the program until the last day of the quarter in which they turn 26 years old.</p> <p><b>If it is targeted to all unemployed, does it include special focus to young people (for example, by providing more incentives if young unemployed are targeted)?</b></p> <p>If it is targeted to young unemployed.</p>
Youth involvement	<p><b>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). Please describe if Yes/Partly</b></p> <p>Partly. The agreement is signed between Actiris on the one hand and the OPI on the other hand. However, the young person has to make an "Individual Support Plan" with Actiris that allows the definition of a professional project. The young person can at this moment communicate about his desires or his capacities.</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p><b>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</b></p>



	<p>The measure is part of the European Youth Guarantee. Indeed, this measure is divided into three sub-measures, one of which (“CPE-OIP Youth Guarantee”) is directly linked to the European project.</p>
<p>Available evaluations</p>	<p><b>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</b></p> <p>Actiris makes a monitoring of the program. Public documents can be found here: <a href="#">Link here</a></p> <p>The data presented here, however, are the updated data provided directly by Actiris.</p> <p><b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b></p> <p>The evaluation is internal: Actiris sets up the measurement and carries out the monitoring.</p> <p><b>If evaluations of this program are available how detailed is the information provided (please, consider, do they include only basic information or more information, including evaluation of deadweight loss (hiring to subsidized jobs of individuals who would have found regular employment nevertheless); substitution effect (original regular workers possibly better paid and qualified are displaced with participants in the intervention possibly with lower salaries); displacement effect (rises in public sector spending drive down or even eliminate private sector spending)?</b></p> <p>The monitoring carried out cannot be recognized as a scientific evaluation. Actiris collects annual information on the cost, the number of young people involved (disaggregated by sex, level of study and professional status) and the involved OPI.</p>
<p>Summary of evaluation results</p>	<p><b>Please summarise the main results of evaluations. If there are many evaluations about the same measure, please indicate the results of these separately together with the source.</b></p> <p>As mentioned above, the monitoring carried out cannot be recognized as a scientific evaluation. However, Actiris' inspection services conducted a survey of employers and workers who seem to find the measure positive. No other</p>



	information is available.
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p><b>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects? Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>The lack of a serious evaluation does not allow to determine whether the young people concerned by the measure were able to find a job at the end of their subsidized employment.</p> <p>However, knowing that the stated goal is to bring professional experience to young NEETs, we can say that the measure achieves its objectives.</p> <p>Knowing that the NEET rate in Brussels was 15.2% of young people aged 15 to 24 in 2016, the scale of the measure seems however to be low to address the problem of NEETs.</p> <p><b>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage? Possible barriers for participation (lack of information, complexity of system, conditionality, degree of attractiveness for young people, etc.)?</b></p> <p>Knowing that this measure is aimed exclusively at NEETs, it seems that conditionality is not a problem. The lack of evaluation explained above, however, makes the analysis of barriers to participation difficult.</p> <p><b>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</b></p> <p>The measure is relatively expensive when we look at the cost per beneficiary (30.553 euros in 2016). The lack of quality evaluation makes it difficult, however, to highlight the weaknesses of this measure.</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p><b>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people and target the risk groups among young people? Explain how or, instead, why not?</b></p> <p>The recommendations made by the European Commission to Belgium in 2017 emphasized the importance of giving particular attention to disadvantaged groups in order to participate in the labor market. In this context, it seems that this measure responds adequately to this recommendation by focusing particularly on NEETs.</p> <p>On the other side, the disadvantage associated with these groups (low level of education and lack of training) is not directly addressed. The level of training that young people will</p>



	acquire from the IOP will not be translated into the form of a certificate and cannot be directly valued.
Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example	<p><b>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main “success factors” of this intervention.</b></p> <p><b>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</b></p> <p><b>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b></p> <p>Several studies show that an unemployment experience at the beginning of a professional career can durably deteriorate the employability of the people concerned in the longer term, as the risk of unemployment is indeed higher during their career<sup>20, 21</sup>. In this context, this measure seems to be an adequate response to avoid a negative signal for future employers.</p> <p>The problem of the high rate of NEET in the Brussels-Capital Region (15.2% of young people aged 15 to 24 in 2016, compared with 11.6% for the 28) makes the measures centered on these of utmost importance. The cost seems to be high, but it is an effective response to the problem of discrimination related to periods of unemployment at the beginning of a career.</p> <p>In Belgium, access to unemployment benefits is conditional on one year of employment. In this context and even if the young person cannot find a job afterwards, this measure has the advantage of providing a basic income to the young person, who will ensure not to fall into poverty and to be followed by a PES.</p>

Name of the initiative	STAGE D'INSERTION PROFESSIONNELLE/ BEROEPSINSCHAKELINGSTIJD WAITING PERIOD BEFORE INTITLEMENT TO UI BENEFITS
Short description	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b></p> <p>The main objective of this measure is enhancing incentives of unemployed young people to search more intensively for jobs and to accept offers more quickly.</p> <p>Proactive steps must be agreed with the aim of finding employment or participating in an “individual employment</p>

<sup>20</sup> Arulampalam, W., Gregg, P. & Gregory, M. (2001). *Unemployment scarring*. The Economic Journal 111, 577—584.

<sup>21</sup> Heylen, V. (2011). *Scarring, effects of early career unemployment*. Leuven: HIVA - Steunpunt Werk en Sociale Economie.



	<p>plan”. These steps will be evaluated during four-monthly interviews with the regional placement services, the first taking place in the month after registering as a jobseeker. Three positive evaluations must be received; otherwise the applicant will not receive any benefits, called “vocational development benefit”.</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b></p> <p>The expected effects are an increase in the youth employment rate, which is particularly low in Belgium. It aims to encourage young people to actively search for jobs knowing that they are not entitled to unemployment insurance benefits.</p> <p><b>Target groups and eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b></p> <p>All school-leavers aged less than 26.</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b></p> <p>The type of ALMP intervention</p> <p><b>Level:</b></p> <p>This measure is at federal level.</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b></p> <p>The waiting period was extended from 9 to 12 months in 2012 (1 August) and still applies today.</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b></p> <p>No.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b></p> <p>The measure is decided in Government Agreement of 1 December 2011 and enters into force with the Royal Decree of 20 July 2012 (Belgian Monitor of 30 July 2012).</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b></p> <p>The measure has no cost and so no budget.</p>
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p><b>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled</u> and <u>who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job.</b></p> <p>Number of young people covered in the Region of Brussels-Capital: 5.479 (November 2017). Source: Actiris (Brussels PES).</p>



	<p>Number of young people covered in the Walloon Region: 35.140 (October 2017). Source: Forem (Walloon PES).</p> <p>Number of young people covered in the Flemish Region: 12.521 (December 2017). Source: VDAB (Flemish PES).</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b></p> <p>The measure has no cost.</p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</b></p> <p>The measure has no cost.</p>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b></p> <p>The target audience for this measure is all young people under the age of 26 who are graduating.</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b></p> <p>The program is especially targeted to young people aged less than 26.</p> <p><b>If it is targeted to all unemployed, does it include special focus to young people (for example, by providing more incentives if young unemployed are targeted)?</b></p> <p>It is targeted to young unemployed.</p>
Youth involvement	<p><b>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). Please describe if Yes/Partly</b></p> <p>No.</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p><b>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</b></p> <p>No.</p>
Available evaluations	<p><b>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</b></p> <p><b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b></p> <p>The evaluation is external. This is a study carried out in 2016 by authors from the University of Ghent on behalf of the Werk</p>



	<p>and Social Economy (Work and Social Economy) department, linked to the Flemish Ministry of Employment.</p> <p>The study can be found here: <a href="#">Link here</a></p> <p>This study is an evaluation ex-post, based on data provided by VDAB (Flemish PES).</p> <p><b>If evaluations of this program are available how detailed is the information provided (please, consider, do they include only basic information or more information, including evaluation of deadweight loss (hiring to subsidized jobs of individuals who would have found regular employment nevertheless); substitution effect (original regular workers possibly better paid and qualified are displaced with participants in the intervention possibly with lower salaries); displacement effect (rises in public sector spending drive down or even eliminate private sector spending)?</b></p> <p>The evaluation uses a discontinuity in the duration of the waiting period at age 26 that was present prior to the reform in 2012: school-leavers younger than 26 were eligible to UI after 9 months, while those older had to wait one year. This technique makes it possible to determine the effectiveness of the measure.</p> <p>The authors analyze also the effect of the measure on a number of indicators of job quality, such as the daily wage, the time spent in employment, the incidence of part-time work and annual earnings from salaried employment.</p>
Summary of evaluation results	<p><b>Please summarise the main results of evaluations. If there are many evaluations about the same measure, please indicate the results of these separately together with the source.</b></p> <p>The study finds that such an extension of the waiting period slightly, but statistically insignificantly, increased the transition rate to employment. The authors argued that “a potential explanation of this small impact could be that these youths were not much financially constrained by this extension, because most of them would still be financially dependent on their parents’ income and, hence, not experience an effective drop in income”. However, the authors did not find “supporting evidence for this hypothesis, since, if the analysis was conducted separately for the group with equivalent household</p>



	<p>income above and below the median, it was found that the positive impact on the transition rate to employment was more driven by the group with high income, i.e. for the group that was the least financially constrained”. They highlight that “the precision of these estimated effects was low, suggesting that there was not sufficient power to test this hypothesis”.</p> <p>The authors find that “another potential explanation of this weak impact could be that these youths form biased or non-rational expectations that could make them less responsive to future incentives”. They think that “even if these elements could play a role, the analysis nevertheless finds that future incentives do affect job acceptance behavior”. Knowing that the extension of the waiting period did not affect the level of the accepted wage, the authors find “some suggestive, but robust evidence that it did reduce the number of working days and, hence, earnings in the five quarters following exit from unemployment”. According to them, that means that “the extension of the waiting period induces young job seekers to accept more easily short-term job offers and, in line with expectations, these effects were also found to be larger for youths living in poorer households”.</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p><b>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</b></p> <p>Based on the results of the scientific evaluation, it seems that this program does not achieve its stated goals and intended effects.</p> <p>The impact on youth employment is very slight and not significant, which means that the implementation of the measure didn’t improve the youth employment rate.</p> <p><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>The measure has only a slight impact on job search behaviour, if any.</p> <p><b>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage? Possible barriers for participation (lack of information, complexity of system, conditionality, degree of attractiveness for young people, etc.)?</b></p> <p>Knowing that the measure applies to all school-leavers aged less than 26, the coverage can be evaluated as very good.</p> <p>An important limitation, however, is the requirement to obtain a compulsory education diploma. If this is not the case, the</p>



	<p>young person must wait until they reach the age of 21 before claiming unemployment benefits. In this case, setting up a waiting period of one year cannot have any effect.</p> <p><b>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</b></p> <p>The measure initially has two advantages: it does not represent any cost and applies to almost all young people aged less than 26.</p> <p>However, the evaluation shows that this measure has almost no effect on youth employment. In addition, young people who have not completed their studies are not affected by the measure, which may increase the difference in treatment between NEETs and other young people.</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p><b>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people and target the risk groups among young people? Explain how or, instead, why not?</b></p> <p>This is an important measure that impacts almost all young people under the age of 26. However, it has a negative effect on young people who have not completed their studies, as they are more likely to be NEET.</p> <p>The underlying assumption of a lack of motivation of young people to find work, however, does not appear to be realistic as the evaluation showed that this measure had almost no effect.</p>
<p>Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example</p>	<p><b>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention.</b></p> <p>The main success factors of the measure were its zero cost and high coverage (a large proportion of young people are covered). However, its rigorous evaluation has shown that an innovative measure is not always enough to produce significant effects.</p> <p><b>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice? Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b></p> <p>Although the measure may have appeared as particularly well-designed (no cost, very good coverage), it seems that the measure is not adapted to the problem of the particularly low employment rate of young people.</p> <p>It is possible, however, that in a more dynamic national job market with less unemployment in general, the effect may be</p>



	more positive.
--	----------------

Name of the initiative	JEUGDWERKPLAN YOUTH WORK PLAN (YWP)
Short description	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b></p> <p>The Youth Work Plan is a set of specific actions targeted at young job-seekers who did not find a job after 4 months. All young people who have not yet found a job at this time are called personally and an interview with VDAB (Flemish PES) can be scheduled. During this interview, advice in terms of employment and training are given to ensure the best possible professional integration.</p> <p>The main goals of this action-oriented plan are as follows:</p> <p>Activating Flemish unemployed young people aged less than 25;</p> <p>Ensure that no young Flemish will become a NEET by ensuring that every young person is offered a job or training after 4 months.</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b></p> <p>The intended effects are that after a period of 4 months, every young unemployed Flemish has a job or training.</p> <p><b>Target groups and eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b></p> <p>All unemployment young people aged less than 25.</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b></p> <p>The type of intervention are orientation courses, preparation for training or employment, vocational guidance and career counselling.</p> <p><b>Level:</b></p> <p>This measure has been set up in the Flemish Region and is part of the Youth Guarantee.</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b></p> <p>The Flemish PES introduced the Youth Work Plan in 2008 as a pilot project targeted at low-educated youth in the largest Flemish cities. In 2009 the YWP was extended to all young people aged less than 25.</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/</b></p>



	<p><b>implementation of this measure?</b></p> <p>There is no evidence of stakeholders' involvement.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b></p> <p>The VDAB (Flemish PES) implements the measure. The institution's advisers carry out phone calls, reception and counseling procedures for unemployment young people.</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b></p> <p>The measurement is supported by the VDAB and therefore has no direct cost per se. However, the workload that the measure represents for VDAB advisers should be taken in account.</p>
Achieved results	<p><b>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled</u> and <u>who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job.</b></p> <p>All Flemish young unemployed are entitled in the program. According to the VDAB, 38.459 young people aged less than 25 were unemployed in Flanders (December 2017).</p> <p>VDAB data show that 93% of the unemployed young people were really reached in 2013 by the Youth Work Plan.</p> <p>VDAB data show also that 57,5% of entitled people find a job in 6 months and 63,5% in 12 months <a href="#">Link here</a></p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b></p> <p>As explained above, the measure has no direct cost.</p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</b> NA.</p>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b></p> <p>The target group for this measure is all young people under the age of 25 who are unemployed.</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b></p> <p>The program is especially targeted to young people aged less than 25.</p> <p><b>If it is targeted to all unemployed, does it include special focus to young people (for example, by providing more incentives if young unemployed are targeted)?</b></p> <p>It is targeted to young unemployed.</p>



<p>Youth involvement</p>	<p><b>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). Please describe if Yes/Partly</b></p> <p>No, there are no specific activities to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme. However, young people are directly involved in the implementation of agreements with the VDAB to meet their needs in terms of training and employment. They can thus actively participate in the objective of improving the employment rate of young people, taking into account their desires as well.</p>
<p>Links to EU initiatives</p>	<p><b>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</b></p> <p>Yes, the program is linked to the Youth Guarantee.</p>
<p>Available evaluations</p>	<p><b>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</b></p> <p><b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b></p> <p>The evaluation is external. This is a study carried out in 2016 by authors from the University of Ghent on behalf of the Werk and Social Economy (Work and Social Economy) department, linked to the Flemish Ministry of Employment.</p> <p>The study can be found here: <a href="#">Link here</a></p> <p>This study is an evaluation ex-post, based on data provided by VDAB (Flemish PES).</p> <p><b>If evaluations of this program are available how detailed is the information provided (please, consider, do they include only basic information or more information, including evaluation of deadweight loss (hiring to subsidized jobs of individuals who would have found regular employment nevertheless); substitution effect (original regular workers possibly better paid and qualified are displaced with participants in the intervention possibly with lower salaries); displacement effect (rises in public sector spending drive down or even eliminate private sector spending)?</b></p>



	<p>As explained above, the measure is provided only for young people aged less than 25. In this context and to the extent that the PES strictly denies these services for those older than 25 one month after registration and the YWP is effective, the authors think that “this could generate an age discontinuity close to the one that determines the length of the waiting period. For the latter the discontinuity occurs at 26, 9 months after registration as job seeker. If the age is measured 9 months after registration, the potential age discontinuity of the YWP would occur at the age of 25 and 8 months”.</p> <p>The authors analyze also the effect of the measure on a number of indicators of job quality, such as the daily wage, the time spent in employment, the incidence of part-time work and annual earnings from salaried employment.</p>
Summary of evaluation results	<p><b>Please summarise the main results of evaluations. If there are many evaluations about the same measure, please indicate the results of these separately together with the source.</b></p> <p>The authors show that “YWP did not have any significant positive impact on the exit rate from unemployment to employment.” They highlight however that “as for the extension of the waiting period, it did robustly reduce the number of working days by about 6-7%, while leaving the wage unaffected.” They find that “for youths living in households with below median equivalent income this working time fell even by about 12% and was significant [...] and that the effect on earnings was also negative, although slightly smaller and never statistically significant”.</p> <p>The authors explain these findings by the fact that “PES caseworkers advised young unemployed graduates to accept more temp jobs and fixed-term contracts potentially arguing that these could be stepping stones to a permanent job.” However, they point that “the stepping stone hypothesis should be refuted as the number of working days within the first 5 quarters in the labour market was actually reduced.” According to them “the fact that the YWP induced some school-leavers to participate in training may explain why these lower aspirations in the job acceptance behaviour did not enhance the job finding rate”.</p> <p>Finally, the authors underline the fact that “training temporarily ‘locks-in’ participants into unemployment and that the effects</p>



	<p>of training may only realize in the longer run”. According to them, “this locking-in effect could have counterbalanced the positive effect of the reduced selectivity on the job finding rate”.</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p><b>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</b></p> <p>Based on the results of the scientific evaluation, it seems that this program does not achieve its stated goals and intended effects.</p> <p>This program has no effect, which means that the implementation of the measure didn’t improve the youth employment rate. However, it seems that the low effectiveness of the program is related to misleading advices of the PES workers that lead unemployed young people to accept temporary jobs with the objective of reaching a permanent job after. The evaluation shows that it is not appear in the reality. However, evaluations in other countries show that this kind of program can be efficient<sup>22</sup>.</p> <p><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>As currently designed, the measure has no effect.</p> <p><b>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage? Possible barriers for participation (lack of information, complexity of system, conditionality, degree of attractiveness for young people, etc.)?</b></p> <p>Knowing that the measure applies to all unemployed youths aged less than 25, the coverage can be evaluated as very good. VDAB data show that 93% of the unemployed Flemish young people were really reached in 2013 by the Youth Work Plan.</p> <p>However, this good result does not cover young people that are not registered in the VDAB. These people – the most fragile – are therefore not concerned by the program, which affects its effectiveness.</p> <p><b>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</b></p> <p>The measure initially has two advantages: it does not</p>

<sup>22</sup> Vilckström, J., Rosholm, M. and Svarer M. (2013). *The effectiveness of active labor market policies: Evidence from a social experiment using non-parametric bounds*, Labour Economics 24, pp. 58-67.



	<p>represent any cost and applies to all unemployed young people aged less than 25.</p> <p>However, the evaluation shows that this measure has no effect on youth employment. In addition, young people who are not registered in the VDAB are not entitled and no particular approach was considered in this context.</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p><b>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people and target the risk groups among young people? Explain how or, instead, why not?</b></p> <p>This measure was well-designed (see above) to help unemployed young people to find a job or to follow a training and finally find a job. Beyond the problem of its effectiveness, this program has no answer to tackle the problem of excluded NEET's (who are not registered in the PES). This element doesn't allow addressing the main cause of social exclusion of young people.</p>
<p>Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example</p>	<p><b>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention.</b></p> <p>The main success factors of the measure were its zero cost and high coverage (a large proportion of young people are covered). However, its rigorous evaluation has shown that an innovative measure is not always enough to produce significant effects.</p> <p><b>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice? Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b></p> <p>Although the measure may have appeared as particularly well-designed (no cost, very good coverage, international examples of effectiveness), the evaluation shows that the measure is not effective as such. The program could be improved with better advices (based on international good evaluations) of the workers of the PES. More meetings between PES advisors and entitled young people can also lead to an improvement. As said in the evaluation, "experimental evidence in Denmark suggests that very intensive (fortnightly) meetings with caseworkers can generate significantly positive effects on the job-finding rate".</p>



## Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives

Belgium presented its implementation plan of the Youth Guarantee in 2013, updated in 2014. It is divided into 4 parts, depending on the level of power involved: the Federal State, the Flemish Region, the Walloon Region and the Brussels-Capital Region. The institutional and socio-economic structure of Belgium is reflected in very different situations between regions.

In terms of figures, Flanders has a much more dynamic labor market than Brussels and Wallonia. According to Eurostat, unemployment was 4.8% in 2016 in the Flemish Region compared to 10.5% in the Walloon Region and 16.8% in the Brussels-Capital Region. The trend is the same for youth unemployment even though the rates are much higher: 14.1% of 15-24 are unemployed in Flanders, 27.9% in Wallonia and 35.9% in Brussels. Finally, the NEET rate among young people aged 15 to 24 is much lower in Flanders (7.5% in 2016) than in the Walloon Region (12.2%) and in Brussels (15.2%). These differences translate into different public policies aimed at young people between regions. The implementation of the Youth Guarantee led to a very important impact in Brussels, which has set up an ambitious policy aimed at reducing youth unemployment by making maximum use of the Youth Guarantee tools. If Wallonia has also taken it (but to a smaller extent), Flanders has instead incorporated the Youth Guarantee into its policies already carried out.

The Brussels Youth Guarantee scheme, coordinated by the Minister-President of the Brussels-Capital Region, is supported by a Steering Committee involving the various Ministers in charge of Employment, Training, Education and Social inclusion as well as Administrations. This scheme provides to any young person aged less than 30 and newly registered as a job seeker at Actiris to be accompanied in order to propose him a job, an internship or a training course within 4 months. The estimates of the targeted young people were about 6,000. The results are encouraging: 4,007 training places were offered in 2016 to those under 25 years of age (3,000 were planned in the scheme) and 2,247 work placement places in companies were insured (against 2,000 originally planned). The financing of the scheme could largely be ensured by the European level. The amount allocated to Brussels for the 2014-2020 period under the European Social Fund and the Youth Employment Initiative is € 17.6 million (50% each), which is considerable for the Brussels-Capital Region city. With a total budget of 82,366 euros, the EURES system remains marginal.

The Walloon Region has planned a system around 5 components: the promotion of trades, coaching, training, internships and job placement. The amount granted to Wallonia (provinces of Liège and Hainaut) for the period 2014-2020 under the European Social Fund and the Youth Employment Initiative is 73.4 million euros (50% each).

In the Flemish Region, the Youth Guarantee has not resulted in additional resources and actions for young people. However, this European recommendation helps to make



decision-makers aware of the importance of good support for this target group (Desière *et al.*, 2017).

Finally, it is important to underline the implementation in 2014 of the 6th state reform, an institutional reform aimed at strengthening the regions' competencies with respect to the federal state. This has significantly strengthened the Regions' capacity to implement employment policies targeting young people (and other targeted groups). This reform took place at the same time as the implementation of the Youth Guarantee. Regions have so all the necessary tools to put in place policies targeting young people.

## Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion

Table 6 A brief overview of selected youth employment interventions related to components of social policies

No	Name	Level	Main target group <sup>23</sup>	Starting year; end year (if not ongoing)	Funding source	Part of EU initiatives	Evaluation	The impact of the policy measures <sup>24</sup>	Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people <sup>25</sup>
1	ACTIRIS CHILDREN'S HOUSE	Regional	C	2014	EU, regional	FSE	No	NA	NA

### Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	MAISON D'ENFANTS D'ACTIRIS ACTIRIS CHILDREN'S HOUSE
Short description	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b></p> <p>The program provide childcare facilities for children under the age of three, whose parents are looking for a job or have just found a job and are engaged in an integration path with Actiris (PES Brussels).</p> <p>"Nursery" places (for a maximum period of three months) or "drop-in" arrangements (for a few hours or a day) are made available to jobseekers confronted with an increasingly difficult context of a shortage of childcare</p>

<sup>23</sup> a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group

<sup>24</sup> 1 - very weak; 2 - weak; 3 - medium; 4 - strong; 5 - very strong; N/A - not applicable

<sup>25</sup> 1 - Significant improvement; 2 - Improvement; 3 - No change; 4 - Deterioration; 5 - Significant deterioration; N/A – not applicable



	<p>facilities for children aged 0 to 3 years. This provision of childcare places aims to remove obstacles in the path of insertion of job seekers.</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b></p> <p>This measure should allow job seekers to avoid the problem that is you have to place your child in a childcare facility in order to be able to work. In practice, it is often compulsory to be able to prove the existence of an employment contract in order to benefit from a childcare place.</p> <p>This measure should increase the chances of the unemployed finding a job by reducing their exclusion.</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b></p> <p>Unemployed parents who may be excluded because of their parenthood.</p> <p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b></p> <p>Being parent and having an integration contract with Actiris.</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b></p> <p>Vocational guidance, career counselling: parents have to be registered in Actiris and follow a vocational program or actively looking for work.</p> <p><b>Level:</b></p> <p>Regional: Brussels-Capital Region.</p> <p><b>Start/end date:</b></p> <p>2015-2020.</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b></p> <p>Yes, it is a partnership between Actiris (the Brussels PES) and a structure in the form of ASBL "Maison d'Enfants d'Actiris". In addition, the unemployed are accompanied within Actiris</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b></p> <p>Actiris (PES Brussels).</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b></p> <p>2016: 3,200 thousand EUR (Brussels-Capital Region).</p>
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p><b>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled</u> and <u>who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job.</b></p> <p>677 children (and so parents).</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b></p> <p>3,2 million EUR (2016).</p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure</b></p>



	<p><b>data what is available.</b></p> <p>4.720 EUR (2016).</p>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b></p> <p>Unemployed parents.</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b></p> <p>The program is provided to all unemployed parents.</p> <p><b>If it is targeted to all unemployed, does it include special focus to young people (for example, by providing more incentives if young unemployed are targeted)?</b></p> <p>No, there is no special focus on young unemployed.</p> <p>But if we suppose that parents are on average younger than other people (44,3% of parents are &lt;30), they are <i>de facto</i> more entitled.</p>
Youth involvement	<p><b>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). Please describe if Yes/Partly</b></p> <p>No.</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p><b>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</b></p> <p>The program is no longer funded by FSE.</p>
Available evaluations	<p><b>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</b></p> <p>There is no scientific evaluation but a monitoring is done by the Brussels Employment Observatory: <a href="#">Link here</a></p> <p><b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b></p> <p>The monitoring is internal. The Brussels Employment Observatory is linked to Actiris.</p> <p><b>If evaluations of this program are available how detailed is the information provided (please, consider, do they include only basic information or more information, including evaluation of deadweight loss (hiring to subsidized jobs of individuals who would have found regular employment nevertheless); substitution effect (original regular workers possibly better paid and qualified are displaced with participants in the intervention possibly with lower salaries);</b></p>



	<p><b>displacement effect (rises in public sector spending drive down or even eliminate private sector spending)?</b></p> <p>There is no scientific evaluation.</p>
Summary of evaluation results	<p><b>Please summarise the main results of evaluations. If there are many evaluations about the same measure, please indicate the results of these separately together with the source.</b></p> <p>There is no scientific evaluation.</p>
In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?	<p><b>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</b></p> <p>Yes, the important waiting list (to have access to the measure) attests to the real demand for that kind of programs.</p> <p><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>The number of children cared is relatively small compared to the demand because of relatively high cost of the measure.</p> <p><b>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage? Possible barriers for participation (lack of information, complexity of system, conditionality, degree of attractiveness for young people, etc.)?</b></p> <p>Space is limited and only 30% of applications are accepted without waiting. As this is to answer pressing needs, the device does not completely meet expectations. Moreover, the structural lack of places in "classic" childcare facilities in Brussels and nursery schools decreases the capacity of turn-over. Children stay longer at the Actiris children's house.</p> <p><b>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</b></p> <p>The duration of reception is limited to 3 months, which is not enough knowing that it is very difficult to find a place in public or private child care structure in Brussels.</p> <p>Knowing the structural lack of places in "classic" childcare facilities in Brussels (and the growing price of these facilities), the number of places is insufficient.</p>
Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups	<p><b>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people and target the risk groups among young people? Explain how or, instead, why not?</b></p> <p>This device makes it possible not to isolate young unemployed parents from the labour market. These young people are often very far from the labor market because they have to look after their children.</p>



<p>Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example</p>	<p><b>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main “success factors” of this intervention.</b></p> <p>On the one hand parents can entrust their children for a relatively long time to actively seek work. On the other hand, parents can also drop off their child for a very short time, which makes it possible to answer an urgent professional meeting. All of these elements make the chances of finding a job greater and prevent parents from being isolated from the labor market.</p> <p><b>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</b></p> <p>Having children is very rarely taken into account in youth employment policies. This device provides an effective response to a major problem that helps to keep young people out of the labor market.</p> <p><b>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b></p> <p>If other countries have a high-quality childcare system, the implementation of this program targeting unemployed parents would not be necessary.</p>
--	--



## References

- Arulampalam, W., Gregg, P. & Gregory, M. (2001). *Unemployment scarring*. The Economic Journal 111, 577—584.
- Baert S., Cockx B., Gheyle N. and Vandamme C. (2013), *Jonas plutôt que Okan? Discrimination ethnique à l'égard des jeunes diplômés en Flandre*, Regards économiques de l'IRES.
- Bollens, J. (2012), *Within reach? On the use of administrative data for conducting labour market policy evaluations in Belgium*, Mutual Learning Programme 2012, European Commission.
- Caliendo M. and Schmidl R. (2016), *Youth unemployment and active labor market policies in Europe*, IZA Journal of Labor Policy, 5:1.
- Cockx B. and Van Belle E. (2016a), *Waiting Longer Before Claiming, and Activating Youth. No Point?*, WSE Report 2016 n°1, Leuven.
- Cockx B. and Van Belle E. (2016b), *Jongeren sneller aan het werk krijgen? Een evaluatie van twee maatregelen*, Over Werk. Tijdschrift van het Steunpunt Werk, 26(2), p.29-34, Leuven.
- Conseil national du travail, Conseil central de l'économie (2017), *Evaluation des conventions du premier emploi*, Rapport 103.
- Conseil supérieur de l'emploi (2017), *Rapport 2017 : Allongement et qualité des carrières professionnelles*.
- Cooremans, L. (2015), *La Garantie Jeunes. Pour de meilleurs mécanismes d'insertion*, HR Public.
- Cour des comptes (2017), *Entreprises de formation par le travail, organismes d'insertion socioprofessionnelle, missions régionales pour l'emploi : financement par la Région wallonne et par le Forem*.
- Dejemeppe M. et Van Der Linden, B. (2006), *Actions du Plan Marshall sur le marché du travail wallon*, Regards économiques de l'IRES, n°40, p.19.
- Desiere, S., van Dessel, A., Coomans, S., & Struyven, L. (2017), *Externe evaluatie van de Vlaamse jongerengarantie in het kader van het Europese jongerengarantieplan*, Leuven: HIVA – KU Leuven.
- European Commission (2017), *Youth guarantee country by country. Belgium*.
- Heylen, V. (2011). *Scarring, effects of early career unemployment*. Leuven: HIVA - Steunpunt Werk en Sociale Economie.
- Holderbeke F. and Sanders D. (2016), *Dienstverlening voor werkzoekende jongeren en de monitoring in het kader van de jongerengarantie*, Over.Werk. Tijdschrift van het Steunpunt Werk, 26(1), 22-27, Leuven.



Observatoire bruxellois de l'emploi (2017), *Inventaire des mesures d'aide à l'emploi en 2015*, Brussels.

Parenté, W. (2016), *Mesurer l'effet des politiques publiques : l'essor des évaluations aléatoires*, Regards économiques de l'IRES, n°124.

Philips J. (2016), *De jongerengarantie en het Vlaamse werkgelegenheidsbeleid: een overzicht van de huidige initiatieven*, Over.Werk. Tijdschrift van het Steunpunt Werk, 26(1), 13-21, Leuven.

Scholiers B. and Herremans, W. (2016), *Wel jong, niet NEET. Een analyse van de NEET-jongeren in Vlaanderen*, Over.Werk. Tijdschrift van het Steunpunt Werk, 26(1), 82-91, Leuven.

Van Der Linden B. (2014), *Chômage des jeunes. On a très peu d'évaluations sérieuses des plans précédents*, Le soir.

VDAB (2016), Jaarverslag.

Vilkström, J., Rosholm, M. and Svarer M. (2013), *The effectiveness of active labor market policies: Evidence from a social experiment using non-parametric bounds*, Labour Economics 24.