Contribution ID: fa3d7580-6550-46bc-b19f-b626a5735a20

Date: 20/02/2018 16:28:19

# Public Consultation on EU funds in the area of Cohesion

lds marked with * are mandatory.
----------------------------------

## Introduction

#### Read the introduction

#### Guidance

- Are you replying as a as an individual in your personal capacity? If so, please tick the first option under question 1. You will then be invited to enter your personal details and then led directly to questions 27 to 40 which relate to EU funds in the area of cohesion.
- Are you replying as an entity or in your professional capacity? If so, please tick the second option under question 1. You will then be invited to enter your personal details as well as information on the entity of behalf of which you are replying and then then led directly to questions 27 40 which relate to EU funds in the area of cohesion.
- In both cases, you may skip the non-mandatory questions and upload a document (1 MB max) under point 41 and enter any other comment under point 42. Please do not include any personal data in documents submitted in the context of the consultation if you opt for anonymous publication. It is important to read the specific privacy statement for information on how your personal data and contribution will be dealt with.

# About you

Kenny

*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 Samuel
*9	Respondent's last name

\*10 Respondent's professional email address

samuel.kenny@transportenvironment.org
11 Name of the organisation
Transport & Environment
12 Postal address of the organisation
18 Square de Meeus, Brussels 1050, Belgium
13 Type of organisation Please select the answer option that fits best.  Private enterprise
<ul> <li>Professional consultancy, law firm, self-employed consultant</li> <li>Trade, business or professional association</li> </ul>
Non-governmental organisation, platform or network
Research and academia
<ul> <li>Churches and religious communities</li> <li>Regional or local authority (public or mixed)</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>International or national public authority</li> </ul>
Other
22 Is your organisation included in the Transparency Register?  If your organisation is not registered, we invite you to register <a href="here">here</a> , although it is not compulsory to be registered to reply to this consultation. <a href="https://www.why.a.gov.negister">Why a transparency register</a> ?
Yes
<ul><li>No</li><li>Not applicable</li></ul>
23 If so, please indicate your Register ID number.
58744833263-19
24 Country of organisation's headquarters  O Austria
Belgium
Bulgaria
Croatia
© Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia

	Finland
	France
	Germany
	Greece
	Hungary
	Ireland
	Italy
	Latvia
	Lithuania
	Luxembourg
	Malta
	Netherlands
	Poland
	Portugal
	Romania
	Slovak Republic
	Slovenia
	Spain
	Sweden
0	United Kingdom
0	Other
	Your contribution,
	hat, whatever option chosen, your answers may be subject to a request for public access to documents under Regulation (EC) 49/2001
0	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.
EU F	Funds in the area of cohesion
27 F	lease let us know whether you have experience with one or more of the following funds and
progra	ammes
at me	ost 6 choice(s)
<b>√</b>	The European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)
1	The Cohesion Fund (CF)

28 Please let us know to which of the following one or more topics your replies will refer

☐ The European Social Fund (ESF)

Employment and Social Innovation (EaSI)

The European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF)The Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived (FEAD)

## at most 3 choice(s)

- Economic and sustainable development
- Employment, skills and education
- Social inclusion

29 The Commission has preliminarily identified a number of policy challenges which programmes/funds under the policy area of cohesion could address. How important are these policy challenges in your view?

	Very important	,   '		Rather not important	Not important at all	No opinion
a. Promote economic growth in the EU as a whole	0	0	0	0	0	•
b. Reduce regional disparities and underdevelopment of certain EU regions	0	0	0	0	0	•
c. Address the adverse side-effects of globalisation	0	0	0	0	0	•
d. Reduce unemployment, promote quality jobs and support labour mobility	0	0	©	0	0	•
e. Promote social inclusion and combat poverty	0	0	0	0	0	•
f. Promote common values (e.g. rule of law, fundamental rights, equality and non- discrimination)	•	0	•	0	0	•

g. Facilitate transition to low carbon and circular economy, ensure environmental protection and resilience to disasters and climate change	•	•	•	•	•	•
h. Foster research and innovation across the EU	0	0	0	0	0	•
i. Facilitate transition to digital economy and society	0	0	0	•	0	•
j. Promote sustainable transport and mobility	•	0	0	0	0	0
k. Promote territorial cooperation (interregional, cross-border, transnational)	0	0	0	0	0	•
I. Support education and training for skills and life-long learning	0	0	0	0	0	•
m. Improve quality of institutions and administrative capacity	0	0	0	0	0	•

n. Promote sound economic governance and the implementation of reforms	0	•	•	•	•	•
o. Other (please give degree of importance here and fill in question 30 below)	•	0	•	0	0	•

	To a large extent	To a fairly large extent	To some extent only	Not at all	No opinio
a. Promote economic growth in the EU as a whole	0	0	0	0	•
b. Reduce regional disparities and underdevelopment of certain EU regions	0	0	0	0	•
c. Address the adverse side-effects of globalisation	0	0	0	0	•
d. Reduce unemployment, promote quality jobs and support labour mobility	0	0	0	0	•
e. Promote social inclusion and combat poverty	0	0	0	0	•
f. Promote common values (e.g. rule of law, fundamental rights, equality and non-discrimination)	0	0	0	0	•
g. Facilitate transition to low carbon and circular economy, ensure environmental protection and resilience to disasters and climate change	0	0	•	0	0
h. Foster research and innovation across the EU	0	0	0	0	•
i. Facilitate transition to digital economy and society	0	0	0	0	•
j. Promote sustainable transport and mobility	0	0	•	0	0
k. Promote territorial cooperation (interregional, cross-border, transnational)	0	0	0	0	•
I. Support education and training for skills and lifelong learning	0	0	0	0	•
m. Improve quality of institutions and administrative capacity	0	0	0	0	•
n. Promote sound economic governance and the implementation of reforms	0	0	0	0	•
o. Other (please give degree of importance here	0	0	0	0	0

30 If you selected 'Other' in the above question, please specify it here:

32 If you selected 'Other' in the above question, please specify it here:

200 character(s) maximum

200 character(s) maximum

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 without EU funds?
To a large output

- To a large extent
- To a fairly large extent
- To some extent only
- Not at all
- Don't know

34 Please explain how the current programmes/funds can add value compared to what Member States could achieve at national, regional and/or local levels

1500 character(s) maximum

Please clearly indicate to which policies, programmes and funds your answers refer.

The EU is comprised of a wide variety of countries and regions. These are not all equally economically prosperous. That is what makes the ESIF funds (CF and ERDF) so important to the future of Europe; they can provide financing to places that otherwise have no access to such money or would have to take unstable loans from elsewhere to build the infrastructure. The fact that the funds are part of the EU means that they can coordinate projects under the umbrella of different policy objectives. Decarbonising transport isone such policy objective that the ESIF funds must contribute to.

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?

1500 character(s) maximum

Please clearly indicate to which policies, programmes and funds your answers refer.

The management of the Cohesion and European Regional Development Funds is very sporadic in comparison with other funding schemes (e.g. CEF). Management is done at local level, including the drafting of tenders and the appraisal of responses. Although language exists on sustainability in the legislation relating to the ESIF funds, it is impossible to gauge the importance of such language in the projects themselves. Applications are confidential and a harmonised Climate Impact Assessment doesn't exist for such projects. There should be a CIA developed for all EU-funded transport projects. This would help to ensure smarter spending and also make auditing simpler regarding climate spending. Furthermore, more control/management of ESIF funds at EU level could ensure alignment of projects with EU policy and objectives.

In addition, the EU should set aside specific grants for independent NGOs in ESIF countries. Civil society must be given the capacity and opportunity to monitor how EU money is being spent. This is an essential aspect of ensuring money is spent well and corruption is avoided.

36 To what extent do you consider the following as obstacles which prevent the current programmes /funds from successfully achieving their objectives?

	To a large extent	To a fairly large extent	To some extent only	Not at all	No opinion
--	-------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------	------------------	---------------

a. Complex procedures leading to high     administrative burden and delays	0	•	0	0	0
b. Heavy audit and control requirements	0	•	0	0	0
c. Available funding does not address the real challenges	•	0	0	0	0
d. Insufficient administrative capacity to manage programmes	0	•	0	0	0
e. Insufficient information about funding and selection process	•	0	0	0	0
f. Lack of flexibility to react to unforeseen circumstances	0	0	0	0	•
g. Difficulty of combining EU action with other public interventions	•	0	0	0	0
h. Insufficient synergies between the EU programmes/funds	•	0	0	0	0
i. Difficulty to ensure the sustainability of projects when the financing period ends	•	0	0	0	0
j. Insufficient use of financial instruments	•	0	0	0	0
k. Co-financing rates	0	0	0	•	0
I. Late disbursement of funds / delays in payments to beneficiaries	0	0	0	0	•
m. Insufficient linkages of the Funds with the EU economic governance and the implementation of structural reforms	0	•	0	0	•
n. Legal uncertainty	0	•	0	0	0
o. Insufficient ownership	0	•	0	0	0
p. Insufficient involvement of civil society in design and implementation	•	0	0	0	0
q. Other (please specify below)	0	0	0	0	0

37	lf '	vou	selected	'Other'	in the	above	question,	please	specif	v it he	re

1	1000 character(s) maximum								

<sup>38</sup> To what extent would these steps help to further simplify and reduce administrative burdens for beneficiaries under current programmes/funds?

	To a large extent	To a fairly large extent	To some extent only	Not at all	No opinion
a. Alignment of rules between EU funds	•	0	0	0	0
b. Fewer, clearer, shorter rules	0	•	0	0	0
c. More freedom for national authorities to set rules	0	0	•	0	0
d. More flexibility of activity once funding is eligible	0	0	0	•	0
e. More flexibility of resource allocation to respond to unexpected needs	0	0	0	•	0
f. Simplify the ex-ante conditionalities	0	0	0	0	•
g. More effective stakeholders' involvement in the programming, implementation and evaluation	•	0	0	0	0
h. Other (please specify below)	0	0	0	0	0

39 If you selected 'Other' in the above question, please specify it h	equestion, please specify it her	ve c	ie a	n the	r in	Other	selected	it you	39
---	----------------------------------	------	------	-------	------	-------	----------	--------	----

Tuuu character(s) maximum								

40 How could synergies among programmes/funds in this area be further strengthened to avoid possible overlaps/duplication? For example, would you consider grouping/merging some programmes/funds?

1500 character(s) maximum

Please clearly indicate to which policies, programmes and funds your answers refer.

If management of funds is maintained at a regional/national level then there should be more resources spent on auditing projects to ensure transparency and the respecting of EU policy, as well as climate objectives. There should be more involvement of civil society from the countries receiving the funds regarding design and implementation.

# 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.

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

A Climate Impact Assessment that is applicable to all EU-funded transport projects should be developed to ensure that EU investment is in line with the objective to decarbonise this sector, which is now Europe's largest emitter. Money should be streamlined for decarbonisation projects and away from projects that encourage the use of fossil fuels. A Climate Impact Assessment must become an independent pillar of all Cost Benefit Analyses and should also be then made available publicly to ensure transparency and proper auditing at EU level.

The ESIF funds should be more centrally managed at EU-level to reduce the risk of being misspent. This would also better ensure that there's a corollary between EU policy and EU spending.

### Contact

Dana.DJOUDJEV@ec.europa.eu