

Procedure file

Basic information		
INI - Own-initiative procedure	2016/2242(INI)	Procedure completed
Control of spending and monitoring of EU Youth Guarantee schemes cost-effectiveness		
Subject		
4.15.02 Employment: guidelines, actions, Funds		
4.40 Education, vocational training and youth		
4.40.10 Youth		
8.70.03 Budgetary control and discharge, implementation of the budget		

Key players			
European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	CONT Budgetary Control		11/10/2016
		 VAUGHAN Derek	
		Shadow rapporteur	
		 SALA FRANCA SÁNCHEZ-NEYRA José Ignacio	
		 FITTO Raffaele	
		 DLABAJOVÁ Martina	
		 STAES Bart	
		 VALLI Marco	
	Committee for opinion	Rapporteur for opinion	Appointed
	BUDG Budgets		31/08/2016
		 MAŇKA Vladimír	
	EMPL Employment and Social Affairs		27/10/2016
		 ŽITŇANSKÁ Jana	
	CULT Culture and Education		13/05/2016
		 COMODINI CACHIA Therese	

Key events

06/10/2016	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
25/09/2017	Vote in committee		
11/10/2017	Committee report tabled for plenary	A8-0296/2017	Summary
23/10/2017	Debate in Parliament		
24/10/2017	Results of vote in Parliament		
24/10/2017	Decision by Parliament	T8-0390/2017	Summary
24/10/2017	End of procedure in Parliament		

Technical information

Procedure reference	2016/2242(INI)
Procedure type	INI - Own-initiative procedure
Procedure subtype	Initiative
Legal basis	Rules of Procedure EP 54
Other legal basis	Rules of Procedure EP 159
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	CONT/8/07997

Documentation gateway

Committee draft report		PE603.072	06/06/2017	EP	
Committee opinion	CULT	PE603.034	27/06/2017	EP	
Amendments tabled in committee		PE608.054	11/07/2017	EP	
Committee opinion	EMPL	PE602.832	19/07/2017	EP	
Committee opinion	BUDG	PE606.163	31/08/2017	EP	
Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading		A8-0296/2017	11/10/2017	EP	Summary
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading		T8-0390/2017	24/10/2017	EP	Summary
Commission response to text adopted in plenary		SP(2018)7	08/03/2018	EC	

Control of spending and monitoring of EU Youth Guarantee schemes cost-effectiveness

The Committee on Budgetary Control adopted an own-initiative report by Derek VAUGHAN (S&D, UK) on the control of spending and monitoring of EU Youth Guarantee schemes cost-effectiveness.

Youth unemployment continues to be a serious problem in a number of Member States, with more than 4 million young people aged between 15-24 unemployed in the EU in 2016. The Youth Guarantee (YG) and the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) have already become established

as the most effective and visible action at Union level aimed at combating youth unemployment. They cover different actions, with the YG intended to encourage structural reform in education and serve as a short-term measure to combat youth unemployment, while the YEI is a funding instrument.

General remarks: Members noted that in four years of the Youth Guarantees implementation, from 2013 to 2017, the youth unemployment rate in the EU has decreased by more than 7 percentage points, from 23.8 % in April 2013 to 16.6 % in April 2017, which means that almost 2 million young people have ceased to be unemployed. However, they regretted that in many instances too much of this decrease is because so many young people have been forced to seek employment outside the EU, a loss that will be sorely felt in future decades.

Regretting that in mid-2016, 4.2 million young people in the EU were still unemployed, Members urged the Member States to use available EU support in order to tackle this longstanding issue. Deploring the fact that the majority of young people not in employment, education or training (NEETs) in the EU do not yet have access to any YG scheme, Members called on the Council to consider continuing a learning exchange within the existing public employment services network with a view to developing strategies based on best practices. The development of one-stop-shops should be supported in order to boost the positive impact of the YG by ensuring that all services and guidance are available for young people at one location.

Implementation and monitoring: the report noted that a lack of information on the potential cost of implementing a scheme in a Member State can result in inadequate funding for implementing the scheme and achieving its objectives. Member States are invited to establish an overview of the cost of implementing the YG.

The Commission is called on to provide more precise information about the cost-effectiveness of the YG and how implementation of the programme is monitored in the Member States, and to provide comprehensive annual reporting on this.

Member reiterated their commitment to monitor closely all Member State activities in order to make the YG a reality and invited youth organisations to keep Parliament updated on their analysis of Member State action. The involvement of youth organisations in the communication, implementation and evaluation of the YG is also crucial for its success.

Members expressed concern that data on the beneficiaries, outputs and results of the YEI are sparse and often inconsistent. Measures are needed to lighten the administrative burden and provide more up-to-date monitoring systems for the remaining YEI funding. The Commission is asked to revise its guidance on data collection and Member States to revise their baselines and targets in order to minimise the risk of overstating results.

The report stressed the need to set up a system of indicators and measures to assess and monitor the effectiveness of both public employment schemes and the YG, since even though provision was made for such a system from the start, there are still many shortcomings.

Members called for efficient and transparent scrutiny, reporting and monitoring of how funds allocated at European and national levels are spent so as to prevent abuses and the wasting of resources.

Improvements to be made: Members stressed the need to create and develop high-quality lifelong careers guidance with the active involvement of families in order to help young people make better choices about their education and professional careers.

Member States for their part are called on to:

- properly assess the costs of their YG schemes, to manage expectations by setting realistic and achievable objectives and targets, to mobilise additional resources from their domestic budgets;
- ensure the provision of follow-up data to assess the long-term sustainability of outcomes from a quality and quantity perspective, and for more transparency and consistency in data collection, including gender-disaggregated data collection, in all the Member States.

Lastly, the Commission should carry out a detailed analysis of the effects of measures implemented in the Member States, to single out the most efficient solutions and, based on these, to provide recommendations to the Member States as to how to attain better results with a higher degree of efficiency.

Control of spending and monitoring of EU Youth Guarantee schemes cost-effectiveness

The European Parliament adopted by 554 votes to 61, with 53 abstentions, a resolution on the control of spending and monitoring of EU Youth Guarantee schemes cost-effectiveness.

Youth unemployment continues to be a serious problem in a number of Member States, with more than 4 million young people aged between 15-24 unemployed in the EU in 2016. In some Member States more than one quarter of young people are unemployed.

The Youth Guarantee (YG) and the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) have already become established as the most effective and visible action at Union level aimed at combating youth unemployment. They cover different actions, with the YG intended to encourage structural reform in education and serve as a short-term measure to combat youth unemployment, while the YEI is a funding instrument.

General remarks: Parliament noted that in four years of the Youth Guarantees implementation, from 2013 to 2017, the youth unemployment rate in the EU has decreased by more than 7 percentage points, from 23.8 % in April 2013 to 16.6 % in April 2017, which means that almost 2 million young people have ceased to be unemployed. However, it regretted that in many instances too much of this decrease is because so many young people have been forced to seek employment outside the EU, a loss that will be sorely felt in future decades.

In order to tackle youth unemployment which remains far too high, Parliament called on the Member States to utilise available EU support and implement strategies that meet the requirements and needs of the labour market of each single Member State in order to create high-quality training opportunities and lasting employment. However, the YEI/ESF funds available should not replace Member States public expenditure.

Deploring the fact that the majority of NEETs in the EU do not yet have access to any YG scheme, Parliament called on the Council to consider continuing a learning exchange within the existing PES network with a view to developing strategies based on best practices to reach and support NEET youth. It also recommended that the possibility of funding local campaigns organised in conjunction with all local partners, including youth organisations, be increased, and that the development of platforms for young people to register on the scheme be supported.

In addition, the development of one-stop shops should be supported to encourage the positive impact of YG by ensuring that all services and

guidance are available for young people at one location.

Implementation and monitoring: noting that the lack of information available on the potential cost of implementing a system such as the YG in a Member State may lead to inadequate funding, Parliament called on the Council to support the Member States in improving the reporting of data and establishing an overview of the cost of implementing the YG.

The resolution emphasised the need to:

- provide more precise information about the cost-effectiveness of the YG and how implementation of the programme is monitored in the Member States;
- ensure early intervention mechanisms, the quality of job, further education and training offers, clear eligibility criteria and partnership-building with the relevant stakeholders;
- further involve youth organisations in the communication, implementation and evaluation of the YG;
- disseminate good monitoring and reporting practices, so that the results from the Member States can be communicated consistently and reliably, and assessed seamlessly, including as regards quality;
- set up less administratively burdensome and more up-to-date monitoring systems for the remaining YEI funding;
- focus on results achieved by the YEI programme, through the definition of concrete indicators in the form of reforms carried out in the Member States, knowledge and skills obtained from the programme, and the number of permanent contracts offered;
- set up a system of indicators and measures to assess and monitor the effectiveness of both public employment schemes and the YG;
- monitor in an efficient and transparent manner how funds allocated at European and national levels are spent so as to prevent abuses and the wasting of resources.

Improvements to be made: Parliament called for:

- the need to guarantee a long-term commitment through ambitious programming and stable financing from both the EU budget and the national budgets in order to offer full access to all young people who are NEETs in the EU;
- the creation and development of high-quality lifelong careers guidance with the active involvement of families in order to help young people make better choices about their education and professional careers;
- sufficient funding to be available in order to ensure the successful integration of all young workers who are unemployed or do not have access to a suitable training or educational offer.

Member States should: (i) properly assess the costs of their YG schemes, to manage expectations by setting realistic and achievable objectives and targets; (ii) reinforce the financing of their PES in order to enable them to fulfil additional duties linked to YEI implementation; (iii) ensure the provision of follow-up data to assess the long-term sustainability of outcomes from a quality and quantity perspective.