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1. **PURPOSE**
2. Provide a brief introduction on the socio economical context and the development problems addressed by the programme.

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 more mature part of the population, young people experienced lower employment (16.9 per cent and 40.8 per cent in 2009, respectively), and higher unemployment (40.7 per cent and 17.4 per cent, respectively)[[1]](#footnote-1). Labour statistics indicates that certain young people were more disadvantaged than others. National origin, sex, educational level, geographical location and disability strongly affected youth employment outcomes. The transition to decent work remains difficult for low-educated youth, especially for those living in less developed regions and in rural areas. Poverty in the country has 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 are the main factors pushing youth to migrate internally and abroad. Following the Readmission Agreement signed by Serbia and the European Union in 2007, it was 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. 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 deployed to addressing the needs of young people facing multiple barriers to labour market entry and strong pushes 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 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 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[[2]](#footnote-2). 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.

The Joint Programme deployed a three-pronged strategy touching upon policies, institutions and programmes that concurred to the delivery of integrated employment and social services targeting disadvantaged young women and men exposed to migration. It centred on three interlinked outcomes aimed at: I) mainstreaming youth employment and migration policy objectives into national development and employment frameworks; II) strengthening the capacity of national institutions to develop integrated labour market and social services, and III) implementing a package of programmes on employment and social services. The Joint Programme was expected to: 1) improve the knowledge and understanding of integrated policies and measures to tackle youth employment and migration; 2) give more prominent focus to youth employment in national development frameworks; 3) develop a national policy on the management of labour migration and improve the capacity of Serbian institutions to tackle youth migration; 4) establish an inter-institutional system combining employment and social services for disadvantaged youth; 5) deploy a comprehensive package of gender-sensitive youth employment and social protection services; and 6) design a system for replicating and scaling-up of pilot programmes at national level.

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).

1. List joint programme outcomes and associated outputs as per the final approved version of the joint programme Document or last agreed revision.

**JP Outcome 1: Youth employment and migration policy objectives are included into national development frameworks**

JP outcomes and outputs:

* 1. Knowledge base on youth employment and migration improved to inform national development strategy and action plans.

*Output 1.1.1 15 statistical indicators on youth employment, informal employment and internal migration developed and used for policy-making purposes by the end of the first year of the JP*

*Output 1.1.2 At least 5 key youth migration indicators developed and used for policy making purposes at both the national and local level*

*Output 1.1.3 At least 10 key indicators for youth social protection developed and used for policy making purposes at both the national and local level*

*Output 1.1.4 DevInfo database system and data collection processes upgraded with the integration of new sets of indicators on youth employment, migration and social protection*

* 1. Policy on management of labour migration, including returns of young Serbs, developed and linked to employment policy and strategies.

*Output 1.2.2 A national policy on labour migration and an accompanying action plan with specific priorities and outcomes adopted by the Serbian Government*

* 1. Youth employment and migration targets included in national development strategy.

*Output 1.3.1 An advocacy campaign conducted by the end of the first year of the JP by organizations representing the interests of young people to prioritize youth employment and migration targets in national development policies*

*Output 1.3.2 Youth employment and migration targets are included in national development strategies and budgetary planning frameworks*

**JP Outcome 2: National institutions develop integrated labour market and social services that meet employment and migration policy objectives targeting disadvantaged young women and men.**

JP outcomes and outputs:

1. A system integrating labour market, migration and social services for youth established and functioning.

*Output 2.1.1 An integrated service delivery system that reaches out to disadvantaged youth is developed and operationalized*

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

*Output 2.2.1 A referral system for integrated service delivery that targets disadvantaged youth developed and in use by the NES*

*Output 2.2.2 Methodology, guidelines and minimum content requirements of annual operational actions plans of CSWs agreed by MoLSP and elaborated in Handbook for Operational Planning for CSWs*

*Output 2.2.3 A referral mechanism to employment and social services that targets disadvantaged youth developed and in use by the MYS and relevant Youth Offices*

*Output 2.2.4 At least 6 YOs participating in the delivery and type of services that are integrated to target the needs of disadvantaged youth*

* 1. A long-term national financial mechanism to implement employment measures targeting disadvantaged youth established and implemented.

*Output 2.3.1 By the end of the JP, the Youth Employment Fund (YEF) finances employment interventions*

*Output 2.3.2 A monitoring system to assess performance and cost-effectiveness of active labour market programmes developed and in use by labour market institutions*

*Output 2.3.3 A framework for PPPs for youth employment developed and in use by labour market institutions*

*Output 2.3.4 At least 10 private enterprises are contributing to selected youth employment initiatives through CSR*

**JP Outcome 3: Integrated employment programmes and social services targeting young returnees and other disadvantaged young women and men implemented in three target districts.**

JP outcomes and outputs:

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

*Output 3.1.1 At least 6 municipalities in the three target districts develop evidence-based policies and strategies on youth employment, migration and social protection*

*Output 3.1.2 Local coordination mechanisms in at least 6 municipalities in the three target districts prioritize youth employment interventions to be financed by the YEF and other sources*

*Output 3.1.3 CSWs covering all key municipalities in all the three target districts use referral and information outreach methods targeting disadvantaged youth*

*Output 3.1.4 CSW and NES branch offices covering all key municipalities in the three target districts deliver integrated services targeting disadvantaged youth*

*Output 3.1.5 At least 6 Youth Offices autonomously manage InfoPoints that provide information to young women and men*

*Output 3.1.6 At least 6 Youth Offices demonstrate capacity to be actively engaged in the local coordination of activities affecting youth in a youth friendly manner*

*Output 3.1.7 At least 6 Youth Offices demonstrate increased capacity to design and implement projects targeted towards disadvantaged youth providing direct benefit to at least 400 young men and women*

* 1. Integrated packages of active labour market measures implemented through the financing of the Youth Employment Fund.

*Output 3.2.1 All NES branch offices in the 3 target districts provide integrated packages of active labour market measures targeting young returnees and other disadvantaged youth through the funding of the YEF by the end of the second year of the JP*

*Output 3.2.2 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*

*Output 3.2.3 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*

*Output 3.2.4 250 disadvantaged youth (50% women, 30% Roma and 5% youth with disabilities) receive self-employment assistance by the end of the JP and Serbian government contributes at least 300,000 USD towards self-employment initiatives by the end of the JP*

* 1. Youth awareness raised on existing local services as well as on risks of irregular migration.

*Output 3.3.1 7,000 information packages targeting disadvantaged youth on services available, regular migration and risks of irregular migration and trafficking developed and disseminated in target regions*

*Output 3.3.2 One nationwide information campaign implemented to raise awareness of issues of youth employment and migration and of the JP and its donor.*

1. Explain the overall contribution of the joint programme to National Plan and Priorities

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 2011-2020*, 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 a secretariat to the 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 pre-experience, especially in the field of policy and programme effectiveness. In consultations with MoERD, Ministry of Religion and the Diaspora and Commissariat for Refugees priorities for labour migration policy were agreed and the White Paper on a labour migration policy for Serbia completed. The *White Paper* made significant inroads in addressing these gaps and in providing the Government with a reliable framework for policy and programme development. MoERD was supported with drafting of the new law on employment of foreigners by presenting the EU Acquis on the Employment of Third-Country nationals and by delivering comparative study on the Employment of Foreign Nationals in France, Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) and Montenegro.

Regular collection and analysis of data on youth labour supply and labour demand, as well as internal and international migration patterns and social protection, was improved to inform the policy making process. Through the capacity building of the inter-ministerial working group, run by the MoYS, the JP contributed to the implementation of the National Strategy for Career Guidance and Counselling. Also, technical inputs for the development of the Law on youth were provided, as well as inputs for guidelines on standards for the youth offices and competencies of the youth office coordinators. In the final phase, the JP supported the process of the establishment of the national association of the youth offices. These were important steps in development of mechanisms for quality implementation of national and local youth policy.

The Joint Programme has also enhanced policy coherence and coordination among government institutions and particularly among the MoERD and the NES on the one hand, and the MoLSP and the CSWs, on the other. In this regard, the Joint Programme has to be considered successful and worthy of being studied 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.

1. Describe and assess how the programme development partners have jointly contributed to achieve development results

The achievement of Joint Programme results was based on the 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 development of national and local M&E capacities, youth participation and youth-friendly services, child-care reform and child protection; by the IOM on supporting voluntary returns and reintegration of returnees, 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 Joint Programme was developed and implemented through a participatory process involving participating UN agencies and national partners. Synergy and coordination between the agencies was ensured from the very beginning, having in mind interdependence of different outputs which required well planned time-sequence and synchronization of activities. The findings of the final evaluation indicate that all JP outcomes were met, thanks to the full dedication and contribution of all development partners involved in implementation and monitoring of programme results.

Also, the Joint Programme was able to maintain relevance throughout the three years of implementation, thanks to a flexible approach to implementation and close cooperation between national partners and implementing UN Agencies.

The participatory approach adopted the constant involvement of stakeholders, partner institutions and other organizations as well as the subsequent extensive dialogue established amongst them yielded optimal results in terms of impact and sustainability and improved policy coherence and coordination in the delivery of youth employment and social inclusion policy objectives.

II ASSESSMENT OF JOINT PROGRAMME RESULTS

1. Report on the key outcomes achieved and explain any variance in achieved versus planned results. The narrative should be results oriented to present results and illustrate impacts of the pilot at policy level

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

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 Labour Force Survey (LFS). The developed social protection indicators and data sources enabled monitoring and evaluation of social protection and social services in the most relevant areas for children and youth, disaggregated by age, sex, disability, municipality and ethnicity, which was not the case at the commencement of the JP. The new |Law on Social Protection anticipated the development of social protection indicators and the streamlining of reporting formats within the social protection system, thus enabling their availability through regular annual reports and specific analytical reporting. The capacity of the Republic Institute for Social Protection has been developed to produce these analytical reports.

Inclusion of youth employment and migration policy objectives into national strategies, development of integrated labour market and social services to support young migrants and implementation of integrated employment programmes and social services targeting young returnees and other disadvantaged young women and men, has improved policy tools for migration management, strengthened communication between relevant national stakeholders in this field, eased transfer of policy tools from central to local level, increased awareness about importance of migration issues and tested means of assistance to vulnerable youth at local level.

Migration management is much more recognized as an important developmental issue today than before the JP’s start, and as a proof of influence is the raised capacity of national stakeholders to deal with migration problems, raised awareness of local stakeholders on vulnerability of young migrants, improved policy framework for migrations as well as increased number of refugees and internally displaced included into employment programmes.

The systematic revision of the national and local DevInfo database indicators, adjusted them so as to reflect EU social inclusion indicators, national MDG indicators and the newly developed youth social protection, youth labour and migration indicators. Revision of local DevInfo database is of a particular relevance for future decentralisation processes. The regular availability of data on the local level will assist municipal actors to develop evidence-based interventions. This work within the JP included both changes to the DevInfo database system itself − as the existing system could not fully support local processes − and improvement of the capacity of local institutions to use the data for policy and programme development.

Of equal significance is the assistance delivered by the JP 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 for data analyses and reporting and provision of 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[[3]](#footnote-3)*.

Six specific youth employment targets were mainstreamed in the *National Employment Strategy* based of the work done by the JP 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.[[4]](#footnote-4) The on-the-job training programme (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 JP 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 JP on the referral system between the CSWs and the NES, as well as the research on activation services and welfare to work programmes.

The national advocacy campaign, based on an extensive research on youth employment problems and wide consultative process that involved all relevant stakeholders, has contributed in setting of youth employment priorities. One of the key results of the campaign was signing of a Memorandum of Cooperation between the two ministries (MoERD and Ministry of Education) on entrepreneurship education for youth. The memorandum was further developed into a Protocol of Cooperation, involving numerous interested partners in the development of life-long entrepreneurial education in Serbia.

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

The Joint Programme had, and through the Commissariat for Refugees in its new role as a secretariat to the 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 a poor knowledge and pre-experience with clear gaps in policy and programme effectiveness. The greatest achievement of the JP migration component is an increase of visibility and of measurability of migration flows and diversification of the concept of labor migration, as well as use of migration indicators in strategic documents and transfer of outputs to the local level through YO capacity building and information campaign. 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 JP was an instrumental to: I) the establishment of partnership agreements among public service providers; II) the development of an integrated service delivery system and its operational procedures; III) the building of capacity of staff of the NES and CSWs in managing referrals; IV) 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. One of the JP aims 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 application 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 YOs as referral partners in the delivery of integrated service.

As regards the advancement of institutional change and the impact of reforms at local level, some specific comments are warranted on the CSWs workflow, the by-laws 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 and the contribution of the JP is significant, 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.

To summarize, the JP 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 constitutes a remarkable development that shifted what was *ad hoc* cooperation to a systemic relationship, in terms of procedure and planning processes.

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

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 MoERD and the NES, to address the national youth employment challenge. 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.

The employment measures offered through Youth Employment Funds (YEF) influenced employment prospects of disadvantaged youth. About half of participants to on-the-job training were able to find a job at one point after completion the programme, despite their low level of education, longer unemployment spells and lack of work experience and 25 percent was employed at follow up which is a fair return on the investment, since the share of low educated youth who are employed according to the LFS, is mere 3 per cent of the youth population. Programme designed for persons with disabilities yielded the largest share of employment at follow up 97.6 per cent, due to the design (employment subsidy accompanied by workplace and premises adaptation grant). The self-employment programme also gave good results with 74.3 per cent of respondents employed.

Overall, the employment interventions supported through the JP resulted in significant decrease of the share of YEF target groups - educationally disadvantaged youth - in the total youth unemployment in districts targeted by the JP. The positive difference between the ‘before’ and ‘after” status, in all districts covered through JP, was no less than 5 percentage points. The total number of unemployed disadvantaged youth aged 15-30 in five YEF regions dropped by 24.9 percent which indicates that interventions did leave positive mark on the overall labour market situation of the disadvantaged youth in Serbia.

In sum, the employment interventions promoted under the aegis of the JP 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.

In addition, through the work of YOs and establishment of the first information, outreach and, counselling services more than 4,000 young people had an access to information on education and employment opportunities. Approximately 600 young people received some kind of direct service, of whom 200 peer career informing, 170 non-formal education session in key competencies (foreign language, computer literacy and similar) and 160 participated in voluntary programmes and activities.

1. In what way do you feel that the capacities developed during the implementation of the joint programme have contributed to the achievement of the outcomes?

The JP has made significant inroads in the reform process within CSWs and NES branch offices, as well as in the development of the capacity and role of YOs, through the building of capacity within agencies and offices.

This ‘building of capacity’ can not be equated to the number of ‘training’ sessions only. It has been a more intensive process of support and mentoring throughout the JP implementation. On the one hand, the reality of ‘training’ programmes in Serbia is that they often involve changing participants at each training session, and often participants are neither prepared for the work of the session or come from a section or level within the organization inappropriate for the content of the programme. In addition, the types of changes in practice implied in the implementation of the operational planning model, the implementation of the *Rulebook on the organisation, normative provisions and standards of work in the CSWs* 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 simple ‘training programme’.

The Joint Programme strengthened the capacity of labour market institutions, the Employment Department of the MoERD and the NES, to mainstream youth employment into the national employment policy and to design, monitor and evaluate integrated packages of youth employment services and programmes. The MERD was empowered to coordinate action on youth employment, as a means to promote the inclusion of youth living at the margin of society, across different stakeholders and to leverage on funds to support initiatives to target the needs of the most disadvantaged groups of the youth population at national and local level.

Extensive support was provided to the MoLSP in improving policy frameworks related to youth through definition of the youth social protection indicators and the support provided in shaping of the Law on Social Protection and the by-law on activation. All capacity building related actions organized within the framework of the JP were intended to support future policy development and monitoring, as well as to create the foundation for inter-sectorial cooperation needed for better planning and delivery of services.

Direct support was provided to CSWs in strengthening their capacities for service delivery. Twenty six CSWs received training in annual operational planning, 17 CSWs developed annual operational plans (AOPs) and 5 AOPs were further developed into best practice examples. Twenty seven CSWs received training in communication, 7 CSWs developed communication plans and communication materials. A total of 374 directors/managers participated and were trained to implement the Rulebook for CSWs with the case management approach and 75 experts were trained to take on a supervisory role ensuring that the critical role of the CSW services reaches the required quality.

Recognizing the importance of integrated service approaches whose integral part are dedicated caseworkers, significant efforts were invested by the JP to provide professionals working CSWs and NES with tools that would enable then to more effectively deliver integrated services, tailored to the needs of individual clients. Case management and training on integrated service model was the key to ensure that young clients receive all the support and services needed for reintegration into society.

Of equal significance is the assistance delivered by the JP to build the capacity of partner institutions, at 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 YOs to provide assistance to municipal authorities in designing youth-specific interventions.

Through the range of trainings based on the learning by doing approach the local YOs have further increased their capacities to reach and engage different and more vulnerable young people in their community, to establish clubs and voluntary services and to deliver employment related projects. Thanks to the JP programme, six YOs have developed services and programs to increase employability of vulnerable youth. In addition, one youth club was established, one local voluntary service for supporting employability of vulnerable youth, one local voluntary education centre, six local teams for peer career informing and more than 30 new partnerships, 14 promotional activities reaching a large number of young people locally.

Through the work of YOs, and establishment of the information, outreach, counselling services more than 4,000 young people were reached with information on education and employment opportunities, app. 600 young people received some kind of direct service: 200 received peer career information, 170 attended non-formal education sessions in key competencies (foreign language, computer literacy etc.) and 160 participated in voluntary programmes and activities.

1. Report on how outputs have contributed to the achievement of the outcomes based on performance indicators and explain any variance in actual versus planned contributions of these outputs. Highlight any institutional and/or behavioural changes, including capacity development, amongst beneficiaries/right holders.

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

The work under this Outcome centred on: improving the knowledge base on youth employment, migration and social protection to inform policy development; developing a policy on the management of labour migration linked to the employment policy; and the inclusion of youth employment and migration targets in national development frameworks.

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.

The scope of the bi-annual LFS was expanded to improve the range of youth employment and migration data available for policy-making purposes. Today, the fifteen youth employment and six migration indicators developed with the assistance of the Joint Programme, ranging from youth activity rates, unemployment, informality and rights at work to the number of foreign citizens working in Serbia and the characteristics of individuals migrating internally and abroad, are part of the national statistical programme. The dataset of the LFS allows computing the transition of individuals between different labour market statuses over time as well as the length and quality of the transition from school to work. Another important achievement under this Outcome relates to the knowledge built through the Occupational Skills Survey on labour demand. Whereas originally this survey was aimed at identifying the occupations most demanded at local level to inform the design of active labour market programmes targeting youth, the figures of the establishment survey are now used for the skill needs forecasting system developed by the MoERD with EU funding.

The work carried out by the Joint Programme with the Institute for Social Protection and the Statistical Office of Serbia was key to the development of social protection indicators in line with the 2011 *Law on Social Protection* and European Union standards.Activities centred on the refinement of the DevInfo database to collect and aggregate figures to be used for monitoring the progress in relevant sectors (social protection, employment, health, education etc.) on the national and local levels. Some work still remains to be done for the institutional changes initiated to become entrenched, especially with regard the use of data for policy, programme and client-oriented service design.

The Joint Programme contributed to the development of a labour migration management policy by drafting a *White Paper* on labour migration. This document informed the design of the new *National Employment Strategy* (2011-2020), provided inputs to the Government’s *Action Plan on Migration Management* and was used to draft a technical cooperation initiative on migration management to be financed by the EU Instrument of Pre-Accession Assistance. The *White Paper* proposes that the thirteen migration indicators developed within the framework of the Joint Programme be used to monitor migration management interventions. Migration indicators are organized into six categories: mismatches between labour supply and demand; brain-circulation, monitoring of returns; labour migrants in Serbia; Serbian labour migrants abroad; and social inclusion of hard to employ individuals affected by migration.

As a result of the above mentioned activities, the Government of Serbia included six measurable youth employment targets in the *National Employment Strategy* (2011-2020). By 2020, the initiatives put forward are expected to increase youth activity and employment rates (to 30.7 per cent and 23.3 per cent, respectively), decrease the youth unemployment rate (to 24 per cent), improve the ratio of youth unemployment to overall unemployment (from 2.1 to 1) and raise the share of teenagers and young adults enrolled in education (to 90 per cent and 40 per cent, respectively). The same Strategy assigns priority to interventions targeting social welfare beneficiaries and population groups more exposed to internal and external migration pushes.

Significant resources were allocated by the Government of Serbia during the implementation of the Joint programme to reach youth employment policy objectives, for active labour market programmes (ALMPs), targeting youth despite the fiscal adjustment constraints caused by the economic crisis. In 2009, approximately €66 million were earmarked for active labour market measures, which represent a 60 per cent increase, compared to the previous year allocation. Of the total funding available, approximately €32 million were assigned to measures targeting youth (up to 30 years of age) through the *First Chance Programme* (e.g. a doubling of the resources available to youth employment). The Government of Serbia also assigned more than US$385,000 directly to the Youth Employment Fund (YEF). Overall, the total contribution of the Government of Serbia to the Joint Programme for youth employment and social inclusion amounted to nearly US$ 1.7 million[[5]](#footnote-5).

The advocacy campaign organized at the national level helped in raising awareness and defining of the key youth employment priorities that are to be addressed by the policy makers. Activities organized within the campaign instigated a concrete action that will have a significant impact on youth employment prospects.

Lastly, the 2012 National Employment Action Plan (NEAP) envisages that young persons with a low level of qualification, beneficiaries of social assistance and individuals exposed to migration push factors be given priority in the referral to active labour market programmes implemented by the NES of Serbia. The promotion of youth employment is one of the pillars of the NEAP to be achieved, among others, through the direct financing of the YEF by the budget of the Government of Serbia.

***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 NES, the MoLSP 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 during 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[[6]](#footnote-6). Recognizing the importance of activation services for the employment prospects of CSWs 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 for 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 CSWs to the NES and *vice versa*. Of these, 242 individuals benefitted from the employment promotion programmes implemented during the JP.

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 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 2,837 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 six 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).

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. Such monitoring system comprised: I) the 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); II) the calculation of employment and earnings levels at programme’s end (through both administrative and survey data); III) 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.

### *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 YEF 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 prioritizing groups for inclusion into employment promotion programmes at 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 put at disposition by the Serbian Government on a competitive basis for the implementation of local employment initiatives[[7]](#footnote-7). Funding decisions are based on local employment action plans, with interventions based on the situation analysis of local labour markets and clear targeting approaches. The Joint Programme assisted local beneficiaries to prioritize interventions for youth population groups at risk of labour market exclusion (young Roma, refugees, young people with disabilities, young members of household on social assistance). In addition, six local policy councils received support to conduct labour market situation analysis, analyze 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 strand of work, the capacity of representatives of local government, YOs and CSWs was built to use local data for policy making purposes, as well as monitoring and evaluation. Sectoral working groups were formed to decide on the indicators to be included in the database.

Through trainings and learning by doing (implementing direct projects with and for vulnerable young people), the local YOs, as a seed for further development of youth services and programmes at the local level, have increased their understanding and capacities to reach out to and engage different kinds of and all together vulnerable young people in their community. Six YOs developed first information, outreach, non-formal education and career informing programmes that increase the spectrum of learning and development opportunities for young people, particularly the most vulnerable ones.

Seventeen YOs were assisted by the JP to develop and deliver services targeting disadvantaged youth through InfoPoints. The initiatives targeting YOs included significant inputs to delivering 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 YOs in developing their knowledge and skills. As a result, these YOs demonstrated an enhanced capacity to contribute to the coordination of youth activities at local level, including cooperation with education and training institutions, the NES and the CSWs. The JP supported them in strengthening inter-sectorial collaboration and made initial steps in positioning them in the community as one of the service providers that can contribute to increasing young people’s employability.

Although not included in its design, the JP provided assistance to build the capacity of the CSWs to implement the 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 key to support social protection approaches, on the one hand, and to improve the effectiveness of CSWs functions, on the other.

Through the range of different JP activities the CSWs capacities at the local level have undoubtedly been strengthened. They have improved efficiency in identifying and addressing the needs of individual clients, planning improvement of existing services and development of the new ones as well as in better communication internally, and externally with beneficiaries and with the local communities, all of which has strengthened their ability to better target services to disadvantaged young people and to better cooperate on integrated service delivery in order to activate and socially include important disadvantaged client groups such as young people.

The YEF, as a mean to channel financial resources to achieve youth employment and social inclusion policy objectives, has 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 and are based on evidence. The YEF was also instrumental to: I) decentralize programme design and implementation, with the involvement of local communities; II) increase the transparency and efficiency of employment and social service delivery; III) demonstrate 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 JP targeted young men and women 15 to 30 years old, with low educational level and long unemployment spells, e.g. 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 for young beneficiaries to be 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 station; 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 JP through the YEF was measured in February 2012 and benchmarked against the performance of regular employment service programmes.

1. Who are and how have the primary beneficiaries/right holders been engaged in the joint programme implementation? Please disaggregate by relevant category as appropriate for your specific joint programme (e.g. gender, age, etc)

By the end of the JP, more than 1,866 young beneficiaries were are involved in work placement programmes (32 per cent women and 10 per cent Roma) while youth with disabilities (155 in total) were offered a comprehensive programme (vocational rehabilitation services, employment subsidies and workplace adaptation); 635 beneficiaries are involved in work placement programmes (32 per cent women and 10 per cent Roma) while youth with disabilities (155 in total) were offered a comprehensive programme (vocational rehabilitation services, employment subsidies and workplace adaptation); self-employment assistance was provided to 181 beneficiaries (37 per cent women, 9,5 per cent Roma and 3,5 per cent youth with disabilities).

Entrants of YEM programmes by individual characteristics (percentage)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total** | **Men** | **Women** |
| **Age group**  |
| 15-19 | **17.6** | 66.2 | 33.8 |
| 20-24 | **40.9** | 52.4 | 47.6 |
| 25-30 | **41.5** | 44.8 | 56.7 |
| **Educational attainment**  |
| I | **80.3** | 52.0 | 48.0 |
| II | **8.9** | 39.8 | 60.2 |
| III | **8.2** | 60.0 | 40.0 |
| IV | **2.2** | 44.0 | 56.0 |
| V | **0.0** | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| VI and over | **0.3** | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| **Unemployment spell** |
| None  | **1.3** | 73.3 | 26.7 |
| 1-3 months | **5.0** | 67.1 | 32.9 |
| 3-6 months | **8.6** | 54.5 | 45.5 |
| 6-12 months | **20.3** | 55.7 | 44.3 |
| 12-24 months | **26.7** | 57.3 | 42.7 |
| 24 months + | **38.1** | 41.7 | 58.3 |
| **Prior work experience**  |
| No experience  | **69.7** | 47.9 | 52.1 |
| With work experience | **30.3** | 59.5 | 40.4 |
| **Other characteristics**  |
| Persons with disabilities  | **7.2** | 54.2 | 45.8 |
| Roma population groups | **18.7** | 57.9 | 42.1 |
| Internally displaced persons  | **1.5** | 88.2 | 11.8 |
| Refugees/returnees | **0.0** | 0.0 | 0.0 |

*Source:* NES Information System, February 2012

In total, 297 young individuals were referred from/to the NES and the CSWs (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 (242) resulted in the participation of beneficiaries to the active labour market programmes funded by the YEF.

Due to weak monitoring capacities of the YOs, there isn’t precise information on the coverage of vulnerable young people by the JP activities. However, some reports indicate that at least one third of 600 young people reached are from vulnerable groups.

1. Describe and assess how the joint programme and its development partners have addressed issues of social, cultural, political and economic inequalities during the implementation phase of the programme:
	1. To what extent and in which capacities have socially excluded populations been involved throughout this programme?

Since the JP targeted disadvantaged and socially excluded youth, they were included in all aspects of the JP. The most direct involvement was through the YEF and employment programmes. Also, activities organised by the YOs, implied direct participation and involvement in design and implementation of activities of disadvantaged youth. Working with and for vulnerable young people has not been the strength of the YOs originally, but the significant capacity building and support has been provided throughout JP implementation. The first results have been seen such as engagement of vulnerable young people as part of the team in the outreach activities, involving them as volunteers in various activities, receiving feedback on the activities organised for them to shape next ones. Another result was the first inclusive youth club established in Temerin, realised through a partnership between the YO/municipality and young people with disabilities. Youth groups and other CSOs working with vulnerable youth were direct partners to the YO in designing and implementing projects – e.g. Roma and NGOs working with young people with disabilities, second chance education school, social protection institutions for children and youth etc. Experiential learning gained through the implementation of projects especially enhanced the capacities of YOs to work with disadvantaged youth.

* 1. Has the programme contributed to increasing the decision making power of excluded groups vis-a-vis policies that affect their lives? Has there been an increase in dialogue and participation of these groups with local and national governments in relation to these policies?

The JP didn’t affect this result significantly. However through engaging of NGOs to directly work with and for vulnerable young people, the JP has indirectly affected their capacities, increased their partnership networks which are prerequisites for their more efficient role in the policy advocacy.

* 1. Has the programme and it development partners strengthened the organization of citizen and civil society groups so that they are better placed to advocate for their rights? If so how? Please give concrete examples.

An outcome related to the advocacy campaign was the establishment of “advocacy base”, a core group of interested NGOs and institutions that continued advocating as a group on youth employment issues. Also, the JP has provided additional support and strengthening of locally based NGO -s (from Pozarevac and Surdulica) to work more closely with YOs on issues related to youth employment and carrier guidance as it was recognised that additional capacity building of local NGOs is needed in these specific segments. NGO Sansa from Pozarevac for example contributed to the public advocacy campaign by raising awareness on the need for early interventions (through establishing career development centres and providing relevant information concerning education and career prospects to children in primary and secondary schools) while NGO from Surdulica in partnership with several other NGOs, YOs and local branches of the NES organised series of events related to better informing of young people on available carrier and educational opportunities.

In addition, each local project with YO/municipalities also considered a partnership with the NGO working with and for vulnerable young people. Through capacity building and local implementation of projects these NGOs/CSOs have been actively participating, thus increasing their capacities and position in the local community.

* 1. To what extent has the programme (whether through local or national level interventions) contributed to improving the lives of socially excluded groups?

All segment of the JP were directed towards improving lives of socially excluded groups. Inroads were made by the JP to correct gender and social status inequalities in accessing employment and training services. Gender concerns were mainstreamed in the implementation of active labour market programmes and this resulted in the achievement of a gender balance in participation. The targeting of young Roma population groups also proved successful, with over a third of beneficiaries belonging to these groups and achieving notable results in gaining and retaining jobs in private sector enterprises.

The YEF 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 MoERD and the NES, to address the national youth employment challenge. The MERD, as the ministry in charge of employment, 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 employment interventions promoted through this Fund 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 and 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 services and programmes organized by the YO/municipalities (information, non-formal education and other activities), aimed at increasing employability of young people, increasing their inclusion through engaging them in targeted or other programmes organized by the YO. Although initial and small scale, results has proved that local services for young people, particularly reaching out and addressing needs of vulnerable young people, are highly needed.

1. Describe the extent of the contribution of the joint programme to the following categories of results:
	1. Paris Declaration Principles
	* Leadership of national and local governmental institutions

The JP had the full backing of all senior officials of the MoERD, MoYS, of the management and staff of the NES, CSWs, and of the Statistical Office of Serbia. Such support allowed the Joint Programme to exceed expectations and to achieve a high quality of outputs. The Government of Serbia delivered the promised human resources and facilities in a timely manner and co-financed the YEF for the implementation of active labour market programmes. This is remarkable considering the fiscal and budgetary constraints the country has been facing since the onset of the global financial and economic crisis, which coincided with the JP launch.

* + Involvement of CSOs and citizens

Involvement of CSOs and youth was insured through an advocacy campaign organised at the national and local level. For the purpose of conducting an advocacy campaign JP contracted a CSOs that organised wide consultative process that involved youth associations, NGOs, decision-makers and government representatives from both national and local level. The process enabled that voices of the young people and their understanding of the key youth employment issues are heard. Through a number of events which include round tables, workshops, street actions, media appearances, the awareness has been raised on the priority youth employment issues that need to be addressed. A related outcome of the advocacy campaign was the establishment of “advocacy base”, a core group of interested NGOs and institutions that continued advocating as a group on youth employment issues.

In addition, the partnerships between YO/municipalities was one of the key requirement for the implementation of the local projects.

* + Alignment and harmonization

The achievement of Joint Programme results 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 JP was implemented through a participatory process that involved UN agencies and national partners. Harmonization and coordination between the Agencies was ensured from the very beginning, having in mind interdependence of outputs which required sound planning and synchronization of activities. The findings of the final evaluation indicate that all JP Outcomes were met which was possible through contribution of all development partners involved in achieving envisaged outputs.

Equally important is that fact that JP keep relevance and importance thanks to flexibility and continuous consultation with the national counterparts which enabled JP’s alignment and harmonization with government priorities.

* + Innovative elements in mutual accountability (justify why these elements are innovative)

Mutual accountability was ensured through a number of mechanisms set at the very early stage of the JP’s implementation. One of the mechanisms established within the JP was Project Implementation Unit meetings, which apart from UN implementing agencies involved representatives of all line ministries. Such mechanism enabled constant coordination as these meetings were held once a week and ensured mutual accountability that was maintained throughout the programme.

* 1. Delivering as One
	+ Role of Resident Coordinator Office and synergies with other MDG-F joint programmes
	+ Innovative elements in harmonization of procedures and managerial practices (justify why these elements are innovative)
	+ Joint United Nations formulation, planning and management

In Serbia, three joint programmes have been approved. YEM was the first one approved. It started in May 2009, while the other two JPs (Sustainable Tourism for Rural Development (under Development and Private Sector thematic window) and Peace Building and Inclusive Development in South Serbia (under Conflict Prevention and Peace Building thematic window) started in December 2009.

Close coordination around these three JPs has been established at all levels:

Internal UN:

* RC/RCO ensured overall coordination of the three JPs and took active part in overseeing the overall processes;
* Each JP has a JP Manager recruited. JP Mangers work closely with RCO and RC. They take active part in the work of the UNCT and UNCT inter-agency thematic groups relevant for the topics of the respective programmes (ie youth, Roma etc);
* JPMs worked directly with individual Agency Heads as required, in particular with the lead Agency (each MDG F JP had one lead Agency and lead Ministry selected to support the overall coordination and management of the project). Lead Agency most often was the one that recruited the JPM;
* JPM worked directly with MDG F Secretariat as required;
* Joint MDG F Communications and Advocacy Officer was recruited to support he C&A work of the MDG Fs. The incumbent was paid from 3 JPs (50%) and MDG F Secretariat (50%);
* Joint Monitoring and Evaluation Officer was not recruited, as it was considered by participating Agencies as not necessary. The teams relied on the internal capacities for M&E work;
* There was regular horizontal communication between the three JPMs who discussed complementarities and occasionally even implemented some activities jointly;
* YEM JPM was the first one recruited and he assisted the start up of the other two programmes and served as coach to his peer in the initial periods. JPMs attended as observers PMCs of the other two JPs, as necessary to discuss complementarities.

External:

* MDG F NSC was formed and it was fully coordinated by the RCO. It consisted of RC, Spanish Ambassador, Government (Government representative to the NSC was in 2009-2010 a representative from the Ministry of Finance, Head of the Development Aid Coordination Unit and in 2010-2012 it was Director of the EU Integration Office Director, as the person in charge of the international aid coordination; this change was due to Government restructuring and the transfer of duties went smoothly) representative. It met once-two times per year officially, had several meetings per year as informal gatherings hosted by the RC (lunches, receptions etc) and communicated in between by e-mail very efficiently (approving funds transfers, reports etc). At the official meetings of the NSC all PMC members were invited to attend as observers;
* MDG F NSC grew into UNDAF NSC (in 2011) with minor changes to the composition (Spanish Ambassador was not there and MFA representative joined as observer). In this other capacity, the pannel met separately;
* Each MDG F JP had its own PMC. The PMCs were chaired by lead Agency and lead Ministry (in YEMs case, IOM and Ministry of Economy and Regional Development) and it included all participating UN and Government partners (IOM, UNDP, UNICEF, ILO, Ministry of Social Affairs, Ministry of Youth and Sports, Statistical Office, National Employment Service, Ministry of Education and several others as listed on the cover of this report). The work of the PMC was coordinated by JPM. RCO, Government and Spanish Embassy attended PMC meeting as observers;
* The horizontal cooperation between YEM and other programmes (MDG F and others implemented under the UNDAF in Serbia)is most appreciated by donors, particularly in the context of the contribution that YEM and other programmes make to the EU integration processes in the country.

YEM PMC was co-chaired by the MoERD and IOM, and it was very active and operated very well. National ownership in the management and implementation of this programme was at the very good level. Given the fact that MoERD has chaired two out of three MDG F PMCs in Serbia, a delegation from the Ministry paid an official visit to US in early December 2011, on which occasion they met with representatives from MDG F Secretariat HQ and discussed possible follow up initiatives.

National ownership promoted through the MDG F JPs is seen to pave the way for the forthcoming decentralized implementation modality to be put in place on the way to the EU integration.

In order to further strengthen, extend and expand some of the good results achieved during the YEM I JP, the team developed a one-year cost extension of the JP (YEM bis) that was submitted to Spanish Government for review and potentially also for funding. A fully fledged YEM II JP is in the process of being developed by the team and PMC and will be presented to donors for funding.

There is interest expressed by national and UN partners that are active on the current project to continue with the YEM activities and objectives through new programmatic ventures.

International JP Manager finished his assignment on 15 November. During the last period of the project implementation, IOM as the lead agency managed to coordinate the project implementation and closure in close cooperation with RCO.

Good management practices from YEM JP were presented at numerous forums, meetings and publications. This JPs input to UN Reform and Coordination were presented in the Global UN Coordination Synthesis Report for 2010, which gave good visibility to MDG F JPs.

RCO in Serbia was very active in connecting the MDG F and Alliance of Civilizations. Programming, Coordination and Management practices from MDG F JPs in Serbia and in the Region were presented to the AOC and were used for reference in the Alliance of Civilizations Strategic documents. Close cooperation in this dialogue was demonstrated in this dialogue between AOC Portugal Office, RCO Serbia, MDG F Secretariat and Spanish Embassy in Belgrade.

All three MDG F JPs are well coordinated and included in the UNDAF for Serbia that is implemented in the period 2011-2015. Best practices from the MDG F JPs are presented in the UNDAF Annual Reports issued by RCO in Serbia.

MDG F and in particular YEM JP activities were put in the focus during the UN Week celebration. Particular attention to the YEM JP activities was dedicated during the UN Week celebration in 2009, when the overarching theme was ‘youth’. YEM JPM was actively working with UNCT in coordinating activities and events during this celebration.

**III. GOOD PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED**

1. Report key lessons learned and good practices that would facilitate future joint programme design and implementation
	* Joint programming, as a modality to implement complex and innovative interventions, is effective when underpinned by 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 throughout understanding of the challenges to be addressed and appreciation of national priorities allows to maintain 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 ethnic belonging. The experience of the Joint Programme revealed that effective targeting produce good programme results, especially in terms of increasing participants’ labour market attachment. Effective targeting, however, may also result in slower intake of participants into programmes, longer treatment periods and lower share of participants employed at follow up. 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); increased 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 the 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.
	* 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 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.
	* The experience of the Joint Programme has shown that clear targeting, out-reach practices and case management approaches are of the essence for the delivery of integrated services to the most vulnerable youth. The establishment of clear and transparent criteria for the selection of young men and women most in need of assistance allows segmenting service delivery (from low to high intensity assistance) and maximizing the effect of resource-intensive treatment. However, just making reintegration services available is not sufficient to ensure that youth at risk actually take them up. This is particularly the case for young Roma individuals living in settlements and for 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 latter are mostly 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 to increase young people participation. The treatment of disadvantaged youth is resource-and time-intensive and requires 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 adopted case management approaches and 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 take up and labour market integration.
	* 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 Joint programme 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.
	* Evidence-based policy and programme formulation should not fall within the exclusive mandate of national-level institutions. Assistance to local government institutions to identify their 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 Joint Programme to strengthen local policy and programme development as well as 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 is in channelling public resources.
	* If investing in youth, local communities need to invest in establishing and supporting local services and programmes for youth. They have to rely largely on the existing institutional resources ensuring that access, co-ordination and “youth-friendliness” is increased. However, there is a need to increase low-cost youth-to-youth services and programmes as the first line for reaching out and engaging all young people (including vulnerable young people) in the personal and community development.
2. Report on any innovative development approaches as a result of joint programme implementation

The JP delivered a set of innovative 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 CSWs 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 JP, 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 YOs, in its operations. The development of the role and capacity of YOs to assist in service delivery and policy formulation at the local level must also be mentioned in the context of potential longer term impact.

The ALMPs piloted by the Joint Programme targeted young men and women 15 to 30 years old, with low educational level and long unemployment spells, e.g. 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 for young beneficiaries to be exposed to multiple interventions according to the specific disadvantages faced in entering the labour market, which was an entirely new approach for the counselors of the NES. 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 station; 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.

In addition to this, innovative methods to carry out establishment surveys to detect skills demanded by employers were pioneered to provide new evidence for youth employment policy-making.

1. Indicate key constraints including delays (if any) during programme implementation
	1. Internal to the joint programme

Since mid November 2011, when the contract of the international Joint Programme Manger has ended and the recruitment process of the national JP was unsuccessful, the JP operates without Program Manager. However, the process of program implementation was not affected, as each agency designated staff that has continued to coordinate and monitor their specific activities.

* 1. External to the joint programme

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, employment rate of participants that took place in measures offered through YEF is more than satisfactory[[8]](#footnote-8)

* 1. Main mitigation actions implemented to overcome these constraints

In spite the fact that the JP YEM operated without the Programme Manager the JP activities continued to be implemented in line with initial plans, showing the commitment of all UN participating Agencies to drive the JP and add value to the change processes affected within national institutions. The YEM PIU continued to regularly organize meetings in order to discuss ongoing issues and further improve coordination among partners.

The employment interventions promoted under the aegis of the JP 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.

Hence, the longer term gains of including disadvantaged youth into 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.

1. Describe and assess how the monitoring and evaluation function has contributed to the:
	1. Improvement in programme management and the attainment of development results

The JP 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 (3 cycles) 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 conducted in April 2012.

The main aim of all different levels of monitoring and evaluation was to generate knowledge, identifying best practices and lessons learned and improve implementation of the programmes during their remaining implementation. As a result, the conclusions and recommendations generated by these internal monitoring and external evaluations (both mid-tem formative and the final summative evaluations) were addressed to its main users: the Programme Management Committee, the National Steering Committee and the Secretariat of the Fund. As confirmed by the final evaluation, the YEM management has largely taken on board the recommendations in line with improved organizational performance and Results Based Management practices.

* 1. Improvement in transparency and mutual accountability

Accountability and transparency was ensured through a number of mechanisms set at the very early stage of the JP’s implementation. Such mechanism include regular PIU meetings where day to day activities and issues were discussed and coordinated, Fund Management Committee which ensured that all activities related to operation of the YEF run smoothly, Project Management Committee which governed and steered JP implementation etc.

* 1. Increasing national capacities and procedures in M&E and data

The JP YEM aimed to strengthen the capacity of national and local institutions to generate and use data for programme development and implementation, policy advocacy and reporting. It also strengthened labour market institutions and social protection partners to design, monitor and evaluate youth employment and social policies and programmes.

As the JP confirmed, the design of youth employment policies and programmes needs to be informed by regular monitoring and evaluation exercises that bring focus on what works for whom and why. Over the three years of programme implementation, the JP YEM has significantly increased national capacities and procedures in M&E and data:

* + - A set of youth related indicators for systematic monitoring of youth labour market developed;
		- a result of training workshops organized for representatives of institutions mandated to address emigration and returns as well as representatives of young people a set of 5 statistical indicators focused on international youth migration identified and developed;
		- social protection indicators in line with the 2011 *Law on Social Protection* and European Union standards were developed by the Institute for Social Protection (RISP) and the Statistical Office of Serbia. The instruments to be used for the collection of the new social protection indicators have been developed and integrated in the system, also enabling analyses by age, disability, ethnicity and municipality.

Activities centred on the refinement of the DevInfo database collected and made available Social inclusion and poverty reduction, national MDG and other relevant indicators to the national and local level. The key local level indicators have defined in consultation with municipalities and representatives of relevant sectors, integrated into local DevInfo database and available in a user-friendly municipal profile format. Capacities of national and local partners built on data usage for policy advocacy has been made.

* 1. To what extent was the mid-term evaluation process useful to the joint programme?

The med-term evaluation was very useful, as it provided very concrete recommendations that the JP team was able to use to enhance some of the segments as well as the effects of the JP.

1. Describe and asses how the communication and advocacy functions have contributed to the:
	1. Improve the sustainability of the joint programme

The YEM communications and advocacy strategy was initiated and designed with the main aim to create a framework for policy advocacy and strategic communication for YEM, promoting the inclusion of key issues in youth employment and migration into national policies and action plans In particular, the strategy served to:

* guide YEM communications internally among partner agencies to support YEM implementation;
* provide guidance and quality assurance for YEM external communication in order to ensure consistent and appropriate visibility for YEM activities, and to support the creation and maintenance of positive and successful relationships with YEM stakeholders;
* outline YEM communication activities’ framework to support the achievement of programme outputs and outcomes, assisting in the identification of, and forward planning to utilize opportunities, and supporting collaboration between different agencies;
* provide the basis for coordinated advocacy action among all YEM partners and team members, utilizing advocacy opportunities and resources to help achieve the positive change identified, and contributing to advocacy around the achievement of YEM goals and MDGs.

In partnership with a national NGO, the national advocacy campaign on youth and employment has been completed, resulting, inter alia, in the signing of a Memorandum between MERD and Ministry of Education as the foundation for introducing entrepreneurial learning into the Serbian education system. Another outcome of the advocacy campaign that has contributed to sustainability of the JP was the establishment of “advocacy base” - interested NGOs and institutions, which will continue advocating as a group.

* 1. Improve the opportunities for scaling up or replication of the joint programme or any of its components

Donor community and other financing partners have been well informed about YEM’s activities by exchange of programme information through governance mechanisms (via YEM PMC/NSC meetings, presentations and reports), provision of additional information in ad hoc meetings as required, production of factsheets as summary information products, promotion of web-page etc. As they were regularly supplied with progress reports and informed about the achievements of the programme, representatives of donor community expressed their satisfaction with the programme on many occasions, which contribute to potential provision of financial support for the replication of the programme.

* 1. Providing information to beneficiaries/right holders

Communication and advocacy has ensured that the beneficiaries/right holders are well-informed about YEM’s activities and continuously updated on overall achievements of the programme. This was achieved through production of factsheets as summary information products, proactive work to ensure local and regional media appearances and presence with success stories and overall positive coverage, advocacy and awareness-raising campaigns in relation to youth (un)employment and specific activities, outreach activities in order to disseminate relevant information to all beneficiaries, as well as through promotion of YEM web-page as an information hub.

In addition, certain JP activities, such as Youth Employment Fund, activities of YO targeting vulnerable youth, delivery of integrated services, were throughout the implementation followed by a comprehensive information campaign which included posters, leaflets addressing beneficiaries and providing detailed information on various programmes offered, regional presentations and round tables, info-packages for beneficiaries on services they can obtain etc. All this productions ensured JP visibility and well informed beneficiaries and right holders.

1. Please report on scalability of the joint programme and/or any of its components
	1. To what extend has the joint programme assessed and systematized development results with the intention to use as evidence for replication or scaling up the joint programme or any of its components?

The full exploitation of the gains achieved through the JP in the area of integrated service delivery will require significant scaling-up, accompanied by a further strengthening of the various components of the integrated service delivery system. The ultimate success of the integrated service delivery system *per se*, as well as the ripping of 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 tool 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 ensure quality 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 YOs, their mandate and their responsiveness to the requirements of the referral system. The work done through the JP is fully integrated in the guidance for implementation of standards of the YO and competencies of the YO co-ordinators and lessons learnt and good practices from the Jp will be used throughout the country.
	1. Describe example, if any, of replication or scaling up that are being undertaken

The work on youth employment as a means to social inclusion fostered policy coordination and the involvement of numerous governmental and non-governmental partners in policy design and implementation, addressed the identified efficiency gaps in the provision of employment and social services and provided a solid management base for up-scaling and diversifying services and programmes targeting disadvantaged youth. Such work generated a number of spin-off effects, including the decision of the Government to continue, with the European Union’s funds for pre-accession, the implementation of employment measures for young individuals at risk of social exclusion. The Ministry in charge of employment has already committed to continue the financing of the Youth Employment Fund and has embedded the good practices stemming from the Joint Programme on targeting approaches into its strategic planning. This is most evident in the inclusion of the most successful ALMP designed by the YEM into the palette of measures regularly offered by the NES.

In relation to the integrated service delivery model it should be stated that this approach has been further supported through the National Employment Strategy 2011-2020, and that the Government’s Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) planning envisages a nation-wide roll-out of the model developed within the YEM.

* 1. Describe the joint programme exit strategy and asses how it has improved the sustainability of the joint program

In the course of the JP implementation, several models to assure the sustainability of the YEF were presented to the Government of Serbia 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). The 2011 Government budget earmarked funds to reach the youth employment targets set by the Joint Programme, while additional resources were granted by the National Action Plan on Employment for 2012 (activation of young social assistance beneficiaries and on-the-job-training combined with employment subsidies).

**IV. FINANCIAL STATUS OF THE JOINT PROGRAMME**

1. Provide a final financial status of the joint programme in the following categories:

1. Total Approved Budget 2.Total Budget Transferred 3. Total Budget Committed 4.Total Budget Disbursed

|  |
| --- |
| **Budget Summary** |
| **Total Approved Budget:**  | IOM: ILO: UNDP: UNICEF: Total:  | 984,9011,344,3703,052,701761,028**6,143,000** |
| **Total Budget Transferred:** | IOM: ILO: UNDP: UNICEF: Total:  | 984,9011,344,3703,052,701761,028**6,143,000** |
| **Total Budget Committed:** | IOM: ILO: UNDP: UNICEF: Total:  | 984,9011,344,3703,052,701761,028**6,143,000** |
| **Total Budget Disbursed:** | IOM: ILO: UNDP: UNICEF: Total:  | 984,9011,344,3703,052,701761,028**6,143,000** |

 b. Explain any outstanding balance or variances with the original budget

**V. OTHER COMMENTS AND/OR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

N/A

**VI. CERTIFICATION ON OPERATIONAL CLOSURE OF THE PROJECT**

By signing, Participating United Nations Organizations (PUNO) certify that the project has been operationally completed.

**VII. ANNEXES**

* + 1. List of all document/studies produced by the joint programme
		2. List all communication products created by the joint programme
		3. Minutes of the final review meeting of the Programme Management Committee and National Steering Committee
		4. Final Evaluation Report
		5. M&E framework with update final values of indicators
1. Labour Force Survey 2009 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. 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 NES) Strategy for Change (2006-2008). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. As Serbia neither formulated nor 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-3)
4. *National Employment Action Plan of the Republic of Serbia*, adopted by the Government of the Republic of Serbia (Government’s Conclusion 05 101-7599/2011, Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia No. 79/11) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The agreement signed between the Government of Serbia and the implementing UN agencies envisaged that the Government contributed to the Youth Employment Fund US$ 1.9 million. The amount of 1.7 million relates to the implementation of youth employment programmes only and does not cover the in-kind contribution provided by the Government of Serbia for the implementation of the Joint Programme (Joint Programme premises, communication costs and others). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. 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-6)
7. 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-7)
8. Please note that the programme for persons with disabilities yielded the largest share of employment at follow up (97.6 per cent), due to the design (employment subsidy accompanied by workplace and premises adaptation grant). The self-employment programme also gave good results with 74.3 per cent of respondents employed. About half of participants to on-the-job training were able to find a job after the programme, despite their low level of education, longer unemployment spells and lack of work experience. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)