Contribution ID: 201651bd-76dc-4072-90f2-93fbd52e598e

Date: 08/03/2018 17:52:38

Public consultation on EU funds in the area of investment, research & innovation, SMEs and single market

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Public consultation on EU funds in the area of of investment, research & innovation, SMEs and single market

Introduction

'A stronger Union needs to be equipped with appropriate financial means to continue to deliver its policies. The Union has changed fundamentally in recent years, as have the challenges it faces. Our Union needs a budget that can help us achieve our ambitions. The Multiannual Financial Framework for the period after 2020 must reflect this.' (Commission Work Programme 2018)

The EU budget currently amounts to less than 1 euro per citizen per day. Although a modest budget, at around 1% of the EU's gross national income or 2% of all EU public spending, it supports the EU's shared goals by delivering essential public goods and tangible results for EU citizens. These include: investing in skills, innovation and infrastructure; ensuring sustainable food systems and developing rural areas; ensuring a clean and healthy environment and the protection of natural resources; promoting joint research and industrial projects; funding shared activities in the field of migration and security; and supporting development and humanitarian aid.

The current Multiannual Financial Framework — the EU's long-term budget — runs until the end of 2020. In 2018, the Commission will put forth comprehensive proposals for the post-2020 Multiannual Financial Framework and for the next generation of financial programmes that will receive funding. These programmes/funds provide financial support to hundreds of thousands of beneficiaries such as regions, towns, NGOs, businesses, farmers, students, scientists, and many others.

The Commission's proposals will be designed to make it possible for the EU to deliver on the things that matter most, in areas where it can achieve more than Member States acting alone. This requires a careful assessment both of what has worked well in the past and what could be improved in the future. What should the priorities be for future policies and programmes/funds? And how can they be designed to best deliver results on the ground?

As an integral part of this process and following on from the <u>Reflection Paper on the Future of EU Finances</u>, the Commission is launching a series of public consultations covering all the major spending areas to gather views from all interested parties on how to make the very most of every euro of the EU budget.

The EU has developed a variety of instruments to stimulate investment and entrepreneurship to create jobs and growth. The Investment Plan for Europe, the so-called Juncker Plan, aims to unlock investment throughout Europe through to the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI), which provides a EU guarantee to mobilise investment. The EFSI also complements other existing instruments like COSME that make it easier for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) to access finance in all phases of their lifecycle – creation, expansion, or business transfer. Through EU support, businesses have easier access to guarantees, loans and equity capital.

Research and innovation are instrumental for addressing the EU's productivity gap and play a crucial role in providing solutions to many global challenges the EU and its citizens are facing today. In that context, the EU has made a major contribution with the Horizon 2020 programme.

The European Single Market is one of the EU's greatest achievements. It has fuelled economic growth and made the everyday life of European businesses and consumers easier. A well-functioning Single Market, including in its digital dimension, stimulates competition and trade, improves efficiency, raises quality, and helps cut prices. In that context, the EU has set up several programmes in a wide range of areas (health, food safety, customs...) to facilitate the free circulation of goods, services, capital and persons across the European continent.

Recent consultations already covered several policy areas, including on current performance and future challenges. The views already expressed by stakeholders in these consultations will be taken into account as part of the current process for the future MFF.

Link to portal for recent consultations: https://ec.europa.eu/info/consultations en

Interim evaluation of the programme for the competitiveness of enterprises and small and medium-sized enterprises (COSME) (2014-2020)

https://ec.europa.eu/info/consultations/interim-evaluation-programme-competitiveness-enterprises-and-small-and-medium-sized-enterprises-cosme-2014-2020_en

Consultation on modernising and simplifying the common agricultural policy (CAP) https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/consultations/cap-modernising/2017_en

Public stakeholder consultation – interim evaluation of Horizon 2020 https://ec.europa.eu/research/consultations/interim h2020 2016/consultation en.htm

Open Public Consultation of the mid-term evaluation of the 3rd Health Programme 2014-2020 https://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/consultations/midterm_evaluation_fr

Public stakeholder consultation – Interim evaluation of Joint Undertakings operating under Horizon 2020. http://ec.europa.eu/research/consultations/interim_joint-undertakings_h2020/consultation_en.htm Public Consultation – Evaluation of Public-Public Partnerships (Art.185 initiatives) in the context of the Horizon 2020 Interim Evaluation.

http://ec.europa.eu/research/consultations/pp_partnerships_art185/consultation_en.htm

Public consultation on Transformation of Health and Care in the Digital Single Market https://ec.europa.eu/info/consultations/public-consultation-transformation-health-and-care-digital-single-market_en

Λ	1.	_				_	
A	n	\cap	ш	Ť.	\/	\cap	ш
$\boldsymbol{\sqcap}$	v	v	u	ı.	V	v	u

*1 You are replying
as an individual in your personal capacity
in your professional capacity or on behalf of an organisation
*8 Respondent's first name
Nicola
*9 Respondent's last name
Bedlington
*10 Respondent's professional email address
nicola.bedlington@eu-patient.eu
*11 Name of the organisation
European Patients' Forum (EPF)
*12 Postal address of the organisation
*12 Postal address of the organisation
Chaussée d'Etterbeek 180, 1040 Brussels, Belgium
*13 Type of organisation
Please select the answer option that fits best.
Private enterprise
Professional consultancy, law firm, self-employed consultant
Trade, business or professional association
Non-governmental organisation, platform or network Output Description:
Research and academia
 Churches and religious communities Regional or local authority (public or mixed)
Tregional of local authority (public of filixed)

Other
22 Is your organisation included in the Transparency Register?
If your organisation is not registered, we invite you to register here, although it is not compulsory to be registered to reply to this consultation. Why a transparency register?
Yes
O No
Not applicable
23 If so, please indicate your Register ID number.
61911227368-75
24 Country of organisation's headquarters
Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
© Croatia
© Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark
© Estonia
© Finland
© France
© Germany
© Greece
Hungary
Ireland
Italy
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Netherlands
O Poland
O Portugal
Romania
Slovak Republic
© Slovenia
Spain
© Sweden
United Kingdom
Other

International or national public authority

Note that, whatever option chosen, your answers may be subject to a request for public access to documents under Regulation (EC) N°1049/2001

- can be published with your organisation's information (I consent the publication of all information in my contribution in whole or in part including the name of my organisation, and I declare that nothing within my response is unlawful or would infringe the rights of any third party in a manner that would prevent publication)
- can be published provided that your organisation remains anonymous (I consent to the publication of any information in my contribution in whole or in part (which may include quotes or opinions I express) provided that it is done anonymously. I declare that nothing within my response is unlawful or would infringe the rights of any third party in a manner that would prevent the publication.
- *27 Please let us know whether you have experience with one or more of the following funds and

27 Thouse let de knew which you have expending with one of the fellowing funds and
rogrammes.
at least 1 choice(s)
European Fund for Strategic Investments (Investment Plan for Europe)
✓ Horizon 2020
European Structural and Investment funds
COSME
▼ EU Health Programme
EU Food and Feed Programme
Customs 2020
Fiscalis
Anti-Fraud Information System
□ EURES
Employment and Social Innovation Programme
Standards in the field of financial reporting Programme
☐ Implementation of single market for financial services
Enhancing consumers involvement in EU policy-making in the field of financial services
Consumer Programme
European statistical programme
☐ Interoperability solutions and common frameworks for European public administrations, businesses at
citizens (ISA2 programme) as a means for modernising the public sector
Support for the functioning of various aspects of the single market (including goods, services, taxation
company law) – standardisation, assistance to citizens and businesses, enforcement
Digital Single Market support programme
EEEF (European energy efficiency fund)
PF4EE (private finance for energy efficiency)
None of the above
28 Please let us know to which of the following topics your replies to this questionnaire will refer.
EU support for Investment
☑ EU support for research and innovation
EU support for SME and entrepreneurship

EU funds in the area of investment, research & innovation, SMEs and single market

EU support for the Single Market

29 The Commission has preliminarily identified a number of policy challenges which programmes/funds in this area of investment, research & innovation, SMEs and single market could address. How important are these policy challenges in your view?

	Very important	Rather important	Neither important nor unimportant	Rather not important	Not important at all	No opinion
Facilitate transition to low carbon and circular economy and resilience to climate change, support security of supply	0	•	©	•	•	•
Foster research and innovation across the EU	•	0	0	0	0	0
Support industrial development	0	0	0	0	0	•
Support education, skills and training	0	•	0	0	0	0
Ensure a clean and healthy environment and the protection of natural resources	•	0	0	0	0	0
Facilitate digital transition of the economy, industry, services and society	0	•	0	0	0	0

Ensure that existing rules are applied and enforced consistently across the EU	•	•	•	©	©	0
Ensure smooth circulation of goods both within EU and at EU borders	0	•	•	0	0	0
Ensure fair conditions of competition in the EU	0	0	0	0	0	•
Promote security of citizens	0	0	0	0	0	•
Support labour mobility	0	0	0	0	0	•
Support capital flows and investment	0	0	0	0	0	•
Facilitate access to finance, in particular to SMEs	0	0	0	0	0	•
Promote financial stability	0	0	0	0	0	•
Improve quality of public institutions (including digitalisation)	0	•	0	0	0	0
Reduce unemployment and social disparities	•	0	0	0	0	0

Ensure safe, sustainable transport and mobility	•	•	0	•	•	•
Promote and protect public health	•	0	0	0	0	0
Promote a safe and sustainable food chain	•	0	0	0	0	0
Support social investment and social innovation	0	•	0	0	0	0
Ensure a high level of consumer protection and effective redress	•	•	0	•	•	0
Provide reliable and comparable statistics	0	•	0	0	0	0
Other (Please specify below)	•	0	0	0	0	0

*30 If you identified another policy challenge, please specify it here:

200 character(s) maximum

Chronic disease and multi-morbidity bring specific challenges to citizens and healthcare in terms of care models and delivery; these affect all countries and need EU level collaboration.

31 To what extent do the current policies successfully address these challenges?

	Fully addressed	Fairly well addressed	Addressed to some extent only	Not addressed at all	No opinion
Facilitate transition to low carbon and circular economy and resilience to climate change; support security of supply	0	0	0	0	•
Foster research and innovation across the EU	0	•	0	0	0
Support industrial development	0	0	0	0	•
Support education, skills and training	0	0	•	0	0
Ensure a clean and healthy environment and the protection of natural resources	0	0	•	0	0
Facilitate digital transition of the economy, industry, services and society	0	•	0	0	0
Ensure that existing rules are applied and enforced consistently across the EU	0	•	0	0	0
Ensure smooth circulation of goods both within EU and at EU borders	0	0	•	0	0
Ensure fair conditions of competition in the EU	0	0	0	0	0
Promote security of citizens	0	0	0	0	•
Support labour mobility	0	0	0	0	•
Support capital flows and investment	0	0	0	0	•
Facilitate access to finance, in particular to SMEs	0	0	0	0	•
Promote financial stability	0	0	0	0	•

Improve quality of public institutions (including digitalisation)	0	•	0	0	0
Reduce unemployment and social disparities	0	0	•	0	0
Ensure safe, sustainable transport and mobility	0	•	0	0	0
Promote and protect public health	0	•	0	0	0
Promote a safe and sustainable food chain	0	•	0	0	0
Support social investment and social innovation	0	0	•	0	0
Ensure a high level of consumer protection and effective redress	•	0	0	0	0
Provide reliable and comparable statistics	•	0	0	0	0
Other (please specify below)	0	0	0	•	0

*32 If you identified another policy challenge in Question 1, please let us know how well the current policies address it:

200 character(s) maximum

To a limited extent. Some projects were funded but no firm policy is in place; projects without coherent strategy are not sufficient to achieve results

- *33 To what extent do the current programmes/funds add value, compared to what Member States could achieve at national, regional and/or local levels?
 - To a large extent
 - To a fairly good extent
 - To some extent only
 - Not at all
 - Don't know
- 34 Please specify <u>how</u> the current programmes/funds add value compared to what Member States could achieve at national, regional and/or local levels. Please clearly indicate to which policies, programmes and funds your answer refer.

1500 character(s) maximum

In health, the EU has enabled coordinated action to tackle major determinants of chronic diseases, including alcohol, diet, tobacco and physical activity. In health systems, EU collaboration can bring a significant added value by promoting evidence-based policy, for example through pilot projects and research initiatives that can trigger concrete actions at Member State level. Addressing cross-border health threats and antibiotic resistance, developing digital health tools, supporting national vaccination efforts, increasing cooperation on rare diseases e.g. through European Reference Networks have shown this. The recently published 2018

State of the Health in the EU reinforces the Commission's commitment to and the EU added value in actions to reduce health inequalities. Action at European level demonstrates genuine commitment of the EU to addressing issues that European people consider important; health is consistently a top priority. EU action on health can support monitoring and benchmarking of health systems and set ambitious but achievable targets for improvement, reduce inequalities in access and empower European citizens. Impact assessments of current and previous health programmes recognised that it made possible activities where economic constraints would not have allowed them to be made a priority in member states, promoted important topics on political agendas, and influenced policy and implementation at national level.

35 Is there a need to modify or add to the objectives of the programmes/funds in this policy area? If yes, which changes would be necessary or desirable? Please clearly indicate to which policies, programmes and funds your answer refer.

1500 character(s) maximum

Embedding patient-centredness in EU health systems through patient empowerment (PE) is recognised in the Regulation setting up HP3, and PE is identified as a key priority by several policy documents in the last years; but a concrete EU strategy in this area is lacking. Without being a specific policy objective this aspect risks being overlooked and valuable but fragmented work done to date lost. There are also important synergies with OECD work on healthcare quality indicators. This directly benefits citizens, and adds value beyond initiatives in single disease-areas or countries, supporting health system sustainability in health promotion, prevention, self-management and chronic disease care. Access to information is an aspect of PE. HP3 states, "transparency of healthcare activities and systems and the availability of reliable, independent and user-friendly information to patients should be optimised." Directive 2011/24/EU obliges Member States to give information on safety and quality to patients but is poorly implemented. EU support to Member States in monitoring health literacy and enabling provision of evidence-based, accessible information at EU level would provide high added value. Promoting equity of access, e.g. by developing a framework for monitoring, benchmarking and implementation of good practice would add significant value for EU patients. Improved patient safety will reduce unwarranted variation in health system effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

36 The Commission has preliminarily identified a number of possible obstacles, which could prevent the current programmes/funds from achieving their objectives. To what extent do possible obstacles prevent the current programme/funds from achieving their objectives?

	To a large extent	To a fairly large extent	To some extent only	Not at all	Don' t know
Too complex procedures leading to high administrative burden and delays	•	0	0	0	0
Insufficient administrative capacity to manage programmes	•	0	0	0	0
Lack of flexibility to react to unforeseen circumstances	•	0	0	0	0
Insufficient synergies between the EU programmes/funds	0	0	•	0	0

Difficulty of combining EU action with other public interventions and private finance	0	•	©	0	0
Insufficient critical mass	0	0	•	0	0
Insufficient use of financial instruments	©	0	•	0	0
Lack of information/communication	0	0	•	0	0
Insufficient scope	0	0	•	0	0
Lack of EU standards and EU rules	©	0	0	•	0
Inadequate facilities to support enhanced cooperation	©	•	0	0	0
Out of date and inadequate IT capabilities	•	0	0	0	©
Insufficient involvement of citizens	•	0	0	0	0
Other (Please specify below)	0	•	0	0	0

*37 If you have identified another obstacle, please specify it here:

1000 character(s) maximum

The visibility of the EU health programme is not as good as it could be, the communication of its achievements and benefits is inadequate, as is often the dissemination and subsequently take-up of results of very good projects. Only since the end of 2016 some actions have been taken to build synergies among actions. Even though there is high request to contribute to Health Policy activities at EU level, limited funds are allocated to ensure the sustainability of civil society NGOs (including patient organisations). In the research programme, we have seen a very limited number of projects accepted for funding, which often results in applications that are of high quality being excluded and results in a waste of time in developing complex applications that are ultimately rejected. This is especially pertinent for non-governmental organisations with limited human resources, such as patient organisations, whose participation provides added value to many research projects.

38 The Commission has preliminarily identified a number of steps that could help to further simplify and reduce administrative burdens for beneficiaries under current programmes/funds. To what extent would these steps be helpful in your view?

	To a large extent	To a fairly large extent	To some extent only	Not at all	Don' t know
Alignment of rules between EU funds	•	0	0	0	©
Fewer, clearer, shorter rules	•	0	0	0	0
More reliance on national rules	0	0	•	0	©
A stable but flexible framework between programming periods	•	0	0	0	0
Extension of the single audit principle	0	•	0	0	0

Better feedback to applicants	•	0	0	0	
More structured reporting	•	0	0	0	0
User-friendly IT tools	•	0	0	0	0
E-governance	•	0	0	0	0
Adequate administrative capacity	•	0	0	0	0
Other (Please specify below)	•	0	0	0	0

*39 If you have identified another way to simplify and reduce burdens, please specify it here:

1000 character(s) maximum

In reviewing the impact and added value of EU actions, the extent it enables the active participation of civil society actors such as patient organisations to give vital input into health policy should be given careful consideration. Amongst other things, transparency of policy and how consultation processes are managed should be reviewed to ensure they enable maximum input; and the frameworks through which patients organisations participate should be examined taking into account feedback received from grant beneficiaries under projects, joint actions and other grants. The objective should be to support and enable a genuinely participatory, democratic and inclusive approach to EU health policy-making, with appropriate financial and administrative supports in place.

overlaps/duplication? For example, would you consider grouping/merging some programmes? Please clearly indicate to which policies, programmes and funds your answer refer.						
500 character(s) maximum						
ć	arly indicate to which policies, programmes and funds your answer refer.					

40 How could synergies among programmes/funds in this area be further strengthened to avoid possible

Document upload and final comments

41 Please feel free to upload a concise document, such as a position paper. The maximum file size is 1MB.

Please note that the uploaded document will be published alongside your response to the questionnaire which is the essential input to this public consultation. The document is optional and serves as additional background reading to better understand your position.

7c235a01-f6bd-4274-a077-234a5b303a04/AttachmentMFFconsultation.pdf

42 If you wish to add further information — within the scope of this questionnaire — please feel free to do so here.

1500 character(s) maximum

We regret that the questions in this questionnaire are somewhat biased and the answer options provided direct answers in a specific direction. For example, question 28 asks which topic the respondent is referring to, but includes only four pre-defined options – EU support for investment, research and innovation, SME and entrepreneurship, and the single market – and no possibility to select any "other" topic, such as health. For further information supporting our answers to this questionnaire, please see EPF's supplementary statement uploaded as an appendix.

Contact

SG-OPC-INVESTMENT-SME-INNOVATION@ec.europa.eu