Contribution ID: 040d39e5-ed35-458c-b4c3-6417bbe06677

Date: 15/03/2023 14:43:35

Late payments – update of EU rules

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

This consultation is part of the European Commission preparation for the revision of the Late Payment Directive (Directive 2011/7/EU). The directive lays down obligations concerning payment terms in commercial transactions between businesses (B2B) or between public authorities and businesses (G2B).

In general, payment terms shall not exceed 30 days. In limited cases, some public authorities can pay their suppliers within a maximum of 60 days. In commercial transactions between businesses payment terms of more than 60 days can be negotiated as long as they are not 'grossly unfair' to the creditor. The directive also lays down provisions on late payment interest and compensation. These include a flat rate compensation of at least EUR 40 per invoice, to which the creditor is entitled when the payment is received later than the deadline agreed in the contractual or legal payment term

For the purposes of this questionnaire:

- Payment term refers to the time limit for payment agreed in the contract or any other form of agreement between the parties (this can be expressed in days or months, for example).
- **Payment delay** is the time that exceeds the payment term.
- Payment period is the sum of the payment term and payment delay.

You can find more information at: https://single-market-economy.ec.europa.eu/smes/sme-strategy/late-payment-directive_en

This consultation aims to collect information on the following aspects of late payments:

- the main features of payment terms used by businesses;
- interested parties' experiences of unfair payment practices;
- interested parties' views on and experiences of the handling of disputes about payment delays;
- interested parties' views on possible policy measures to combat late payments;
- interested parties' views on the possible impact of policy measures to combat late payments;
- the impact of late payments on interested parties.

About you

*Language of my contribution

Danish
Dutch
English
Estonian
Finnish
French
German
Greek
Hungarian
Irish
Italian
Latvian
Lithuanian
Maltese
Polish
Portuguese
Romanian
Slovak
Slovenian
Spanish
Swedish
*I am giving my contribution as
Academic/research institution
Business association
Company/business
Consumer organisation
EU citizen
Environmental organisation
Non-EU citizen
Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
Public authority

Bulgarian

Croatian

Czech

	Trade union
	Other
* Fir	rst name
	Miriam
*Su	ırname
	Salomons
*En	nail (this won't be published)
	m.salomons@minezk.nl
*Sc	cope
	International
	Local
	National
	Regional
* Or	ganisation name
	55 character(s) maximum
	Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate Policy
* Or	ganisation size
	Micro (1 to 9 employees)
	Small (10 to 49 employees)
	Medium (50 to 249 employees)
	 Large (250 or more)
Tra	ansparency register number
	55 character(s) maximum
	neck if your organisation is on the <u>transparency register</u> . It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to luence EU decision-making.
1111	idence Lo decision-making.

*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.

	Afghanistan		Djibouti		Libya		Saint Martin
0	Åland Islands	0	Dominica	0	Liechtenstein	0	Saint Pierre and Miquelon
	Albania		Dominican	0	Lithuania		Saint Vincent
			Republic				and the
							Grenadines
	Algeria	0	Ecuador	0	Luxembourg		Samoa
	American Samoa	0	Egypt	0	Macau		San Marino
	Andorra	0	El Salvador		Madagascar		São Tomé and
							Príncipe
	Angola	0	Equatorial Guinea	a [©]	Malawi		Saudi Arabia
	Anguilla		Eritrea		Malaysia		Senegal
	Antarctica		Estonia		Maldives		Serbia
	Antigua and		Eswatini		Mali		Seychelles
	Barbuda						
	Argentina	0	Ethiopia	0	Malta		Sierra Leone
	Armenia		Falkland Islands		Marshall Islands		Singapore
	Aruba		Faroe Islands		Martinique		Sint Maarten
	Australia		Fiji		Mauritania		Slovakia
	Austria	0	Finland	0	Mauritius		Slovenia
	Azerbaijan	0	France	0	Mayotte		Solomon Islands
	Bahamas	0	French Guiana	0	Mexico		Somalia
	Bahrain		French Polynesia		Micronesia		South Africa
	Bangladesh		French Southern		Moldova		South Georgia
			and Antarctic				and the South
			Lands				Sandwich
							Islands
	Barbados	0	Gabon		Monaco		South Korea
	Belarus		Georgia		Mongolia		South Sudan
	Belgium		Germany	0	Montenegro		Spain
	Belize	0	Ghana	0	Montserrat		Sri Lanka
	Benin	0	Gibraltar	0	Morocco	0	Sudan
	Bermuda		Greece		Mozambique		Suriname

Bhutan	Greenland	Myanmar/Burma	0	Svalbard and Jan Mayen
Bolivia	Grenada	Namibia	0	Sweden
Bonaire SaintEustatius andSaba	Guadeloupe	Nauru		Switzerland
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Guam	Nepal	0	Syria
Botswana	Guatemala	Netherlands		Taiwan
Bouvet Island	Guernsey	New Caledonia		Tajikistan
Brazil	Guinea	New Zealand		Tanzania
British IndianOcean Territory	Guinea-Bissau	Nicaragua	0	Thailand
British Virgin Islands	Guyana	Niger	0	The Gambia
Brunei	Haiti	Nigeria		Timor-Leste
Bulgaria	Heard Island ar McDonald Islan		0	Togo
Burkina Faso	Honduras	Norfolk Island		Tokelau
Burundi	Hong Kong	Northern Mariana Islands	0	Tonga
Cambodia	Hungary	North Korea	0	Trinidad and Tobago
Cameroon	lceland	North Macedonia	a 🔘	Tunisia
Canada	India	Norway	0	Türkiye
Cape Verde	Indonesia	Oman	0	Turkmenistan
Cayman Islands	Iran	Pakistan	0	Turks and Caicos Islands
Central AfricanRepublic	Iraq	Palau	0	Tuvalu
© Chad	Ireland	Palestine	0	Uganda
Chile	Isle of Man	Panama	0	Ukraine
China	Israel	Papua New Guinea	0	United Arab Emirates
Christmas Island	Italy	Paraguay	0	United Kingdom

0	Clipperton	Jamaica	Peru		United States
0	Cocos (Keeling)	Japan	Philippines		United States
	Islands				Minor Outlying
					Islands
0	Colombia	Jersey	Pitcairn Islands		Uruguay
0	Comoros	Jordan	Poland		US Virgin Islands
0	Congo	Kazakhstan	Portugal		Uzbekistan
0	Cook Islands	Kenya	Puerto Rico		Vanuatu
0	Costa Rica	Kiribati	Qatar		Vatican City
0	Côte d'Ivoire	Kosovo	Réunion		Venezuela
0	Croatia	Kuwait	Romania		Vietnam
0	Cuba	Kyrgyzstan	Russia		Wallis and
					Futuna
0	Curaçao	Laos	Rwanda		Western Sahara
0	Cyprus	Latvia	Saint Barthélemy		Yemen
0	Czechia	Lebanon	Saint Helena		Zambia
			Ascension and		
			Tristan da Cunha	ı	
0	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 1 - General questions

Late payments account for one in four bankruptcies in the EU. Fewer than 40% of commercial transactions between businesses are paid on time. The European Commission is seeking your views about how to combat this problem.

*Question 1

How has the EU Late Payment Directive contributed to more timely payments in commercial transactions since 2011?

- Very positively
- Somewhat positively
- Neutrally
- Rather negatively
- Very negatively

*Question 2

What causes late payment?

Please tick all the applicable answers

- Paying late is a form of financing at no cost to the debtor
- Lack of money to pay own suppliers
- Paying on time is not incentivised/rewarded

1	Late payments are a vicious circle (a company is paid late and then pays late
	in return)
	Companies are not aware of the specific rules on payments
	Existing rules are not clear
V	Existing rules are not properly enforced
V	Small companies have to accept terms set by bigger players, otherwise they
	lose their clients
	Lack of access to financial training /credit management tools
	Lack of access to information about the payment discipline of your client (e.g.
	credit checks)
	Other reason

Question 3

How would you rate the clarity of the following provisions of the EU directive and, therefore, how they are applied in practice?

	Very clear	Rather clear	Rather unclear	Very unclear	Don't know
* Provisions on the terms 'unfair' or 'grossly unfair'	0	0	•	0	0
* Provisions on payment terms, particularly in business to business (B2B) transactions	0	•	0	0	0
* Provisions on the interest rate for late payments	0	•	0	0	0
* Provisions on the EUR 40 compensation fee to recuperate internal costs	•	0	0	0	0

*Question 4

Currently, the EU directive sets the maximum payment terms for **public authorities** at **30 days** or, in very exceptional circumstances, at 60 days.

Businesses must pay their invoices within **60 days** unless they expressly agree otherwise, and provided it is not 'grossly unfair'.

What is your opinion of the payment terms between businesses (B2B)?

- Should remain unchanged
- Should be capped at 30 days without exceptions for all B2B transactions
- Should be capped at 60 days without exceptions for all B2B transactions
- Should be capped at 30 days for payments from large companies to SMEs only, not between SMEs

- Should be capped at 60 days for payments from large companies to SMEs only, not between SMEs
- Should allow for specific payment terms for certain sectors
- Other opinion

Question 5

What will be the likely impact of the following measures on your situation?

Question 5a

MAKING THE LAW STRONGER

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	No opinion /Don't know
* Strengthening the current EU provisions by introducing a maximum fixed payment term for all B2B commercial transactions	0	0	0	0	•
* Laying down provisions that clearly identify when a contractual clause or practice relating to payment is 'unfair' to the creditor	0	•	0	0	0

Question 5b

IMPROVING ENFORCEMENT OF THE LAW

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	No opinion /Don't know
* Setting up national enforcement bodies that act upon complaints by companies, while keeping the complainant's identity confidential	0	0	0	•	•
* Putting in place national bodies that can carry out inspections on their own initiative and have sanctioning powers, including administrative fines	0	•	•	•	•
* Putting in place the means for alternative dispute resolution, such as arbitration and mediation, and facilitating SMEs' access to them	0	0	•	0	0

Question 5c

IMPROVING THE TRANSPARENCY OF THE PAYMENT BEHAVIOUR

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	No opinion /Don't know
* Ensuring better transparency of payment behaviour of businesses by including (good /bad) payment performance in credit ratings	0	•	0	•	0
* Ensuring better transparency of payment behaviour by making it compulsory for large businesses to publish regularly information about average payment terms negotiated with suppliers, average time taken to pay suppliers, payment of interests and compensations	©	•	•	•	•
* Setting up a permanent European Observatory of payments managed by the Commission to monitor payment performance and trends in payments	©	0	•	0	0

Question 5d

CREATING A BETTER FRAMEWORK FOR THE UPTAKE OF DIGITAL PAYMENT TOOLS

	Very positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	No opinion /Don't know
* Making e-invoicing mandatory in B2B transactions	0	0	0	0	•
* Setting-up a new EU standard for e-invoicing	0	0	0	0	•
* Removing barriers to factoring (including e-factoring)	•	0	0	0	0
* Fostering the integrated payments into digital invoicing	0	0	0	0	•
* Improving availability of programmes dedicated to foster digital skills in particular in SME workforces	0	•	0	0	0
* Incentivising adoption of key digital technologies such as AI and cloud by SMEs	0	0	0	•	0

Question 5e

IMPROVING RESILIENCE AND PREPAREDNESS OF COMPANIES AGAINST LATE PAYMENT

	Highly positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	No opinion /Don't know
* Improving the provision of training on credit management and financial literacy, and facilitating companies' access to it	0	•	0	•	0
* Laying down minimum common criteria of compliance, monitoring and sanctioning, for voluntary prompt payment codes	0	0	0	•	0

Question 5f

If you want to report other impacts, please specify

1000 character(s) maximum

Question 5d proposes removing barriers to factoring (including e-factoring). We would like the European Commission to consider the option of removing barriers to prohibition of pleding too. Pledge prohibitions are problematic to SMEs, as they cannot use outstanding claims as collateral to obtain a loan. By removing this prohibition, businesses gain more room to finance their activities.

*Question 6

If the current rules (e.g the current EU Late Payment Directive) remain unchanged (see above for a description of the main elements of the directive), how will this affect the financial situation of companies?

- Very negatively
- Somewhat negatively
- Remain unchanged
- Somewhat positively
- Very positively
- Don't know

*Question 7

The smaller the business, the more vulnerable it is to the negative effects of late payment. This question seeks your views on introducing measures to protect SMEs (especially self-employed people and micro and small businesses) from the risk of late payments and on providing relief. What kind of measures should be considered?

Please tick all the options that you find appropriate

In the case of uncontested invoices, public authorities should pay micro and small enterprises and self-employed people in less than 30 days.

V	Public authorities should put in place mechanisms to verify that main
	contractors are complying with the rules on prompt payment when paying
	subcontractors, in particular when a subcontractor is an SME.

Public authorities should offset an SME' tax, and social security debts against any outstanding amounts that they owe to SMEs because of late payment

Other

Question 8

What other aspects could a revision of the Late Payment Directive improve?

1000 character(s) maximum

Please see the attachment for some additional explanation on the viewpoint of the Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate Policy with regards to the revision of the Late Payment Directive

Question 9

You may upload below any document which you would like to share in relation to the revision of the Late Payment Directive (maximum file size 1 MB)

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

e033f16e-438f-4d98-9c27-4448b40e72c7

 $/ Additional_explanation_on_the_position_of_the_Dutch_Ministry_of_Economic_Affairs_and_Climate_Policy and a superconduction of the position of the position$

- *If you are a company, please tick yes to open a specific set of questions
 - Yes
 - No

Contact

GROW-A2@ec.europa.eu