



Council of the  
European Union

033695/EU XXVI. GP  
Eingelangt am 06/09/18

Brussels, 6 September 2018  
(OR. en)

11744/18

---

---

**Interinstitutional File:**  
**2018/0202(COD)**

---

---

SOC 508  
ECOFIN 788  
FSTR 50  
COMPET 581  
FIN 619  
IA 265  
CODEC 1399  
CADREFIN 183

**NOTE**

From:	Presidency
To:	Delegations
No. Cion doc.:	9701/18 + ADD 1
Subject:	Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL on the European Globalisation

Delegations find attached the Presidency's summary on the delegations' views on the Commission Impact Assessment (IA).

---

## **Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL on the European Globalisation (EGF)**

In accordance with the guidance on Impact Assessment (doc. 6270/18) delegations will find attached the summary of the replies to the Impact Assessment questionnaire on the above mentioned proposal.

### **Summary of replies to the Impact Assessment questionnaire**

Almost all delegations considered **the policy context and the legal basis** of the initiative to be clearly explained in the Impact Assessment. Most delegations positively evaluated the problem definition, while one Member State considered there is no evidence to support the lowering the threshold of displaced workers.

Most of the delegations acknowledged the coherence and consistence of **the policy objectives** with the initiative, while two delegations pointed to the lack of specific operational objectives. Majority of the delegations agreed fully or to some extent to that the objectives are linked to **measurable monitoring indicators**. Two delegations stressed that more information could be provided on the common monitoring system and on common output and impact indicators.

Almost all delegations considered the proposal to be in line with **the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality**. As regards chosen **policy options**, delegations generally evaluated them positively. Some delegations would have welcomed more consideration of alternative revisions to the EGF, while one indicated that the reason not to merge EGF with ESF+ could have been elaborated further. Individual delegation thought that more clarification was needed on the disadvantaged groups and on guidance which stakeholders would qualify.

Majority of delegations recognized that **the impacts of the different policy options**, including environmental, economic, and social costs were fully or to some extent clearly considered. In this context some delegations stated that the impacts for various policy options with regard to merging funds, including consequences of merging the EGF and the ESF +, as well as the policy option 'no EU action' could have been more comprehensively analysed.

Regarding specifically **economic impacts**, including on competition and competitiveness, on consumers, and small and medium enterprises, as well as **environmental impacts** some delegations viewed as fully or partially clearly presented, while some other Member States considered these not relevant. In general delegations found **the social impacts** to have been sufficiently considered.

Majority of respondents were satisfied fully or to some extent with the impact assessment of the **regulatory costs** and **impacts on individual Member States**. Some of the delegations, however, pointed that not all costs, including administrative burden, have been taken into account, particularly when referring to monitoring and evaluation activities. As regards impacts **on third countries** and **impact on fundamental rights**, some respondents were satisfied or partially satisfied with the impact assessment, others considered it not relevant.

Almost all respondents acknowledged that **the Impact Assessment Board** comments were well considered in the Impact Assessment. As for the measurement of the effects as well as monitoring and evaluation arrangements, responses showed general support for the proposed indicators, while some delegations commented that responsible monitoring structures need to be clarified.

Respondents generally considered that the used **methodology** fully or partially to be appropriate and the limitations, and uncertainties of the methodology used made clear.

---