

Public Consultation - EU funding for competitiveness

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

In 2025, the European Commission will put forward a comprehensive proposal for the next long-term budget – the multiannual financial framework (MFF). This includes EU funding providing financial support to hundreds of thousands of beneficiaries, including research and technology organisations, small and medium /sized businesses, startups and scale-ups, educational and research institutions, industry clusters, and many others.

Today, EU funding in support of competitiveness is spread over too many overlapping programmes, many of which fund the same thing but with different requirements and difficulties in combining funding effectively, which hinders access to EU funding and limits the impact that the funding can have.

As highlighted in President von der Leyen's Commission's [Political Guidelines](#), as well as in the [Competitiveness Compass](#), the Commission will work on a simpler, more focused and impactful MFF that reflects the European strategic priorities (with the ambition of being an “investment-focused Commission”),

The guidelines also announced the creation of a European Competitiveness Fund, as part of the proposal for the next MFF. As set out in the Competitiveness Compass, this investment capacity should channel investment in strategic technologies along the entire investment journey, from research, through scale-up, industrial deployment, to manufacturing – using the power of the EU budget to de-risk and mobilise private investment for our common goals.

The Commission's proposal for the next MFF will be focused on the things that matter most, in areas where the EU 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. The next MFF will draw lessons from the current budget – notably in terms of simplicity and flexibility, speed and strategic focus.

As an integral part of the process, the Commission is launching a series of public consultations to gather views from all interested parties on the future EU budget. This consultation covers EU funding in support of EU competitiveness. The decision to cluster issues serves to support the preparatory work and does not pre-empt the architecture of future programmes. This questionnaire consists of 3 parts:

Part 1 collects some information about you Part 2 contains questions related to EU funding for competitiveness. Part 3 comprises 2 closing questions.

Your feedback will inform the analysis of the impact assessment for the European Competitiveness Fund. You can save your replies as a draft and finish later. Please be concise in those questions with a free text box for additional comments. If you want, you can also upload a document with your views at the end of the survey.

About you

Part 1. Questions about you

*** Language of my contribution**

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

*** I am giving my contribution as**

- ☐ Academic/research institution
- ☐ Business association
- ☐ Company/business
- ☐ Consumer organisation
- ☐ EU citizen
- ☐ Environmental organisation
- ☐ Non-EU citizen

- ☐ Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- ☐ Public authority
- ☐ Trade union
- ☒ Other

* First name

Amrit

* Surname

Nanda

* Email (this won't be published)

amrit.nanda@plantetp.eu

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

Plants for the Future European Technology Platform

* Organisation size

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

Transparency register number

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

167413627983-49

* Country of origin

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

This list does not represent the official position of the European institutions with regard to the legal status or policy of the entities mentioned. It is a harmonisation of often divergent lists and practices.

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| ☐ Afghanistan | ☐ Djibouti | ☐ Libya | ☐ Saint Martin |
| ☐ Åland Islands | ☐ Dominica | ☐ Liechtenstein | ☐ Saint Pierre and Miquelon |

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| ☐ Albania | ☐ Dominican Republic | ☐ Lithuania | ☐ Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| ☐ Algeria | ☐ Ecuador | ☐ Luxembourg | ☐ Samoa |
| ☐ American Samoa | ☐ Egypt | ☐ Macau | ☐ San Marino |
| ☐ Andorra | ☐ El Salvador | ☐ Madagascar | ☐ São Tomé and Príncipe |
| ☐ Angola | ☐ Equatorial Guinea | ☐ Malawi | ☐ Saudi Arabia |
| ☐ Anguilla | ☐ Eritrea | ☐ Malaysia | ☐ Senegal |
| ☐ Antarctica | ☐ Estonia | ☐ Maldives | ☐ Serbia |
| ☐ Antigua and Barbuda | ☐ Eswatini | ☐ Mali | ☐ Seychelles |
| ☐ Argentina | ☐ Ethiopia | ☐ Malta | ☐ Sierra Leone |
| ☐ Armenia | ☐ Falkland Islands | ☐ Marshall Islands | ☐ Singapore |
| ☐ Aruba | ☐ Faroe Islands | ☐ Martinique | ☐ Sint Maarten |
| ☐ Australia | ☐ Fiji | ☐ Mauritania | ☐ Slovakia |
| ☐ Austria | ☐ Finland | ☐ Mauritius | ☐ Slovenia |
| ☐ Azerbaijan | ☐ France | ☐ Mayotte | ☐ Solomon Islands |
| ☐ Bahamas | ☐ French Guiana | ☐ Mexico | ☐ Somalia |
| ☐ Bahrain | ☐ French Polynesia | ☐ Micronesia | ☐ South Africa |
| ☐ Bangladesh | ☐ French Southern and Antarctic Lands | ☐ Moldova | ☐ South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands |
| ☐ Barbados | ☐ Gabon | ☐ Monaco | ☐ South Korea |
| ☐ Belarus | ☐ Georgia | ☐ Mongolia | ☐ South Sudan |
| ☒ Belgium | ☐ Germany | ☐ Montenegro | ☐ Spain |
| ☐ Belize | ☐ Ghana | ☐ Montserrat | ☐ Sri Lanka |
| ☐ Benin | ☐ Gibraltar | ☐ Morocco | ☐ Sudan |
| ☐ Bermuda | ☐ Greece | ☐ Mozambique | ☐ Suriname |
| ☐ Bhutan | ☐ Greenland | ☐ Myanmar/Burma | ☐ Svalbard and Jan Mayen |
| ☐ Bolivia | ☐ Grenada | ☐ Namibia | ☐ Sweden |

- | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| ○ Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba | ○ Guadeloupe | ○ Nauru | ○ Switzerland |
| ○ Bosnia and Herzegovina | ○ Guam | ○ Nepal | ○ Syria |
| ○ Botswana | ○ Guatemala | ○ Netherlands | ○ Taiwan |
| ○ Bouvet Island | ○ Guernsey | ○ New Caledonia | ○ Tajikistan |
| ○ Brazil | ○ Guinea | ○ New Zealand | ○ Tanzania |
| ○ British Indian Ocean Territory | ○ Guinea-Bissau | ○ Nicaragua | ○ Thailand |
| ○ British Virgin Islands | ○ Guyana | ○ Niger | ○ The Gambia |
| ○ Brunei | ○ Haiti | ○ Nigeria | ○ Timor-Leste |
| ○ Bulgaria | ○ Heard Island and McDonald Islands | ○ Niue | ○ Togo |
| ○ Burkina Faso | ○ Honduras | ○ Norfolk Island | ○ Tokelau |
| ○ Burundi | ○ Hong Kong | ○ Northern Mariana Islands | ○ Tonga |
| ○ Cambodia | ○ Hungary | ○ North Korea | ○ Trinidad and Tobago |
| ○ Cameroon | ○ Iceland | ○ North Macedonia | ○ Tunisia |
| ○ Canada | ○ India | ○ Norway | ○ Türkiye |
| ○ Cape Verde | ○ Indonesia | ○ Oman | ○ Turkmenistan |
| ○ Cayman Islands | ○ Iran | ○ Pakistan | ○ Turks and Caicos Islands |
| ○ Central African Republic | ○ Iraq | ○ Palau | ○ Tuvalu |
| ○ Chad | ○ Ireland | ○ Palestine | ○ Uganda |
| ○ Chile | ○ Isle of Man | ○ Panama | ○ Ukraine |
| ○ China | ○ Israel | ○ Papua New Guinea | ○ United Arab Emirates |
| ○ Christmas Island | ○ Italy | ○ Paraguay | ○ United Kingdom |
| ○ Clipperton | ○ Jamaica | ○ Peru | ○ United States |

- | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|---|--|
| ☐ Cocos (Keeling) Islands | ☐ Japan | ☐ Philippines | ☐ United States Minor Outlying Islands |
| ☐ Colombia | ☐ Jersey | ☐ Pitcairn Islands | ☐ Uruguay |
| ☐ Comoros | ☐ Jordan | ☐ Poland | ☐ US Virgin Islands |
| ☐ Congo | ☐ Kazakhstan | ☐ Portugal | ☐ Uzbekistan |
| ☐ Cook Islands | ☐ Kenya | ☐ Puerto Rico | ☐ Vanuatu |
| ☐ Costa Rica | ☐ Kiribati | ☐ Qatar | ☐ Vatican City |
| ☐ Côte d'Ivoire | ☐ Kosovo | ☐ Réunion | ☐ Venezuela |
| ☐ Croatia | ☐ Kuwait | ☐ Romania | ☐ Vietnam |
| ☐ Cuba | ☐ Kyrgyzstan | ☐ Russia | ☐ Wallis and Futuna |
| ☐ Curaçao | ☐ Laos | ☐ Rwanda | ☐ Western Sahara |
| ☐ Cyprus | ☐ Latvia | ☐ Saint Barthélemy | ☐ Yemen |
| ☐ Czechia | ☐ Lebanon | ☐ Saint Helena
Ascension and
Tristan da Cunha | ☐ Zambia |
| ☐ Democratic Republic of the Congo | ☐ Lesotho | ☐ Saint Kitts and Nevis | ☐ Zimbabwe |
| ☐ Denmark | ☐ Liberia | ☐ Saint Lucia | |

The Commission will publish all contributions to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. **For the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, 'business association', 'consumer association', 'EU citizen') country of origin, organisation name and size, and its transparency register number, are always published. Your e-mail address will never be published.** Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

* Contribution 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 organisation details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.

☒ **Public**

Organisation details and respondent details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published. Your name will also be published.

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

Since 2021 have you applied for EU funding managed directly or indirectly by the European Commission?

Maximum 1 selection(s)

☒ Yes

☐ No

Which funds have you applied for?

☒ Horizon Europe

☐ Digital Europe

☐ Innovation Fund

☐ InvestEU

☐ LIFE

☐ Connecting Europe Facility

☐ European Defence Fund

☐ European Defence Industry Reinforcement Through Common Procurement Act (EDIRPA)

☐ Act in support of Ammunition programme (ASAP)

☐ IRIS²

☐ European Space Programme (including Cassini Initiative)

☐ Euratom Research and Training Programme

- ☐ ITER
- ☐ EU4Health
- ☐ Other

If other: please indicate which fund

Was one or more of your application(s) successful? (Did you receive funding for your project?)

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

For which programme(s)/fund(s)?

- ☒ Horizon Europe
- ☐ Digital Europe
- ☐ Innovation Fund
- ☐ InvestEU
- ☐ LIFE
- ☐ Connecting Europe Facility
- ☐ European Defence Fund
- ☐ European Defence Industry Reinforcement Through Common Procurement Act (EDIRPA)
- ☐ Act in support of Ammunition programme (ASAP)
- ☐ IRIS²
- ☐ European Space Programme (including Cassini initiative)
- ☐ Euratom Research and Training Programme
- ☐ ITER
- ☐ EU4Health
- ☐ Other

How would you describe your experience?

	Very positive	Positive	Negative	Very negative	No opinion
Identifying the funding opportunity	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

The relevance and clarity of the calls	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
The duration of the procedure	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
The application procedure	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
The evaluation of your proposal	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
The implementation of the project	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
The disbursement of the funding	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

Please describe what you consider to be the key challenges in this procedure

500 character(s) maximum

The resources needed to prepare a proposal are substantial and often the time from publication to submission is too short to ensure integration of all project partners, particularly private sector partners, that might need time for internal assessment before joining a consortium. The administrative burden for application and management of EU projects is too high for private sector partners. Funding that should be going towards research is instead allocated to administrative tasks.

Part 2. EU funding on Competitiveness

The Commission has preliminarily identified the following challenges linked to competitiveness. How important are these challenges in your view?

	Very important	Important	Moderately important	Not important	No opinion
The innovation and technological gap for the EU in strategic technologies, with respect to key competitors globally	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Underinvestment in research and innovation	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Disparities in innovation and industrial capacity across Member States	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of fertilisation between civil and military research and development	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
Insufficient innovation and manufacturing capacity for strategic technologies	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Insufficient focus of EU funding on EU strategic priorities	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

Lack of coherence between EU, national and regional policies for competitiveness	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Climate resilience and costs associated with decarbonisation	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Excessive dependence of the EU on non-EU countries for critical inputs, raw materials and strategic technologies	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Access to finance for small businesses and for scale-up companies from research to manufacturing	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Attracting world class researchers, skilled workers and entrepreneurs from abroad	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Incapacity to translate innovation into marketable technologies, and failure to integrate these technologies into the EU's industrial base	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Mismatch between skills and labour market demands	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Digitalisation and diffusion of advanced technologies in key sectors	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Insufficient private investment, including by institutional investors	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Challenges related to the effective protection of EU funds against fraud, corruption and other illegal activity	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Other (please specify below)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

If other: please specify below

500 character(s) maximum

Lack of coherence between R&I investment and regulatory environment

Which development stages for technologies and products should be supported by the next MFF to support EU competitiveness?

	To a large extent	Somewhat	Very little	Not at all	Don't know/not applicable
Fundamental research	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Applied research	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Early-stage development of technologies	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Scaling up	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Industrial deployment	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Manufacturing capacities	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (please specify below)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

If other, please specify

The entire research and innovation cycle needs to be supported. any gaps in this cycle will create barriers to transnational research.

To what extent does the current EU budget contribute to addressing the following challenges?

	To a large extent	Somewhat	Very little	Not at all
Attracting world class researchers, skilled workers and entrepreneurs from abroad	☒	☐	☐	☐
Facilitating collaboration between research and industry	☐	☐	☒	☐
Translation of innovation into marketable technologies, and integration of these technologies into the EU's industrial base	☐	☐	☒	☐
Disparities in innovation and industrial capacity and resources across Member States	☐	☐	☒	☐
Providing world class technological and research infrastructure across the EU	☐	☒	☐	☐
Reducing excessive dependencies in critical inputs, raw materials and strategic technologies	☐	☒	☐	☐
Fertilisation between civil and military research and development	☐	☒	☐	☐
Ensuring continuity in EU funding across the stages from research to manufacturing	☐	☐	☒	☐
Demand-side public initiatives for innovation and strategic technologies (e.g. procurement, standards)	☐	☒	☐	☐
Decarbonisation and environmental sustainability of strategic sectors	☐	☒	☐	☐
Digitalisation and diffusion of advanced technologies in key sectors	☐	☒	☐	☐

Support for small businesses and for scale up companies from research to manufacturing	☐	☐	☒	☐
Insufficient mobilisation of private financing (e.g. by de-risking private investment)	☐	☐	☒	☐
Other (please specify below)	☐	☐	☐	☐

The Commission has identified a number of possible measures for EU funding to better support EU competitiveness. To what extent do you think such measures could have a positive impact?

	To a large extent	Somewhat	Very little	Not at all	Don't know/ not applicable
Applying common rules, timelines and eligibility criteria to all relevant EU funds	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Increased focus of funding on key current and future strategic priorities	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Reducing the number of EU funding programmes	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Continuity in EU funding from research to manufacturing	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Aligning industrial and research policies and investment at EU and national levels	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Increase international collaboration with like-minded non-EU partners	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Targeted tools and measures to limit EU dependencies in strategic key sectors	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Strengthen business advisory support services (e.g. coaching, mentoring, training) for successful applicants	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
User-friendly IT tools	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Better feedback to applicants	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Introduce more flexibility into resource allocation to react to crises and emerging needs	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Place greater focus on achieving results, including via performance-based funding (such as financing not linked to costs)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
Preventing and combat fraud and corruption better as well as other illegal activities targeting EU funds	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

Other (please specify below)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------



If other, please specify

install specific mechanisms for public private collaborations e.g., public private partnerships

Part 3. Closing questions

If you would like to add further information – within the scope of this questionnaire – feel free to do so here.

It is essential to ensure a strong EU R&I Framework Programme that will cover the entire research and innovation cycle and will address the needs of the different sectors. Collaborations between public and privates sectors should be prioritised, as they are essential to ensure uptake of research outcomes and translation into products, services and knowledge for the benefit of society.

An eventual competitiveness fund should ensure funding for R&I is ring-fenced and cannot be allocated to other activities. Otherwise this could result in inequalities in R&I across Europe and inevitably a reduction in R&I quality.

Attach any relevant documents to support your replies

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

Contact

SG-MFF-PUBLIC-CONSULTATIONS@ec.europa.eu