

ETF MONITORING FRAMEWORK 2026

Guidelines for policy and system
monitoring

This report has been prepared by the European Training Foundation.

Author(s): Mihaylo Milovanovitch (ETF).

The views reflected in this document do not necessarily reflect the corporate position of the ETF.

© European Training Foundation, 2026



Except otherwise noted, the reuse of this document is authorised under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 international (CC BY 4.0) licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). This means that reuse is allowed provided appropriate credit is given and any changes are indicated. For any use or reproduction of photos or other material that is not owned by the European Training Foundation, permission must be sought directly from the copyright holders.

When citing this report, please use the following wording:

European Training Foundation (2026), *ETF Monitoring Framework 2026 – Guidelines for policy and system monitoring*, Turin: ETF

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4
Monitoring initiatives	4
Monitoring deliverables	5

SCOPE AND FOCUS OF MONITORING	7
Developments in education, skills and employment	7
Performance of education and training policies and systems	7

SOURCES OF EVIDENCE AND DATA	11
------------------------------	----

METHOD AND MONITORING PROCESS	13
-------------------------------	----

GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE	14
---------------------	----

TORINO PROCESS POLICY REVIEWS	15
Scope and purpose of reviews	15
Process and deliverables	15
Summary of responsibilities	16

ANNEX: KIESE INDICATORS	17
-------------------------	----

ACRONYMS	26
----------	----

INTRODUCTION

Monitoring initiatives

Every year, the European Training Foundation (ETF) collects and analyses data to monitor developments in education, skills and employment across its partner countries in the Eastern Partnership, Southeastern Europe and Türkiye, Central Asia, and the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean¹. The results help to understand what is working well and what needs improvement. They also support countries in making informed decisions on how to adjust their policies in support of vocational education and training (VET) and lifelong learning.

To this end, the ETF operates three complementary annual monitoring initiatives: the Key Indicators on Education, Skills and Employment (KIESE) data collection; the Torino Process; and monitoring under the Copenhagen Process, a flagship EU initiative in VET². KIESE and the Torino Process cover all ETF partner countries, whereas monitoring under the Copenhagen Process applies to a smaller group of EU candidate countries.

The KIESE data collection forms the quantitative backbone of ETF monitoring activities. In close cooperation with international partners and national statistical offices, the ETF compiles a comprehensive dataset each year from national and international sources such as UNESCO, Eurostat and the OECD.

The Torino Process (TRP) is a long-standing flagship initiative of the ETF. It tracks developments in education, skills and employment across ETF partner countries. Since 2023, the Torino Process monitoring framework has selected a subset of KIESE indicators, aggregates them into system performance indices (SPIs), and combines them with qualitative evidence to track how well VET systems deliver on key commitments to learners, such as access, quality, relevance and system efficiency. In addition, the Torino Process enables countries to carry out voluntary reviews of their VET policies. These reviews help to contextualise the monitoring results and identify ways to improve performance through targeted policy interventions.

The Copenhagen Process is a key framework for voluntary European cooperation in VET. Established in 2002, it supports the development of high-quality, inclusive, flexible and relevant VET systems across Europe.

The current monitoring cycle began in 2020 with the Osnabrück Declaration, which sets out policy priorities and actions for the period 2021–25, in line with the Council Recommendation on VET for sustainable competitiveness, social fairness and resilience. The declaration focuses on four main objectives: resilience and excellence through high-quality, inclusive and flexible VET; a stronger culture of lifelong learning, including through continuing VET and digitalisation; sustainability, through stronger links between VET and the green transition; and strengthening the European Education and Training Area, including through the internationalisation of VET.

Five candidate countries—Albania, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Türkiye—have signed the Osnabrück Declaration. In this context, the ETF is responsible for monitoring VET developments in these countries. This monitoring follows progress linked to their National Implementation Plans and is carried out in close cooperation with its sister EU agency, Cedefop.

In September 2025, ministers responsible for VET from the EU Member States, EU candidate countries and EEA countries signed the Herning Declaration on attractive and inclusive vocational

¹ In 2026, the ETF partner countries included in the annual monitoring are: Albania, Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Egypt, Georgia, Israel, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Libya, Moldova, Montenegro, Morocco, North Macedonia, Palestine, Serbia, Tajikistan, Tunisia, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan. The full list of ETF partner countries as of 2026 can be found here: <https://www.etf.europa.eu/it/where-we-work>.

² For more information see <https://www.etf.europa.eu/en/what-we-do/torino-process-policy-analysis-and-progress-monitoring>

education and training for increased competitiveness. The declaration opens the next Copenhagen Process cycle, which will run until 2030. The ETF and Cedefop support the European Commission and participating countries by monitoring implementation and reporting regularly to the Advisory Committee on Vocational Training and the Directors-General for VET.

Monitoring deliverables

Each year, the ETF produces monitoring deliverables in two broad categories: country-level reporting and cross-country reporting. Cross-country reporting includes the annual cross-country monitoring report and thematic cross-country reports. The annual cross-country monitoring report brings together the main results of the monitoring cycle across ETF partner countries and presents them from a comparative perspective. Thematic cross-country reports use selected subsets of KIESE and Torino Process evidence to address specific issues, learner groups or monitoring questions in greater depth.

Country-level deliverables

At the country level, the ETF prepares monitoring reports for each of its partner countries. These reports present the results of monitoring developments in education, skills and employment. They cover the country context, recent developments in education and employment, and key monitoring results based on headline indicators and system performance indices³.

In addition, each year the ETF publishes a small number of VET policy review reports prepared in the context of the Torino Process. These reviews analyse the impact of policies on the performance of national VET systems and provide hands-on recommendations for improvement.

Beyond this, the ETF also produces Copenhagen Process-specific deliverables for the five EU candidate countries covered by this process: Albania, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey. These concise monitoring summaries cover policy developments and progress towards the priorities defined in the Osnabrück Declaration. They draw on evidence collected specifically for this purpose, as well as on KIESE indicators and Torino Process indices. Due to the specific EU-level mandate of the Copenhagen Process, the results are published separately.

Cross-country deliverables

Annual cross-country reporting

The annual cross-country reporting presents the results of the monitoring cycle for all partner countries in a single analysis. It sets these results against demographic, economic, education and labour market conditions, reports on system performance in key areas such as access, quality and system organisation, and identifies trends across countries and regions⁴.

Thematic cross-country reporting

Thematic cross-country reporting is a specific type of cross-country deliverable. It uses selected subsets of KIESE and Torino Process data to address specific cross-country issues in greater detail. These reports often focus on particular learner groups or characteristics, such as gender, socioeconomic disadvantage or the availability of evidence.

Data availability and reliability reporting

The KIESE database combines Labour Force Survey (LFS) indicators reported by national statistical offices for 2015–2025 with indicators from international sources for 2010–2025. The full list of KIESE indicators can be found in the annex.

³ The country fiches for 2025 are available on the pages of ETF partner countries: <https://www.etf.europa.eu/it/where-we-work/countries>.

⁴ The 2025 edition of the ETF cross-country monitoring report of trends and developments can be found here: <https://bit.ly/48FsuJ>

The main international data sources, including Eurostat, ILOSTAT, UNESCO, the UN and World Bank, provide data for almost all ETF partner countries. Other sources, such as TIMMs data, cover only some ETF countries. In 2025, for example, for indicators collected at the national level, overall the data coverage was 71.2%. The missing data is concentrated in a relatively small set of indicators, countries and years, rather than being evenly spread across the dataset. Overall, the KIESE dataset is suitable for broad comparative analysis. However, country trends and results for individual indicators should be interpreted carefully where data coverage is limited.

In addition to assessing system performance, the Torino Process monitoring tracks the international comparability and reliability of the evidence used to calculate the System Performance Indices (SPIs). In 2026, this is done through two supplementary indices, each ranging from 0 to 100, which measure different aspects of the data.

The International Comparability Index (ICI) assesses the extent to which a country's results are based on internationally comparable data. It is calculated by measuring how many of the intended quantitative indicators are available for a country across the entire monitoring framework. The more indicators are available, the more comparable the results are, with 100 being the highest possible score.

The Bias Propensity Index (BPI) measures the risk of bias in the data used to calculate the system performance results of a country (see below for a description of the Torino Process system performance indices—SPIs). It tracks the proportion of results that rely on internationally comparable quantitative indicators and the proportion that rely on self-assessment responses. A higher BPI score indicates a higher risk of bias, as it means that more of the results are based on self-assessment data. Conversely, a lower BPI score suggests a lower risk of bias, since more of the results are based on quantitative indicators rather than subjective assessments.

SCOPE AND FOCUS OF MONITORING

Developments in education, skills and employment

The focus of ETF monitoring is on developments, conditions and outcomes in education, skills and employment in ETF partner countries, specifically on the environment in which education and training systems operate, the populations they serve, the resources available to them, and the outcomes associated with learning, skills development and labour-market participation.

The monitoring indicators are collected through the **Key Indicators on Education, Skills and Employment (KIESE)** initiative of the ETF. They cover demographic, economic and social conditions; participation in education and training; educational attainment and learning outcomes; employment, unemployment and skills demand; education financing; human resources; infrastructure; digital skills; migration; equity; and data availability. The indicators are collected to provide answers to a broad set of factual questions, such as who the potential learners are; who participates in education, training and work; what levels of education, skills and employment people achieve; what resources are available to support learning; and what labour-market conditions shape the use and value of skills.

The KIESE data cover several connected areas. Context indicators describe population trends, age structure, migration, income levels, poverty, inequality, economic growth and other conditions that influence the demand for education and training. Education indicators describe participation at different levels and following different pathways, including general education, VET, tertiary education and adult learning. They also cover attainment, completion, early leaving, learning outcomes, teachers, infrastructure, education expenditure and the availability of comparable evidence.

The employment and skills indicators describe how people participate in the labour market and how their qualifications and skills relate to work. They include labour force participation, employment, unemployment, youth unemployment, NEET rates, employment of recent graduates, employment by sector and occupation, vulnerable and informal employment, educational mismatch, vacancies, wages and participation in labour-market measures. The dataset also includes indicators on digital skills, use of technology, green skills, education for sustainable development, migration and inclusion.

For annual reporting purposes, the ETF does not use the full KIESE dataset in the same way. Instead, it selects a smaller set of headline indicators that can support a clear and accessible monitoring narrative. This selection is designed to answer a limited number of guiding questions: who takes part in education, training and work; what learners and workers achieve; how education and training systems are resourced; and how these outcomes relate to the wider economic, demographic and labour-market context. The reporting selection therefore prioritises indicators that are internationally comparable, available for a relatively large number of countries, and directly relevant to the main monitoring themes.

Performance of education and training policies and systems

Through the Torino Process initiative, the ETF monitoring also focuses on the performance of education and training policies and systems. The main focus is the extent to which VET systems deliver on a targeted selection of commitments to learners and other stakeholders in support of lifelong learning.

Here, “performance” refers to the extent to which VET systems deliver on selected commitments to learners and other stakeholders. “lifelong learning” refers to all learning activity undertaken throughout life, with the aim of improving knowledge, skills, competences or qualifications for personal, social or professional reasons. A VET system is understood as the network of institutions, policies, actors and resources that organise vocational learning in a country.

The Torino Process framework is designed to capture how effectively VET systems deliver on these commitments. The framework is built around a carefully defined set of commitments derived from national legislation and international agreements. These commitments were selected for their relevance to diverse national contexts, reform trajectories and policy priorities.

The purpose is to provide decision-makers, practitioners and stakeholders with reliable data on how well education and training systems deliver what is expected of them. Experience from previous monitoring rounds suggests that these results can support informed decisions on policy improvement, resource allocation, strategy design and follow-up analysis in support of lifelong learning.

Across countries, education stakeholders typically expect VET systems to deliver in three major areas:

- **Area A: Access**—ensuring broad and equitable access and participation;
- **Area B: Quality**—delivering high-quality and relevant learning;
- **Area C: System organisation**—maintaining effective and efficient system organisation.

These three areas are further divided into six monitoring dimensions:

- **Area A:** Dimension A.1 **Access** and Dimension A.2 **Completion**;
- **Area B:** Dimension B.1 **Quality and relevance** and Dimension B.4 **Responsiveness**;
- **Area C:** Dimension C.1 **Steering and management** and Dimension C.2 **Resourcing**.

The table below describes the six dimensions.

Table 1. Dimensions of Torino Process system performance monitoring (2026)

Area	Monitoring dimension	Description of the dimension
A. Access	A.1. Access	Measures the extent to which VET and adult learning opportunities are accessible and attractive to learners.
	A.2 Completion	Captures the extent to which learners in initial VET are supported in progressing through their programmes and successfully completing them or graduating.
B. Quality	B.1 Quality and relevance	Tracks how effectively learners in VET and adult education are equipped with basic skills and key competences, the relevance of their learning for employment, and whether they receive adequate career guidance.
	B.4 Responsiveness	Measures how effectively the VET system incorporates strategic priorities—such as the green transition and digitalisation—in curricula, and how responsive it is to immediate socio-economic developments and changes in labour market demand.
C. System organisation	C.1 Steering and management	Captures VET system performance in ensuring the availability of data for informed decision-making, maintaining transparent quality assurance processes, securing competent leadership, and facilitating international cooperation.
	C.2 Resourcing	Monitors the sufficiency and efficiency of financial and human resources allocated to VET, as well as whether the physical infrastructure supports effective teaching, training, and learning.

To align these dimensions more closely with practical realities and policy specifics, the framework was refined further in 2026 into a total of 20 policy and system outcomes. Each outcome represents a specific commitment that VET systems are expected to fulfil.

The outcomes are organised as follows:

AREA A: ACCESS

Dimension A.1—Access

- **Outcome A.1.1:** Access to initial VET
- **Outcome A.1.2:** Access to continuing VET
- **Outcome A.1.3:** Access to other opportunities for adult learning, in particular in the context of active labour market policies

Dimension A.2 – Completion

- **Outcome A.2.1:** Completion in initial VET

AREA B: QUALITY

Dimension B.1—Quality and relevance

- **Outcome B.1.1:** Quality of learning outcomes: basic skills and key competences for youth in VET
- **Outcome B.1.2:** Adult skills and competences
- **Outcome B.1.3:** Links between learning and the world of work
- **Outcome B.1.4:** Employability of learners
- **Outcome B.1.5:** Opportunities for career guidance

Dimension B.4—Responsiveness

- **Outcome B.4.1:** Responsiveness of VET to the green transition
- **Outcome B.4.2:** Responsiveness of VET to the digital transition
- **Outcome B.4.3:** Responsiveness of programme offering

AREA C: SYSTEM ORGANISATION

Dimension C.1—Steering and management

- **Outcome C.1.1:** Data and monitoring
- **Outcome C.1.2:** Participatory governance
- **Outcome C.1.3:** Quality assurance: public accountability and reliable quality assurance
- **Outcome C.1.4:** School leadership: professional capacity of staff in leadership positions
- **Outcome C.1.5:** Internationalisation of VET

Dimension C.2—Resourcing

- **Outcome C.2.1:** Adequate financial resource allocation and use
 - **Outcome C.2.2:** Adequate human resource allocation and use
 - **Outcome C.2.3:** Adequate material base
-

These outcomes describe the key commitments that education and training systems are expected to deliver. The outcomes covering access, participation, quality and relevance are also tracked by age and gender, where the availability of evidence allows this level of disaggregation.

SOURCES OF EVIDENCE AND DATA

The ETF monitoring draws on two main sources of evidence. The first is quantitative evidence from the ETF KIESE database. The second is evidence collected through structured country questionnaires, designed as expert surveys. These two sources provide the basis for the calculation of the Torino Process System Performance Indices, which synthesise selected KIESE indicators and quantified expert assessments into composite measures of VET system performance.

The KIESE database provides the quantitative backbone for ETF monitoring. It covers areas such as demographics, educational attainment, labour market outcomes, resource allocation in education systems and participation in lifelong learning. Some KIESE indicators are obtained directly from ETF partner countries through active collaboration with members of the KIESE data network. This network includes national statistical offices and authorities responsible for active labour market policies, including Public Employment Services and line ministries responsible for education, training and/or employment data. Most other indicators are obtained from international repositories, including UNESCO, the World Bank, the OECD, Eurostat and the ILO. Table 2 provides an overview of the provenance of KIESE data used in 2026.

Table 2. Provenance of KIESE data in 2026

Data repository	No. of indicators	Data repository	No. of indicators
UIS UNESCO	57	UNDP	5
OECD PISA	41	European Social Survey	4
World Bank	30	ILOSTAT	3
Eurostat	21	OECD DIOC	3
National: Statistical Offices (LFS)	20	National: Ministries of Education	1
TIMSS	13	Cornell University, INSEAD, and WIPO	1
UNHCR	6	IMF	1
UN DESA	5	Portulans Institute, Oxford Saïd Business School	1

In addition to the KIESE data, ETF monitoring relies on evidence collected through structured country questionnaires. As in 2025, these questionnaires are designed as expert monitoring surveys. National experts use them to provide contextual information and assess policy performance for each monitoring target on a scale from 1, the weakest result, to 5, the strongest result. Their responses are provided independently, although in many cases they may draw on consultations with national authorities. Table 3 provides an example of a typical question⁵.

⁵ The full list of questions used in the 2025 round of Torino Process system performance monitoring can be found here: <https://bit.ly/3YUlbXE>.

Table 3. Sample of a monitoring question, Torino Process 2026, Question.A.1.1—Access to initial VET (Outcome A.1.1)

Outcome	Part 1: Narrative component	Part 2: Self-assessment component
A.1.1	How accessible are initial VET programmes in your country overall, and to what extent do these programmes attract learners? <i>Additional guidance: You may refer to relevant factors such as entry requirements, availability and geographical coverage of programmes, learner motivation, costs (including fees), access to accommodation and transport, and the public image of initial VET, including work-based learning and apprenticeships. Include relevant policies and arrangements where available.</i>	On a scale from 1 (very poor) to 5 (very good), how would you rate the current situation in this area? <i>Additional guidance: Your rating should reflect the extent to which the VET system delivers to learners in the area covered by the question.</i> (Tick one box only) ☐ Very poor ☐ Poor ☐ Average ☐ Good ☐ Very good

The expert survey approach serves two main purposes. First, it helps to fill gaps in the KIESE data, which makes it possible to calculate SPIs even when quantitative indicators for a given monitoring target are incomplete or unavailable. Second, it provides qualitative insights that support a more nuanced and context-sensitive interpretation of the SPI results. Each outcome corresponds to one questionnaire item, to a total of 38 self-assessment results per country. The questions are identical across countries to support consistency in the assessment process, and each question includes two mandatory components: a narrative explanation and a numerical assessment.

On this basis, the ETF monitoring produces composite evidence in the form of Torino Process System Performance Indices. The SPIs are derived from a curated selection of KIESE indicators and quantified expert assessments⁶. They are used to measure how effectively education and training systems deliver on key commitments to learners and other stakeholders in different areas of lifelong learning. In 2026, the ETF is compiling 38 SPIs covering system outcomes against commitments in the three broad areas described in the preceding section: access, quality and system organisation.

The SPIs offer a flexible tool for monitoring performance across multiple dimensions. They can be used to track performance by country across all thematic monitoring areas, providing a comprehensive view of the performance within each country. They can also be used to analyse selected themes across multiple countries or groups of countries. These themes may concern broad areas of system performance, such as access, quality or governance, or they may focus on specific learner groups, for instance female learners.

⁶ The subset of KIESE indicators used for the calculation of the Torino Process SPIs in 2026 can be found here: <https://bit.ly/4uHDLjY>.

METHOD AND MONITORING PROCESS

To ensure consistency in the collection of data across countries, the annual ETF monitoring follows a uniform sequence of steps.

The first step is the annual compilation of KIESE data in the form of quantitative indicators for each country and theme. While the selection of data is the same for all countries, it is reviewed annually and updated if necessary to ensure its continued relevance. The indicators are sourced from open-access international repositories, and from ETF partner countries directly.

The second step is the submission of evidence and information by national experts through the Torino Process monitoring questionnaires. This involves the distribution of questionnaires to experts, and the collation of information by them. Once the questionnaires are filled out, the ETF carries out a technical compliance check to ensure that all subsections of each question are addressed and requests additional information if any sections are left blank.

The third step is the calculation of the Torino Process System Performance Indices for all the outcomes included in the monitoring framework based on quantitative and qualitative evidence. Unlike in previous years, where quantified self-assessment data was used only where quantitative data was missing, in 2026 the SPIs will be calculated by systematically combining quantitative data and self-assessments, rather than relying primarily on quantitative data and using self-assessments only to fill data gaps. This combined approach is intended to reduce potential biases that may arise from reliance on either data source alone and, as a result, it will improve the robustness and reliability of the SPIs.

A full overview of how the SPIs are calculated can be found here: <https://bit.ly/3XJg101>.

GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE

The ETF monitoring framework is designed to cover all ETF partner countries. However, actual coverage may differ from year to year depending on geopolitical developments. In 2026, monitoring has been suspended for Belarus, Russia and Syria.

The coverage of monitoring also depends on the type of monitoring deliverable. Cross-country reporting covers all countries for which monitoring is active, while in 2026, the annual country-level reporting excludes the Central Asian partner countries to account for their participation in the DARYA EU initiative.

TORINO PROCESS POLICY REVIEWS

Scope and purpose of reviews

The Torino Process policy reviews complement the monitoring strand of the Torino Process. While monitoring tracks developments in education and training and assesses how effectively systems deliver on commitments to learners and stakeholders, policy reviews provide in-depth qualitative insight into the policies, practices and institutional arrangements behind those results.

The reviews focus on selected policy-related issues in VET and broader adult learning, including access, quality, and system management and organisation. They explore how policies and practices support or hinder the fulfilment of commitments in these areas, and do so through stakeholder dialogue, consultation and contextual analysis. Reviews may also focus on learner groups of strategic importance to countries, such as youth, adults, female learners, socioeconomically disadvantaged youth, or adults at risk of exclusion due to low or no formal education.

In this way, the review strand carries forward the depth, qualitative insight and collaborative approach that characterised earlier “classic” Torino Process cycles, which many countries have valued over the years and explicitly requested again from 2023 onwards.

Process and deliverables

The Torino Process policy reviews are demand-driven, voluntary and participatory. They are carried out in close cooperation with participating countries and combine desk research, site visits, stakeholder consultation and joint validation of findings.

Each review is preceded by a preparation stage, during which the country formally expresses interest, the review theme and timing are agreed, and a national coordinator is nominated. The review itself then follows four main phases: launch, desk research, site visits, and reporting with validation.

Phase 1: Review launch

The launch phase establishes the organisational basis for the review. In consultation with the national coordinator, the ETF forms the review team, confirms the thematic focus and agrees on the main steps of the process. The review team usually includes national and international expertise, ETF representatives and, where relevant, the ETF liaison for the country under review.

A launch event may be organised to inform stakeholders about the review, gather initial perspectives and expectations, and, where appropriate, establish a national reference group.

Phase 2: Desk research

Desk research provides the initial evidence base for the review. It draws on national and international documentation, monitoring evidence, policy documents, data sources and other material relevant to the selected theme.

This phase leads to an issues paper, which summarises preliminary findings, identifies policy questions for further exploration and helps guide the site visits. The issues paper is shared with the national coordinator for verification and may include requests for supplementary data or clarification where the available evidence is incomplete.

Phase 3: Site visits

Site visits are used to deepen, validate and contextualise the findings from desk research. They allow the review team to engage directly with relevant stakeholders, including national and regional

institutions, education and training providers, social partners, civil society organisations, practitioners, learners and other groups relevant to the review theme.

The scope, duration and format of the site visits are agreed with the national coordinator and adapted to the theme and country context. Depending on the review, consultations may take place in the capital, in selected regions, or in rural and remote areas where direct engagement with providers, beneficiaries or disadvantaged learner groups is important.

Evidence is gathered mainly through individual or group interviews, usually in semi-structured or unstructured formats. Focus groups may also be used where appropriate, but only where the review team can ensure that the methodology is suited to the theme and setting.

The site visit phase concludes with a debriefing meeting, during which the review team shares preliminary findings with the national coordinating institution and relevant stakeholders before drafting the report.

Phase 4: Reporting and validation

The review team prepares a draft report based on the analysis of evidence, site visit findings and stakeholder consultations. The structure of the report may vary depending on the theme and country context, but all reports include a common set of elements: an executive summary, an introduction to the scope and background of the review, analytical chapters presenting the findings, recommendations for follow-up action, and annexes covering the methodology, review team, site visits and stakeholders consulted.

The draft report is shared with national stakeholders for feedback and discussed at a consultation and dissemination event organised by the ETF in cooperation with the partner country. This event serves to validate the findings, discuss the feasibility of recommendations and identify possible follow-up actions, including technical or financial support by the EU delegation and other international partners active in the country.

The report and recommendations are finalised after this consultation stage.

Summary of responsibilities

Participating countries nominate a national coordinator, usually from a relevant ministry or agency. The coordinator acts as the main counterpart for the ETF and the review team and supports communication with national authorities and stakeholders.

The participating country is expected to support the process by formally confirming its interest in the review, agreeing on the thematic focus, providing relevant documents and data, commenting on the issues paper and draft report, helping identify stakeholders for consultation, and supporting the organisation of site visits, debriefing and validation meetings.

Because the policy reviews are customised and resource-intensive, only a limited number of countries can participate each year, on a rolling basis.

ANNEX: KIESE INDICATORS

National Data Collection (LFS)

- (ART) Labour force participation rate (%)
- (ATP) Distribution of total and labour force population by educational attainment and age (%)
- (ELE) Early leavers from education and training by sex (%)
- (ERG) Employment rate of recent graduates (age group 20-34, ISCED levels 3-8) by sex (%)
- (ERGP) Employment rate of recent graduates (age group 20-34, ISCED levels 3-4) by sex and programme orientation (%)
- (ERT) Employment rate by sex and educational attainment (%)
- (ESC) Employment by sex and NACE economic sectors (number of employed persons aged 15+)
- (ESC_BROAD) Distribution of employment by broad economic sectors (% aged 15+)
- (EST) Distribution of employment by status in employment (%)
- (LLL_12m) Participation in training/lifelong learning by sex in the previous 12 months, age, education and labour status [%]
- (LLL_4w) Participation in training/lifelong learning by sex in the previous 4 weeks, age, education and labour status [%]
- (NEET) NEET rate by sex, age, labour status, educational attainment
- (OCUP) Employment by sex and ISCO-08 occupational categories (number of employed persons aged 15+)
- (OCUP_BROAD) Distribution of employment by broad occupational categories (% aged 15+)
- (OLF) People outside the labour force (%)
- (PEA) Public expenditure on education, by level of education (in national currency units)⁷
- (RYAU) Ratio of youth unemployment ratio (15-29) to adult unemployment ratio (30-74)
- (SEM) Incidence of self-employment, by sex (%)
- (URT) Unemployment rate by sex and educational attainment [%]
- (VEM) Incidence of vulnerable employment by sex (%)
- (YURO) Youth unemployment ratio (age 15-29)

Data Collection from International Sources

UIS—UNESCO

- (ALIT) Adult Literacy
- (BANK_ONL) Proportion of adults (25-74 years old) who did Internet banking
- (CALL_VOIP) Proportion of adults (25-74 years old) who made calls (telephoning over the Internet/VoIP, using Skype, WhatsApp, Viber, iTalk, etc.; includes video calls via webcam)

⁷ National Statistical Office/Ministry of Education

- (CODING) Proportion of adults (25-74 years old) who programmed or coded in digital environments (e.g. computer software, app development)
- (CONN_DEV) Proportion of adults (25-74 years old) who connected and installed new devices (e.g. a modem, camera, printer) through wired or wireless technologies
- (COPY_PASTE) Proportion of adults (25-74 years old) who used copy and paste tools to duplicate or move data, information and content in digital environments (e.g. within a document, between devices, on the cloud)
- (CR_SEC) Completion rate, in lower and upper secondary education by sex (%)
- (ENR_STU) Number of enrolled students
- (ENROL_PRIVATE) Percentage of enrolment in private institutions by level of education
- (EXPEDU) Government expenditure on education as a percentage of GDP by level of education (%)
- (EXPEDU_INI) Initial private expenditure on education (household) as a percentage of GDP (%)
- (EXPEDU_P_HH_ODA) Expenditure on education (public, households, ODA) as a percentage of GDP
- (EXPTOT) Public expenditure on education (% of total public expenditure)
- (GCS_CURRICULA) Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development are mainstreamed in (b) curricula
- (GCS_NATLEDUPOL) Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development are mainstreamed in (a) national education policies
- (GCS_STUDENTASSESSMENT) Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development are mainstreamed in (d) student assessment
- (GCS_TEACHEDU) Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development are mainstreamed in (c) teacher education
- (GERT) Gross Enrolment Ratio in Tertiary Education
- (GRAD_FIELD_RT) Percentage of graduates by field of education (both sexes)
- (GRAD_TERTIARY) Gross graduation ratio from tertiary education by sex
- (HLTH_INFO) Proportion of adults (25-74 years old) that sought health related information (on injury, disease, nutrition, etc.)
- (IMR) Inbound mobility rate
- (INF_EMP) Proportion of informal employment in total employment by sex and sector (%)
- (INFO_GOODS) Proportion of adults (25-74 years old) who obtained information about goods or services
- (INFO_VER) Proportion of adults (25-74 years old) who have verified the reliability of information found online
- (INST_SOFT) Proportion of adults (25-74 years old) who found, downloaded, installed and configured software and applications
- (LEARN_ONL) Proportion of adults (25-74 years old) who have done an online course (in any subject)

- (MSG_FILE) Proportion of adults (25-74 years old) who sent messages (e.g. e-mail, messaging service, SMS) with attached files (e.g. document, picture, video)
- (NERPP) Net Enrolment Rate in Pre-Primary Education
- (OMR) Outbound mobility ratio
- (OOS_SEC) Out-of-school rate for adolescents and youth of lower and upper secondary school age
- (POSTSEC_VET) Share of all students in post-secondary non-tertiary education enrolled in vocational programmes
- (PRES_SOFT) Proportion of adults (25-74 years old) who created electronic presentations with presentation software (including text, images, sound, video or charts)
- (PRIV_SET) Proportion of adults (25-74 years old) who changed privacy settings on their device, account or app to limit the sharing of personal data and information (e.g. name, contact information, photos)
- (PUBEXP_CUR) Current expenditure as a % of total expenditure in public institutions, by level of education
- (PUP_TCH_RT) Pupil-qualified teacher ratio (headcount basis)
- (QUAL_TCH) Percentage of qualified teachers by level of education (both sexes, %)
- (READ_DIG) Proportion of adults (25-74 years old) who read or downloaded newspapers, magazines or electronic books in digital format
- (REP_lower_SEC) Repetition rate in lower secondary general education (all grades) (%)
- (SEC_MEAS) Proportion of adults (25-74 years old) who set up effective security measures (e.g. strong passwords, log-in attempt notification) to protect devices and online accounts
- (SHOP_ONL) Proportion of adults (25-74 years old) who have purchased or ordered goods or services
- (SOC_NET) Proportion of adults (25-74 years old) who participated in social networks, both sexes (%)
- (SPREAD_BAS) Proportion of adults (25-74 years old) who used basic arithmetic formula in spreadsheet
- (STAFF_COMP) All staff compensation as a percentage of total expenditure in public institutions (%) by education level
- (TCH_ATTR_RT) Teacher attrition rate (%)
- (TCH_COMP) Teaching staff compensation as a percentage of total expenditure in public institutions by education level
- (TCH_SAL_COMP) Average teacher salary by level of education relative to other professions requiring a comparable level of qualification, both sexes
- (TCH_SEC_TRAIN) Percentage of teachers in lower secondary education who received in-service training
- (TEXT_EDIT) Proportion of adults (25-74 years old) who used software run over the Internet for editing text documents
- (TNER) Total net enrolment rate (primary, lower secondary, upper secondary)

- (TRANSFER_FILE) Proportion of adults (25-74 years old) who transferred files or applications between devices (including via cloud-storage)
- (UPL_CONT) Proportion of adults (25-74 years old) who uploaded self/user-created content to a website to be shared
- (VET) Share of all students in upper secondary enrolled in vocational programmes
- (VETN) Students enrolled in vocational programmes at upper secondary level of education (ISCED 3)
- (VOTE_ONL) Proportion of adults (25-74 years old) who took part in consultation or voting via the Internet to define civic or political issues, both sexes (%)
- (YEARS_COMP_EDU) Number of years of compulsory primary and secondary education guaranteed in legal frameworks
- (YVET) Proportion of 15-24 year-olds enrolled in vocational education

OECD-PISA

- (CAREER_GUID) Availability of career guidance in schools
- (COMP_STU) Availability of computers in schools
- (EDU_FUND_GOV) Percentage of public school funding provided by the government
- (HIND_AST) A school's capacity to provide instruction is hindered to some extent or a lot by: A lack of assisting staff
- (HIND_AST_QL) A school's capacity to provide instruction is hindered to some extent or a lot by: Inadequate or poorly qualified assisting staff
- (HIND_INFRA) A school's capacity to provide instruction is hindered to some extent or a lot by: A lack of physical infrastructure (e.g. building, grounds, heating/cooling systems, lighting and acoustic systems)
- (HIND_INFRA_QL) A school's capacity to provide instruction is hindered to some extent or a lot by: Inadequate or poor-quality physical infrastructure (e.g. building, grounds, heating/cooling systems, lighting and acoustic systems)
- (HIND_MAT) A school's capacity to provide instruction is hindered to some extent or a lot by: A lack of educational material (e.g. textbooks, ICT equipment, library or laboratory material)
- (HIND_MAT_QL) A school's capacity to provide instruction is hindered to some extent or a lot by: Inadequate or poor-quality educational material (e.g. textbooks, ICT equipment, library or laboratory material)
- (HIND_TCH) A school's capacity to provide instruction is hindered to some extent or a lot by: A lack of teaching staff
- (HIND_TCH_QL) A school's capacity to provide instruction is hindered to some extent or a lot by: Inadequate or poorly qualified teaching staff
- (PISA_BTMSOC_LOW_M) Students in the national bottom quarter of ESCS: Underachievers in math
- (PISA_BTMSOC_LOW_R) Students in the national bottom quarter of ESCS: Underachievers in reading
- (PISA_BTMSOC_LOW_S) Students in the national bottom quarter of ESCS: Underachievers in science

- (PISA_BTMSOC_TOP_M) Students in the national bottom quarter of ESCS: Top achievers in math
- (PISA_BTMSOC_TOP_R) Students in the national bottom quarter of ESCS: Top achievers in reading
- (PISA_BTMSOC_TOP_S) Students in the national bottom quarter of ESCS: Top achievers in science
- (PISA_M) Underachievers in mathematics by sex
- (PISA_R) Underachievers in reading by sex
- (PISA_S) Underachievers in science by sex
- (PISA_TOP_R) Top achievers in reading by sex
- (PISA_TOP_S) Top achievers in science by sex
- (QA_CONS) Quality assurance at school: Regular consultation aimed at school improvement [...] over a period of at least six months
- (QA_CURR) Quality assurance at school: Written specification of the school's curricular profile and educational goals
- (QA_DATA) Quality assurance at school: Systematic recording of data such as [...] attendance and professional development
- (QA_EXPERT) Regular expert consultation aimed at school improvement
- (QA_EXT) Quality assurance at school: External evaluation
- (QA_FEED) Quality assurance at school: Seeking written feedback from students (e.g. regarding lessons, teachers or resources)
- (QA_INT) Quality assurance at school: Internal evaluation/Self-evaluation
- (QA_MENT) Quality assurance at school: Teacher mentoring
- (QA_PERF) Quality assurance at school: Written specification of student performance standards
- (QA_READ) Quality assurance at school: Implementation of a standardised policy for reading subjects
- (QA_TEST) Quality assurance at school: Systematic recording of student test results and graduation rates
- (SCH_ACCT_PAR) School accountability, calculated as the percentage of school principals who reported that: "Achievement data are provided directly to parents"
- (SCH_ACCT_PUB) School accountability, calculated as the percentage of school principals who reported that "Achievement data are posted publicly (e.g. in the media)"
- (SCH_ACCT_TRK) School accountability, calculated as the percentage of school principals who reported that: "Achievement data are tracked over time by an administrative authority"
- (SCH_SUP_PEER) School support for participation and graduation: Peer-to-peer tutoring
- (SCH_SUP_RM) School support for participation and graduation: Room(s) where the students can do their homework
- (SCH_SUP_STF) School support for participation and graduation: Staff help with homework
- (TCH_CERT) Percentage of teachers fully certified by the appropriate authority (in schools attended by 15-year-olds)

- (TCH_PD) Share of teachers who had attended a programme of professional development in the three months prior to the PISA test

World Bank

- (CSPI) Civil society participation index
- (FBS) Fixed broadband subscriptions (per 100 people)
- (FDI_GDP) Foreign direct investment, net inflows (% of GDP)
- (FDI_USD) Foreign direct investment, net inflows (BoP, current US\$)
- (GDP_constant_LCU) GDP (constant LCU)
- (GDP_current_LCU) GDP (current LCU)
- (GDP_deflator) GDP deflator
- (GDP_GROWTH) GDP Growth Rate (Annual %)
- (GDP_PC) GDP Per Capita (PPP \$)
- (GDP_PE) GDP Per Employed (constant 2017 PPP \$)
- (GINI) Gini Index
- (GVA) Gross value added by broad economic sector (%)
- (HCI) Human Capital Index
- (IUI) Individuals using the Internet (% of population)
- (MIG_REMIT_IN) Annual Migrant Remittance inflows (US\$ mil.)
- (MIG_REMIT_IN_P) Migrant remittance inflows as % of GDP
- (OBS) Biggest Obstacles of firms (%)
- (POP) Total population by sex
- (POV_HCR) Poverty headcount ratio at \$3.00 a day (2021 PPP) (% of population)
- (POVR_d_low) Poverty headcount ratio at \$4.20 a day (2021 PPP) (% of population)
- (POVR_d_middle) Poverty headcount ratio at \$8.30 a day (2021 PPP) (% of population)
- (PPP_conversion_factor) PPP conversion factor, GDP (LCU per international \$)
- (RD_EXP) Research and development expenditure (% of GDP)
- (SIS) Secure Internet servers (per 1 million people)
- (TFR) Total fertility rate
- (TGGE) Total greenhouse gas emissions (kt of CO2 equivalent)
- (YPOP) Relative size of youth population by sex (%)
- (INF_CP) Inflation, consumer prices (annual %)
- (AGE_DEP) Age dependency ratio (% of working-age population)
- (POP_GR) Population growth (annual %)

Eurostat

- (IVET_PREM) Employment premium for recent IVET graduates (over general stream) (%)
- (NEET_VET) NEETs ratio (ISCED 3-4, general to vocational), by sex
- (VET_GRAD) Share of VET graduates as the percentage of all graduates from the same level of education, by sex
- (CVET_COST) Average cost of CVET courses per participant expressed through purchasing power standard
- (ENT_CVT) Number of enterprises providing any type of CVT training as a percentage of all enterprises
- (EXP_CVT) Enterprise direct monetary expenditure on CVT courses as percentage of total labour costs of all enterprises surveyed
- (HRS_CVT) Number of hours of CVT courses per 1000 hours worked by employed individuals in all surveyed enterprises
- (IT_CVT) Percentage of CVT courses in enterprises targeting as the main skills general IT skills and professional IT skills.
- (IVET_CONT) Percentage of IVET graduate students enrolled in further VET or general educational and training programmes
- (LTU_EUROSTAT) Long-unemployment rate by sex (Eurostat)
- (NO_LANG) Share of adults (aged 25-64) who do not know any foreign languages
- (PART_CVT) Number of participants in CVT training as a percentage of all individuals employed in all enterprises surveyed
- (PLAN_CVT) Enterprises with a training plan including CVT as percentage of all enterprises
- (RES_PERM_EDU) Number of residence permits in EU27: education reason
- (RES_PERM_EMP) Number of residence permits in EU27: employment reason
- (RES_PERM_FAM) Number of residence permits in EU27: family reason
- (SEAS_WORK) Number of authorisations for the purpose of seasonal work in EU27 (decision to grant) by economic sector
- (SRC_LEARN) Percentage of people searching for information on learning possibilities
- (TEACHER_RATIO_UPPERSEC) Ratio of pupils and students to teachers and academic staff in the upper secondary vocational education
- (URGP) Unemployment rate of recent VET graduates (ISCED 3-4)
- (WORK_BASED) Percentage of VET students enrolled in work-based programmes

TIMSS

- (DIG_EFF) Percent of Students (VIII grade) with High Digital Self-Efficacy
- (ENV_KNOW) Average Environmental Knowledge (grade VIII)
- (ENV_VAL) Percentage of students that very strongly value environmental preservation (grade VIII)
- (MATH_ACH) Average mathematics achievement (grade VIII) by sex
- (MATH_BENCH) Percentage of students (grade VIII) reaching Intermediate Benchmark (475) in mathematics by sex

- (SCH_INT_ASSIGNMENT) Percent of students (VIII grade) who use the Internet for schoolwork at least once a week: access assignments posted online by teacher
- (SCH_INT_COLLABORATION) Percent of students (VIII grade) who use the Internet for schoolwork at least once a week: collaborate with classmates on assignments or projects
- (SCH_INT_GAMES) Percent of students (VIII grade) who use the Internet for schoolwork at least once a week: access learning games or activities related to mathematics or science
- (SCH_INT_INFORMATION) Percent of students (VIII grade) who use the Internet for schoolwork at least once a week: find information, articles, or tutorials about mathematics or science
- (SCH_INT_QUESTIONS) Percent of students (VIII grade) who use the Internet for schoolwork at least once a week: ask the teacher questions
- (SCH_INT_TXT) Percent of students (VIII grade) who use the Internet for schoolwork at least once a week: access the textbook or other course materials
- (SCI_ACH) Average science achievement (grade VIII) by sex
- (SCI_BENCH) Percentage of students (grade VIII) reaching the Intermediate Benchmark (475) in science by sex.

UNHCR

- (ASY_SEEK) Number of asylum-seekers
- (IDP) Number of internally displaced persons
- (NO_STATE) Number of persons under UNHCR's statelessness mandate
- (REF) Number of Refugees
- (REF_NN) Number of non-specified persons of concern
- (RET_REF) Number of returned refugees

UN DESA

- (INT_MIG_E_POP) International migrant population by country of origin as % of total population of country of origin
- (CR_NET_MIG) Crude rate of net migration
- (INT_MIG) International migrant population of mid-year by age-groups and sex
- (INT_MIG_POP) International migrant population as % of the total population
- (POP_EST) Share of total population by age group (estimates for 2000, 2020, 2050)

UNDP

- (AVYS) Average Years of Schooling
- (EXYS) Expected Years of Schooling
- (HDI) Human Development Index
- (HDI_rank) Human Development Index (Rank)
- (LAYS) Learning-Adjusted Years of Schooling

European Social Survey

- (WAGE_ISCED2_IVET) Ratio of wages of ISCED 2 workers and IVET graduates
- (WAGE_ISCED2_IVET_DIS) Ratio of wages of ISCED 2 workers and IVET graduates for people with low household income
- (WAGE_UNIV_IVET) Ratio of wages of university graduates and IVET graduates
- (WAGE_UNIV_IVET_DIS) Ratio of wages of university graduates and IVET graduates for people with low household income

ILOSTAT

- (EDU_MIS) Share of employment by educational mismatch (normative approach)
- (CBCR) Collective bargaining coverage rate (%)
- (HR_EARN) Average hourly earnings of employees (2021 PPP \$): by education and by broad economic sector

OECD DIOC

- (MIG_AGE) Share of migrant population in OECD countries by age group and by sex
- (MIG_EDU) Educational attainment of migrant population in OECD countries by sex
- (MIG_EMP) Employment rate of migrant population in OECD countries by sex and by educational attainment.

Cornell University, INSEAD, and WIPO

- (GII) Global Innovation Index rank

IMF

- (RDGT) Research and development in green technologies as % GDP

Portulans Institute, Oxford Saïd Business School

- (NRI) Network Readiness Index

ACRONYMS

BPI	Bias Propensity Index
CEDEFOP	European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training
DARYA	Dialogue and action for resourceful youth in Central Asia (EU initiative)
EEA	European Economic Area
ETF	European Training Foundation
EU	European Union
Eurostat	Statistical office of the European Union
ICI	International Comparability Index
ILO	International Labour Organization
ILOSTAT	International labour statistics, operated by the International Labour Organization (ILO)
IMF	International Monetary Fund
INSEAD	<i>Institut Européen d'Administration des Affaires</i> (European Institute of Business Administration).
KIESE	Key Indicators on Education, Skills and Employment
LFS	Labour Force Survey
NEET	Not in Education, Employment, or Training
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OECD-PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment, run by the OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development)
OECD DIOC	Database on Immigrants in OECD and non-OECD Countries
SPIs	System Performance Indices
TIMSS	Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study

UN	United Nations
UN DESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNHCR	United Nations Refugee Agency
UIS-UNESCO	Institute for Statistics of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
VET	Vocational Education and Training
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)