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Executive Summary

Since May 2009, the International Labour Office (ILO), the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) have been providing technical assistance to the Government of Serbia through the Joint Programme (JP) *Support To National Efforts For The Promotion Of Youth Employment And Management Of Migration*. The Joint Programme was co-financed by the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F) and the Government of Serbia with contributions of US$6.1 million and US$1.9 million, respectively.

The aim of the Joint Programme was to address the youth employment and migration challenges of Serbia by combining employment and social policy objectives and integrating them into long-term national development goals. The direct recipients were decision-makers and staff of the Ministry of Economy and Regional Development (MoERD), the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy (MoLSP), the Ministry of Youth and Sport (MoYS), the Ministry of Human and Minority Rights (MoHMR), the National Employment Service (NES), Centres for Social Work (CSW); the Republic Statistical Office (RSO), social partners (staff of employers’ and workers’ organisations), as well as the local authorities of the Districts of South Backa, Belgrade and Pcinjski. The ultimate beneficiaries were disadvantaged young women and men (15 to 30 years old) in the 35 municipalities of the three target Districts, highly affected by unemployment and poverty and expected to be the re-settlement destination of many returnees.

The Joint Programme was designed with a three-pronged strategy touching upon *policies*, *institutions* and *programmes* vital to delivery of integrated employment and social services targeting disadvantaged young women and men exposed to migration, especially young returnees. It built on three, interlinked outcomes:

* Mainstreaming youth employment and migration policy objectives into national development strategies.
* Strengthening the capacity of national institutions to develop integrated labour market and social services.
* Implementing a package of programmes on employment and social services.

The Joint Programme was developed through a robust participatory process involving participating UN agencies and national partners. The design process ensured that the external context, including a thorough analysis of the problems to be addressed and the country strategic priorities, was well understood. This joint intervention benefited from the high level of commitment of national partners, which ensured that the assistance deployed responded to the development challenges faced by the country. The level of participation can be attributed, to a large extent, to the establishment of an open dialogue between national partners and participating UN Agencies during design, implementation and monitoring of the Programme.

The Joint Programme was designed with the priorities of the UNDAF and, of course, the MDGs in mind. The Programme was designed within the YEM thematic window of the MDG-F. The YEM thematic window defines the following priorities:

* Make youth employment a national priority - national development plans and frameworks.
* Identify, develop and implement measures to help young people access and remain in the labour market -
	+ innovative interventions re impact of migration on youth.
	+ innovative interventions to address rural- urban migration, with special emphasis on youth.
* Strengthen institutional capacity to effectively deliver employment, youth and migration interventions, including improved coordination and policy coherence.

The Joint Programme had a direct and measurable impact on ensuring a more prominent focus on youth employment in national strategic frameworks through the embedding of youth employment targets in the *National Employment Strategy*; the design and implementation of employment programmes targeting disadvantaged youth; and the development of by-laws for the 2011 *Law on Social Protection*.

It had − and through the Commissariat for Refugees in its new role as coordination body for migration monitoring and management (CPPM) will continue to have − a direct influence on the management of labour migration. This is an area where Serbia had little prior experience with clear gaps in policy and programme effectiveness. The 2010 *White Paper*: *Towards Developing a Policy on Labour Migration in the Republic of Serbia* has made significant inroads in addressing these gaps and in providing the Government with a reliable framework for policy and programme development.

The Joint Programme assisted Serbian institutions in establishing a coordinated and multi-sector system for the delivery of services to youth at risk of social exclusion, which not only coordinates the delivery of social and employment services, but also includes work on activation and skills development programmes. The Joint Programme was instrumental in:

* The establishment of partnership agreements among public service providers.
* the development of an integrated service delivery system and its operational procedures.
* The building of capacity of staff of the National Employment Service and the Centres of Social Works in managing referrals.
* The increase of coordination between the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy and the Ministry of Economy and Regional Development and their decentralized structures.

The results achieved in this field are significant in their structural nature and long-term significance. In addition, the wide range of lessons learned stemming from the piloting of integrated service delivery provide good ground for its scaling-up across the whole territory of Serbia.

The Youth Employment Fund introduced a mechanism to improve on the delivery of youth employment and social inclusion policy objectives, similar to those used by the European Union Social Fund. This instrument allows the Government of Serbia, through the Ministry of Economy and Regional Development and the National Employment Service, to address the national youth employment challenge. The Ministry in charge of employment has already committed to continue the financing of the Fund and has embedded the good practice on targeting approaches, stemming from the Joint Programme, into its strategic planning.

The quantitative targets set by the Project Document for final beneficiaries of gender-sensitive employment programmes (3,000 disadvantaged youth receiving individualized employment services and programmes) were not reached, the key constraint being the overall costs of interventions targeting low-skilled youth and the length of treatment required to prepare them for labour market entry. However, the employment rate of participants at follow-up (25 per cent) is in line with the experience of countries in the European Union, where the average employment outcome for disadvantaged youth typically ranges below 20 per cent.

The employment interventions promoted under the aegis of the Joint Programme succeeded in increasing the labour market attachment of the target group (measured in terms of progression of the individual towards labour market activity, rather than a job in the open labour market). Therefore, the longer term gains of including disadvantaged youth in the labour market (in terms of lower spending on social benefits, higher labour tax revenues and stronger aggregate demand through the consumption multiplier) largely offset programme’s costs.

The Joint Programme will have had a lasting, positive and systemic impact on policy making and operational activities of Serbian national and local institutions. It has enhanced policy coherence and coordination among government institutions and particularly among the Ministry of Economy and the National Employment Service on the one hand, and the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy and Centres for Social Work, on the other. The Joint Programme has been successful, and is worthy of study as a good practice model for the establishment of an integrated employment and social service delivery system characterized by individualized and client-oriented assistance and case management approaches. All of these acquire specific importance due to their structural nature and represent the key feature of the Joint Programme success. The impact of the Joint Programme is measurable in terms of the changes it has occasioned at policy, procedural and operational levels within the Ministries of Economy and Regional Development, Labour and Social Policy, Youth and Sports, as well as the Republic Statistical Office, the NES, CSWs and Youth Offices.

The Joint Programme was designed to deliver structural change. It did so and the results are clearly visible. Its implementation strategy, centred on a policy and institutional capacity development component and one aimed at providing direct assistance, was instrumental to the achievement of outputs, which in turn allowed the attainment of planned outcomes.

|  |
| --- |
| **Main Highlights Of The YEM Joint Programme In Serbia*** The extensive work done on employment, migration and social protection indicators and their use in evidence-based policy-making.
* The enhancement of institutional capacity to collect and analyse data at national and local levels, as an instrument for evidence-based policy development as well as the continuous involvement of the Republic Statistical Office in this process.
* The assistance provided in strategy and policy formulation (on employment, migration, youth development and social protection) as well as in the establishment of the Youth Employment Fund as a versatile instrument for the achievement of employment and social inclusion objectives.
* The piloting of the integrated service delivery model, the work on activation services, the implementation of the principles set forth by the *Rulebook*, the capacity building of local government institutions and agencies and their potential for national scaling-up.
* Improved provision of client-oriented employment and social services not only for disadvantaged youth, but for all population groups at risk of exclusion.
* The work on operational planning has changed the way CSWs approach their service delivery.
* The significant development of the role and capacity of Youth Offices to assist in policy formulation and service delivery at local level.
 |

**Lessons Learned**

* Joint programming, as a modality to implement complex and innovative interventions, is effective when underpinned by a robust design logic, with clearly assigned responsibilities among participating UN Agencies, and an extensive involvement of national and local partners in all the stages of the project cycle. A thorough understanding of the challenges to be addressed and appreciation of national priorities ensures maintenance of the relevance and strategic fit of the intervention. Open dialogue between participating Agencies and national and local partner institutions ensures their commitment to the attainment of intermediate outcomes and final ownership of the policy, procedural and legislative changes realized.
* Policies aimed at improving youth employment prospects should be wide in scope, while programmes need to be targeted to those who are most at risk of permanent labour market exclusion. In the past, fewer resources have been devoted to implement programmes to redress the multiple layers of disadvantage that affect many young people, such as low educational and training levels, rural residence and ethnicity. There are strong links between support to planning, statistical database development and the ease of direct intervention. The experience of the Joint Programme revealed that effective targeting produces good programme results, especially in terms of increasing the labour market attachment of participants. Effective targeting, however, may also result in a slower intake of participants into programmes, longer treatment periods and a lower share of participants employed at follow-up. Although broad interventions are important for policy development, concrete actions need to have firmer links with target groups. While the policy segment of social enterprise activity brought insights into institutional frameworks, the concrete intervention did not have disadvantaged youth employed in social enterprises as its focus.
* Traditional measures to compute the success of active labour market programmes targeting disadvantaged youth − namely employment and earnings rate at follow-up − may fail to capture all the benefits accruing to individuals and to society. The return on the investment, in fact, should be measured in terms of savings accrued in social assistance expenditures (for those youth who are beneficiaries of social assistance); increases in wage tax revenues from individuals who would not normally be able to find work in the formal economy; and increased aggregate demand through the consumption multiplier. At the individual level, the return on investment should compute the value of increased labour market attachment and self-confidence in navigating the labour market; enhanced well-being and lower poverty risk.
* Support to the creation of local action plans has contributed to the expansion of locally initiated active labour market programmes.
* As part of an approach to continually adjust programmes to changing contexts, the NES should continue to pilot new assistance programmes, even if they might never take off, while ensuring that those programmes that do deliver measurable success are integrated into standard programmes.
* Strategies that combine institutional capacity building with demonstration programmes and services are more effective in responding to the needs of young people at risk of social exclusion. This is because national and local institutions require extensive support to target disadvantaged groups and to implement innovative measures. The use of coaching techniques as part of capacity building activities is particularly effective when piloting alternative service delivery models. The changes in practice implied in the implementation of the operational planning model, the implementation of the Rulebook on Activation and the complex set of changes incorporated in the implementation of the ISD system in coordination with other agencies and institutions goes well beyond participation in a ‘training programme’. The key to successful implementation of these changes within CSWs and NES branch offices is a concerted programme of on-going support that is much more in-depth than a training programme. For capacity to be built, as widely and as deeply as is required within CSWs and the NES, as well as Youth Offices and other local entities, the follow-up/ scaling-up programme should include both a clear, structured path to involvement of more agencies (and staff) in more municipalities/ districts and strengthening the knowledge, skills and attitudes of actors in current participating municipalities. One approach would be to make use of agency participants of the ISD piloting as leaders/ mentors in the follow-up/ scaling-up initiative, as ‘models of good practice’. The technical reports noted that entrusting local staff in the NES and CSWs was an effective approach – and further development of this approach is warranted.
* The participatory approach adopted, the constant involvement of stakeholders, partner institutions and other organisations ‒ as well as the subsequent extensive dialogue established amongst them ‒ yielded higher results in terms of impact and sustainability and improved policy coherence and coordination in the delivery of youth employment and social inclusion policy objectives.
* Clear targeting approaches facilitate the delivery of integrated services to the most vulnerable among the youth population. The establishment of clear and transparent criteria for the selection of young clients most in need of assistance allows segmenting of service delivery (from low to high intensity assistance) and to maximize the effect of resource-intensive treatment. The JP established primary and secondary eligibility criteria whereby case workers could easily identify for treatment those clients who, out of a large pool of potential beneficiaries, face multiple barriers to reintegration into mainstream society.
* Outreach practices are critical to involving discouraged youth living at the margin of society. Just making reintegration services available is not sufficient to ensure that young people most at risk actually take them up. This is particularly the case for young Roma individuals living in settlements or inter-generational beneficiaries of financial social assistance. The former are often unaware of their entitlements and of the social and employment services that would be available to them. The later are often discouraged youth who believe there is no way out from their current situation. Outreach services that envisage that caseworkers visit settlements and make house calls to offer available services and programmes are instrumental in increasing the participation of young people.
* Case management approaches are key to ensuring young clients receive all the support and services needed for reintegration into society. Case management approaches that build on a comprehensive needs assessment and clear action planning ensure client commitment to treatment, on the one hand, and the involvement of relevant service providers on the other. The JP was able to establish a procedure whereby practitioners in the NES and CSWs carried out an assessment of a young client’s case, and outlined an intervention sequence. Once the intervention sequence was agreed on by the client, and an individual service plan was drafted, the case manager could initiate the intervention. Professional and dedicated caseworkers are the most important component of a successful ISD system. Assistance to the most disadvantaged among the youth population is resource and time intensive and requires a high level of counselling and guidance skills as well as personal dedication. The measurement of performance of integrated services delivery at the end of the pilot phase revealed that caseworkers that invested more time in reaching out to young clients and in mentoring them during service delivery attained the best results in terms of service uptake and labour market integration.
* Further work is necessary in a number of areas of the ISD system, to improve the effectiveness of its functioning.
	+ There is a need for greater clarity on the definition of a ‘referral system’, and the specific nature of is functioning. This includes a clearer understanding of referrals in all directions, particularly where the ISD system includes more components than the NES and CSWs.
	+ There is a need for greater cohesion within the system of actions/ approaches between the NES and CSWs, ie operational procedures.
	+ There is a potentially greater formal involvement of Youth Offices in the ISD system. Such a development implies operational procedures across the YOs as well as the NES and CSWs, to ensure cohesiveness of approach. A greater coordination/ cooperation framework is also required, which has implications nationally (within the MoLSP, MoYS and the NES) and locally.
* Evidence-based policy and programme formulation should not fall within the exclusive mandate of national-level institutions. Assistance to local government institutions in identifying specific employment and social challenges is of the essence to support decentralization processes and make the delivery of national policy objectives responsive to the needs of people and communities. The advisory services provided by the Joint Programme, in strengthening local policy and programme development as well as in the design of client-oriented services, played a significant role in increasing and diversifying the assistance offered to the most vulnerable groups of the population.

**Recommendations**

* The Government of Serbia will soon be faced with the challenge to deliver on the objectives of the newly adopted employment and social inclusion framework that is aligned to the EU *acquis communitaire*. It is recommended that the Government of Serbia build on and expand the activities that were successfully piloted by the Joint Programme, in particular the integrated employment and social service delivery model, case management and operational planning approaches, as well as outreach services to engage the most vulnerable groups of the Serbian population. This would allow the policy, procedural and legislative changes brought about by the Joint programme to be permanently embedded in national and local institutional frameworks. The scaling up of integrated service delivery to other Municipalities and Districts in the country would provide an effective means to promote social inclusion and decrease poverty risks for disadvantaged individuals − and not only for the younger ones. The costs associated with such an investment would be offset in the medium to long term by savings accrued in public spending on social benefits, higher labour tax revenues and an expanded tax base. The involvement of other service providers, namely education and training institutions and municipal Youth Offices, would ensure an improvement in the range of services offered to individuals at risk and contribute to the attainment of the employment, social inclusion and lifelong learning principles pursued by Serbia in its accession to the European Union.
* The development of a follow-up Joint Programme would greatly improve the means available to national and local partners to deliver on the objectives of the employment and social inclusion policy framework. As well as the further strengthening of the Youth Employment Fund as a means to support the decentralization of employment and social inclusion programmes and the expansion of the integrated service delivery system, for which specific recommendations are formulated below, the follow-up technical assistance package should focus on:
	+ The formulation of the national Social Protection Strategy and Action Plan to guide the development of the social welfare system, its standards and services as well as operationalize the reforms introduced by the Law on Social Protection.
	+ The mainstreaming of case management and outreach practices in the provision of employment and social services to disadvantaged population groups throughout the country. Further strengthening of the capacity of NES and CSW caseworkers in the provision of individualized services would be instrumental to the completion of the reform process, while the inclusion of early school leaving and second chance education measures would extend the scope and range of service delivery.
	+ The extension of annual operational planning to all CSWs and capacity building to manage operational planning mechanisms.
	+ A more extensive use of administrative and survey data for policy and programme design, monitoring and evaluation accompanied by capacity building of national and local users and producers. In particular, more work is required to increase the frequency of labour demand data collection and analysis, to promote the use of municipal DevInfo databases; and on labour migration indicators.
* It is recommended that the integrated service delivery system piloted by the Joint Programme be further developed and expanded based on the lessons that were learnt during its piloting phase. Such work would include:
	+ The development of implementing regulations to apply the model throughout the country.
	+ A reformulation of the operational procedures to include other service providers such as education and training institutions and the Youth Offices.
	+ Inclusion of activation services and programmes targeting recipients of social welfare benefits in the National Cooperation Protocol and the Partnership Agreements.
* It is recommended that the Government of Serbia take action to formalize the operations of the Youth Employment Fund as a means to ensure that the priority assigned to youth employment in the national employment framework delivers concrete and measurable results. The National Employment Action Plan for 2012 specifically channels budgetary resources to the Youth Employment Fund for the implementation of programmes targeting disadvantaged youth, but the resources invested in many other employment-related interventions − implemented by various government agencies – are not passing through this financial mechanism. As a result, the performance of these interventions, and the impact they have on youth employment goes undetected and unrecorded, undermining efforts to develop a comprehensive understanding of the level of national commitment to youth employment. The experience of the Joint Programme is that it is possible to ensure a high degree of transparency and accountability in Fund management with a minimum of resource investment.
* The Joint Programme allowed local employment offices to decide the mix and sequence of active labour market programmes to be delivered, and specific resource allocations according to individual characteristics. This was critical to the success of the direct assistance component of the Joint Programme. It is recommended that the Government of Serbia encourage the further extension of this model of decentralized management of employment services and programmes. Stronger promotion and linkage to local actors will significantly increase the numbers of participants from target groups, and implementation of an intensive promotion and outreach campaign for the YEF at the local levels is recommended. Additionally, the practice of trialling employment programmes before they are scaled-up should become a regular activity of the National Employment Service. The experience of the Joint Programme demonstrated that not all offered employment services and programmes attract the interest of private sector enterprises, or respond fully to the needs of individual beneficiaries.

# Background And Rationale

Since May 2009, the International Labour Office (ILO), the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) have been providing technical assistance to the Government of Serbia through the Joint Programme (JP) *Support To National Efforts For The Promotion Of Youth Employment And Management Of Migration*. The Joint Programme was co-financed by the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F) and the Government of Serbia with contributions of US$6.1 million and US$1.9 million, respectively.

|  |
| --- |
| **Box 1: The Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund**The Government of Spain and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) signed at the end of 2006 a partnership agreement, the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F), aimed at advancing the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals through the United Nations System. The MDG-F operates at national level through the UN Country Team to increase the coherence and effectiveness of UN development interventions. The MDG-F uses joint programming as modality of intervention, reflecting eight thematic windows. The Youth, Employment and Migration (YEM) window, launched in August 2007, supported 14 joint programmes across the world with an allocation of US$80 million. The priorities of the YEM window envisaged that joint programmes at country level should strive to: * Assign priority to youth employment in national development plans and frameworks;
* Identify, develop and implement measures to help young people access and remain in the labour market, including interventions to address the impact of internal and external migration on youth; and
* Strengthen institutional capacity to effectively deliver employment, youth and migration interventions, including improved coordination and policy coherence.

The MDG-F pursues a results-oriented monitoring and evaluation approach to measure the overall impact of joint programmes. Such strategy – grounded on the principles and standards of the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) and the OEDC Development Assistance Committee− builds on the information needs and interests of the different stakeholders while striking a balance between their accountability and learning purposes. *Source*: MDG Achievement Fund, *Joint Programme approval process,* at <http://www.mdgfund.org/page/ourprogrammes> |

The aim of the Joint Programme was to address the youth employment and migration challenges of Serbia by combining employment and social policy objectives and integrating them into long-term national development goals. The direct recipients were decision-makers and staff of the Ministry of Economy and Regional Development (MoERD), the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy (MoLSP), the Ministry of Youth and Sport (MoYS), the Ministry of Human and Minority Rights (MoHMR), the National Employment Service (NES), Centres for Social Work (CSWs); the Republic Statistical Office (RSO), social partners (staff of employers’ and workers’ organisations), as well as the local authorities of the Districts of South Backa, Belgrade and Pcinjski. The ultimate beneficiaries were disadvantaged young women and men (15 to 30 years old) in the 35 municipalities of the three target Districts, areas highly affected by unemployment and poverty and expected to be the resettlement destination of many returnees.

The Joint Programme Document for Serbia was approved by the MDG-F in April 2009 and it became operational in May 2009. The initial duration of thirty months was extended by the MDG-F at no additional cost. The lead government counterpart during Joint Programme implementation was the Employment Department of the Ministry of Economy and Regional Development (MoERD), while the lead among participating Agencies was taken by the IOM.

At the national level, the UN Resident Coordinator, the Spanish Government and the Serbian Government representatives formed a National Steering Committee (NSC) tasked with overseeing all activities. A Programme Management Committee (PMC) – comprised of representatives of partner Ministries and Agencies – was responsible to monitor and provide operational guidance and coordination. A Programme Implementation Unit (PIU) was appointed to provide technical inputs and backstopping. The PIU team comprised a Programme Manager and a National Technical Team staffed with five experts appointed by participating United Nations Agencies. The areas of expertise of these national experts included employment policy and programme development, social policy, youth development policy and child protection.

# Description Of The YEM Joint Programme In Serbia

The transition to a market economy, years of conflict and economic downturn worsened the situation of many young people in Serbia. Approximately 500,000 youth left the country from 1991 to 2001 in search of better livelihoods, while hundreds of thousands of refugees and displaced persons exerted dramatic pressure on the country’s labour market. Compared to adults, young people experienced lower employment (18.7 per cent and 51.7 per cent in 2007, respectively), higher informality (63.2 per cent compared to an overall rate of 43.3 per cent) and higher unemployment (43.7 per cent and 18.8 per cent, respectively). Labour statistics reported that certain young people were more disadvantaged than others. National origin, gender, educational level, geographical location and disability strongly affected youth employment outcomes. The transition to decent work remained difficult for youth with low levels of education, especially for those living in less developed regions and in rural areas. Poverty in the country had a pronounced regional dimension, with the poverty index ranging from 3 per cent in the urban area of Belgrade up to 18.7 per cent in the rural areas of South-East Serbia.

The absence of decent work opportunities and the hope of a better future were the main factors pushing youth to migrate internally and abroad. The Readmission Agreement signed by Serbia and the European Union in 2007 estimated that between 100,000 to 150,000 individuals would return to the country, with more than 40 per cent of these expected to settle in the districts of Pcinjski, South Backa and Belgrade.

Notwithstanding the positive growth trends experienced by Serbia in the early 2000s, the economy continued to face low employment intensity, with young labour market entrants particularly affected. Despite considerable efforts, many interventions for youth employment continued to be focused on increasing the number of jobs with little attention paid to addressing the poor working conditions affecting many young workers. The main problems identified during the formulation of the joint programme were: the fragmentation of policy interventions, with little synergies across the various government agencies and actors; the little attention paid to addressing the needs of young people facing multiple barriers to labour market entry and a strong push to migrate both internally and abroad; the narrow scope of youth employment interventions, often focused either on labour demand or labour supply measures; the lack of coordination among the institutions entrusted to provide of social inclusion services; and limited monitoring and evaluation that did not allow implementing evidence-based policies nor the targeting of public services to those most in need of assistance.

Against this backdrop, the Joint Programme was designed to contribute to the overall development of the country and to assist national institutions to deliver on the policy objectives established on poverty reduction, economic and regional development, employment and social inclusion, human capital development and protection of vulnerable groups.[[1]](#footnote-1) The design of the Joint Programme built on the knowledge, experience and lessons learnt by the UN participating agencies and national institutions on youth employment and migration (Box 2).

|  |
| --- |
| **Box 2: Main Lessons Learned Embedded In The Design Of The Serbian Joint Programme*** The formulation and implementation of youth employment and migration policies are of the essence to address the youth employment challenge in Serbia. It is equally important that youth employment and migration targets be part of national development frameworks and plans;
* Policies aimed at improving employment prospects of young people should have a wider scope, while programmes need to be targeted to those who are more disadvantaged in the labour market, especially youth with low educational and training levels and young people living in rural areas. Employment measures aimed at addressing the multiple layers of disadvantage faced by many young people need to be offered as a comprehensive package of employment and social services informed by regular monitoring and evaluation exercises that bring focus on what works for whom and why;
* Policy- and decision-makers need to take into consideration the risk factors associated with neglecting disadvantaged youth who are at risk of social exclusion and irregular migration;
* Representatives of local authorities, the social partners, civil society and the private sector have a better knowledge of the needs of both young people and the labour market. The empowerment and active participation of local stakeholders results in a more significant impact when implementing centralized funding mechanisms;
* Working with the returnee population requires a multi-faceted and integrated set of services to minimize the risks of re-migration.

*Source*: MDG-F Joint Programme Document 1929, Serbia |

The Joint Programme was designed with a three-pronged strategy touching upon *policies*, *institutions* and *programmes* vital to delivery of integrated employment and social services targeting disadvantaged young women and men exposed to migration, especially young returnees. It built on three, interlinked outcomes:

* Mainstreaming youth employment and migration policy objectives into national development strategies.
* Strengthening the capacity of national institutions to develop integrated labour market and social services.
* Implementing a package of programmes on employment and social services.

The Joint Programme was expected to:

* Improve knowledge and understanding of integrated policies and measures to tackle youth employment and migration.
* Make a more prominent focus on youth employment within national development frameworks.
* Develop a national policy on management of labour migration and an improved capacity of the Serbian government to tackle youth migration.
* Establish an inter-institutional system combining employment and social services for disadvantaged youth.
* Deploy a comprehensive package of gender-sensitive programmes in the realm of youth employment and social protection available at local level.
* Design a system for replicating and scaling-up pilot programmes country-wide.

The Joint Programme was aligned to the outcomes of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Serbia, namely “Sustainable development plans that effectively responds to the needs of people, communities and promote rural development” (Outcome 3.1) and “Improved network of employment services and strengthened employment promotion policies” (Outcome 3.7).

# Purpose And Methodology Of The Final Evaluation

The monitoring and evaluation rationale, detailed in the Joint Programme Document, envisaged that the ILO be assigned responsibility to coordinate the monitoring and evaluation of the Joint Programmein line with the *Monitoring and Evaluation Framework*. The Joint Programme team managed a range of monitoring and evaluation processes throughout the life of the programme to ensure the quality, relevance and effectiveness of the technical assistance provided to national partners. These processes included regular performance monitoring exercises focused on the technical aspects of the Joint Programme; a mid-term evaluation that appraised also management arrangement, synergies and coordination among implementing agencies; and a final summative evaluation.

The final evaluation of the Serbian Joint Programme was conducted in April 2012 and was informed by the findings of the field researches commissioned on youth employment policy and programme development, labour migration policy, the piloting of integrated employment and social services delivery, the improvement of the social services governance system, and assistance to youth development policy implementation. The evaluation was carried out under the guidance of the Evaluation Reference Group and in close coordination with the members of the YEM Joint Programme team.

Within the framework of the revised *Monitoring and Evaluation Framework,* the evaluation exercise reviewed the progress made in relation to the SMART outputs produced and assessed the overall performance of the Joint Programme, focusing particularly on its overall relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. In particular, the objective of the evaluation were to: i) measure the extent to which the Joint Programme contributed to solve the problems identified during the design phase; ii) appraise the quality of the outputs delivered; iii) identify the sustainability of interventions deployed towards the targeted population; and iv) assess the Joint Programme contribution to the priorities set by the YEM thematic window and the overall objectives of the MDG-F.

A pragmatic approach has been adopted for the evaluation based on both qualitative and quantitative methods. The following data sources and data collection methods were used in this regard:

* A comprehensive analysis of various sources of information. This comprised the desk review of survey data and Joint Programme files, including the Joint Programme Document, technical and policy papers produced by participating UN Agencies; work plans; progress reports and minutes of the Programme Management Committees’ meetings.
* The review of the technical monitoring reports compiled by national and international experts under each of the components of the Joint Programme (youth employment policy and programme development; management of migration; social protection, social assistance services and integrated service delivery; youth policy development and implementation).
* Interviews and meetings with governmental counterparts and Joint Programme partners, direct beneficiaries, participating UN Agencies, Joint Programme management and staff.

# Review Of Implementation

The Joint Programme rationale was based on the on a set of coordinated interventions that drew on the expertise of the participating UN agencies, as well as of national and local partners. The intervention built on the activities implemented by UNDP in the field of social services, youth and employment; by UNICEF on youth participation, formal and non-formal education and child protection; by the IOM on supporting voluntary returns and returnee reintegration, especially of Roma population groups; and by the ILO on the development of a youth employment action plan and programmes targeting disadvantaged youth, employment promotion policy and strategies promoting labour market integration of socially-excluded individuals.

The main activities implemented by the Joint Programme are summarized under three headings, reflecting the Joint Programme’s Outcomes:

* Integration of youth employment and migration policy objectives into national development strategies.
* Strengthening the capacity of national institutions to develop integrated labour market and social services.
* Implement a package of programmes on employment and social services.

As discussed, the appraisal of the technical content of the Joint Programme was informed by expert reviews that are available separately.[[2]](#footnote-2) A synopsis of the achievements of the Joint Programme is appended as Annex I.

## Youth employment and migration policy objectives are included in national development frameworks (Outcome 1)

The Joint Programme improved the range, scope and quality of labour market, migration and social protection statistics that are now being used by the national and local institutions in the formulation of evidence-based policies and programmes, as well as for the delivery of public services. Within its strategic framework, the JP has provided assistance to the Government of Serbia in terms of youth employment and migration policy objectives. This assistance has helped improve knowledge about youth employment (with the use of youth employment indicators) and therefore policies related to youth employment, helped in designing and implementing programmes directly relevant to improving the employment prospects for young people, and did this while improving the capacity of institutions (national and local) to respond to indicated need through programme initiatives and improved service approaches.

The JP has contributed to improvements in the quality and quantity of change taking place in the systems for gathering and using data that can and are being used effectively by the Government of Serbia (Ministries and Institutions) in developing effective policy and programme responses. This change that will assist Government in moving in the right policy and procedural directions.

Work, and outputs, in relation to the knowledge base on youth employment and migration has been a highlight of the JP. In brief, three points are most critical:

* The work has been of a high quality, as has been the participation of institutions such as the RSO.
* The foundation has been laid (and in many cases much more than a foundation has been built) for the future use of this work.
* The Government of Serbia (through it Ministries and institutions) is making use of the data, and the systems from which the data is drawn, in informing its work on national strategies and action plans.

JP activities assisted Government in improving its knowledge on labour market trends, and the capturing of these trends with labour market statistics. The work of the JP has impacted on the quality of the LFS (both expansion of the range of data collected and the structure of the LFS itself), the Skills and Occupation Survey (broadened as part of the JP to inform the MERD’s skill needs anticipation system), and the KILM time-series (including integration of youth labour market indicators). As well, pre-2008 LFS data has been adjusted in order that the 2004 – 2011 KILM reflects consistent data and analysis, which has allowed a better understanding of trends.

This work also contributed to development of the National Employment Strategy. Use of the five youth employment indicators, which will be continually monitored (youth activity ratio, youth employment ratio, youth unemployment ratio, number of youth included in active labour market programmes of the NES and number of youth employed through NES mediation and assistance) provide significantly better data on youth employment trends. As a result, the LFS demonstrated more significant downward trends in youth employment over the period 2004-2011 than had been understood, and the National Employment Strategy was drafted to respond more effectively to this trend.

Within this framework, MERD has included six, measurable, youth employment targets in the National Employment Strategy 2011-2020. The targets, examples of data being used to inform policy, are:

* Youth activity rate - 30.7%.
* Youth employment rate - 23.3%.
* Youth unemployment rate - 24%.
* Ratio of youth unemployment rate to general unemployment rate - 2.1:1.
* Youth (15-19) participation in education - 90%.
* Youth (20-24) participation in education - 40%.

Improvements in the knowledge base have been significant, and these improvements are being used in framing policy and strategy at the national level. Policy inputs have been made, and strategies influenced, and funds were provided within budgets to address youth employment targets - In 2011, some €66 million were allocated to ALMPs compared to €40 million in the previous year, an increase of some 60%. However, there are budgetary pressures on these funds (ALMPs have been cut in the 2012 budget). It remains to be seen what will happen in the medium term.

Interlinking the national and local level was work done with the Institute for Social Protection on social protection standards, in line with the *Law on Social Protection* and EU standards, and tied to the work of CSWs. The developed social protection indicators are a regular feature of the monitoring and reporting system of the social welfare system. Refinements to the DevInfo database (both completed and on-going), by a team of internal and external consultants, including the RSO, through a consultation process, interviews and focus groups, with national and local institutions in the social protection field, will have long-lasting impact on policy development as availability of quality data is used in formulating policy directions.

Work is still required in this area for the changes that have been initiated to become entrenched. The changes are in two key areas:

* Issues remain at both the national and local levels as to who is supposed to analyse data.
* Capacity is being built at both the national and local levels in the use of data, but further development of capacity in the analysis and use of data is of critical importance. This is not a question of ‘training’, but of in-depth support to build a set of skills in order to the data, and to produce a set of reports that inform.

The JP has directly contributed to the development of labour migration management policy through a White Paper, which influenced the development of the National Employment Strategy and will be used extensively by Government in preparing its *Action Plan on Migration Management*. The design and priorities of the CBBM Project, an IPA-funded initiative in migration management, was significantly influenced by the White Paper. The White Paper drew on the JP’s 13 migration indicators, gathering them into six groups and proposing them for monitoring on a regular basis.

The indicators, and their groupings are as follows:

* Identifying mismatches between labour supply and demand in the domestic market:
	+ Unemployed population by age, qualifications and regions/municipalities.
	+ Available vacancies (current and foreseen) by economic sector, qualifications and age requirements, and regions/municipalities.
* Addressing brain-circulation:
	+ Tertiary students studying abroad by country of destination.
	+ Highly qualified returning population by age and regions/municipalities.
	+ Number of persons registered in the database of the Ministry of Science and Technological Development.
* Monitoring return:
	+ Returning nationals by education and professional qualifications, employment structure.
* Labour migrants abroad:
	+ Valid work permits in the EU, Switzerland and Norway by sphere and other destination countries.
	+ Serbian citizens employed abroad within the international agreements.
* Labour migrants in Serbia:
	+ Foreigners received work permits in Serbia by type of permit, citizenship, gender.
	+ Foreigners received residence permit by type of permit, gender, citizenship.
	+ Number of businesses employing foreigners by economic sector and number of foreigners employed.
* Inclusion:
	+ Persons from the “hard to employ” migration affected part of the population participated in the active labour market measures.
	+ Persons from “hard to employ” migration affected population registered as unemployed with the NES.[[3]](#footnote-3)

### Summary of the Outcome and Outputs

In summary, this Outcome (Youth employment and migration policy objectives are included in the national development strategy) has been achieved.

#### Output 1.1 – Knowledge base on youth employment and migration improved to inform national development strategy and action plans.

This Output has been fully achieved.

The knowledge base on youth employment and migration has been improved, in the immediate term and for future deliberations, and, this improved knowledge base has been used and is currently being used to inform Government in terms of policy, strategy and action planning.

#### Output 1.2 – Policy on management of labour migration, including returns of young Serbians, developed and linked to employment policy and strategies.

This Output has been partially achieved.

The developed White Paper provides the necessary framework for inclusion of youth migration targets in national development strategies, but this has not happened as yet.

#### Output 1.3 – Youth employment and migration targets included in national development strategy.

This Output has been fully achieved.

Following from improvements in the knowledge base on youth employment and migration, the Government has made use of this knowledge in developing national development strategies, including the National Employment Strategy and a number of related strategic measures.

## National institutions develop integrated labour market and social services that meet employment and migration policy objectives targeting disadvantaged young women and men (Outcome 2)

This Outcome was grounded on the establishment of a system integrating labour market, migration and social services; strengthening the capacity of the National Employment Service, the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy and the Ministry of Youth and Sport to deliver targeted youth employment and social services; and the setting up of a long-term national financial mechanism to implement employment measures targeting disadvantaged youth.

The work under this Outcome was guided by a research on existing good practices on integrated employment and social protection services in Serbia and in Europe, as well as the knowledge gained during a fellowship to the United Kingdom where practices of integrated service delivery were examined. The inter-ministerial working group − established under the aegis of the Joint Programme − developed a set of *Operational Procedures* for the delivery of integrated services to disadvantaged youth and selected the municipalities for the piloting of the model agreed upon in the Districts of South Backa, Belgrade and Pcinjski.[[4]](#footnote-4) Recognizing the importance of activation services for the employment prospects of CSW clients, a research was commissioned to map their current labour market status and activation level. The data gathered served as a baseline to monitor the outcomes of the new law on *Social Protection* and to develop implementing regulations on activation, welfare-to-work programmes and advance case management approaches.

The piloting of the integrated service delivery model was also informed by the functional assessment of the public employment services geared to identify areas of improvement in the provision of services and programmes to clients. Since early 2011, nearly 300 young men and women (long term unemployed, beneficiaries of different social services and Roma population groups) were referred from the CSW to the NES and *vice versa*. Of these, 242 individuals benefitted from the employment promotion programmes implemented under the aegis of the Joint Programme.

A performance monitoring system to measure both progress and gross impact indicators of these youth employment measures was established with the assistance of the Joint Programme. The monitoring system comprised:

* Collection and analysis of administrative figures on young beneficiaries (by a number of individual characteristics such as age, sex, level of education, length of unemployment spell and any other factor constituting a barrier to labour market entry) and service providers (training institutions, state and private enterprises, civil society organizations).
* The calculation of employment and earnings levels at programme’s end (through both administrative and survey data).
* The benchmarking of employment and earning figures by type of programme, individual characteristics and geographical location.

Information technology software was designed and attached to the NES *Unified Information System* to compute the total cost per individual beneficiary. This system is now applied to all programmes offered through the public employment services.

Finally, at the request of the lead national counterpart, assistance on public-private partnerships was shifted to advisory services to develop a framework for the promotion of social enterprises. Such work included the review of the legal framework with recommendations on amendments needed, as well as a guide on how to establish and manage a social enterprise under the prevailing legislation. Twelve social enterprises received tailored business support services and, as a result, improved their performance in sales, marketing, finance management and human resource development. Based on the recommendations formulated in the review of legislation and the lessons learnt during the deployment of business development services , the Government drafted a law on social cooperatives.

It is worth emphasising here the *structural nature* and potential long-term significance in terms of the Outputs within this Outcome:

* The ISD system (including its further development, which is a matter of high priority).
* The capacity building within Institutions (particularly support processes in developing new knowledge, skills and attitudes – ie not ‘training’).
* Operational planning. The work on operational planning has changed the way CSWs function, and is demonstrably improving the service approach to clients.
* ALMPs such as the YEF within budgetary frameworks.

It was intended that the JP would assist Serbia in establishing a coordinated and multi-sector system for the delivery of services to youth, and system which would address the social exclusion of disadvantaged youth as a result of low education and poor levels of employment. The system would include not just the coordination of services across social assistance and employment services, but would also include programmes of training and work activation. This integrated service delivery system has been envisaged and designed, and a wide range of experience and lessons have been learned that will enable a fully scaled-up system to operate effectively across Serbia, should such a direction be determined. The ISD system was piloted, and a number of important, even significant changes have begun as a result. The JP has changed the way target institutions operate in this area, based on knowledge building as a critical component of design and implementation.

The work of the JP focused on improvements of cooperation between CSWs and the NES, as a way of improving servicing to disadvantaged youth – improving their employability. The piloted ISD system focused in this area, on the mentioned coordination/ cooperation between CSWs and the NES, as well as introducing a new workflow system that would direct the servicing of youth in the most appropriate directions.

There is no question that capacities within the target groups has been strengthened, particularly structurally, ie at a policy and procedural level. Within the ISD system, case management and operational planning approaches have been initiated and CSW/ NES staff trained and prepared in working within these approaches.

The longer-term potential is in how approaches to service delivery have changed, and can continue to change, where mid-term support and direction continues. There is an implied and critical set of priorities for future development and implementation of the ISD system. The ultimate success of the ISD system requires five issues to be addressed, all based on a policy/ planning decision to scale-up the changes beyond the pilot municipalities and related work on accessing the necessary funding to implement the changes in the medium and long term:

* Implementation of the By-law on Activation will require significant further support if it is to be effective. This further support includes more training, more on-going support and a conscious focus on sharing of best practice across CSWs.
* The work on operational planning has been excellent, and is actually happening, ie planning is actually looking at how improvements can be made in the delivery of what CSWs actually do. How does this work get extended to CSWs that did not participate in the pilot?
* How effective was the actual piloting, and how can its effectiveness be improved, and the system scaled-up? Feedback from the field would indicate that the training was not as effective as it could have been, notably in terms of type and consistency of participation – there needs to be a much clearer link between ‘training’ and the building of capacity necessary within the CSWs and NES offices to deliver an effective ISD system. While the ISD was designed to pilot cooperation around referral, to a certain large extent it piloted cooperation around exchange of information, an area that would require addressing in any scaling-up.
* Case management was not a significant component of the project design, but it was a more than successful component of the work of the JP in this outcome area. Further successful application of case management by staff working in CSWs is a precondition for successful implementation of the ISD system, and the question is to what extent are CSWs successfully applying case management currently, and how its successful integration into CSW work systems can be extended and strengthened.
* Youth Offices. In the context of the JP, and the integrated nature of the work and initiatives of the JP, the question has been asked about the potential role Youth Offices can play in a ISD system. Can Youth Offices play a formal role in ISD, making referrals to the NES or CSWs, or indeed having referrals made to then?

These issues are at the heart of JP outcomes in this area, and as can be seen, the five issues are inter-linked. Indicatively, further work is needed, and is desirable, particularly if the ISD system is to be effectively scaled-up. It is the view of the evaluator that the brief discussion on the points above is only an opening of discussions that are necessary to further understand the significance of the ISD approach and to work on improvements in its design and implementation. Further, on the basis of the technical reports, there is a strong argument for seeking the resources and commitment necessary to scale-up the ISD system nationally, if not immediately, then in the mid-term. Arguably, the first step would be to take on board the questions and issues that have been raised and develop a project initiative for scaling-up that is designed in light of the experiences and lessons learned from the YEM JP.

### Summary of the Outcome and Outputs

In summary, this outcome (National institutions develop integrated labour market and social services that meet employment and migration policy objectives targeting disadvantaged young women and men) has been achieved, particularly given the focus on *developing* the integrated services. As will be seen within the discussions at Outcome 3, the next steps in development of the services are critical.

#### Output 2.1. A system integrating labour market, migration and social services for youth established and functioning.

This Output has been fully achieved.

An integrated service delivery system has indeed been piloted. The ISD system was appropriately researched, had support/ direction in its development from MERD, MoLSP, the Ministry of Education, MYS, the NES and the ISP. A set of Operational Procedures has been developed. The basis is there – a strong, well conceived framework and operational system has been established, and piloting work undertaken.

#### Output 2.2. The capacity of the National Employment Service, the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy and the Ministry of Youth and Sport to deliver targeted youth employment and social services strengthened.

This Output has been achieved to a large extent.

The capacity of the three target groups has been strengthened – on a structural level more than on the individual level. The capacity improvement are directly related to the ISD system. However, more work is required, including procedural improvements, improvements in the actual skills of staff, and a policy decision to scale up the changes beyond the pilot municipalities.

#### Output 2.3. A long-term national financial mechanism to implement employment measures targeting disadvantaged youth established and implemented.

This Output has been fully achieved.

The YEF has been one of the most effective, most relevant outputs of the JP, in both direct initiatives (employment of young, disadvantaged youth) and in the medium and longer term (establishing a policy and programme framework of active labour market initiatives). Models for YEF sustainability (funding and institutional framework) are critical. To support Serbian labour market institutions in the provision of a comprehensive package of services targeting both labour demand and supply, the Joint Programme co-financed with the MoERD a Youth Employment Fund (YEF). By March 2012, the Joint Programme contribution of US$ 1.9 million was matched by US$ 1.7 million provided by the Government of Serbia. During implementation, several models to assure the sustainability of the YEF were presented to the Government for consideration (independent government agency, specialized Department attached to a ministry or set of dedicated budget lines under the control of the institutions responsible for employment promotion).

In the period from September 2009 to April 2012, the resources provided by the Joint Programme to the YEF allowed the treatment 2,682 young individuals in Belgrade, Novi Sad, Nis, Jagodina and Vranje (51.4 per cent young men and 48.6 per cent young women). Over two thirds of young beneficiaries (69.5 per cent) participated to on-the-job training programmes organized in private sector enterprises; self-employment programmes were taken up by 6.7 per cent of young beneficiaries, while 23.7 per cent benefitted from work placement schemes. Over 4.5 per cent of participants were young persons with disabilities. The contribution made by the Government to the YEF allowed the targeting of additional 1,478 young men and women (11.4 per cent participated to labour market training, 54 per cent benefitted to work placement schemes and 34.6 per cent to self-employment programmes).

## Integrated employment programmes and social services targeting young returnees and other disadvantaged young women and men implemented in three target districts (Outcome 3)

The work under this Outcome focused on the strengthening of local partnership for youth employment; the implementation of integrated packages of active labour market measures financed by the Youth Employment Fund and on raising awareness on the availability of local services and the risks of irregular migration.

Support activities targeted 28 local policy councils and ranged from capacity building to prioritize groups for inclusion into employment promotion programmes at the local level to the development of *Guidelines For The Development Of Local Employment Action Plans.* As a result, 22 municipalities were successful in accessing the financial resources made available by the Serbian Government, on a competitive basis, for the implementation of local employment initiatives. [[5]](#footnote-5) Funding decisions are based on local employment action plans, with interventions constructed on a situation analysis of local labour markets and clear targeting approaches. The Joint Programme assisted local beneficiaries in prioritising their interventions towards population groups at risk of labour market exclusion (young Roma, refugees, young people with disabilities, young members of households on social assistance). In addition, six local policy councils received support to conduct a labour market situation analysis, analyse problems and profile population groups at risk of exclusion.

The DevInfo database was further developed to allow the use of local data sources to inform policy discussion and planning. As part of this work, the capacity of representatives of local government, Youth Offices and CSWs was built to use local data for policy-making purposes, as well as for monitoring and evaluation. Sectoral working groups were formed to decide on the indicators to be included in the database.

Seventeen Youth Offices were assisted by the Joint Programme to develop and deliver services targeting disadvantaged youth through InfoPoints. The initiatives targeting Youth Offices included significant inputs to developing their capacity and, in particular, to assist local institutions and municipalities in the formulation of youth policies and programmes. Mentoring approaches were deployed to provide long-term support and assistance to Youth Offices in developing their knowledge and skills. As a result, these Youth Offices demonstrated an enhanced capacity to contribute to the coordination of youth activities at the local level, including with education and training institutions, the NES and CSWs.

Although not included in its design, the Joint Programme provided assistance to build the capacity of CSWs in the implementation of a case management approach envisaged by the *Rulebook On The Organisation, Normative Provisions And Standards Of Work In The CSWs*, introduced by the MoLSP in 2008. This was a key to the support of social protection approaches and to improve the effectiveness of CSW functions.

The Youth Employment Fund – as a means for channelling financial resources to achieve youth employment and social inclusion policy objectives − provided a model for the design and implementation of active labour market measures that respond to the needs of individuals and of the labour market that are evidence-based. The Fund was also instrumental in:

* Decentralising programme design and implementation, with the involvement of local communities.
* Increasing the transparency and efficiency of employment and social service delivery.
* Demonstrating that effective partnerships can be built among central and local governance structures, the donor community and the private sector.

The active labour market programmes piloted by the Joint Programme targeted young men and women 15 to 30 years old, with low levels of education and long unemployment spells (considered ‘hard-to-place’ due to their personal and household characteristics – e.g. at risk of social exclusion). Employment services and programmes were sequenced to individual needs and envisaged the possibility of young beneficiaries being exposed to multiple interventions according to the specific disadvantages faced in entering the labour market. The type of programmes offered included: intensive and individualized counselling and guidance, including job search training; labour market training (on- and off-the-job); and work placement schemes (work training contracts, work trials and employment subsidies). Additional measures were offered to young persons with disabilities, namely adaptation of work premises and/ or work stations; wage subsidies; and grants for single parents and transport to reach training/ work premises. Also, relaxed entry criteria and the possibility of longer programme duration were envisaged for the most disadvantaged among the youth population, such as young Roma individuals and youth with disabilities.

The performance of the active labour market measures supported by the Joint Programme through the Youth Employment Fund was measured in February 2012 and benchmarked against the performance of regular employment service programmes. The main findings of this performance monitoring are summarized in Box 3.

### Summary of the Outcome and Outputs

In summary, this Outcome (Integrated employment programmes and social services targeting young returnees and other disadvantaged young women and men implemented in three target districts) has been achieved.

#### Output 3.1. Local partnerships for youth employment strengthened to coordinate implementation of employment programmes that are linked to social services.

This Output has been achieved.

It is the view of the evaluator that the work done in relation to this Output has been good, and important, but it is not done, and there is significant potential for further developments in this area.

#### Output 3.2. Integrated packages of active labour market measures implemented through the financing of the Youth Employment Fund in the target districts.

This Output has been achieved, and was a critical component of the success of the JP.

The YEF models an effective, targeted approach to ALMPs that can, and, it is anticipated will, be implemented into the future by the Government of Serbia. Arandarenko’s detailed analysis provides strong support to continuation of the initiative.

#### Output 3.3. Youth awareness raised on existing local services as well as on risks of irregular migration.

This Output has been achieved to a certain extent.

An information package (*Right to know Guide*) was developed and distributed to raise awareness on existing local services. Information activities on the risk of irregular migration took the form of an internet-based game (*Life not for sale*).

|  |
| --- |
| **Box 3: Performance monitoring of active labour market programmes targeting disadvantaged youth** By February 2012 approximately 2,680 youth had participated to the measures financed by the Youth Employment Fund (51.4 per cent young men and 48.6 per cent young women). Of these, 242 young individuals were targeted by integrated service delivery (piloted in the branch offices of Novi Sad and Vranje and specifically in the municipalities of Novi Sad, Backi Petrovac, Becej, Vranje and Vladicin Han). The figures on participants show a similar distribution of between the age group 20-24 and 25-30 old (around 41 per cent), with more young women in the older cohort participating to available measures compared to men (44.8 per cent and 56.7 per cent, respectively). Teen-agers represented 17.6 per cent of total programme entrants. Over 89 per cent of participants had primary education or less and 64.8 per cent were long term unemployed (one year and longer) at the time of entry. Youth belonging to Roma population groups represented 18.7 per cent of total programme entrants (nearly two thirds of whom were young men), while the share of young entrants with disabilities was 7.2 per cent of total participants. The monitoring of performance, conducted six months after programme’s end, found a placement rate of 25.4 per cent (compared to a follow up rate of 41.6 per cent for regular NES programmes). The better employment performance found for beneficiaries of regular NES programmes is due to their individual characteristics, e.g. NES programme entrants were better educated, had shorter unemployment spells and lower barriers to labour market entry. The figures disaggregated by individual measure offered by the Joint Programme revealed that self-employment was the intervention yielding the higher employment outcomes (with 76 per cent of participants employed at any time and 40 per cent still self-employed six month after the programme’s end), while institution-based training was the least successful (10 per cent). On the job training scored somewhere in the middle range (35.5 per cent). In terms of current labour market status, however, institution-based training improved with time, with an employment rate of 20 per cent, while on-the-job training gains decreased as time passed (to 24 per cent). Average cost per entrant showed that the Joint Programme measures were more costly (US$ 1,780 per beneficiary) compared to NES regular programmes (US$ 1,184). This is due to both the type of measures offered by the Joint Programme and their design. First, training programmes envisages that participants receive a monthly allowance (calculated as a percentage of the unemployment benefit) throughout the duration of the measure. A training grant is also paid to the service provider (be it a training provider or a private enterprise) on the basis of the number of individuals trained. The programme for persons with disability was the most expensive as it combines a number of programmes: first training (off or on the job), then the enterprise recruiting the young person with disability was provided with a wage subsidy as well as lump sum grants to ease the access of workers with disabilities to the enterprise premises and to the equipment needed for performing the tasks of the job. To ease the participation of young people facing mobility issues and care responsibilities transport and child care grants were also devised by the Joint Programme, which increases the cost per individual treated. The main differences between the programmes offered by the NES and those piloted under the Joint Programme relate to the type of jobs participants gained after the measure and the quality of the training provided. This is evidenced by the fact that: i) over a third of Joint Programme participants worked in the manufacturing sectors, with lower entry wages but higher job tenure, ii) over two thirds worked in the occupation of training, iii) over 60 per cent worked for the same enterprise that provided the training, and iv) 70 per cent used the skills learnt during the programme in their current job. Conversely, less than 23 per cent of NES participants worked in the occupation of training and just over 40 per cent used the skills learnt in their current job. Over two thirds of NES participants, in addition, worked in the service sector that is characterized by higher earnings at entry, but also higher staff turnover. The dispersion of employment in the informal economy was high for both sets of measures (18.9 per cent for Joint Programme participants and 13.6 for NES regular programmes), but lower than the informality rate among low educated young workers detected by the Labour Force Survey (28.5 per cent of all young workers). *Source*: V. Corbanese *Performance monitoring of active labour market programmes targeting youth*, Belgrade 2012 |

# Presentation Of Findings

This section of the report analyses the key aspects of the Joint Programme in terms of relevance, validity of design, impact orientation and sustainability.

## Relevance and strategic fit

The Joint Programme was developed through a robust participatory process involving participating UN agencies and national partners. The design process ensured that the external context, including a thorough analysis of the problems to be addressed and the country strategic priorities, was well understood. This contributed to an effective development of the design logic.

The Joint Programme was relevant at the time of design and it was able to maintain such relevance throughout the ensuing three years, through a flexible approach to implementation and close cooperation between national partners and implementing UN Agencies. This later point was explored in detail during the evaluation process to understand to which extent the Joint Programme had been able to respond effectively to external changes. Feedback was consistently strong that effective adjustments were made to maintain the strategic fit of the Joint Programme to national priorities. For instance, it was noted that the public-private partnership focus was changed to assistance to set up a governance system for social enterprises and cooperatives and that support was provided − at the request of the MoSP − to the drafting of by-laws on the activation of social benefit recipients within the 2011 *Law on Social Welfare*.

The Joint Programme benefited from the high level of commitment of national partners, which ensured that the interventions deployed responded to the development challenges faced by the country. This level of participation can be attributed, to a large extent, to the establishment of an open dialogue between national partners and participating UN agencies in the design, implementation and monitoring of the Programme. A number of examples were provided by national partners on the relevance of the Joint programme. Chief among these were the Youth Employment Fund (YEF), the integrated service delivery system, the work on indicators as a tool for evidence-based policy-making and the institutional changes advanced in the CSWs. These latter, in particular, revolved around:

* Casework methods, which were part of the social service workflow system according to the *Rulebook On The Organisation, Normative Provisions And Standards Of Work In CSWs*, but had not been used previously. This strand of activities, although not specifically planned during the Joint Programme design, was remarked by national partners as particularly relevant to effect changes in the CSWs service delivery work and the overall success of client-oriented approaches; and
* The effectiveness of activities on operational planning as a means to improve the overall workflow of CSWs.

This Joint Programme is a good example of joint programming. Although management processes were not the main focus of the final evaluation, it was noted that the joint delivery process worked effectively thanks to three key factors. First, the strong design logic of the Joint Programme, with clear linkages between activities, outputs and outcomes and clearly defined UN agency responsibility within output areas. Second, the strong leadership of national partners in design and implementation and the ownership taken on the related changes. Finally, the strong commitment of some key actors of UN participating Agencies to drive the Joint programme and add value to the change processes effected within national institutions.

## Validity of design

As a result of effective design –confirmed by the technical monitoring reports and the interviews with national partners and YEM team members − planned outputs and intended contributions to outcomes fully responded to the needs of national partners and added value to their planning processes. The revision work undertaken during implementation to improve the coherence of project logic was effective.

The one exception to this overall strength of design was found in Outcome 3, where there is a certain lack of coherence between activities, outputs and indicators. The design logic would have benefited from more output statements, especially with regard to *Output 3.1* (*Local partnerships for youth employment strengthened to coordinate implementation of employment programmes that are linked to social services).* This strand of work encompassed the DevInfo database; secondary eligibility criteria for employment programmes; action planning of local policy councils; the development of outreach services; annual operational planning in the CSWs; and a number of other initiatives. As designed, the logic becomes somewhat awkward and difficult to manage, in terms of the PIU’s ability to clearly see how their work delivered intended outputs and outcomes. Having said this, it has to be noted that the Joint Programme monitoring and evaluation system, which was of high quality and delivered in a strong professional way, did not refer to this weakness either during performance monitoring or mid-term appraisal. Hence, addressing this relatively small flaw would have been difficult. A revision could have added strength to the design by clarifying specific outputs and related activities and indicators. In any case, activities were implemented and outputs achieved to a significant extent.

It can be argued that there are some weaknesses either in the design or implementation of the integrated service delivery system. However, given the pilot nature of this set of activities– and the fact that they started from a nil baseline, it is likely that this could not be anticipated. In this context, it is more important to emphasize the many lessons learned through the piloting, which should be taken on board for a follow up programme and/or scaling-up of initiatives.

The Joint Programme was singular in its ability to contribute to the UNDAF outcomes for Serbia and to the priorities set by the YEM thematic window of the MDG-F. The Serbian Joint Programme specifically focused on, and was successful in:

* Assigning priority to youth employment in the national employment framework.
* Designing and implementing measures to help disadvantaged young men and women to enter the labour market.
* Strengthening institutional capacity to effectively deliver employment, youth and migration interventions, particularly through improved coordination and policy coherence.

## Impact orientation and sustainability

The review of findings under this evaluation criterion are organized around the key results that the Joint Programme was expected to achieve by its end, e.g. improved knowledge on youth employment and migration; more prominent focus to youth employment in national development frameworks; development of a national policy on the management of migration; inter-institutional system combining employment and social services; and comprehensive package of youth employment and social protection services.

### Improved knowledge and understanding of integrated policies and measures to tackle youth employment and migration

The achievement of this result went beyond expectations. The YEF establishes an important approach for the Government of Serbia: Arandarenko - ‘The practice of establishing employment funds is relatively new in the non-EU countries, although many attempts are being made to replicate mechanisms that are similar to the European Social Fund. The YEF allows the Government of Serbia, through the Ministry of Economy and Regional Development and the National Employment Service, to address the youth employment challenge.’[[6]](#footnote-6) There are several aspects of the work done on youth employment, migration and social protection indicators – at national and local level − that have particular significance for the alignment of national statistical programmes to EUROSTAT standards and, in the longer term, for the development of evidence-based policies. This latter is evidenced by the inclusion of several of the statistical indicators developed by the Joint Programme into the *National Employment Strategy* (2011-2020), by the regular collection of labour demand data through the *Occupational Skills Survey* and the measuring of internal migration through the semi-annual LFS.

MoERD saw the ISD as critical as it provided, for the first time, a connection to MoLSP at the operational level. This was a significant change, moving what was an ad hoc cooperation to a structural relationship, a relationship defined in procedure and planning processes.

Certain features of the work done on the DevInfo database will be of particular relevance for future decentralization processes. Similarly to the work done at national level, the activities implemented at local level on the DevInfo database was aimed at assisting municipal actors to develop evidence-based interventions. This work included both changes to the DevInfo database system itself − as the existing system could not support local processes − and improvement of the capacity of local institutions to use the data for policy and programme development.

Of equal significance the assistance delivered by the Joint Programme to build the capacity of partner institutions, at both central and local level, to use the knowledge base generated for the formulation of policies and programmes as well as the reform of public services. This resulted in a number of spin-offs, such as the ability of local policy councils to ensure additional budgetary resources for the implementation of local employment plans and that of Youth Offices to provide assistance to municipal authorities in designing youth-specific interventions.

### A more prominent focus on youth employment within national development frameworks.

The Joint Programme had a direct and measurable impact on ensuring a more prominent focus on youth employment in national strategic frameworks through the embedding of youth employment targets in the *National Employment Strategy*; the design and implementation of employment programmes targeting disadvantaged youth; and the development of by-laws for the 2011 *Law on Social Protection*.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Six specific youth employment targets were mainstreamed in the *National Employment Strategy* based of the work done by the Joint Programme on youth employment indicators, including those that now are a permanent feature of the Labour Force Survey data gathering process.

The 2012 National Employment Action Plan (NEAP) offers two additional examples of the impact the Joint Programme had on youth employment policy and programme development.[[8]](#footnote-8) The on-the-job training programme – detailed in the in Chapter VIII of the NEAP – aims at providing individuals of any age with no prior qualifications with work-related knowledge and skills. The design of this programme, which combines training in a private enterprise with employment subsidies, stems from the lessons learnt by the Joint Programme during the implementation of the on-the-job training programme targeting disadvantaged youth. Similarly, the priority assigned by the NEAP to beneficiaries of social assistance for participation in active labour market programmes originates from the work carried out by the Joint Programme on the referral system between the CSW and the NES, as well as the research on activation services and welfare to work programmes.

### A national policy on management of labour migration and an improved capacity of the Serbian government to tackle youth migration.

This result was achieved to a large extent. The Joint Programme has had − and through the Commissariat for Refugees in its new role as coordination body for migration monitoring and management (CPPM) will continue to have − a direct influence on the management of labour migration. This is an area where Serbia had little prior knowledge and experience with clear gaps in policy and programme effectiveness.

The 2010 *White Paper*: *Towards Developing a Policy on Labour Migration in the Republic of Serbia* has made significant inroads in addressing these gaps and in providing the Government with a reliable framework for policy and programme development.

The Joint Programme provided inputs to the development of laws and strategies that have both direct and indirect effects on migration. These include the *National Employment Strategy (2011-2020)* and its action plans; the *Action Plan for Migration Management*, the *Action Plan for Scientific and Technological Development (2010-2015)*, the *Action Plan on the Relations between the Homeland and Diaspora*, the *Law on Migration* and the *Law on Employment of Foreigners*.

### An inter-institutional system combining employment and social services targeting disadvantaged youth

Important inroads have been made in the establishment of an integrated, inter-institutional system targeting disadvantaged youth, and much has been achieved in terms of improving the knowledge based at national and local level on integrated service delivery. The Joint Programme was instrumental in:

* The establishment of partnership agreements among public service providers.
* The development of an integrated service delivery system and its operational procedures.
* The building of capacity of staff of the NES and CSW in managing referrals.
* The increase of coordination between the MoLSP and the MoERD and their decentralized structures.

It is worth mentioning the structural nature and long-term significance of the results achieved in this field. The aim was to assist Serbian institutions in establishing a coordinated and multi-sector system for the delivery of services to youth at risk of social exclusion, which would not only coordinate the delivery of social and employment services, but also include work on activation and skills development programmes. The integrated service delivery system was designed, with a wide range of lessons learned stemming from its piloting that will allow its scaling-up across the whole territory of Serbia.

Institutional changes were realized through enhanced cooperation between the CSWs and the NES; the use of case management approaches; the introduction of new workflow practices through operational planning; and the piloting of services to reach out to the most vulnerable population groups. One area of further development in this sense would be a better involvement of the Youth Offices as referral partners in the integrated service delivery system.

As detailed in the monitoring reports, however, the full exploitation of the gains achieved through the Joint Programme would required significant scaling-up, accompanied by a further strengthening of the various components of the integrated service delivery system. [[9]](#footnote-9) This statement does not undermine in any way the significance of achievements, but rather point to the need of further assistance if the integrated service delivery system is to be scaled-up at national level. The ultimate success of the integrated service delivery system *per se*, as well as ensuring the longer-term gains of the results achieved, would require addressing a number of issues, such as:

* The capacity building needed to implement the by-laws on the activation of social welfare beneficiaries, especially in terms of knowledge and information sharing across the CSWs.
* The extension of operational planning approaches – as a means to improve service delivery −to the CSWs not involved in the piloting activities of the Joint Programme.
* The shift from cooperation and exchange of information among service providers to actual referral, including joint assessment, action planning and monitoring of individual progress. In this regard it has to be noted that the caseworkers trained by the Joint Programme were not always those actually tasked with the actual delivery of services.
* Case management was not included in the original Joint Programme design, but it became one of its successful outputs. The deployment of case management approaches is *conditio sine qua non* for the successful scaling up of the integrated service delivery system. The question remains how to integrate case management approaches in the workflow of all the CSWs in Serbia.
* The role that other institutions, outside those engaged in employment, social and education services, may play in the integrated services delivery system. This comment relates specifically to the Youth Offices, their mandate and their responsiveness to the requirements of the referral system.

As regards the advancement of institutional change and the impact of reforms at local level, some specific comments are warranted on the CSW workflow, the bylaws to the *Law on Social Protection* and client-oriented service delivery approaches. The Joint Programme worked closely with the MoLSP to refine the policy and procedural frameworks within which local staff operated. This has been a remarkable output of the Joint Programme, as the policy and procedural framework today reflects good practices in the delivery of coordinated interventions and client-oriented services.

The mainstreaming of the by-law on activation services across all CSWs is deemed critical to the overall social protection reform process. Similarly, the success of annual operational planning as a means to improve service delivery indicates that this initiative should be scaled up significantly.

Case management and integrated service delivery together with client-oriented approaches − and the impact these have on the way the CSWs operate − will generate a significant change in policy and service outcomes.

### A comprehensive package of gender-sensitive youth employment and social protection services implemented

This result was largely achieved, with important lessons learned in the design and monitoring of active labour market programmes targeting youth at risk of social exclusion.

The Youth Employment Fund introduced a mechanism to improve on the delivery of youth employment and social inclusion policy objectives, similar to those used by the European Union Social Fund. This instrument allows the Government of Serbia, through the Ministry of Economy and Regional Development and the National Employment Service, to address the national youth employment challenge.[[10]](#footnote-10) The MoERD has already committed to continue the financing of the Fund and has embedded the good practices stemming from the Joint Programme on targeting approaches into its strategic planning.

The quantitative targets set by the Project Document for final beneficiaries of gender-sensitive employment programmes (3,000 disadvantaged youth receiving individualized employment services and programmes) could not be reached, the key constraint being the overall costs of interventions targeting low-skilled youth and the length of treatment required to prepare them for labour market entry.

Overall, an employment share of 25 per cent for disadvantaged youth is a fair return on the investment, since the share of youth with low levels of education who are employed, according to the LFS, is a mere 3 per cent of the youth population. Such gross employment rate is also in line with the experience of countries in the European Union, where the average employment outcome for disadvantaged youth typically ranges from 10 to 20 per cent of participants.

The employment interventions promoted under the aegis of the Joint Programme succeeded in increasing the labour market attachment of the target group (measured in terms of progression of the individual towards labour market activity, rather than a job in the open labour market). The fact that young participants who remained unemployed were actively searching for work well beyond the end of the measure is a good indication of this.

However, the longer term gains of including disadvantaged youth into the labour market (in terms of lower spending on social benefits, higher tax revenues and stronger aggregate demand) largely offset the programme’s costs.

To summarize, the Joint Programme has had a significant impact, and initiated robust institutional change in the delivery of coherent and coordinated policies. The MoERD considers the integrated service delivery experience of key importance as it provided, for the first time, a connection to the MoLSP at the operational level. This constitute a remarkable development that shifted what was *ad hoc* cooperation to a systemic relationship, in terms of procedure and planning processes.

### Sustainability

The key sustainability features of the changes realized by Joint Programme’s activities, already mentioned throughout this report, are summarized below:

* The extensive work done on employment, migration and social protection indicators and their use in informing policy-making;
* The enhancement of institutional capacity to collect and analyze data at national and local level, as an instrument for evidence-based policy development as well as the continuous involvement of the Serbian Statistical Office in this processes;
* The assistance provided in strategy and policy formulation (on employment, migration, youth development and social protection) as well as in the establishment of the Youth Employment Fund as a versatile instruments for the achievement of employment and social inclusion objectives;
* The piloting of the integrated service delivery model, the work on activation services, the implementation of the principles set forth by the Rulebook, the capacity building of local government institutions and agencies − and their potential for national scaling-up − improved the provision of client-oriented employment and social services not only for disadvantaged youth, but for all population groups at risk of exclusion;
* The significant development of the role and capacity of Youth Offices to assist in policy formulation and service delivery at local level.

All of these acquire specific importance due to their structural nature and represent the key feature of the Joint Programme success. The real impact of the Joint Programme is not measurable only in terms of the quantitative indicators that were attained, but especially in the changes it brought about at policy, procedural and operational levels within the ministries of Economy and Regional Development, of Labour and Social Policy, of Youth and Sports, as well as the Statistical Office, the NES, the CSWs and the Youth Offices.

As the outputs produced relate to policy, procedures and legislation, their impact will be long lasting. When combined with the capacity built among partner national and local institutions, even greater significance can be attributed to the intervention. The Joint Programme was designed to deliver structural change. It did so and the results are clearly visible. Its implementation strategy, centred on a policy and institutional capacity development component and one aimed at providing direct assistance, was instrumental to the achievement of outputs, which in turn allowed the attainment of planned outcomes.

# Conclusions

The Joint Programme *Support To National Efforts For The Promotion Of Youth Employment And The Management Of Migration* had a lasting, positive and systemic impact on policy making and operational activities of Serbian national and local institutions. It also enhanced policy coherence and coordination among government institutions and particularly among the Ministry of Economy and the National Employment Service on the one hand, and the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy and the Centre for Social Work, on the other. In this regard, the Joint Programme has to be considered successful and worthy of study as a good practice model for the establishment of an integrated employment and social service delivery system characterized by individualized and client-oriented assistance and case management approaches.

The Joint Programme delivered a set of initiatives that will have long-term, positive and structural impact on policies, procedures and legislative instruments at both national and local level. As well as the immediate impact the Joint Programme had on disadvantaged youth − who gained better access to employment opportunities and experienced a more effective and client-oriented servicing from both the CSWs and the NES − the changes in workflow and practices realized in these institutions are likely to be sustainable and effective in the mid- to long-term.

The piloting of the integrated service delivery system improved service delivery not only for disadvantaged youth, but for all CSW and NES beneficiaries through a more client-oriented delivery approach that cuts across social and employment services at both national and local level. This has been accompanied by changes in legislation, assistance in implementing the new procedures enacted by the MoLSP, improvements in the cooperation among national and local institutions, a better balance between national and local development priorities and enhanced institutional adaptability and flexibility.

It may well be that these institutional changes and the improved clients’ focus will constitute the most critical and lasting effect of the Joint Programme, depending on developments over the next years, including the scaling up of the integrated service delivery system to other Serbian municipalities and the involvement of more local institutions, such as Youth Offices, in its operations. The development of the role and capacity of Youth Offices to assist in service delivery and policy formulation at the local level must also be mentioned in the context of potential longer term impact.

These are not, however, the only significant achievements of the Joint Programme, nor the only features of sustainability. In this regard, the comprehensive work done on assigning priority to youth employment in national policy frameworks through the inclusion of measureable youth employment targets, as well as the development and use of youth employment, migration and social protection indicators for policy-making, deserves special mention. This work has resulted in specific and marked improvements in youth employment policy design, implementation and monitoring; in establishing the Youth Employment Fund as a means to channel budgetary resources towards the achievement of youth employment and social inclusion policy objectives; and in setting a framework for the development of a migration policy for the coming period.

The fact that this Joint Programme was designed and implemented through a continuous dialogue among participating UN Agencies and national partner institutions resulted in a high level of national commitment to the achievement of its outcomes and contributed significantly to the success of the JP. Such open dialogue fostered the understanding of national priorities and the areas where technical assistance would be required, which, in turn, contributed to the ability of the implementation team to address emerging challenges and maintain the relevance and strategic fit of the interventions deployed.

The collegial, participatory character of the work implemented jointly by UN Agencies and national partners is also evidenced in the effect the Joint Programme had in its most complex and innovative areas, namely integrated employment and social services delivery and the provision of youth employment programmes that simultaneously address labour supply and demand constraints and are geared to promote the inclusion of the population groups most at risk.

## Lessons learned and good practices

Virtually all the lessons learned from the Joint Programme were positive in nature – the most critical are detailed below.

* Joint programming, as a modality to implement complex and innovative interventions, is effective when underpinned by a robust design logic, with clearly assigned responsibilities among participating UN Agencies, and an extensive involvement of national and local partners in all the stages of the project cycle. A thorough understanding of the challenges to be addressed and appreciation of national priorities ensures maintenance of the relevance and strategic fit of the intervention. Open dialogue between participating Agencies and national and local partner institutions ensures their commitment to the attainment of intermediate outcomes and final ownership of the policy, procedural and legislative changes realized.
* Policies aimed at improving youth employment prospects should be wide in scope, while programmes need to be targeted to those who are most at risk of permanent labour market exclusion. In the past, fewer resources have been devoted to implement programmes to redress the multiple layers of disadvantage that affect many young people, such as low educational and training levels, rural residence and ethnicity. There are strong links between support to planning, statistical database development and the ease of direct intervention. The experience of the Joint Programme revealed that effective targeting produces good programme results, especially in terms of increasing the labour market attachment of participants. Effective targeting, however, may also result in a slower intake of participants into programmes, longer treatment periods and a lower share of participants employed at follow-up. Although broad interventions are important for policy development, concrete actions need to have firmer links with target groups. While the policy segment of social enterprise activity brought insights into institutional frameworks, the concrete intervention did not have disadvantaged youth employed in social enterprises as its focus.
* Traditional measures to compute the success of active labour market programmes targeting disadvantaged youth − namely employment and earnings rate at follow-up − may fail to capture all the benefits accruing to individuals and to society. The return on the investment, in fact, should be measured in terms of savings accrued in social assistance expenditures (for those youth who are beneficiaries of social assistance); increases in wage tax revenues from individuals who would not normally be able to find work in the formal economy; and increased aggregate demand through the consumption multiplier. At the individual level, the return on investment should compute the value of increased labour market attachment and self-confidence in navigating the labour market; enhanced well-being and lower poverty risk.
* Support to the creation of local action plans has contributed to the expansion of locally initiated active labour market programmes.
* As part of an approach to continually adjust programmes to changing contexts, the NES should continue to pilot new assistance programmes, even if they might never take off, while ensuring that those programmes that do deliver measurable success are integrated into standard programmes.
* Strategies that combine institutional capacity building with demonstration programmes and services are more effective in responding to the needs of young people at risk of social exclusion. This is because national and local institutions require extensive support to target disadvantaged groups and to implement innovative measures. The use of coaching techniques as part of capacity building activities is particularly effective when piloting alternative service delivery models. The changes in practice implied in the implementation of the operational planning model, the implementation of the Rulebook on Activation and the complex set of changes incorporated in the implementation of the ISD system in coordination with other agencies and institutions goes well beyond participation in a ‘training programme’. The key to successful implementation of these changes within CSWs and NES branch offices is a concerted programme of on-going support that is much more in-depth than a training programme. For capacity to be built, as widely and as deeply as is required within CSWs and the NES, as well as Youth Offices and other local entities, the follow-up/ scaling-up programme should include both a clear, structured path to involvement of more agencies (and staff) in more municipalities/ districts and strengthening the knowledge, skills and attitudes of actors in current participating municipalities. One approach would be to make use of agency participants of the ISD piloting as leaders/ mentors in the follow-up/ scaling-up initiative, as ‘models of good practice’. The technical reports noted that entrusting local staff in the NES and CSWs was an effective approach – and further development of this approach is warranted.
* The participatory approach adopted, the constant involvement of stakeholders, partner institutions and other organisations ‒ as well as the subsequent extensive dialogue established amongst them ‒ yielded higher results in terms of impact and sustainability and improved policy coherence and coordination in the delivery of youth employment and social inclusion policy objectives.
* Clear targeting approaches facilitate the delivery of integrated services to the most vulnerable among the youth population. The establishment of clear and transparent criteria for the selection of young clients most in need of assistance allows segmenting of service delivery (from low to high intensity assistance) and to maximize the effect of resource-intensive treatment. The JP established primary and secondary eligibility criteria whereby case workers could easily identify for treatment those clients who, out of a large pool of potential beneficiaries, face multiple barriers to reintegration into mainstream society.
* Outreach practices are critical to involving discouraged youth living at the margin of society. Just making reintegration services available is not sufficient to ensure that young people most at risk actually take them up. This is particularly the case for young Roma individuals living in settlements or inter-generational beneficiaries of financial social assistance. The former are often unaware of their entitlements and of the social and employment services that would be available to them. The later are often discouraged youth who believe there is no way out from their current situation. Outreach services that envisage that caseworkers visit settlements and make house calls to offer available services and programmes are instrumental in increasing the participation of young people.
* Case management approaches are key to ensuring young clients receive all the support and services needed for reintegration into society. Case management approaches that build on a comprehensive needs assessment and clear action planning ensure client commitment to treatment, on the one hand, and the involvement of relevant service providers on the other. The JP was able to establish a procedure whereby practitioners in the NES and CSWs carried out an assessment of a young client’s case, and outlined an intervention sequence. Once the intervention sequence was agreed on by the client, and an individual service plan was drafted, the case manager could initiate the intervention. Professional and dedicated caseworkers are the most important component of a successful ISD system. Assistance to the most disadvantaged among the youth population is resource and time intensive and requires a high level of counselling and guidance skills as well as personal dedication. The measurement of performance of integrated services delivery at the end of the pilot phase revealed that caseworkers that invested more time in reaching out to young clients and in mentoring them during service delivery attained the best results in terms of service uptake and labour market integration.
* Further work is necessary in a number of areas of the ISD system, to improve the effectiveness of its functioning.
	+ There is a need for greater clarity on the definition of a ‘referral system’, and the specific nature of is functioning. This includes a clearer understanding of referrals in all directions, particularly where the ISD system includes more components than the NES and CSWs.
	+ There is a need for greater cohesion within the system of actions/ approaches between the NES and CSWs, ie operational procedures.
	+ There is a potentially greater formal involvement of Youth Offices in the ISD system. Such a development implies operational procedures across the YOs as well as the NES and CSWs, to ensure cohesiveness of approach. A greater coordination/ cooperation framework is also required, which has implications nationally (within the MoLSP, MoYS and the NES) and locally.
* Evidence-based policy and programme formulation should not fall within the exclusive mandate of national-level institutions. Assistance to local government institutions in identifying specific employment and social challenges is of the essence to support decentralization processes and make the delivery of national policy objectives responsive to the needs of people and communities. The advisory services provided by the Joint Programme, in strengthening local policy and programme development as well as in the design of client-oriented services, played a significant role in increasing and diversifying the assistance offered to the most vulnerable groups of the population.

## Recommendations

* The Government of Serbia will soon be faced with the challenge to deliver on the objectives of the newly adopted employment and social inclusion framework that is aligned to the EU *acquis communitaire*. It is recommended that the Government of Serbia build on and expand the activities that were successfully piloted by the Joint Programme, in particular the integrated employment and social service delivery model, case management and operational planning approaches, as well as outreach services to engage the most vulnerable groups of the Serbian population. This would allow the policy, procedural and legislative changes brought about by the Joint programme to be permanently embedded in national and local institutional frameworks. The scaling up of integrated service delivery to other Municipalities and Districts in the country would provide an effective means to promote social inclusion and decrease poverty risks for disadvantaged individuals − and not only for the younger ones. The costs associated with such an investment would be offset in the medium to long term by savings accrued in public spending on social benefits, higher labour tax revenues and an expanded tax base. The involvement of other service providers, namely education and training institutions and municipal Youth Offices, would ensure an improvement in the range of services offered to individuals at risk and contribute to the attainment of the employment, social inclusion and lifelong learning principles pursued by Serbia in its accession to the European Union.
* The development of a follow-up Joint Programme would greatly improve the means available to national and local partners to deliver on the objectives of the employment and social inclusion policy framework. As well as the further strengthening of the Youth Employment Fund as a means to support the decentralization of employment and social inclusion programmes and the expansion of the integrated service delivery system, for which specific recommendations are formulated below, the follow-up technical assistance package should focus on:
	+ The formulation of the national Social Protection Strategy and Action Plan to guide the development of the social welfare system, its standards and services as well as operationalize the reforms introduced by the Law on Social Protection.
	+ The mainstreaming of case management and outreach practices in the provision of employment and social services to disadvantaged population groups throughout the country. Further strengthening of the capacity of NES and CSW caseworkers in the provision of individualized services would be instrumental to the completion of the reform process, while the inclusion of early school leaving and second chance education measures would extend the scope and range of service delivery.
	+ The extension of annual operational planning to all CSWs and capacity building to manage operational planning mechanisms.
	+ A more extensive use of administrative and survey data for policy and programme design, monitoring and evaluation accompanied by capacity building of national and local users and producers. In particular, more work is required to increase the frequency of labour demand data collection and analysis, to promote the use of municipal DevInfo databases; and on labour migration indicators.
* It is recommended that the integrated service delivery system piloted by the Joint Programme be further developed and expanded based on the lessons that were learnt during its piloting phase. Such work would include:
	+ The development of implementing regulations to apply the model throughout the country.
	+ A reformulation of the operational procedures to include other service providers such as education and training institutions and the Youth Offices.
	+ Inclusion of activation services and programmes targeting recipients of social welfare benefits in the National Cooperation Protocol and the Partnership Agreements.
* It is recommended that the Government of Serbia take action to formalize the operations of the Youth Employment Fund as a means to ensure that the priority assigned to youth employment in the national employment framework delivers concrete and measurable results. The National Employment Action Plan for 2012 specifically channels budgetary resources to the Youth Employment Fund for the implementation of programmes targeting disadvantaged youth, but the resources invested in many other employment-related interventions − implemented by various government agencies – are not passing through this financial mechanism. As a result, the performance of these interventions, and the impact they have on youth employment goes undetected and unrecorded, undermining efforts to develop a comprehensive understanding of the level of national commitment to youth employment. The experience of the Joint Programme is that it is possible to ensure a high degree of transparency and accountability in Fund management with a minimum of resource investment.
* The Joint Programme allowed local employment offices to decide the mix and sequence of active labour market programmes to be delivered, and specific resource allocations according to individual characteristics. This was critical to the success of the direct assistance component of the Joint Programme. It is recommended that the Government of Serbia encourage the further extension of this model of decentralized management of employment services and programmes. Stronger promotion and linkage to local actors will significantly increase the numbers of participants from target groups, and implementation of an intensive promotion and outreach campaign for the YEF at the local levels is recommended. Additionally, the practice of trialling employment programmes before they are scaled-up should become a regular activity of the National Employment Service. The experience of the Joint Programme demonstrated that not all offered employment services and programmes attract the interest of private sector enterprises, or respond fully to the needs of individual beneficiaries.

# Annexes

## Annex 1 –Summary Achievement Of The Project’s Indicators[[11]](#footnote-11)

| OUTCOME 1: Youth employment and migration policy objectives are included in the national development strategy |
| --- |
| OUTPUTS | INDICATORS | RESULTS ACHIEVED  |
| Output 1.1. Knowledge base on youth employment and migration improved to inform national development strategy and action plans | At least 15 key indicators of the youth labour market, including informal employment and migration developed and regularly collected | The following 15 indicators of the youth labour market have been developed and are computed regularly on the basis of data collected bi-annually through the Labour Force Survey (LFS): 1. Labour force participation rate
2. Inactivity rate
3. Employment rate
4. Percentage of wage employees, self-employed (including employers) and contributing family members,
5. Employment by economic activity,
6. Employment in the informal economy
7. Employment (%) by type of job (seasonal, temporary, unlimited)
8. Temporary work (%), voluntary and involuntary
9. Part-time work
10. Hours of work
11. Average net salary of youth
12. Young employees and self-employed by rights at work
13. Unemployment rate
14. Unemployment ratio
15. Long-term unemployment rate

The range of data collected by the LFS survey was improved and expanded. It is now possible to compute the transition of individuals among different labour market statuses, the length and quality of the transition of youth from school to work and internal migration movements. The following migration indicators are computed and disaggregated from LFS data:1. Number of persons staying in Serbia for less than one year
2. Country of birth of recent migrants
3. Citizenship and demography of persons working away from home (municipality/other country)
4. Education and occupation of persons working away from home
5. Nationality and demographic characteristics of internal migrants
6. Employment and educational attainment of internal migrants
7. Foreign migrants

The LFS data collected prior to 2008 (when the current methodology was introduced) was adjusted to provide for 2004-2010 Key Indicators of the Labour Market (KILM) time-series. **Products/means of verification:** Youth labour market indicators (bi-annual, from October 2008 to October 2011); Improving the Labour Force Survey Data and Analysis; Preparing Consistent Time-series on LFS Data; Results for Adjusted LFS Time-series 2004-2010; Transition from School to Work (Youth Module) instrument, instructions and published report. |
| At least 5 key youth migration indicators developed and regularly collected | The following 13 migration indicators were proposed to decision-makers responsible for labour migration for consideration: ***Identifying mismatches between labour supply and demand in the domestic market****:*1. Unemployed population by age, educational attainment and regions/municipalities. (Source: LFS)
2. Available vacancies (current and foreseen) by economic sector, education/qualification and age requirements, and regions/municipalities.

***Addressing brain-circulation:***1. Tertiary students studying abroad by country of destination. (Source: Ministry of Education and the OECD database)
2. Highly qualified returning population by age and regions/municipalities. (Source: household surveys, including LFS, and specialized surveys)
3. Number of persons (researchers and academics of Serbian origin residing abroad) registered in the database of the Ministry of Science and Technological Development.

***Monitoring return:***1. Returning nationals by education and professional qualifications, employment structure. (Source: household surveys, including LFS)

***Labour migrants abroad:***1. Valid work permits in the EU, Switzerland and Norway and other destination countries. (Source: destination country statistics, EUROSTAT, administrative data in Western Balkans, Russia and Belarus).
2. Serbian citizens employed abroad within the international agreements. (Source: MLSP)

***Labour migrants in Serbia:***1. Foreigners who received work permits in Serbia by type of permit, citizenship and sex. (National Employment Service register).
2. Foreigners who received residence permits by type of permit, sex, citizenship (Source: IOM)
3. Number of businesses employing foreigners by economic sector and number of foreigners employed. (Source: MoERD)

***Social inclusion:***1. Persons from the “hard to employ” migration-affected part of the population participating to active labour market measures (Source: National Employment Service)
2. Persons from “hard to employ” migration-affected population registered as unemployed with the National Employment Service.

A survey on the Serbian diaspora was implemented, according to the methodology agreed upon with the inter-ministerial working group on migration.  |
| At least 10 key indicators for youth social protection developed and regularly collected | Indicators for the monitoring and evaluation of social protection and social services were developed by the Republican Institute for Social Protection in May 2010. The indicators revolve around four domains: social benefits, social services to children and youth, social services to adults and elderly persons, and social services provided by the Centres for Social Work (CSWs). Out of 22 indicators, 8 are related to youth social protection: 1. Number of users of social benefits by type: child allowance, home care, social benefits to poor parents, one-off support
2. Social benefits’ users (rate)
3. Activated/employed users of social benefits (rate)
4. Long time social benefits’ users (rate)
5. Number of children and youth entering residential institutions and foster care
6. Children and youth in residential institutions and foster care (rate)
7. Number of children and youth in residential institutions and foster care
8. Ratio of children and youth in residential institutions and foster care
9. Number of children and youth whose entitlements ceased
10. Percent of children and youth in direct communication with legal guardians and/or parents
11. Percent of children from residential institutions and foster care in education
12. Number of licensed social services’ providers to children and youth
13. Number and rate of licensed social services’ providers to adults and elderly
14. Percent of available social services provided by the community
15. Ratio of persons with disabilities (PWDs) using “independent living” assistance and using home care social benefits
16. Number and ratio of elderly in residential care
17. Number and ratio of adults in residential care
18. Volume and percentage of local municipal budgets allocated to social protection
19. Number of victims of violence registered with CSWs
20. Number of victims of violence using CSWs social services
21. Number of social workers per municipality (availability of CSWs services)
22. Case load per social worker

As a follow up to this activity, and in line with the requirements of the new Law on Social Welfare, the Institute for Social Protection (ISP) revised the data collection instruments to ensure that figures gathered allow an adequate level of disaggregation and respond to the new indicators. Since the beginning of 2012, the ISP is using the data collected to compile analytical reports on selected topics to inform decision making. **Products/means of verification**: Annual Report of theRepublic Institute for Social Protection, list of produced indicators |
| Number of youth labour market, migration and social protection indicators integrated into the DevInfo database system | The DevInfo helps monitoring MDG and poverty reduction indicators as well as the implementation of the Action Plan for Children. The database, set up by UNICEF in 2004, covers 11 domains, including social protection. In 2006 DevInfo became part of the regular programme of the Republican Statistical Office (RSO), updated twice a year. The Statistical Office, with support of the joint programme, started to refine the database indicators, adjusting them to reflect EU social exclusion indicators, national MDG indicators and the newly developed youth social protection indicators. The Statistical Office will agree on protocols of data transfer with the Institute of Social Protection to enable the regular supply of data for the DevInfo database. The update and adjustment of DevInfo was conducted in the period May 2011 until the end of the joint programme. **Products/mans of verification:** DevInfo database system (Statistical Office of Serbia) |
| Number of developed youth labour market indicators used in policy-making | Capacity building of policy makers in the field of employment and labour market statistics was conducted through a series of workshops on data requirements and analysis as well labour market indicators (evidence based policy making). With the technical assistance provided by the joint programme, the Ministry of Economy and Regional Development’s (MoERD) developed the Employment Strategy 2011-2020, featuring the following five youth labour market indicators to be continuously monitored:1. Youth activity ratio (disaggregated by sex, education level and region)
2. Youth employment ratio (disaggregated by sex, education level and region)
3. Youth unemployment ratio (disaggregated by sex, education level and region)
4. Number of youth included in active labour market programmes of the NES (disaggregated by sex, education level, unemployment spell, district and region)
5. Number of youth employed through NES mediation and assistance (disaggregated by sex, education level, unemployment spell, district and region)

The Employment Strategy was adopted by the Government of Serbia in May 2011. **Products/means of verification**: Youth Employment: A training module on data requirements and analysis; Evidence Based Policy Making, Employment Strategy of the Republic of Serbia, 2011-2020 |
| Number of developed youth migration indicators used in policy-making | Parts of the 2010 *White Paper* (*Towards Developing a Policy on Labour Migration in the Republic of Serbia*) were used to draft the National Employment Strategy 2011-2020Three migration indicators are used in policy making: 1. Unemployed population by age, qualifications and regions/municipalities.
2. Persons from the “hard to employ” migration-affected part of the population participating to active labour market measures
3. Persons from “hard to employ” migration-affected population registered as unemployed with the national Employment service.

**Products/means of verification:** Manke, M (2010): Towards Developing a Policy on Labour Migration in the Republic of Serbia, A White Paper, Employment Strategy of the Republic of Serbia, 2011-2020. |
| Number of developed youth social protection indicators used in policy-making | A proposal on the youth social protection indicators to be used for policy-making purposes was made by the Republic Institute for Social Protection, as follows: 1. Number of children and youth entering residential institutions and foster care
2. Children and youth in residential institutions and foster care (rate)
3. Number of children and youth in residential institutions and foster care
4. Ratio of children and youth in residential institutions to foster care
5. Number of children and youth whose entitlements ceased
6. Percent of children and youth in direct communication with legal guardians and/or parents
7. Percent of children from residential institutions and foster care in education
8. Number of licensed social services’ providers to children and youth

The above indicators were used for monitoring the child care reform. The Institute of Social Protection is currently using the indicators to compile the2011 Annual Report and two analytical reports with policy recommendations. **Products/means of verification**: Reports of the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs and Institute of Social Protection |
| Data for national MDG indicators collected | The DevInfo database system has been the key tool for national MDG reporting since 2006. The Statistical Office (in charge of DevInfo) has been refining with the technical assistance of the joint programme the database indicators to better reflect the national MDG reporting requirements. **Products/means of verification:** DevInfo database system |
| Output 1.2. Policy on management of labour migration, including returns of young Serbians, developed and linked to employment policy and strategies | Labour migration policy and action plan with specific priorities and outcomes, which are aligned with national MDG indicators, adopted by the Serbian Government | A *Policy on Labour Migration in the Republic of Serbia 2010-2020* (with d goals, objectives and expected results) was drafted. Parts of this document were used in the development of the National Employment Strategy 2011-2020. **Products/means of verification:** Manke, M (2010): Towards Developing a Policy on Labour Migration in the Republic of Serbia, A White Paper; National Employment Strategy 2011-2020 |
| Output 1.3. Youth employment and migration targets included in national development strategy | Number of measurable targets on youth employment included in the national development strategy | Following the work commissioned by the joint programme on youth employment projections and target setting for the Employment Strategy 2011-2020, the MoERD included six measurable youth employment targets to be achieved by 202, namely: 1. Youth activity rate 30.7%
2. Youth employment rate 23.3%
3. Youth unemployment rate 24%
4. Ratio of youth unemployment rate to general unemployment rate 2.1:1
5. Youth (15-19) participation in education 90%
6. Youth (20-24) participation in education 40%

**Products/means of verification**: Youth Employment Projections and Targets for the Employment Strategy 2011-2020; Employment Strategy 2011-2020. |
| Expenditure for reaching measurable targets on youth employment envisaged by national development strategies planned in the budgetary framework | Significant resources were allocated by the Government of Serbia to reach the established youth employment targets and for active labour market programmes (ALMPs) despite budgetary constraints. In 2009, approximately €66 million were allocated to ALMPs compared to €40 million of the previous year, which represents an increase of some 60%.Of these funds, approximately €32 million were earmarked for measures targeting youth (up to 30 years of age) through the *First Chance Programme*. Compared to the €16 million allocated in 2009, the resources available were doubled reflecting the enhanced attention of policy makers to youth employment. The Government of Serbia also contributed €150,000 directly to the Youth Employment Fund (YEF).The National Employment Action Plan (2012) envisages that young persons with a low level of qualification be given priority in ALMPs. The promotion of youth employment is one of the pillars of the NEAP to be achieved, among others, through the financing of the Youth Employment Fund by the budget of the Government of Serbia. **Products/means of verification**: Government of Serbia budgetary framework 2011, NES budgetary framework 2011; Government of Serbia budgetary framework 2012, NES budgetary framework 2012; National Employment Action Plan (2012). |
| Number of measurable targets on youth migration included in the national development strategy | The *White Paper* was used to formulate the National Employment Strategy 2011-2020. The MoERD also received advisory services to draft the new *Law on Employment of Foreigners*. The same document informed the development of the action plan for the implementation of the Migration Management Strategy.**Products/means of verification:** Manke, M (2010): Towards Developing a Policy on Labour Migration in the Republic of Serbia, A White Paper; Becker, H (2010): Comparative Study on the Employment of Foreign Nationals in France, Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) and Montenegro; Becker, H (2010): EC Acquis on the Employment of the Third-country nationals. |
| Expenditure for reaching measurable targets on youth migration envisaged by national development strategies planned in the budgetary framework | The Action Plan for the implementation of the National Employment Strategy contains specific measures targeting migrants (point 1.7 and 1.14 of the Action Plan) as well as financial resources for their implementation. **Products/means of verification**: National Employment Action Plan (2012). |
| One Advocacy campaign conducted by organizations representing the interests of young people to prioritize youth employment and migration targets in national development policies | This task was commissioned to the local NGO *Civic initiatives*. Key achievements regarding this output were: a) the setting of priorities (youth entrepreneurship and easing the cooperation between education and the economy) for the public advocacy campaign based on an extensive research on youth employment problems, b) the organization of public hearings for Serbian policy makers, members of Parliament, NGO representatives and other interested parties and c) the facilitation of the cooperation between Ministry of Education (MoE) and MoERD. As a result, a *Memorandum of cooperation* between the two ministries on entrepreneurship education for youth was signed in December 2010. This was later on expanded into a *Protocol of cooperation* involving numerous partners in the development of life-long entrepreneurial education in Serbia.**Products/means of verification**: Report on Youth Employment and Migration: Review of policies and measures and recommendation for public advocacy, Civic Initiatives, August 2010 (Serbian language only), Memorandum of Understanding on the Introduction of Entrepreneurial Education (agreement signed by the MoE and MoERD). |

| OUTCOME 2: National institutions develop integrated labour market and social services that meet employment and migration policy objectives targeting disadvantaged young women and men. |
| --- |
| **OUTPUTS** | **INDICATORS** | **RESULTS ACHIEVED**  |
| Output 2.1. A system integrating labour market, migration and social services for youth established and functioning | An integrated service delivery system based on referral targeting disadvantaged youth developed | Following the research conducted on existing good practices on integrated and/or coordinated employment and social protection services in Serbia and in Central and Eastern Europe, as well as the knowledge gained during a study trip to the UK where practices of integrated service delivery were examined, the inter-ministerial working group established under the aegis of the joint programme developed a set of *Operational Procedures* for the delivery of integrated services to disadvantaged youth. The inter-ministerial working group − that includes representatives of the Ministry of Economy and Regional Development, Ministry of Labour and Social Protection, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Youth and Sport, National Employment Service and the Republic Institute for Social Protection − selected 7 sites (Palilula, Savski Venac, Becej, Backi Petrovac, Novi Sad, Vranje, Vladicin Han) for the piloting of integrated services delivery.Training of the practitioners working in the Centres for Social Work (CSW) and the National Employment Service (NES) on integrated service delivery was held in February 2011, followed by piloting in selected sites. The piloting was completed in March 2012 and resulted in the development of a referral mechanism for joint clients of the CSW and the NES and the activation of 242 unemployed, long-term beneficiaries’ of financial social assistance. Recognizing the importance of activation for the beneficiaries of Centres for Social Work in improving their employment outcomes, the joint programme carried out a research that mapped the current labour market status of these beneficiaries and their activation level. Data gathered through this research will serve as a baseline against which the new law on Social Welfare will be assessed. Based on the experience and lessons learned during the piloting of integrated services as well as the data gathered by the above mentioned research, inputs for the by-law on activation of social welfare beneficiaries were provided to the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy. As part of the technical assistance package to the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy for the provision of better services, the joint programme commissioned a research on non-take up of social assistance in Serbia. This survey provided data on the reasons for non-take up of assistance for eligible individuals. The policy recommendations stemming from the report are being used by decision-makers to improve targeting and access to services for the most vulnerable categories of the population.**Products/means of verification:** Good Practices in Integrated Service Delivery: Case of Serbia; Good Practices in Providing Integrated Employment and Social Services in Central and Eastern Europe; UK Fellowship Report; Integrated Service Delivery Inter-ministerial Working Group and Operational Procedures Report; Report on social assistance and activation: in search of inclusive policy options; Marina Petrovic (2011) Final report on the Consultancy on Integrated Service Delivery, Final Report on the Consultancy on Activation of Social Welfare Beneficiaries, Report on Determinants of low take up of financial social assistance in Serbia |
| Output 2.2. The capacity of the National Employment Service, the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy and the Ministry of Youth and Sport to deliver targeted youth employment and social services strengthened | Number of NES Branch Offices participating in the delivery of and type of services that are integrated to target the needs of disadvantaged youth | The piloting of the integrated service delivery model commenced in February 2011 in seven municipalities (Palilula, Savski Venac, Novi Sad, Becej, Backi Petrovac, Vranje and Vladicin Han) of the three Districts targeted by the joint programme. Training on integrated services delivery was provided to caseworkers of the NES Branch Offices targeted by the joint programme, as well as staff of outreach employment offices in smaller municipalities. A functional assessment of the NES was carried out by the joint programme prior to the piloting of integrated service delivery to identify areas of improvement in the provision of services to unemployed clients. A set of action-oriented recommendations were formulated for the NES and MoERD top management. These recommendations guided all the NES capacity building activities conducted by the joint programme.**Products/means of verification:** Integrated Service Delivery Inter-ministerial Working Group and Operational Procedures Report; Final report on the Consultancy on Integrated Service Delivery, NES Functional Analysis |
| Model for annual operational action plans of CSWs elaborated in the Handbook for Operational Planning for CSW on the basis of the agreed methodology, guidelines and minimum content with MLSP | The *Handbook for Operational Planning* for the CSWs was developed, published and distributed to all Centres in 2010. It is now used by the CSWs in their planning process.**Products/means of verification:** Handbook for Operational Planning for CSWs |
| Number of Youth Offices (YOs) participating in the delivery of (and type of) services that are integrated to target the needs of disadvantaged youth  | Six Youth Offices (in Palilula, Backi, Petrovac, Temerin, Surdilica with Vladicin Han and Becej) received direct support to implement projects aimed at increasing youth employability. These Youth Offices are becoming important actors at local level through outreach and networking activities, provision of peer career information and non-formal education, as well as regular youth services (e.g. voluntary services, youth clubs).Young people from seven youth Offices were trained in peer career information and have established youth teams that regularly work with their peers.Seventeen Youth Offices received support in implementing Info Points, thus improving access and availability of information to young people.Three youth offices (in Palilula, Backi Petrovac and Vladicin Han) were additionally supported to implement projects for disadvantaged youth with a view to demonstrate the potential role that Youth Offices can play in improving the employability of young people, liaising with the CSWs and NES tasked to implement integrated service delivery.The joint programme also provided, at the Ministry of Youth and Sport request, technical assistance to coordinate the inter-ministerial working group on the Career Guidance and Counselling Strategy.**Products/means of verification:** Integrated Service Delivery Inter-ministerial Working Group and Operational Procedures Report; Inter-ministerial working group on Career Guidance and Counselling Strategy monthly reports, MYS annual report, YOs’ project and annual reports |
| Number of disadvantaged and returning youth treated with targeted employment and social services, disaggregated by type of assistance they receive from CSW, sex and rural / urban residence | The piloting of the integrated service delivery, which started in February 2011 in seven municipalities, focused on the joint work of the National Employment Service (NES) Branch Offices and the Centres for Social Work (CSW) in reaching out to disadvantaged youth. The actual services, however, were delivered in only five of the seven municipalities selected (namely Novi Sad, Becej, Backi Petrovac, Vranje and Vladicin Han), due to the failure of the CSW of the Belgrade District to participate. Since the beginning of the piloting, 252 youth at risk of social exclusion (long term unemployed, beneficiaries of different social services, Roma population groups) were treated with targeted employment and social services. Of these, 242 young men and women were referred to active labour market programmes financed by the Youth Employment Fund. Data disaggregated by sex and other personal characteristics (including risk factors) were collected by both the NES and CSW. **Products/means of verification:** Integrated Service Delivery Inter-ministerial Working Group and Operational Procedures Report, Final report on the Consultancy on Integrated Service Delivery, ISD Monitoring tables, NES and CSWs reports |
| Number of referrals of disadvantaged young women and men between CSW, NES branch offices and local Youth Offices demonstrating an improved mechanism for integrated service delivery | In total, 297 young individuals were referred from/to the NES and the CSW (58.2 per cent young women; 4 per cent young persons with disabilities, 26 per cent youth of Roma population groups and 36.3 per cent long term unemployed). The majority of these referrals (see above) resulted in the participation of beneficiaries to the active labour market programmes funded by the Youth Employment Fund.The Youth Offices were not part of the integrated service delivery model. However, approximately 60 vulnerable youth were referred from the Youth Offices of Backi Petrovac and Palilula to the CSWs and the NES. **Products/means of verification:** Integrated Service Delivery Inter-ministerial Working Group and Operational Procedures Report; NES branch offices and CSWs reports, YO project reports |
| Output 2.3. A long-term national financial mechanism to implement employment measures targeting disadvantaged youth established and implemented | A long-term financial mechanism (Youth Employment Fund) set up to implement employment measures | Several models to assure the sustainability of the Youth Employment Fund were presented to the Government for consideration.The annual budget for 2011 envisaged funds for reaching the youth employment targets set by the joint programme, while future allocations are to be decided on the cost-effectiveness of the individual measures piloted (see performance monitoring exercise conducted by the joint programme in February 2012). To April 2012, the Government of Serbia had contributed a total amount of RSD 117 million (or US$1.6 million).**Products/means of verification:** YEF Sustainability models; tracking table on Government of Serbia contribution to the YEF. |
| Number and type of active labour market programmes targeting disadvantaged youth, including young returnees, financed by the YEF (at both national and local level) | Active labour market measures were developed with national partners and stakeholders to target disadvantaged youth. A set of six, intensive treatment measures, designed to be combined and complement each other, was financed by the Youth Employment Fund (YEF). Programmes were offered after a three-week gateway period of intensive individual counselling and job brokering including the revision of Individual Employment Plans. These measures targeted youth, 15-30 years of age, with low educational attainment and with an unemployment spell of at least three months. The main purpose was to raise the level of skills for employment in economic sectors and occupations most demanded by local labour markets. These latter were identified through Occupation and Skills surveys. The measures are:1. Institution based training
2. Pre-employment qualification
3. Work-training contracts
4. Employment subsidies
5. Work trial contracts
6. Self employment programmes

Three additional measures were offered to young persons with disabilities: i) adaptation of work premises and/or work station; ii) wage subsidy and iii) grants for single parents and transport to reach training/work premises. In addition, entry criteria were relaxed and duration extended for most disadvantaged youth (such as young Roma, refugees, youth with disabilities).**Products/means of verification:** Active Labour Market Programmes Guidelines; Occupations and Skills Survey (Beogradski, Juzno-backi and Pcinjski Districts): instrument, instructions and published report; Improved Occupations and Skills Survey instrument (Niski and Pomoravski district). |
| Cost-effectiveness of active labour market programmes targeting disadvantaged youth, including young returnees, financed by the YEF (at both national and local level) assessed | Information technology software was designed and attached to the NES Unified Information System to allow for the computation of total cost per individual beneficiary participating to active labour market programmes. This system is now applied to all programmes offered by the National Employment Service. The joint programme also financed the purchase of specialized software to compute process and performance indicators of active labour market programmes implemented by the NES. Compared to NES standard programmes, the services supported by the YEM programme are more costly. This is due to both the type of programmes offered and their design. First, training programmes envisaged that participants received a monthly allowance (calculated as a percentage of the unemployment benefit) throughout the duration of the programme. A training grant was also paid to the service provider (be it a training provider or a private enterprise) on the basis of the number of individuals trained. The programme for persons with disability is the most expensive, as it combines a number of programmes: 1) training of the beneficiary (off or on the job), 2) wage subsidy to the enterprise recruiting the young person with disability and 3) lump sum grants to ease the access to the enterprise premises and to the equipment needed for performing the tasks of the job.To ease the participation of young people facing mobility issues and care responsibilities transport and child care grants were also devised. At the time of performance measurement, 411 young participants had accessed these subsidies (or 30.5 per cent of all beneficiaries). **Products/means of verification:** Software linking beneficiary data base and accounting system of the NES. Preliminary findings on employment and earnings outcomes of beneficiaries of active labour market programmes targeting disadvantaged youth, Performance monitoring of ALMPs targeting disadvantaged youth |
| Framework for the development and management of PPPs developed*Changed to:* **Framework for the development and management of social enterprises developed.** | This output was revised during joint programme implementation, at the request of the national partner, towards the development of a framework to regulate and promote social enterprises. The rationale for the change is contained in the Minutes of a meeting held with the MoERD on 16 September 2010.An analysis of the existing legal framework with recommendations on amendments needed as well as a guide on how to establish a social enterprise under the prevailing legislation was prepared by the joint programme. The Government of Serbia decided to draft a law on social cooperatives. Against this backdrop, the joint programme organized in March 2011 a fellowship to Italy, which has a long tradition of social enterprises and cooperatives. The aim was to familiarize decision-makers on good practices in social enterprise governance systems. **Products/means of verification:** Minutes of the Meeting (MoERD 16/09/2010); Analysis of current legal framework; Report of study visits to Italy (*Strengthening the capacity of the Serbian institutions to develop a framework for the establishment and functioning of social enterprises in Serbia)* |
| At least 10 private enterprises are contributing to selected youth employment initiatives through CSR | In 2010 the joint programme initiated a campaign for providing business development support to twelve social enterprises. Support was provided through mentors and experts in various business fields (e.g. marketing and sales, finance, public relations, project management and so on). This work was based on needs assessment conducted for each enterprise. In December 2011, the 7 month long support ended, resulting in increased capacities and better performance of social enterprises in the area of sales, marketing, strategic planning and human resources development. A number of experts assisted beneficiary enterprises in improving sales process, better targeting of customers, development of sales plans and viable product portfolios, establishment of new partnerships, improvement of communication plans and tools (websites, promotional material), as well as systematization of working places and recruiting system.**Products/means of verification:** Call for application and related documents; Needs assessment reports; Guide for monitoring and evaluation of social enterprises; Consultants’ reports on support provided to social enterprises; Final and evaluation report of business development services provided. |

| OUTCOME 3: Integrated employment programmes and social services targeting young returnees and other disadvantaged young women and men implemented in three target districts. |
| --- |
| **OUTPUTS** | **INDICATORS** | **RESULTS ACHIEVED**  |
| Output 3.1. Local partnerships for youth employment strengthened to coordinate implementation of employment programmes that are linked to social services | Local councils identified in at least 6 municipalities for capacity building | A capacity assessment of local councils was conducted in 2009. Based on the findings of the assessment, six municipalities were selected and an in-depth situation analysis conducted.**Products/means of verification:** Milosav Milosavljevic, Capacity Assessment of Local Policy Councils, 2009, Situation analyses: Becej, Mladenovac, Novi Sad, Obrenovac, Surdulica and Vranje |
| Local DevInfo databases for 6 focal municipalities developed and functional | The Statistical Office, in cooperation with municipalities and national stakeholders, developed the list of indicators with meta data relevant at municipal level. This means that all municipalities in Serbia, and not only the six targeted by the joint programme, are using the data made available for local decision making.**Products/means of verification:** Cooperation agreement with the Statistical Office of Serbia, the List of local DevInfo indicators |
| Local strategies, plans and reports in 6 focus municipalities are referring to DevInfo database as a source of information | The capacity of the representatives of local Municipalities was built through two round of training workshop (May-June 2011 and March 2012) on data collection, data analysis for policy making purposes as well as monitoring and reporting. The representatives from nine Youth Offices participated to these workshops, but also received additional coaching on how to use DevInfo and other data in monitoring and reporting as well as in the preparation of policy briefs. The policy briefs prepared by the Youth Offices on the DevInfo figures highlighted issues of importance for youth employment, activism and overall improvement of youth status in specific municipalities. **Products/means of verification:** Training modules for M&E, policy briefs and reports prepared by YOs, SECONS reports |
| At least 6 municipalities in the 3 target districts produce annual reports providing updated data on youth that is instrumental for evidence-based policy making and strategies regarding youth employment | Six local policy councils, (Becej, Mladenovac, Novi Sad, Obrenovac, Surdulica and Vranje), selected on the basis of the 2009 capacity assessment, completed their situation analysis and identified youth population groups to be targeted by employment programmes. The reports provide data on the main youth employment challenges at local level, as well as actions to be taken. The young staff of eight Youth Offices (Backi Petrovac, Temerin, Becej, Palilula, Vladicin Han, Surdulica, Presevo and Bujanovac) were trained in data analysis and the development of policy briefs to be used for advocacy and evidence based policy making.**Products/means of verification:** Situation analysis and identification of priority youth groups in 6 municipalities (available in Serbian language only); Policy briefs |
| Number of secondary eligibility criteria defined to prioritize and coordinate the implementation of employment programmes for disadvantaged youth that are linked to available social services in each NES Branch Office | The *Guidelines for the implementation of active labour market programme targeting disadvantaged youth* envisaged that the local employment offices, within the general eligibility criteria established, had discretion in prioritizing sub-groups of young individual facing specific labour market barriers (for instance young Roma, refugees, young people with disability, young members of household on social assistance and so on) with a view to better target services to the specificities of local labour markets.In addition, six local policy councils (see above) received technical assistance to identify groups of young people that needed to be granted priority access to the active labour market programmes financed by the Youth Employment Fund and other sources of funding. In most municipalities young Roma, youth with disabilities and young people leaving residential care were identified as particularly vulnerable and in need of assistance.**Products/means of verification:** CSW and NES reports, Training material on integrated services, Marina Petrovic (2011) Final report on the Consultancy on Integrated Service Delivery. |
| At least 6 municipalities successfully using a set of replicable resources (funds, project ideas) for the delivery of integrated services to disadvantaged young men and women | In the period October-November 2010 the joint programme supported 28 local policy councils to develop local employment action plans. A set of guidelines prepared by the joint programme guided local councils in this task and resulted in 22 councils applying to, and receiving, co-financing of local employment plans from the state budget (as envisaged in the new *Law on Employment and Insurance against Unemployment*). The amount received by these 22 municipalities for employment programmes totalled approximately 2 million US$ (RSD 156 million).Most of these initiatives supported youth employment through apprenticeship and on the job training programmes. The number of young beneficiaries supported by additional funding in the Districts targeted by the joint programme was 546.**Products/means of verification:** MoERD decision on funding allocation to local governmententities, NES Annual Reports |
| Number of disadvantaged young men and women informed about and participating in employment programmes and/or social services for the first time as a result of improved outreach activities of state institutions | Twenty-seven CSWs received training in communication and outreach services and seven of these designed and implemented communication and outreach plans within the local community. **Products/means of verification**: 7CSR plans, published leaflets, Communication Guide |
| Number of annual operational action plans of CSWs developed and implemented | Seventeen CSWs developed Annual Operational Plans (ten implemented in 2011 and seven being implemented in 2012). Thirty-six CSWs received training in annual Operational Planning. **Products/means of verification: 17**  Annual operational plans of CSWs, published Handbook for Ann. Operationa Planning |
| Number of CSW offices in 6 key municipalities that use referral and information outreach methods targeting disadvantaged youth | All CSW offices are today using basic referral methods, while seven CSWs carried out specific outreach activities targeting disadvantaged youth. **Products/means of verification:** CSWs reports |
| Number of CSW and NES branch offices covering municipalities in the three target districts participating in the delivery of services that are integrated to target the needs of disadvantaged youth | The delivery of integrated employment and social services, as per Draft Operational Procedures prepared under the aegis of the joint programme, was piloted in five municipalities of Serbia from February 2011 to March 2012. Fifty caseworkers of the NES and the CSW received training on integrated service delivery and referral procedures. **Products/means of verification:** Integrated Service Delivery Inter-ministerial Working Group and Operational Procedures Report; The Right to Know Guide, CSWs reports, Marina Petrovic (2011) Final report on the Consultancy on Integrated Service Delivery. |
| Number of Youth Offices‘ staff participating in local council meetings regarding activities affecting youth | Many municipalities in the districts targeted by the joint programme have socio-economic and employment councils, with some of them having councils for social policy, for youth, education, health, minority rights, and persons with disabilities. Participation of at least one member of the Youth Office was ensured in the six policy councils supported through the joint programme (Becej, Mladenovac, Novi Sad, Obrenovac, Surdulica and Vranje) during the identification of priority groups of young people to be involved in active labour market programmes.**Products/means of verification:** Situation analysis and identification of priority youth groups in 6 municipalities , Questionnaires filled in by municipalities,Youth Councils’, Local Employment Councils’ and Socio-economic Councils’ reports in 35 municipalities, JP monitoring and evaluation reports |
| At least 6 Youth Offices established InfoPoints | The “Information Point” model was introduced in 2010. At present InfoPoints in seventeen municipalities are used to disseminate information to young people on education and employment opportunities, cultural and sport events, social services and volunteering openings. **Products/means of verification**: InfoPoints in 17 municipalities,; Group 484 - Needs assessment report, Group 484 Final report on info-points.  |
| At least 6 Youth Offices autonomously manage InfoPoints | The staff of seventeen Youth Offices were trained in 2010 to manage the InfoPoint system, including its continuous updating. Since then, InfoPoints have been managed autonomously by the Youth Offices. Five of the seventeen targeted Youth Offices received additional support to enrich their Info Points activities.**Products/means of verification:** Youth Offices, Group 484 Final report on info-points.   |
| Number of young women and men using the information available through pilot InfoPoints | The information made available though the InfoPoints is regularly accessed by young men and women. Since their establishment, approximately 4,500 young men and women used info-points services to obtain information on education and employment opportunities, cultural and sport events, social services and volunteering openings in their municipalities and beyond.**Products/means of verification:** Reports of the 17 YOs, number of hits per InfoPoint, JP monitoring and evaluation reports |
| Number of YOs managing programmes for disadvantaged youth | The joint programme provided grants to six Youth Offices (in Temerin, Backi Petrovac, Palilula, Surdulica with Vladicin Han, Becej). Activities focused on strengthening reach out services for disadvantaged youth; the establishment of voluntary services (education, social support, career guidance) and youth clubs; the organisation of events in partnership with other local institutions; and the improvement of information gathering and sharing. The implementation of these programmes informed the assessment of the role Youth Offices could play within the integrated service delivery model.Thirty-eight staff members of six Youth Offices (Palilula, Rakovica, Backi Petrovac, Temerin, Surdulica and Bujanovac) were trained to use psycho-social approaches in working with young people. The training comprised nine modules (psychosocial/cultural/economic situation of youth in Serbia; characteristics of vulnerable youth and good practices in their treatment; psychosocial approaches; communication and negotiation skills; public advocacy and creation of social networks; activating the local community; tolerance and motivation building; psychosocial approach through art/cultural activities; project development).The staff of seven Youth Offices (Temerin, Backi Petrovac, Palilula, Surdulica,Vladicin Han, Becej and Bujanovac) were trained in peer career counselling (establishing peer career teams). Staff of the Presevo Youth Office were trained also in project monitoring and evaluation and reporting.**Products/means of verification:** Youth Offices reports, Final Report on the Capacity Building Programme of YO staff |
| At least 400 young women and men benefitted from YO programmes designed at local level as per specific needs | The Youth Offices of seventeen municipalities in the three target Districts of the joint programme continue to cater to the needs of vulnerable youth through information services. Six Youth Offices provide various programmes for vulnerable youth – through voluntary services in Palilula and Backi Petrovac, the Youth Club in Temerin and peer career information in the other municipalities.During the implementation of the joint programme, more than 600 youth benefitted from the services supported. For example, the Youth Office in Backi Petrovac carried out a door-to-door survey to identify vulnerable youth in the municipality. More than 90 households, unrecorded by the official statistics of the NES and CSW, were identified. Approximately 90 young people (of whom 54 from vulnerable groups) were enrolled in various education courses and 23 received peer career counselling . The Youth Office of Palilula collaborates with NGOs targeting youth with disabilities. Through this partnership, 20 young people with visual impairments benefiting from the Youth Office programmes, and additional 20 from peer career counselling. Surdulica introduced 73 new participants in youth activities and Temerin engaged 34 youth in basic training courses. Peer career information reached 180 additional youth.**Products/means of verification:** YO reports, JP monitoring and evaluation reports, Final Report on the Capacity Building Programme, participants’ evaluations |
| Output 3.2. Integrated packages of active labour market measures implemented through the financing of the Youth Employment Fund in the target districts | All NES Branch Offices in the three target districts provide integrated packages of active labour market measures targeting young returnees and other disadvantaged youth through the funding of the YEF | The youth employment programmes designed under the aegis of the joint programme are available to unemployed youth in five Districts of Serbia (Beogradski, Juzno-backi, Pcinjski, Nisavski and Pomoravski) through the NES branch offices and 48 outreach offices.The youth employment programmes available were promoted through brochures and leaflets (distributed to NES branch offices and outreach offices, Centres for Social Work, Youth Offices) and through a TV and Radio campaign (the advertisement was aired 146 times in the period August-October 2010). **Products/means of verification:** Active Labour Market Programmes Guidelines; Promotional brochures, leaflets and TV advertisement; NES monthly reports |
| 1,750 disadvantaged youth (50% women, 20% Roma and 10% youth with disabilities) are trained in occupations required by enterprises and 60% are employed in decent work | By April 2012, more than 1,865 young beneficiaries were trained in occupations demanded by private sector enterprises (42% women, 17,3% Roma and 6% youth with disabilities). Nearly all participants comply with the eligibility criteria set by the joint programme, namely low educational attainment and long unemployment spells. The performance monitoring carried out in February 2012 show a placement rate of beneficiary equal to 25.4 per cent of entrants. Over a third of participants worked in the manufacturing sector, while over two thirds were employed in the occupation of training. Over 60% worked for the same enterprise that provided the training and 70% used the skills learnt in their current position.The Government of Serbia contributed directly to the employability of young people with RSD 8.5 million (or US$ 121,315). These resources allowed the targeting of 169 young men and women. **Products/means of verification:** NES data base, NES monthly reports |
| 1,000 disadvantaged youth (50% women, 20% Roma and 10% youth with disabilities) participate in work placement programmes and 60% are employed in decent work | By April 2012, 635 beneficiaries are involved in work placement programmes (32% women and 10% Roma) while youth with disabilities (155 in total) were offered a comprehensive programme (vocational rehabilitation services, employment subsidies and workplace adaptation). The Government of Serbia contributed to this programme with RSD 56.6 million (or US$810,000). These resources allowed the participation of 798 young men and women**Products/means of verification:** Signed contracts, NES data base, NES monthly reports |
| 250 disadvantaged youth (50% women, 30% Roma and 5% youth with disabilities) receive self-employment assistance | Self-employment assistance was provided to 181 beneficiaries (37% women, 9,5% Roma and 3,5% youth with disabilities). The self-employment programme was the one yielding the higher return in terms of employment at follow up (with 76 per cent of beneficiaries still self-employed at programme’s end).The Government of Serbia contributed to the self-employment programme for youth with approximately RSD 21 million (or US$ 300,500). These resources allowed the treatment of 511 young men and women. **Products/means of verification:** Signed contracts, NES data base, NES monthly reports |
| Output 3.3. Youth awareness raised on existing local services as well as on risks of irregular migration | At least 7,000 information packages developed and disseminated | After a mapping of the information materials and campaigns already implemented, the joint programme decided to develop an online game to inform youth on the risks of irregular migration. The game was finalized in December 2011 and tested in January 2012. In line with the recommendations from the Ministry of Interior, the domain [www.lifeonsale.rs](http://www.lifeonsale.rs) was transferred to [www.lifenotforsale.rs](http://www.lifenotforsale.rs).The "Right to Know" guide was finalized and distributed during the final conference organized by the joint programme in April 2012.**Products/mans of verification**: [www.lifenotforsale.rs](http://www.lifenotforsale.rs), signed contracts, brochures, "Right to Know" guide. |
| Number of disadvantaged youth informed about available services and safe migration through number of articles in national and local print media, number of TV appearances, number of radio appearances and number of advertisements aired/published on electronic and printed media | Since February 2012, 324 persons played the online game on the risks of irregular migration. **Products/mans of verification:** Life not for sale IT support system |

## Annex 2 –Summary Of The Contribution Of The Government Of Serbia To The Youth Employment Fund

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **INDIVIDUALS** | **DISBURSEMENTS** | **TOTAL ADMIN. COSTS (RSD)**  | **TOTAL COSTS (RSD)** | **TOTAL COST (USD)[[12]](#footnote-12)** |
| **Programme**  | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2012** | **Total**  | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2012** | **Total (RSD)** |
| Functional elementary education | 14 | 28 | 0 | 0 | **42** | 980,000 | 1,960,000 | 0 | 0 | **2,940,000** | 249,312 | **3,189,312** | 45,627 |
| Labour market training | 40 | 71 | 9 | 1 | **121** | 1,600,000 | 2,840,000 | 360,000 | 60,000 | **4,860,000** | 179,564 | **5,039,564** | 72,097 |
| Job specific training | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | **6** | 0 | 240,000 | 0 | 0 | **240,000** | 11,130 | **251,130** | 3,593 |
| Subsidized employment | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | **1** | 0 | 45,000 | 0 | 0 | **45,000** | 0 | **45,000** | 644 |
| Virtual enterprise | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **0** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **0** | 0 | **0** | 0 |
| Entrepreneurship training  | 91 | 285 | 48 | 0 | **424** | 0 | 8,550,000 | 0 | 0 | **8,550,000** | 157,304 | **8,707,304** | 124,568 |
| Self-employment subsidies  | 16 | 6 | 32 | 1 | **55** | 2,080,000 | 0 | 5,120,000 | 160,000 | **7,360,000** | 265,265 | **7,625,265** | 109,088 |
| Self-employment subsidies (Vojvodina) | 22 | 3 | 1 | 0 | **26** | 3,575,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **3,575,000** | 125,398 | **3,700,398** | 52,938 |
| Self-employment subsidies, farm (Vojvodina) | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **6** | 975,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **975,000** | 0 | **975,000** | 13,948 |
| Subsidies for workplace equip. and job creation | 46 | 81 | 126 | 6 | **259** | 5,673,318 | 9,989,973 | 15,750,000 | 1,200,000 | **32,613,291** | 2,402,225 | **35,015,516** | 500,937 |
| Subsidies (at risk groups) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **0** | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | **0** | 0 | **0** | 0 |
| Subsidies for job creation (Vojvodina) | 44 | 29 | 13 | 0 | **86** | 5,720,000 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | **5,720,000** | 797,650 | **6,517,650** | 93,242 |
| Persons under 30 | 67 | 60 | 144 | 4 | **275** | 408,812 | 366,101 | 3,101,904.00 | 86,1640 | **3,962,981** | 4,999,225 | **8,962,206** | 128,215 |
| Beginners under 30 | 0 | 2 | 69 | 0 | **71** | 0 | 12,203 | 1,486,329.00 | 0 | **1,498,532** | 1,922,893 | **3,421,425** | 48,947 |
| Persons with disabilities | 10 | 35 | 57 | 4 | **106** | 51,910 | 181,685 | 893,190.00 | 62,680 | **1,189,465** | 1,455,062 | **2,644,527** | 37,833 |
| **Total** | **356** | **607** | **499** | **16** | **1,478** | **21,064,040** | **24,184,962** | **26,711,423** | **1,568,844** | **73,529,270** | **12,565,028** | **86,094,298** | **1,231,678** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Contribution to YEM programmes** | **Total participants** | **Costs****(RSD)** | **Cost** **(USD)** |
| Training programmes | 1,203 | 3,124,191 | 44,695 |
| Self-employment promotion  | 98 | 472,654 | 6,762 |
| Subsidies for youth with disabilities  | 55 | 265,265 | 3,795 |
| **Total** | **1,356** | **3,862,110** | **55,252** |
|  |  |  |  |
| Voluntary contribution 2011  |  | 27,000,000 | 386,266 |
| Total cost NES Programmes |  | 86,094,298 | 1,231,678 |
| **OVERALL CONTRIBUTION TO YEM**  | **116,956,409** | **1,673,196** |

1. The design of the Joint Programme is in line with the aims of the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS, 2003); the National Strategy for Economic Development (2006-2012); the National Sustainable Development Strategy (2008-2013); the Strategy for Regional Development (2007-2012); the National Employment Strategy (2005-2010); the Strategy for the Development of Secondary Vocational and Adult Education; the Strategy for Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment of Persons with Disabilities; the Strategy for the Integration of Returnees; the Strategy for the Improvement of the Status of Roma population groups; and the National Employment Service (NES) Strategy for Change (2006-2008). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See V. Corbanese, *Performance monitoring of active labour market programmes targeting youth* 2012; B. Andjelkovic, P. Golicin *Performance monitoring of the integrated service delivery system*, 2012; M. Arandarenko, *Performance monitoring of the Joint Programme: Employment component*, 2012; A. Taylor, *Performance monitoring of the Joint Programme: Social protection and integrated service delivery*, 2012; Slobodan Cvejic, *Performance monitoring of the Joint Programme: Management of migration*, 2012; Sever Dzigurski, *Performance monitoring of the Joint Programme: Capacity building of Youth Offices*, 2012. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Manke, M, 2010, *Towards Developing a Policy on Labour Migration in the Republic of Serbia, A White Paper.* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. This working group comprises representatives of the Ministry of Economy and Regional Development, the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Youth and Sport, the National Employment Service and the Republic Institute for Social Protection. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. According to the new *Law On The Promotion Of Employment And Protection Against Unemployment*, local government authorities may receive co-financing from the Government budget for the implementation of employment initiatives at local level. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Arandarenko, M. March 2012. *Report On The Third Cycle Of Monitoring Of Progress Achieved In The Promotion Of Youth Employment In Serbia*, technical monitoring report for the YEM JP. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. As Serbia neither formulated or plans to formulate in the near future a development strategy, the national employment strategy is taken as the most prominent policy in which youth employment could be mainstreamed. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. *National Employment Action Plan of the Republic of Serbia*, adopted with Government's Conclusion 05 101-7599/2011, Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia No. 79/11. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. A detailed analysis of the integrated service delivery system can be found in A. Taylor *Performance monitoring of the Joint Programme on youth employment and migration: Social Protection*, Belgrade, 2012 and in the empirical study of B. Andjelkovic and P. Golicin *Performance monitoring of the integrated service delivery,* Belgrade, 2012. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Mihail Arandarenko, *Performance monitoring of the Joint Programme on youth employment and migration: Employment*, Belgrade 2012 [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. The summary table presents the achievements of indicators at Joint Programme’s end according to the monitoring framework that was revised by the ILO at Joint Programme start to better measure the performance in producing Outputs and achieving the Outcomes. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. The exchange rate Serbian Dinar US dollar used for the computation is the one in force at UN system level in May 2009 when the Joint Programme Document was approved. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)