



# Youth employment policies in Croatia

EXCEPT working paper no. 31  
June 2018

Dunja Potočnik

[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:**

---

Potočnik, D. (2018). *Youth employment policies in Croatia*, EXCEPT Working Papers, WP No 31. Tallinn University, Tallinn. <http://www.except-project.eu/working-papers/>

---

© Author

ISSN 2504-7159

ISBN 978-9949-29-400-8 (pdf)

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



## Contents

The key risk groups in the labour market in Croatia.....	4
Youth employment policies: a general overview .....	7
Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions.....	13
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures .....	15
Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives .....	28
Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion.....	31
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures .....	33
References .....	44
Appendix 1.....	47



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

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

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Young people with outdated qualifications	4	3	2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

Note: The main source of ranking for the viewpoint of the mainstream policy is the National programme for Youth 2014-2017 (available only in Croatian) and National Employment Plan.

### Youth employment

According to research results on a national representative sample of 2,000 young people in 2013<sup>2</sup>, out of 508 young employees covered by the survey, the largest share of young people (38.0%) was employed in a small private enterprise or craft. Employment in a large private enterprise (26.5%) is almost equal to working in the public sector (23.7%). Employment in a family or a private company or craft is at modest levels and together includes less than tenth of youth. Regarding the type of contract signed by young people, half of all young people are employed on indefinite period full-time contracts (49.8%) and 41.7% on definite period full-time contracts, while only a modest part of them is employed for a certain (4.6%) or indefinite (2.8%) reduced working hours (i.e. part-time jobs). The average number of working hours indicates almost half of the young people (46.9%) who are doing average hours (40 hours a week), one third of them (33.5%) is working above the average and up to 50 hours a week, while those working more than 50 hours is 9.1%, and youth who work less than average is 11.4%. The earnings of young people are largely below the national average; 14.2% of young people receive monthly wages below the minimum

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

<sup>2</sup> Ilišin; Spajić Vrkaš, 2013. [Needs, problems and potentials of youth in Croatia](#). Report. Zagreb: Ministry of social policy and youth (last accessed 08/10/2017).



wage, 28.9% receive between HRK 2.501 and 3.500, 21.8% of them receive HRK 3.501-4.500, 17.1% of them receive HRK 4.501-5.400, and only 18.1% have wages around the national average.

## Youth unemployment

Croatia holds the top position in Europe for youth unemployment at the time of writing this paper, which has been the main social challenge for a long time alongside precarious work and the increasing number of young people who opted for (long) lasting leave abroad. Total unemployment of young people aged 15-29 in 2016 was 24.4%, while unemployment broken down into age subgroups was 52.0% for young people aged 15-19, 25.3% for young people aged 20-24, 18.8% for 25-29 years old, and in the subgroup of 20-29 years unemployment was 21.4%<sup>3</sup>. There are 42.4% of young people with low education, 32.1% of upper secondary school and 20.9%<sup>4</sup> of young people with a diploma. There are 15.3% long-term unemployed young people aged 15-29, while the EU average is 5.9%<sup>5</sup>. The share of youth outside the education system, training and the labour market (NEET) is also relatively high and in 2016 it was 16.9%<sup>6</sup> for the 15-29 age group.

The results of the aforementioned research<sup>7</sup> show that in the group of unemployed 62.9% of young people are supported by parents during the unemployment, 38.4% occasionally perform various jobs, 12.6% are supported by their employed spouse, 10.5% receive [cash benefits from the Croatian Employment Service](#), 1.8% receive assistance from humanitarian organizations, and 0.8% have another source of unemployment support.

## Youth risk groups not adequately addressed by national policies

Media and public opinion most frequently tackle young generation in general, bringing into relation slow economic recovery of Croatian market and high rate of youth unemployment. Recently some more attention has been given to the young people who migrate from Croatia to economically more advanced countries. In this case, young highly educated emigrants are in the focus of media and public opinion. Academic accounts of this group of young people are still sporadic, while mainstream policy has not developed any specific measure targeting young people leaving the country. Among the youth leaving Croatia highly educated young people take a significant part, and therefore, they are interesting to the media and general public. However,

---

<sup>3</sup> Eurostat, [Unemployment rates by sex, age and educational attainment level \(%\)](#), 2016 (last accessed 08/10/2017).

<sup>4</sup> Eurostat, [Youth unemployment by sex, age and educational attainment level](#), 2016 (last accessed 08/10/2017).

<sup>5</sup> Eurostat, [Youth long-term unemployment rate \(12 months or longer\) by sex and age](#), 2016 (last accessed 08/10/2017).

<sup>6</sup> Eurostat, [Young people neither in employment nor in education and training by sex](#), 2016 (last accessed 08/10/2017).

<sup>7</sup> Ilišin; Spajić Vrkaš, 2013. [Needs, problems and potentials of youth in Croatia](#). Report. Zagreb: Ministry of social policy and youth (last accessed 08/06/2017).



mainstream policy and researchers have not put this group of young people in their focus yet.

Early school leavers are not under attention in Croatia as they make only a minority of young people (Croatia has one of the lowest drop-out rate in Europe). Young people without qualifications or with low qualifications are in a similar position; general public and media are not interested in their status, while mainstream policy and researchers do pay certain attention to them. The major hindrance to improvement of their status is postponed reform of school curricula and outdated courses that are not interlinked with the labour market demands.

The NEET came in the focus of mainstream policy along with adoption of the Youth Guarantee plan, which is followed by somehow increased interest of researchers. Media and general public are still not much interested in this group of young people; the term “NEET” has not entered everyday vocabulary, while term “young unemployed” still prevails, even in the case of young people out of education, employment and training.

Young people from workless families and from remote areas often share their position in regard to public perception, coverage by mainstream policy and interest from researchers. Frequently young people from workless families also reside in remote areas, making it even harder to find their place on the labour market.

Last two specific groups to mention, migrants and ethnic minorities, and young people with disabilities are to similar extent covered by media reporting and public legislation. However, researchers are showing more interest into status and perspective of minorities (especially Roma minority) than into status of disabled young people.

In the Appendix 1 there are references (since 2010) that include academic accounts of young people and labour market in Croatia.



## Youth employment policies: a general overview

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

	Year	2005	2010	2015 <sup>8</sup> or the last year of available data, specify
Indicator				
1	Total number of active labour market programmes	11	16	7
1.1	including youth-targeted	6	5	5
2	Number of participants (stock) in active labour market programmes:			
2.1	Total number	14.485 <sup>9</sup>	13.088 <sup>10</sup>	30.700
2.2	% of the labour force (15-64)	0,80	0,73	1,65
3	Number of youth participants (up to 29 years old) in active labour market programmes:			
3.1	Total number	2.399 <sup>11</sup>	2.907 <sup>12</sup>	13.966
3.2	% of the labour force (15-29)	4,65 <sup>13</sup>	6,33 <sup>14</sup>	8,72
3.3	% of the total number of participants (stock)	16,6	22,2	45,49
4	Expenditures on active labour market programmes:			
4.1	Total amount (EUR)	34.095.624	26.063.921	163,310 million <sup>15</sup>
4.2	% of GDP	0,76	0,69	0,37 <sup>16</sup>
5.	Expenditures on all active labour market programmes for youth participants:			
5.1	Total amount (EUR)	7.049.751	12,74 million	97,39 million
5.2	% of GDP	0,17	0,29	0,22
6	Expenditures on youth-targeted active labour market programmes:			
6.1	Total amount (EUR)	2.830.000	2.741.679	92,14

<sup>8</sup> Source: Eurostat.

<sup>9</sup> Source: Croatian Employment Service, [Yearly Bulletin, 2005](#) and interviews with the officials from the Croatian Employment service; Eurostat includes only 2012-2015 data for Croatia.

<sup>10</sup> Source: Croatian Employment Service, [Yearly Bulletin, 2010](#) and interviews with the officials from the Croatian Employment service; Eurostat includes only 2012-2015 data for Croatia.

<sup>11</sup> Available only for a 15-24 cohort.

<sup>12</sup> Available only for a 15-24 cohort.

<sup>13</sup> Available only for a 15-24 cohort.

<sup>14</sup> Available only for a 15-24 cohort.

<sup>15</sup> Out-of-work-income maintenance and support is 146,51 million, which is excluded from the total amount spent on the ALMP.

<sup>16</sup> Although the total sum in 2015 is higher than in 2005 and 2010, in 2015 a share of GDP invested was lower; majority of financing in 2015 was covered by the ESF and Youth Guarantee plan.



				million
6.2	% of GDP	0,06	0,06	0,20
6.3	% of the total expenditures on active labour market programmes	8,30	8,72	48,66

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>17</sup>	Preventive/reactive <sup>18</sup>	Youth specific	Main source of funding <sup>19</sup>	Linked to EU initiatives <sup>20</sup>	Main actors of delivery <sup>21</sup>	Evaluation present	Youth/participant feedback used to improve the delivery
(Re-)orientation courses, preparation for training or employment	1	2	No <sup>22</sup>	1: 8.670.000,00 euro; 2: 1.530.000,00 euro for 2013-2017	6: Efficient human resources 2014-2020	1: Croatian employment service; 7	No	No
Occupational training without commencing employment	3	3	Yes	1 = ESF 2	1 2 3	1 = Croatian employment service	Yes	Yes
On the job training	2	2	No	1 2	3	1 = Croatian employment service	Yes	No

<sup>17</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>18</sup> To what extent do policies focus on preventative measures or are purely reactive to manifest problems PREVENTIVE = 1; REACTIVE = 2; BOTH=3.

<sup>19</sup> EU = 1; national = 2, regional = 3, local = 4; other -5

<sup>20</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>21</sup> Insert; 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

<sup>22</sup> only for older than 29



Vocational guidance, career counselling	2	3	Yes <sup>23</sup>	2: 160.000,00 euro at the annual level	1 4 6: <a href="#">EU Guidelines for Lifelong Guidance Policies and Systems</a>	1: Croatian employment service; 7: career centres at the universities	Partly <sup>24</sup>	No
Training (with certificates)	2	3	No	2	3	5, 6, 7	No	No
Training (without certificates)	1	3	No	2	3	5, 6	No	No
Employment incentives, subsidies for employer	3	3	Yes	1 2	1 2 5	1: Croatian Employment service, Ministry of Labour and Pension system	Partly	Partly
Direct job creation	No such measure							
Start-up incentives, self-employment programmes	2	3	Yes	1 2	IPA, ESF, YEI	1: Croatian Employment Service; The Ministry of Labour and Pension System	Yes	No
Other	A) 1: <a href="#">Public works</a> <sup>25</sup> B) 1: Measure "permanent seasonal"	A) 2 B) 3	No	National	No	A) 1: Croatian Employment Service; 2 B) 1: The Ministry of Labour and Pension System	A) No B) No	A) No B) No

<sup>23</sup> Croatian employment service provides professional orientation to [pupils of final grades of primary school and secondary school students](#), including professional information and professional counselling, and it is implemented in collaboration with schools and parents through a [Survey of Professional Choices for Primary and Secondary School Students](#). Information on education, relevant areas for occupational choice and employment is organized for [students](#). Professional orientation through the [lifelong career guidance centres](#) is also available to other users who wish to participate in formal education or retraining system or want to change their profession, and [professional rehabilitation](#) programmes are also being implemented

<sup>24</sup> The Croatian Employment Service submits annual reports on its work to the Croatian Parliament.

<sup>25</sup> Based on socially useful work initiated by the local community or civil society organizations



	<a href="#">worker<sup>26</sup></a>							
--	-------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Re-orientation courses, preparation for training or employment are measures designed for general population, with no distinctive measure targeting young people. They are organised for people with low employability, usually those with low or no qualifications, and are in line with the labour market demands. Most often they are organised in the fields of construction and carpentry.

Vocational guidance and career counselling are organised for general population, but have several streams targeting young people only. In particular, they are targeting pupils before they chose secondary school (at the age of 14), then students before enrolling to university, and students during their secondary and high education. Their shortcoming lies in the fact that they are targeting young people from relatively late age (14) and that they are offered mainly through the Croatian Employment Service and career centres at the university. Career guidance is still not embedded in curriculum of the primary or secondary educational system.

Provision of training with certificates has multiplied in last 20 year with establishment of many private institutions in Croatian. Public and private institutions are the main channel of executing certified training, offering wide range of professions. The shortcoming of private certified training lies in the costs which are completely covered by participants. On the other hand, public institutions offer relatively narrow scope of professions, and often with outdated curricula.

Training without certificates in Croatia is mainly provided by the non-governmental organisations and are still not recognised by employers. Young people are therefore very hesitant to enter this kind of training.

Employment incentives and subsidies for employer are quite important as they are very often the only channel through which a young person can get employed. Labour market in Croatia is struck with economic crisis and recession and many employers decide on hiring a new person only upon receiving financial contribution from the state.

Direct job creation has not been established in Croatia.

Start-up incentives and self-employment programmes are well-received measure and they get attention of many young people. However, due to administrative burdens of starting up a company in Croatia many young people decide against it. On one hand we have well-designed and various measures, but on the other hand there is outdated administrative apparatus that does not allow for easy business development in Croatia.

\*There are no studies or reports of a newer data that evaluate the above mentioned measures. Only for the Youth Guarantee related measures.

---

<sup>26</sup> aimed to financially support workers who are employed only during the season, and the second part of the year they are not employed. Employer is financed with 100% of the expense of extended insurance for the first 3 months, and in the next period lasting for no more than 3 months 50% of the extended insurance.



In the year 2016, [the Evaluation of participant, mentor and employer experiences of the Occupational training without commencing employment](#) coordinated by the [Croatian Employment Service](#), and conducted by the [Ipsos Puls](#) Agency, with the help of experts from the [Institute of Public Finance](#) was undertaken. Three questionnaires were administered in the survey: for young people (N = 537), employers (N = 458) and mentors (N = 375). The objectives of the study were:

1. to determine the quality of the content of the vocational training;
2. to examine familiarity with the objectives of vocational training;
3. to evaluate the quality of the implementation of the vocational training programme;
4. to examine experiences related to the adoption of programmes (knowledge transfer, adoption of professional competencies);
5. to determine the familiarity/knowledge of the contents and objectives of the vocational training programme by the user;
6. to evaluate the satisfaction with the aspects of defining and implementing the vocational training programme;
7. to examine the expectations of participation in the measure in the area of competence acquisition;
8. to examine the circumstances of entry/decision on entry into the measure;
9. to determine the expected objectives of applying vocational training programmes in the context of occupation/profession;
10. to identify the factors of favourable outcomes;
11. to examine the attitudes of competences achieved after exiting the measure and assess the fulfilment of the expectations of vocational training.

[Evaluation of the Youth Employment Initiative under the Operational Programme Efficient Human Resources 2014-2020 \(OPEHR\)](#) (2015) was coordinated by the [Ministry of Labour and Pension System](#) (MLPS) and conducted by the [ECORYS Croatia](#). The overall objective of the evaluation was to evaluate the impact of planned activities in the context of the sustainable integration of the NEET1 young people into the labour market. The evaluation indicators are linked to the degree of relevance and justification, consistency and internal coherence, effectiveness, external coherence and effectiveness. The interviews with the users of vocational training have also been conducted as part of the evaluation.

[Evaluation of occupational training implementation](#) was conducted by the [Croatian Youth Network](#)\_2016. This evaluation, along with the numerical indicators of implementation and characteristics of the beneficiaries, included the assessment of the effect on employment (12 months employment after expiry of the measure) and the structural and financial aspects of the YG implementation.



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
Croatia had measures targeting the unemployed youth back in the pre-accession period, so the policy makers and implementation bodies have experience in designing and managing their implementation.	Croatia still lacks well-founded mechanisms for registering and monitoring the NEETS. Currently the NEETs can be registered only at the Croatian Employment Service and their registration is optional. Therefore, it can be assumed there is a number of young unemployed persons who stay out of the system, without help of any mechanism that would enhance their (re)integration into educational system or labour market.
The employment measures manage to target a big number of young people in risk of employment or exclusion. The activities under the YEI scheme contributed to sustainable integration of the young people in the labour market mainly by acquisition of the work experience, which is most often the most important prerequisite in the job competitions in Croatia.	Social inclusion measures are linked to the family status and there are no social measures targeting young people during training for employment. Social measures, with exception of people with disabilities and minorities, are designed for general population.
Accessibility of information: information on employment incentives are available through 5 macro-regional, 17 regional and 99 local offices of the Croatian Employment Service.	A special attention should be given to the implementation of educational measures because data on their implementation provide signal that there might be problems in reaching the target groups and the absorption of funds which could eventually lead to a failure to achieve the planned indicator values.



## Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions

In Croatia, there is no any initiative or a measure that is aimed at providing young people 'good jobs'. Labour market situation is so unstable that providing any job is a goal at the moment. Moreover, all measures that could be used for youth employment are already described in the table 3. Occupational training without commencing employment is already in the EU database, so there is not much choice. The measures listed in this table can be assessed as the ones that provide new opportunity („Subsidies for self-employment“), add to the skills („On the job training“ and „(Re-)orientation courses, preparation for training or employment“). All three measures are universal and do not specifically target the youth.

Table 5 A brief overview of selected youth employment interventions

No	Name	Level	Main target group <sup>27</sup>	Type <sup>28</sup>	Starting year	Funding source	Part of EU initiatives	Evaluation	“Good practice” <sup>29</sup> example	Impact youth inclusion <sup>30</sup>	Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people
1	Subsidies for self-	All	b	6	2001. based on the	EU: IPA, ESF, YEI;	IPA; ESF; YEI	Yes, positive <sup>31</sup>	Yes	3 <sup>32</sup>	2 <sup>33</sup>

<sup>27</sup> a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group;

<sup>28</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>29</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>30</sup> 1 - very weak; 2 - weak; 3 - medium; 4 - strong; 5 - very strong; N/A - not applicable.

<sup>31</sup> Summary evaluation report is available in [Croatian](#)

<sup>32</sup> The measure has relatively high impact on young people since it is targeting proactive people who possess distinctive skills, and they can mainly be found in young population

<sup>33</sup> Young people with entrepreneur mind-set nowadays have many financial instrument on disposal, both via national and EU channels\*. However, the ones offered through the Croatian employment service are targeting young people who might be hesitant to ask for help or submit a project to other instances. Also, grants available through more competitive sources (like the EU grants) often target young people in hi-tech or cutting edge disciplines, which is not available to all young people. Financing through the Self-employment subsidy often provides financial help to small businesses and crafts, which are not eligible for more competitive funds. In



	employment				old model; 2013. new model	National					
2	On the job training	National	b	1 2	2001. based on an old model; since 2010 the new model	EU national	Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship	Mixed results	Partially	1 <sup>34</sup>	This measure has only modestly influenced trends in youth unemployment by adding to the new skills of a number of young people, thus, enhancing their employability.
3	(Re-)orientation courses, preparation for training or employment	National	b	1	2001. based on an old model; since 2010 the new model	1: 8.670.000,00 euro; 2: 1.530.000,00 euro for 2013-2017	Efficient human resources 2014-2020	Mixed	Partially, it does not include young people	This measure does not target young people	This measure does not target young people

### Comments about table 5

The ratings of the above listed measures is based on the evaluation report “[External evaluation of the Active Labour Market Policies 2010-2013](#)” (2016) (available only in Croatian), where each of the measure is briefly assessed in regard to its overall results.

summary, the prerequisites of this measure are relatively easy to fulfil and it enables young people who have entrepreneur mind-set but maybe lack some other skills or come from not highly competitive areas to start their business.

<sup>34</sup> This measure has a very limited impact on youth inclusion since it is not exclusively targeting young people. Moreover, the young people included in this measure are ‘on the risk’ group; low skilled and/or long-term young unemployed people with secondary education.



This evaluation has not addressed impact of these measures on different target groups, i.e. youth.

Here follows a brief description of other instruments targeting young people who wish to start their own business:

The main channels of support and informing young entrepreneurs are [34 entrepreneurial incubators](#) and [52 development agencies](#) run by the [Ministry of Entrepreneurship and Crafts](#). Entrepreneurial incubators and development agencies offer support in the form of:

1. consulting services;
2. education for start-up entrepreneurs and entrepreneurs in the stage of growth and development;
3. subsidized rental of business premises;
4. the use of common infrastructure that facilitates the start of operations;
5. subsidized rental of equipment.

Beside [entrepreneurial incubators](#) and [development agencies](#), financial resources for young entrepreneurs are ensured by:

1. [Croatian Agency for SMEs, Innovations and Investments \(HAMAG-BICRO\)](#) through [Financial instruments: guarantees](#) and loans ([programme EU Beginner](#)), [grants](#) and [innovation programmes Eureka](#).
2. [The Croatian Bank for Reconstruction and Development](#), through the [Entrepreneur Starter Programme for beginners entrepreneurs](#), [Youth Entrepreneurship](#), [micro-crediting with the EU support](#) and [Free Zones](#), established by local and regional self-government units with an aim to enable businesses to operate at much more favourable conditions.

[The Ministry of Entrepreneurship and Crafts](#) through the programme [E-impuls](#), which is the result of Croatia's participation in European and Structural Funds, and helps micro and small enterprises to start up and expand their operations.

## Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	Self-employment subsidy [ <a href="#">Potpora za samozapošljavanje</a> ]
Short description	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b> providing financial help to the unemployed people with entrepreneurial aspirations</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b> to decrease the unemployment rate, contribute to development of Croatian economy and foster entrepreneurial thinking</p> <p><b>Description:</b></p> <p>Self-employment subsidies are granted to the unemployed persons with an aim to help them start a business. A beneficiary has to be registered at the Croatian Unemployment Service (CES) for at least a year prior to usage of</p>



	<p>this measure. The beneficiary has to develop a reliable business and financial plan with a help from the CES counsellor.</p> <p>An individual financial support amounts from 4.660 for starting a business only, to euro 6.000 for starting a business and training in certain field.</p> <p>In a case of starting a cooperative or a firm, a business entity can claim up to 23.330 euro (for up to 5 persons).</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b> all unemployed persons registered at the Croatian Employment Service (CES)</p> <p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b> registering at the CES and filling in the business plan in cooperation with the counsellor</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b> self-employment subsidy</p> <p><b>Level:</b> financed from the national level; implementation is not linked to the size of municipality, can be implemented in entire territory of Croatia</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b></p> <p>The programme was initially introduced back in 1990's, with some changes during course of the time. The newest reform has occurred in 2017 when the financing become available to the cooperatives.</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b> There are consultations with the main social partners: the <a href="#">Croatian Chamber of Trades and Crafts</a>, and in some programmes the <a href="#">Croatian Employers' Association</a> is also included.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b> The Croatian Employment Service</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b></p> <p>Since 2011 there were 3.908 young people self-employed through this measure. Estimated budget 2011-2017 is: 35 million euro.</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>There is no explicit target number for this measure, it is constantly ongoing and its performance depends on the interest of the beneficiaries. Therefore, it cannot be assessed whether the accomplished target number is in accordance with the aims. Since 2011 there were 3.908 beneficiaries. In terms of impact on the overall youth employment this is a rather modest result, although it cannot be said there are no effects on the labour market.</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b> Total expenditures for the program on annual basis is variable, depending on the number of participants and a size of business they would like to start</p>



	<p>(the company may have up to 5 founders)</p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</b></p> <p>An individual financial support amounts from 4.660 for starting a business only, to euro 6.000 for starting a business and training in certain field.</p> <p>In a case of starting a cooperative or a firm, a business entity can claim up to 23.330 euro (for up to 5 persons).</p>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b></p> <p>The target groups is all unemployed.</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>Young people covered by the Self-employment subsidy present around 25-30% of beneficiaries, depending on a year. This measure is especially targeting young people who otherwise could not apply for funds for starting their own business. These young people are often of background in crafts or fields that do not require high education, and therefore, are not eligible for more competitive funds (like EU grants).</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 Croatian Youth Network (CYN) is an active member of the Council for Implementation of the Youth Guarantee. Despite the fact that the decisions of this body are not binding, the proposals of the CYN are most often taken into account. However, this body has no impact on the creation of the active labour measures plan and programme. Moreover, the last meeting of this council was held in 2016.</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>Yes, to the Support to youth entrepreneurship, the Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative and Framework of Quality traineeships and apprenticeship.</p>
Available evaluations	<p><b>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)?</b></p> <p>Evaluation report [External Evaluation of the Active Labour Market Measures 2010-2013 Vanjska evaluacija mjera aktivne politike tržišta rada 2010.-2013.] is available in <a href="#">Croatian</a>.</p>



<http://www.hzz.hr/default.aspx?id=31711>

**If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring? Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?**

There are ex-post and permanent monitoring available, which is done by the Croatian Employment Service and these reports are not publicly available. The report is available only in a form of the annual report, which is being prepared and submitted to the Croatian Government. The Ministry of Labour and Pension System and the Croatian Employment Service are in charge of preparing annual reports.

Ex-post evaluations are conducted by independent external experts, and the last ex-ante external evaluation was done in 2016. for 2010-2013 implementation period. External experts have assessed the number of reached target beneficiaries, and this assessment was coupled by a short questionnaire on satisfaction of the beneficiaries registered at the Croatian Employment Service and the employers.

**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)?)**

The 2016 evaluation included following elements for all labour market action programmes:

- Channels of communicating the measures to the beneficiaries;
- Samples of the beneficiaries (age, gender, education, previous work experience);
- Perception of the implementation procedures by beneficiaries;
- Intensity of job-searching before entering the programme;
- Modes of entering the programme;
- Motivation for entering the programme;
- Perception of change in life standard or quality of life after entering the programme.

Evaluation of the self-employment subsidy has also included following evaluation criteria:

- Perception of the personal traits and skills useful for establishing one's own company;



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Perception of usefulness of the self-employment subsidy in establishing one's own company;</li> <li>- Success in establishing one's own company after entering the programme.</li> </ul> <p>The evaluations done so far in Croatia do not include evaluation of deadweight loss, substitution effect or displacement effect.</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>The main results of the 2016 evaluation following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 38% of the unemployed who took part in the programme had been unemployed for more than a year before entering the programme and 17% of beneficiaries were unemployed for 6-12 months. This indicates that the programme targeted people of low employability, thus increasing their chances for success on the labour market;</li> <li>2. 40% of the beneficiaries were female and 60% male, while the young people took 27% of incentives;</li> <li>3. 91% of beneficiaries had some kind of previous working experience;</li> <li>4. 95% of the beneficiaries did not take part in any kind of state-funded programme during participation in the programme;</li> <li>5. 93% of the beneficiaries stated that the programme was useful for establishing their own company and 32% of them said that they would never start their own company if they had not entered the programme;</li> <li>6. When asked if they would apply for the self-employment incentive again, 80% of beneficiaries gave a positive answer;</li> <li>7. 74% of the beneficiaries continued with their business after end phase of the programme and more than one third (35%) of beneficiaries managed to expand their business activities;</li> <li>8. Evaluators of the programme suggested that the measure would be even more effective if the beneficiaries were provided help through workshops on different elements of successful entrepreneurship (e.g. how to ensure sustainability and growth of your business activities).</li> </ol>
<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>Two main goals of the programme: lowering the unemployment rate and giving opportunity to the unemployed who are not at the very top of requiring competencies to success in desired business have been accomplished by this programme.</p> <p><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>Magnitude of the effect is not very big, but the programme can be evaluated as positive change as it provides opportunities to young people who cannot apply to highly competitive funds.</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>The only condition for participation is registration at the Croatian Employment Service (CES). The job-seeker advisers are obliged to inform the unemployed about all active labour measures upon their registration at the CES, so lack of information does not present a problem. System could use institutional support in a form of workshops for young people aiming to start their own business, especially in the field of transversal skills and enhancing their business success.</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>In comparison to other successful programmes, like Occupational training without commencing employment, this is a relatively small measure targeting young people who possess some distinctive skills or have entrepreneurial mindset. However, this does not lower a value of this programme, as it reaches young people who in most cases cannot apply to highly competitive entrepreneurship grants.</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 targets one of the main causes of unemployment in Croatia – lack of jobs – by allowing young people to start their own business.</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>Self-employment incentive allows young people with entrepreneurial aspirations, but with a lack of skills in creating their own business plan and with a lack of financial means, to start their own business and receive support during the first phases of their business activities.</p>

<p>Name of the initiative</p>	<p>On the job training [<a href="#">Potpora za usavršavanje</a>]</p>
<p>Short description</p>	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b> to enable unemployed persons to acquire the knowledge and skills required to perform jobs in the same workplace.</p> <p>Intended effects: encouraging further education of newly employed or</p>



	<p>employed persons with the aim of preserving jobs and introducing new technologies and production programmes, and raising competitiveness.</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b> all unemployed persons registered at the Croatian Employment Service (CES)</p> <p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b></p> <p><b>The measure is targeting:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Newly employed persons who are signing with a new employer for at least 12 months</li><li>- Employed persons who have a permanent contract</li><li>- Employed persons who are under a threat of losing a job due to changes in production, introduction of new technologies or higher standards of production.</li></ul> <p><b>Description:</b></p> <p>‘On the job training’ scheme is being implemented through giving funds to the employers for education or training of the current or new employees. The grant is then used to pay to the educational institution providing the training course. The state gives subsidies for a 6-month period in a maximum amount of 2.000 euro per employee.</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b> Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship</p> <p><b>Level:</b> financed from the national level; implementation is not linked to the size of municipality, can be implemented in entire territory of Croatia</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b></p> <p>The programme was initially introduced back in 1990’s, with some changes during course of the time.</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b> There are consultations with the main social partners: the <a href="#">Croatian Chamber of Trades and Crafts</a>, and in some programmes the <a href="#">Croatian Employers' Association</a> is also included.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b> The Croatian Employment Service</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b> estimated budget 2011-2017 is 2.7 million euro. It is partially financed from the national sources and partly from the ESF.</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>Since 2011 there were 331 young beneficiaries.</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis: cca 387.000 euro</p>



	<p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</b></p> <p>630 euro. The maximum amount is set at 2.000 euro.</p>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Newly employed persons who are signing with a new employer for at least 12 months</li> <li>- Employed persons who have a permanent contract</li> <li>- Employed persons who are under a threat of losing a job due to changes in production, introduction of new technologies or higher standards of production.</li> </ul> <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> No</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>Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship</p>
Available evaluations	<p><b>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)?</b> Evaluation report is available in <a href="#">Croatian</a></p> <p><b>If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring? Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b></p> <p>There are ex-post and permanent monitoring available. Ex-post evaluations are conducted by independent external experts, while the Croatian Employment Service is in charge of permanent monitoring. The last ex-ante external evaluation was done in 2016. for 2010-2013 implementation period. Otherwise, only annual report is prepared and submitted to the Croatian Government. The Ministry of Labour and Pension System and the Croatian Employment Service are in charge of preparing annual reports.</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 <u>evaluation of deadweight loss (hiring to subsidized jobs of individuals who would have found regular employment nevertheless); substitution effect (original regular</u></b></p>



	<p><b><u>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)?</u></b></p> <p>The 2016 evaluation included following elements for all labour market action programmes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Channels of communicating the measures to the beneficiaries;</li> <li>- Samples of the beneficiaries (age, gender, education, previous work experience);</li> <li>- Perception of the implementation procedures by beneficiaries;</li> <li>- Intensity of job-searching before entering the programme;</li> <li>- Modes of entering the programme;</li> <li>- Motivation for entering the programme;</li> <li>- Perception of change in life standard or quality of life after entering the programme.</li> </ul> <p>The evaluation has not included deadweight loss, substitution effect or displacement effect.</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The beneficiaries (the employees) of this programme has assessed it as highly useful as it decreased a possibility of losing a job due to the changes in profession</li> <li>- The employers have found this measure useful, although they have complained about complicated procedure for applying at the Croatian Employment Service</li> <li>- Counsellors at the CES have stated that this measure is rather challenging for them since it demands them to make assessment of justification of financing certain business activities they might not be acquainted with (like justification of the costs, working hours or amortisation)</li> </ul>
<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>The measure has achieved its stated goals – ruling out unemployment of currently employed persons.</p> <p><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>The magnitude of the effect is modest as this measure is applicable only if someone is already employed, therefore, it does not increase current unemployment rate, but rather the one that might happen in the future.</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,</b></p>



	<p><b>etc.)?</b></p> <p>The main barrier concerning the coverage is a complex process of applying at the Croatian Employment Service. Young people do not apply for this measure themselves, their employer does it instead, so the employers need additional help in understanding administrative demands in order to be able to utilise this programme.</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 major weaknesses are indicated in the evaluation results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Complicated administrative procedures that demotivate the employers to apply at the Croatian Employment Service.</li> <li>- Counsellors at the CES have stated that this measure is rather challenging for them since it demands them to make assessment of justification of financing certain business activities they might not be acquainted with (like justification of the costs, working hours or amortisation).</li> </ul>
<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>No, the measure is intended for already employed people and it does not specifically target the 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. 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>This measure could be assessed as a good practice as it helps both the employers and employees in keeping their production and employment. At the same time, its administrative demands make the employers hesitant to apply, and if this measure is to be replicated in other contexts the administrative procedure had to be made easier and adapted to other settings.</p>

<p>Name of the initiative</p>	<p>(Re-)orientation courses, preparation for training or employment  <a href="#">[Obrazovanje nezaposlenih]</a></p>
<p>Short description</p>	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b></p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b> increasing employability of the unemployed by adjusting their qualifications to the labour market requirements.</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b> all unemployed persons registered at the Croatian Employment Service (CES)</p>



	<p><b>Description:</b></p> <p>This measure is targeting the unemployed who are registered at the Croatian Employment Service for at least 6 months. They are being advised to take part in the training or (re)orientation courses that would increase their employability. The Croatian Employment Service (the Ministry of Labour and Pension System) is covering 100% educational and training costs and up to 50% of minimal national wage for the beneficiary (the unemployed person).</p> <p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b> registering at the CES and filling in the business plan in cooperation with the counsellor</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b></p> <p><b>Level:</b> financed from the national level; implementation is not linked to the size of municipality, can be implemented in entire territory of Croatia</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b></p> <p>The programme was initially introduced back in 1990's, with some changes during course of the time.</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b> There are consultations with the main social partners: the <a href="#">Croatian Chamber of Trades and Crafts</a>, and in some programmes the <a href="#">Croatian Employers' Association</a> is also included.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b> The Croatian Employment Service</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b></p> <p>EU: 8.670.000,00 euro;</p> <p>National: 1.530.000,00 euro for 2013-2017</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>Since 2011 there were 12.309 young beneficiaries.</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b></p> <p>Total expenditure on annual basis are cca 4.445 million euro</p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</b></p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary is cca 600 euro. The educational institution receives 100% of costs for the beneficiary, while the beneficiary receives up to 180 euro of monthly allowance.</p>
<p>Targeting</p>	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b></p>



	<p>The target groups is all unemployed.</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</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>Efficient human resources 2014-2020</p>
Available evaluations	<p><b>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)?</b> Evaluation report is available in <a href="#">Croatian</a></p> <p><b>If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring? Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b></p> <p>There are ex-post and permanent monitoring available. Ex-post evaluations are conducted by independent external experts, while the Croatian Employment Service is in charge of permanent monitoring. The last ex-ante external evaluation was done in 2016. for 2010-2013 implementation period. Otherwise, only annual report is prepared and submitted to the Croatian Government. The Ministry of Labour and Pension System and the Croatian Employment Service are in charge of preparing annual reports.</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 <u>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)?</u></b></p> <p>The 2016 evaluation included following elements for all labour market action programmes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Channels of communicating the measures to the beneficiaries;</li> <li>– Samples of the beneficiaries (age, gender, education, previous work</li> </ul>



	<p>experience);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Perception of the implementation procedures by beneficiaries;</li> <li>- Intensity of job-searching before entering the programme;</li> <li>- Modes of entering the programme;</li> <li>- Motivation for entering the programme;</li> <li>- Perception of change in life standard or quality of life after entering the programme.</li> </ul> <p>The evaluation has not included deadweight loss, substitution effect or displacement effect.</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>The main results of the 2016 evaluation indicate this is a measure burdened by multiple issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is no clear development plan of economic activities that could indicate skills requirements at least five years in advance so the institutions and employers could adapt and prepare the training programmes</li> <li>- The unemployed are often talked into taking part in the programme by their counsellor at the CES, although they do not have desire to take part in such training</li> <li>- The educational institutions can enter the programme only upon successful winning at the public procurement. The main criteria for success at the public procurement is the price of the programme, which forces the educational institutions to start disloyal competition by offering dumping prices, which results in lowering a quality of the education or training</li> <li>- Less than half of the unemployed who took part in this programme have managed to find a job where they actually employed the knowledge and skills obtained through the programme.</li> </ul>
<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>The programme has achieved the results only partially as less than half of the unemployed who took part in this programme have managed to find a job where they actually employed the knowledge and skills obtained through the programme.</p> <p><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>Magnitude of the effect is not very big and the programme needs substantial change in order to reach the planned effects.</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,</b></p>



	<p><b>etc.)?</b></p> <p>The only condition for participation is registration at the Croatian Employment Service (CES). The job-seeker advisers are obliged to inform the unemployed about all active labour measures upon their registration at the CES, so lack of information does not present a problem.</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 major weaknesses are indicated in the evaluation results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is no clear development plan of economic activities that could indicate skills requirements at least five years in advance so the institutions and employers could adapt and prepare the training programmes</li> <li>- The unemployed are often talked into taking part in the programme by their counsellor at the CES, although they do not have desire to take part in such training</li> <li>- The educational institutions can enter the programme only upon successful winning at the public procurement. The main criteria for success at the public procurement is the price of the programme, which forces the educational institutions to start disloyal competition by offering dumping prices, which results in lowering a quality of the education or training</li> <li>- Less than half of the unemployed who took part in this programme have managed to find a job where they actually employed the knowledge and skills obtained through the programme.</li> </ul>
<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 targets one of the causes of unemployment in Croatia – lack of skills – by helping the young people to pursue new education and training.</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>As stated above, this programme needs substantial reform in order to reach the planned effects at the national level. Therefore, it is not recommended to replicated this programme into other countries.</p>

### Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives

Croatia has a burden of one of the highest youth unemployment rates in Europe. Therefore, any measure that could lower the unemployment rate and increase



potentials of young people for quality employment or self-employment, is appreciated. Key results to be achieved by the measures under the Youth Guarantee and Youth Employment Initiative include increasing stable and sustainable employment and self-employment of the unemployed youth, especially long-term unemployed NEETs. It is also planned to increase the employability of the long-term unemployed youth, providing necessary working experience, skills upgrade and practical skills attainment. The Youth Guarantee and the Youth Employment Initiative are currently the most significant mechanisms for combating youth unemployment in Croatia.

The existing system enables young unemployed person to directly access programmes of the YEI through 5 macro-regional, 17 regional and 99 offices of the Croatian Employment Service. The participants that took part in the YEI activities received an offer up to four months after completing their education or registering at the Croatian employment service, and the offers mainly came from the open market. A main precondition for entering one of the programmes was registration at the Croatian Employment Service.

[The Evaluation of participant, mentor and employer experiences of the Occupational training without commencing employment, Evaluation of the Youth Employment Initiative under the Operational Programme Efficient Human Resources 2014-2020 \(OPEHR\) and Evaluation of occupational training implementation](#) suggest that the quality of the job offers in Youth Guarantee was high, meaning that the participants received an offer of continuing education/training or apprentice/employment placement up to four months after completing education or becoming unemployed, and upon registration at the Croatian Employment Service. The offers mainly came from the open market, as the results of promotion of the Youth Guarantee schemes. Young unemployed people who were informed about the Youth Guarantee and the Youth Employment Initiative in Croatia showed a high level of motivation as majority of them entered apprenticeship after finding an employer who was willing to hire them.

The activities under the YEI scheme contributed to sustainable integration of the young people in the labour market mainly by acquisition of the work experience, which is most often the most important prerequisite in the job competitions in Croatia.

Since 2013, nearly 96.000 young people have been employed through various measures streaming from the EU policy initiatives.



Table 5 Funding for the YEI and other ESF youth employment actions (EUR)

YEI (EUR)			Other ESF actions under investment priority 8ii	
<b>Total sum: 144,032,608</b>			<b>Total sum: 80,772,489</b>	
Specific allocation for YEI (EU)	Corresponding national ESF allocation	Co-financing from the national budget	ESF part	Co-financing from the national budget
Sum: 66,177,144	Sum: 66,177,144	Sum: 11,678,320	Sum: 68,656,616	Sum: 12,115,873
<b>Pre-financing for YEI in 2014-2015 (EU)</b>				
Sum: 19,853,143				

The above table presents funding available for the measures under Youth Employment Initiative and Youth Guarantee in a period 2014-2020. Source: European Commission, [‘Youth Employment Initiative Croatia’](#).



## Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion

Croatia does not have well established measures or mechanisms that would combine social policies and employment policies. There are no public policies in this regard. Three projects I have listed in the table are the ones that showed the most effect.

In Croatia there is no any measure that interlinks social policies with employment policies. There are no subsidies for housing, housing for young people looking for a job, any specific training directed exclusively at the people with disabilities or young people with criminal record. In a case of people with disabilities employers can receive higher financial support for their employment than for employment of a regular employee. Social measures are separated from those tackling unemployment and are based on providing financial help to the families of low income. The programmes that are being implemented are coordinated by the conducted by the civic society organisation, sometimes with financial or organisational help from the local, regional or national authorities.

Three examples of good practice selected for this report was evaluated as good practice example for their inclusion of young beneficiaries, although they are actually targeting entire population.

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

No	Name	Level	Main target group <sup>35</sup>	Starting year; end year (if not ongoing)	Funding source	Part of EU initiatives	Evaluation	The impact of the policy measures	Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people
1	PREUZMIT E KONTROL U, A MI ĆEMO SKRB - Nove usluge skrbi za djecu tražitelja zaposlenja <sup>36</sup>	Local	c. the unemployed mothers without kindergarten care for their children	2013-2015, with follow-up activities until 2020	EU – ESF fund Local – Croatian employment service, municipality, kindergarten and NGO	No	Yes, positive <sup>37</sup>	A lack of childcare service is an issue troubling entire Croatian population, especially the unemployed parents. Most often, the unemployed mothers cannot afford enrolling a child in a kindergarten. By providing this kind of	N/A

<sup>35</sup> a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group

<sup>36</sup> YOU TAKE CHARGE, WE'LL TAKE CARE – New childcare service for job seekers



								support to the unemployed mothers was quite successful both in a sense of raising awareness of this issue and in enabling unemployed mothers to find a job while the kindergarten takes care of their children.	
2	Resocijalizacija: Želim raditi <sup>38</sup>	Regional	c.drug addicts and addicted gamblers	2016-2016	National: Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Labour and Pension System (by implementation through the Croatian Employment Service)	No	Yes, positive <sup>39</sup>	The impact is rather small since it aims at enhancing employability of a very small segment of young population	N/A
3	Resocijalizacija: Edukacija za osnaživanje samozapošljavanja liječenih ovisnika i ovisnika o medicinskom tretmanu <sup>40</sup>	Regional	c. drug addicts	2015-2015	Local: the City Budget Other: own finances	No	Yes, positive <sup>41</sup>	The impact is rather small since it aims at enhancing employability of a very small segment of young population	N/A

<sup>37</sup> Total number of beneficiaries: 66 unemployed mothers and 74 pre-school children. The evaluation report (Logožar, B., 2014) is not available online.

<sup>38</sup> Resocialisation: I want to work

<sup>39</sup> It is not possible to provide reference to evaluation report. Description of the project (in Croatian) contains a short paragraph stating that the beneficiaries were satisfied with inclusion in the programme. Evaluation was done by interviews with the beneficiaries and no other information on evaluation was provided. There were 10 beneficiaries in total, out of them 8 were young

<sup>40</sup> Resocialisation: Education for empowerment of self-employment of recovered addicts and addicts to a medical treatment

<sup>41</sup> It is not possible to provide reference to evaluation report. [Description of the project](#) (in Croatian) contains a short paragraph stating that the beneficiaries were satisfied with inclusion



## Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	<a href="#">PREUZMITE KONTROLU, A MI ĆEMO SKRB - Nove usluge skrbi za djecu tražitelja zaposlenja</a> [YOU TAKE CHARGE, WE'LL TAKE CARE – New childcare service for job seekers]
Short description	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b> The main aim of the measure was to establish a system of cooperation between the civil and public sector for the provision of a short term child care service for children whose mothers seek a job (5 months of cost free child care service in municipal kindergarten, with the possibility of a permanent stay for the children whose mothers manage to get employed).</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- establishment of a short term child care service for children whose mothers seek a job</li><li>- organisation and implementation of training activities for unemployed women who seek a job and come from families with pre-school children.</li></ul> <p><b>Target groups:</b> unemployed women who seek a job and come from families with pre-school children.</p> <p><b>Description:</b></p> <p>The main aim of the measure was to establish a system of cooperation between the civil and public sector for the provision of a short term child care service for children whose mothers seek a job (5 months of cost free child care service in municipal kindergarten, with the possibility of a permanent stay for the children whose mothers manage to get employed).</p> <p>The project was implemented through following activities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Public campaigns aimed at raising awareness of a lack of free-of-charge preschool care</li><li>2. Informing the unemployed mothers of pre-school children of the project activities</li><li>3. Training in job-related skills</li><li>4. Evaluation and monitoring activities</li><li>5. Establishing a database of families with preschool children whose mothers are long-term unemployed</li><li>6. Records of the use of childcare service, job seeking activities and attendance to activities of empowerment programme for each member of the target group.</li></ol> <p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b> unemployed women who seek a job and come from families with pre-school children, the project was widely</p>

in the programme. Evaluation was done by interviews with the beneficiaries and no other information on evaluation was provided. There were 34 beneficiaries in total, out of them 7 were young people.



	<p>promoted in media in order to attract as many women as possible.</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b> ALMP: information on opportunities for employment and self-employment, training on transferable skills; Social policy: provision of a short term child care service for children whose mothers seek a job.</p> <p><b>Level:</b> local</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b> 2013-2015, with follow-up activities until 2020</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b> The Croatian Employment Service provided help in organising workshops and counselling, the municipality and local kindergarten organised a childcare service.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b> The NGO “Ženska grupa Korak” [Women’s Group Step]</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b> total budget of the project – euro 232.718,05; ESF fund – euro 198.461,96; local – partners on the project (Croatian employment service, kindergarten and NGO): euro 34.256,09</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><b>Total number of beneficiaries:</b> 66 unemployed mothers and 74 pre-school children.</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis</b> euro 232.718,05</p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- if calculated on the basis of costs per mother – 3.526 euro</li> <li>- if calculated on the basis of costs per child – 3.144 euro</li> </ul>
<p>Targeting</p>	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b> unemployed women who seek a job and come from families with pre-school children</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b></p> <p>Unemployed women</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>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</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>No</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 were internal process evaluation, and mid-term and final external evaluation. The project evaluation (Logožar, B., 2014) is not available online.</p> <p><b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b></p> <p>There were internal process evaluation, and mid-term and final external evaluation.</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 report does not refer to deadweight loss, substitution effect or displacement effect.</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>The project evaluation (Logožar, B., 2014) is not available online.</p> <p>The project raised awareness of the issue of lack of childcare service for the unemployed women. It also enhanced the skills of the unemployed women and enabled them to be more successful at seeking a job. Although the project aimed to enable 50% of women to get to a stage of a job interview, and 10% of women to find employment, 70% of them made it to the job interview, and 27 out of 66 women managed to find a job, which resulted in 23 permanent placement of children in kindergarten.</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of</p>	<p><b>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</b></p> <p>Yes, the programme has achieved its stated goals and intended effects</p> <p><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>Overall impact is small since it aims at enhancing employability of a small</p>



<p>the intervention?</p>	<p>segment of young population in one town, but the impact on local community was significant.</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>Coverage is small as the measure included only unemployed mothers and their pre-school children in one Croatian town</p> <p><b>Total number of beneficiaries:</b> 66 unemployed mothers and 74 pre-school children.</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>Coverage is the main weakness as the measure included unemployed mothers and their pre-school children in one Croatian town</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>No, since the measure is targeting a very specific part of young population</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>The project can be valued as a good practice example for several reasons: Established network of main stakeholders in the field of child care and employment Sufficient financial means during the project implementation made the service available to those who otherwise wouldn't have access to it Synergy effect of both new social service for children and individual support to the unemployed women in finding employment The project has improved job searching skills of the target women and their activity Based on the project results, the project partners signed a 3-year agreement on cooperation to continue with the practice after the project's official end.</p> <p><b>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b></p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Name of the initiative</p>	<p><a href="#">Resocijalizacija: Želim raditi</a> [Resocialisation: I want to work]</p>
<p>Short</p>	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b> The main aim of the measure is to</p>



description	<p>enable drug addicts and addicted gamblers for employment and self-employment</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b> development of social and work-related skills and knowledge that would enhance employability of drug addicts and addicted gamblers</p> <p><b>Description:</b></p> <p>The main aim of the project was to enable beneficiaries to seek a job by a help of active labour measures. The beneficiaries took part in several training courses and seminars, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- a training on presentation skills and writing a CV</li><li>- a seminar on active labour measures and active job searching</li><li>- education on social entrepreneurship and possibilities for starting a business</li><li>- a joint seminar for beneficiaries and potential employers</li><li>- training on usage of specific tools and machines required by potential employers.</li></ul> <p>Since the beneficiaries were members of the therapy community they were provided free of charge accommodation and meals during the project implementation.</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b> drug addicts and addicted gamblers</p> <p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b> members of the therapy community “Moji dani” [My days]</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b> ALMP: information on opportunities for employment and self-employment; Social policy: social integration of drug addicts and addicted gamblers</p> <p><b>Level:</b> regional</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b> 2016-2016</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b> The Croatian Employment Service provided help in organising workshops and counselling</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b> The NGO “Moji dani” [My days]</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b> 16.000, source: National: Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Labour and Pension System (by implementation through the Croatian Employment Service)</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><b>Total number of beneficiaries:</b> 34; young people: 7</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis</b> euro 16.000</p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available:</b> euro 470</p>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b> drug addicts and addicted gamblers</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b></p> <p>The programme is targeted at population with addiction issues</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>
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>The evaluation report contains only a paragraph stating there were interviews with the beneficiaries on their satisfaction with the programme. It is available only in <a href="#">Croatian</a>.</p> <p>The evaluation has encompassed satisfaction of the beneficiaries by the workshops and counsellors engaged on the project. It is done in a form of interviews. No other information on evaluation is available.</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, done by the beneficiaries of the programme</p> <p>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</p>



	<p>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)?</p> <p>The evaluation has encompassed satisfaction of the beneficiaries by the workshops and counsellors engaged on the project.</p> <p>The evaluation report does not refer to deadweight loss, substitution effect or displacement effect.</p> <p>2 beneficiaries have managed to find a job after the programme</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>The beneficiaries have concluded that the programme enabled them to acquire new skills and knowledge that could enhance their employability. In total, apart from taking part in workshops on opportunities for employment and self-employment, 2 beneficiaries have enrolled to the secondary school, 5 have completed vocational training programme, 5 have finished training on computer skills, and</p> <p>2 beneficiaries have managed to find a job after the programme</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>Yes, the programme has achieved its stated goals and intended effects by helping the drug addicts to better integrate in society after leaving the institution.</p> <p><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>The impact is rather small since it aims at enhancing employability of a very small segment of young population</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>Coverage is small as the measure includes young people under rehabilitation programme of the “My days” community</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>Coverage is the main weakness as the measure includes young people under rehabilitation programme of the “My days” community</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>No, since the measure is targeting one of the most vulnerable and very small</p>



	part of young population
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>This programme has been selected as a good practice example since it targets both drug addicts and addicted gamblers and their families. The programme provides rehabilitation and counselling services to the addicts and counselling service to the families of the addicts who would like to get employed or self-employed. Employment of addicts and recovered addicts is one of the weakest points in Croatian public policy and employment practice and this kind of programmes are welcome as they give at least a small chance for employment to one of the most vulnerable part of population.</p>

Name of the initiative	<a href="#"><u>Resocijalizacija: Edukacija za osnaživanje samozapošljavanja liječenih ovisnika i ovisnika o medicinskom tretmanu</u></a> [Resocialisation: Education for empowerment of self-employment of recovered addicts and addicts to a medical treatment ]
Short description	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b> The main aim of the measure is to enable drug addicts for employment and self-employment</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b> development of social and work-related skills and knowledge that would enhance possibilities of employment</p> <p><b>Description:</b></p> <p>The project was implemented through three main strains of training:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- training in soft skills (namely the presentation skills) and active job searching</li> <li>- presentation of the labour market measures and active job searching</li> <li>- training in computer programmes</li> </ul> <p>All beneficiaries were provided free of charge accommodation and meals during implementation of the project (12 months).</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b> drug addicts</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: the programme is eligible to the ex-convicts with addiction history and to the drug addicts</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b> ALMP: information on opportunities for employment and self-employment; Social policy: social integration of drug addicts</p> <p><b>Level:</b> local</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b> 2015-2015</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b> The Croatian Employment Service provided help in organising</p>



	<p>workshops and counselling. Misdemeanour court in Zagreb was a partner on the project.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b> NGO Otvorena računalna radionica “Svi smo protiv” [Open computer workshop [We are all against] was an implementation body of the programme</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b> total: euro 2.660: 2.000 eur, from City of Zagreb, funds of the NGO euro 660</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>Total number of beneficiaries: 14; young people: 12</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis</b> 2.660 eur</p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary?</b> If not available, other expenditure data what is available: euro 190</p>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b> drug addicts</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b></p> <p>The programme is targeted at population with addiction issues</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>
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>The evaluation report contains only a paragraph stating there were interviews with the beneficiaries on their satisfaction with the programme. It is available only in <a href="#">Croatian</a>.</p> <p>The evaluation has encompassed satisfaction of the beneficiaries by the</p>



	<p>workshops and counsellors engaged on the project. It is done in a form of interviews. No other information on evaluation is available.</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, done by the coordinators and beneficiaries of the programme</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 has encompassed satisfaction of the beneficiaries by the workshops and counsellors engaged on the project</p> <p>3 beneficiaries got employed at the NGO through the ALMP “Public works”</p> <p>One of the beneficiaries who was entered the programme as homeless has managed to find a job, which lead him to more stable financial and housing situation, finding a spouse and starting a family.</p> <p>The evaluation report does not refer to deadweight loss, substitution effect or displacement effect.</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>The beneficiaries have concluded that the programme enabled them to acquire new skills and knowledge that could enhance their employability. The beneficiaries took part in workshops on opportunities for employment and self-employment, and in workshops on computer skills</p> <p>After completion of the programme 3 beneficiaries got employed at the NGO through the ALMP “Public works”</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>Yes, the programme has achieved its stated goals and intended effects by helping the drug addicts to better integrate in society after leaving the institution.</p> <p><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>The impact is rather small since it aims at enhancing employability of a very small segment of young population</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>Coverage is small as the measure includes young people under rehabilitation programme of the “My days” community</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>Coverage is the main weakness as the measure includes young people under rehabilitation programme of the “My days” community</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>No, since the measure is targeting one of the most vulnerable and very small part of young population</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>This programme has been selected as a good practice example since it targets both drug addicts and addicted gamblers and their families. The programme provides rehabilitation and counselling services to the addicts and counselling service to the families of the addicts who would like to get employed or self-employed. It is very important to emphasize that the programme was implemented by very modest financial means, and that is succeeded to provide counselling, training and meals to all participants and housing to one participant who was homeless at that time.</p> <p>Employment of addicts and recovered addicts is one of the weakest points in Croatian public policy and employment practice and this kind of programmes are welcome as they give at least a small chance for employment to one of the most vulnerable part of population.</p>



## References

### Web sources

- Croatian Bank for Reconstruction and Development <https://www.hbor.hr/en/>
- Croatian Chamber of Trades and Crafts <http://www.hok.hr/>
- Croatian Employers' Association <http://www.hup.hr/>
- Croatian Employment Service <http://www.hzz.hr/>
- Croatian Employment Service: Active Labour Market Policies <http://mjere.hr/>
- Croatian Employment Service: Lifelong career guidance centres  
<http://www.hzz.hr/default.aspx?id=11153>
- Croatian Employment Service: Professional Guidance  
<http://www.hzz.hr/default.aspx?id=10182>
- Croatian Employment Service: Professional Rehabilitation Centres  
<http://www.hzz.hr/default.aspx?id=11879>
- Croatian Employment Service: Survey of Professional Choices for Primary and Secondary School Students <http://www.hzz.hr/default.aspx?id=11163>
- Croatian Agency for SMEs, Innovations and Investments (HAMAG-BICRO)  
<http://www.hamagbicro.hr/>
- Development Agencies <https://poduzetnistvo.gov.hr/arhiva/stranice/poduzetnicke-potporne-institucije/razvojne-agencije/149>
- Entrepreneurial Incubators <https://poduzetnistvo.gov.hr/arhiva/stranice/poduzetnicke-potporne-institucije/poslovni-inkubatori/151>
- Ministry of Entrepreneurship and Crafts  
<https://poduzetnistvo.gov.hr/arhiva/stranice/poduzetnicke-potporne-institucije/poslovni-inkubatori/151>

### Publications

- Bacalja, D.; Perin, V. (2011). Gdje rade ili uče završeni srednjoškolci? [Where do high school graduates work or learn?], in: Matijević, M.; Žiljak, T. (Eds.): *Andragoška profesija i kompetencije stručnjaka u obrazovanju odraslih [Andragogical profession and competences of experts in adult education]*. Zagreb: Agencija za strukovno obrazovanje i obrazovanje odraslih.
- Bečić, M.; Jasprica, D. (2015). Prijelaz iz obrazovanja u svijet rada u Dubrovačko-neretvanskoj županiji. [Transition from education to the world of work in Dubrovnik-Neretva County]. *Ekonomska misao i praksa* 24(2): 509-532.



Bejaković, P.; Gotovac, V. (2012). *Gospodarska kriza i mjere za njezino ublažavanje u Republici Hrvatskoj s naglaskom na tržište rada [Activities on economic recovery in Croatia, with particular attention to the labour market]*. Beograd: fakultet političkih nauka.

Croatian Employment Service (2005). *Yearly Bulletin*.

Croatian Employment Service (2010). *Yearly Bulletin*.

Croatian Employment Service (2016). *Vanjska evaluacija mjera aktivne politike tržišta rada 2010.-2013. Sumarno evaluacijsko izvješće*

Croatian Youth Network (2016). *Evaluation of occupational training implementation*.

Council of the European Union Recommendation of 14 July 2015 on the National Reform Programme 2015 of Croatia and delivering a Council Opinion on the convergence Programme of Croatia [2015] OJ C 272/15.

ECORYS & Ministry of Labour and Pension System (2015), *Evaluation of the Initiative for Youth Employment under the Operational Programme "Efficient Human Resources 2014-2020"*.

European Commission (2014), *Guidance on Evaluation of the Youth Employment Initiative, ESF Thematic Paper*.

European Commission (2014), *Guidance on Implementing the Youth Employment Initiative, ESF thematic paper*.

European Commission (2014), *Youth Employment Initiative and the European Social Fund, ESF thematic paper, March 2014*.

European Commission (2014), *Youth Employment Initiative Croatia, 2014*.

European Commission (2015), *Youth Guarantee Country by Country: Croatia, Country fiche*.

European Commission (2017) Country Report Croatia 2017 Including an In-Depth Review on the prevention and correction of macroeconomic imbalances.

Gvozdanović, A.; Ilišin, V.; Potočnik, D. – Eds. (2015). *Demokratski potencijali mladih u Hrvatskoj [Democratic potential of youth in Croatia]*. Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja & Centar za demokraciju i pravo Miko Tripalo.

Ilišin, V. – Ed. (2015). *Sociološki portret hrvatskih studenata [Sociological portrait of Croatian students]*. Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja u Zagrebu.

Ilišin, V.; Bouillet, D.; Gvozdanović, A.; Potočnik, D. (2013). *Mladi u vremenu krize = Youth in Time of Crisis*. Zagreb: Institute for Social Research & Friedrich Ebert Stiftung.

Ilišin, V.; Spajić Vrkaš, V. (2013). *Needs, problems and potentials of youth in Croatia*. Report. Zagreb: Ministry of social policy and youth (last accessed 08/10/2017).



Levačić, D.; Ostojić, J.; Rukavina, I. (2015). *Kriza i nejednakost na tržištu rada : rezultati istraživanja mjere Stručnog osposobljavanja za rad bez zasnivanja radnog odnosa [Crisis and inequality on the labour market: Occupational training without commencing employment - Active labour market policy research ]*. Zagreb: Baza za radničku inicijativu i demokratizaciju (BRID).

Logožar, B. (2014). Final Evaluation Report: YOUT TAKE CHARGE, WE TAKE CARE – new childcare service for job seekers. Karlovac: Women's Group Step.

Ministry of Labour and Pension System (2016) The Evaluation of participant, mentor and employer experiences of the Occupational training without commencing employment.

Potočnik, D: (2014). Profesionalne aspiracije i svijet rada u očima hrvatskih studenata [Professional aspirations and the world of work from the view of Croatian students], in: Ilišin, V. (Ed.): Republic of Croatia (2014), *Annual and Final Implementation Reports for the Investment for Growth and Jobs Goal*.

Republic of Croatia (2014), *Operational Programme under the 'Investment for Growth and Jobs' Goal*.

Republic of Croatia (2014), *Youth Guarantee Implementation Plan*.

*Sociološki portret hrvatskih studenata [Sociological portrait of Croatian students]*. Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja u Zagrebu.

The European Lifelong Guidance Policy Network (2015). *Guidelines for Policies and Systems Development for Lifelong Guidance*.

Ured za suzbijanje zlouporaba droga Republike Hrvatske (2016). *Resocijalizacija: "ŽELIM RADITI": Description of the Project*.

Ured za suzbijanje zlouporaba droga Republike Hrvatske (2015). *Resocijalizacija: Edukacija za osnaživanje samozapošljavanja liječenih ovisnika i ovisnika o medicinskom tretmanu: Description of the Project*.

### Databases

Eurostat, [Unemployment rates by sex, age and educational attainment level \(%\)](#), 2016 (last accessed 08/10/2017).

Eurostat, [Youth unemployment by sex, age and educational attainment level](#), 2016 (last accessed 08/10/2017).

Eurostat, [Youth long-term unemployment rate \(12 months or longer\) by sex and age](#), 2016 (last accessed 08/10/2017).

Eurostat, [Young people neither in employment nor in education and training by sex](#), 2016 (last accessed 08/10/2017).



## Appendix 1

### References (since 2010) that include academic accounts of young people and labour market in Croatia

Bacalja, D.; Perin, V. (2011). Gdje rade ili uče završeni srednjoškolci? [Where do high school graduates work or learn?], in: Matijević, M.; Žiljak, T. (Eds.): *Andragoška profesija i kompetencije stručnjaka u obrazovanju odraslih [Andragogical profession and competences of experts in adult education]*. Zagreb: Agencija za strukovno obrazovanje i obrazovanje odraslih.

Bečić, M.; Jasprica, D. (2015). *Prijelaz iz obrazovanja u svijet rada u Dubrovačko-neretvanskoj županiji. [Transition from education to the world of work in Dubrovnik-Neretva County]*. *Ekonomski misao i praksa* 24(2): 509-532.

Bejaković, P.; Gotovac, V. (2012). *Gospodarska kriza i mjere za njezino ublažavanje u Republici Hrvatskoj s naglaskom na tržište rada [Activities on economic recovery in Croatia, with particular attention to the labour market]*. Beograd: fakultet političkih nauka.

Gvozdanović, A.; Ilišin, V.; Potočnik, D. – Eds. (2015). *Demokratski potencijali mladih u Hrvatskoj [Democratic potential of youth in Croatia]*. Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja & Centar za demokraciju i pravo Miko Tripalo.

Ilišin, V. (2014). – Ed.: *Sociološki portret hrvatskih studenata [Sociological portrait of Croatian students]*. Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja u Zagrebu.

Ilišin, V.; Bouillet, D.; Gvozdanović, A.; Potočnik, D. (2013). *Mladi u vremenu krize = Youth in Time of Crisis*. Zagreb: Institute for Social Research & Friedrich Ebert Stiftung.

Ilišin, V.; Spajić Vrkaš, V. (2013). *Needs, problems and potentials of youth in Croatia*. Report. Zagreb: Ministry of social policy and youth (last accessed 08/10/2017).

Levačić, D.; Ostojić, J.; Rukavina, I. (2015). *Kriza i nejednakost na tržištu rada : rezultati istraživanja mjere Stručnog osposobljavanja za rad bez zasnivanja radnog odnosa [Crisis and inequality on the labour market: Occupational training without commencing employment - Active labour market policy research ]*. Zagreb: Baza za radničku inicijativu i demokratizaciju (BRID).

Potočnik, D. (2014). *Profesionalne aspiracije i svijet rada u očima hrvatskih studenata [Professional aspirations and the world of work from the view of Croatian students]*, in: Ilišin, V. (Ed.): *Sociološki portret hrvatskih studenata [Sociological portrait of Croatian students]*. Zagreb: Institut za društvena istraživanja u Zagrebu.