

InvestEU proposal : contested aspects

ELTI POSITION

Project Team
composed by independent experts in charge of the technical assessment and the risk evaluation of the proposals to allow the correct allocation of the EU guarantee and to maintain the geographical balance

A

Risk and technical assessment

The EC cannot be responsible for risk management, rating mapping and portfolio modeling

C

Geographical balance

Risk of geographical imbalance: small or young NPBI and Member States without NPBI are disadvantaged.

Governance unfeasible

Additional unnecessary governance and approval levels for EIB Group operations

B

ELTI POSITION

The proposed governance can reduce the risk of conflicts of interest and ensures adequate management and monitoring of the collateral portfolio

Costs




Increasing of the overall costs for the EU Institutions because of the the duplication of the EC resources charged to the MS

D

ELTI POSITION

No duplication of costs/functions

Governance across EU Regulations: comparative analysis

	EFSD	InvestEU (COM proposal)	
Policy assessment	<p>STEERING BOARD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consulting body composed by 5 members 	<p>STRATEGIC BOARD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consulting body composed by representatives from EC, EEAS, MSs, EIB, EP (observer) 	<p>ADVISORY BOARD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consulting body in 2 configurations: (i) IPs; (ii) MSs
Technical/risk assessment	<p>EIB GROUP</p>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Composed by experts from IFIs ▪ Compulsory opinion 	<p>G-TAG</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Composed by experts from IFIs ▪ Compulsory opinion <p>→ <i>similar to EFSD.</i> </p>	<p>PROJECT TEAM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Composed by IP's seconded experts ▪ compulsory opinion for IC decision
Decisional level	<p>INVESTMENT COMMITTEE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decisional body composed by external experts ▪ Decisions taken by simple majority → Does not involve representatives from MSs or IFIs involved in financing proposals 	<p>OPERATIONAL BOARD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decisional body composed by representatives from EC, MSs and IFIs ▪ Decisions taken by consensus → <i>The presence of representatives from EC, MSs and IFIs allows a more thorough decision-making process</i> 	<p>INVESTMENT COMMITTEE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decisional body composed by 6 members for each Window ▪ Decisions taken by simple majority → <i>Decision-making process similar to EFSI.</i> 

Rationale for not abolish the function of the Project Team

Why is this function key:

- To support from a technical point of view (banking expertise) the Investment Committee by providing pieces of information necessary for an informed decision.
- Make a clear distinction between the risk assessment and the operational departments like in the current banking practice.
- To make possible a true direct access to the EU guarantee
- **In presence of a multiplicity of diverse Implementing Partners**
 - ✓ **need to** check and ensure the additionality of the EU intervention and translate into concrete indications in terms of pricing and allocation of the guarantee
 - ✓ Need to make comparable different proposals in order to ensure a true level playing field for the EIB and other

And last but not least

- Collaboration platform for knowledge exchange, best practices among IPs

Project cycle with a multiplicity of Implementing partners



INITIAL PROJECT PROPOSAL



**SUBMISSION BY
IMPLEMENTING PARTNER
TO InvestEU FOR
GUARANTEE COVERAGE**



**COMMISSION
VERIFICATION OF
COMPLIANCE WITH EU
LAW AND POLICIES**



**PROJECT TEAM
(Independent Experts)
QUALITY CHECK OF THE
PROJECT APPRAISAL**

**INVESTMENT COMMITTEE
DECISION
(scoreboard)**

