

Invest Europe’s response to the Open Public Consultation on the European Innovation Act

This document addresses only the consultation questions for which answers have been provided

1. [Access to an easier, more coordinated framework](#)

1.1. EU definition for innovative companies, startups & scaleups

1. Has your company / organisation experienced concrete benefits or problems associated with the way in which such definitions are used in the country(ies) in which you operate?

	Yes	No	Not applicable
I find the way in which my country applies such definitions beneficial		X	
I find the way in which my country applies such definitions problematic	X		
I have experienced problems because different countries in which my organisation operates are using different definitions	X		

2. Please share your views on what we could learn from the benefits or problems that you have experienced when creating EU-wide definitions for what is a ‘start-up’, a ‘scale-up’ and an ‘innovative company’. Please also share the lessons you have learned about what elements ‘should’ or ‘should not’ be used to create EU-wide definitions.

Answer:

Defining startups, scaleups, or innovative companies through fixed thresholds – such as age, headcount, turnover, ownership, or R&D spending – risks penalizing growth and success, misclassifying investor-backed businesses, creating more problems than they solve, boxing firms into metrics that do not reflect their reality, while potentially excluding the very firms innovation policies aim to support, and at the same time including others that are not truly innovation-driven. With multiple definitions, a company’s legal and financial context could also shift each time it changes status. Innovation and scaling are non-linear and require space to pivot, consolidate, and evolve.

Private equity and venture capital (PE/VC)-backed businesses are particularly vulnerable to misclassification, as they are often mislabeled as part of larger groups due to outdated control criteria, despite operating independently with no consolidated accounts, shared services, or operational integration.

The lesson is clear: definitions should not be introduced for the sake of it. If used at all, they must remain functional, flexible, and sector-neutral, supporting firms throughout their lifecycle – from early-stage to late growth – and aligned with their financing needs, thus avoiding structural misalignments that penalize PE/VC financing. Rather than focusing on labels, EU policy should prioritize the growth journey and the activities that needs to be promoted, ensuring that support measures remain inclusive, effective, and responsive as firms evolve.

Possible way forward

3. To what extent do you agree that the establishment of EU-level definitions for 'innovative company', 'start-up' and 'scale-up' could bring the following benefits:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
Easier to operate my business in more than one country in the EU			X			
Simpler, clearer and better targeted national and EU support mechanisms for the community of innovative companies, start-ups and scale-ups			X			
Improved legal certainty on the status of the company across the EU and its associated rights and obligations			X			
Enhanced collaborations leading to a richer innovation-driven ecosystem						X
Easier access to research and technology infrastructures						X
Easier access to finance			X			
Better options for lowering the administrative and regulatory burden on start-ups, scale-ups and innovative companies			X			

4. Once EU definitions of start-ups, scale-ups and innovative companies are created, which existing requirements under EU law should be simplified for these categories of companies?

Answer:

The real question is not which EU requirements should be simplified, but who will be allowed to benefit from those simplifications once definitions are introduced. Simplification is valuable, but only if it applies to all high-potential companies, including those backed by PE/VC. These companies are often excluded from SME benefits and other simplified regimes due to outdated ownership and control criteria. If new EU definitions are used to gatekeep access to simplifications, the policy risks reinforcing the very barriers it aims to remove. This is a well-documented problem under the current SME definition and should not be repeated. This applies not only to existing requirements, but also to upcoming initiatives like the 28th regime. Innovation policy should reward ambition and scale, not disqualify companies for succeeding in attracting investment. Any simplified requirements, whether related to reporting, funding access, procurement, or regulatory compliance, should not be applied based on a company's capital

structure. Definitions must not become exclusion mechanisms or, worse, discourage investment in exactly the types of companies Europe needs to scale its innovation economy.

1.2. Innovation stress test

Current situation

5. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
There is currently legislation in place in the EU that hinders my organisation in developing and testing innovative solutions and/or easily placing them on the market.		X				
Legislators need to more carefully assess the potential impact that legislation can have on innovation, both when they prepare new legislation and when they revise existing legislation.	X					

Possible way forward

6. To what extent do you agree that, when assessing the potential impact of legislation on innovation...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
legislators should consider if it makes sense to introduce a regulatory ladder that increases regulatory requirements in line with the increasing size of companies and their impact on the market, to check if the regulatory burden can be relieved on innovative start-ups.		X				
legislators should consider if it makes sense to introduce a fast-track procedure for companies to obtain regulatory advice.		X				
legislators should consider if makes sense to make provision for		X				

regulatory sandboxes in their legislation.						
legislators should consider if it makes sense to introduce a fast-track procedure for obtaining permits for innovative technologies that are strategic for safeguarding EU economic security.		X				

7. What potential impact on innovation do you think should be considered in an innovation stress test? Note: Legislators could assess different types of potential impact on different steps and different stakeholders involved in innovation., e.g. impact that the legislation could have on hampering or stimulating the development, testing, deployment and daily use of innovation, impact on innovators, financial investors in and potential customers of the innovation, etc.

Answer:

An effective “competitiveness test” should assess whether proposed legislation could unintentionally prevent startups and scaleups from operating or growing in the EU through the lens of the full innovation cycle. It should consider how regulation affects not only innovators themselves, but also the investors who finance innovation, whose lifecycle often mirrors that of the companies they support, from formation to scale and exit. The stress test should identify any provisions that could discourage investment, because if regulation discourages capital at key growth stages, it directly undermines innovation. For private capital providers, the focus is not simply on volume of deal flow, but on whether more companies can become fundable. Regulatory frameworks – from attracting top talent to testing new technologies and scaling across borders – should help startups and scaleups reach the point where they meet the thresholds of investability by lowering structural barriers, not reinforcing them.

1.3. Regulatory sandboxes

8. Current situation

	Yes	No	Don't know
Do you / your organisation have experience with participating in or setting up a regulatory sandbox in the EU?		X	
If you answered ‘Yes’ to the first question, did you / your organisation experience any problems when involved in regulatory sandboxes in the EU?			
If you answered ‘Yes’ to the first question, did you / your organisation experience concrete benefits from being involved in regulatory sandboxes in the EU?			

Possible way forward

10. In your opinion, how important is it to address the following aspects to facilitate the wider implementation of regulatory sandboxes?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
There should be regulatory sandboxes for newly emerging technologies.		X				
There should be regulatory sandboxes for existing technologies that are evolving.		X				
There should be more possibilities for regulatory sandboxes at national level.			X			
There should be more possibilities for cross-border EU-level sandboxes.	X					
There is a need for a better common understanding across Europe on regulatory sandbox implementation to foster their wider implementation.			X			
An EU-level definition of 'regulatory sandbox' would help to achieve a better common understanding across Europe.		X				
Regulatory sandboxes should enable all types of companies from across Europe to test their innovations efficiently.		X				
There is a need for tailored initiatives to facilitate the participation of SMEs, start-ups or scale-ups in regulatory sandboxes (e.g. awareness campaigns, guidance).			X			

1.4. Coordination of innovation policies and programmes

Current situation

11. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
The insufficient coordination of innovation policies* between the EU and the national authorities as well as among the different countries themselves makes investments in innovation less effective.	X					
There is a need for better alignment of innovation programmes and investments between the EU national authorities as well as among the different countries themselves.	X					

*innovation policies, in this context, means policies for non-R&D innovation

Possible way forward

13. To what extent do you agree that the following approach is well-suited to improving coordination between innovation policies and programmes?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
Turning the existing European Innovation Council Forum into an official innovation forum at EU level – which would be composed of national high-level representatives responsible for innovation policy and programmes and the Commission – with a mandate to coordinate innovation policies, programmes and investments between the EU and national authorities, as well as among the different countries themselves.		X				

2. Access to finance

2.1. Access to sufficient financing for bringing innovations to the market

Current situation

14. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
To bring R&D successfully to the market, it is important to increase not only public investment in R&D but also simultaneously public investments in innovation.		X				
Raising investments in strategic technologies is particularly needed, due to their economic importance and high up-front costs and risks		X				
Public investment in innovation needs to be strengthened in order to close the innovation gap with other parts of the world.		X				
Raising public investment in innovation would have a positive effect on raising private investment in innovation.		X				

15. What are the most important barriers that you are facing to raise sufficient public and private investment to bring innovative solutions to the market?

Answer:

The most important barriers to raising sufficient investment for innovation lie in the structural inefficiencies of Europe’s innovation and investment environment, including: private funding gaps, misalignment between public and private capital, and fragmented regulatory frameworks. Firstly, Europe continues to face a scaleup gap. While scientific talent and early-stage innovation are strong, too few companies transition into late-stage growth and commercial success. This is due in part to limited access to long-term capital. Without sufficient private capital access, promising innovations startups, particularly in their most risky phases, cannot reach their potential. Secondly, public investment tools also remain too complex, slow, and inflexible. Instead of catalyzing private investments, they often create parallel structures that fail to crowd in private capital, leaving promising innovations underfunded because of this market failure. Public investments should be smarter and more targeted, not simply “more.” Thirdly, inconsistent rules across Member States raise costs, slow time-to-market, and reduce legal certainty for both

businesses and investors. This complexity undermines cross-border scaling and makes it harder for portfolio companies to reach investable maturity, as PE/VC-backed firms depend on legal clarity and efficient pathways to scale and exit. Especially in highly competitive sectors, this uncertainty can suppress investment appetite, with many high-potential companies deemed too complex or risky to support under current EU conditions, despite strong foundations.

Possible way forward

16. To what extent do you agree with the following statements? Good steps forward are:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
Develop an EU action plan or roadmap to raise the level of innovation investment across the EU.	X					
Develop national action plans or roadmaps, in conjunction with the EU, for raising innovation investment in Member States.		X				
Monitor the level of innovation investment in the EU, and benchmark this against investments in other parts of the world.	X					
Ensure that there is an appropriate balance between supply- and demand-driven innovation, in public innovation investment.		X				
Cooperate/align with the private sector to raise the level of public and private innovation investment in the EU.	X					
Develop specific innovation investment pathways to accelerate time it takes for strategic technologies to reach the market.	X					
Move to more agile governance structures to combine national, EU and private financing for opening these innovation investment pathways.	X					

3. Access to Talent

3.1. Talent attraction and retention

Current situation

27. To what extent do you agree that the following challenges are preventing innovative companies in the EU from attracting and retaining talent?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
The difficulties to offer globally competitive benefits and remuneration, including employee ownership schemes (such as employee stock options).	X					
The lack of harmonised conditions for employee stock option schemes across EU Member States (for example, in terms of taxation and employee and company eligibility).	X					
The lack of mutual recognition of employee stock option schemes across EU Member States.	X					

28. Are there any other key challenges as regards talent attraction and retention through employee stock options that you would like to highlight?

Answer:

Employee stock options are a vital tool for startups and scaleups to attract and retain talent, especially when companies cannot offer globally competitive salaries. These “sweat equity” incentives align long-term interests and help early-stage companies recruit the skilled workers they need to grow. However, the patchwork of national tax and legal regimes across the EU makes it difficult to implement stock option schemes at scale or across borders, deterring both cross-border hiring and mobility. Different tax treatments on grant, vesting, or sale of shares, combined with inconsistent rules on valuation disincentivize companies from expanding or hiring talent across Member States. Companies face either duplicative, costly valuations or the risk of retroactive tax challenges. Employees face widely varying tax consequences based simply on where they live.

Possible ways forward

29. To what extent do you agree that the following solutions would be positive steps towards tackling the challenges identified?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
Develop a harmonised framework with common standards on the scope of national employee stock option regimes (for example, covering taxation, employee and company eligibility, and shareholder and dividend rights).	X					
Develop a safety net that protects employees in the case of unforeseen events (e.g. where the employee is made redundant because the company goes out of business, or where employees are asked to move to another EU country due to company restructuring).		X				
Align tax regimes across the Member States as regards the point and type of taxation for employee stock options.	X					
Adopt a common EU valuation mechanism to determine the value of the employee stock option.	X					
Ensure the mutual recognition of employee stock option schemes between Member States.	X					

30. Are there any other possible solutions for talent attraction and retention through employee stock options that you would like to highlight?

Answer:

A harmonised framework that allows the implementation of stock option schemes across borders without triggering unpredictable or unfair tax treatment should be introduced, including uniform tax rules on the grant, vesting, and sale of shares regardless of corporate law status and jurisdiction, in addition to mutual recognition of tax treatment and valuation rules for equity awards between Member States. These changes would reduce administrative burden, including redundant or costly appraisals and the risk of disputes with tax authorities, increase legal certainty, and make it easier for companies to offer competitive incentives and hire cross-border talent.

4. Access to Markets

4.1. Accessing the private procurement market

Current situation

31. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about the private procurement market in the EU?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No opinion
It is difficult for innovative companies to find private buyers in the EU for their innovative solutions.		X				
Private buyers in the EU are still too risk-averse to buy solutions from smaller innovative companies.		X				
There is a need to ensure a level playing field so that innovative EU suppliers can compete with non-EU suppliers on the private procurement market.	X					
EU companies are facing supply chain dependencies, including the risk of over-reliance on non-EU products, especially concerning products that rely on strategic technologies that are key to safeguarding EU resilience and EU technological sovereignty.	X					
There are legal barriers or a lack of regulatory incentives or simplifications that hold back private buyers from buying in a more innovation-friendly way and/or to increase their resilience.		X				

32. Please let us know if, as a supplier, you have experienced any other barriers to bringing innovative solutions to the private procurement market in the EU, and please provide any suggestions you may have on how to overcome such barriers.

Answer:

Although we are not suppliers, nor buyers ourselves, slow and fragmented procurement processes delay scaling and market entry. For young, innovative firms, lengthy procedures and uncertainty about requirements can be as significant a barrier as regulatory complexity. Simplifying procurement rules and ensuring quicker decision-making would lower barriers and make it easier for startups and scaleups to bring solutions to the market. Faster uptake of innovation would also improve their investment attractiveness and resilience.

33. Please let us know if, as a private buyer, you have experienced regulatory or other barriers that deter you/your company to procure in a more innovation-friendly way and to improve the resilience of your operations/supply chains. In particular, please tell us if there are specific regulatory simplifications or legal incentives that could be introduced to make it easier for your company to procure in a more innovation-friendly/resilient way.

Answer:

Please see our answer to question 32 above.

Possible way forward

34. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about the private procurement market in the EU?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
Private buyers in the EU that receive public funding to procure solutions (e.g. from public R&I or deployment funding programmes), should adopt procurement practices that promote innovation and support the participation of start-ups and innovative companies.		X				
In general, also when private buyers in the EU procure solutions without public funding, they should adopt procurement practices that promote innovation and support the participation of start-ups and innovative companies.		X				
Private buyers that own/operate critical infrastructure* should take special care to procure in a way that safeguards the	X					

resilience of their supply chains, preventing blackouts in essential services and ensuring that public security is not compromised.						
Private buyers that own/operate critical infrastructures should adopt procurement practices that enable access to innovative solutions and facilitate participation by startups. These should support the development of strategic technologies** within national or European ecosystems and help reduce dependencies on external suppliers.		X				

* Some private buyers own or operate critical infrastructure that offer essential services that underpin functions or economic activities that are vital to society in the EU (e.g. telecom operators, airline operators etc.)

** Technologies that are of strategic importance to EU economic security (such as microchips and AI). These tend to be high-tech, innovative technologies that are often building blocks or enablers for many other products/systems that are used by critical infrastructure.

35. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
Private buyers in the EU face challenges in commercializing innovations from their supply chain due to misalignments between the intellectual property rights (IPR) policies of their suppliers and those of their customers		X				
Private buyers in the EU are hampered in commercialising innovations from universities due to conflicts between the IPR policies of universities and that the IPR policies of their customers.						X

4.2. Accessing the public procurement market

36. To what extent do you agree with the following expert recommendations for addressing the barriers faced by innovative companies in such public procurement?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
Public buyers should carry out open market consultations before public procurements that buy R&D and/or innovative solutions, so that buyers are well informed about the most recent developments and innovations when drafting tender specifications.		X				
Suppliers sometimes miss important business opportunities because announcements for upcoming open market consultations and the resulting public procurement for R&D and/or innovative solutions are not always transparently publicised. Public buyers should therefore make it easier for suppliers to become aware of such business opportunities.	X					
In order to ensure that IPR conditions used in public procurement that buy R&D and/or innovative solutions do not deter suppliers from protecting and commercialising their innovations, public buyers should buy only those IPR rights that they really need. (studies show that usage rights and some licensing rights tend to be sufficient, and that full transfer of IPR ownership to the buyer is only needed in limited situations).		X				
To ensure that public buyers give suppliers sufficient room to offer innovative solutions, such public procurements that buy R&D and/or innovation solutions should make wider use of functional or performance-based specifications. Such specifications do not prescribe the solution to be delivered but, rather, the problem		X				

to be solved, and leave it to suppliers to propose the best solution to meet the required functionalities or performance levels.						
In public procurements for buying R&D and/or innovative solutions, contracts should be awarded based not only on lowest price, but also on other criteria.		X				
For this type of procurements, it would be helpful to create a set of EU innovation procurement criteria that provide legal certainty on how public buyers can take into account factors other than price, such as i) the quality of different types of innovative solution and of various strategic technologies that the solutions may rely on, ii) the EU added value, iii) innovation impact and iv) the total cost of ownership of an innovative solution.		X				
The EU should provide legal clarity on how value engineering can be used in such public procurements that buy R&D and/or innovative solutions. This would enable public buyers i) to accept proposals from their suppliers to incorporate new technological improvements that become available only during contract implementation (e.g. to improve quality/performance at the same cost or lower cost) and ii) to provide contractors financial incentives for engaging in such an approach.		X				
Payment methods used in public procurements that buy R&D and/or innovative solutions should be made more suitable for start-ups and scale-ups: e.g. by increasing the use of pre-financing payments and accelerated payments to start-ups and scale-ups (e.g. within 15 days)	X					
A template subcontracting agreement should be created that protects the rights of subcontractors in public		X				

procurements that buy R&D and/or innovative solutions (such as the right to proper payment, respect of their IPR and the rights that financial investors may have in such innovative companies) in order to help such companies avoid financial difficulties.						
Unjust disqualification of bidders in procurements for R&D and/or innovative solutions should be prevented. This could be facilitated e.g. by clearly defining when financial requirements are disproportionate, by ensuring that bidders can prove their financial capacity by means other than just turnover (e.g. backing from financial investors / banks), and by discouraging disqualification of bidders based solely on lack of performance history or purely on administrative omissions that could be rectified.	X					
To make it easier for new players to enter the market, public buyers should have a simpler way to implement multiple sourcing in procurements for R&D and/or innovative solutions.						
Legal hurdles that make it difficult for public buyers from different EU countries to procure R&D and/or innovative solutions collaboratively should be removed so that such procurements can create sufficient critical mass of demand that enables innovative companies to grow across the EU.	X					
Clear legal provisions should be provided for how public buyers can reinforce EU technological sovereignty in procurements that buy R&D and/or innovative solutions.		X				
Public buyers that own/operate critical infrastructure* should take special care to procure in a more innovation-friendly way. Why? Firstly, the procurement of R&D and/or innovative solutions can	X					

help upgrade their critical infrastructure with cutting edge solutions that are essential for them to deliver high quality, safe and robust essential services to society, and, secondly, it can help them to diversify their supply chains with innovative companies and prevent over-reliance on non-EU suppliers that could have a detrimental effect on the security of supply of strategic technologies.						
Public buyers that own/operate critical infrastructure* should award public contracts for R&D and/or innovative solutions that rely on strategic technologies not only based on the lowest price, but also on other criteria.		X				

* Some public buyers own or operate critical infrastructure that offer essential services that underpin functions or economic activities that are vital to society in the EU (e.g. government data networks, energy and water utilities)

6. Encouraging commercialisation of publicly funded research and innovation

Current situation

44. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
IPR policies in European universities and RTOs are not sufficiently geared to fostering the commercialisation of academic research results.		X				
Standardisation policies in European universities and RTOs are not sufficiently developed to fostering the commercialisation of academic research results.		X				
There are still barriers to research and innovation collaboration between industry, academia and public sector organisations.	X					

6.1 Commercialisation of academic research results

Possible way forward

45. To what extent do you agree with the following statement about improving the framework conditions for commercialisation of academic research results?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
Member States should adopt, if not yet in place, strategies promoting commercialisation of publicly funded research results generated in universities and RTOs, including intellectual asset management, spin-off creation, and go-to-market strategies.		X				

46. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about overcoming IPR-related barriers that hamper the commercialisation of academic research results?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
European universities and RTOs should have an IPR policy in place that clearly outlines how they handle not only the protection, but also licensing and transfer of intellectual assets.		X				
For all their publicly financed research, European universities and RTOs should pursue adequate protection and commercialisation of academic research results. To this end, every university/RTO should have their own transfer office or set up joint transfer offices between networks of universities / RTOs.						X
Incentives and reward mechanisms, both financial and non-financial, should be put in place to motivate researchers and universities/RTOs to pursue		X				

robust IPR protection and to enable them to benefit from successful commercialisation of academic IPRs.						
IPR transfer and licensing processes should mitigate liquidity issues for start-ups/spinoffs, while allowing universities and researchers to benefit from the economic success of the commercialisation of academic research results. Templates should be made available for organising the IPR transfer/licensing process based on e.g. virtual shares or licensing conditions that draw liquidity out of the company only when it starts making profits from successfully selling the solution to customers on the market or when co-investors [e.g. Venture Capitalists] exit.	X					
Capacity building (which includes technology scouting, identifying and assessing the appropriate technology transfer routes, IPR valuation, venture building, teaming up with investors and/or industry partners etc.) for staff in universities and RTOs should be strengthened to ensure that their technology transfer offices operate at high quality standards and facilitate the cross-border exploitation of knowledge.	X					
A Europe-wide platform should be available to researchers and universities and RTOs where they can list their IPR assets. This would make it easier for them to contact companies interested in exploiting their IPRs and for investors to	X					

assess, value and invest in innovative projects.						
--------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

47. To what extent do you agree with the following statements about overcoming barriers relating to standardisation and certification and obtaining permits for innovative solutions that hamper the commercialisation of academic research results?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
European universities and RTOs should adopt a standardisation policy, closely linked to their research and innovation and IPR policies, that clearly outlines how they will pursue standardisation and certification to foster market uptake of their innovations.		X				
European universities and RTOs should pursue adequate standardisation and certification activities in cooperation with their transfer offices. This involves identifying standardisation and certification objectives from the early research stages and pursuing them throughout the research and innovation cycle.		X				
Training, advisory and support services should be put in place to help researchers understand how standardisation and certification works and to support them in taking part in standardisation and certification processes.		X				
Incentives should be provided to encourage researchers to carry out standardisation and certification activities (e.g. stronger career recognition and potential secondments of academic researchers to spinoffs/start-ups for standardisation and product certification activities).	X					
Processes for standardisation, certification and permitting of strategic technologies should be shortened (fast-track procedure).	X					
It should become the norm in the EU that start-ups and scale-ups pay reduced prices for certification and permitting processes.	X					

6.2 Facilitating collaboration between industry, academia and the public sector

Current situation

48. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
Collaboration between industry, academia, other public sector organisations and buyers can be difficult when they work under incompatible IPR policies (e.g. if there is a conflict between a university's IPR licensing requirements for a spinoff conflict and the IPR requirements of IPR-backed financiers or those of public buyers, then the spinoff may have difficulty obtaining financing or taking part in public procurements).	X					

Possible way forward

49. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
To get innovations out of the lab into the market, IPR policies should be better aligned across different forms of public financing for research and innovation, so that innovators are not blocked from commercialising their IPR when using different types of public R&I financing, either in sequence or in combination.	X					

50. Feel free to provide information on any difficulties you have experienced in the commercial exploitation of publicly funded research and innovation, and please provide any suggestions you may have on how to overcome those difficulties.

Answer:

Building stronger connections between research, businesses and investors should be a key focus. Simplified partnerships, aligned IPR frameworks, and streamlined standardization processes would make it easier for the whole innovation ecosystem – researchers, entrepreneurs and investors alike – to turn public research into commercial success, which remains one of the main barriers in Europe. Closing the gap between knowledge creation and market deployment requires a two-way street: researchers transferring knowledge and skills into the private sector, and businesses and investors actively taking up and scaling the results of public research.