PRESIDENZA DEL CONSIGLIO DEI MINISTRI
DIPARTIMENTO POLITICHE EUROPEE
Servizio Informative parlamentari e Corte di Giustizia UE

Camera dei Deputati
Ufficio Rapporti con l'Unione Europea

Senato della Repubblica
Ufficio dei rapporti con le istituzioni dell'Unione Europea

e, p.c.

Ministero del lavoro e delle politiche sociali
Segretariato generale
Nucleo di valutazione degli atti UE

Ministero degli affari esteri e della cooperazione internazionale
Nucleo di valutazione degli atti UE

Rappresentanza Permanente d'Italia
presso l'Unione Europea

OGGETTO: Trasmissione, ai sensi dell'articolo 6, comma 2, della legge 24 dicembre 2012 n. 234, dei commenti relativi alla consultazione pubblica sul Fondo europeo sull'adeguamento alla globalizzazione. Valutazione ExPost (2014-2020)

Si trasmettono, ai sensi dell'articolo 6, comma 2, della legge 24 dicembre 2012 n. 234, i commenti elaborati dal Ministero del lavoro e delle politiche sociali e inviati alle Istituzioni europee in risposta alla Consultazione pubblica sulla valutazione della consultazione in oggetto.

Il Coordinatore del Servizio
f.to Daria Provvidenza Petralia

Draft ID: 7df52957-d1d3-42a9-a294-2448b9fb85d5
Date: 01/09/2020 11:31:50

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

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

Ministero del Lavoro e delle Politiche Sociali

* 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

Barbara

* Surname

Giampaolo

* Email (this won't be published)

bgiampaolo@lavoro.gov.it

* Country of origin

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

- Afghanistan
- Åland Islands
- Albania
- Algeria
- American Samoa
- Andorra
- Angola
- Anguilla
- Antarctica
- Antigua and Barbuda
- Argentina
- Armenia
- Aruba
- Australia
- Austria
- Djibouti
- Dominica
- Dominican Republic
- Ecuador
- Egypt
- El Salvador
- Equatorial Guinea
- Eritrea
- Estonia
- Eswatini
- Ethiopia
- Falkland Islands
- Faroe Islands
- Fiji
- Finland
- Libya
- Liechtenstein
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Macau
- Madagascar
- Malawi
- Malaysia
- Maldives
- Mali
- Malta
- Marshall Islands
- Martinique
- Mauritania
- Mauritius
- Saint Martin
- 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

- Azerbaijan
- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- Barbados
- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- 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
- France
- French Guiana
- French Polynesia
- French Southern and Antarctic Lands
- Gabon
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland
- Grenada
- Guadeloupe
- Guam
- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Honduras
- Mayotte
- Mexico
- Micronesia
- Moldova
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Montserrat
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar /Burma
- Namibia
- Nauru
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Niue
- Norfolk Island
- Solomon Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
- South Korea
- South Sudan
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- Syria
- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand
- The Gambia
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
- Tokelau

- Burundi
- Cambodia
- Cameroon
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba
- Curaçao
- Hong Kong
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel
- (•) Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jersey
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos
- Northern Mariana Islands
- North Korea
- North Macedonia
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Russia
- Rwanda
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States Minor Outlying Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
- Vietnam
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara

- Cyprus
- Czechia
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Denmark
- Latvia
- Lebanon
- Lesotho
- Liberia
- Saint Barthélemy
- Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia
- Yemen
- Zambia
- Zimbabwe

* 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

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

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	(●)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
The objective of the EGF is appropriate	(●)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Workers are aware of the EGF in my country	( )	( )	( )	( )	(●)	( )
Workers' organisations are aware of the EGF in my country	( )	( )	( )	( )	(●)	( )
There are barriers that prevent Member States from applying for EGF support	( )	( )	(●)	( )	( )	( )
There are factors that encourage some Member States to apply for EGF 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
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)	○	○	◉	○	○	○
EGF support altered the type of support made available to redundant workers by Member States	○	◉	○	○	○	○
The actions supported by the EGF (e.g. job search support, training, help with self-employment etc.) help redundant workers to find employment	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Actions funded by the EGF help NEETs find work or return to education	○	○	◉	○	○	○
The EGF was more effective than national level measures to support redundant workers (e.g. job search support, training, help with self-employment etc.)	○	◉	○	○	○	○
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	○	◉	○	○	○	○
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	○	◉	○	○	○	○

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

Il supporto del FEG è più efficace perché consente di attuare misure più specifiche e focalizzate su un contingente di esuberi con caratteristiche in gran parte simili.

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	○	◉	○	○	○	○
Challenges existed in monitoring the effectiveness of EGF	○	◉	○	○	○	○

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

La principale sfida consiste nella rapidità richiesta per l'attivazione delle misure, che non è sempre facilmente conciliabile con le procedure amministrative. Tale difficoltà potrebbe essere in parte superata con una più tempestiva risposta da parte delle istituzioni comunitarie circa la effettiva circa la approvazione della domanda di intervento.

What could be improved in terms of monitoring?

Non è sempre possibile o è comunque difficile seguire i percorsi lavorativi e formativi delle persone oggetto dell'intervento. Inoltre, permangono difficoltà nella valutazione comparativa rispetto ad interventi finanziati con altri fondi.

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	○	○	○	○	◉	○
There are more cost-effective responses to job losses than the EGF	○	○	◉	○	○	○
The results of the EGF could have been achieved in a shorter period of time	○	○	○	◉	○	○
The results of the EGF could have been achieved with less money	○	○	○	◉	○	○
The procedures currently in place for the EGF enabled quick implementation of the support	○	○	○	◉	○	○

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.).

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

Occorre avere certezza del finanziamento del FEG il prima possibile.

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)	◉	○	○	○	○	○
EGF support **adds to** measures or activities funded with other EU funds (such as the ESF, YEI)	○	◉	○	○	○	○
EGF support **complements** measures or activities funded by national funds	◉	○	○	○	○	○
EGF support **adds to** measures or activities funded by national funds	◉	○	○	○	○	○

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 quality 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	○	○	◉	○	○	○

It still makes sense to tie EGF support to major structural changes in world trade patterns due to globalisation	○	◉	○	○	○	○
It still makes sense to tie EGF support to global financial and economic crises	○	◉	○	○	○	○

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	○	○	○	○	◉	○
The intervention criteria for the EGF are still useful	○	○	○	○	◉	○

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

La soglia minima di esuberi prevista per attivare una domanda di intervento dovrebbe essere ridotta significativamente. 500 esuberi rappresentano una soglia troppo alta.

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	○	○	○	○	◉	○

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

I Neet costituiscono un gruppo target molto diverso dagli esuberi di ex lavoratori adulti. Includere i Neet in un intervento FEG significa progettare, gestire, comunicare, monitorare due interventi molto diversi.

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	○	◉	○	○	○	○

Can you provide any examples or evidence of this?

Il FEG ha sostenuto azioni di formazione calibrate sulle esigenze delle imprese candidate alle future assunzioni e quindi ha consentito di fornire una formazione progettata sulle richieste del mercato del lavoro.

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	○	◉	○	○	○	○

Can you provide any examples or evidence of this?

Gli interventi FEG hanno fornito assistenza specifica agli esuberi coinvolti, diversamente da quanto avrebbero ricevuto altrimenti. Ad esempio, orientamento personalizzato, consulenza formativa, servizi di incontro tra domanda e offerta.

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	○	○	◉	○	○	○

Can you provide any examples or evidence of this?

Le lezioni (eventualmente) apprese sono applicabili a livello regionale. non disponiamo di informazioni precise in materia.

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	○	○	◉	○	○	○

Can you provide any examples or evidence of this?

Le lezioni (eventualmente) apprese sono applicabili a livello regionale. non disponiamo di informazioni precise in materia.

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	○	◉	○	○	○	○

Can you provide any examples or evidence of this?

In alcuni casi il FEG ha finanziato indennità di mobilità, formazione, voucher di conciliazione.

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.

Contact

Mariana.RIQUITO-PEREIRA@ec.europa.eu