

5 December 2023

## EAPB call for revision of the EU SME Definition as provided in the Recommendation 2003/361/EC.

Register ID: 8754829960-32

### Background

EAPB highly welcomes the [SME relief package](#) and in particular the announcement that, by the end of 2023, the EC will analyse the impact of high inflation and longer-run increases in productivity with a view to raising - when justified - the financial thresholds of the current SME definition and developing a harmonised definition for small mid-cap companies.

Compared to large companies, SMEs are subject to disadvantages specifically linked to their size. Complex regulations and administrative burden have increased in recent years. This is also reflected in the implementation of the requirements for European Structural and Investment Funds as well as European funding programmes in the current programming period and State aid regulation. In order to achieve the EU's economic development objectives, it is necessary to incentivize SMEs to make targeted investments. Therefore, the rules should be clear and unambiguous for them.

More than 99% of European businesses are SMEs. There is a constant lack of mid and large-caps with a strong growth potential in employment and the ability to compete with European and Asian competitors. Indeed, mid and large-caps only represent 0,2% of EU businesses but gather more than 30% of persons employed. In a [2022 study](#) the EC rightly highlighted the essential role of mid-caps in the EU economy and in particular their prominent role in sectors that are key to the EU's competitiveness and technological sovereignty: electronics, aerospace and defence, energy, energy-intensive industries, and health. A revision of the current SME definition could have a potentially positive impact.

As it stands, the definition appears to hinder the expansion of SMEs beyond the provided thresholds. In particular, unlisted small mid-caps from 250 to 500 employees remain excluded from the scope of the SME European definition. It reduces the level of support they can benefit from. Also, they have to comply with stronger requirements or face larger fees for EU administrative compliance relative to their size. It penalizes their development and the overall European economy. In this field, it should be kept in mind that American and Japanese definitions provide higher thresholds in terms of staff headcount, turnover or balance sheet total. Furthermore, even the EIF considers enterprises up to 500 employees as SMEs for its investment operations.

### Adjustment of thresholds:

Given that the inflation growth between 2003 and 2023 amounts to 53.93%, there is a strong case for a compensation at least for inflation and indeed productivity growth, as acknowledged by the EC in the SME Relief Package. In addition to considering the inflation rate in annual sales and the balance sheet total, the criteria referring to the number of employees should be adjusted. The EC itself recognized in its 2021 Risk Capital Guidelines that certain companies exceeding employee numbers and / or financial thresholds as stated in the definition of SMEs may face similar financial bottlenecks.

Furthermore, in some EC support programmes such as InnovFin small mid-cap companies can also be funded. These thresholds should be included in the future SME definition. We also agree, as mentioned in the 2022 study, that the Recovery and Resilience Facility, Horizon Europe and InvestEU will have a positive impact on mid-cap firms, even if they are not designated as mid-cap support activities. It would be difficult to understand why European funded programmes can support more companies and a higher support amounts than those programmes using European and / or national funds granted or managed by Member States. The 2023 Communication rightly highlights that various funding schemes for risk finance and scaling-up are available at national level to support their dynamic growth process and to address their funding gap. The Guidelines on State aid to promote risk finance investments contain a definition for small mid-caps and allow support under certain conditions to these companies. While the Commission

allows for Member States to support mid-cap companies under the Temporary Crisis and Transition Framework and the revised General Block Exemption Regulation (under very strict conditions), further support measures are necessary.

Against this background, we propose raising the thresholds as follows:

Company category	Staff headcount	Turnover	or	Balance sheet total
Medium-sized	< 500	≤ € 75 m		≤ € 75 m
Small	< 100	≤ € 20 m		≤ € 20 m
Micro	< 20	≤ € 4 m		≤ € 4 m

The 2021 evaluation also recognised the need to “look into the challenges that companies meet once they have ‘outgrown’ the SME-phase”. There may indeed be threshold effects if the benefits of different measures in favour of SMEs are all lost in the event that a growing company exceeds one of those parameters. We therefore agree that with the finding of the 2022 study, it would help firms in their growth process if ‘hard’ thresholds in firm size are softened. While keeping a targeted definition, EAPB members would welcome a more dynamic handling of the way the criteria are combined (e.g., an enterprise fulfilling the criteria of balance sheet and turnover, but having more than the maximum number of employees could be newly recognized as being an SME).

## Adjustment of linked companies

The calculation of thresholds should take into account only single undertakings with their linked companies in the meaning of the de minimis Regulation (Regulation (EU) No 1407/2013).

Article 2 (2) of the de minimis Regulation:

2. ‘Single undertaking’ includes, for the purposes of this Regulation, all enterprises having at least one of the following relationships with each other:

- (a) one enterprise has a majority of the shareholders’ or members’ voting rights in another enterprise;
- (b) one enterprise has the right to appoint or remove a majority of the members of the administrative, management or supervisory body of another enterprise;
- (c) one enterprise has the right to exercise a dominant influence over another enterprise pursuant to a contract entered into with that enterprise or to a provision in its memorandum or articles of association;
- (d) one enterprise, which is a shareholder in or member of another enterprise, controls alone, pursuant to an agreement with other shareholders in or members of that enterprise, a majority of shareholders’ or members’ voting rights in that enterprise. ”

This definition is used in the context of compliance with the so-called de minimis threshold. The definition can be traced back to a judgment of the European Court of Justice in which financial and corporate links between individual legal entities were assessed in order to assess an economic entity. In that sense, this definition has the same objective as the SME definition. Although the granting of de minimis aid is not linked to the SME definition, many SMEs also apply for de minimis aid. The alignment of the SME definition and de minimis aid thresholds would therefore not only simplify the rules but would also increase the legal certainty for businesses.

We would further welcome if the clarifications brought in the “User guide to the SME definition” (box pg. 14) <sup>1</sup> and the Decision regarding the Seventh Framework Programme 2 would be reflected in the Regulation for the sake of legal certainty.

<sup>1</sup> “.. Article 4.2 does not apply in the case of enterprises that exceed the relevant SME thresholds as a result of a change in ownership following a merger or acquisition, which is usually not considered temporary and not subject to volatility. Enterprises that are subject to a change in ownership need to be assessed on the basis of their shareholder structure at the time of the transaction, not at the time of closure of the latest accounts (\*). Therefore, the loss of SME status may be immediate.

<sup>2</sup> \*See Section 1.1.3.1, point 6(e) of Commission Decision 2012/838/EU, Euratom of 18 December 2012.”

## Elimination of connections via natural persons

When considering the "single undertaking" under the de minimis Regulation inter-firm relationships should be considered like in Recommendation 2003/361/EC. In contrast to the SME recommendation, however, this does not include corporate links that arise through natural persons or a group of natural persons who in the past have, in many cases, contributed to significant interpretation difficulties and thus to legal uncertainty. The generalization of the jurisdictional practice of the EC for very complicated individual cases may also have led to a more stringent interpretation than was originally intended by decision-makers. The interpretation of unclear legal concepts, such as "*relevant market or to adjacent markets*" or the difficult consideration of the degree of relatedness for the assessment of groups of natural persons could thus be dispensed with.

## Elimination of the partner connections

Furthermore, this proposal would eliminate the need to consider partner companies, which would also reduce complexity and increase legal certainty. Questions to what extent the partner companies of partner companies have to be included in the calculation of the thresholds, or other very specific constellations could be removed. The whole very hard-to-understand complex of partners enterprises referred to in the second subparagraph of Article 3 (2) in conjunction with paragraph 4 as exceptions to the rule would therefore become obsolete.

Moreover, for equity investments of institutional investors ("business angels", VC companies and other investment companies), there would be no effect on the classification as a SME below the control limit. This seems justified to us, since in the past - with the objective of maintaining the SME status of the target companies - difficulties have been experienced with the € 1.25 million limit set out in Article 3 (2) or the 25% threshold, as defined by the autonomous companies in Article 3 (1) of the SME definition with no justification. This has made it more difficult to ease the funding difficulties for certain SMEs.

## Equal treatment of companies with municipality ownership

Except for small municipalities, a company cannot currently be considered as an SME if 25% or more of its capital or voting rights is controlled, directly or indirectly, by one or more public authorities or public law entities (Article 3 para. 4 of the SME Recommendation).

This rule should be deleted without replacement. Public-sector involvement in companies generally does not result in these companies having much better access to the capital market than 'normal' companies. A company of which a local authority has shares has similar difficulties to those of a "normal" company of the same size.

## Elimination of connections to Temporary Consortia

Finally, difficulties with Temporary Consortia (TC) have also been reported. In Spain for example, a Temporary Consortium is a unique company (without legal personality) created by a group of companies with the aim to deliver a specific service for a period of time. TC are important because they allow a SME to participate in bigger projects where its current size would otherwise not allow, or to share experiences and knowledge with other SMEs or larger enterprises. In these cases, it is not clear to what extent these Temporary Consortia have to be included in the calculation of thresholds. In the absence of clear rules about how to consolidate this kind of temporary companies, it could be considered to apply the same rules that apply for "normal" companies, but this could lead to a disproportionate result, especially when considering a company which owns more than 50% of a Temporary Consortium.

We believe companies having participations in Temporary Consortia should not be taken into account in the calculation of thresholds, except when there are employees and assets belonging exclusively to the TC. Only in this case the percentage attributable to the SME should be included in the calculation of the thresholds. And upstream enterprise data should not be included in neither case. Only when the TC is the one receiving the financing directly (and not the companies integrating it), the calculation should be done with the current rules.

*\* The European Association of Public Banks (EAPB) gathers over 30 member organisations which include promotional banks such as national or regional public development banks and local funding agencies, public financial institutions, associations of public banks and banks with similar interests from 17 European Member States and countries, representing directly and indirectly the interests of over 90 financial institutions towards the EU and other European stakeholders.*