



# Youth employment policies in Hungary

EXCEPT working paper no. 38  
June 2018

Márton Csillag  
Veronika Vighová

[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:**

---

Csillag, M. & Vighová, V. (2018). *Youth employment policies in Hungary*, EXCEPT Working Papers, WP No 38. Tallinn University, Tallinn. <http://www.except-project.eu/working-papers/>

---

© Author

ISSN 2504-7159

ISBN 978-9949-29-407-7 (pdf)

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



## Contents

The key risk groups in the labour market in Hungary.....	4
Youth employment policies: a general overview.....	5
Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions.....	11
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures .....	13
Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives .....	29
Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion.....	31
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures .....	31
References .....	41



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

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

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Young people with outdated qualifications	1	1	1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

### Comments on Table 1

Political documents concerning the potential risk groups:

- All young people: [National Youth Strategy 2009-2024](#), Framework Programme for the Future of the New Generation 2012 ([Új nemzedék jövőjéért program](#)), [Public Education Development Strategy](#)
- Young unemployed - [National Youth Strategy 2009-2024](#), [Economic Development and Innovation Operational Programme](#) (EDIOP), [Competitive Central Hungary Operational Programme](#) (CCHOP)
- Early school leavers - [A framework strategy for lifelong learning policy \(2014-2020\)](#), [Strategy against early school leaving](#)
- Young people with low skills - [A framework strategy for lifelong learning policy \(2014-2020\)](#)
- Young people with outdated qualifications
- Young people without qualifications - [Human Resources Development Operational Programme](#) (HRDOP), EDIOP, CCHOP
- NEET - [A framework strategy for lifelong learning policy \(2014-2020\)](#), EDIOP, CCHOP

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



- Higher education graduates - [National Youth Strategy 2009-2024](#), Framework Programme for the Future of the New Generation 2012 ([Új nemzedék jövőjéért program](#))
- Migrants/Ethnic minorities- [National Convergence Strategy \(2011-2020\)](#)
- Teenage/single parents
- Young people from workless families
- Young people from remote/disadvantaged areas – [National Convergence Strategy \(2011-2020\)](#), [HRDOP](#)
- Young people with a disability
- Other (please indicate & if necessary include new row/s)

The ratings above relied on: a cursory analysis of (online) news articles for ‘public opinion/media’; an analysis of recent academic articles in the field of employment policies; and a brief analysis of the political and policy documents listed above.

The latter analysis yields that in no way are there specific tools/programmes designed for single mothers – this issue does not seem to be acknowledged by the government. While there are some programmes/policies designed for the labour market inclusion of persons with disabilities, there is no component of these policies which would specifically address young disabled persons.

## Youth employment policies: a general overview

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

	Year	2005	2010	2015 or the last year of available data, specify
	Indicator			
1	Total number of active labour market programmes	25	20	18
1.1	including youth-targeted	4	2	5
2	Number of participants (stock) in active labour market programmes:			
2.1	Total number	74 661	207 937	1 127 763
2.2	% of the labour force (15-64)	1.8%	5%	25%
3	Number of youth participants ( <i>up to 25 years old</i> ) in active labour market programmes:			
3.1	Total number	15 827	25 517	206 280
3.2	% of the labour force (15-24)	4.6%	8.6%	61%



3.3	% of the total number of participants (stock)	21%	12%	18%
4	Expenditures on active labour market programmes:			
4.1	Total amount (EUR)	209.02 million	534.46 million	1 329.51 million
4.2	% of GDP	0.23%	0.54%	1.23%
5.	Expenditures on all active labour market programmes for youth participants:			
5.1	Total amount (EUR)	55.16 million	77.85 million	259.06 million
5.2	% of GDP	0.06%	0.08%	0.23%
6	Expenditures on youth-targeted active labour market programmes:			
6.1	Total amount (EUR)	31.07 million	25.52 million	43.6 million
6.2	% of GDP	0.03%	0.03%	0.04%
6.3	% of the total expenditures on active labour market programmes	14.86%	4.77%	4.98%

## COMMENTS ON TABLE 2

The Eurostat data on the number of participants and expenditures for 2015 are complemented with data on the measures of the Job Protection Action Plan which entered into force in 2013 and supplemented the Start Programme (using the so called Start Card).<sup>2</sup>

The total number of ALMPs and of youth-targeted ALMPs for 2005 and 2010 is based on the Hungarian Labour Market (published annually by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences). The data for 2015 are based on the report of the Hungarian National Employment Service.

The youth-targeted ALMPs for 2005 include the following programmes: Support for the employment of young first-time unemployed, Work experience for persons entering the labour market, a so-called Start Card (which started in October 2005), and two other programmes which are not included in the Eurostat statistics (Subsidy for employing a young person entering the labour market – “Pályakezdő fiatal foglalkoztatásának kedvezménye” and Scholarship employment – “Ösztöndíjas foglalkoztatás”).<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Source: [Hungary's Convergence Programme](#) and data provided by the Ministry for National Economy

<sup>3</sup> Source: Frey, 2006 & Eurostat



The youth-targeted ALMPs for 2010 include the following programmes: Work experience for persons entering the labour market, and Start Card.<sup>4</sup>

The youth-targeted ALMPs for 2015 include the following programmes: Work experience for persons entering the labour market, three components of the Youth Guarantee scheme in Hungary (Youth Guarantee programme of complex personalized assistance, Traineeship programme, and a Self-employment programme) and a summer student jobs programme.<sup>5</sup>

The number of all participants in ALMP and of young (15-24) participants is the sum of the number of participants under those ALMP types that are available in Eurostat. Thus, we are missing data on some of the programmes not included in the Eurostat data and these data are incomplete. The same problem occurs when calculating the expenditures on ALMP and youth-targeted ALMP programmes. Expenditures on young participants is estimated, based on the average (per-head) expenditure on measures (per measure), multiplied by the number of young participants. Naturally, we excluded those ALMP measures that did not have young participants. The data on the expenditure on all ALMPs for youth participants in 2015 also include data provided by the Hungarian Ministry of National Economy. The Ministry provided the data on the tax reliefs provided to private businesses for employees under the age of 25 as part of the Job Protection Action Plan (in 2015 this amounted to 27.7 billion HUF – approximately 92.3 million EUR).<sup>6</sup>

In case of the data on the expenditure on youth-targeted ALMPs we include the Eurostat data with the exception of 2015 – here we include the data of the spending on Youth Guarantee programme in 2015 as stated in the National Employment Service report. The expenditure on Youth Guarantee programme are merged together with the „Road to the Labour market“ programme (EDIOP 5.1.1). In the two programs, HUF 13.1 billion was used in 2015, most notably in the Youth Guarantee program, as the planning for the „Road to Labor market“ was published only with considerable delay in September 2015.

---

<sup>4</sup> Source: Frey, 2010 & Eurostat

<sup>5</sup> Source: Gedei, 2015 & Eurostat

<sup>6</sup> Note that these are not 'expenditures' strictly speaking, rather a decrease in social security payments.



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>7</sup>	Preventive/reactive <sup>8</sup>	Youth specific	Main source of funding <sup>9</sup>	Linked to EU initiatives <sup>10</sup>	Main actors of delivery <sup>11</sup>	Evaluation present	Youth/participant feedback used to improve the delivery
(Re-)orientation courses, preparation for training or employment	2	2	No	1	6	2 (PES local office)	Yes	Partly
Vocational guidance, career counselling	3	2	Yes	1	1, 2	2 (PES local office)	No (Planned)	Partly
Training (with certificates)	3	2	Yes	1	1, 2	2 (PES local office)	No (Planned)	Partly
Training (without certificates)	3	2	Yes	1	1, 2	2 (PES local office)	No (Planned)	Partly
Direct job creation	3	2	No	2	No	2 (PES local office)	No	Partly
Employment incentives, subsidies for employer	3	3	No	2	No	1	Partly	No
Employment incentives, subsidies for employer (traineeships)	2	3	Yes	1	1	2 (PES local office)	No (Planned)	Partly
Start-up incentives, self-employment programmes	1	2	Yes	1	1	7	No	Partly
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

<sup>7</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>8</sup> To what extent do policies focus on preventative measures or are purely reactive to manifest problems PREVENTIVE = 1; REACTIVE = 2; BOTH=3.

<sup>9</sup> EU = 1; national = 2, regional = 3, local = 4; other =5

<sup>10</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>11</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



**Comments on Table 3**

The Youth Guarantee Programme is a complex programme based on personalized assistance. Thus, it involves such measures as: vocational training/guidance, career counselling and mentoring, subsidized work, work experience.

Importance is based on planned budget and number of participants. Note that there are changes in the ‘importance’ of different types of measures with the introduction of the Youth Guarantee. Prior to its introduction, a significant proportion (number) of youth were participating in Public Works programmes (in direct job creation). The introduction of the Youth Guarantee ushered in an increasing importance for (re-)training programmes, as well as additional resources devoted to counselling/mentoring.

The importance of self-employment programmes is very limited, based on planned budgets of the Youth Guarantee, as little as 11% of resources are devoted to this type of measure. Furthermore, as little as 461 young persons have participated in such measures as of 2017 September.

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

Effectiveness of the overall policy approach towards tackling youth unemployment and social exclusion	
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
Most ALMPs for youth have existed for 5-10 years, some of them seemingly effective.	Weak evidence-based policy-making.
Well-developed data collection and monitoring system.	Due to lack of sufficient staff, limited outreach activities on the side of PES local offices to reach inactive and disadvantaged youth.
Long tradition of social work for disadvantaged youth in the guise of family assistance (social services).	No coherent strategy for preventive actions, little communication between educational institutions and PES.
Well-designed Youth Guarantee, building on previous experiences, including mentoring for those youth currently not in a measure (ALMP).	Limited communication between local social services and PES. Very few attempts at providing integrated services for disadvantaged youth.
	Segmentation of jobseekers (youth) is rather crude, the targeting of ALMPs thus is not necessarily effective, hence issue of cream-skimming.
	As of recently, the majority of youth who participate in an ALMP were assigned to public works (public employment), a measure that is not effective at integrating youth into the primary labour market. Currently, with the implementation of the YG (starting in 2016), this practice has changed, only those youth who have no alternative offer can participate in public works.



	Relatively few measure aimed at disadvantaged youth (NEETs), most ALMPs are for non-disadvantaged youth.
	Relatively little support and lack of coherent strategy for (non-employed) single parents.



## Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions

Table 5 A brief overview of selected youth employment interventions

No	Name	Level	Main target group <sup>12</sup>	Type <sup>13</sup>	Starting year	Funding source	Part of EU initiatives	Evaluation	“Good practice” <sup>14</sup> example	Impact of policy measures on youth inclusion <sup>15</sup>	Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people <sup>16</sup>
1	Youth Guarantee Programme	National	Targeted youth risk group	2, 1, 4	2015	EU + national	Yes – Youth Guarantee & YEI	No	Partially	4	2
2	Job protection action plan	National	Targeted risk group	4	2013	National	No	Yes (not public)	Partially	3	2
3	Traineeship programme for school leavers	Regional	Targeted youth risk group	4	2015	EU + national	Yes – Youth Guarantee	No	Partially	2	2
4	Support to young people	National	Targeted youth risk group	6	2015	EU + national	Yes – Youth Guarantee	No	Partially	1	3

<sup>12</sup> a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group;

<sup>13</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>14</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>15</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>16</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.



in becomi ng entrepr eneurs											
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Comments on Table 5**

*Comment 1:* There are no mainstream employment policies specifically aimed at career advancement and improving job quality in Hungary. While one can consider (re-)training programmes as improving young persons skills, and career counselling a s aiming to improve young persons’ knowledge of their own preferences and the labour market both types of measures ultimately leading to better jobs, none of the policies explicitly aim for this. The employment policies’ primary objective is to find jobs for NEETs.

*Comment 2:* Measures were selected after interviews with government officials in charge of active measures. The Youth Guarantee programme was selected since it will reach a large number of young persons, and it is a novelty in the Hungarian context in the sense that it provides a unified framework for complex programmes involving a variety of services and measures. The Job Protection Act was chosen because it is a relatively novel instrument in the Hungarian context (in the sense that it operates through the Tax Authority, without the active involvement of the Public Employment Service), and because it reaches a large number of youth participants. The traineeship programme was selected since it has been very successful in terms of take-up, and it explicitly incorporates a workplace-based mentoring element (a novelty in the Hungarian context). The support programme to young entrepreneurs was selected since it is a relatively well designed programme, in the sense that it provides both entrepreneurship skills courses and financial aid for starting up businesses.

*Comment 3:* Notes on influence and impact.

The Youth Guarantee as a package is planned to reach a large number of unemployed young persons, and given that it is a relatively well designed package, will lead to an improvement of their labour market situation.

The Job Protection Action Plan was used by a large number of employers (for the employment of young persons). It is difficult to assess however how much of this programme lead to net employment creation, hence it is likely to have lead to a modest improvement in young persons’ labour market situation.

The traineeship programme aims only at involving a more modest number of young participants, but is a well-designed programme, so is likely to improve the labour market situation this smaller group of participants.

The entrepreneurship programme, while being well designed, was marred by implementation issues, so has only reached a very small number of participants, and



hence is unlikely to have more than a marginal positive contribution to the improvement of young persons' labour market situation.

### Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	<b>Ifjúsági Garancia Programme – Youth Guarantee Programme</b> Calls covering this programme under two operational programmes: GINOP-5.2.1-14 - Ifjúsági Garancia Program VEKOP-8.2.1-15 - Ifjúsági Garancia a Közép-magyarországi régióban EDIOP-5.2.1-14 – Youth Guarantee Programme CCHOP 8.2.1-15 - Youth Guarantee in the Central Hungarian Region
Short description	<b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b> The aim is for young unemployed to spend as little time as possible in unemployment and to receive personalized assistance to improve their job market situation. In the case of unskilled young people, this can be achieved primarily by returning to learning, providing a new opportunity to acquire a vocational qualification adapted to the needs of the economy. In the case of skilled young people, the emphasis should be on acquiring work experience and helping them to find work in the business sector. <b>Intended effects:</b> Under call GINOP-5.2.1-14 at least 36 000 young people should have participated in the programme in the less developed regions until September 2016 and 4000 young people in Central Hungary (VEKOP-8.2.1-15). The overall number of young people that should benefit from the Youth Guarantee programme by 2020 is 180 000. <b>Target groups:</b> young jobseekers, young NEETs under 25 <b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b> young people under the age of 25 must be registered jobseekers at the PES office <b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b> The Youth Guarantee Programme is a complex programme based on personal assistance to young unemployed people. The measures include vocational training, subsidies to employers, work experience (including internships). <b>Level:</b> national <b>Start/ end date:</b> 2015-2021 (ongoing) <b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b> Yes, in the implementation process. The Youth Guarantee Expert Steering Committee coordinated by the Ministry for



	<p>National Economy guides the implementation process and invites such members as the National Youth Council and the Hungarian Chamber of Commerce and Industry. In certain issues the National Roma Self-Government and the National Association of Young Entrepreneurs are involved as well. It is, however, not clear how exactly these organisations shape the implementation process.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented? –</b> Implemented through PES offices.</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b> GINOP-5.2.1-14: 620 million EUR (186 billion HUF), source: YEI, ESF, state budget; VEKOP-8.2.1-15: 14 million EUR (4 200 million HUF), source: state 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>As of October 2017 the number of young people who entered into the Youth Guarantee scheme was over 100 000. According to the Ministry for National Economy, more than 45,000 young people have been involved in subsidized employment and nearly 22,000 young people have received some training.<sup>17</sup> There are, however, no specific data available. The report on the YEI supported part of the programme is expected by early 2019. The number of young NEETs in the age 15-24 was 160 833 in the 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter of 2013, while the number of young registered jobseekers (15-24) was 90 439 in the first half of 2013.<sup>18</sup></p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b> Based on the available data it is not possible to determine the expenditures on annual basis. (Based on available information we know only that in 2015 the amount spent on EDIOP 5.2.1. together with another call under EDIOP 5.1.1. was approximately 43 million EUR (13.1 billion HUF)).</p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</b></p> <p>Between 2015 and 2017 the expenditures amount to 143.8 million EUR (43.2 billion HUF) in the convergence regions (GINOP-5.2.1-14) and 3.96 million EUR (1.2 billion HUF) in Central Hungary (VEKOP-8.2.1-15)</p>
<p>Targeting</p>	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b> The implementation process of the Youth Guarantee Programme is gradual, meaning that</p>

<sup>17</sup> Source: <http://www.kormany.hu/hu/nemzetgazdasagi-miniszterium/hirek/mar-tobb-mint-100-ezer-fiatal-lepett-be-az-ifjusagi-garancia-rendszerbe>

<sup>18</sup> Hungary's National Youth Guarantee Implementation Plan



	<p>in the first step the target group of the measure is specifically young jobseekers under the age of 25 registered at least for 6 months, later extended to young people registered for 4 months. The young registered jobseekers registered for 4 months were targeted by the PES as of June 2016. Until 2018, the programme should be extended to all young people under 25 years of age and not working, regardless of the length of their registration at the PES office.</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b> Especially targeted on young people.</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>Not applicable.</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 – No.</b> There is no information on the involvement of youth in the design of the programme. Youth organisations are, however, involved in the monitoring of the measure (GINOP Monitoring Committee, Youth Guarantee Expert Steering Group – this applies to all of the GINOP calls)</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? – Yes:</b> Youth Guarantee and Youth Employment Initiative</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> So far only an ex-ante evaluation is available – Analysis of the Youth Employment Initiative by Hétfa Research Institute.<sup>19</sup></p> <p>Permanent (internal) monitoring of YEI is in place.</p> <p>Mid-term and ex-post evaluations about YEI by external researchers is planned.</p> <p><b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b> external</p>

<sup>19</sup> Szabó-Morvai, Á. et al. (2015): Az Ifjúsági Foglalkoztatási Kezdeményezés elemzése („Analysis of the Youth Employment Initiative”). Hétfa Research Institute, Budapest.



	<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>NO evaluations as of date.</p> <p>Please note that the ex-ante evaluation mentioned above outlines how net employment effects could potentially be estimated in future (ex-post) evaluations. It also highlights two issues: (a) that limiting substitution effects via administrative rules is only possible in certain cases (such as hiring subsidies) and that these rules have had limited success previously; and (b) that limiting deadweight losses are rather difficult – only possible via careful targeting of services and measures -, given that the logic of the YG is providing an offer to all NEETs (hence youth who would in principle be able to find a job in the absence of the programme cannot be excluded).</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>N/A</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><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></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><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 YG reaches all those who register as jobseekers at PES, and in this sense, its coverage is adequate. Preliminary results show that during the first six months of implementation, roughly 18% of the target</p>



	<p>group entered the YG<sup>20</sup>. More recent results suggest that close to two-thirds of the target group has entered the Youth Guarantee.</p> <p>It is less clear how inactive youth will be reached by the programme, preliminary results about the very first six months of the implementation show that very few such youth have entered the YG. This is likely related to the modest staffing of PES offices, thus limited effort in reaching out to those further from the labour market (young women with children, young persons from segregated Roma communities etc.).</p> <p>Given the relatively late implementation of the YG (which started in 2015 March), it is too early to assess its factual achievements.</p> <p>Despite the issues listed above, the intervention will likely reach the aim of providing support to a large number of NEETs.</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>Yes, it does, insofar as it offers a wide range of measures and services for unemployed youth.</p> <p>It is by design not supposed to address some other causes of youth non-employment, such as: early school leaving, discrimination against ethnic minorities in the labour market, insufficient support for early childcare education for single parents etc.</p>
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>The implementation of the YG in Hungary has the following strong points: (a) it builds on existing programmes which seem effective; (b) it adds a strong mentoring element, in other words, youth prior to participating in a measure are intensive communication with a PES counsellor and (c) services and measures are more individualised (tailor-made) than in previous programmes.</p> <p>It cannot be recommended as a good practice since there is very limited evidence about the effectiveness of the Youth Guarantee.</p>

Name of the initiative	<b>Munkehelyvédelmi akcióterv</b> <b>Job Protection Action Plan</b>
------------------------	--

<sup>20</sup> See: Szabó-Morvai, Á. et al. (2015): Az Ifjúsági Foglalkoztatási Kezdeményezés elemzése (Analysis of the Youth Employment Initiative). Hétfa Research Institute, Budapest.



<p>Short description</p>	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b> The Job Protection Action Plan aims at boosting economic recovery through effective tax policy tools - by protecting jobs and creating new ones, and by strengthening the role of predictability and simplicity in the tax system.</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b> To increase employment rates of those workers' groups where employment levels are lower in Hungary than in the EU by reducing the employer tax burdens.</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b> age groups under 25 years, and over 55 years, low skilled, long-term unemployed, women with small children, parents with at least 3 children</p> <p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b> The tax reduction applies for both newly hired and existing employees. For certain reductions, the employees under the age of 25 cannot have more than 180 days of employment. The employers, for example, do not need to pay vocational training contributions for 2 years for such employees and also the social contribution tax on wages is 0% instead of 27% in the first two years of employment. Employers are eligible for tax reduction if they employ a person who was registered as unemployed for at least 183 days out of 275, or a person after returning from parental leave (meaning a person who is no longer receiving parental allowance: GYED, or recently stopped receiving or is still receiving child care or child-raising allowance: GYES and GYET). Lastly, employers are eligible for tax reduction also for filling positions that do not require any qualifications.</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b> Employment incentives</p> <p><b>Level:</b> national</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b> 2013-ongoing</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b> No</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b> – national tax authority (National Tax and Customs Administration)</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b> source: state 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>On average there were 28 271 young people with fewer than 180 days of previous employment covered by the Job Protection Action Plan,</p>



	<p>and 138 900 young people with more than 180 days of previous employment covered in 2016.</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b></p> <p>The total expenditures on young people under the age of 25 were as follows (Data provided by the Ministry for National Economy):</p> <p>2013 – 63.4 million EUR (19.3 billion HUF)</p> <p>2014 – 84.5 million EUR (25.3 billion HUF)</p> <p>2015 – 92.4 million EUR (27.7 billion HUF)</p> <p>2016 – 96.3 million EUR (28.9 billion HUF)</p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</b></p> <p>Data for 2016 (provided by the Ministry of National Economy, calculated with the average number of participants and average spending per year):</p> <p>Young people with more than 180 days of employment – 41.7 EUR/person (12 519.8 HUF/person)</p> <p>Young people with fewer than 180 days of employment – 78.9 EUR/person (23 663.8 HUF/person)</p>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b> age groups under 25 and over 55, low skilled, long-term unemployed and women with small children</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b> Not targeted to young people, but to specific groups.</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> Yes, more incentives are given to employers to hire young people under the age of 25 with no work experience (fewer than 180 days of employment).</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 - No</b></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? – No</b></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</b></p>



	<p><b>permanent monitoring?</b> The evaluations are not available to the public, only a short summary.</p> <p><b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b> Internal</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> NA, as full report is not available.</p> <p>Please note that the Research Unit of the Department of Tax Policy and International Taxation of the Ministry of National Economy is currently working on an ex-post evaluation of the Job Protection Action Plan. This full report will be circulated only internally (within the Administration), during the course of 2018. A shorter version of this report will be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal, as well as excerpts being published in overview reports. Indeed, the fact is that evidence-based policymaking is not common in Hungary. In this sense, the fact that a counterfactual evaluation of a non-EU funded programme will be done is a positive phenomenon. By contrast, open governance is not the strong suit of the current government, thus it is no surprise that the full-length version of a report done by internally within the Ministry of National Economy will not be released to the general public.</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> The summary of research results indicates that the Programme likely increased the employment rate of those aged 22-23 by about 2-3 percentage points between 2013-2015. <sup>21</sup> A further positive achievement of the Programme is that it is relatively successful at targeting low-wage workers, in the sense that roughly 50% of all employment incentives were paid for employees in the bottom two quantiles of the wage distribution (note that this includes all beneficiaries, not just youth).</p>

<sup>21</sup> The Hungarian Government (2016): Magyarország Konvergenciaprogramja 2016-2020. [The convergence Programme of Hungary, 2016-2020]. pp. 66-67.



<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><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></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><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 advantage of this programme is that it provides incentives for employers to employ workers from 'risk groups' without a large administrative burden for the companies. It is widely known (for both employers and employees), and as a result, the take-up of this tax incentive is high.</p> <p>Very little is known about this measure's 'effectiveness', in the sense that we do not know how many jobs were created (were not lost). On purely theoretical grounds, one might suspect that it leads to large deadweight effects, as the conditionalities attached are relatively light.</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>It does address the potential gap between young persons (perceived) productivity and employers' wage costs. There is some targeting in the sense employers are entitled to higher subsidies for those without (prior) work experience. However, there is no 'fine tuning' of the measure for those who are presumably especially disadvantaged. (Indeed, close to one-third of all employees working in the private sector are included in target group of the Programme.)</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><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>Given that very little is know about the measure's effectiveness (in terms of net employment creation), it is difficult to assess whether it is a good practice.</p> <p>The success factor is high take-up.</p>
<p>Name of the initiative</p>	<p><b>Gyakornoki program – Traineeship programme</b></p>



	<p>Calls covering the programme under Economic Development and Innovation Operational Programme</p> <p>GINOP-5.2.4-16 - Gyakornoki program pályakezdekők támogatására</p> <p>GINOP-5.2.5-16 - Gyakornoki program - támogató szolgáltatások</p> <p>EDIOP-5.2.4-16 – Traineeship Programme to support school-leavers</p> <p>EDIOP-5.2.5-16 – Traineeship Programme – Support Services</p>
<p>Short description</p>	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b> Promoting job creation, promoting the utilization of vocational qualifications acquired through school-based training, adult education or adult training, helping young people in gaining early work experience, thereby increasing their later employability.</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b> The programme plans to provide work experience to about 4 500 young people. The programme also intends to reach 5 000 employers and provide them services supporting the integration of trainees into the workplace. These services are covered by vocational training centres and involve, e.g. the recruitment of trainees, to deepen the trainees' knowledge and to monitor trainees' progress and evaluation.</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b> young NEETs under the age of 25</p> <p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b> young people under the age of 25 must be registered jobseekers at the PES office in the Youth Guarantee system, with vocational qualifications and must not have been employed by the same firm previously. For employers: SMEs.</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b> Job creation, Mentoring and preparation for employment, Wage subsidies to employers during the period of 9 months (subsidies covering the wage of the trainees, as well as a support for employing a person who serves as a contact person for the vocational training centre – work place mentor)</p> <p><b>Level:</b> regional (convergence regions)</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b> 2016-2020 (ongoing)</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b> As this programme is part of the YG Scheme, The Youth Guarantee Expert Steering Committee coordinated by the Ministry for National Economy guides the implementation process and invites such members as the National Youth Council and the Hungarian Chamber of Commerce and Industry. In certain issues the National Roma Self-Government and the National Association of</p>



	<p>Young Entrepreneurs are involved as well. It is, however, not clear how exactly these organisations shape the implementation process.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b> – Implemented through PES offices and vocational training centres.</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b> GINOP-5.2.4-16: 100 million EUR (30 billion HUF), source: ESF, state budget; GINOP-5.2.5-16: 6.7 million EUR (2 billion HUF), source: state budget, ESF</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>Currently, there are 2 841 young people participating in the Traineeship Programme. (Source: Interview, Ministry of National Economy). The call set out as its target number 4 500 young people completing the traineeship.</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b> Based on the available data it is not possible to determine the expenditures on annual basis.</p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</b></p> <p>Between 2015 and 2017 the expenditures on wage subsidies under GINOP-5.2.4-16 amount to 8.7 million EUR (2.6 billion HUF). The expenditures on the mentoring and counselling by vocational training centres amounted to 3.96 million EUR (1.2 billion HUF) under GINOP-5.2.5-16 between 2015 and 2017.</p>
<p>Targeting</p>	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b> The target group is young people under the age of 25 not in employment, education or training, with vocational education. The young people become eligible for the Traineeship after registration at the PES office.</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b> Especially targeted on young people.</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> NR</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 - No</b></p>



<p>Links to EU initiatives</p>	<p>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? – Yes: Youth Guarantee</p>
<p>Available evaluations</p>	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)?  <b>If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</b> No, monitoring reports (not public).  <b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b> Internal  <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> NR</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>          NR</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? Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b>  <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>  <b>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</b>          It likely does achieve its goals, since it gives young persons practical and vocational knowledge in a workplace. It might also lead to net employment creation, due to conditionalities attached. (These are: the trainee must not have been employed by the same firm previously; it is mandatory for the employer to employ the young person for 4,5 months after the 9 month traineeship period has ended.)          Furthermore, the application for the subsidies is relatively simple, if the would-be trainee and her future employer meet eligibility criteria, there</p>



	<p>is no further need for further negotiations between the PES and the employer (as opposed to more traditional hiring subsidies). This is likely to increase take-up.</p> <p>However, the number of planned participants seems relatively low. (As the total number of the potential target group is likely to be on the order of 60,000 young persons). However, in response to the popularity of the measure, the budget devoted to it has been doubled, hence it will likely reach 9000 young persons.</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>It does offer the young person an opportunity to gain useful experience in the workplace. By the same token, it provides monetary incentives for the employer, which would bridge the gap between the young persons' (perceived) productivity and wage costs. Furthermore, it provides an opportunity for the employer to use an extended 'trial period' – in the guise of the traineeship programme. Finally, the fact an internal (company) mentor is mandatory, (with subsidies provided for the wages of the mentor) implies that any issues the young person might have with integrating into the workplace will be solved.</p> <p>It needs to be noted that by definition, it is aimed at addressing a relatively limited problem: the lack of practical (work) experience for young persons who have vocational qualification.</p>
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>The fact that (a) a mandatory company mentor is assigned to the young person, (b) the application for the subsidy is automatized and (c) the conditionalities attached are likely to contribute to net employment creation are the three main success factors.</p> <p>However, as little is known about the programme's effectiveness to date, it cannot be recommended to be a good practice.</p>

Name of the initiative	<p><b>Fiatalok vállalkozóvá válása - Supporting entrepreneurship of young people</b></p> <p>Calls covering the programme under EDIOP and CCHOP</p> <p>GINOP-5.2.2-14 - Fiatalok vállalkozó válása /A komponens</p> <p>GINOP-5.2.3-16 - Fiatalok vállalkozóvá válása - Vállalkozás indítási költségeinek támogatása</p> <p>GINOP-5.2.7-17 - Fiatalok vállalkozó válásának támogatása</p>
------------------------	---



	<p>GINOP-5.1.9-17 - Álláskeresők és fiatalok vállalkozóvá válásának ösztönzése - képzés és mentorálás</p> <p>VEKOP-8.3.1-16 - Fiatalok vállalkozóvá válásának támogatása (Vállalkozz itthon fiatal)</p> <p>EDIOP-5.2.2-14 – Entrepreneurship of young people /A component</p> <p>EDIOP-5.2.3-16 – Entrepreneurship of young people - Support for start-up costs for entrepreneurs</p> <p>EDIOP-5.2.7-17 – Supporting entrepreneurship of young people</p> <p>EDIOP-5.1.9-17 - Encouraging jobseekers and young people to become entrepreneurs - training and mentoring</p> <p>CCHOP-8.3.1-16 - Supporting entrepreneurship of young people (Become a young entrepreneur)</p>
<p>Short description</p>	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b> Preparing young people for starting their individual or micro enterprise, providing them with the knowledge and skills, helping with the development of their own plan, and providing financial support for the start-up costs of their business based on an approved business plan.</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b> All of the programmes together aim to provide training to overall ca. 8000 young people. The intended effect is that young people will start altogether 6 625 new businesses. Finally, about 750 businesses are expected to make use of mentoring.</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b> Young people not in education, employment or training in the age 18-30. Most notably those who have a business idea, or entrepreneurial attitude to start a business (Based on call GINOP 5.2.2-14, 20% of the participants need to be registered at the PES office for at least 4 months, and the 25-30 years-old jobseekers can make up maximum 35% of the target group).</p> <p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b> young people under the age 25 must be registered in the Youth Guarantee Programme, young people between the age of 25 and 30 must be registered jobseekers. The participants cannot hold majority ownership in an already existing business.</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b> Start-up incentives, self-employment programmes</p> <p><b>Level:</b> national</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b> 2016-2020 (ongoing)</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b> Partly. The Young Entrepreneurs Association in Hungary is member of the GINOP Monitoring Committee that monitors</p>



	<p>the implementation of the measures, as well as an invited member of the YG Expert Steering Committee. It is, however, not clear how it is involved in the shaping of the measure.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b> – Implemented through PES offices, training and mentoring organizations</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b> GINOP-5.2.2-14: 3.7 million EUR (1.1 billion HUF), source: ESF, state budget; GINOP-5.2.3-16: 9.7 million EUR (2.9 billion HUF), source: ESF, state budget; GINOP-5.2.7-17: 53.3 million EUR (16 billion HUF), source: ESF, state budget; GINOP-5.1.9-17: 20 million EUR (6 billion HUF), source: ESF, state budget; VEKOP-8.3.1-16: 3.5 million EUR (1.04 billion HUF), source: ESF, state budget</p>
Achieved results <sup>22</sup>	<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>So far there have been 123 applications registered from the Central Hungarian region and 288 applications from the convergence regions for the support of start-up costs. However, the number of financially supported business plans is so far only 51 and 19, respectively.</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b> Based on the available data it is not possible to determine the expenditures on annual basis.</p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</b></p> <p>From among the so far supported business plans the expenditures in the Central Hungarian region amount to 278.2 thousand EUR (83.5 million HUF) and to 91.8 thousand EUR (275.6 million HUF) in the convergence regions between 2016 and 2017.</p> <p>On average, the subsidy per applicant in the convergence region amount to 4.8 thousand EUR (1.5 million HUF). In the Central Hungarian region the average subsidy per applicant is 5.5 thousand EUR (1.6 million HUF)</p>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b> The target groups are young people between the age of 18 and 25 registered in the</p>

<sup>22</sup> Data as of October 26th 2017 – Source:  
[http://emir.palyazat.gov.hu/nd/kozvel/?link=eupr\\_eljarasrendi&sc=2&ml=1&sr=171&offset=8&id\\_op=1382&id\\_tamogatascel=-1&id\\_paly\\_tip=-1](http://emir.palyazat.gov.hu/nd/kozvel/?link=eupr_eljarasrendi&sc=2&ml=1&sr=171&offset=8&id_op=1382&id_tamogatascel=-1&id_paly_tip=-1)



	<p>Youth Guarantee Programme (NEETs) and young registered jobseekers in between the age of 25 and 30.</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b> Especially targeted on young people.</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> N/A</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 - No</b></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? – Yes: Youth Guarantee</b></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? No</b></p> <p><b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)? NR</b></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)? NR</b></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. NR</b></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><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p><b>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage?</b></p> <p><b>Possible barriers for participation (lack of information, complexity of system, conditionality, degree of attractiveness for young people, etc.)?</b></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>Very little is currently known about this programme, since the implementation of the programme was delayed considerably.</p> <p>The programme does set some ambitious targets, so in terms of coverage (if current goals are achieved) it will be adequate.</p> <p>There is some anecdotal evidence that participants in previous similar programmes were positively selected, so it is doubtful whether this programme will reach disadvantaged youth.</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>It does, partially. Young persons having entrepreneurial spirit but lacking skills and capital can benefit. It likely does not affect the employment rates of most disadvantaged youth.</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><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>The potential success factor of this programme is that besides giving financial support to youth wanting to start their own business, it also provides training on 'entrepreneurial skills'.</p> <p>No evidence on the effectiveness of this programme, hence cannot be recommended as a good practice.</p>

## Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives

To the extent that different EU initiatives provide funding for youth employment programmes, these are extremely important. All in all, close to 60% of all expenditures on ALMPs for youth and basically all of the youth-targeted measures are part of the Youth Guarantee currently. However, when it comes to the design of youth employment policies, a number of 'prototypes' for some (partial) programmes were developed 'quasi-independently' of the EU Initiatives (even prior to joining the EU).

More specifically, for the Youth Guarantee, a large number of the sub-programmes build on measures implemented within the 'Social Renewal Operational Programme' (2007-2013), which in turn was partly financed by ESF. It is difficult however to precisely assess what proportion of youth in active labour market programmes was financed from ESF budgets, it likely represented as much as one-fourth of expenditures in this period.



The novelty (besides the adequate funding for youth employment policies), of the YG is that (a) it provides a framework for time-bound placement in services and measures; (b) services and measures are better integrated than before; and (c) a tailor-made and personalised ‘package’, largely facilitated by the existence of a YG mentor in each PES local office. In the sense that the YG provided the means as well as the incentives to organise youth employment programmes in such a framework, the influence of this EU initiative is substantial.

The introduction of the Youth Guarantee also marked an important shift in the types of measures where young persons are participating. More specifically, the effective implementation of the Youth Guarantee has led to a tightening of how young persons can enter the Public Works programmes. In 2017, only those young persons can be enrolled in the Public Works programmes, who did not successfully get an offer for measures within the Youth Guarantee. This has translated in a fall in the overall number of young persons in Public Works programmes (17100 young persons on average in a given month between January-September 2017; as opposed to 31300 for the similar period in 2014), as well as in the proportion of youth participants in Public Works programmes.



## Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion

No ALMP measures that are linked or even contain components of social policies exist, at the national level.

Two policies at the local level were chosen, as these two are (a) clearly an integrated service, in the sense that social (housing) and employment-oriented services are provided simultaneously to the target group; (b) are targeted at a sizeable risk group; (c) are the object of currently running or planned future evaluations.

Numerous other smaller scale (social and employment) programmes targeted at socially excluded (Roma) youth exist in Hungary, but these are significantly smaller in size; and no evaluation (monitoring) exists.

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	Funding source	Part of EU initiatives	Evaluation	Impact of the policy measures <sup>24</sup>	Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people <sup>25</sup>
1	Minimum Income Scheme	Local, 14 <sup>th</sup> District of the City of Budapest	c	2015 -	Local	No	Yes, positive	4	2
2	Social Rental Agency, HomeLab Project	Local, Town of Veszprém	c	2016-; 2017-2019	Local, EU	No	No	3	2

Note: Please note that impact and the influence of the measures can be interpreted as the effect on the local targeted risk group.

### Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	Minimum income scheme in the 14th district of Budapest
Short description	<b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b> Reduction of poverty through a minimum income scheme, a housing subsidy covering utility bills and facilitation of employment and access to specialised services through counselling. Counselling is provided by the child welfare services of the municipality, where a specialised employment counselling group

<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>was created. Clients are required to attend meetings regularly, and are directed to specialised services, motivational groups or debt reduction counselling if necessary. The employment group of the child welfare services established direct partnership with several employers, which enables them to refer jobseekers directly to job openings.</p> <p>The minimum income subsidy guarantees that the total monthly per capita income (including other welfare) cannot be lower than 28500 HUF (approx.. 92 EUR) in households, while the housing subsidy helps households with low income levels to cover utility bills based on an estimated cost of housing maintenance (based on the number of people in the household).</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b> Improved life quality for the most impoverished, reduction of social exclusion, debt prevention and increased employment rate</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b> Households with the lowest income levels, mostly unemployed</p> <p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b> Lower than 28500 HUF (approx.. 92 EUR) per capita monthly income in the household, no valuable property, residence in the district</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b> Counselling at the local child welfare services as a condition of welfare</p> <p><b>Level:</b> Regional.</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b> Start date: early 2015, ongoing</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b></p> <p>Consultations with stakeholder institutions took place before the introduction of the programme, enabling stakeholders to express their opinion on the planned measures and to propose any adjustments.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b></p> <p>The municipality of the district and the municipality's child welfare services.</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b> Approximately 260 million HUF (~840 000 EUR) per year not including the costs of counselling, source: municipality budget. The child welfare services hired ten additional colleagues since 2014, some of them work on counselling, but the previously existing staff is also participating in the implementation of the programme. In 2017, 64 people work for the</p>
---



	<p>services, and the total annual budget is around 230 million HUF (~742 000 EUR), but this also covers other activities.</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>In 2016, 104 out of the 490 total recipient households of the minimum income subsidy and 99 out of the 741 total recipient households of housing subsidy had a member between 16 and 25 years of age. There is no data on the number of young people who found a job.</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b></p> <p>Approximately 260 million HUF (~840 000 EUR) per year, not including the costs of counselling. The child welfare services hired ten additional colleagues since 2014, some of them work on counselling, but the previously existing staff is also participating in the implementation of the programme. In 2017, 64 people work for the services, and the total annual budget is around 230 million HUF (~742 000 EUR), but this also covers other activities.</p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</b></p> <p>Minimum income scheme: approximately 19 000 HUF (61EUR)/month/beneficiary. This does not include the cost of counselling.</p>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b></p> <p>Households with lower than 28500 HUF (approx. 92 EUR) per capita monthly income.</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b></p> <p>To all unemployed with a monthly income lower than 28 500 HUF.</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 it doesn't.</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, there aren't.</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</b></p>



	<p><b>and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</b></p> <p>It isn't linked to any EU initiatives.</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>There are bi-annual monitoring reports (currently not available online) prepared by an external institute, focusing on the income distribution of recipients, changes in the number and composition of recipients, organisational aspects and potential problems of implementation. Data on employment outcomes is limited.</p> <p><b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b></p> <p>They are prepared by an external institute.</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>Data on employment outcomes is limited.</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>Based on a sample of 100 clients participating in counselling, 18% of the clients found employment within one year. According to data from the child welfare services, 29% of the clients participating in specialised employment counselling found a job.</p> <p>Results show that the programme seems to be successful in reaching those who are most in the need of assistance, and it led to a reduction of the number of requests for emergency financial assistance. Child poverty also decreased in the municipality since the introduction of the programme.</p> <p>In terms of employment, out of 453 minimum income subsidy recipients who are required to participate in counselling, 183</p>



	<p>participated in specialised employment counselling, and 49 recipients found a job by the end of November 2017.</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>          Yes, it is more successful in targeting those with the lowest income levels (the share of households with no income or less than 10 000 HUF monthly per capita income among the recipients increased compared to the previous welfare system).          It is not possible to evaluate the impact of counselling, but based on a sample of 100 clients participating in counselling, 18% of the clients found employment within one year, while others gained access to specialised services.</p> <p><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b>          N/A.</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>          Even though for a couple of months after the introduction of the new system take-up was lower than today, take-up data suggests that potential recipients got informed about the new system, and participation rates stabilized in 2016.</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>          Due to capacity problems of mental health services, the system is not able to adequately help long-term unemployed who suffer from motivational or mental health issues, which are often the main barriers that prevent them from finding employment. Due to national regulations the ceiling of the minimum income subsidy might be too low, excluding households with slightly higher per capita income, who would still need assistance.</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>          It offers individual counselling along with financial assistance for the households with the lowest income levels (including households with young members) in the district. The counsellors monitor the situation of the clients, assist them in finding further help or specialised services,</p>



	and work on their inclusion in the labour market. This personalised assistance also reduces the risk of social exclusion.
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>It is a complex programme that combines financial assistance with individual counselling, it helps those who are most in risk of social exclusion and provides personalised assistance.</p> <p><b>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</b></p> <p>It targets those who need assistance the most, and the combination of financial assistance and individual counselling enables recipients to receive help that is tailored to their individual needs.</p> <p><b>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b></p>

Name of the initiative	Social rental agency of the city of Veszprém and the Hungarian Charity Service of the Order of Malta (VESZOL Non-profit Ltd.), integrated service provision by the Hungarian Charity Service of the Order of Malta (HomeLab project)
Short description	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b></p> <p>To provide social rentals for low-income families, and to provide them with employment and social services</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b> To stabilize families' housing and labour market situation, such that families are able to pay rental fees (not fall into arrears and pay off debts).</p> <p>Description of main activities:</p> <p>The main idea is integrated service provision (in the fields of housing, employment and social service) through a one-stop shop approach.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Access to social housing (low-cost rentals) through VESZOL Non-profit Ltd.</li> <li>2. Access to counselling on social issues, debt and budget management counselling, implemented by the Hungarian Charity Service of the Order of Malta.</li> <li>3. Access to employment counselling, including job search counselling, referrals to employers, and post re-employment counselling implemented by the Hungarian Charity Service of the Order of Malta (HomeLab project team).</li> <li>4. Providing referrals to other service providers for counselling related to family, psychological and addiction issues (implemented by social services of the town of Veszprém and other NGOs).</li> </ol>



	<p><b>Target groups:</b> Low-income families with unstable housing situation</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: Family income, needs assessment (based on family size, arrears, indebtedness, threat of homelessness).</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b> Employment counselling, complex social work, social rentals (housing provision)</p> <p><b>Level:</b> Local (town of Veszprém, approx.. 60 thousand inhabitants)</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b> 2016 April (VESZOL) -, 2017 October-2019 September (HomeLab pilot project)</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b></p> <p>During the formulation of the VESZOL (the social rental agency) approach consultation with local social workers of HCSOM (especially those working at the homeless service), and local social services (Family Support and Child Welfare Services; Youth Protection Services etc.). Implementation is done by VESZOL and HCSOM, but regular contact local social services (Family Support and Child Welfare Services; Youth Protection Services etc.) and local employment services (Local Labour Office of the National Employment Service).</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b></p> <p>VESZOL Community Housing Agency Veszprém Nonprofit Ltd., Hungarian Charity Service of the Order of Malta (HomeLab project team)</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b> Running cost of VESZOL: 55 thousand EUR/year (provided by the Municipality of Veszprém); 20thousand EUR/year HCSOM in Veszprém; 90thousand EUR/year costs of social and employment services in HomeLab project (EU EaSI programme)..</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>Number of (young) persons entitled – unknown; number of households applying for a social rental: 162; number of households newly moving to an apartment 57 (130 persons); total number of flats managed by VESZOL: 204; approx. 20% of household heads are young (age 16-30); approx. 60% of households have a member age 16-30.</p>



	<p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b> Running costs of VESZOL: 75thousand EUR; Costs of integrated services in HomeLab project: 90 thousand EUR</p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</b> Roughly 325EUR/family/year (admin costs, not including cost of social and employment services)</p>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b> Low-income families with unstable housing, living in the town of Veszprém..</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b> <i>NO</i></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> <i>NO</i></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> <i>NO</i></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> <i>NO</i>, the HomeLab pilot project is financed by EU Programme for Employment and Social Innovation (EaSI).</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> <i>NO</i>, future evaluation of HomeLab project planned</p> <p><b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b> <i>External</i></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> <i>Counterfactual impact evaluation of HomeLab project planned</i></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. NA</b></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>In general, yes. There have been very few cases where tenants of social housing fell into serious arrears which led to non-renewal of rental contracts (eviction). VESZOL seems to have been successful in preventing the social exclusion of a non-negligible number of families.</p> <p><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>This is difficult to say, since no monitoring/evaluation results are available. For the families in social rentals, we expect a significant impact on income and non-exclusion.</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>The coverage of the programme seems to be too low, as the number of applicants for social housing are close to triple the number of flats available (which is partly due to the rise in market rental prices in Veszprém). However, this is due to the number of flats provided by the municipality of Veszprém. VESZOL and HCSOM is currently working on expanding the number of flats available for social rentals. Persons in need and potential participants of integrated service provision programmes are knowledgeable about the social rental programme, and the HCSOM is well-known. The social rental and the integrated service provision programme both use a rights-and-duties type approach, so few persons in need might be excluded.</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>It needs to be noted that this service covers only those low-income families which can become self-sufficient within a limited amount of time, it is not designed for the most excluded. Furthermore, since the intervention is only in its early stages, the referral system between different institutions (especially when linking municipality/state run services to ones provided by HCSOM) is not running smoothly.</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment</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>and target risk groups</p>	<p>The social rental agency addresses one of the major causes of social exclusion: the lack of stable and good quality housing. Person on the brink of homelessness will have difficulties keeping decent jobs due to low living conditions. Integrated service provision can address complex social issues of youth, as well as (through) employment counselling help them find and keep decent jobs. Finally, access to (re-)training programmes through the YG can help the upskilling of young persons.</p> <p>Clearly, the programme is not intended to address the roots causes of unemployment and social exclusion: low education and skills (and discrimination).</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>This is an innovative project in Hungary, whereby the social and employment services are provided to tenants of social housing by the <u>same institution</u> as the one signing the rental agreements. In this sense, prevention, early intervention and needs-based approaches go hand-in hand. On the other hand, the provider of social services can also practice a rights-and-duties approach. Further key to success is that the NGO effectively implementing the social rental agency has proven experience in the field, and is known by potential beneficiaries (HCSOM have been running local homeless shelters and social services in Veszprém since 2009.)</p> <p><b>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</b></p> <p>Integrated service provision, which is unique in Hungary.</p> <p><b>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b></p> <p>No evaluation and monitoring results yet.</p>



## References

- Calls for application under Operative Programmes SROP, EDIOP and CCHOP.  
Retrieved from: <https://www.palyazat.gov.hu/doc/829>,  
<https://www.palyazat.gov.hu/doc/4380> and <https://www.palyazat.gov.hu/doc/4385>
- Data on the number of applications received and finances spent under Operational Programmes EDIOP and CCHOP retrieved from:  
[http://emir.palyazat.gov.hu/nd/kozvel/?link=eupr\\_eljarasrendi&sc=2&ml=3&sr=188&offset=8&id\\_op=1382&id\\_tamogatascel=1401&id\\_paly\\_tip=1411](http://emir.palyazat.gov.hu/nd/kozvel/?link=eupr_eljarasrendi&sc=2&ml=3&sr=188&offset=8&id_op=1382&id_tamogatascel=1401&id_paly_tip=1411)
- Hungarian Government (2016): The Convergence Programme of Hungary, 2016 – 2020. Budapest, Hungary.
- Hungary's National Youth Guarantee Implementation Plan. Retrieved from:  
<http://ngmszakmaiteruletek.kormany.hu/download/9/4c/c0000/Youth%20Guarantee%20Implementation%20Plan.pdf>
- Nemzeti Munkaügyi Hivatal (National Labor Office) (2014). Tájékoztató a Magyar Közlöny 136. számával kihirdetett Munkahelyvédelmi Akcióterv megvalósításához kapcsolódó törvénymódosításokról (Information on the amendments to the Act on the Implementation of the Job Protection Action Plan published in the Hungarian Gazette No. 136). NFSZ, Budapest. Retrieved from:  
[http://fovaros.munka.hu/resource.aspx?ResourceID=budapest\\_munkahelyvedelmiakcio\\_terv\\_2014](http://fovaros.munka.hu/resource.aspx?ResourceID=budapest_munkahelyvedelmiakcio_terv_2014)
- Sebők, N. (2007). A 2005. évben befejezett munkaerőpiaci programok hatékonyságának értékelése a monitoring vizsgálat eredménymutatói alapján (Evaluation of the effectiveness of the labor market programs completed in 2005 on the basis of the results of the monitoring study). Foglalkoztatási Hivatal (Employment Office), Budapest. Retrieved from:  
[http://nfsz.munka.hu/engine.aspx?page=afsz\\_stat\\_fobb\\_aktiv\\_eszkozok](http://nfsz.munka.hu/engine.aspx?page=afsz_stat_fobb_aktiv_eszkozok)
- Tajti, J. 2010. évben befejezett főbb aktív foglalkoztatáspolitikai eszközök hatékonyságának vizsgálata (Analysis of the effectiveness of the main active employment policy instruments completed in 2010). Nemzeti Munkaügyi Hivatal (National Labor Office). Retrieved from:  
[http://nfsz.munka.hu/engine.aspx?page=afsz\\_stat\\_fobb\\_aktiv\\_eszkozok](http://nfsz.munka.hu/engine.aspx?page=afsz_stat_fobb_aktiv_eszkozok)
- Szabó-Morvai, Á. et al. (2015): Az Ifjúsági Foglalkoztatási Kezdeményezés elemzése (Analysis of the Youth Employment Initiative). Hétfő Research Institute, Budapest.
- Eurostat (2012). Labour market policy statistics - Qualitative report: Hungary 2010. Eurostat LMP database. Date of extraction: 18 May 2012
- Eurostat (2017). Labour market policy statistics - Qualitative report: Hungary 2015. Eurostat LMP database. Date of extraction: 20 April 2017



Sebők, N. & dr. Sziklai, É. A foglalkoztatáspolitikai eszközök működése 2006-ban (Functioning of employment policy in 2006). ÁFSZ, Foglalkoztatási és Szociális Hivatal (Employment and Social Affairs Office). Retrieved from:

[http://nfsz.munka.hu/engine.aspx?page=full\\_afsz\\_a\\_foglalkoztataspolitikai\\_eszkozok\\_mukod](http://nfsz.munka.hu/engine.aspx?page=full_afsz_a_foglalkoztataspolitikai_eszkozok_mukod)

Tajti, J. Az aktív foglalkoztatáspolitikai eszközök fontosabb létszámadatai 2010-ben (Important developments of the active employment policy instruments in 2010). NFSZ, Foglalkoztatási Hivatal (Employment Office). Retrieved from:

[http://nfsz.munka.hu/engine.aspx?page=full\\_afsz\\_a\\_foglalkoztataspolitikai\\_eszkozok\\_mukod](http://nfsz.munka.hu/engine.aspx?page=full_afsz_a_foglalkoztataspolitikai_eszkozok_mukod)

Gedei, H. Az aktív foglalkoztatáspolitikai eszközök fontosabb létszámadatai 2015-ben (Important developments of the active employment policy instruments in 2015). NFSZ, Ministry of National Economy. Retrieved from:

[http://nfsz.munka.hu/engine.aspx?page=full\\_afsz\\_a\\_foglalkoztataspolitikai\\_eszkozok\\_mukod](http://nfsz.munka.hu/engine.aspx?page=full_afsz_a_foglalkoztataspolitikai_eszkozok_mukod)

Frey, M. (2006). A munkaerőpiac jogszabályi és intézményi környezete (The legal and institutional environment of the labor market). In *Munkaerőpiaci Tükör 2006* (pp. 133–158). Budapest: MTA KRTK. Retrieved from

<http://econ.core.hu/doc/mt/2006/hun/jog.pdf>

Frey, M. (2010). A munkaerőpiac jogszabályi és intézményi környezete (The legal and institutional environment of the labor market). In *Munkaerőpiaci Tükör 2010* (pp. 219–254). Budapest: MTA KRTK. Retrieved from

[http://econ.core.hu/file/download/mt\\_2010\\_hun/kornyezet.pdf](http://econ.core.hu/file/download/mt_2010_hun/kornyezet.pdf)

Scharle, Á. (2016). A munkapiaci szakpolitika eszközei (The labour marker policy instruments – May 2015 – March 2016). In *Munkaerőpiaci Tükör 2015* (pp. 173–179). Budapest: MTA KRTK. Retrieved from

[http://econ.core.hu/file/download/mt\\_2015\\_hun/szakpolitika.pdf](http://econ.core.hu/file/download/mt_2015_hun/szakpolitika.pdf)