



Youth employment policies in Luxembourg

EXCEPT working paper no. 42
June 2018

Patrick Thill

www.except-project.eu
twitter.com/except_eu
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:

Thill, P. (2018). *Youth employment policies in Luxembourg*, EXCEPT Working Papers, WP No. 42. Tallinn University, Tallinn. <http://www.except-project.eu/working-papers/>

© Author

ISSN 2504-7159

ISBN 978-9949-29-411-4 (pdf)

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



Contents

The key risk groups in the labour market in Luxembourg	4
Youth employment policies: a general overview	5
Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions.....	9
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures	10
Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives	23
Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion.....	24
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures	24



The key risk groups in the labour market in Luxembourg

Table 1 “Risk group” construction¹

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Young people with outdated qualifications	4	5	5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

Youth unemployment as a vulnerable population group has been a much-discussed topic both at the media level and in academic circles since the late 1990s. It has also been on the policy agenda since the Luxembourg process in the late 1990s and the related legislation has not changed fundamentally since then. As can be seen from the table, the NEET and early school leavers groups have been significantly covered by the media and academics and these groups witnessed higher rates during the financial and economic crisis and were the subject of a series of academic studies². Further, the government responded to a series of consecutive country-specific recommendations by the European Commission's in the context of the European Semester regarding youth unemployment³. More specific sub-groups have received less attention by the media and have been covered in the context of a more general coverage of youth unemployment. For them, it is often the case that academic studies are missing.

¹ 1=no significant role to 5=very important

² <https://www.liser.lu/?type=module&id=104&tmp=4067>

³ In 2014, for example, the European Commission recommended for Luxembourg that it has to 'pursue efforts to reduce youth unemployment for low-skilled jobs seekers with a migrant background, through a coherent strategy, including by further improving the design and monitoring of active labour market policies, addressing skills mismatches, and reducing financial disincentives to work' (<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52014DC0417&from=EN>).



Youth employment policies: a general overview

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

	Year Indicator	2005	2010	2015
1	Total number of active labour market programmes	30	31	31
1.1	including youth-targeted	5	7	4
2	Number of participants (stock) in active labour market programmes:			
2.1	Total number	9,286	17,923	22,511 ⁴
2.2	% of the labour force (15-64)	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Number of youth participants (up to 29 years old) in active labour market programmes:			
3.1	Total number	N/A	N/A	2.458 ⁵ ⁶ (2017)
3.2	% of the labour force (15-29)	N/A	N/A	N/A
3.3	% of the total number of participants (stock)	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	Expenditures on active labour market programmes:			
4.1	Total amount (EUR)	33159 million ⁷ (2016)	485.48 million	620 million
4.2	% of GDP	0.4	0.427	0.505
5.	Expenditures on all active labour market programmes for youth participants:			
5.1	Total amount (EUR)	N/A	N/A	9.152515,92 EUR
5.2	% of GDP	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	Expenditures on youth-targeted active labour market programmes:			
6.1	Total amount (EUR)	N/A	N/A	N/A
6.2	% of GDP	N/A	N/A	N/A
6.3	% of the total expenditures on active labour market programmes	N/A	N/A	N/A

⁴This data has been obtained by the national employment service ADEM (<http://www.adem.lu>).

⁵This refers to young jobseekers in the Young Guarantee programme.

⁶Some of the employment measures in Luxembourg have been extended for young unemployed until the age of 30.

⁷Jean Ries, *Les politiques d'emploi*, STATEC, April 2012, <http://www.statec.lu>



Data on youth unemployment has been difficult to obtain for some of the elements in the table, especially for sub-groups and budgets. Available data from the National Statistical Office was mostly mobilised for this section, but no data on expenditures on youth-targeted labour market programmes could be identified.

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 ⁸	Preventive/reactive ⁹	Youth specific	Main source of funding ¹⁰	Linked to EU initiatives ¹¹	Main actors of delivery ¹²	Evaluation present	Youth/participant feedback used to improve the delivery
(Re-)orientation courses, preparation for training or employment	3	3	Yes	2	1	1,6,7	Yes	N/A
Vocational guidance, career counselling	3	3	Yes	2	1	1,6,7	Yes	N/A
Training (with certificates)	3	3	Yes	2	1	1,7	Yes	N/A
Training (without certificates)	2	3	Yes	2	1	1,7	Yes	N/A
Employment incentives, subsidies for employer	3	3	No	2	1	1	Yes	N/A
Direct job creation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Start-up incentives, self-employment programmes	2	3	Yes	2	5	1	Yes	N/A
Tailor-made programmes	3	3	Yes	2	1	1	Yes	N/A

Some remarks on the aforementioned table in Luxembourg are worth considering. The implementation of the Youth Guarantee in Luxembourg from 2015 onwards has reorganised to some extent training, guidance and the reinsertion of jobseekers (i.e. a

⁸ Importance depends on the comparative scale of the program (coverage & expenditure) -> Does not exist = 0; Not relevant = 1; Quite important = 2; Very important = 3

⁹ To what extent do policies focus on preventative measures or are purely reactive to manifest problems PREVENTIVE = 1; REACTIVE = 2; BOTH=3.

¹⁰ EU = 1; national = 2, regional = 3, local = 4; other =5

¹¹ Youth Guarantee =1; Youth Employment Initiative =2; Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship =3; Eures =4; Support to youth entrepreneurship =5; Other = 6

¹² 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



more individual approach). At the same time, youth measures have to be placed in a larger context of a PES reform that started in 2012 and that revamped many areas and missions. While the majority of measures related to youth unemployment are organised centrally at the National Employment Agency ADEM, other government agencies such as the *Action locale pour jeunes* ALJ (for apprenticeships) or the Service national de la Jeunesse SNJ (for youth interests, voluntary work) have been increasingly involved in the implementation of the Youth Guarantee in Luxembourg. These measures based on the three main government agencies are considered as reactive measures to increasing levels of youth unemployment.

Orientation, preparation and training courses are organised mainly by the national PES and constitute a key pillar in the Youth Guarantee. An internal PES youth guarantee department has been created. Although that the PES constitutes the main actor of delivery, other actors such as the *Ecole de la deuxième chance* (Second Chance School) provide young jobseekers or young people out of school or employment with the opportunity to get back into school (upskilling) or by integrating back into employment through apprenticeships for examples. These can be considered as both reactive and preventive to a large extent law-based measures.

Similar than incentives for jobseekers in general registered at the national PES, employers can benefit from incentives if they recruit young jobseekers (see CIE contract case study) and this by parts of their social contributions reimbursed by the National Employment Fund. The National Employment Fund (*Fonds pour l'emploi*) constitutes the main source of funding for employment measures in general and active labour market measures regarding young unemployed. Tailor-made programmes have been identified as of particular relevance at the PES level as they are flexible and applied as a reaction to the requirements of the general labour market or of certain professions in economic sectors: if an employer requires a certain amount of employees with a specific qualification and if these are not directly available in the PES database, tailor-made training programmes can be designed after a profiling is conducted at the PES¹³. Jobseekers are then reskilled in that profession and reintegrated back into employment. The implementation of the Youth Guarantee has also highlighted the importance of private initiatives and actors in the delivery of measures against youth unemployment. Some of these private actors from the social sectors apply for FSE funding, as the outreach work example underlines in this report.

¹³See Thill Patrick. *Tailor-made Training Programmes, Mutual Learning Programme (MLP), Host Discussion Paper for the Peer Review on Tailor-made Training Programmes in Luxembourg: Luxembourg, March 2009.*



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
Measures and initiatives are tailor-made with the result of a fast response to sector-specific needs	Skills mismatches (for some sectors and professions), opening positions registered at the PES are not filled
Close link to employers through creation of a new Employment department at the PES	Risk of long-term unemployment if employment measures do not work
Creation of a Youth Guarantee department and Orientation House (Maison de l'orientation, http://portal.education.lu/mo) where representatives of all the major agencies provide guidance	No evaluation in the long run (especially how many measures result in permanent working contracts), no qualitative impact study of measures
Available financing through the Employment Fund	High failing rate in employment measures
Increase of staff at PES	
Coordination of actors, centralisation at state and ministry level	



Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions

Table 5 A brief overview of selected youth employment interventions

No	Name	Level	Main target group ¹⁴	Type ¹⁵	Starting year	Funding source	Part of EU initiatives	Evaluation	"Good practice" ¹⁶ example	Impact of policy measures on youth inclusion ¹⁷	Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people ¹⁸
1	Contrat d'initiation à l'emploi (CIE), Employment initiation contract	National	A.	1	2013	National	Not directly, but mobilised by the national PES in the Youth Guarantee scheme	Yes (internal monitoring only), mixed results	Yes	4	2 The number of CIE is important but there have been no thorough follow-up impact study and the number of permanent contracts is low although that there are employer incentives and that youth receive a good experience
2	Jonk Entrepreneuren	National	A.	2, 6	2005	National	No	Yes, positive	Yes	4	2 An assessment can be done in terms of

¹⁴ a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group;

¹⁵ (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

¹⁶ 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."

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

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



											numbers of participating youth in terms of workshops, but a qualitative analysis is difficult to be conducted
3	Ecole de la deuxième Chance	National	A.	2, 6	2009	National	No (mobilised by the Youth Guarantee if necessary)	No	Yes	4	2 No qualitative assessment has been conducted.

The first measure presented in this table can be regarded as a measure to increase the number of ‘good jobs’ as it aims at the reintegration of young registered jobseekers back into employment. Young jobseekers receive benefits, as well as a tutoring during the contract with the objective to increase their employability in the longer run. On the other hand, companies receive incentives to offer contracts to young registered jobseekers. The second measure in the table deals with the promotion of self-employment among young people within schools. The measure is efficient, as it not only offers a series of workshops, but it also pools a large amount of private and public actors who are all interested in promoting self-employment. The promotion of self-employment is not only regarded as a way to prevent unemployment, but also as a way to boost still increasing employment levels as the rate of self-employed in Luxembourg is still very low if compared to the social or public sector which seem to be more attractive to young people. This measure has to be embedded in the larger context of promoting self-unemployment, through for example the recent introduction of more flexible statutes at the level of the company law.

The last measure has been added to the table and offers a wide range of training schemes (both practical and theoretical) for jobseekers: although that it has been reported that strong selection criteria apply, the school (based on a legal status) aims to provide school and career paths and constitutes a significant pillar of the Youth Guarantee despite that national funding is mobilised

Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	Contrat d'initiation à l'emploi (CIE), Employment initiation contract
Short description	(Primary/Main) aim of the measure: This measure focuses on a practical training through the recruitment of young job seekers registered at the national PES by employers who



	<p>receive a reimbursement of parts of the social contributions. Young jobseekers are reintegrated back into employment with a 12 month CIE contract (with a possible extension of 6 more months) and a salary of 100% of the minimum social salary.</p> <p>Intended effects:</p> <p>The policy aims to increase the employability of the young jobseeker and create a professional perspective in a company.</p> <p>Target groups:</p> <p>The target group are young jobseekers registered at the national PES and less than 30 years old.</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</p> <p>Beneficiaries must be less than 30 years old and registered at the PES for a minimum period of three months. Eligible companies and employers must offer a real professional perspective (i.e. through a permanent contract at the end of the CIE) and help to increase the young jobseeker's employability on the job market.</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy):</p> <p>Reinsertion measure.</p> <p>A registered youth (<30) is offered a 12-month contract by a private employer.</p> <p>The employer designates a monitor for the company and establishes a training plan monitored by ADEM and this within the period of a month after the signature of the contract.</p> <p>The youth is offered a salary according to the level of education and in relation to the social minimum wage (80% of the social minimum wage if under 18 years old and 130% for a higher degree such as a Bachelor or Master)</p> <p>As an incentive, the employer gets social contributions (only the employers 'part) as well as 50% of the benefits reimbursed by the National Employment Fund.</p> <p>In the longer run and in the event when the employer proceeds to a recruitment three months after the end of the CIE contract, the young CIE participant is regarded as a priority.</p> <p>Level:</p> <p>National</p> <p>Start/ end date:</p>
--	--



	<p>The measure is a law-based permanent measure.</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</p> <p>Stakeholders were involved in the implementation of the policy (legislative process in parliament) and there are close links between the employers' association and the PES, notably through the new employer department.</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</p> <p>The measure is implemented by the national employment service ADEM.</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</p> <p>The measure is financed by the national Employment fund (Fonds pour l'emploi).</p>
Achieved results	<p>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.</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</p> <p>No data has been disclosed on the total expenditure of this measure. In August 2017, 713 CIE contracts were concluded (437 men and 276 women). This constitutes an increase if compared to data of August 2016 when 666 CIE contracts were concluded. The average number of CIE contracts for 2015 was 754 contracts. However, the number of contracts has decreased since 2010 (841 in 2010).</p>
Targeting	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure?</p> <p>The target group is young jobseekers (< 30 years) registered at the PES.</p> <p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</p> <p>This program is only targeted to young jobless people registered at the PES.</p> <p>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)?</p> <p>This is not the case.</p>
Youth involvement	<p>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</p> <p>No, the programme is defined by law.</p>



Links to EU initiatives	<p>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</p> <p>The programme is national and law-based. It can be mobilised by the PES in the context of the Youth Guarantee.</p>
Available evaluations	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</p> <p>Data is published on a monthly bases by the PES in the Employment bulletin (http://www.adem.public.lu/fr/index.html). It is not known if there are qualitative or impact assessment studies on the CIE measure.</p> <p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</p> <p>It is not known if there are internal evaluations. There have been no external studies or scientific publications by institutes.</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 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>Only quantitative data is available by the PES. Data indicates the number of CIE contracts per month and compared to the months before.</p>
Summary of evaluation results	<p>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.</p> <p>No evaluations are available.</p>
In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</p> <p>Yes, the programme is successful if the number of CIE contract is considered. It has achieved its goals to reintegrate a large number of young jobseekers back into employment and increase their employability.</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</p> <p>A high number of CIE contracts have been concluded between ADEM, young jobseekers and companies. It is not known to what extent CIE</p>



	<p>contracts are transformed into permanent or temporary contract arrangements.</p> <p>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.)?</p> <p>Companies and employers must be motivated to participate in the measure and to offer a professional perspective. This is the most challenging aspect of this programme.</p> <p>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</p> <p>The measure requires the cooperation of employers and companies. They must offer a professional training to provide opportunities to reskill or reintegrate young jobseekers back into employment. Companies and employers also must offer a professional future, which is not always feasible as the economic environment and the priorities of the company might change. Long-term impact studies are required to analyse if these CIE contracts lead to permanent contracts, as well as studies analysing the number of completed CIE contracts.</p>
Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups	<p>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?</p> <p>This programme can contribute to address the main causes for unemployment as young jobseekers are reintegrated back into employment, at least for the time of the CIE contract. The problem of skills mismatches as one of the fundamental causes for youth unemployment in Luxembourg is to some extent addressed as the measure includes training and tutoring. It does not, however, eradicate, long term unemployment in the sense that young jobseekers in this measure might not get a permanent position and fall back into other employment measures at the PES when employers do not offer a follow-up. Although that the employability is increased, it might be the case that there are not suitable or open positions at the PES or on the labour market in general, which is very competitive in Luxembourg due to the large number of cross-border workers.</p>
Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example	<p>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention.</p> <p>The programme focuses on the reintegration into employment with a large part of tutoring and training, as well as a salary (i.e. 100% of the social minimum wage). The CIE contract offers the opportunity for registered</p>



	<p>young jobseekers to receive a permanent or temporary work contract, and increase their employability on the employment market.</p> <p>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</p> <p>A large number of young jobseekers are low-skilled or NEET and have no opportunities to be reintegrated back into the labour market that is competitive as Luxembourg forms part of a Greater Region with a pool of qualified workforce. In the case of a CIE contract, young jobseekers receive an opportunity to be supported by an employer who receives incentives while at the same time accumulating work experience and practical training.</p> <p>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</p> <p>The measure is transferable to other contexts if considerable funding is available (i.e. to pay back parts of employers' social contributions as in the case of the CIE), which is done in Luxembourg through the law-based national employment Fund. Further, the socio-economic environment must be favourable if employers are willing to recruit young jobseekers.</p>
--	---

Name of the initiative	Jonk Entrepreneuren Luxembourg, Young entrepreneurs Luxembourg¹⁹
Short description	<p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</p> <p>The private-public initiative aims to help young people at the various levels of their education (fundamental, secondary and higher education) to get interested in entrepreneurship and initiative-taking.</p> <p>Intended effects:</p> <p>The organization behind the initiative, which has the statute of a non-profit organization (asbl), has two main objectives in the field of youth entrepreneurship: first, it initiates with the cooperation and support of both larger entrepreneurs in the banking and service sectors, and actors from the field of entrepreneurship in Luxembourg (i.e. professional associations such as the Chamber of Commerce or the Chamber of Craft), programs explaining and promoting entrepreneurship among young people (i.e. Fit for Live programme for the 14 to 16 year old). The programs seek to illustrate that the professional status of being self-employed constitutes a promising alternative to the more attractive profession of a wage earner. Second, the activities of the association aim to promote innovation, entrepreneurship, and decision-taking among young people. Activities range from the production of cartoons for primary schools on the subject of enterprise creation to project work in "mini companies" where young</p>

¹⁹<http://jonk-entrepreneuren.lu>



	<p>people are coached and assume the responsibility for the management of their own company.</p> <p>Target groups:</p> <p>The target group are young people in schools (all levels of education) and can include young jobseekers.</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</p> <p>The general approach of the initiative is flexible, interactive with actors from the private sector who provide their expertise on a voluntary basis in workshops. The non-profit organization offers tailor-made and practice-orientated programmes supported by private actors, as well as by the main professional chambers in Luxembourg providing guidance and expertise. Students from all levels of education (primary and secondary) can participate in the workshops offered by the association.</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy):</p> <p>Orientation and guidance measure.</p> <p>The private association Jonk Entrepreneuren organises workshops and programs for children and students whose objective it is to explain and promote self-employment. Programs and workshops include for example management workshops (i.e. students manage their own mini budget) or the production of cartoons.</p> <p>Level:</p> <p>National</p> <p>Start/ end date:</p> <p>The measure is permanent.</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</p> <p>Yes, stakeholders such as the Chamber of Commerce (Chambre de Commerce) and the Chamber of Crafts (Chambre des métiers) (employers' associations) are involved in the implementation of the measure, as well as a large entrepreneurs from the private sector such as banks, consultancies or larger companies from the catering or retail sector.</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</p> <p>The measure is implemented by a private association.</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</p> <p>No information is disclosed on the budget.</p>
--	---



Achieved results	<p>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.</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</p> <p>No data on expenditure is available after an analysis of reports and documentation on the initiative. In 2016, 10.000 young people have participated in the various activities of the initiative.</p>
Targeting	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure?</p> <p>The target group is young people at all levels of education, including secondary and primary education.</p> <p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</p> <p>This program is only targeted to young people in general.</p> <p>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)?</p> <p>This is not the case.</p>
Youth involvement	<p>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</p> <p>Yes, young people are actively contributing to the implementation of the measure. In the new programme, young people are for example given a starting budget of 40 EUR to create a simulation of a small micro business.</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</p> <p>The programme is not directly linked to an EU initiative.</p>
Available evaluations	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</p> <p>There are no qualitative evaluations or impact assessments in the long run. However, the high number of participants in the various activities points towards a great impact.</p>



	<p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</p> <p>It is not known if there are internal evaluations. There have been no external studies or scientific publications by institutes.</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 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>Only quantitative data is available. An overview of press reports for this report indicates that the measure has a positive impact on self-employment among young people.</p>
Summary of evaluation results	<p>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.</p> <p>No evaluations are available.</p>
In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</p> <p>Yes, the programme is successful if the number of activities and participants are considered.</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</p> <p>A high number of young participants take part in the various activities of the association. There are indications that the measure has a positive effect on self-employment (see http://paperjam.lu/questions/de-plus-en-plus-de-jeunes-ont-envie-de-se-lancer)</p> <p>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.)?</p> <p>No problems are encountered from the expert point of view.</p> <p>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</p> <p>The measure requires the cooperation of entrepreneurs and volunteers. The association has indicated that more than 490 entrepreneurs take part in the organisation of events and workshops, but that more companies are</p>



	required. The measure is highly adequate, especially as self-unemployment is not only a priority of the government, but that it can also create employment in niche sectors. The effectiveness is difficult to measure as it is unknown how many young people do become entrepreneurs in the long run after their education.
Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups	<p>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?</p> <p>This measure contributes indirectly to address the main causes for unemployment in Luxembourg. Business creation is regarded as one avenue for young people to be integrated in the labour market, and in this programme children and students receive a first insight into self-employment and the labour market.</p>
Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example	<p>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention.</p> <p>Among the success factors are the mobilisation of entrepreneurs to address self-employment. Students are invited to create mini-companies and manage a small amount.</p> <p>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</p> <p>The initiative is successful in terms of participation. It provides guidance and a first insight into self-employment and the labour market through practical examples.</p> <p>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</p> <p>This measure is transferable to other contexts. However, it requires the involvement of entrepreneurs in order to organise the various initiatives, as well as of business associations that contribute with the experience and networks.</p>

Name of the initiative	Ecole de la deuxième Chance (Second Chance School)
Short description	<p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</p> <p>The measure focuses on early school leavers and provides more broadly a certificate that enables young jobseekers to be reintegrated into society and the labour market. Training and education courses from secondary and professional training are offered by the school.</p> <p>Intended effects:</p> <p>The policy aims to reintegrate young school leavers and jobseekers back into employment and create a professional perspective.</p> <p>Target groups:</p>



	<p>The target group are young jobseekers and early school leavers aged 16 to 30.</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: A selection process applies.</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy): Training, school and reinsertion measure (linked to the Youth Guarantee). The measure has the following aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Early school leavers between 16 and 30 years old are provided the opportunity to continue their education either in secondary education (first years), technical and professional training, or towards the degree of an educator in the social field. - Students in the school receive individual support through an individualised monitoring and tutoring scheme that addresses both educational and socio-pedagogical difficulties. <p>Level: National</p> <p>Start/ end date: The measure is a law-based permanent measure (starting date: April 2009).</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? N/A</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented? The measure is implemented by Ministry of Education</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: N/A</p>
Achieved results	<p>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.</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</p> <p>No data has been disclosed.</p>
Targeting	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure?</p> <p>The target group are young jobseekers or early school leavers aged 16 to 30.</p>



	<p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</p> <p>This program is only targeted to young people only aged 30 maximum.</p> <p>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)?</p> <p>This is not the case.</p>
Youth involvement	<p>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</p> <p>N/A</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</p> <p>The programme is national and law-based. It can be mobilised by the PES in the context of the Youth Guarantee.</p>
Available evaluations	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</p> <p>No evaluations are available.</p> <p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</p> <p>It is not known if there are internal evaluations. As far as the research for this questionnaire showed, there have been no external studies or scientific publications by institutes.</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 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>N/A</p>



Summary of evaluation results	<p>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.</p> <p>No evaluations are available.</p>
In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</p> <p>Yes, the programme is successful, especially as the school offered tailor-made career paths as for example the 'educateur' (social worker).</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>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.)?</p> <p>Strong selection criteria apply. They might constitute a barrier for many unskilled young jobseekers that left school a long time ago.</p> <p>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</p> <p>The measure is highly adequate as the number of early school leavers is still high despite that EU2020 objectives were already reached. There are no long-term studies on the school, for example if young jobseekers are successfully integrated back into employment.</p>
Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups	<p>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?</p> <p>This programme can contribute to address the main causes for unemployment as young jobseekers are given the opportunity to get back into school and benefit by more flexible programmes. They receive a diploma, which can help them find a job. The programme is also vital in the context of the Youth Guarantee when young jobseekers are guided towards education.</p>
Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example	<p>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention.</p> <p><u>The programme is flexible and has both a theoretical and practical side. Students receive certification and programmes are tailor-made.</u></p> <p>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</p> <p>A good reason to value the school as a good practice is that the programmes are flexible, practical and tailor-made. The school addresses only young vulnerable jobseekers and early school leavers and staff are usually well skilled to accompany young people. Certification is an</p>



	<p>incentive, as well as an opportunity to be integrated back into the school or employment system.</p> <p>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</p> <p>A bottleneck might constitute the selection process. The school requires a strong cooperation between the different agencies (i.e. ADEM and the School, for example in the context of the Youth Guarantee), certification to be recognised as well as considerable funding in order to be replicated in other contexts.</p>
--	---

Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives

The implementation of the Youth Guarantee in Luxembourg has had a positive impact on the youth labour market inclusion, especially as youth unemployment levels have increased during the economic and financial crisis since 2007. EU initiatives are important for the development and evaluation of policies against youth unemployment (notably in terms of peer pressure) although that the demarcation line with national policy initiatives is often blurred, as measures to combat youth unemployment had existed prior to the Youth Guarantee which is not an entirely new strategy in Europe. Luxembourg has a strong employment legislation and measures regarding the young had already been part of the Code of Work since the 1990s and have been adapted during the crisis in order to react more efficiently to increasing levels of youth unemployment. The implementation of EU initiatives such as the Youth Guarantee also benefitted from a reform of the national PES that started in 2012, including for example an increase of staff, the creation of an employers' department to promote better links with businesses, etc.



Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion

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

No	Name	Level	Main target group ²⁰	Starting year; end year	Funding source	Part of EU initiatives	Evaluation	Impact of the policy measures	Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people
1	Outreach Youth Work	Regional	C.	2016-2017	EU and national	No	No	It is too early to conduct an assessment of the policy measure.	N/A

The selected employment intervention is rather a project than a ALPM but it has a particular focus on vulnerable youngsters (in most cases NEETs) in a particular environment (social field, youth houses, etc.) and the measure is closely linked to ALMPS (i.e. youth guarantee) in Luxembourg as young jobseekers/NEETs are not only identified but they are also guided towards other agencies participating in the Youth Guarantee (i.e. ADEM). The concept of “outreaching” is new in Luxembourg and there was no such a measure available when I contributed to the MLP. Therefore, I consider this measure as significantly innovative and efficient, as well as a good practice related to components of social policy because social workers as the main contact points for young NEETs in this projects deal with all sorts of problems encountered by NEETS. I did not put this measure under chapter 3, as I do not have enough empirical material to provide a fair and thorough assessment. Also, I chose a single measure in this section because there are (to my knowledge) no other measures fitting into the criteria enumerated above.

Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	Outreach Youth Work
Short description	(Primary/Main) aim of the measure: The main aim of this project is to identify young NEETS in the social field and guide them towards other actors who organise their integration back into the education system or the labour market. Intended effects:

²⁰ a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group



	<p>The project seeks to change the situation of young NEETS by providing guidance and help.</p> <p>Target groups:</p> <p>The target group consists of young jobseekers and NEETS aged between 16-26.</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</p> <p>A part from age, no eligibility criteria are defined.</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy):</p> <p>Orientation, insertion and guidance measure.</p> <p>The measure regarding the 16 to 26 years old NEETs has the following objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- In a first stage of this FSE-funded project, educators in a youth house identify and establish contact with the young NEET with the objective to build up a relation of trust in the longer run- A second stage consists of developing an individual development plan, including for example the search for a job or the solution to a problem related to health or the family.- In a last stage of the intervention, the educator provides an individual support in the reactivation of the young NEET, including for example to get an appointment at the ADEM or the social office. <p>The intervention ends when another agency (i.e. ADEM) continues to support and guide the young NEET.</p> <p>Level:</p> <p>Municipal/local level</p> <p>Start/ end date:</p> <p>The measure started on 1 of December 2016 and ends on the 31 of December 2017.</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</p> <p>Yes, the project is organised by the Entente des Gestionnaires des Maisons de jeunes (EGMJ), together with municipalities and government agencies.</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</p> <p>The measure is implemented by the Entente des Gestionnaires des Maisons de jeunes (EGMJ)</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</p> <p>The budget is 1.158900 EUR and 50% are covered by the European Social Fund (579.450 EUR).</p>
--	--



Achieved results	<p>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.</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</p> <p>No expenditure data is communicated by the EGMJ. 270 young people have been identified to participate in the measure.</p>
Targeting	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure?</p> <p>The target group is young jobseekers and NEETS aged between 16 and 26 years.</p> <p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</p> <p>This program is only targeted to young people.</p> <p>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)?</p> <p>This is not the case.</p>
Youth involvement	<p>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</p> <p>No</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</p> <p>The programme is not directly linked to a EU initiative, but can be mobilised in the context of the Youth Guarantee.</p>
Available evaluations	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</p> <p>There are no evaluations available. The project is evaluated by the INSIDE department of the University of Luxembourg.</p> <p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</p> <p>The project is evaluated by the INSIDE department of the University of Luxembourg.</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 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>No information has been disclosed on what aspects of the measure will be analysed.</p>
Summary of evaluation results	<p>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.</p> <p>No evaluations are available at the moment of writing.</p>
In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</p> <p>The goal of the project is ambitious, but it is too early to anticipate if it achieves its goals.</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</p> <p>The project involves a high number of young jobseekers and NEETS (270). Data from a major study by LISER underlines that the current rate of NEETs in Luxembourg stands at 5.7% to 6.3% which corresponds to a heterogeneous youth population of around 2000 NEETs (see: Laetitia Hauret. Etude sur le lien entre décrochage scolaire et statut de NEET. LISER, June 2016, http://www.liser.lu).</p> <p>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.)?</p> <p>NEETs are a heterogeneous youth population group and they are difficult to identify. Youth centres are a vital source to identify NEETs and gain their confidence by providing them with guidance and orientation. Educators serve not only as contact points for NEETs but also as resources for the youth.</p> <p>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</p> <p>The measure is highly adequate as it deals with the NEET problem from a different and more practical perspective. The measure is applied where a</p>



	<p>large number of NEET usually meet, namely in youth centres. It also covers a large and ambitious target group of 270 NEETs, which constitutes the main challenge from an expert point of view. But, if successful, the potential to guide these young people towards employment or any other youth measure is significant. The measure is effective as educators in youth centres are mobilised and share their professional and practical experience through for example project work.</p>
Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups	<p>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?</p> <p>The measure targets the main causes of unemployment and addresses in particular the most vulnerable risk group in Luxembourg. NEETs constitute a heterogeneous population marked by health and family issues that are difficult to address. The measure is applied on the grounds in youth centres where many NEETs are, where educators work and share their experience by constituting the main pillar of the project. Educators can address issues that are relevant to this vulnerable population groups. Further, youth unemployment in Luxembourg rates vary according to the municipalities and regions with higher rates in the Southern communities. By mobilising municipalities as a participating actor in the project, those regions with the highest unemployment rate can be mobilised, which can lead to a decrease of unemployment levels in those regions.</p>
Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example	<p>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention.</p> <p>The measure puts forward an outreaching strategy for young NEETs, the most vulnerable and heterogeneous population group. It is also an efficient measure to deal with the problem on the grounds in youth centres where NEETs gather (and by doing so addressing the identification problem) and where they are guided by experienced educators. Also, a success factor will be the evaluation performed by the University of Luxembourg as this reinforces the quality of the overall project.</p> <p>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</p> <p>The measure is a good practice because it addresses the NEET problem with an outreach strategy, a strategy that allows to reinforce links with NEETs. It is also an individually-based project in the sense that for each identified NEET, a 'plan' is designed together with social workers on how to change the situation and to organise the way of inactivity back into employment or any other measure. NEETs often require more guidance and educators do not only monitor advancement but also accompany the young NEET in the various phases of the project.</p> <p>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</p>



	This measure is transferable to other contexts if youth work is applied in these context, if sufficient staff and funding is available, and if the cooperation between the various actors is organised efficiently.
--	---