Contribution ID: 44049d08-13dc-4ee9-bca3-88b82975ba5b

Date: 04/03/2025 12:33:04

## Public consultation on the next MFF: Implementing EU funding with Member States and regions

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

#### Introduction

The current multiannual financial framework (MFF) – the EU's long-term budget – runs until the end of 2027. In 2025, the Commission will adopt comprehensive proposals for the post-2027 multiannual financial framework and for the next generation of funding programmes. These programmes provide financial support to a wide range of beneficiaries across the EU - including universities, regions, towns, civil society organisations, businesses, farmers, students, scientists and many others.

Following President von der Leyen's <u>Political Guidelines for the 2024-2029</u> <u>European Commission</u>, the Commission will work together for a simpler, more focused and responsive long-term budget that reflects the European strategic priorities with the ambition to be an 'Investment Commission', while moving towards. The next long-term budget will be simpler in the way it works – with fewer programmes and a plan for each country linking key reforms with investment, and focusing on our joint priorities, including promoting economic, social and territorial cohesion. The multiannual financial framework for the period after 2027 must reflect this.

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. The next EU long-term budget will draw lessons from the current one – notably in terms of simplicity and flexibility, speed and strategic focus.

To gather evidence to support the preparation of these proposals, the Commission is launching a series of public consultations to gather views from all interested parties on how to make the very most of every euro of the EU budget.

To deliver on these objectives, this consultation covers EU funding implemented with Members States and regions in the following policy areas: cohesion policy, common agricultural policy, fisheries and maritime policies, home affairs and Trans-European Networks. 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 three parts. Part 1 collects some information about you, while Part 2 contains questions related to the EU funds. Section 3 contains two closing questions.

It should take about 9 minutes to complete the survey. You can save your replies as a draft and finish them later. Please be concise when providing additional comments on the questions with a free text box. You can upload a document stating your views at the end of the survey.

olding your vio	Wo at the one t	or and darvey.		
Part 1				
About you				

## \*Language of my contribution

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech
- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- German
- Greek

0	Hungarian
0	Irish
0	Italian
0	Latvian
0	Lithuanian
0	Maltese
0	Polish
0	Portuguese
0	Romanian
0	Slovak
0	Slovenian
0	Spanish
0	Swedish
I am	giving my contribution as
0	Academic/research institution
0	Business association
0	Company/business
0	Consumer organisation
0	EU citizen
0	Environmental organisation
0	Non-EU citizen
0	Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
0	Public authority
0	Trade union
0	Other
First	name
F	Paul
Surn	ame
	DE RAEVE
Ema	il (this won't be published)
	fn@efn.be

## \*Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

European Federation of Nurses Associations (EFN)

## \*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.

87872442953-08

### \*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.

		 inionioanon or onton arro	90,	it note and practices.	
	Afghanistan	Djibouti		Libya	Saint Martin
	Åland Islands	Dominica		Liechtenstein	Saint Pierre and
					Miquelon
	Albania	Dominican		Lithuania	Saint Vincent
		Republic			and the
					Grenadines
	Algeria	Ecuador		Luxembourg	Samoa
	American Samoa	Egypt		Macau	San Marino
	Andorra	El Salvador		Madagascar	São Tomé and
					Príncipe
	Angola	Equatorial Guinea	a	Malawi	Saudi Arabia
	Anguilla	Eritrea		Malaysia	Senegal
	Antarctica	Estonia		Maldives	Serbia
0	Antigua and	Eswatini		Mali	Seychelles
	Barbuda				
0	Argentina	Ethiopia		Malta	Sierra Leone
	Armenia	Falkland Islands		Marshall Islands	Singapore

	Aruba	0	Faroe Islands		Martinique		Sint Maarten
	Australia		Fiji		Mauritania		Slovakia
	Austria		Finland		Mauritius		Slovenia
0	Azerbaijan		France	0	Mayotte		Solomon Islands
	Bahamas		French Guiana		Mexico		Somalia
	Bahrain		French Polynesia	0	Micronesia		South Africa
0	Bangladesh	0	French Southern		Moldova		South Georgia
			and Antarctic				and the South
			Lands				Sandwich
							Islands
	Barbados		Gabon		Monaco		South Korea
	Belarus		Georgia		Mongolia		South Sudan
0	Belgium		Germany		Montenegro		Spain
	Belize		Ghana		Montserrat		Sri Lanka
0	Benin		Gibraltar		Morocco		Sudan
0	Bermuda		Greece		Mozambique		Suriname
0	Bhutan		Greenland		Myanmar/Burma		Svalbard and
							Jan Mayen
0	Bolivia		Grenada		Namibia		Sweden
0	Bonaire Saint		Guadeloupe		Nauru		Switzerland
	Eustatius and						
	Saba						
	Bosnia and		Guam		Nepal		Syria
	Herzegovina						
	Botswana		Guatemala		Netherlands		Taiwan
	Bouvet Island	0	Guernsey		New Caledonia		Tajikistan
	Brazil	0	Guinea		New Zealand		Tanzania
	British Indian		Guinea-Bissau		Nicaragua		Thailand
	Ocean Territory						
	British Virgin	0	Guyana		Niger		The Gambia
	Islands						
0	Brunei	0	Haiti	0	Nigeria	0	Timor-Leste
0	Bulgaria		Heard Island and	0	Niue		Togo
			McDonald Islands	3			
	Burkina Faso		Honduras		Norfolk Island		Tokelau

Burundi	Hong Kong	Northern	0	Tonga
		Mariana Islands		
Cambodia	Hungary	North Korea		Trinidad and
				Tobago
Cameroon	Iceland	North Macedonia	0	Tunisia
Canada	India	Norway		Türkiye
Cape Verde	Indonesia	Oman	0	Turkmenistan
Cayman Islands	Iran	Pakistan	0	Turks and
				Caicos Islands
Central African	Iraq	Palau		Tuvalu
Republic				
Chad	Ireland	Palestine	0	Uganda
Chile	Isle of Man	Panama	0	Ukraine
China	Israel	Papua New	0	United Arab
		Guinea		Emirates
Christmas Island	Italy	Paraguay	0	United Kingdom
Clipperton	Jamaica	Peru	0	United States
Cocos (Keeling)	Japan	Philippines	0	United States
Islands				Minor Outlying
				Islands
Colombia	Jersey	Pitcairn Islands	0	Uruguay
Comoros	Jordan	Poland	0	US Virgin Islands
Congo	Kazakhstan	Portugal	0	Uzbekistan
Cook Islands	Kenya	Puerto Rico	0	Vanuatu
Costa Rica	Kiribati	Qatar		Vatican City
Côte d'Ivoire	Kosovo	Réunion	0	Venezuela
Croatia	Kuwait	Romania	0	Vietnam
Cuba	Kyrgyzstan	Russia	0	Wallis and
				Futuna
Curaçao	Laos	Rwanda	0	Western Sahara
Cyprus	Latvia	Saint Barthélemy	0	Yemen
Czechia	Lebanon	Saint Helena	0	Zambia
		Ascension and		
		Tristan da Cunha		

Democratic	Lesotho	Saint Kitts and	Zimbabwe
Republic of the		Nevis	
Congo			
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. Fo r 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

#### Part 2 - Questions related to EU funds implemented with Member States and regions

How important are the following policy challenges to you?

	Very important	Important	Moderately important	Not at all important	Don't know/not applicable
--	-------------------	-----------	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------------------

Limited public investment capacities to meet the needs of EU priorities (e.g. green and digital transitions, security, competitiveness)	0	•	©	•	©
Persisting social, economic, regional and territorial disparities	0	•	0	0	©
Limited capacity of regions and communities to benefit from the single market and new economic opportunities	0	•	•	0	0
Demographic challenges	0	0	•	0	0
Labour and skills shortages, need for upskilling and reskilling, and unpreparedness of education and training systems for the 21st century	•	©	•	•	•
Decline in labour productivity and competitiveness	0	0	0	0	•
Lack of progress in addressing poverty and social exclusion	0	•	0	0	0
Barriers to the access to essential services, health, quality care, housing and social protection	•	0	0	0	0
Digitalisation of the public administration, including public services and the justice systems	0	0	0	0	•
Digital transformation in key sectors	0	•	0	0	0
Lack of connectivity in Member States and regions (e.g. transport, energy and digital)	©	0	0	•	•
Challenges related to the respect of the rule of law (e.g. independence of the judiciary, right to a fair trial, fight against corruption)	0	0	©	©	•
Challenges related to the effective protection of EU funds against fraud, corruption and other illegal activity	0	0	•	0	•

Security threats such as organised crime	0	0	0	0	•
Challenges related to ensuring a complete and fully functioning Schengen area with the free movement of people	0	•	•	•	•
Challenges related to migration and asylum management	©	•	0	0	0
Increasing impacts of climate change and environmental degradation (e.g. natural disasters, loss of biodiversity)	•	•	•	•	•
Decarbonising the economy	0	•	0	0	0
Securing an affordable, sustainable and secure energy supply	0	0	0	0	•
Maximising the potential of the circular economy	0	•	0	0	0
Securing a stable supply of high- quality food at all times at reasonable prices	0	0	0	0	•
Economic disparities and crises faced by the agricultural and fishery sectors	0	0	0	•	•
Struggling cultural and creative sectors, precarity of artists, limited access to culture and preservation of heritage	0	0	•	•	•
Other (please specify below)	•	0	0	0	0

If you have identified other policy challenges or would like to elaborate on the challenges above, please specify (mentioning the policy area to which you refer in the latter case):

500 character(s) maximum

The shortage of healthcare professionals must be addressed otherwise the EU healthcare systems will collapse. A designated EU fund should be developed to invest in EU healthcare workforce capacity building and development.

To what extent do you consider the following factors as obstacles to the EU budget achieving its objectives?

	To a large extent	Somewhat	Very little	Not at all	Don't know/ not applicable
Too many funds with overlapping objectives	•	0	0	0	0
Different and often complex fund-specific rules on access to funding and compliance	0	0	0	0	•
Administrative capacity at national, regional and local level	0	0	0	0	•
Administrative burden for beneficiaries, regional and national authorities	0	0	0	0	•
Overly complicated governance and distribution of funds	0	•	0	0	0
Lack of flexibility to adapt to new and unforeseen developments	•	0	0	0	0
Lack of consistency and effectiveness to deliver on EU policy priorities	•	0	0	0	0
Insufficient alignment with national policies	0	•	0	0	0
Low absorption of funds and insufficient number of high-quality projects	•	0	0	0	0
Insufficient focus on projects with the highest EU added value (e.g. multi-country projects)	•	0	0	0	0
Insufficient focus on achieving results	•	0	0	0	0
Insufficient mobilisation of private financing (e. g. by de-risking private investment)	0	0	0	0	•
National regulatory environment makes EU funding less effective	•	0	0	0	0
Fraud, corruption and other illegal activities targeting EU funds	0	0	0	0	•
Other (please specify below)	•	0	0	0	0

## If you have identified any other obstacles, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

The European Commission is always saying that EU funds cannot be used for EU domestic health workforce capacity building and development because of Subsidiarity, but this must change. Investing in the health workforce is a shared competence of the EU and the Member States!

To what extent do you agree that the below objectives are supported by EU policies - for Cohesion Policy?

	To a large extent	Somewhat	Very little	Not at all	Don't know/not applicable
Contribute to achieving EU objectives, including territorial, social and economic cohesion	•	0	0	0	0
Support EU public goods (e.g. cross-border / multi-country projects)	0	•	0	0	0
Address cross-border challenges (e.g. climate change)	•	0	0	0	0

To what extent do you agree that the below objectives are supported by EU policies - for Common agriculture policy?

	To a large extent	Somewhat	Very little	Not at all	Don't know/not applicable
Contribute to achieving EU objectives, including a fair standard of living for the farming community) and to making the agricultural sector attractive to new entrants	0	•	•	0	•
Support EU public goods (e.g. the provision of eco-system services, and cross-border cooperation)	0	•	0	0	0
Address cross-border challenges (e.g. climate change, food security)	0	•	0	0	0

To what extent do you agree that the below objectives are supported by EU policies - for Fisheries and maritime policies?

	To a large extent	Somewhat	Very little	Not at all	Don't know/not applicable
Contribute to achieving EU objectives, including fostering sustainable fisheries, and restoring and conserving aquatic biological resources	0	0	0	0	•
Support EU public goods (e.g. cross-border cooperation)	0	0	0	0	•
Address cross-border challenges (e.g. climate change)	0	0	0	0	•

To what extent do you agree that the below objectives are supported by EU policies - for Home affairs?

	To a large extent	Somewhat	Very little	Not at all	Don't know/not applicable
Contribute to achieving EU objectives, including efficient management of migration, asylum and external borders	0	•	©	0	•
Support EU public goods (e.g. cross-border / multi-country projects)	0	0	0	0	•
Address cross-border challenges (e.g. security threats)	0	0	0	0	•

# To what extent do you agree that the below objectives are supported by EU policies - for Trans-European Networks?

	To a large extent	Somewhat	Very little	Not at all	Don't know/not applicable
Contribute to achieving EU objectives, including a smooth functioning single market, and territorial, social and economic cohesion	0	0	0	0	•
Support EU cross-border / multi-country infrastructure projects	0	0	0	0	•
Address cross-border challenges (e.g. military mobility and defence, climate change)	0	0	0	0	•

# To what extent do you agree that the following options could help the EU budget become more effective and efficient?

	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	0	0	0	0	•
Fewer, clearer and simpler rules	0	0	0	0	•
Reduce the number of EU funding programmes	0	0	0	0	•
Simplify the management of EU funding programmes at national and regional level	0	0	0	0	•
Prioritise projects with high EU added value, such as multi-country projects and projects that contribute to the EU's strategic priorities	•	0	0	0	0
Introduce more flexibility into resource allocation to react to crises and emerging needs	•	0	0	0	0

Use funds to promote both reforms and investments	•	0	0	0	0
Simplify access to funding for beneficiaries	0	•	0	0	0
Use more EU funds to stimulate private and national investment, including through financial instruments (e.g. loans, guarantees, equity)	0	0	0	0	•
Place greater focus on achieving results, including via performance-based funding (such as financing not linked to costs)	0	•	0	0	•
Prevent and combat fraud and corruption better, as well as other illegal activities targeting EU funds	0	0	0	0	•
Other (please specify below)	•	0	0	0	0

If you have identified other ways to make the EU budget more effective, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

EU Member States should be able to use EU funding to invest in domestic health workforce capacity building and development. The European Commission must stop hiding behind subsidiarity, and develop a dedicated EU fund for the health workforce, which is key for the resilience of the EU healthcare systems!

Do you agree that the policies covered by the EU budget should continue to support all types of regions and communities in the future?

Maximum	1	selection(s)	
---------	---	--------------	--

Yes

■ No

## If you selected 'yes', please explain why:

500 character(s) maximum

EU funding must be made available to support EU Member States in investing in health workforce capacity building and development, otherwise EU healthcare systems will collapse, putting the livelihood of millions of patients and citizens at risk.

## If you have any concrete suggestions for improvement, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

EU funding should be directed to EU domestic health workforce capacity building and development. We need highly educated and qualified EU nurses, in line with the Directive 2013/55/EU, otherwise EU healthcare systems will collapse. So the EU and the Member States must stop hiding behind subsidiarity.

If you think that these stakeholders could be involved more effectively, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

Nurses and their representatives, such as EFN, should be involved at all stages in the planning and coordination of funding opportunities for EU health workforce capacity building and development, to ensure that they are tackling the most urgent frontline needs of EU nurses.

Which of the following aspects do you consider the most important for improving the administrative and institutional capacity of public administrations in Member States?

	Predictability of the programming cycle associated with EU-funded investments
	Flexibility to address a wide variety of Member States' needs
<b>V</b>	Focus on key EU priorities with more EU added value
	Helping Member States to identify the areas where technical support would be
	more impactful
	Sustainability of capacity over time
	Support a wide range of beneficiaries in public administrations at different
	levels
	Support and information about funding opportunities to potential beneficiaries
	/applicants
	Addressing skills needs of national, regional and local authorities
1	Other (please specify below)
	Don't know / unable to answer

If you have identified any another aspects, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

EU Member States must be able to use EU funds to investing domestic health workforce capacity building and development.

#### Part 3 - Closing questions

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

2000 character(s) maximum

Through the Recovery and Resilience Facility and the National Recovery and Resilience Plans, some EU Member states have invested in initiatives meant to support their domestic health workforce, showing that this can be done. Therefore EU funds can and must play a key role in supporting the EU Member States in developing a strong and resilient domestic health workforce. This must be a central component of the new MFF. During COVID-19 everyone was clapping the nurses, but now it looks like everyone has forgotten

already, as the EU and the Member States cut the healthcare budgets. Unless this changes quickly, and more EU and National funding is provided, we will not be ready for the next pandemic! Therefore what is needed is clear: we need a new EU fund, building on previous good practices like the RRF and the RRPs, dedicated to EU health workforce capacity building and development!

Please attach any relevant documents to support your replies.

File upload box - 1 MB max and only pdf, txt, doc, docx, odt and rtf files are allowed.

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

cb219447-b5f3-4f59-a30e-e980170668f1/Navigating-the-EU-nursing-workforce-crisis-July-2024.pdf

#### Contact

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