1. **Strategic Framework**
Advocacy for workforce development (WfD) is a priority on the political agenda, as expressed in a number of policies and sector strategies. Policies and strategy documents, however, have yet to be aligned under a unified strategic vision. The implementation of these strategies is challenged by a lack of coordination among different ministries, the limited resources available for WfD and, more generally, the country’s political situation.

2. **System Oversight**
Although institutional accreditation mechanisms are in place and valued by industry, competency-based testing is limited and a national qualifications framework is not yet in place. Government funding is insufficient for the monitoring and improvement of programs, and allocations to institutions are neither linked to performance nor supplemented by other sources.

3. **Service Delivery**
Despite improvements in access to training and the increased participation of private providers, the quality of training continues to be a challenge. The lack of financial autonomy, combined with limited financial resources allocated for WfD, has hindered a systematic review and evaluation of training programs. In addition, the lack of up-to-date data about training outcomes and labor market needs prevents institutions from reviewing and updating their programs.
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Executive Summary

A decade of sustained economic growth from 2000 to 2010 enabled the Republic of Yemen to achieve substantial improvements in social and economic indicators. The government’s commitment to education, expressed in the development of level-specific strategies as well as sustained public investment, led to a remarkable expansion in access to basic education and, consequently, higher demand at the secondary and tertiary levels. However, quality has remained a challenge at all levels: Increased enrollment has not resulted in higher completion rates or improved student performance, and students leave the education system ill-prepared for the labor market. After the events of 2011, and reaching an unemployment rate of 29 percent in 2012—estimated at 60 percent for youth—workforce development (WfD) has become a priority on Yemen’s political agenda.

The SABER-WfD benchmarking results, summarized below, reveal the various challenges faced by the WfD system in Yemen. These include a strong supply-driven approach, weak links between education outcomes and labor market needs, a small private sector, and a shortage of employment opportunities in the public sector. Addressing them will require focused and sustained efforts and collaboration across multiple WfD stakeholders in the public and private sectors, as well as civil society organizations and donors engaged in supporting WfD policies and programs. Capitalizing on the increased attention given to WfD in the last two years, two priority actions could be pursued: (i) formulating a unified strategic vision for WfD in Yemen; and (ii) identifying key economic sectors that are growing at the local level and developing training and apprenticeship programs accordingly.
1. Introduction

Yemen, which belongs to the category of Least Developed Countries according to the OECD’s Development Assistance Committee, has faced many challenges during the last two decades in its endeavor to achieve an acceptable level of economic development. Such challenges include high population growth, slow economic growth, declining oil resources, depleting water resources, a poor standard of public health and education, widespread poverty, recurrent conflicts, and political unrest. While no panacea, workforce development (WfD) is nonetheless viewed by the government as an important means for improving the country’s socioeconomic prospects.¹

To inform policy dialogue on these important issues, this report presents a comprehensive diagnostic of the country’s WfD policies and institutions. The results are based on a new World Bank tool designed for this purpose. Known as SABER-WfD, the tool is part of the World Bank’s initiative on Systems Approach for Better Education Results (SABER),² whose aim is to provide systematic documentation and assessment of the policy and institutional factors that influence the performance of education and training systems. The SABER-WfD tool encompasses initial, continuing, and targeted vocational education and training that are offered through multiple channels, and focuses largely on programs at the secondary and post-secondary levels.

Analytical Framework

The tool is based on an analytical framework³ that identifies three functional dimensions of WfD policies and institutions:

(1) **Strategic framework**, which refers to the praxis of advocacy, partnership, and coordination in relation to the objective of aligning WfD in critical areas to priorities for national development;

(2) **System Oversight**, which refers to the arrangements governing funding, quality assurance, and learning pathways that shape the incentives and information signals affecting the choices of individuals, employers, training providers and other stakeholders; and

(3) **Service Delivery**, which refers to the diversity, organization, and management of training provision, both state and non-state, that deliver results on the ground by enabling individuals to acquire market- and job-relevant skills.

Taken together, these three dimensions allow for systematic analysis of the functioning of a WfD system as a whole. The focus in the SABER-WfD framework is on the institutional structures and practices of public policymaking and what they reveal about capacity in the system to conceptualize, design, coordinate and implement policies in order to achieve results on the ground.

Each dimension is composed of three Policy Goals that correspond to important functional aspects of WfD systems (see Figure 1). Policy Goals are further broken down into discrete Policy Actions and Topics that reveal more detail about the system.⁴

Figure 1: Functional Dimensions and Policy Goals in the SABER-WfD Framework

![Figure 1: Functional Dimensions and Policy Goals in the SABER-WfD Framework](image)

Source: Tan et al. 2013

---

¹ See Annex 1 for a list of acronyms used in this Report.
² For details on SABER see http://www.worldbank.org/education/saber.
³ For an explanation of the SABER-WfD framework see Tan et al 2013.
⁴ See Annex 2 for an overview of the structure of the framework.
Implementing the Analysis

Information for the analysis is gathered using a structured SABER-WfD Data Collection Instrument (DCI). The instrument is designed to collect, to the extent possible, facts rather than opinions about WfD policies and institutions. For each Topic, the DCI poses a set of multiple choice questions which are answered based on documentary evidence and interviews with knowledgeable informants. The answers allow each Topic to be scored on a four-point scale against standardized rubrics based on available knowledge on global good practice (See Figure 2). Topic scores are averaged to produce Policy Goal scores, which are then aggregated into Dimension scores. The results are finalized following validation by the relevant national counterparts, including the informants themselves.

Figure 2: SABER-WfD Scoring Rubrics

The rest of this report summarizes the key findings of the SABER-WfD assessment and also presents the detailed results for each of the three functional dimensions. To put the results into context, the report begins below with a brief profile of the country’s socioeconomic makeup.

---

5 See Annex 3 for the rubrics used to score the data. As in other countries, the data are gathered by a national principal investigator and his or her team, based on the sources indicated in Annex 4; and they are scored by the World Bank’s SABER-WfD team. See Annex 5 for the detailed scores and Annex 6 for a list of those involved in data gathering, scoring and validation and in report writing.

6 Since the composite scores are averages of the underlying scores, they are rarely whole numbers. For a given composite score, $X$, the conversion to the categorical rating shown on the cover is based on the following rule: $1.00 \leq X \leq 1.75$ converts to “Latent”; $1.75 < X \leq 2.50$, to “Emerging”; $2.50 < X \leq 3.25$, to “Established;” and $3.25 < X \leq 4.00$, to “Advanced.”
2. Country Context

Sociopolitical context: Yemen is located at the corner of the Arab peninsula. Although adjacent to some wealthy countries, Yemen is classified as one of the poorest countries in the Arab region with a GDP per capita of $1,494 in 2012. During the past five decades, Yemen went through cycles of conflict and successive civil wars that hampered economic and social progress. The unification of the former Yemen Arab Republic and the People’s Democratic Republic of Yemen in 1990 was considered an important step towards stability, especially with the promising oil discovery in the Ma’rib and Shabwah governorates. However, for the last two decades the newborn Republic of Yemen has faced a wider range of challenges including escalating civil unrest, a number of armed conflicts in the north and south, and a resulting humanitarian crisis with over 300,000 internally displaced persons.

The 2011 crisis and intensified conflict have caused Yemen’s fragile stability to deteriorate. With disturbed supply and production chains, economic activity has since declined by 11 percent, leading to increased unemployment. Recent reports suggest that one in three children is suffering from life-threatening acute malnutrition and more than 10 million people are thought to be at risk due to food scarcity. As an urgent measure to manage this crisis, a two-year Transitional Program for Stabilization and Development (TPSD) was created. The Program is intended to cover the current political transition that is expected to culminate in a new constitution and general elections in early 2014. The hopes of Yemenis are high; they trust that the outcome of the National Dialogue launched in early 2013 will pave the way for a new social contract that addresses their basic development needs.

Socioeconomic indicators: The Human Development Index (HDI) for Yemen is 0.458, ranking it at 160 out of 187 countries. Oil income provides about 75 percent of national revenues and 90 percent of export revenues, but the absence of new discoveries and the predicted depletion of oil resources threaten to have a significant effect on the country’s economy.

Poverty is an increasing threat for social and economic stability in Yemen. Due to the fuel, food and financial crisis of 2008, the number of Yemenis estimated to be under the national poverty line (less than $2 a day) went from 34.8 percent in 2007 to 42.8 percent in 2008. With the recent events in 2011, estimates have risen to 54.4 percent. A recent assessment concluded that "the Yemeni economy is caught in a jobless slow growth cycle leading to stagnant per capita incomes and rising..."
levels of unemployment, particularly among the youth. Prior to the 2011 crisis, the MDG Report (2010) indicated that Yemen was unlikely to achieve most of the Millennium Development Goals by 2015 given the slow progress of most indicators.

Poverty incidence is particularly high in rural areas, home to 68 percent of the country’s population. Heavily dependent on agriculture, the majority of jobs available in the rural labor market do not require literacy skills. In consequence, the rural-urban disparity has been exacerbated by the low literacy rate among the population over the age of 15 and the shortage of education and training opportunities in rural areas. Further, only half of the urban population has access to improved water sources; hence infant mortality in Yemen is significantly above the average among Lower Middle Income countries (see Figure 3).

Gender inequality is common in rural and urban areas. For the last six years, Yemen has been ranked last in the World Economic Forum’s Global Gender Gap Index. The gender gap in basic education is 31.8 percent, and about half of the female population has limited access to basic and reproductive health and family planning services.

Access to education has increased remarkably in the last decade, particularly at the basic level: Between 2000 and 2008, enrollment went from 3.6 million students to 4.3 million. By 2010/11, this figure increased to 4.7 million, reaching an enrollment rate of 86.1 percent. Less improvement has been observed in secondary and tertiary education, with gross enrollment rates of 46 percent in 2011 and 10 percent in 1999, respectively. As shown in Table 1, enrollment in both secondary and post-secondary technical and vocational education and training (TVET) is significantly smaller than in general education, which suggests an equally small participation of this subsector in labor market dynamics. This is partially explained by the negative social perception of TVET.

Demographics and Employment: The population of Yemen was estimated at 23.8 million in 2012, growing at an annual rate of 2.3 percent. With 74 percent of the population under the age of 30, Yemen has the most youthful age structure in the world outside sub-Saharan Africa. This consequently puts pressure on education and health services, drinking water and employment opportunities. Only 4 percent of Yemenis are aged 60 or older (see Figure 4).

In 2010, about 4.8 million people were engaged in the labor force which, compared to 3.6 million in 2004, suggests an annual growth of 5.7 percent. According to the formal Census of 2004, women represent quite a small percentage of the official labor force (less than 5 percent). The majority of employment opportunities in Yemen are in the informal sector, particularly in agriculture and trade and services (see Figure 5). An informality rate of 91.4 percent in 2011 reflects the inability of the formal sector to provide job opportunities, the fragmented and weak nature of the country’s labor market, and the need to support small

---

20 World Development Indicators. See: http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.GROW
22 The Fourth Human Development Report for Yemen, 2013
and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in contributing to job creation.

Agriculture is the main source of income for 73.5 percent of Yemenis, whether engaged directly in agriculture or working in agriculture-related services. The sector’s contribution to GDP was 12 percent in 2010, and about 33.1 percent of the total national income according to the Household Budget Survey (2005/2006). Given that Yemen has one of the lowest levels of water availability per capita and agriculture utilizes 90 percent of the country’s groundwater, agricultural production has been adversely impacted by recurrent and severe water shortages.

Agriculture, fisheries, construction, and general services are seen as the sectors with the biggest potential for job creation. Despite the vulnerability of the agriculture sector to water scarcity and climate changes, it is still a main source of income for most of the population in rural areas. The service sector, including supermarkets, restaurants and training facilities, is growing at a fast pace in urban areas and has contributed to job creation.

Unemployment is still very high: 52.9 percent for youth (aged 15-24), and 44.4 percent for adults (aged 25-59). Unemployment among women was estimated at 40.2 percent in 2006 compared to the national average of 14.6 percent. Interestingly, unemployment is higher among graduates from general secondary and tertiary education, as they tend to compete for full-benefit jobs in the public sector, even when it represents only 21 percent of total jobs available. This situation is also explained by the relatively high entry barriers in the private sector, which usually requires qualifications that are likely to be unaffordable for recent graduates such as fluency in English, computer skills or practical experience. As indicated in Figure 5, these types of skills are not readily available in an economy where an important proportion of the workforce is employed in typically low-skilled sectors such as agriculture, fisheries, and trade and services. Thus, wide skills gaps and the weak absorptive capacity of the labor market can be considered as two critical constraints to the development of Yemen’s workforce.

Figure 4: Population per age category -2010

Figure 5: Manpower contribution to the economic sectors

---

27 Data from the Ministry of Planning and International Development for 2012.
3. Overview of Findings and Implications

This chapter highlights findings from the assessment of Yemen’s workforce development (WfD) system based on the SABER-WfD analytical framework and tool. The focus is on policies, institutions, and practices in three important functional dimensions of policymaking and implementation—strategic framework, system oversight, and service delivery. Because these aspects collectively create the operational environment in which individuals, firms, and training providers, both state and non-state, make decisions with regard to training, they exert an important influence on observed outcomes in skills development. Strong systems of WfD have institutionalized processes and practices for reaching agreement on priorities, collaboration and coordination, and generating routine feedback that sustain continuous innovation and improvement. By contrast, weak systems are characterized by fragmentation, duplication of efforts and limited learning from experience.

The SABER-WfD assessment results summarized below provide a baseline for understanding the current status of the WfD system in Yemen, as well as a basis for discussing ideas on how best to strengthen it in the coming years.

Overview of the SABER-WfD Assessment Results

Figure 6 shows the overall results for the three SABER-WfD Functional Dimensions. At the strategic level, Yemen is rated at the Latent level (1.7); and for Service Delivery, the score reaches the Emerging level of development (1.9).

At the strategic level, the findings suggest that advocacy for WfD is a priority on the political agenda, as expressed in a number of policies and sector strategies for WfD, including the 2014-2016 National Plan for Youth Employment, developed during the country’s transitional phase (2012-2014). Policies and strategy documents, however, have yet to be aligned under a unified strategic vision. The implementation of these strategies by different ministries (i.e., education, vocational training, higher education, health, labor, etc.) does not take place in a coordinated fashion.

Implementation also faces challenges due to the political situation in the country and the limited resources available for WfD.

At the system oversight level, the assessment shows that institutional accreditation mechanisms are in place, but competency-based testing is limited and a national qualifications framework is not yet in place. Government funding of training providers is neither linked to performance, nor supplemented by other sources. In addition, scarcity of funds impedes monitoring and improvement of programs.

At the service delivery level, the findings suggest that, despite improvements in access to training and increased participation of private providers, the quality of training continues to be a challenge. The lack of financial autonomy, exacerbated by limited financial resources allocated for WfD, has hindered a systematic review and evaluation of training programs. In addition, the lack of up-to-date data about training outcomes and labor market needs prevents institutions from reviewing and updating their programs.

Figure 6: Yemen’s Dimension-Level Scores

Note: See Figure 2 for an explanation of the scale on the horizontal axis. Source: Based on analysis of the data collected using the SABER-WfD questionnaire.

---

29 See Annex 5 for the full results.
Policy implications

The demographic and socioeconomic situation of the country, combined with the analysis provided in this report, clearly indicates the need to develop a unified strategic vision of what Yemen wants to achieve through the development of its workforce. As identified by the SABER-WfD assessment, a national WfD plan should prioritize measures to address skills constraints, adopt a demand-driven approach to training provision, and improve the quality and relevance of current education and training programs. Coordination of efforts from different WfD stakeholders is crucial to translate the vision and related strategies into actions that can effectively contribute to better preparation and utilization of the country’s human resources.

A comprehensive review of current vocational education and training programs is necessary in order to bridge the vast gap between graduates’ skills and labor market needs. With an increasing unemployment rate, weak investment by the private sector, and rapidly expanded poverty, there is an urgent need to design and diversify training programs, especially those related to small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). The increased diversity in training providers and programs must be accompanied by the establishment and enforcement of quality standards and monitoring and evaluation systems.

As Yemen seeks to embark on formulating a new constitution, the opportunity to address the most pressing challenges of the country’s WfD system seems unique. It is true that political stability is a key pillar for any country to achieve socioeconomic development, but the willingness and enthusiasm of different political powers engaged in a long process towards building a new Yemen would pave the road for WfD key stakeholders to bravely commence a concrete reform of education and training programs.
4. Aligning Workforce Development to Key Economic and Social Priorities

Workforce development (WfD) is not an end in itself but an input toward broader objectives – of boosting employability and productivity; of relieving skills constraints on business growth and development; and of advancing overall economic growth and social well-being. This chapter briefly introduces Yemen’s socioeconomic aspirations, priorities and reforms before presenting the detailed SABER-WfD findings on Strategic Framework.

Socioeconomic Aspirations, Priorities and Reforms

Security threats and continued conflict in Yemen have diverted the government’s attention and resources from critical development priorities. In recent years, the country has undertaken significant efforts to address immediate humanitarian needs and restore basic services destroyed by recurrent attacks on oil pipelines and power lines. The Transitional Program for Stabilization and Development (TPSD) for 2012–2014, prepared by the Yemeni government in 2012, focused on four priorities:

1. Finalizing the peaceful transfer of power and restoring political stability
2. Achieving security stability and enhancing the rule of law
3. Meeting urgent humanitarian and material needs
4. Achieving macroeconomic stability

Two initiatives related to WfD can be distinguished. The first is to implement a parallel emergency response to address the deteriorating socioeconomic situation in the country by improving livelihood conditions and job creation in the short term. The second is to initiate a medium-term Economic Recovery Program.30

Yemen has also embarked on longer-term initiatives to improve its WfD system. The last two decades have witnessed the development of six strategies for different education levels, covering basic education, secondary education, literacy and adult education, higher education and scientific research, and technical and vocational education and training (TVET) (see Box 1).

Examples of key laws include:

- General Education Law No.45, 1992
- Technical Education and Vocational Training Law, 2006
- Community Colleges Law No. 5, 1996
- Labor Code Act No. 5, 1995

Although these laws and strategies reflect the commitment of policymakers towards enhancing WfD in the country, coordination mechanisms need to be revisited. Most of these strategies work independently, which has led to major disconnects in terms of investment and implementation. A coordinated vision for skills development is crucial for Yemen to effectively capitalize on the “demographic gift”31 and increase employment opportunities for its youth.

Box 1: Major Education Strategies in Yemen

Since 2002, the government has approved the following strategies:

1. The National Basic Education Development Strategy (NBEDS, 2003–15), which aims to increase enrollment with an emphasis on girls and rural areas.
2. The National General Secondary Education Strategy (NGSES, 2007–2015), which aims to provide equitable and cost-effective quality education and focuses on recruitment, deployment, and monitoring of teachers.
5. The National Children and Youth Strategy (NCYS), which focuses on identifying issues that are most likely to impact the achievement of the MDGs, and coordinating actions to address them.
6. The National Strategy for Literacy and Adult Education, which aims to eradicate illiteracy among the population aged between 10 and 40 years old.


---


31 The “demographic gift,” also known as the demographic window of opportunity, connotes the presence of a large working-age population and low dependency ratio.

http://www.shababinclusion.org/section/about/why_shabab
SABER-WfD ratings of the Strategic Framework

In the SABER-WfD framework, the role of WfD in realizing Yemen’s socioeconomic aspirations materializes through actions to advance the following three Policy Goals: (i) setting a strategic direction for WfD; (ii) fostering a demand-led approach in WfD; and (iii) ensuring coordination among key WfD leaders and stakeholders. The ratings for these Policy Goals are presented and explained below.

Based on data collected by the SABER-WfD questionnaire, Yemen receives an overall rating of 1.7 (Latent) on the Strategic Framework dimension (see figure below). This score is the average of the ratings for the underlying Policy Goals relating to: (i) Setting a Direction for WfD (2.0); (ii) Fostering a Demand-led Approach to WfD (1.8); and (iii) Strengthening Critical Coordination for WfD (1.3). The explanation for these ratings on the Policy Goals and their implications follow below.

Policy Goal 1: Setting a Strategic Direction for WfD

Leaders play an important role in crystallizing a strategic vision for WfD appropriate to Yemen’s unique circumstances and opportunities. Their advocacy and commitment attracts partnerships with stakeholders for the common good, builds public support for key priorities in WfD, and ensures that critical issues receive due attention in policy dialogue. Taking these ideas into account, Policy Goal 1 assesses the extent to which apex-level leaders in government and in the private sector provide sustained advocacy for WfD priorities through institutionalized processes.

Yemen is rated at the Emerging level (2.0) on this Policy Goal, reflecting a fragmented advocacy for WfD by government champions, lack of participation in policy dialogue from non-government stakeholders, and the existence of various WfD measures that are yet to be institutionalized, coordinated, and strengthened.

Overall, advocacy for WfD in Yemen can be best described as fragmented. Such advocacy is more evident on paper, but has rarely materialized into specific programs. Prior to the 2011 crisis, considerable progress had been achieved in developing different national education strategies and expanding educational services and institutions throughout the country. A cabinet decree, issued in 1998, declared May 24 as the national day for TVET, on which exhibitions and public events were to be held. In 2004 the government approved the National Strategy for the Development of Vocational and Technical Education (NSDVTE, 2004–2014). WfD was part of the government’s National Reform Agenda (NRA) (2009-2010), and one of its top priorities included achieving sustainable growth rates that would help reduce unemployment and poverty.

During and after the crisis, the government has undertaken various measures to address the most pressing issues of WfD. In the midst of the political uprising, the previous government tried to mitigate protesters’ anger by issuing a presidential decree to employ 60,000 youth, many of whom had been long waiting for a government position in the Ministry of Civil Service lists. This unplanned and temporary measure added a financial burden to the state budget and was then followed by a suspension of any new employment opportunities in the public sector for two years. With increased public attention on the high level of youth unemployment and the need to address skills mismatches, advocacy for WfD became more noticeable in the formal speeches of key political leaders such as the President and Prime Minister. WfD was established as one of the four priorities of the TPSD and has been a predominant topic in the National Dialogue in which Yemen is currently engaged.

Increased advocacy for WfD has not led to coordination of stakeholders or measures. Government champions...
have identified higher education (universities and colleges) and initial vocational education and training (IVET) at the secondary and post-secondary levels as priorities in supporting economic and social development. However, little has been done to identify WfD priorities in these areas or to establish coordinated and widespread support for WfD in the country. Donors have supported stakeholder coordination efforts in the past, best represented by the establishment of the Ministry of Technical Education and Vocational Training in 2001, but such achievements are highly dependent on the availability of donor leadership and funds.

Policy Goal 2: Fostering a Demand-driven Approach

Effective advocacy for WfD requires credible assessments of the demand for skills, engagement of employers in shaping the country’s WfD agenda and incentives for employers to support skills development. Policy Goal 2 incorporates these ideas and benchmarks the system according to the extent to which policies and institutional arrangements are in place to: (i) establish clarity on the demand for skills and areas of critical constraint; and (ii) engage employers in setting WfD priorities and in enhancing skills-upgrading for workers.

Yemen is rated at the Emerging level (1.8) for Policy Goal 2 reflecting the modest steps made so far to foster a demand-driven approach. Although donor-led systematic and ad-hoc assessments of the country’s economic prospects have been conducted in recent years (particularly after the 2011 crisis), they have not included analyses of skills needs and have not benefited from input from employers or research institutions.

The low score for this Policy Goal indicates the dominance of a supply-driven approach in Yemen. An important obstacle to the fostering of a demand-driven approach is the unavailability of accurate and updated data on the demand for skills. A designated unit under the Ministry of Labor used to provide this information but, due to lack of funding, this unit’s responsibilities were modified in 2005 and it currently focuses on collecting and presenting annual statistics about foreign laborers only.32

The last national comprehensive labor survey was conducted in 2003. The drastic changes that Yemen’s economy has endured since then call for an updated labor-demand survey. During the last 10 years, the demand for skills has been identified through ad-hoc, informal and non-systematized ways. Examples of such ad-hoc identification mechanisms include small-scale studies and surveys, mainly prior to establishing donor-supported programs. Such studies or surveys are not usually shared with or validated by other relevant WfD stakeholders and therefore are not used to feed into a well-developed labor market information system (LMIS). There is a critical shortage of national and strategic studies or surveys that identify skills and qualifications needed locally and regionally. Also, there is little information on the basic characteristics and trends of the labor market.

As more than 1 million Yemenis work abroad and remittances are important for the country’s economy,33 information on labor market trends and demand for skills would benefit from including neighboring countries. Any strategic WfD planning needs to be informed by solid research on the kinds of jobs available in the Gulf countries, particularly those typically performed by Yemenis.34 Special attention should be given to Saudi Arabia as the main destination of Yemenis, given its geographic proximity and availability of job opportunities. The impact of Saudi Arabia’s labor market dynamics was demonstrated in April 2013 when new labor regulations forced more than 200,000 Yemeni workers to leave the country. The International Organization for Migration (IOM) believes that more Yemeni workers will return home as Saudi Arabia continues to enforce these recent regulations.35

Policy Goal 3: Strengthening Critical Coordination

Ensuring that the efforts of multiple stakeholders involved in WfD are aligned with the country’s key socioeconomic priorities is an important goal of strategic coordination. Such coordination typically

---

32 This was confirmed in an interview with key personnel in the Ministry of Labor and the Ministry of Technical Education and Vocational Training (MTEVT).

34 GTZ & GET/ICON, (2008)
requires leadership at a sufficiently high level to overcome barriers to cross-sector or cross-ministerial cooperation. Policy Goal 3 examines the extent to which policies and institutional arrangements are in place to formalize roles and responsibilities for coordinated action on strategic priorities.

Yemen scores at the **Latent** level for Policy Goal 3 (1.3). While some legislation and agreements amongst stakeholders exist to promote coordination, resulting committees or coordinating boards have not succeeded in enabling strategic coordination and their efforts rarely lead to significant and sustainable achievements.

Four ministries in Yemen have legally-defined roles and responsibilities for WfD: the Ministry of Education (MOE), the Ministry of Technical Education and Vocational Training (MTEVT), the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research and the Ministry of Social Affairs and Labor (MOSAL). Each ministry is responsible for a different education level; hence a major overlap in mandates is not common. The role of non-government WfD stakeholders in policy dialogue is not regulated. The mandate work and general role of trade unions and civil society organizations are determined by the law, but there are no provisions directly associated with WfD. Participation of these stakeholders takes place in workshops, conferences, or meetings for consultative purposes.

Coordination among WfD stakeholders faces three main challenges. First, there is no champion or strategic vision for WfD around which stakeholders can coordinate. Second, few mechanisms exist for coordination between government and non-government WfD stakeholders. Third, established coordination mechanisms, such as the Supreme Council for Education Planning (SCEP), advisory coordinating boards, and inter-ministerial committees, have delivered suboptimal results.

The SCEP is in charge of developing strategies for different education paths and collecting annual education statistics. Its role has been limited to advising policy-makers, and has not been reflected in increased ministerial coordination. Legally established advisory coordinating boards under MTEVT are responsible for coordination between different WfD stakeholders in a way that fosters better policies and programming. For example, the Supreme Council for the Skills Development Fund includes representatives from the Ministries of Finance, Trade and Industry, and Legal Affairs, as well as the Federation of Chambers of Commerce, the General Federation of Trade Unions of Yemen, and small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). Despite the representation of a wide range of stakeholders, the stability of communication and coordination in this and other boards depends on personalities and loyalties, which is the result of a lack of institutionalization, clear lines of responsibility, and stakeholder accountability. On the other hand, **inter-ministerial committees**, officially established to enhance coordination, have found that institutional incentives within ministries (regarding information sharing, communication and collaborative work at the technical level) support the protection of territorial interests rather than collaboration towards a common goal. In addition, financial and administrative autonomy is highly protected by these ministries, which makes them inflexible and less willing to coordinate.
5. Governing the System for Workforce Development

An important function of workforce development (Wfd) authorities is to foster efficient and equitable funding of investments in workforce development, facilitate effective skills acquisition by individuals, and enable employers to meet their demand for skilled workers in a timely manner. The objective is to minimize systemic impediments to skills acquisition and mismatches in skills supply and demand. This chapter begins with a brief description of how the Wfd system is organized and governed before presenting the detailed SABER-Wfd findings on System Oversight.

Overall Institutional Landscape

The main actors in Yemen’s Wfd system are the Ministries of Technical Education and Vocational Training (MTEVT), Education (MOE), Higher Education (MOHE), Finance (MOF), and Social Affairs and Labor (MOSAL). Wfd is treated as an integral and central part of the national strategies and action plans of these ministries. It is also included in the five-year national plan.

The MOE is responsible for basic and secondary education, in addition to literacy and adult education matters. The MOHE is concerned with tertiary education and directly supervises public and private universities. The MTEVT oversees all types of long- and short-term technical education and vocational training programs at the post-basic and post-secondary levels. These three levels of education are overseen by the Supreme Council for Education Planning (SCEP), which acts as the coordinating body, approves annual education plans, and gathers annual education statistics. The relationship between SCEP and the Ministries, however, is not hierarchical. Given that the different ministries depend on the MOF, which controls their funding and annual budgets, the ability of SCEP to ensure coordination and effective implementation of Wfd strategies is rather limited (see Figure 8).

Figure 8: Institutional Landscape of Yemen’s Wfd System
SABER-WfD ratings on System Oversight

According to the data collected by the SABER-WfD questionnaire, Yemen receives an overall rating of 1.7 (Latent level) for system oversight (see Figure 9 below). This score is the average of the ratings for the underlying Policy Goals: ensuring efficiency and equity of funding (1.4); assuring relevant and reliable standards (2.1); and diversifying pathways for skills acquisition (1.7). The explanation for these ratings follows below.

Figure 9: SABER-WfD Ratings of Dimension 2

Policy Goal 4: Ensuring Efficiency and Equity in Funding

WfD requires a significant investment of resources by the government, employers, and households. To ensure that these resources are effectively used it is important to examine the extent to which policies and institutional arrangements are in place to: (i) ensure stable funding for effective programs in initial, continuing and targeted VET; (ii) monitor and assess equity in funding; and (iii) foster partnerships with employers for funding WfD.

Yemen is rated at the Latent level (1.4) on Policy Goal 4. This rating reflects the inadequate levels of funding for technical and vocational education and training (TVET), the lack of autonomy of training providers over expenditure decisions, and the limited efforts towards assessing the impact of funding for WfD on the beneficiaries of training programs.

As Figure 10 indicates, the largest proportion of public expenditure on education is allocated to basic and secondary levels, with only a small proportion being allocated to TVET. Lower enrollment in TVET programs, combined with relatively higher operational costs, puts TVET programs at a disadvantage. Hence, although TVET in Yemen has benefited from a relative increase in budget in the last decade, current funding is still not sufficient to improve the quality of vocational education and training programs.

Figure 10: Recurrent Government Expenditure by Level

In general terms, the government has two sources of funding for WfD: general taxation and mandatory contributions towards the Skills Development Fund (SDF), which finances short programs for continuing vocational education and training (CVET).

Decisions on capital investments, salaries and other operational spending are proposed by the relevant WfD ministries, but controlled by the MOF, which administers training budgets through a very centralized process. The MOF’s predominant role in controlling how and on what ministries and their associated training institutions spend their annual budgets has resulted in a lack of financial autonomy and left very little room to innovate or improve training programs.

Recurrent funding for training at the initial vocational education and training (IVET) level is determined based on the previous year’s budget and enrollment figures, and is disbursed in the form of budget allocations to training providers. At the CVET level, recurrent funding is decided through a formal process of application and approval, and resources are allocated in the form of earmarked levies channeled through the SDF. Restructured in 2009, the SDF is funded by a 1 percent levy on the payroll of each enterprise and is designed to support enterprises and employees in improving their skills. This has allowed sustained funding for a variety of programs, including training for the unemployed, on-
the-job training, and career development services. In addition, as NGOs that provide training services can compete with private training providers for public funds from the SDF, this funding mechanism has the potential of incentivizing good performance by providers at the CVET level.

The SABER-WfD results point to weakness with respect to formal reviews of the impact of funding on the beneficiaries of training programs. Although some donor-led projects do include these types of reviews (mostly GIZ), they all operate individually and hardly provide any comprehensive picture of the effect on equity of funding for different education and training programs. In this respect, donors that support TVET should learn from good practices in the basic education sector, where strong harmonization from donors has enabled the effective development of funding policies and efficient allocation of resources towards common education reform objectives.

An assessment of the impact of funding on the beneficiaries of training programs is one of the areas that requires attention by WfD stakeholders as well as increased funding. Although reviews of national plans and budget allocations are conducted (such as the evaluation of five-year national development plans, and post-2011 crisis reviews), it is not clear how such nationwide reviews translate into measures to improve efficiency and equity in funding, particularly for WfD.

**Policy Goal 5: Assuring Relevant and Reliable Standards**

The WfD system comprises a wide range of training providers offering courses at various levels in diverse fields. An effective system of standards and accreditation enables students to document what they have learned and employers to identify workers with the relevant skills. For Policy Goal 5, it is therefore important to assess the status of policies and institutions to: (i) set reliable competency standards; (ii) assure the credibility of skills testing and certification; and (iii) develop and enforce accreditation standards for maintaining the quality of training provision.

Yemen scores at the Emerging level (2.1) for this Policy Goal, which reflects the modest steps taken towards defining competency standards and the absence of a sound quality assurance system.

Yemen has taken some steps towards defining competency standards for a large number of occupations. In 1995, MTEVT developed the Occupational Classification Manual, a comprehensive work that provides a detailed job description for different teachers/instructors and technicians in different technical and vocational specializations. This manual is mostly used by training providers under MTEVT as a basis to develop competency-based curricula and testing. Although back in 1995 this work was considered pioneering, the Manual has not been updated since and is not used by training providers outside MTEVT.

In 2003, a new policy in curricula and program development was adopted. Created with support from ILO, this policy encouraged training providers to use a competency-based approach to design modular training units. Training programs created under this model would offer trainees the possibility of enrolling first in “general grounding training”, followed by “special grounding training”, and later “specialized training” in the chosen occupation. This system was expected to enhance the flexibility of training programs and facilitate their adaptation to the changing needs of the labor market. MTEVT officials, with support from ILO, were responsible for reviewing and adapting existing training programs in order to fully adopt the competency-based approach. Although this exercise resulted in the development of some modules, it was suspended due to lack of funding.

Only training providers under MTEVT use competency-based testing to grant “certificates of occupation achievement” upon completion of training programs. This type of testing is also used by MTEVT to grant skills certificates that recognize prior on-the-job learning for individuals without formal qualification certificates. MTEVT also acknowledges, in conjunction with the Executive Council for Community Colleges, certificates issued by eligible private providers if their graduates need to provide such certificates to employers. Possession of these certificates appears to improve graduates’ employability, mobility, and earnings in most occupations.

Accreditation of training providers and programs is the responsibility of MTEVT and the Higher Council for Community Colleges. All providers regardless of funding
are required to obtain accreditation, but accreditation standards are not widely publicized. In an attempt to supervise the training offered by non-state training providers, MTEVT requires their accreditation in order to obtain a license to operate. Licenses must be renewed annually, which allows a strong supervisory role for the MTEVT. However, funding restrictions have limited its ability to monitor compliance properly.

Dialogue about the establishment of a National Qualifications Framework (NQF) has taken place, mainly among MOE, MTEVT, and donors such as UNICEF and the World Bank. In fact, in a 2010 report, the latter encouraged Yemen to “establish an NQF to bring together the skills levels that link TVET and general education from secondary to higher education.” 36 As explained in this report, a comprehensive quality assurance system that covers public and private training providers, such as the NQF, would have a positive impact on the alignment between the supply side of the WfD system and the skills needs of the labor market.

For Yemen, skills mismatches are a matter of concern not only at the TVET level, but also in higher education. The quality of education provided at this level has been frequently questioned, especially with the emergence of private universities and colleges with barely any measures to ensure the quality of programs delivered. The recent establishment of the Accreditation Council for Higher Education constitutes a much needed step to address quality and relevance concerns in a WfD system where the unemployment rate is higher among educated and university graduates (18.2 percent compared to 15.8 percent for the uneducated). 37

Policy Goal 6: Diversifying Pathways for Skills Acquisition

In dynamic economic environments workers need to acquire new skills and competencies as well as keep their skills up-to-date throughout their working lives. They are best served by a system of initial and continuing education and training that promotes lifelong learning by offering clear and flexible pathways for transfers across courses, progression to higher levels of training, and access to programs in other fields. For those already in the workforce, schemes for recognition of prior learning are essential to allow individuals to efficiently upgrade their skills and learn new ones. Policy Goal 6 therefore evaluates the extent to which policies and institutions are in place to: (i) enable progression through multiple learning pathways, including for students in TVET streams; (ii) facilitate the recognition of prior learning; and (iii) provide targeted support services, particularly among the disadvantaged.

Yemen scores at the Latent level (1.7) for Policy Goal 6, which reflects the absence of mechanisms for recognition of prior learning and the rigid regulations for different education paths that impede smooth movement across vocational and general education streams.

Registration requirements at all levels of TVET have maximum age limits that restrict the ability of students to re-enter the system once they have dropped out. 38 Further, entrance requirements for secondary TVET institutions are stricter than those for academic secondary schools. Moreover, TVET is considered a dead-end path as graduates from this stream are unable to pursue further studies in non-vocationally oriented tertiary education institutions: Admission into university programs requires a General Secondary Education Certificate that must have been issued one to four years prior to enrollment. These circumstances, added to the absence of services to provide career guidance, make lifelong learning extremely difficult.

Prior learning has received some attention in MTEVT, which has developed a mechanism to formally acknowledge informally acquired skills. Skilled or semi-skilled workers in many occupations can apply for practical and theoretical tests that, if passed, result in formal “Occupational Certificates” that enable them to show proof of their credentials to potential local and regional employers. These tests are conducted annually and, according to MTEVT officials, the resulting certificates are valued by employers in and outside Yemen.

---

36 Ibid.
6. Managing Service Delivery

Training providers, both non-state and government are the main channels through which the country’s policies in workforce development (WfD) are translated into results on the ground. This chapter therefore provides a brief overview of the composition of providers and the types of services before presenting the detailed SABER-WfD findings on Service Delivery and their policy implications.

Overview of the delivery of training services

The formal education system in Yemen is organized in three levels: Basic, post-basic, and higher education. Basic education lasts nine years and its successful completion results in an Intermediate School Certificate. At the post-basic level, students have the choice of enrolling in one of three branches of education. They can enroll in general secondary education, which lasts three years, after which students are required to take a national exam. Those who pass are awarded a General Secondary Education Certificate or Al Thanawiya. Students can also choose to enroll in vocational secondary education, which lasts three years, or vocational training, which lasts two years. Training offered in both branches covers the fields of industry, engineering, commerce, business, agriculture and crafts. As shown in Figure 11, while vocational secondary education allows graduates to pursue further studies in community colleges, vocational training does not. Graduates from both branches can also progress to technical education, which offers two- and three-year programs in fields such as information technology, commerce, health, engineering, business, agriculture, design, and hospitality. While this is option is available at the post-secondary level only, it is not considered part of the higher education level.

Since the early 2000s, the government of Yemen has established new technical and vocational education and training (TVET) institutes and community colleges in different governorates and, as a result, the demand for secondary and post-secondary TVET has increased (for enrollment figures in 2010/11, see Table 2).

Unfortunately, this expansion has not been properly accompanied by the necessary funding or training inputs such as furniture, instructors, equipment, etc. The capacity of government institutes is limited to the

---

39 Information confirmed by Ministry of Technical Education and Vocational Training (MTEVT) officials in May 2013.
extent that, in the academic year of 2010/2011, about 57 percent of the applicants for the two-year technical diploma were rejected. A noticeable rise in the number of non-state training providers has opened new opportunities for training and contributed towards the diversification of training services (including on-the-job training opportunities sponsored by the Skills Development Fund, or SDF). In 2010, the Ministry of Technical Education and Vocation Training (MTEVT) approved about 11,683 certificates from 162 private training institutions.

The relevance of the training provided by public institutes is still questioned. TVET in Yemen continues to be largely supply-driven, with few linkages between firms and training providers. Quality is also constrained by low instructor wages and the consequent lack of instructors with good qualifications and proper industry experience. On the private providers’ side, certain training packages seem to be popular and successful as the skills taught to the students are listed in most of the jobs advertised by public and private employers, such as computer skills, software programming, and foreign languages.

SABER WfD ratings on Service Delivery

The Policy Goals for this Dimension in the SABER-WfD framework focus on the following three aspects of service delivery: (i) enabling diversity and excellence in training provision; (ii) fostering relevance in public training programs; and (iii) enhancing evidence-based accountability for results. The ratings for these three Policy Goals are presented below.

According to the data collected by the SABER-WfD questionnaire, Yemen receives an overall rating of 1.9, Emerging level, for the Service Delivery Dimension as shown in Figure 12. This score is the average of the ratings for the underlying Policy Goals: (i) enabling diversity and excellence in training provision (2.3); (ii) fostering relevance in public training programs (1.8); and (iii) enhancing evidence-based accountability for results (1.7). The explanation for these ratings and their implications follow next (Figure 12).

---

40 Ministry of Technical Education and Vocational Training (MTVET), 2012: Annual Report 2010
The number and diversity of non-state training providers has expanded in the past few years as the demand for skills such as computing, foreign languages, management, and accounting, etc. has been increasing in urban areas. There is a diverse mix of non-state training providers that encompasses private firms, private specialized education institutes (medical, technical, etc.), and nonprofit civil society organizations. No non-state training providers can function unless they are registered and licensed. Licenses must be renewed annually, as a condition to continue operating and being able to issue certificates that are formally approved and authorized. Unfortunately, the impact of these measures on quality and performance is not clear.

The SDF has recently introduced funding mechanisms that could have a positive impact on quality. The SDF has begun to engage non-state providers in introducing different tailored training programs funded or co-funded by the SDF and employers. In 2012, the SDF funded various training programs focusing on computer skills, graphics, interior design, networks and computer maintenance, and mobile maintenance. One example is the program implemented by the firm Universal Group in partnership with the SDF to train a group of youth who live in remote and touristic areas in Mareb to be professional tourist guides.

SDF’s new funding mechanism creates competition among non-state providers, and it is expected to have a positive impact on the quality and performance of training programs. However, very little is known about the quality standards used to determine which private providers are eligible for receiving funds. In addition, such financial incentives are limited to urban providers in a few cities. In many rural areas, the presence of training providers is rare and the accessibility of these providers to SDF grants is highly unlikely. Consequently, the impact of SDF in the quality of training provided nationwide might be questioned, too.

Most public training institutions have some autonomy over the main functions such as the selection and admission of trainees, purchase of materials, and selection of instructors. There is also space for these institutions to seek direct links with the private sector or donors to gather additional funding or support for the introduction of new training programs. Some public training providers are allowed to generate income through the delivery of short, fee-based courses to cover some of their expenses.

With regard to state training providers, the system shows a lack of incentives to improve performance. This is aggravated by the fact that lagging institutions do not face consequences for performing poorly. Community colleges are granted financial autonomy, but this apparent incentive is not associated with meeting any quality standards. State training providers are not expected to meet specific performance targets and are only required to provide data about enrollment and graduation rates. Other significant targets such as job placement, employers’ satisfaction, quality of training, or capacity to meet market needs are not taken into consideration when assessing training providers’ performance.

**Policy Goal 8: Fostering relevance in public training programs**

Public training institutions need reliable information on current and emerging skills demands in order to keep their program offerings relevant to market conditions. It is therefore desirable for public training institutions to establish and maintain relationships with employers, industry associations, and research institutions. Such partners are a source of both information about skills competencies and expertise and advice on curriculum design and technical specifications for training facilities and equipment. They can also help create opportunities for workplace training for students and continuing professional development for instructors and administrators. Policy Goal 8 considers the extent to which arrangements are in place for public training providers to: (i) benefit from industry and expert input in the design of programs and (ii) recruit administrators and instructors with relevant qualifications and support their professional development.

Yemen is assessed at the **Latent** level of development for Policy Goal 8, which reflects the limited involvement of industries and research institutions in the design of curricula and facility standards. The low score also reflects the fact that there are no explicit standards for the recruitment of instructors and administrators of public training institutions, and the opportunities for
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41 As confirmed by the Head of the SDF
professional development in both cases are rather scarce.

The 2003 Labor Force Survey pointed out that 16 percent of employees in business industries believe there is a wide skills gap. Yet, links between public training providers and industry are very weak. Some informal and irregular links exist, but they are limited to the involvement of firms in curriculum design in the form of occasional consultations. No involvement in, for example, the specification of standards for training facilities has been observed.

Although the representation of the private sector in higher advisory boards or higher committees at MTEVT, the SDF, and the Skills Development and Community Colleges Executive Council was intended to contribute to the increased relevance of training programs, even in these scenarios firms have a limited role in providing input into training content and quality. Between 2006 and 2008, GIZ and the World Bank supported efforts to develop links between MTEVT and the private sector. Under their initiatives, firms were involved in the development of curricula, participated in student final practical examinations in TVET institutes, and offered internship opportunities for students in TVET institutes and colleges. Unfortunately, the collaboration between MTEVT and employers decreased dramatically once donors’ programs concluded. Currently, participation in some of the practical examinations conducted in state TVET institutes, as well as internship opportunities for trainees, are limited to few cooperative employers. Collaboration depends on how active and capable the heads of TVET institutes are in establishing links with firms and, hence, their scope and sustainability vary from case to case.

Some employers establish their own training institutes or training programs and engage with public training providers informally. Such is the case of the Hail Saeed Group, a leading private business in Yemen that has its own training center in its industrial complex located in the Taiz Governorate. The center trains close to 2,000 people every year, both for the Group’s own needs and other companies upon request.42 Also, this training center has informal links with the Public Technical Institute in Taiz under which the two institutions exchange instructors and the Group’s center receives trainees from the Public Technical Institute.43

The relevance of higher education, which represents the main supply of employees for public and private sector jobs, is affected by mainly two factors. The first is the large share of graduates from humanities disciplines (about 67.5 percent from public and private universities), at the expense of scientific disciplines. These humanities graduates face great difficulty in getting a job, given the limited number of available jobs, and thus join the long waiting list of job seekers at the Civil Services Ministry. Second, the parallel system of education programs in public universities, which grants access to students with lower scores as long as they pay high tuition fees. While this measure creates a source of income for these universities, it also means that the limited resources, qualified university staff, and equipment are thinly stretched. This situation adversely affects the quality of higher education and, as a result, the quality of its outcomes.

Relevance in public training programs can be enhanced through links between training providers and research institutions. These links in the case of Yemen are rare. The newly established Unit for Externally Funded Projects in the MTEVT was assigned to act as a focal point for different donor-supported projects and, as such, would be best positioned to manage information from studies or assessments conducted during the implementation of these projects.

Recruitment of administrators and instructors in training institutes

The low score on this Goal also reflects the fact that the recruitment criteria for instructors and administrators of public training institutions are rather lax. Having a certificate in the subjects taught at the technical institutes and some practical experience are the main requirements. Specific industry experience is not a criterion and, as a result, many trainers have little or no enterprise-based experience. In fact, many graduates from the technical institutes are appointed as teachers shortly after they complete their studies, which means that they engage in training although they have very little practical experience or knowledge about the labor


43 As confirmed by Mr. Fathi Saeed, Head of the NATCO company.
market. Furthermore, despite formal provisions, instructors often face practical difficulties in accessing opportunities for professional development. In an attempt to address this issue, in 2012 the MTEVT and the Executive Council for Community Colleges launched a more competitive process to select the heads of community colleges based on publicly announced criteria that include a specific set of experience and qualifications.

**Policy Goal 9: enhancing evidence-based accountability for results**

Systematic monitoring and evaluation of service delivery are important for both quality assurance and system improvement. Accomplishing this function requires gathering and analyzing data from a variety of sources. The reporting of institution-level data enables the relevant authorities to ensure that providers are delivering on expected outcomes. Such data also enable these authorities to identify gaps or challenges in training provision or areas of good practice. Additionally, periodic surveys and evaluations of major programs generate complementary information that can help enhance the relevance and efficiency of the system as a whole. Policy Goal 9 considers these ideas when assessing the system’s arrangements for collecting and using data to focus attention on training outcomes, efficiency and innovation in service delivery.

Yemen scores at the *Latent* level for Policy Goal 9, which reflects the limited availability of data on education outcomes from training providers, as well as general surveys or assessments related to skills development or labor market needs.

All training providers, state and non-state, are required to collect and report basic administrative data. Since most of the data reported are descriptive (counting personnel and resources), it is rarely used to inform program performance or review training programs. These data are collected and archived in all educational and training institutions, and serve as input for the annual reports of the Ministry of Education (MOE), MTEVT, and the Central Statistical Organization. The management of data is not centralized or standardized: Each ministry has an internal unit or department that collects and stores data. At MTEVT, for example, some data are archived manually and electronically by the Information and Statistics Department and some by other relevant departments.

Sources of data on education outcomes, labor market analysis, or other skills-related information are limited to a few *ad-hoc* surveys or evaluations of specific targeted programs. Two studies conducted in 2012, one supported by the SDF to assess labor market needs, and UNDP’s “Participatory Market and Training Needs Assessment,” are examples of such *ad-hoc* studies. Public access to these studies and data is limited and only some information is made available to the public through the website of the relevant ministry.

The Ministry of Social Affairs and Labor (MOSAL) was expected to monitor the labor market routinely and make collected data available to the public. It indeed conducted two labor force surveys in 1999 and 2003, but this initiative was suspended in 2005 when the donor-supported program concluded. The resulting wide information gap about labor market trends and needs requires urgent attention by WfD stakeholders.

---

44 The SDF study is still in draft form.
45 MTEVT officials reported some mismanagement issues as another cause for the suspension of this program.
## Annex 1: Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CVET</td>
<td>Continuing Vocational Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoY</td>
<td>Government of Yemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>German Technical Co-Operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labor Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMIS</td>
<td>Labor Market Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCS</td>
<td>Ministry of Civil Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOF</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOPIC</td>
<td>Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOSAL</td>
<td>Ministry of Social Affairs and Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTEVT</td>
<td>Ministry of Technical Education and Vocational Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NQF</td>
<td>National Qualifications Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDF</td>
<td>Skills Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>Social Fund for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEs</td>
<td>Small and Medium-sized Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPSD</td>
<td>Transitional Program for Stabilization and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVET</td>
<td>Technical and Vocational Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WfD</td>
<td>Workforce Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 2: The SABER-WfD Analytical Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Goal</th>
<th>Policy Action</th>
<th>Topic in DCI 2.5 FINAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension 1: Strategic Framework</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1 Setting a Strategic Direction</td>
<td>Provide sustained advocacy for WfD at the top leadership level</td>
<td>G1_T1 Advocacy for WfD to Support Economic Development, G1_T2 Strategic Focus and Decisions by the WfD Champions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2 Fostering a Demand-Led Approach</td>
<td>Establish clarity on the demand for skills and areas of critical constraint, Engage employers in setting WfD priorities and in enhancing skills-upgrading for workers</td>
<td>G2_T1 Overall Assessment of Economic Prospects and Skills Implications, G2_T2 Critical Skills Constraints in Priority Economic Sectors, G2_T3 Role of Employers and Industry, G2_T4 Skills-Upgrading Incentives for Employers, G2_T5 Monitoring of the Incentive Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3 Strengthening Critical Coordination</td>
<td>Formalize key WfD roles for coordinated action on strategic priorities</td>
<td>G3_T1 Roles of Government Ministries and Agencies, G3_T2 Roles of Non-Government WfD Stakeholders, G3_T3 Coordination for the Implementation of Strategic WfD Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension 2: System Oversight</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4 Ensuring Efficiency and Equity in Funding</td>
<td>Provide stable funding for effective programs in initial, continuing and targeted vocational education and training, Monitor and enhance equity in funding for training, Facilitate sustained partnerships between training institutions and employers</td>
<td>G4_T1 Overview of Funding for WfD, G4_T2 Recurrent Funding for Initial Vocational Education and Training (IVET), G4_T3 Recurrent Funding for Continuing Vocational Education and Training Programs (CVET), G4_T4 Recurrent Funding for Continuing Vocational Education and Training Programs (ALMPs), G4_T5 Equity in Funding for Training Programs, G4_T6 Partnerships between Training Providers and Employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5 Assuring Relevant and Reliable Standards</td>
<td>Broaden the scope of competency standards as a basis for developing qualifications frameworks, Establish protocols for assuring the credibility of skills testing and certification, Develop and enforce accreditation standards for maintaining the quality of training provision</td>
<td>G5_T1 Competency Standards and National Qualifications Frameworks, G5_T2 Competency Standards for Major Occupations, G5_T3 Occupational Skills Testing, G5_T4 Skills Testing and Certification, G5_T5 Skills Testing for Major Occupations, G5_T6 Government Oversight of Accreditation, G5_T7 Establishment of Accreditation Standards, G5_T8 Accreditation Requirements and Enforcement of Accreditation Standards, G5_T9 Incentives and Support for Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6 Diversifying Pathways for Skills Acquisition</td>
<td>Promote educational progression and permeability through multiple pathways, including for TVET students, Facilitate life-long learning through articulation of skills certification and recognition of prior learning, Provide support services for skills acquisition by workers, job-seekers and the disadvantaged</td>
<td>G6_T1 Learning Pathways, G6_T2 Public Perception of Pathways for TVET, G6_T3 Articulation of Skills Certification, G6_T4 Recognition of Prior Learning, G6_T5 Support for Further Occupational and Career Development, G6_T6 Training-related Provision of Services for the Disadvantaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension 3: Service Delivery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7 Enabling Diversity and Excellence in Training Provision</td>
<td>Encourage and regulate non-state provision of training, Combine incentives and autonomy in the management of public training institutions</td>
<td>G7_T1 Scope and Formality of Non-State Training Provision, G7_T2 Incentives for Non-State Providers, G7_T3 Quality Assurance of Non-State Training Provision, G7_T4 Review of Policies towards Non-State Training Provision, G7_T5 Targets and Incentives for Public Training Institutions, G7_T6 Autonomy and Accountability of Public Training Institutions, G7_T7 Introduction and Closure of Public Training Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Fostering Relevance in Public Training Programs</td>
<td>Integrate industry and expert input into the design and delivery of public training programs, Recruit and support administrators and instructors for enhancing the market-relevance of public training programs</td>
<td>G8_T1 Links between Training Institutions and Industry, G8_T2 Industry Role in the Design of Program Curricula, G8_T3 Industry Role in the Specification of Facility Standards, G8_T4 Links between Training and Research Institutions, G8_T5 Recruitment and In-Service Training of Heads of Public Training Institutions, G8_T6 Recruitment and In-Service Training of Instructors of Public Training Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G9 Enhancing Evidence-based Accountability for Results</td>
<td>Expand the availability and use of policy-relevant data for focusing providers’ attention on training outcomes, efficiency and innovation</td>
<td>G9_T1 Administrative Data from Training Providers, G9_T2 Survey and Other Data, G9_T3 Use of Data to Monitor and Improve Program and System Performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Functional Dimension 1: Strategic Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Goal</th>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1: Setting a Strategic Direction for WfD</td>
<td>Visible champions for WfD are either <strong>absent</strong> or take <strong>no specific action</strong> to advance strategic WfD priorities.</td>
<td><strong>Some</strong> visible champions provide <em>ad-hoc</em> advocacy for WfD and have acted on <strong>few</strong> interventions to advance strategic WfD priorities; <strong>no arrangements</strong> exist to monitor and review implementation progress.</td>
<td><strong>Government leaders</strong> exercise <strong>sustained</strong> advocacy for WfD with <strong>occasional, ad-hoc</strong> participation from <strong>non-government leaders</strong>; their advocacy focuses on <strong>selected</strong> industries or economic sectors and manifests itself through a <strong>range</strong> of specific interventions; implementation progress is monitored, albeit through <em>ad-hoc</em> reviews.</td>
<td>Both government and non-government leaders exercise <strong>sustained</strong> advocacy for WfD, and rely on <strong>routine, institutionalized</strong> processes to collaborate on <strong>well-integrated</strong> interventions to advance a <strong>strategic, economy-wide</strong> WfD policy agenda; implementation progress is monitored and reviewed through <strong>routine, institutionalized</strong> processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Functional Dimension 1: Strategic Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Goal</th>
<th>Level of Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2: Fostering a Demand-Led Approach to WfD</td>
<td>There is no assessment of the country's economic prospects and their implications for skills; industry and employers have a limited or no role in defining strategic WfD priorities and receive limited support from the government for skills upgrading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Goal</td>
<td>Level of Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3: Strengthening Critical Coordination for Implementation</td>
<td>Industry/employers have a limited or no role in defining strategic WfD priorities; the government either provides no incentives to encourage skills upgrading by employers or conducts no reviews of such incentive programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry/employers help define WfD priorities on an ad-hoc basis and make limited contributions to address skills implications of major policy/investment decisions; the government provides some incentives for skills upgrading for formal and informal sector employers; if a levy-grant scheme exists its coverage is limited; incentive programs are not systematically reviewed for impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry/employers help define WfD priorities on a routine basis and make some contributions to address skills implications of major policy/investment decisions; the government provides a range of incentives for skills upgrading for all employers; a levy-grant scheme with comprehensive coverage of formal sector employers exists; incentive programs are systematically reviewed and adjusted; an annual report on the levy-grant scheme is published with a time lag.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Latent**: Latent means that the industry/employers have limited or no role in defining WfD priorities, with no incentives provided or reviews conducted of such programs.
- **Emerging**: In this stage, the industry/employers begin to help define WfD priorities on an ad-hoc basis, with limited contributions to address skills implications and some incentives provided.
- **Established**: At this level, the industry/employers help define WfD priorities on a routine basis, making some contributions in selected areas, and providing a range of incentives for skills upgrading.
- **Advanced**: At the highest level, the industry/employers help define WfD priorities on a routine basis, making significant contributions in multiple areas, and ensuring comprehensive coverage of formal sector employers with systematic reviews and adjustments of incentive programs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Goal</th>
<th>Level of Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latent</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring Efficiency and Equity in Funding</td>
<td>The government funds IVET, CVET and ALMPs (but not OJT in SMEs) based on <em>ad-hoc</em> budgeting processes, but takes no action to facilitate formal partnerships between training providers and employers; the impact of funding on the beneficiaries of training programs has <strong>not been recently reviewed</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Goal</td>
<td>Level of Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5: Assuring Relevant and Reliable Standards</td>
<td>Latent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy dialogue on competency standards and/or the NQF occurs on an ad-hoc basis with limited engagement of key stakeholders; competency standards have not been defined; skills testing for major occupations is mainly theory-based and certificates awarded are recognized by public sector employers only and have little impact on employment and earnings; no system is in place to establish accreditation standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Functional Dimension 2: System Oversight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Goal</th>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G6: Diversifying Pathways for Skills Acquisition</strong></td>
<td>Students in technical and vocational education have <strong>few or no options</strong> for further formal skills acquisition beyond the secondary level and the government takes <strong>no action</strong> to improve public perception of TVET; certificates for technical and vocational programs are <strong>not recognized</strong> in the NQF; qualifications certified by non-Education ministries are <strong>not recognized</strong> by formal programs under the Ministry of Education; recognition of prior learning receives <strong>limited</strong> attention; the government provides <strong>practically no support</strong> for further occupational and career development, or training programs for disadvantaged populations.</td>
<td>Students in technical and vocational education can only progress to <strong>vocationally-oriented, non-university programs</strong>; the government takes <strong>limited</strong> action to improve public perception of TVET (e.g. diversifying learning pathways); <strong>some</strong> certificates for technical and vocational programs are recognized in the NQF; <strong>few</strong> qualifications certified by non-Education ministries are recognized by formal programs under the Ministry of Education; policymakers pay <strong>some</strong> attention to the recognition of prior learning and provide the public with <strong>some</strong> information on the subject; the government offers <strong>limited</strong> services for further occupational and career development through <strong>stand-alone local service centers</strong> that are <strong>not integrated</strong> into a system; training programs for disadvantaged populations receive <strong>ad-hoc</strong> support.</td>
<td>Students in technical and vocational education can progress to <strong>vocationally-oriented programs</strong>, including at the <strong>university level</strong>; the government takes <strong>some</strong> action to improve public perception of TVET (e.g. diversifying learning pathways and improving program quality) and reviews the impact of such efforts on an <strong>ad-hoc</strong> basis; <strong>most</strong> certificates for technical and vocational programs are recognized in the NQF; a <strong>large number</strong> of qualifications certified by non-Education ministries are recognized by formal programs under the Ministry of Education, albeit <strong>without the granting of credits</strong>; policymakers give <strong>some</strong> attention to the recognition of prior learning and provide the public with <strong>some</strong> information on the subject; a <strong>formal association</strong> of stakeholders provides dedicated attention to adult learning issues; the government offers <strong>limited</strong> services for further occupational and career development, which are available through an <strong>integrated network of centers</strong>; training programs for disadvantaged populations receive <strong>systematic</strong> support and are reviewed for impact on an <strong>ad-hoc</strong> basis.</td>
<td>Students in technical and vocational education can progress to <strong>academically or vocationally-oriented programs</strong>, including at the <strong>university level</strong>; the government takes <strong>coherent</strong> action on <strong>multiple fronts</strong> to improve public perception of TVET (e.g. diversifying learning pathways and improving program quality and relevance, with the support of a media campaign) and <strong>routinely</strong> reviews and <strong>adjusts</strong> such efforts to maximize their impact; <strong>most</strong> certificates for technical and vocational programs are recognized in the NQF; a <strong>large number</strong> of qualifications certified by non-Education ministries are recognized and <strong>granted credits</strong> by formal programs under the Ministry of Education; policymakers give <strong>sustained</strong> attention to the recognition of prior learning and provide the public with <strong>comprehensive</strong> information on the subject; a <strong>national organization</strong> of stakeholders provides dedicated attention to adult learning issues; the government offers a <strong>comprehensive menu</strong> of services for further occupational and career development, including <strong>online resources</strong>, which are available through an <strong>integrated network of centers</strong>; training programs for disadvantaged populations receive <strong>systematic</strong> support with <strong>multi-year budgets</strong> and are <strong>routinely</strong> reviewed for impact and <strong>adjusted</strong> accordingly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Functional Dimension 3: Service Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Goal</th>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G7: Enabling Diversity and Excellence in Training Provision</td>
<td>There is no diversity of training provision as the system is largely comprised of public providers with limited or no autonomy; training provision is not informed by formal assessment, stakeholder input or performance targets.</td>
<td>There is some diversity in training provision; non-state providers operate with limited government incentives and governance over registration, licensing and quality assurance; public training is provided by institutions with some autonomy and informed by some assessment of implementation constraints, stakeholder input and basic targets.</td>
<td>There is diversity in training provision; non-state training providers, some registered and licensed, operate within a range of government incentives, systematic quality assurance measures and routine reviews of government policies toward non-state training providers; public providers, mostly governed by management boards, have some autonomy; training provision is informed by formal analysis of implementation constraints, stakeholder input and basic targets; lagging providers receive support and exemplary institutions are rewarded.</td>
<td>There is broad diversity in training provision; non-state training providers, most registered and licensed, operate with comprehensive government incentives, systematic quality assurance measures and routine review and adjustment of government policies toward non-state training providers; public providers, mostly governed by management boards, have significant autonomy; decisions about training provision are time-bound and informed by formal assessment of implementation constraints; stakeholder input and use of a variety of measures to incentivize performance include support, rewards and performance-based funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Functional Dimension 3: Service Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Goal</th>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G8: Fostering Relevance in Public Training Programs</td>
<td>There are <strong>few or no attempts</strong> to foster relevance in public training programs through encouraging links between training institutions, industry and research institutions or through setting standards for the recruitment and training of heads and instructors in training institutions.</td>
<td>Relevance of public training is enhanced through <strong>informal</strong> links between <strong>some</strong> training institutions, industry and research institutions, including <strong>input</strong> into the design of curricula and facility standards; heads and instructors are recruited on the basis of <strong>minimum academic standards</strong> and have <strong>limited</strong> opportunities for professional development.</td>
<td>Relevance of public training is enhanced through <strong>formal</strong> links between <strong>some</strong> training institutions, industry and research institutions, leading to collaboration in <strong>several</strong> areas including but not limited to the design of curricula and facility standards; heads and instructors are recruited on the basis of <strong>minimum academic and professional standards</strong> and have <strong>regular</strong> access to opportunities for professional development.</td>
<td>Relevance of public training is enhanced through <strong>formal</strong> links between <strong>most</strong> training institutions, industry and research institutions, leading to <strong>significant</strong> collaboration in a <strong>wide range</strong> of areas; heads and instructors are recruited on the basis of <strong>minimum academic and professional standards</strong> and have <strong>regular</strong> access to <strong>diverse</strong> opportunities for professional development, including <strong>industry attachments</strong> for instructors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Functional Dimension 3: Service Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Goal</th>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G9: Enhancing Evidence-based Accountability for Results</td>
<td>There are <strong>no specific</strong> data collection and reporting requirements, but training providers maintain their <strong>own databases</strong>; the government <strong>does not conduct or sponsor</strong> skills-related surveys or impact evaluations and <strong>rarely</strong> uses data to monitor and improve system performance.</td>
<td>Training providers collect and report <strong>administrative data</strong> and there are <strong>significant gaps</strong> in reporting by non-state providers; <strong>some</strong> public providers issue annual reports and the government <strong>occasionally</strong> sponsors or conducts skills-related surveys; the government <strong>does not consolidate data</strong> in a system-wide database and uses <strong>mostly administrative data</strong> to monitor and improve system performance; the government publishes information on graduate labor market outcomes for <strong>some</strong> training programs.</td>
<td>Training providers collect and report <strong>administrative and other data</strong> (e.g., job placement statistics, earnings of graduates) and there are <strong>some gaps</strong> in reporting by non-state providers; <strong>most</strong> public providers issue internal annual reports and the government <strong>routinely</strong> sponsors skills-related surveys; the government consolidates data in a <strong>system-wide database</strong> and uses <strong>administrative data</strong> and information from <strong>surveys</strong> to monitor and improve system performance; the government publishes information on graduate labor market outcomes for <strong>numerous</strong> training programs.</td>
<td>Training providers collect and report <strong>administrative and other data</strong> (e.g., job placement statistics, earnings of graduates) and there are <strong>few gaps</strong> in reporting by non-state providers; <strong>most</strong> public providers issue <strong>publicly available</strong> annual reports and the government <strong>routinely</strong> sponsors or conducts skills-related surveys and impact evaluations; the government consolidates data in a <strong>system-wide, up to date database</strong> and uses <strong>administrative data</strong>, information from <strong>surveys and impact evaluations</strong> to monitor and improve system performance; the government publishes information on graduate labor market outcomes for <strong>most</strong> training programs <strong>online.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Annex 5: SABER-WfD Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Goal</th>
<th>Policy Action</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| G1          | Provide sustained advocacy for WfD at the top leadership level                 | G1_T1 2.0  
|             |                                                                                | G1_T2 2.0  |
| G2          | Establish clarity on the demand for skills and areas of critical constraint     | G2_T1 2.0  
|             |                                                                                | G2_T2 2.0  
|             | Engage employers in setting WfD priorities and in enhancing skills-upgrading for workers | G2_T3 1.0  
|             |                                                                                | G2_T4 2.0  
|             |                                                                                | G2_T5 2.0  |
| G3          | Formalize key WfD roles for coordinated action on strategic priorities         | G3_T1 2.0  
|             |                                                                                | G3_T2 1.0  
|             |                                                                                | G3_T3 1.0  |
| **Dimension 2** |                                                                                  |       |
| G4          | Provide stable funding for effective programs in initial, continuing and targeted vocational education and training | G4_T1 1.7  
|             |                                                                                | G4_T2 2.0  
|             |                                                                                | G4_T3 2.0  
|             | Monitor and enhance equity in funding for training                             | G4_T4 1.0  
|             | Facilitate sustained partnerships between training institutions and employers   | G4_T5 1.7  
|             |                                                                                | G4_T6 2.0  |
| G5          | Broaden the scope of competency standards as a basis for developing qualifications frameworks | G5_T1 1.0  
|             | Establish protocols for assuring the credibility of skills testing and certification | G5_T2 2.0  
|             | Develop and enforce accreditation standards for maintaining the quality of training provision | G5_T3 2.0  
|             |                                                                                | G5_T4 3.0  
|             |                                                                                | G5_T5 3.0  
|             |                                                                                | G5_T6 info  
|             |                                                                                | G5_T7 2.0  
|             |                                                                                | G5_T8 3.0  
|             |                                                                                | G5_T9 2.0  |
| G6          | Promote educational progression and permeability through multiple pathways, including for TVET students | G6_T1 1.5  
|             | Strengthen the system for skills certification and recognition                 | G6_T2 2.0  
|             | Enhance support for skills acquisition by workers, job-seekers and the disadvantaged | G6_T3 1.0  
|             |                                                                                | G6_T4 2.0  
|             |                                                                                | G6_T5 3.0  
|             |                                                                                | G6_T6 1.0  |
| **Dimension 3** |                                                                                  |       |
| G7          | Encourage and regulate non-state provision of training                         | G7_T1 2.3  
|             |                                                                                | G7_T2 2.0  
|             |                                                                                | G7_T3 3.0  
|             |                                                                                   | G7_T4 1.0  
|             |                                                                                   | G7_T5 3.0  
|             |                                                                                   | G7_T6 2.5  
|             |                                                                                   | G7_T7 2.0  |
| G8          | Integrate industry and expert input into the design and delivery of public training programs | G8_T1 1.9  
|             |                                                                                   | G8_T2 1.5  
|             |                                                                                   | G8_T3 1.0  
|             |                                                                                   | G8_T4 1.0  
|             | Recruit and support administrators and instructors for enhancing the market-relevance of public training programs | G8_T5 2.0  
|             |                                                                                | G8_T6 2.0  |
| G9          | Expand the availability and use of policy-relevant data for focusing providers’ attention on training outcomes, efficiency and innovation | G9_T1 1.7  
|             |                                                                                | G9_T2 1.5  
|             |                                                                                | G9_T3 1.5  |
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