

## **Open Public Consultation**

Open consultation presented a good opportunity to involve a wider range of stakeholders in the evaluation than had previously been possible in evaluations of EGF. In order to encourage as many relevant stakeholders to participate as possible, it was agreed that consultation and piloting of the questions and consultation format should be undertaken. This was done through ISG discussion and through using an EGF networking event to discuss the draft OPC questions,

### **1.1.1 A networking seminar was held with stakeholders to develop OPC**

EGF Networking Seminars are usually held semi-annually in order to provide a platform for the EGF Contact Persons and representatives from organisations that deliver EGF measures or similar support to unemployed persons in Member States to meet and discuss issues of common interest.

The seminar held on 2 March 2016 and used specifically for the purposes of providing information and obtaining input to the Mid-term Evaluation of EGF and to inform the content and workplan for the Open Public Consultation (OPC) to be carried out as part of this evaluation.

The seminar provided an opportunity to discuss the OPC draft questions and workplan. A report of the EGF Networking Seminar with full details is available here:

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=326&eventsId=1128&furtherEvents=yes>

The result of the exercise was an improved set of questions for the OPC, with raised awareness of the process and role in the evaluation among attendees.

### **1.1.2 Process of the Open Public Consultation**

#### **Consultation undertaken for the OPC**

The purpose of the OPC was to enable a wide range of stakeholders to provide opinion and evidence to inform the evaluation. As described in the preceding section targeted consultation with those delivering EGF cases was undertaken, the OPC enabled a wider range of stakeholders to provide opinion and evidence to inform the evaluation. The OPC took the form of an online questionnaire placed on the European Commission website. The questionnaire contained questions related to each of the evaluation themes (effectiveness, sustainability, efficiency, relevance, coherence, and added value of EGF).

In order to develop the specific questions for the OPC an EGF Networking Seminar<sup>1</sup> held on 02 March 2016 was used specifically for the purpose of obtaining input from EGF national Contact Persons on a set of draft questions and the means of disseminating the OPC.

The workplan for dissemination of the OPC followed the following process: firstly, an email was sent out to target organisations by the European Commission. This communication explained the purpose of the OPC with a link to the online survey. For the ten Member States included in the 29 cases that were part of this evaluation, ICF promoted participating in the OPC. This was done through

---

<sup>1</sup> EGF Networking Seminars are held biannually in order to provide a platform for EGF national Contact Persons and representatives from organisations that deliver EGF measures or similar support to unemployed persons in Member States to meet and discuss issues of common interest

national Contact Persons, requesting that they promote this to their networks. Typically this resulted in the details of the OPC being placed on websites.

The stakeholder consultation was planned for a 12 week period, planned to run from May - August 2016. The Commission monitored the responses received, as a result of a low response rate it was decided that the OPC should be extended by 1 month to allow more responses to be submitted following the summer break. The OPC closed on 19 September 2016.

The table below provides a breakdown of the responses received and the Annex provides a detailed report on the responses received through the OPC.

**Table A6.1 Breakdown of OPC responses by Member State and nature of organisation**

Member State	Organisations	Individuals
Austria	1	
Germany	10	2
Greece	4	54
Hungary	1	
Ireland	2	
Latvia	1	
Malta	2	
Belgium	3	1
Netherlands	1	
Spain	1	1
Sweden	1	
UK	1	1
The entire EU	2	2
Czech Republic	1	
Finland	3	
Cyprus		1
France		1

There were 97 responses to the OPC, 34 of which were provided on behalf of organisations, and 63 were submitted on behalf of individuals. Of those responding on behalf of their organisation, a quarter responded on behalf of their national ministry. Almost half of respondents indicated they had never been directly involved in the EGF. A similar number had been involved in the EGF in the last 12 months. Only few had been involved in previous iterations of the EGF.

## Annex: Open Public Consultation Report

### A. Information on respondents

Two-thirds of respondents responded as an individual citizen, the rest on behalf of their organisation:

#### I am responding as

Responding as	Frequency	Per cent
As an individual citizen	63	65%
On behalf of my organisation	34	35%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>100%</b>

Of those responding on behalf of their organisation, a quarter responded on behalf of their national ministry:

#### What is the nature of the organisation on behalf of which you are responding?

Nature of the organisation	On behalf of my organisation	As an individual citizen	Grand Total
Consultancy	1		1
Employers' organisation at national/regional level	2		2
National ministry	9		9
Non-governmental organisation representing individuals not in employment, education or training (NEETS) or other disadvantaged individuals	1		1
Organisation representing redundant workers (from a specific EGF case)	1		1
Other (please specify)	4		4
Other non-governmental or	1		1

charitable organisation			
Other private sector organisation	2		2
Public employment service	3		3
Regional/local authority	1		1
University	3		3
Workers' organisation/trade union at European level	1		1
Workers' organisation/trade union at national/regional level	5		5
N/A		63	63
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

Two-third of those responding on behalf of an organisation indicated their organisation was not included in the EU's Transparency Register:

#### Is your organisation included in the EU's Transparency Register?

Organisation included in the EU's Transparency Register	On behalf of my organisation	As an individual citizen	Grand Total
No	22		22
Yes	12		12
N/A		63	63
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

Two third of all respondents indicated they would prefer their consultation to be published anonymously:

#### In line with the EC guidelines, contributions to open public consultation should be published. For the purposes of reporting, how would you prefer your consultation to be published?

Publishing preference	On behalf of my organisation	As an individual citizen	Grand Total
-----------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------

1. In full - I consent to the publication of any information in my completed form, including my identity	13	7	20
2. Anonymously - I consent to the publication of any information in my completed form, apart from my name / the name of my organisation	19	45	64
3. Not at all - My response will not be published and will not be used by the Commission for analysis and aggregation purposes	1	9	10
(blank)	1	2	3
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

Almost half of respondents indicated they had never been directly involved in the EGF. A similar number had been involved in the EGF in the last 12 month. Only few had been involved in previous iterations of the EGF:

#### **Have you been involved with the EGF in the past?**

<b>Involvement with the EGF in the past</b>	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
No, I've never been directly involved in the EGF	10	31	41
Yes, I've been involved in the EGF but before the 2014-2020 programming period	7	2	9
Yes, I've been involved in the EGF in the last 12 months	17	27	44
(blank)		3	3
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

Almost half of those responding as an organisation indicated their role in the 2014-2020 EGF Regulatory period was that of an authority planning or implementing the EGF support. Respondents replying as individual citizen had mostly been recipient of EGF support (40 % of individuals):

### What was/is your role in the 2014-2020 EGF Regulatory period?

Role in the 2014-2020 EGF period	On behalf of my organisation	As an individual citizen	Grand Total
Individual receiving EGF support		25	25
National, regional or local authority planning or implementing EGF support	15	3	18
National, regional or local social partner organisation involved in planning or implementation of EGF support	8	6	14
Organisation delivering EGF support	3	6	9
Other	7	18	25
(blank)	1	5	6
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

Most respondents responding on behalf of their organisation came from Germany (almost 30 % of all responses from organisations); most individual responses came from Greece (86 %):

### Which Member State(s) do your answers relate to?

Member State(s) answers relate to	On behalf of my organisation	As an individual citizen	Grand Total
1 Austria	1		1
11 Germany	10	2	12
12 Greece	4	54	58
13 Hungary	1		1

14 Ireland	2		2
16 Latvia	1		1
19 Malta	2		2
2 Belgium	3		3
20 Netherlands	1		1
26 Spain	1	1	2
27 Sweden	1		1
28 UK	1		1
29 The entire EU	2	1	3
6 Czech Republic	1		1
9 Finland	3		3
2 Belgium;5 Cyprus;10 France;12 Greece;18 Luxembourg;26 Spain;28 UK;29 The entire EU		1	1
(blank)		4	4
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

## B. The 'effectiveness' of the EGF

Most respondents (strongly) agree that the objective of the EGF is clearly defined:

### The objective of the EGF is clearly defined

The objective of the EGF is clearly defined	On behalf of my organisation	As an individual citizen	Grand Total
I strongly agree	13	14	27
I agree	20	35	55
Neutral	1	6	7
I disagree		3	3
I strongly disagree		1	1
Do not know / Not applicable		2	2
(blank)		2	2
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

A third of respondents agreed there are barriers that prevent Member States from applying. Half of respondents from organisations agreed with this more often. Three-quarters of individuals were neutral, did not know or left this blank:

### There are barriers that prevent Member States from applying for EGF funding

Barriers prevent Member States from applying for EGF	On behalf of my organisation	As an individual citizen	Grand Total
I strongly agree	5	3	8
I agree	11	7	18
Neutral	6	12	18
I disagree	7	4	11
I strongly disagree		1	1



Do not know / Not applicable	4	34	38
(blank)	1	2	3
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

Half of respondents (strongly) agreed that there are factors that encourage some Member States to apply for EGF funding. A third did not know (mainly individuals):

**There are factors that encourage some Member States to apply for EGF funding**

<b>There are factors that encourage some Member States to apply for EGF funding</b>	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	11	3	14
I agree	12	23	35
Neutral	6	6	12
I disagree		2	2
Do not know / Not applicable	4	27	31
(blank)	1	2	3
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

60 % of respondents (strongly) agreed that the EGF is more effective than national level support:

**The EGF is more effective than national level measures to support redundant workers (e.g. job search support, training, help with self-employment etc.)**

<b>The EGF is more effective than national level measures to support redundant workers</b>	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	8	9	17

I agree	10	31	41
Neutral	6	10	16
I disagree	3	6	9
I strongly disagree	3	1	4
Do not know / Not applicable	4	4	8
(blank)		2	2
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

About half of respondents (strongly) disagree that the support offered by Member States to redundant workers in the absence of EGF is sufficient to help them into employment: respondents replying as individuals slightly more so than organisations (52 % vs 41 %):

**The support offered by Member States to redundant workers (in the absence of EGF) is sufficient to help them into employment**

<b>Support offered by Member States to redundant workers is sufficient</b>	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	2	1	3
I agree	6	10	16
Neutral	9	12	21
I disagree	8	25	33
I strongly disagree	6	8	14
Do not know / Not applicable	3	3	6
(blank)		4	4
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

Most respondents (strongly) disagreed that EGF funding alters the type of support made available to redundant workers by Member States. Respondents replying as individuals slightly more so than organisations (52 % vs 41 %):

## EGF funding alters the type of support made available to redundant workers by Member States

<b>EGF alters the type of support made available to redundant workers by Member States</b>	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	3	2	5
I agree	8	6	14
Neutral	5	11	16
I disagree	11	22	33
I strongly disagree	3	11	14
Do not know / Not applicable	4	9	13
(blank)		2	2
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

Over two-third of respondents (strongly) agreed that the actions funded by the EGF are suitable for redundant workers to find employment:

**The actions funded by the EGF (e.g. job search support, training, help with self-employment etc.) are suitable for redundant workers to find employment**

<b>The actions funded by the EGF are suitable for redundant workers to find employment</b>	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	14	8	22
I agree	13	31	44
Neutral	4	9	13
I disagree	2	5	7
I strongly disagree		1	1
Do not know / Not applicable	1	4	5

(blank)		5	5
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

Almost 60 % of respondents (strongly) agreed that actions funded by the EGF help young people not in employment, education or training to find work or return to education:

**Actions funded by the EGF help young people not in employment, education or training to find work or return to education**

<b>Actions funded by the EGF NEETs to find work or return to education</b>	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	5	8	13
I agree	11	32	43
Neutral	7	11	18
I disagree	2	1	3
I strongly disagree	1	2	3
Do not know / Not applicable	8	7	15
(blanks)		2	2
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

About a third of respondents (strongly) agreed there were challenges in the implementation of EGF measures. These were mostly organisations (60 %). Almost half of all respondents did not know or where neutral:

**Challenges exist in the implementation of EGF measures**

<b>Challenges exist in the implementation of EGF</b>	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	5	3	8
I agree	15	20	35
Neutral	6	16	22

I disagree	3	4	7
I strongly disagree	2	1	3
Do not know / Not applicable	3	17	20
(blank)		2	2
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

About half of respondents did not know or were neutral on whether there are any challenges in monitoring the effectiveness of EGF. However, more than 60 % of respondents from organisations (strongly) agreed:

### **Challenges exist in monitoring the effectiveness of EGF**

<b>Challenges exist in monitoring the effectiveness of EGF</b>	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	5	2	7
I agree	16	11	27
Neutral	5	15	20
I disagree	4	8	12
I strongly disagree	1	4	5
Do not know / Not applicable	3	20	23
(blank)		3	3
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

**C. The 'sustainability' of the EGF**

Two-third of all respondents were neutral or did not know whether individuals stay in the job/similar job or self-employment they entered following participation in EGF funded actions 6 months after the end of such support and complete and training started:

**Individuals stay in the job/similar job or self-employment they entered following participation in EGF funded actions 6 months after the end of such support and complete and training started**

<b>Individuals retain employment 6 months after end of support</b>	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	3	1	4
I agree	10	11	21
Neutral	6	13	19
I disagree	2	5	7
I strongly disagree		1	1
Do not know / Not applicable	13	28	41
(blank)		4	4
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

70 % of all respondents were neutral or did not know whether individuals stay in the job/similar job or self-employment they entered following participation in EGF funded actions 12 months after the end of such support and complete and training started:

**Individuals stay in the job/similar job or self-employment they entered following participation in EGF funded actions 12 months after the end of such support and complete and training started**

	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	3	1	4
I agree	10	7	17

I disagree		8	8
Neutral	6	14	20
Do not know / Not applicable	15	28	43
(blank)		5	5
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

About half of respondents (strongly) agreed there are long-term effects generated for organisations delivering EGF support in terms of being better placed to deliver support to redundant/unemployed workers. The other half is mostly neutral, does not know or left this blank:

**There are long-term effects generated for organisations delivering EGF support in terms of being better placed to deliver support to redundant/unemployed workers**

	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	6	3	9
I agree	16	18	34
Neutral	3	18	21
I disagree		2	2
I strongly disagree		1	1
Do not know / Not applicable	9	17	26
(blanks)		4	4
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

Half of all respondents (strongly) agreed 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. The other half is mostly neutral, does not know or left this blank:

**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**

	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	8	5	13
I agree	11	25	36
Neutral	3	12	15
I disagree	1	6	7
I strongly disagree		1	1
Do not know / Not applicable	11	10	21
(blanks)		4	4
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

More than half (strongly) agreed that lessons learnt from the EGF have been/could be implemented elsewhere:

**Lessons learnt from the EGF have been/could be implemented elsewhere (i.e. by national/regional/local authorities)**

	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	6	8	14
I agree	14	27	41
Neutral	2	11	13
I disagree	2	2	4
Do not know / Not applicable	9	11	20
(blank)	1	4	5
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

More than half of respondents were neutral or did not know whether there is sufficient evidence to assess the sustainability of outcomes for EGF cases. A third (strongly) agreed:



**There is sufficient evidence to assess the sustainability of outcomes for EGF cases**

	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	6	3	9
I agree	7	13	20
Neutral	9	12	21
I disagree	2	6	8
Do not know / Not applicable	10	25	35
(blank)		4	4
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

**D. The 'efficiency' of the EGF**

Half of all respondents thought that resources used by the EGF are appropriate given the scale of the issues faced. Of organisations, almost 60 % (strongly) agreed:

**The resources used by the EGF are appropriate given the scale of the issues faced (e.g. there is enough money for support measures given the requirements of redundant workers – instance in relation to how much training/re-training or other support is needed)**

	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	6	3	9
I agree	14	26	40
Neutral	6	8	14
I disagree	2	6	8
I strongly disagree		5	5
Do not know / Not	6	12	18

applicable			
(blanks)		3	3
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

There was an even spread amongst individual respondents on whether the level of resources used to support each redundant worker (or young person) by the EGF is comparable to those used for national measures to support such individuals back into the labour market or education. Almost half of organisation disagreed:

**The level of resources used to support each redundant worker (or young person) by the EGF is comparable to those used for national measures to support such individuals back into the labour market or education**

	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	2	1	3
I agree	5	14	19
Neutral	3	12	15
I disagree	13	10	23
I strongly disagree	3	3	6
Do not know / Not applicable	8	20	28
(blank)		3	3
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

Most respondents were neutral or did not know whether there is sufficient information available to compare costs of EGF measures with similar national measures:

**There is sufficient information available to compare costs of EGF measures with similar national measures**

	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
--	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------

I strongly agree	2		2
I agree	7	7	14
Neutral	7	14	21
I disagree	5	10	15
I strongly disagree	2		2
Do not know / Not applicable	11	28	39
(blank)		4	4
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

Almost 40 % of respondents (strongly) disagreed that the results of the EGF could have been achieved in a shorter period of time. About a third were neutral or did not know:

**The results of the EGF could have been achieved in a shorter period of time**

	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	1	3	4
I agree	9	13	22
Neutral	4	6	10
I disagree	11	16	27
I strongly disagree	4	6	10
Do not know / Not applicable	5	17	22
(blank)		2	2
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

About half of respondents (strongly) disagreed that the results of the EGF could have been achieved with less money. Over a third were neutral or did not know:

### The results of the EGF could have been achieved with less money

	On behalf of my organisation	As an individual citizen	Grand Total
I strongly agree		1	1
I agree	3	7	10
Neutral	4	9	13
I disagree	14	20	34
I strongly disagree	5	8	13
Do not know / Not applicable	8	16	24
(blank)		2	2
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

Over 40 % of respondents were neutral or did not know if the procedures currently in place for the EGF enable quick implementation of the support. Almost half of organisations disagreed, whereas only 14 % of individuals disagreed:

### The procedures currently in place for the EGF enable quick implementation of the support

	On behalf of my organisation	As an individual citizen	Grand Total
I strongly agree	2	2	4
I agree	6	19	25
Neutral	5	12	17
I disagree	11	7	18
I strongly disagree	4	2	6
Do not know / Not applicable	5	19	24
(blank)	1	2	3

<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>
--------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

More than half of respondents were neutral or did not know whether there are more cost effective responses to job losses than the EGF

### **There are more cost effective responses to job losses than the EGF**

	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	1	1	2
I agree	3	11	14
Neutral	6	16	22
I disagree	8	9	17
I strongly disagree	5	2	7
Do not know / Not applicable	11	21	32
(blank)		3	3
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

### **E. The 'coherence' of the EGF**

Almost half of all respondents (strongly) agreed that EGF support complements support provided with national measures or activities funded with other EU funds:

### **EGF support complements support provided with national measures or activities funded with other EU funds (such as the ESF)**

	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	8	3	11
I agree	12	27	39
Neutral	4	14	18

I disagree	2	3	5
I strongly disagree	2	1	3
Do not know / Not applicable	6	11	17
(blank)		4	4
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

More than half of respondents (strongly) agreed that EGF Support works additional to support provided with national measures or activities funded with other EU funds:

**EGF Support works additional to support provided with national measures or activities funded with other EU funds.**

	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	9	4	13
I agree	13	24	37
Neutral	1	14	15
I disagree	1	4	5
I strongly disagree	1	1	2
Do not know / Not applicable	8	12	20
(blank)	1	4	5
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

**F. The 'relevance' of the EGF**

More than 60 % of respondents (strongly) agreed that the scope of the EGF fund is still relevant and appropriate:

**The scope of the EGF fund is still relevant and appropriate**

	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	12	9	21
I agree	11	28	39
Neutral	1	9	10
I disagree	7	2	9
I strongly disagree	1		1
Do not know / Not applicable	2	12	14
(blank)		3	3
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

Almost 45 % of respondents did not know or where neutral as to whether the scope of the fund should be changed. 28 % (strongly) disagreed), 20 (strongly) agreed:

### **The scope of the EGF fund should be changed**

	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	1	2	3
I agree	9	8	17
Neutral	9	19	28
I disagree	8	15	23
I strongly disagree	3	1	4
Do not know / Not applicable	3	11	14
(blank)	1	7	8
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

38 % of all respondents (strongly) agreed that the intervention criteria for the EGF are still appropriate, 27 % (strongly) disagreed:

### The intervention criteria for the EGF are still appropriate

	On behalf of my organisation	As an individual citizen	Grand Total
I strongly agree	2	3	5
I agree	9	23	32
Neutral	5	14	19
I disagree	12	11	23
I strongly disagree	1	2	3
Do not know / Not applicable	3	8	11
(blank)	2	2	4
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

Almost half of all respondents (strongly) agreed that the thresholds for intervention should be changed. Almost two-thirds of organisations (strongly) agreed:

### The thresholds for intervention should be changed

	On behalf of my organisation	As an individual citizen	Grand Total
I strongly agree	8	5	13
I agree	13	20	33
Neutral	6	17	23
I disagree	4	8	12
I strongly disagree		1	1
Do not know / Not applicable	3	10	13
(blank)		2	2



<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>
--------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

45 % of all respondents (strongly) agreed that the derogation clause targeting NEETs is relevant and should extend beyond December 2017. Most others were neutral or did not know:

**The derogation clause targeting NEETs is relevant and should extend beyond December 2017**

	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	7	6	13
I agree	7	24	31
Neutral	8	14	22
I disagree		1	1
I strongly disagree	3	2	5
Do not know / Not applicable	9	14	23
(blank)		2	2
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

**G. The 'EU added-value' of the EGF**

60 % (strongly) agreed that the EGF has added to, or supported, existing actions or policy areas:

**The EGF has added to, or supported, existing actions or policy areas**

	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	9	6	15
I agree	16	27	43
Neutral	3	8	11

I disagree	2	2	4
I strongly disagree			
Do not know / Not applicable	3	17	20
(blank)	1	3	4
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

Almost 60 % (strongly) agreed that the EGF has broadened existing actions by supporting groups or policy areas that would not have received support otherwise:

**The EGF has broadened existing actions by supporting groups or policy areas that would not have received support otherwise**

	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	7	6	13
I agree	18	25	43
Neutral	3	11	14
I disagree	2	3	5
I strongly disagree	1		1
Do not know / Not applicable	3	15	18
(blank)		3	3
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

Two-third of respondents did not know or were neutral as to whether lessons learnt from the implementation of EGF have been applied elsewhere:

**Lessons learnt from the implementation of EGF have been applied elsewhere**

	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	7	2	9

I agree	8	9	17
Neutral	9	15	24
I disagree	2	2	4
I strongly disagree			
Do not know / Not applicable	8	32	40
(blank)		3	3
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>

60 % of respondents did not know or were neutral on whether the EGF improved/changed operational processes and implementation of support measures for redundant workers/NEETs including in relation to other national or European sources of funding. Almost 30 % (strongly) agreed:

**The EGF have improved/changed operational processes and implementation of support measures for redundant workers/NEETs including in relation to other national or European sources of funding.**

	<b>On behalf of my organisation</b>	<b>As an individual citizen</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
I strongly agree	4	4	8
I agree	9	11	20
Neutral	8	14	22
I disagree	3	3	6
I strongly disagree			
Do not know / Not applicable	10	24	34
(blank)		7	7
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>97</b>