

European Globalisation Adjustment Fund - Ex-Post Evaluation (2014-2020)

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

INTRODUCTION TO THE EGF AND HOW IT WORKS

What is the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF)?

The European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) is an instrument used by the European Union to provide assistance to persons who have lost their job as a result of major structural changes in world trade patterns due to globalisation or because of the global economic and financial crisis. This means that when 500 or more persons lose their job, for example because the company they worked for decided to relocate to a country outside of the EU where workers are cheaper to employ, the EU can provide the Member State where this happened with financial support to help the workers who lost their jobs.

This money can be used for the (re-)training of workers, helping people find and apply for a new job, coaching and mentoring, promoting entrepreneurship, providing an allowance to help dismissed workers while they are looking for a new job, etc.

The EGF was first established in 2006 but later extended to the 2014-2020 period by Regulation (EU) No 1309/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 establishing the EGF for the period 2014-2020 and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1927/2006.

For more information about the EGF, please visit this [webpage](#).

Who should answer this questionnaire?

Anyone who is interested in the topic is invited to answer this questionnaire, whether you have previously heard about the existence of the EGF or not.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide the general public, as well as key stakeholders, with a say in whether or not they believe the EU should provide assistance to redundant workers in this way.

Those who are more familiar with the details of the EGF can also provide their views on the extent to which they believe it has achieved what it set out to achieve (its effectiveness), whether the results were achieved without spending a disproportionate amount of money (its efficiency), whether the EGF continues to make sense to exist (its relevance), and whether it is appropriate considering the existence of other sources of funding or support at national and EU level (its coherence).

How will this questionnaire make a difference?

The survey data will contribute to the evaluation of the EGF by finding out if there is a need for the EU to be

providing this type of support to workers who have lost their job, and whether it has actually helped the people who have benefited from the support. Although there is already a proposal for the EGF for the 2021-2027 period, these results can still help the European Commission understand what works well and what does not, and how the general public perceives the existence of the EGF.

The questionnaire should not take more than 15-20 minutes to complete.

Thank you very much for taking the time to respond - we highly appreciate your feedback!

About you

* Language of my contribution

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech
- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- Gaelic
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Italian
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Maltese
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Romanian
- Slovak
- Slovenian
- Spanish
- Swedish

* I am giving my contribution as

- Academic/research institution
- Business association
- Company/business organisation
- Consumer organisation
- EU citizen
- Environmental organisation
- Non-EU citizen
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Public authority
- Trade union
- Other

Age group

- 15 - 24
- 25 - 34
- 35 - 44
- 45 - 54
- 55 - 64
- 65 or older

Gender

- Female
- Male
- Other
- Prefer not to disclose

What best describes your current situation?

- Student / In training
- Employed
- Not employed and looking for a job
- Not employed and not looking for a job
- Retired
- Other

Please specify your current situation:

* Organisation name

Ministerie van Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid

* Scope

- International
- Local
- National
- Regional

* Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

* First name

* Surname

* Email (this won't be published)

* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

- Afghanistan
- Djibouti
- Libya
- Saint Martin

- Åland Islands
- Albania
- Algeria
- American Samoa
- Andorra
- Angola
- Anguilla
- Antarctica
- Antigua and Barbuda
- Argentina
- Armenia
- Aruba
- Australia
- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- Barbados
- Belarus
-
-
- Dominica
- Dominican Republic
- Ecuador
- Egypt
- El Salvador
- Equatorial Guinea
- Eritrea
- Estonia
- Eswatini
- Ethiopia
- Falkland Islands
- Faroe Islands
- Fiji
- Finland
- France
- French Guiana
- French Polynesia
- French Southern and Antarctic Lands
- Gabon
- Georgia
-
-
- Liechtenstein
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Macau
- Madagascar
- Malawi
- Malaysia
- Maldives
- Mali
- Malta
- Marshall Islands
- Martinique
- Mauritania
- Mauritius
- Mayotte
- Mexico
- Micronesia
- Moldova
- Monaco
- Mongolia
-
-
- Saint Pierre and Miquelon
- Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
- Samoa
- San Marino
- São Tomé and Príncipe
- Saudi Arabia
- Senegal
- Serbia
- Seychelles
- Sierra Leone
- Singapore
- Sint Maarten
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Solomon Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
- South Korea
- South Sudan
-
-

Belgium

Belize

Germany

Ghana

Montenegro

Montserrat

Spain

Sri Lanka

- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan

- Bolivia
- Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- Bosnia and Herzegovina

- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
-
- Brunei
- Bulgaria

- Burkina Faso
- Burundi

- Cambodia
- Cameroon

- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands

- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland

- Grenada
- Guadeloupe

- Guam

- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
-
- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands

- Honduras
- Hong Kong

- Hungary
- Iceland

- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
-

- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar /Burma

- Namibia
- Nauru

- Nepal

- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
-
- Nigeria
- Niue

- Norfolk Island
- Northern Mariana Islands

- North Korea
- North Macedonia

- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
-

- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen

- Sweden
- Switzerland

- Syria

- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand

- The Gambia
-
- Timor-Leste
- Togo

- Tokelau
- Tonga

- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia

- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
-

Central African
Republic

Iraq

Palau

Tuvalu

Chad

Ireland

Palestine

Uganda

- | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Chile | <input type="radio"/> Isle of Man | <input type="radio"/> Panama | <input type="radio"/> Ukraine |
| <input type="radio"/> China | <input type="radio"/> Israel | <input type="radio"/> Papua New Guinea | <input type="radio"/> United Arab Emirates |
| | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <input type="radio"/> Christmas Island | <input type="radio"/> Italy | <input type="radio"/> Paraguay | <input type="radio"/> United Kingdom |
| <input type="radio"/> Clipperton | <input type="radio"/> Jamaica | <input type="radio"/> Peru | <input type="radio"/> United States |
| <input type="radio"/> Cocos (Keeling) Islands | <input type="radio"/> Japan | <input type="radio"/> Philippines | <input type="radio"/> United States Minor Outlying Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Colombia | <input type="radio"/> Jersey | <input type="radio"/> Pitcairn Islands | <input type="radio"/> Uruguay |
| <input type="radio"/> Comoros | <input type="radio"/> Jordan | <input type="radio"/> Poland | <input type="radio"/> US Virgin Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Congo | <input type="radio"/> Kazakhstan | <input type="radio"/> Portugal | <input type="radio"/> Uzbekistan |
| <input type="radio"/> Cook Islands | <input type="radio"/> Kenya | <input type="radio"/> Puerto Rico | <input type="radio"/> Vanuatu |
| <input type="radio"/> Costa Rica | <input type="radio"/> Kiribati | <input type="radio"/> Qatar | <input type="radio"/> Vatican City |
| <input type="radio"/> Côte d'Ivoire | <input type="radio"/> Kosovo | <input type="radio"/> Réunion | <input type="radio"/> Venezuela |
| <input type="radio"/> Croatia | <input type="radio"/> Kuwait | <input type="radio"/> Romania | <input type="radio"/> Vietnam |
| <input type="radio"/> Cuba | <input type="radio"/> Kyrgyzstan | <input type="radio"/> Russia | <input type="radio"/> Wallis and Futuna |
| <input type="radio"/> Curaçao | <input type="radio"/> Laos | <input type="radio"/> Rwanda | <input type="radio"/> Western Sahara |
| <input type="radio"/> Cyprus | <input type="radio"/> Latvia | <input type="radio"/> Saint Barthélemy | <input type="radio"/> Yemen |
| <input type="radio"/> Czechia | <input type="radio"/> Lebanon | <input type="radio"/> Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha | <input type="radio"/> Zambia |
| | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <input type="radio"/> Democratic Republic of the Congo | <input type="radio"/> Lesotho | <input type="radio"/> Saint Kitts and Nevis | <input type="radio"/> Zimbabwe |

- Denmark Liberia Saint Lucia

* Publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

Public

Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

Please indicate in which country you live and/or work

- Austria
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Croatia
- Cyprus
- Czechia
- Denmark
- Estonia
- Finland
- France
- Germany
- Greece
- Hungary
- Ireland
- Italy
- Latvia
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Malta
- The Netherlands**
- Poland
-

Portugal

Romania

Slovakia

- Slovenia
- Spain
- Sweden
- United Kingdom
- Other

In which country do you live and/or work?

Are you aware of the existence of the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF)?

- Yes, the organisation I work for is/has been involved in the EGF
- Yes, I am aware of the existence of the EGF and how it works
- Yes, I have heard about the EGF before but am not aware of the details
- No, I do not know anything about the EGF

When have you or your organisation been involved with EGF in the past? (Choose most recent)

- I have / my organisation has been involved in the EGF during the 2014-2020 programming period
- I was / my organisation was involved in the EGF before the 2014-2020 programming period

What was/is your/your organisation's role in relation to the EGF in the 2014-2020 programming period?

- Organisation delivering EGF support
- National, regional or local authority involved in the planning or implementation of EGF support
- National, regional or local social partner organisation involved in the planning or implementation of EGF support
- Other

Please specify what your role was/is in relation to the EGF in the 2014-2020 programming period:

Nationaal contactpunt

Why were you not involved in the EGF in the 2014-2020 programming period?

- No eligible cases in my country / region

- EGF support does not meet the needs of the workers / NEETs in my country / region
- The types of support offered by the EGF are not appropriate for the workers / NEETs in my country / region
- EGF support has no added value compared to other sources of funding
- Imposes too high an administrative burden
- Involves overly lengthy decision-making times
- The co-financing rate is not high enough for my country / region
- Other
- Do not know

Please specify why you were not involved in the EGF in the 2014-2020 programming period:

Effectiveness

An assessment of the effectiveness of EGF considers how successful the EGF was in achieving its goal to help dismissed workers to find another job as quickly as possible (or - where applicable - to support young people not in education, employment or training (NEETs) into work or back into education). It considers whether it was (mainly) the EGF or other activities to support redundant workers which helped them to find a job, become self-employed or get additional skills.

The **objective of the EGF** is to contribute to smart, inclusive and sustainable economic growth and to promote sustainable employment in the EU through support to workers made redundant and self-employed persons whose activity has ceased as a result of major structural changes in world trade patterns due to globalisation, as a result of a continuation of the global financial and economic crisis or as a result of a new global financial and economic crisis.

The **objective of the specific actions benefiting from EGF support** is to ensure that the largest possible number of beneficiaries participating in these actions find sustainable employment as soon as possible after they benefit from that support.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Do not know / no opinion
The objective of the EGF is clear	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The objective of the EGF is appropriate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Workers are aware of the EGF in my country	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Workers' organisations are aware of the EGF in my country	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
There are barriers that prevent Member States from applying for EGF support	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
There are factors that encourage some Member States to apply for EGF support	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	

To what extent do you agree with the following statements...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Do not know / no opinion
EGF support catered to the needs of different types of beneficiaries (e.g. NEETs, older unemployed people, unemployed women, persons at an increased risk of poverty)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
EGF support altered the type of support made available to redundant workers by Member States	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The actions supported by the EGF (e.g. job search support, training, help with self-employment etc.) help redundant workers to find employment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Actions funded by the EGF help NEETs find work or return to education	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The EGF was more effective than national level measures to support redundant workers (e.g. job search support, training, help with self-employment etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<p>The EGF support resulted in long-term effects for organisations delivering EGF support, in terms of being better placed to deliver support to redundant /unemployed workers in the future</p>	○	○	○		○	○
<p>There has been important learning from the EGF and its implementation which have been/ could be applied in the Commission or in national /regional/local authorities</p>	○	○	○		○	○

Why was EGF support more effective than national level measures to support redundant workers?

Nederland ziet de steun vanuit het EGF als additioneel aan nationale maatregelen. Dit betekent dat het belangrijk is dat, om in aanmerking te komen voor EGF steun, de aanvrager ook zelf steun verleent aan de ontslagen werknemers. Omdat EGF steun additioneel is aan nationale maatregelen wordt de kwaliteit van steunmaatregelen over het algemeen vergroot. Het is echter niet zo dat de EGF steun effectiever is dan nationale steunmaatregelen.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Do not know / no opinion
Challenges existed in the implementation of EGF measures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Challenges existed in monitoring the effectiveness of EGF	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

What sort of challenges existed in the implementation of EGF measures and how could these be overcome?

De implementatie van EGF steun in Nederland verloopt goed.

What could be improved in terms of monitoring?

Er wordt nog te weinig gedaan aan monitoring op de lange termijn, na afloop van EGF trajecten. Dit kan worden verbeterd.

Efficiency

To what extent do you agree with the following statements...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Do not know / no opinion
The level of resources used to support each redundant worker (or NEET) by the EGF is similar to that used for national measures to support their (re) integration into the labour market or education	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

There are more cost-effective responses to job losses than the EGF	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The results of the EGF could have been achieved in a shorter period of time	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
The results of the EGF could have been achieved with less money	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The procedures currently in place for the EGF enabled quick implementation of the support	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>

An assessment of the efficiency of the EGF looks at whether the costs of measures delivered with the EGF support were justified given the results achieved (e.g. the proportion of redundant workers finding a job quickly). This includes an overall assessment of whether similar results could have been achieved more cheaply (e.g. by funding other types of less costly measures) or more quickly (for instance through shorter periods of training etc.).

Please specify whether the resources used to support each redundant worker (or NEET) by the EGF were much more or much less than those used for national measures?

Steun van het EGF is additioneel aan nationale maatregelen. Daarom is het niet mogelijk om de kosten van nationale maatregelen en activiteiten die gedeeltelijk gesubsidieerd worden vanuit het EGF met elkaar te vergelijken.

How could the support be delivered in a shorter period of time?

Een van de grootste barrières in het aanvraagproces is dat er voor een aanvraag duidelijkheid moet bestaan over het exacte aantal banen dat verloren gaat terwijl dit in de realiteit vaak nog lang onzeker is.

To what extent could the same results have been achieved with less resources ?

Zoals eerder aangegeven ziet Nederland de EGF steun als additioneel aan nationale maatregelen. Dit betekent dat de kwaliteit van steunmaatregelen kan worden vergroot met EGF steun maar niet dat er zonder EGF geen werk naar werk maatregelen zouden zijn. Minder middelen zijn daarom een mogelijkheid.

Were there barriers to the quick implementation of the support? What sort and how could this be improved?

De implementatie van de EGF steun in Nederland verloopt goed. De meeste barrières voor een snel traject zitten in het aanvraagproces.

Coherence

In relation to the EGF, the term 'coherence' is used to assess the degree to which the EGF supports other activities to help redundant workers or NEETs, which are paid for with national resources or other European Funds (e.g. the European Social Fund (ESF) or Youth Employment Initiative (YEI)) and where similar or complementary activities are being funded.

This could mean two things – either that the EGF may fund very similar measures to those available to workers affected by redundancy at national level, but **adds to** them (e.g. making them available to more people), or that the

EGF **complements** or supports such measures (e.g. by offering activities which are more tailored to the needs of individuals such as individual counselling, peer group support, mobility support etc., by providing the opportunity to offer different types of training or to offer training over longer periods than would be possible with national funds).

To what extent do you agree with the following statements concerning the coherence of the EGF with other EU/national initiatives...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Do not know / no opinion
EGF support complements measures or activities funded with other EU funds (such as the ESF, YEI)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
EGF support adds to measures or activities funded with other EU funds (such as the ESF, YEI)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
EGF support complements measures or activities funded by national funds	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
EGF support adds to measures or activities funded by national funds	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please explain your answer and, wherever possible, provide suggestions for improvement:

Het EGF is additioneel aan nationale maatregelen en kan daarmee de kwaliteit van steunmaatregelen vergroten. Echter is het Nederlandse standpunt dat steun aan ontslagen werknemers vooral een nationale zaak betreft. Wat betreft coherentie ten opzichte van andere EU fondsen is het standpunt van Nederland dat het beter is om fondsen, zoals het ESF+, in te zetten om te werken aan structurele duurzame en inclusieve arbeidsmarkten in plaats van in te zetten op een noodfonds.

Relevance

In order to assess whether the EGF remains relevant, this evaluation will look at its scope (who can be supported and in what situation), intervention criteria (how many redundancies have to take place for a case to qualify for EGF support) and current exceptions in relation to general rules (derogations – at present this applies to the inclusion of NEETs).

The **scope** of the EGF covers:

- Workers made redundant and self-employed persons whose activity has ceased as a result of major structural changes in world trade patterns due to globalisation
- Workers made redundant and self-employed persons whose activity has ceased as a result of the continuation of the global financial and economic crisis.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements relating to the scope of the EGF...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Do not know / no opinion
The scope of the EGF is still appropriate and useful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It still makes sense to tie EGF support to major structural changes in world trade patterns due to globalisation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It still makes sense to tie EGF support to global financial and economic crises	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please justify your answer by providing some examples to the extent possible

Nederland is geen voorstander van het verbreden van de scope van het EGF naar de algemene doelstelling van het verlenen van steun bij herstructureringen die een grote impact hebben. Door het uitbreiden van de scope van het EGF bestaat er veel overlap met het ESF+, waarbij het ESF+ een geschikter instrument is om de negatieve effecten van globalisering of andere herstructureringen tegen te gaan. Het ESF+ draagt namelijk bij aan een inclusieve en duurzame arbeidsmarkt, terwijl het EGF enkel als noodinstrument zou moeten fungeren

The **intervention criteria** for the EGF, as set out in Article 4 of the 2013 Regulation are:

- At least 500 workers have to be made redundant (or self-employed persons' activity ceasing) over a reference period of 4 months in an enterprise in a Member State; or 500 workers at least have to be made redundant (or self-employed persons activity ceasing) over a reference period of 9 months in several enterprises, especially SMEs that belong to the same sectors in one or two adjoining regions
- Another situation not corresponding to the two criteria above can be eligible in small labour markets or in exceptional circumstances (in particular with regard to collective applications involving small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)) if the redundancies have a serious impact on the local, regional or national economy and on employment.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements relating to the intervention criteria of the EGF...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Do not know / no opinion
The intervention criteria for the EGF are still appropriate	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The intervention criteria for the EGF are still useful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please justify your answer by providing some examples to the extent possible

Nederland is geen voorstander van het verlagen van het criteria van 500 ontslagen werknemers naar 250 ontslagen werknemers omdat er ook nu al een uitzonderingsbepaling bestaat in de huidige verordening waardoor aanvragen mogelijk zijn bij minder dan 500 ontslagen werknemers als deze een grote impact op de regio hebben.

Furthermore, the EGF includes a provision which allows Member States to provide personalised services co-financed by the EGF to a number of **individuals not in education, employment or training (NEETs)** under the age of 25 (or under 30 if the Member States decides to). This is only possible if at least some of the redundancies occur in regions where youth unemployment is higher than 25%.

To what extent do you agree with the following statement relating to NEETs and the EGF...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Do not know / no opinion
The inclusion of NEETs was relevant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	

Why do you think the inclusion of NEETs was not relevant?

Niet van toepassing, Nederland heeft nooit gebruik gemaakt van de NEET's mogelijkheid.

EU added value

The concept of the EU added value of European level funding is usually assessed in terms of four different types of effects:

- *Volume effects:* More redundant workers could be supported through EGF than would have been the case if only national (or other EU-funded) measures had been available;
- *Scope effects:* the EGF has contributed to supporting people which would not have received support otherwise or made available activities which might otherwise not have been offered (e.g. longer duration of training, mobility support, help with self-employment, peer group support etc.);
- *Role effects:* Lessons learnt from measures provided with the support of EGF have been applied elsewhere (e.g. to other EGF cases, in other geographical areas, other sources of funding etc.);
- *Process effects:* The use of other EU or national funds are used and the way in which support is implemented has changed as a result of using EGF (e.g. new partnerships are established etc.).

To what extent do you agree with the following statement

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Do not know / no opinion

The EGF has added to, or supported, existing actions or policy areas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
--	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Can you provide any examples or evidence of this?

To what extent do you agree with the following statement

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Do not know / no opinion
The EGF has added to existing actions by supporting groups or policy areas that would not have received support otherwise	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Can you provide any examples or evidence of this?

EGF wordt zo ingezet dat werkgevers/sectoren ook zelf ondersteuning moeten bieden aan de werknemers die zij ontslaan; met of zonder EGF-subsidie. De subsidie zorgt er enkel voor dat de kwaliteit van de werk naar werk-trajecten kan worden verhoogd. Maar dit betekent niet dat de werknemers zonder EGF niet ondersteund worden.

To what extent do you agree with the following statement

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly agree	Do not know / no opinion
Lessons learnt from the implementation of EGF have been applied elsewhere	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Can you provide any examples or evidence of this?

To what extent do you agree with the following statement

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Do not know / no opinion
The EGF has improved operational processes and the implementation of support measures for redundant workers /NEETs in relation to other national or EU sources of funding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Can you provide any examples or evidence of this?

To what extent do you agree with the following statement

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Do not know / no opinion
EGF support has replaced measures or allowances that were being/would have been offered by Member States	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Can you provide any examples or evidence of this?

General questions about the EGF for those who are not aware of the Fund

The **European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF)** is a mechanism used by the European Union to provide assistance to persons who have lost their job as a result of major structural changes in world trade patterns due to globalisation (e.g. because the company decided to relocate to a country outside of the EU where workers are cheaper to employ), or as a result of a global economic and financial crisis (e.g. when a company goes bankrupt /closes down because during an economic downturn they are not making enough money to stay open).

When 500 or more people lose their jobs because of a situation like the ones mentioned above, an EU Member State can apply for financial support from the EGF, instead of paying for everything by themselves. This money can be used for different things, including:

- Training or (re)training workers who lost their job
- Helping workers who lost their job find a new job
- Coaching and mentoring on how to prepare for job interviews
- Helping workers who lost their job to set up their own company (promoting entrepreneurship)
- Offering financial support (allowances) to help workers while they are looking for a new job.

To what extent do you agree that the European Union should...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Do not know / no opinion
Help persons who have lost their job as a result of globalisation (e.g. because the company they worked for relocated to another country outside of the EU)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Help persons who have lost their job as a result of global financial and economic crisis (e.g. because the company they worked for during an economic downturn went bankrupt/closed down)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Help persons who have lost their job as a result of other unexpected major restructuring events (please provide examples below)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Help persons who lost their job to find another job as quickly as possible by providing support through active labour market measures (e.g. tailor-made training and retraining, job-search allowances, employers' recruitment incentives, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Provide support to young people not in education, employment or training (NEETs) to help them find work or go back into education	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

In what other situations leading to major restructuring events would you like the European Union to provide support (if any)? Please give concrete examples:

Nederland is geen voorstander van het uitbreiden van de doelstelling van het EGF naar de algemene doelstelling van het verlenen van steun bij herstructureringen die een grote impact hebben. Door het uitbreiden van de scope van het EGF bestaat er veel overlap met het ESF+, waarbij het ESF+ een geschikter instrument is om de negatieve effecten van globalisering of andere herstructureringen tegen te gaan. Het ESF+ draagt namelijk bij aan een inclusieve en duurzame arbeidsmarkt, terwijl het EGF enkel als noodinstrument zou moeten fungeren.

Why do you think the European Union should not provide this kind of support?

De doelstelling van het EGF, het verlenen van steun bij ontslag naar aanleiding van grote herstructureringen, kan voldoende op lidstaatniveau geregeld worden en betreft een nationale zaak (werkgevers, werknemers en overheid).

Additional comments

If you have additional comments on the EGF, please write them here. If your comments refer to specific questions that we have asked, or to specific elements of the EGF, please make this clear.

If you wish to upload additional files to support your submission, please upload them here.

Please upload your file

The maximum file size is 1 MB

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

Thank you very much for taking the time to answer the questionnaire. Your answers have been recorded.