**Consultation on a future EU financial instrument for the environment (continuation of LIFE+)**

**Section 1 : About you**

To help us analyse the answers to this consultation, please provide the following information about you or your organisation.

* 1. Please state your name (surname, first name)(optional)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

* 1. Please state your email address (optional)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

* 1. In which country are you located?\* (compulsory) (at most 1 answer)

Austria

Belgium

Bulgaria

Cyprus

Czech Republic

Germany

Denmark

Estonia

Spain

Finland

France

Greece

Hungary

Ireland

Italy

Lithuania

Luxembourg

Latvia

Malta

Netherlands

Poland

Portugal

Romania

Sweden

Slovenia

Slovakia

United Kingdom

Croatia

Republic of Macedonia

Turkey

Iceland

Liechtenstein

Norway

Switzerland

Other

If other please specify\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

* 1. Have you heard of the LIFE Programme before?\* (compulsory) (at most 1 answer)

Yes

No

* 1. Have you or your organisation benefited from a grant under the LIFE Programme or previous NGO programme for environmental NGOs?\* (compulsory) (at most 1 answer)

Yes

No

* 1. In which environmental sector do you (or your organisation) operate?\* (compulsory) (between 1 and 14 answers)

Nature and biodiversity

Water

Waste

Sustainable management of natural resources

Climate change

Energy efficiency

Chemicals

Air quality

Industry

Noise

Health

Environmental governance

Awareness raising for the environment

Other

None

If other please specify\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

* 1. In which capacity are you participating in this consultation?\* (compulsory) (at most 1 answer)

Private individual

Organisation

Competent authority

**Section 2: Designing a future EU financial instrument for the environment**

The LIFE Programme has been operational since 1992 and the current LIFE + Regulation applies to the period 2007-2013. The European Commission is currently analysing the need for a specific EU financial instrument for environmental protection beyond 2013.

1. To what extend do you consider that there is a need for a specific EU financial instrument for the environment?\* (compulsory) (at most 1 answer)

To a great extend

To some extend

To a small extend

Not at all

I do not know

1. What are the main justifications for a EU financial instrument for the environment?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very relevant | Relevant | Not very relevant | Not at all relevant | Don’t know |
| The implementation of EU environmental policies and legislation is challenging and therefore requires specific financial assistance from the EU.\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adopting only policy or regulatory approaches to environment at EU level is insufficient. It needs to be complemented with EU funding for environment.\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |
| Some environmental problems (eg. Pollution at river basin scale, air pollution, protection of migratory species) can be efficiently addressed only at a scale that is broader than national, with financial support from the EU.\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |
| A specific EU financial instrument for the environment boosts transnational cooperation to identify common solutions to environmental challenges.\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |
| Although other EU financial instruments (such as the Common Agricultural Policy, the Structural Funds, the Cohesion Fund, etc) can theoretically finance environmental projects, an EU financial instrument for the environment guarantees that funds are available specifically for this sector.\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |

2bis. If you think of other valuable justification, please specify (optional)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. A future EU financial instrument for the environment should ...

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Respond to current European and global challenges for the environment and contribute to EU strategy for a sustainable growth.\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Support the implementation and the update of the existing EU environmental policy and legislation at national, regional and local levels.\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contribute through a multiplier effect, to an increased and more efficient mobilisation of EU and domestic funds for environmental protection.\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contribute to demonstration sharing of “best practices” and transfer of knowledge on how to address major environmental problems.\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contribute to boosting innovative actions for environmental protection.\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Allow EU-wide exchange of information and awareness raising actions on environmental topics.\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |  |

3bis. If you think of other relevant objectives, please specify (optional)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Should the annual budget of the EU financial instrument for the environment be:\* (compulsory) (at most 1 answer)

Higher than the current annual budget of LIFE +

Equivalent than the current annual budget of LIFE +

Lower than the current annual budget of LIFE +

I do not know

If higher, please explain why\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

If equivalent, please explain why\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

If lower, please explain why\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Currently, LIFE + can only finance activities taking place within the territory of the EU Member States. However, in some cases, for action to be effective, investment outside the EU may be required (eg. Migratory species, international river basins etc.). Such activities may not necessarily be supported by other EU financing instruments.

Should the future EU financial instrument for the environment foresee the possibility for some activities to be carried out outside the EU?\* (compulsory) (at most 1 answer)

Yes

No

I don’t know

If Yes please choose one or several options \* (compulsory) (between 1 and 4 answers)

Provided there is a clear contribution to achieving an EU policy objective

In countries aiming at becoming members of the EU in the future ( “candidate countries” and “potential candidates”)

In countries neighbouring the EU

Other

If no please justify\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

If other please specify\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Currently, LIFE + should not finance activities that could be financed by other EU funds. However, enhancing synergies between LIFE + and other EU programmes for the financing of environment protection (related to the Common Agricultural Policy, the Structural Funds, the Cohesion Fund etc.) is a challenging task.

Please state the extent to which you agree with the following statements:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Don’t know |
| In order to better address environmental problems, a structured cooperation between the future EU financial instrument for the environment and other EU funding instruments should be established.\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |
| Due to its more limited size, the future EU financial instrument for the environment should be a catalyst, largely preparing the ground for the intervention of other EU instruments, such as the structural funds, which are able to provide far larger sums for environment protection.\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |
| The various EU funding instruments available for the environment should finance different objectives and different types of projects focusing on their specific scope.\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |

1. The European Commission is currently responsible for managing the LIFE + Programme.

Should the European Commission continue to be responsible for managing the future EU financial instrument for the environment? (optional) (at most 1 answer)

Yes

No

I do not know

If no, would you prefer any of the options below? (only one option is available)\* (compulsory) (at most 1 answer)

Management by national authorities only

A shared management between the European Commission and national authorities

An EU Executive Agency

Other

If other please specify\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Section 3: Possible actions and areas to be covered by a future EU financial instrument for the environment**

1. Three types of interventions are currently possible under LIFE +: action grants for project implementation (main part of the budget), operating grants (in particular for environmental NGOs) and public procurement contracts for service provision.

What types of interventions should be covered by the future EU financial instrument for the environment?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very relevant | Relevant | Not very relevant | Not at all relevant | Don’t know |
| Grants for financing of environmental protection actions.\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operational funding (eg. Grants for NGOs).\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |
| Services linked to the implementation of environmental policies (eg. studies, technical assistance).\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |
| Innovative instruments/approaches such as provision of interest rate subsidies or subsidised loans, venture capital or micro-credit in the environmental sector.\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |

8bis. If you can think of other types of interventions, please specify (optional)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. No specific prioritisation is currently made between the different environmental fields covered by the LIFE + Regulation (eg. climate change, water, air, soil, etc).

In order to increase the focus of the future EU financial instrument for the environment, should the European Commission set a number of environmental thematic issues to be addressed in priority?\* (compulsory) (at most 1 answer)

Yes

No

Don’t know

If yes, which should be those priorities?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very relevant | Relevant | Not very relevant | Not at all relevant | Don’t know |
| Nature and biodiversity\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |
| Climate change\*  compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |
| Air pollution\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chemicals\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |
| Environment and health\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land use and soil\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |
| Noise\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |
| Water\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |
| Marine environment\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |
| Waste\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |
| Resource efficiency and sustainable production/ consumption\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |
| Eco-innovation\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |
| Environmental governance\* compulsory |  |  |  |  |  |

If you can think of other environmental theme not covered above, please specify (optional)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Please justify your answer (optional)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Please justify your answer\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Under the current LIFE+ Programme, the European Commission organises annual calls for proposals to award operating grants to NGOs that actively contribute to developing and implementing EU environmental policy.

Presently a broad and diverse range of European NGOs are receiving operational funding each year by the LIFE + Programme: small/large, specialised/general, regional/pan-European, involved in policy development/implementation or both, new/experienced, etc.

Is there a need to give funding in priority to certain types of NGOs?\* (compulsory) (at most 1 answer)

No, all types of European environmental NGOs should be given equal priority.

Yes, specific priority should be given to certain NGOs.

I do not know.

If yes, please choose between the following options (max.3):\* (compulsory) (between 1 and 3 answers)

NGOs that are involved in influencing EU policy shaping

NGOs working on implementation of EU policy

NGOs working on specific topics

NGOs with a large geographical coverage

New NGOs networks

Other

Which topics? (optional)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

If other, please specify\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Domestic funds and the integration of environmental objectives into the main EU financing instruments (for agriculture, rural development, fisheries and regional cohesion) remain the most important sources to finance environmental policies. Showing to regional and national authorities the benefits of investing in the environmental sector and pushing them to develop strategic frameworks may require demonstrative integrated projects (i.e. projects promoting the integrated use of the various relevant funds) that could be financed by the future EU financial instrument for the environment.

Should the future EU financial instrument for the environment encourage the submission of integrated projects demonstrating synergies with other funds?\* (compulsory) (at most 1 answer)

Yes

No

Don’t know

If yes, please explain why (optional)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

If no, please explain why\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Would such integrated projects be the right approach for funding linked to Natura 2000, in view of the existing challenges (i.e. the obligation to manage the network and varying degree of capacity to do this, together with the difficulties encountered so far in integrating the various EU funds)?\*  (compulsory) (at most 1 answer)

Yes

No

Don’t know

If yes, please explain why (optional)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

If no, Please explain why\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Could a similar approach be also applied to other sectors such as water (river basins management), the marine environment, waste etc.?\* (compulsory) (at most 1 answer)

Yes

No

Don’t know

If yes, explain why (optional)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

If no, explain why\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Section 4: Types of support within the future EU financial instrument for the environment**

1. Is 50 % the most appropriate rate for EU co-financing of environmental projects?\* (compulsory) (at most 1 answer)

Yes

No

Don’t know

If yes, please explain why (optional)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

If no, please choose between the following statements\* (compulsory) (at most 1 answer)

It should be lower

It should be higher

If it should be higher, please choose between the following statements\* (compulsory) (at most 1 answer)

In all cases

In specific cases only according to different criteria

Please choose one or more of the following criteria\* (compulsory) (between 1 and 4 answers)

The EU added value of the project

The type of project beneficiary

Socio-economic elements

Other

If other, please specify\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

The EU added value should be determined based on (please select one or more criteria)\* (compulsory)

(between 1 and 4 answers)

The project target priority habitats and species

The project addresses environmental priorities as set in the annual call for proposals

The project is a transboundary project

Other

If other please specify \* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Please select one or more types of beneficiaries that should receive a higher co-financing rate (max. 3)\* (compulsory) (between 1 and 3 answers)

NGO

University, scientific body or research institution

Public body

Private body

Other

If other please specify\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Please select one or more socio-economic elements that should trigger the benefit of receiving a higher co-financing rate.\* (compulsory) (between 1 and 3 answers)

Whether the beneficiary is based in a “convergence region” (one of the least developed regions in the EU)

Whether the beneficiary is based in a new EU Member State

Other

If other please specify\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Presently, operating grants for NGOs can reach a maximum of 70 % of the global budget, and the remainder has to be funded by other sources. This level of funding is ...\* (compulsory)

Appropriate

Too high

Too low

Don’t know

If too high, please explain why\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

If too low, please explain why\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Should a mechanism be introduced to gradually decrease the amount of operational funding for NGOs if an organisation receives such funding in consecutive years?\* (compulsory) (at most 1 answer)

Yes

No

Don’t know

If yes, please explain why (optional) (at most 2 answers)

EU grants should help organisations to get established, but funded organisations should gradually develop other funding sources and become financially independent of EU funding.

Other reasons

If other, please specify\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

If no, please explain why (optional) (at most 2 answers)

It is important to give stable support to European environmental NGOs, even for consecutive years, to ensure a permanent level of input to the EU policy process.

Other reasons

If other reasons, please specify\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Section 5: Closing questions**

1. How to increase the visibility of the results of LIFE + funded projects as well as their replication at a larger scale? Please choose one or more of the following statements (max.3)\* (compulsory)

By encouraging projects to communicate more on their results (public events, website, etc.)

By creating networks and clusters of projects within the same environmental sector or with similar objectives

By favouring projects involving a higher number of associated beneficiaries

By increasing the importance of transnational projects

By organising thematic events (conferences, expert panels, public meetings, etc.)

Other

Don’t know

If other, please specify\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. What should be done to promote the future EU financial instrument for the environment, especially at local level? Please choose one or more of the following statements (max.3)\* (compulsory)

Request more advertising from ongoing projects (information boards, contact with the medias, publications)

Encourage more advertising by the national and regional authorities

Other

Don’t know

If other, please indicate\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Is there anything you would like to say that has not been covered by the questions mentioned above?\* (compulsory) (at most 1 answer)

Yes

No

If yes, please specify\* (compulsory)

|  |
| --- |
|  |