

# Public Procurement Directives - revision

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

## Introduction

---

As announced in the Political Guidelines for the next European Commission 2024-2029<sup>[1]</sup> and the 2026 Commission Work Programme<sup>[2]</sup>, the European Commission is preparing a **revision of the EU Public Procurement Directives**. The main objectives of the revision are to make public investment and spending more efficient, while continuing to prevent corruption, to design tools to strengthen economic security and sovereignty and to better align public procurement policy with EU strategic policy objectives.

In preparation of the revision and following the evaluation of the EU public procurement Directives<sup>[3]</sup>, the Commission is launching this public consultation to gather views from all interested parties.

This public consultation is an opportunity for everyone to share their thoughts, experiences, and ideas on how to improve public procurement in the EU ahead of the planned revision. This will improve the evidence base underpinning the initiative and enable the Commission to take into consideration information and views of citizens and stakeholders.

The questionnaire is **divided into two parts**. The first part is short and requires no detailed knowledge of public procurement law and systems. The second part is more detailed and technical, requiring specialised knowledge. If you have the opportunity to answer the second part, please set aside some extra time to provide your input.

Please note that this consultation does not cover rules related to defence procurement or the EU Remedies Directive. These areas are outside the scope of this review. The public consultation runs in parallel to a call for evidence.

[1] European Commission, Political Guidelines for the Next European Commission 2024–2029, 2024.

[2] Secretariat-General, 2026 Commission Work Programme and Annexes, European Commission, 21 October 2025.

## About you

---

### \* Language of my contribution

- ☐ Bulgarian
- ☐ Croatian
- ☐ Czech
- ☐ 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
- ☐ Trade union
- ☐ Other

**\* First name**

Jai Krishna

**\* Surname**

Ranganathan

**\* Email (this won't be published)**

jaikrishna.r@eeb.org

**\* Organisation name**

*255 character(s) maximum*

European Environmental Bureau

**\* Organisation size**

- ☐ Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- ☐ Small (10 to 49 employees)
- ☒ Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- ☐ Large (250 or more)

**Transparency register number**

Check if your organisation is on the transparency register. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU 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.*

- |   |   |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan         | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti                            | <input type="radio"/> Libya            | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin                                 |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands       | <input type="radio"/> Dominica                            | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein    | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon                    |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania             | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic                  | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania        | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines             |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria             | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador                             | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg       | <input type="radio"/> Samoa  |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa      | <input type="radio"/> Egypt                               | <input type="radio"/> Macau            | <input type="radio"/> San Marino                                   |
| <input type="radio"/> Andorra             | <input type="radio"/> El Salvador                         | <input type="radio"/> Madagascar       | <input type="radio"/> São Tomé and Príncipe                        |
| <input type="radio"/> Angola              | <input type="radio"/> Equatorial Guinea                   | <input type="radio"/> Malawi           | <input type="radio"/> Saudi Arabia                                 |
| <input type="radio"/> Anguilla            | <input type="radio"/> Eritrea                             | <input type="radio"/> Malaysia         | <input type="radio"/> Senegal                                      |
| <input type="radio"/> Antarctica          | <input type="radio"/> Estonia                             | <input type="radio"/> Maldives         | <input type="radio"/> Serbia                                       |
| <input type="radio"/> Antigua and Barbuda | <input type="radio"/> Eswatini                            | <input type="radio"/> Mali             | <input type="radio"/> Seychelles                                   |
| <input type="radio"/> Argentina           | <input type="radio"/> Ethiopia                            | <input type="radio"/> Malta            | <input type="radio"/> Sierra Leone                                 |
| <input type="radio"/> Armenia             | <input type="radio"/> Falkland Islands                    | <input type="radio"/> Marshall Islands | <input type="radio"/> Singapore                                    |
| <input type="radio"/> Aruba               | <input type="radio"/> Faroe Islands                       | <input type="radio"/> Martinique       | <input type="radio"/> Sint Maarten                                 |
| <input type="radio"/> Australia           | <input type="radio"/> Fiji                                | <input type="radio"/> Mauritania       | <input type="radio"/> Slovakia                                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Austria             | <input type="radio"/> Finland                             | <input type="radio"/> Mauritius        | <input type="radio"/> Slovenia                                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Azerbaijan          | <input type="radio"/> France                              | <input type="radio"/> Mayotte          | <input type="radio"/> Solomon Islands                              |
| <input type="radio"/> Bahamas             | <input type="radio"/> French Guiana                       | <input type="radio"/> Mexico           | <input type="radio"/> Somalia                                      |
| <input type="radio"/> Bahrain             | <input type="radio"/> French Polynesia                    | <input type="radio"/> Micronesia       | <input type="radio"/> South Africa                                 |
| <input type="radio"/> Bangladesh          | <input type="radio"/> French Southern and Antarctic Lands | <input type="radio"/> Moldova          | <input type="radio"/> South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands |

- |  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Barbados                         | <input type="radio"/> Gabon                             | <input type="radio"/> Monaco                   | <input type="radio"/> South Korea            |
| <input type="radio"/> Belarus                          | <input type="radio"/> Georgia                           | <input type="radio"/> Mongolia                 | <input type="radio"/> South Sudan            |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Belgium               | <input type="radio"/> Germany                           | <input type="radio"/> Montenegro               | <input type="radio"/> Spain                  |
| <input type="radio"/> Belize                           | <input type="radio"/> Ghana                             | <input type="radio"/> Montserrat               | <input type="radio"/> Sri Lanka              |
| <input type="radio"/> Benin                            | <input type="radio"/> Gibraltar                         | <input type="radio"/> Morocco                  | <input type="radio"/> Sudan                  |
| <input type="radio"/> Bermuda                          | <input type="radio"/> Greece                            | <input type="radio"/> Mozambique               | <input type="radio"/> Suriname               |
| <input type="radio"/> Bhutan                           | <input type="radio"/> Greenland                         | <input type="radio"/> Myanmar/Burma            | <input type="radio"/> Svalbard and Jan Mayen |
| <input type="radio"/> Bolivia                          | <input type="radio"/> Grenada                           | <input type="radio"/> Namibia                  | <input type="radio"/> Sweden                 |
| <input type="radio"/> Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba | <input type="radio"/> Guadeloupe                        | <input type="radio"/> Nauru                    | <input type="radio"/> Switzerland            |
| <input type="radio"/> Bosnia and Herzegovina           | <input type="radio"/> Guam                              | <input type="radio"/> Nepal                    | <input type="radio"/> Syria                  |
| <input type="radio"/> Botswana                         | <input type="radio"/> Guatemala                         | <input type="radio"/> Netherlands              | <input type="radio"/> Taiwan                 |
| <input type="radio"/> Bouvet Island                    | <input type="radio"/> Guernsey                          | <input type="radio"/> New Caledonia            | <input type="radio"/> Tajikistan             |
| <input type="radio"/> Brazil                           | <input type="radio"/> Guinea                            | <input type="radio"/> New Zealand              | <input type="radio"/> Tanzania               |
| <input type="radio"/> British Indian Ocean Territory   | <input type="radio"/> Guinea-Bissau                     | <input type="radio"/> Nicaragua                | <input type="radio"/> Thailand               |
| <input type="radio"/> British Virgin Islands           | <input type="radio"/> Guyana                            | <input type="radio"/> Niger                    | <input type="radio"/> The Gambia             |
| <input type="radio"/> Brunei                           | <input type="radio"/> Haiti                             | <input type="radio"/> Nigeria                  | <input type="radio"/> Timor-Leste            |
| <input type="radio"/> Bulgaria                         | <input type="radio"/> Heard Island and McDonald Islands | <input type="radio"/> Niue                     | <input type="radio"/> Togo                   |
| <input type="radio"/> Burkina Faso                     | <input type="radio"/> Honduras                          | <input type="radio"/> Norfolk Island           | <input type="radio"/> Tokelau                |
| <input type="radio"/> Burundi                          | <input type="radio"/> Hong Kong                         | <input type="radio"/> Northern Mariana Islands | <input type="radio"/> Tonga                  |
| <input type="radio"/> Cambodia                         | <input type="radio"/> Hungary                           | <input type="radio"/> North Korea              | <input type="radio"/> Trinidad and Tobago    |
| <input type="radio"/> Cameroon                         | <input type="radio"/> Iceland                           | <input type="radio"/> North Macedonia          | <input type="radio"/> Tunisia                |
| <input type="radio"/> Canada                           | <input type="radio"/> India                             | <input type="radio"/> Norway                   | <input type="radio"/> Türkiye                |
| <input type="radio"/> Cape Verde                       | <input type="radio"/> Indonesia                         | <input type="radio"/> Oman                     | <input type="radio"/> Turkmenistan           |

- Cayman Islands
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba
- Curaçao
- Cyprus
- Czechia
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Denmark
- Iran
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jersey
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos
- Latvia
- Lebanon
- Lesotho
- Liberia
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Russia
- Rwanda
- Saint Barthélemy
- Saint Helena  
Ascension and  
Tristan da Cunha
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States  
Minor Outlying  
Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
- Vietnam
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara
- Yemen
- Zambia
- Zimbabwe

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. **For 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](#)

## Overall objectives

---

The **evaluation of the 2014 public procurement directives** (SWD(2025)332) concluded that their intended objectives have only been partially met, and several problems remain: legal clarity and flexibility did not improve, new sector-specific rules added complexity to the legal framework, transparency levels increased but corruption risks and data gaps remain, competition levels can be further enhanced, direct cross-border participation remains limited, and environmental, social and innovation procurement uptake, while progressing, remains uneven. At the same time, new priorities such as economic security and strategic autonomy have emerged, accentuated by recent geopolitical developments.

## Improving efficiency and transparency of the new rules

In view of the evaluation findings, please rank the importance of the proposed characteristics of the new public procurement legal framework in a decreasing order, starting with the most important:

The forthcoming revision should...

*Use drag&drop or the up/down buttons to change the order or accept the initial order.*



**make procurement rules more flexible** (e.g. more space for negotiations, more discretion given to public buyers)



**prioritise broader policy goals by moving beyond the lowest-cost paradigm** (e.g. to include objectives like sustainability, innovation, social responsibility and *Made in Europe*)



**make procurement rules less prone to litigation** (e.g. more detailed procedural rules to avoid ambiguity)



**reduce administrative burden through full digitalisation** (e.g. digitalisation of the entire procurement process, single digital procurement entry point, data reuse)



**make procurement rules less prone to anti-competitive practices** (e.g. wider use of digital tools to facilitate transparency)



**facilitate SMEs participation** (e.g. division into lots, payment schemes including direct payments to subcontractors)



**facilitate the aggregation of demand** (e.g. joint procurement by several authorities, reinforcing the role of central purchasing bodies, framework agreements)



**make procurement rules less detailed** (e.g. focus on high-level concepts, less rules defining procedural steps)

## Green, social and innovative public procurement

In view of the evaluation findings, please rank the importance of the proposed characteristics of the new public procurement legal framework in a decreasing order, starting with the most important:

The forthcoming revision should...

*Use drag&drop or the up/down buttons to change the order or accept the initial order.*



**prioritise quality over price when seeking value for money** (e.g. wider use of the of best pricequality ratio to support strategic and sustainable procurement)

⋮ **facilitate environmentally friendly purchases** (e.g. facilitated use of ecolabels and standards, set targets for green public procurement)

⋮ **facilitate socially responsible purchases** (e.g. improved working conditions, social inclusion)

⋮ **facilitate purchases of innovative solutions** (e.g. simplifying innovation partnerships, easing access to public procurement for startups)

⋮ **facilitate SME participation** (e.g. division into lots, payment schemes including direct payments to subcontractors)

⋮ **avoid additional administrative burden** (e.g. limited rules on social and green conditionalities and associated administrative and evidence requirements for companies and public buyers)

⋮ **prioritise competition and price savings** (e.g. by avoiding ambitious green and social requirements)

⋮ **make procurement rules less detailed** (e.g. focus on high-level concepts, less rules defining procedural steps)

## Economic security and strategic autonomy

In view of the evaluation findings, please rank the importance of the proposed characteristics of the new public

procurement legal framework in a decreasing order, starting with the most important:

The forthcoming revision should...

*Use drag&drop or the up/down buttons to change the order or accept the initial order.*

⋮ **make procurement rules less prone to litigation** (e.g. more detailed to avoid ambiguity in case of third countries access)

⋮ give **preference to European industry**, products and services **in sectors that are critical to EU economic security or of strategic importance** to secure Europe's independence

⋮ **avoid additional administrative burden** (e.g. minimal rules on the extent to which *Made in Europe* requirements are met)

⋮ **make procurement rules more flexible** (e.g. more discretion given to public buyers)

⋮ **make procurement rules less detailed** (e.g. focus on high-level concepts rather than detailed requirements on what products, services and works public buyers can purchase)

⋮ give **general preference to European industry, products and services** (*Made in Europe*) to support investment, growth and jobs in the EU

⋮ **prioritise competition and price savings** (e.g. by allowing unrestrained access to European markets to firms from outside Europe)

## Expert sections

\* The **following sections** deal with **more complex and technical aspects** of public procurement. If you have specialised knowledge or experience with procurement rules and procedures, you may want to respond to these questions. You can also choose not to respond to these questions. In either case, you will be invited to share any general comments you may have on the forthcoming revision of the EU public procurement directives before submitting your response to this public consultation.

- ☒ Yes, I want to proceed with responding to more complex and technical questions.
- ☐ No, I prefer to proceed without responding to more complex and technical questions.

## Simplification

---

Despite attempts to **simplify procurement procedures** and make their use more flexible through the 2014 public procurement directives, the evaluation concluded that procedures are perceived as too complex and rigid for public buyers to achieve their public investment objectives effectively.

We are considering several measures to simplify public procurement procedures. Please assess the potential of each measure to simplify the process:

More **flexible** procedures:

	High simplification potential	Some simplification potential	No or negligible impact	Additional complication potential	High complication potential
Increase flexibility in contract modifications (e.g. revising the duration, price changes)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Simplify procedures for off-the shelf purchases (i.e. compliance only with basic principles, such as non-discrimination, transparency, and procedural fairness)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Allow negotiations throughout the procurement procedure	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Facilitate dialogue with the market	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Allow corrections of procurement documents throughout the procedure	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Facilitate **joint procurement**:

	High simplification potential	Some simplification potential	No or negligible impact	Additional complication potential	High complication potential
Facilitate networking among buyers (e.g., forming buyer groups or communities of practice)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase flexibility in setting the duration of framework agreements	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Enhance the role of Central Purchasing Bodies	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Simplify rules for setting up joint procurements, especially across borders	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Improve **information exchange** and **procedural time-limits**:

	High simplification potential	Some simplification potential	No or negligible impact	Additional complication potential	High complication potential
Provide model contract templates and technical specifications templates for public buyers	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Set time limits for evaluating bids	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Allow re-use of documentation submitted by bidders (once-only principle)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase time limits for submission	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Establish a central EU procurement platform and enhance digitisation	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Support **small and medium-sized enterprises** (SMEs):

	High simplification potential	Some simplification potential	No or negligible impact	Additional complication potential	High complication potential
EU-level targets for SMEs participation in public procurement	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Simplify rules for forming consortia, especially for SMEs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Encourage dividing contracts into smaller lots	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Improve **Implementation** and contract management:

	High simplification potential	Some simplification potential	No or negligible impact	Additional complication potential	High complication potential
Establish rules for direct payments to subcontractors, especially SMEs	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Speed up payments to contractors, especially SMEs	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Establish rules for the post-award phase, including contract implementation	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase use of pre-financing, especially for SMEs	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you wish, you may provide more information on ways to simplify procurement procedures:

*Text of 5 to 1000 characters will be accepted*

Text of 5 to 300 characters will be accepted

The intention to help SME's needs to be balanced by the complications created to the contracting authorities. for example, direct payments to subcontractors is complicated for contracting authorities- because the duty of evaluation of the works, products or services will be an additional burden on the contracting authority.

## Simplification - impacts

How likely do you believe the following outcomes would occur if the **proposed simplification measures** were implemented?

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	No impact	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely
Reduced price of goods /services/works	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased legal certainty	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduced cost for public buyers to conduct public procurement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased SME participation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faster procurement processes	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduced litigation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased cross-border bidding within the EU	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Less corruption	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased buying power of public buyers	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduced cost for bidders to participate in public procurement	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased number of bidders	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
More competition	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Increased bidding by EU-based firms	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
-------------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

If you wish, you may indicate any other likely impacts below:

*Text of 5 to 1000 characters will be accepted*

Text of 5 to 300 characters will be accepted

## Coherence between general rules applicable to all sectors and sectoral rules

---

The current legislative framework define general rules regulating the procedures of public procurement. They include horizontal general rules on “how to buy”, which are applicable to all buyers and sectors. The evaluation showed that the introduction of public procurement provisions in other sectoral legal acts on both “how to buy” and “what to buy” led to a fragmentation of the regulatory framework causing concerns over legal coherence and applicability.

Should existing **sectoral rules (\*)** be integrated with the new legislative framework?

\*Examples of sector-specific EU legislation relating to public procurement the Net-Zero Industry Act or Clean Vehicles Directive

### A) **EXISTING** SECTORAL LEGISLATION

- ☐ Existing **“how and what to buy”** legal provisions in sectoral acts **should be integrated** in the general legislative framework and be removed from sectoral acts.
- ☒ Only existing **“how to buy”** legal provisions in sectoral acts **should be integrated** in the general legislative framework and be removed from sectoral acts. Existing **“what to buy”** legal provisions **should NOT be integrated** in the general legislative framework, they would remain in various sectoral acts and be amended therein to ensure coherence where required.

- ☐ Existing “**how and what to buy**” legal provisions in sectoral acts **should NOT be integrated** in the general legislative framework. Any conflicting or incoherent provisions in sectoral acts would be removed.
- ☐ Other:

#### B) **FUTURE** SECTORAL LEGISLATION

- ☐ Future “**how and what to buy**” requirements **should be integrated** in the general legislative framework.
- ☒ Only future “**how to buy**” requirements **should be integrated** in the general legislative framework. Future “**what to buy**” requirements **should NOT be integrated** in the general legislative framework – they should continue to be included separately in sector-specific legislation.
- ☐ Future “**how and what to buy**” legal provisions in sectoral acts **should NOT be integrated** in the general legislative framework.
- ☐ Other:

Future “**what to buy**” requirements should be subject to a common rules defined in the general legislative framework to avoid conflicts or incoherencies (e.g. the new general legislative framework should foresee mechanisms and templates for harmonised legislation ensuring coherence of “what to buy” requirements contained in sector-specific rules with the general legislative framework).

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

## Concessions

---

The evaluation concluded that, although the EU Concessions Directive helped to harmonise procurement laws across Member States, significant inconsistencies remain. Different legal concepts are still interpreted differently across countries and sectors leading to fragmented legal frameworks. This often results in misunderstandings about applicable rules and definitions, affecting both public buyers and bidders.

Which of the following concepts require modification?

Select all that apply:

- ☒ Definition of “concessions” and “operating risk” for a more consistent application of the general legislative framework and interpretation of financial, operational, regulatory, and market risks in a concession contract (Article 5)
- ☒ Rules on duration (e.g. include considerations of other elements such as technical, environmental, innovation, social, labour, etc.) (Article 18)
- ☐ Publication and transparency requirements (e.g. public buyers to publish the intent to award a concession at least one year in advance, with exceptions for emergencies, to give more time to the bidders) (Articles 30-37)
- ☒ Additional rules on the execution of the contracts (e.g. monitoring of the contract, verification of compliance with objectives, possibility of adapting to unforeseen needs through modifications of contracts, termination, etc.)
- ☐ Other:

## Concessions - impacts

How likely do you believe the following outcomes would occur if the proposed concepts and rules on concessions were modified?

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	No impact	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely
Reduced price of goods /services/works	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased bidding by EU-based firms	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduced litigation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased SME participation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased buying power of public buyers	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased number of bidders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduced cost for public buyers to conduct public procurement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased legal certainty	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Reduced cost for bidders to participate in public procurement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Less corruption	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Faster procurement processes	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
More competition	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased cross-border bidding within the EU	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you wish, you may indicate any other likely impacts below:

*Text of 5 to 1000 characters will be accepted*

Text of 5 to 300 characters will be accepted

The concessions directive still lacks any obligation or option to identify the best tenders using the most economically advantageous tender. With long duration contracts well suited for innovation and long term investments into decarbonised industrial production, the concessions directive could really do more to create lead markets.

## Digitalisation and transparency

The evaluation revealed that, while transparency has improved, persistent data gaps and quality issues, both at the EU and national levels, continue to undermine effective governance, strategic decision-making, and anti-corruption efforts. Additionally, the fragmentation of eProcurement services across the EU creates a burden on bidders and hinders cross border procurement.

Would you support the creation of a digital public procurement marketplace with a single-entry point for economic operators to public procurement procedures?

- ☐ No, the current environment of eProcurement services is appropriate.
- ☒ Yes, by interconnecting all existing Member States' eProcurement services. Economic operators could use any compatible service as a single point of entry to participate in public procurement procedures across the EU.

- ☐ Yes, by interconnecting all existing Member States' eProcurement services, and providing a central eProcurement service. Economic operators could use the central eProcurement service or any Member State compatible service as a single point of entry to participate in public procurement procedures across the EU.
- ☐ Yes, by replacing all existing Member States' eProcurement services with one central EU eProcurement service.
- ☐ No opinion.

### What functionalities should the eProcurement services include?

Select all that apply:

- ☒ Access to procurement procedures **above EU thresholds** together with related procurement documents.
- ☒ Access to procurement procedures **below EU thresholds** together with related procurement documents.
- ☐ Submission of offers from economic operators.
- ☒ Access for public buyers to authentic, up-to-date information about participating economic operators on exclusion grounds (e.g., criminal convictions, bankruptcy, professional misconduct) and selection criteria (e.g. financial capacity, technical ability).
- ☐ Publication of complaints and review decisions.
- ☒ Publication of information about the completion of contracts.
- ☐ Declaration of inclusion of green, social, innovation, or *Made in Europe* aspects.
- ☒ Free access to a library of standardised procurement documents, such as technical specifications or contract templates at least to public authorities.
- ☐ Helpdesk, trainings and capacity building for SMEs.
- ☐ Other:

### Digitalisation and transparency - impacts

How likely do you believe the following outcomes would occur if such a digital public procurement marketplace is set up?

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	No impact	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely

Increased transparency to prevent irregular practices					
Reduced cost for economic operators to participate in procurement procedures					
Wider range of procurement procedures available to economic operators (especially for SMEs)					
In case of one central eProcurement system: higher risks of stopping all public procurement procedures in the EU if the system fails (IT failure)					
In case of one central eProcurement system: higher risk of cyber-attacks/security breaches					
Reduced litigation					
More harmonisation of tender requirements across Member States and emergence of best practices					
Wider access to cross-border procurement procedures in the single market (especially for SMEs)					
Reduced cost for public buyers to conduct procurement procedures					
Higher number of offers received					
Faster exchange of documents and information (including company evidence)					
In case of one central eProcurement system: higher risk of cyber-attacks/security breaches					

If you wish, you may indicate any other likely impacts below:

*Text of 5 to 1000 characters will be accepted*

Text of 5 to 300 characters will be accepted

The simplification here should not replace the national procurement systems with one central system. To Increase access, participation, transparency, harmonisation, its important to keep existing systems while at the same time make all procurements accessible in a single portal while bidding and subsequent procedures should be done in the respective national system. The proposal to bring more national procurement systems into a central procurement notification system should be one step ahead of TED, and help with PPDS.

## Made in Europe

Since the adoption of the 2014 public procurement directives, new priorities such as **economic security** and **strategic autonomy** have emerged. Imbalances in international market access persist and are accentuated by recent geopolitical developments.

Should European goods and services be prioritised in the procurement process?

- ☒ Yes  
☐ No

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

European goods and services should be prioritised in procurement process...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. By giving greater role / prominence / points to non-price criteria in assessment of bids (such as social, green, resilience, innovation, security, <i>Made in Europe</i> , etc.).	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. By excluding bidders from countries that are not signatories to the European Economic Area (EEA) / Government Procurement Agreement (GPA) / Free Trade Agreement (FTA) containing procurement provisions/other international agreements covering public procurement or offering goods or services originating from those countries.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3. By defining Made in Europe criteria for selection of bidders (e.g. criteria placed on business such as European location, and/or conditions placed on product or service, such as share of value added).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
---	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------

If you wish, you may provide any additional information on what *Made in Europe* criteria should be included in EU legislation:

*Text of 5 to 1000 characters will be accepted*

EEB believes that any preference for a "Made in Europe" criteria is a wrong direction or explicit conditions on location of services in the EU does not always lead to either a reduction in GHG emissions nor an increase of EU's competitive position. Any conditionalities should increase the social, environmental, resilience, innovation and security of the works, services and products procured from both EU and other countries. While WTO rules may complicate the issuing of a criteria on even "how the product is produced" in another country, while any criteria linked to origin of a product is considered blatant discrimination.

## Made in Europe - impacts

How likely do you believe the following outcomes would occur if **any type of prioritisation of European products and services** was to be implemented?

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	No impact	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely
Retaliation by 3rd countries (exclusion of EU companies from their procurement)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
EU economic operators could have to adjust their supply chains to be able to bid	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase in administrative cost (verification if conditions are met)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased administrative cost for EU bidders due to additional documents or evidence	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boost EU employment	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Easier access to procurement for EU SMEs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Better quality of products /services/works	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduced litigation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase security of supply	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boost EU innovation	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased chance of winning for EU bidders	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boost investments levels in the EU (e.g. reindustrialisation, reshoring, more FDI)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Meeting environmental goals (e.g. shortening supply chains, carbon footprint)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lower number of bids received	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase in price of goods and services purchased	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you wish, you may indicate any other likely impacts below:

*Text of 5 to 1000 characters will be accepted*

Text of 5 to 300 characters will be accepted

## Green, social and public procurement of innovation - BPQR

The 2014 public procurement reform sought to encourage the uptake of green, social and innovation aspects in public procurement, supporting broader EU policy goals. Public buyers can decide to introduce such quality considerations (green, social, innovation) at different stages of the procurement process and through different means (e.g. via award criteria, or technical specifications). However, the evaluation concluded that public buyers do not systematically make use of these possibilities.

## Best price-quality ratio

The “most economically advantageous tender” (MEAT) can be identified on the basis of price or cost effectiveness only, or can include quality considerations by using the best price-quality ratio (BPQR).

Should EU law require public buyers to include minimum quality requirements in **technical specifications**, subject to a comply-or-explain mechanism?

- ☒ Yes  
☐ No

Should any change be made to the current contract **award criteria** practice based on the “most economically advantageous tender” (MEAT)?

- ☒ Yes  
☐ No

Do you agree with any of the following statements?

Select all that apply:

- ☒ EU law should require public buyers to apply Best Price-Quality Ratio (BPQR) as the standard contract award criterion, subject to a comply-or-explain mechanism.
- ☒ EU law should set a minimum mandatory weight (share) for quality criteria in the application of the use of BPQR.
- ☒ Member States should be required to set national targets for BPQR awards of contracts and put into place corresponding action plans and supportive measures.

How likely do you believe the following outcomes would occur if the future general legislative framework incentivised BPQR?

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	No impact	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely
Achievement of strategic policy goals (e.g. environmental, social, innovation)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improved working conditions	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Increased administrative cost for public buyers (verification if conditions are met)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Wider access to cross border procurement (especially for SMEs)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduced number of bids received	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
More reshoring, reindustrialisation of the EU, more FDI in the EU	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Higher price of goods/services /works purchased	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased security of supply	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Higher chances of winning for EU firms	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Higher costs for EU bidders (additional environmental /social elements)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boost to EU innovation	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased efforts for bidders to adjust their supply chains to be able to bid	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduced litigation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Better quality of products /services/works	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Green public procurement

Regarding green public procurement, the evaluation concluded that environmental aspects are incorporated into approximately 25% of contracts across the EU. However, the level of adoption differs significantly among Member States.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements on green/environmentally friendly public procurement?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
--	----------------	-------	---------	----------	-------------------

1. No amendments are required to the existing legal framework regarding environmental provisions, including both the general legislative framework and public procurement provisions in sectoral legislation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
2. The general legislative framework should further incentivise the use of green public procurement.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. EU public procurement law should mandate further green public procurement obligations.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

You "agree" or "strongly agree" with point 2 above. Which of the following elements should be introduced to further incentivise the use of green public procurement?

Select all that apply:

- ☒ EU law should provide a clear legal definition of green public procurement to facilitate its consistent implementation and improve policymaking.
- ☒ Non-binding targets for green public procurement should be set at the EU and Member State levels, together with accompanying strategies or plans to ensure their achievement.
- ☒ EU law should make the use of environmental labels easier to apply and more effective so as to support public purchasing of green solutions.
- ☐ The use of green public procurement should be supported by standards to facilitate the work of public buyers.
- ☒ EU rules on green public procurement should be kept in sectorial acts but be made more consistent and coherent across sectorial acts.
- ☒ The link to the subject matter principle should be softened, to allow the possibility to take into account companies' overall environmental policies (such as due diligence).
- ☐ EU law should facilitate the prioritisation by public buyers of short supply chains in the public procurement of food.
- ☐ Other:

You "agree" or "strongly agree" with point 3 above. Which of the following elements should be made mandatory?

Select all that apply:

- ☐ The general legislative framework should set mandatory minimum environmental requirements for specific products, services and works to be applied at different stages of procurement procedure.
- ☒ The general legislative framework should set mandatory minimum horizontal environmental requirements, without imposing sector or product specific requirements.
- ☒ The current optional exclusion ground for companies that have violated applicable environmental obligations should be made mandatory.
- ☒ Green public procurement targets should be mandated at EU and at Member State level.
- ☐ Use of ecolabels should be made mandatory.
- ☒ Requirement of a link to the subject matter should be eliminated.
- ☒ Large public buyers shall be legally obliged to develop green public procurement strategies.
- ☐ Other

## Green public procurement - impacts

How likely do you believe the following outcomes would occur as a result of further **incentivising** the use of green public procurement?

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	No impact	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely
Better quality of products / services / works	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased administrative burden for public buyers	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Higher administrative burden for EU bidders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Easier access to cross border procurement within the EU	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased costs for EU bidders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased chance of winning calls for tender by EU bidders	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Higher SME participation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased prices of products / services / works	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduced competition	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduced litigation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boost EU employment	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boost EU innovation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Achievement of environmental policy goals	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you wish, you may indicate any other likely impacts below:

*Text of 5 to 1000 characters will be accepted*

Text of 5 to 300 characters will be accepted

We believe that incentives, which are not clear exactly yet, will not largely increase GPP or corresponding burden on bidders or contracting authorities primarily because when a contracting authority can foresee reduced number of bids because of GPP, they will usually choose a normal procurement, since the risk of a fresh tendering process far outweighs the risk of losing incentives. This is usually assessed before the publication of a contract notice.

How likely do you believe the following outcomes would occur as a result of **mandating** further green public procurement obligations?

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	No impact	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely
Better quality of products / services / works	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Higher SME participation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased chance of winning calls for tender by EU bidders	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boost EU innovation	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased prices of products / services / works	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased costs for EU bidders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduced competition	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Easier access to cross border procurement within the EU	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased administrative burden for public buyers	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boost EU employment	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Higher administrative burden for EU bidders	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduced litigation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Achievement of environmental policy goals	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you wish, you may indicate any other likely impacts below:

*Text of 5 to 1000 characters will be accepted*

Text of 5 to 300 characters will be accepted

Almost all categories of impact listed will increase by a bit if GPP is made mandatory, including the positive impact of achieving environmental goals. Since the mandatory nature of GPP will be a generic target and not specific to any product, the achievement of that target will naturally follow the areas where GPP compliant products are easily available, and will not significantly increase any burden. In the event that the targets requires new products in the market to achieve them, the contracting authorities will most likely choose the next possible GPP compliant works, products or services with the least risk of reduced bids. SME's are unlikely to be impacted if the targets are progressive in nature.

## Social considerations in public procurement

The evaluation concluded that, although it is difficult to estimate the uptake of socially responsible public procurement practices, this has been gaining traction in recent years even if adoption among Member States remains uneven.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements concerning socially responsible public procurement?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. No amendments are required to the existing legal framework regarding social provisions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
2. EU public procurement law should further incentivise the use of socially responsible public procurement.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3. The general legislative framework should mandate further socially responsible public procurement obligations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
--	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

You "agree" or "strongly agree" with point 2 above. Which of the following elements should be introduced to further incentivise the use of socially responsible public procurement?

Select all that apply:

- ☐ Public buyers should be given the option to require bidders to have a collective agreement in place (respecting link to the subject matter principle).
- ☒ Public buyers should be given the option to consider collective agreements as an award criterion (respecting link to the subject matter principle).
- ☒ EU law should clarify that social considerations affecting the workers performing a given contract are linked to the subject matter.
- ☒ The link to the subject matter principle should be softened, to allow the possibility to take into account companies' overall social policies (such as collective agreements covering all workers or corporate and social responsibility).
- ☒ "Completion notices" shall be introduced offering the possibility for public buyers to flag labour or social law compliance issues.
- ☐ Transparency requirements in subcontracting should be increased to ensure compliance with existing labour and social obligations.
- ☒ Non-binding socially responsible public procurement targets should be set at EU and at Member State levels with accompanying strategies or plans to ensure their achievement.
- ☐ Other

You "agree" or "strongly agree" with point 3 above. Which of the following elements should be made mandatory?

Select all that apply:

- ☐ It should not be possible to subcontract an entire contract to a single subcontractor.
- ☒ Subcontracting beyond a certain tier should be limited in sectors at high risk of labour rights violations.

- ☒ In low-skilled labour-intensive sectors, price-only criteria should be banned, requiring BPQR instead.
- ☒ The current optional exclusion ground for companies that have violated applicable labour or social law obligations should be made mandatory.
- ☒ The horizontal social clause should additionally include fundamental and human rights obligations.
- ☐ Socially responsible public procurement targets should be mandated at EU and at Member State levels with accompanying strategies or plans to ensure their achievement.
- ☐ Other

## Social considerations in public procurement - impacts

How likely do you believe the following outcomes would occur as a result of further **Incentivising** the use of socially responsible public procurement?

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	No impact	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely
Make cross-border participation more difficult	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Poverty reduction and increased social inclusion	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduced risk of labour and social law breaches	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased chance of winning calls for tender by EU bidders	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Higher SME participation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduced competition	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased prices of products / services / works	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased costs for EU bidders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Better quality of products / services / works	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boost EU industry	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Improved working conditions	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Higher administrative burden for EU bidders	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased administrative burden for public buyers	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduced litigation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boost EU employment	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you wish, you may indicate any other likely impacts below:

*Text of 5 to 1000 characters will be accepted*

Text of 5 to 300 characters will be accepted

How likely do you believe the following outcomes would occur as a result of **mandating** further socially responsible public procurement obligations?

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	No impact	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely
Higher SME participation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Higher administrative burden for EU bidders	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased administrative burden for public buyers	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boost EU employment	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased costs for EU bidders	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Better quality of products / services / works	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduced competition	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boost EU industry	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased chance of winning calls for tender by EU bidders	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Increased prices of products / services / works	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduced litigation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Improved working conditions	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduced risk of labour and social law breaches	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Make cross-border participation more difficult	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Poverty reduction and increased social inclusion	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you wish, you may indicate any other likely impacts below:

*Text of 5 to 1000 characters will be accepted*

Text of 5 to 300 characters will be accepted

EU should mandate socially responsible procurement. In most of the cases, increasing social conditionalities in a contract leads to direct change in improved working conditions, poverty reduction and increased social inclusion. There may be some impact on contracting authorities to verify the bidder and the evaluation to provide completion notices, but it can be successfully used to improve the quality of employment for the people doing the service and public finances should never become a channel for unfair wages and poor working conditions for anyone.

## Public procurement of innovation

Regarding public procurement of innovation, the evaluation concluded that its uptake remains very low across Member States, representing a marginal share of the total public procurement value and volume, despite its potential to stimulate innovation.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements concerning public procurement of innovation?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. No amendments are required to the existing legal framework regarding the public procurement of innovation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. EU public procurement law should further <b>incentivise</b> the public procurement of innovation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3. EU public procurement law should <b>mandate</b> the public procurement of innovation requirements.	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
---	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

You "agree" or "strongly agree" with point 2 above. Which of the following elements should be introduced to further incentivise the use of public procurement of innovation?

- ☒ EU law should provide a clear legal definition of public procurement of innovation.
- ☒ EU law should simplify and remove legal conditions to facilitate the use of procurement procedures designed to buy innovative solutions, such as innovation partnerships or competitive dialogue.
- ☐ Public buyers should be able to directly buy innovative solutions from start-ups more easily through the creation of a specific procedure.
- ☒ A comply or explain mechanism should be introduced to promote the use of preliminary market consultations when buying innovative solutions, to limit excessive financial guarantees, or to enable suppliers to retain Intellectual Property Rights.
- ☐ The Commission should promote value engineering in relation to the public procurement of innovation.
- ☒ Non-binding targets for public procurement of innovation should be set at EU and Member State levels with accompanying strategies or plans to ensure their achievement.
- ☒ The Commission should promote the aggregation of demand in case of similar needs among public buyers (e.g. collaborative procurement by multiple public buyers).
- ☒ The Commission should establish an EU platform in which all EU public sector innovation challenges are communicated to suppliers of innovative solutions, including start-ups and innovative SME's.
- ☐ Other:

You "agree" or "strongly agree" with point 3 above. Which of the following elements should be made mandatory?

- ☐ Mandatory targets for public procurement of innovation should be set at EU and Member State levels with accompanying strategies or plans to ensure their achievement.
- ☐ Preliminary market consultations when buying innovative solutions.
- ☐ Limiting excessive financial guarantees when buying innovative solutions.
- ☐ Ensuring that suppliers retain Intellectual Property Rights.
- ☒ Other:

Please specify:

*Text of 5 to 1000 characters will be accepted*

Text of 5 to 300 characters will be accepted

Unlike environmental and social conditionalities in procurement, innovation needs to be sector specific and should be set targets. Contracting authorities should be incentivised to use innovative solutions in their procurement especially in areas where the commission identifies lead markets to be created. We would not like to agree to any of the above being made mandatory because it has to be decided on a case- by case basis.

## Public procurement of innovation - impacts

How likely do you believe the following outcomes would occur as a result of **incentivising** public procurement of innovation?

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	No impact	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely
Easier access to cross border procurement within the EU	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boost EU employment	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduced litigation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduced competition	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boost EU industry	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Better quality of products / services / works	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boost EU innovation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased chance of winning calls for tender by EU bidders	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Higher SME participation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Increased prices of products / services / works	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased administrative burden for public buyers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased costs for EU bidders	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Higher administrative burden for EU bidders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you wish, you may indicate any other likely impacts below:

*Text of 5 to 1000 characters will be accepted*

Text of 5 to 300 characters will be accepted

How likely do you believe the following outcomes would occur as a result of **mandating** public procurement of innovation?

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	No impact	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely
Increased chance of winning calls for tender by EU bidders	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduced competition	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boost EU industry	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Higher administrative burden for EU bidders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Better quality of products / services / works	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased costs for EU bidders	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Higher SME participation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduced litigation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased administrative burden for public buyers	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boost EU employment	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Boost EU innovation	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased prices of products / services / works	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Easier access to cross border procurement within the EU	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you wish, you may indicate any other likely impacts below:

*Text of 5 to 1000 characters will be accepted*

Text of 5 to 300 characters will be accepted

## Final comments

---

Would you like to make any additional comments or provide further information relevant for the revision of the EU public procurement legal framework, including on the impacts of policy choices (e.g. quantify impact in terms of costs and benefits)?

*Text of 5 to 3000 characters will be accepted*

Please upload your file(s)

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

## Contact

GROW-D2@ec.europa.eu

