

Public Procurement Directives - revision

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

As announced in the Political Guidelines for the next European Commission 2024-2029^[1] and the 2026 Commission Work Programme^[2], 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^[3], 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

Laura

* Surname

Savini

* Email (this won't be published)

I.savini@europabio.org

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

EuropaBio

* 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 |

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

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

- ⋮ **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*)
- ⋮ **reduce administrative burden through full digitalisation** (e.g. digitalisation of the entire procurement process, single digital procurement entry point, data reuse)
- ⋮ **facilitate SMEs participation** (e.g. division into lots, payment schemes including direct payments to subcontractors)
- ⋮ **make procurement rules less prone to anti-competitive practices** (e.g. wider use of digital tools to facilitate transparency)
- ⋮ **make procurement rules less prone to litigation** (e.g. more detailed procedural rules to avoid ambiguity)
- ⋮ **make procurement rules more flexible** (e.g. more space for negotiations, more discretion given to public buyers)
- ⋮ **make procurement rules less detailed** (e.g. focus on high-level concepts, less rules defining procedural steps)
- ⋮ **facilitate the aggregation of demand** (e.g. joint procurement by several authorities, reinforcing the role of central purchasing bodies, framework agreements)

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.

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

- ⋮ **prioritise quality over price when seeking value for money** (e.g. wider use of the best pricequality ratio to support strategic and sustainable procurement)
- ⋮ **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)
- ⋮ **facilitate socially responsible purchases** (e.g. improved working conditions, social inclusion)
- ⋮ **facilitate environmentally friendly purchases** (e.g. facilitated use of ecolabels and standards, set targets for green public procurement)
- ⋮ **make procurement rules less detailed** (e.g. focus on high-level concepts, less rules defining procedural steps)
- ⋮ **prioritise competition and price savings** (e.g. by avoiding ambitious green and social requirements)

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.

- ⋮ **avoid additional administrative burden** (e.g. minimal rules on the extent to which *Made in Europe* requirements are met)
- ⋮ **make procurement rules less prone to litigation** (e.g. more detailed to avoid ambiguity in case of third countries access)
- ⋮ **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
- ⋮ 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
- ⋮ **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 |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Allow corrections of procurement documents throughout the procedure | <input type="radio"/> | <input 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 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 type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increase flexibility in contract modifications (e.g. revising the duration, price changes) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Facilitate dialogue with the market | <input type="radio"/> | <input 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 |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Enhance the role of Central Purchasing Bodies | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Facilitate networking among buyers (e.g., forming buyer groups or communities of practice) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Simplify rules for setting up joint procurements, especially across borders | <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 type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" 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 |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Increase time limits for submission | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provide model contract templates and technical specifications templates for public buyers | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Allow re-use of documentation submitted by bidders (once-only principle) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Establish a central EU procurement platform and enhance digitisation | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Set time limits for evaluating bids | <input 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 |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Simplify rules for forming consortia, especially for SMEs | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input 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"/> |
| EU-level targets for SMEs participation in public procurement | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" 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 |
|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Increase use of pre-financing, especially for SMEs | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Speed up payments to contractors, especially SMEs | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Establish rules for the post-award phase, including contract implementation | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Establish rules for direct payments to subcontractors, especially SMEs | <input 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

Responses given above on joint procurement reflect the views of EuropaBio Health members. Procurement procedures for healthcare biotech products should not inadvertently disadvantage smaller innovators, SMEs and mid-caps, nor stifle innovation and undermine competition between manufacturers. Procurement measures should be avoided where they could delay patient access due to length of procedure. This is particularly important for therapeutic areas where time to treatment is critical; it is difficult to predict volumes; or patient treatment requires advanced facilities and highly trained staff that are not available in all Member States. EuropaBio Industrial Biotech members suggest giving SMEs greater access to public procurement by reducing the cost and/or burden of participating, including by ensuring contract size is not an obstacle, giving sufficient time to prepare bids, setting proportionate qualification and economic criteria, and dividing contracts into lots.

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 |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Faster procurement processes | <input type="radio"/> | <input 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 type="radio"/> |
| Increased bidding by EU-based firms | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Less corruption | <input 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 type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased buying power of public buyers | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased legal certainty | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Reduced price of goods /services/works | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased number of bidders | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased SME participation | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased cross-border bidding within the EU | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Reduced cost for public buyers to conduct public procurement | <input type="radio"/> |
| More competition | <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 |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Faster procurement processes | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased SME participation | <input type="radio"/> |
| Reduced litigation | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased cross-border bidding within the EU | <input type="radio"/> |
| Reduced cost for bidders to participate in public procurement | <input type="radio"/> |
| Less corruption | <input type="radio"/> |
| Reduced cost for public buyers to conduct public procurement | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased number of bidders | <input type="radio"/> |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Increased buying power of public buyers | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased legal certainty | <input type="radio"/> |
| More competition | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased bidding by EU-based firms | <input type="radio"/> |
| Reduced price of goods /services/works | <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

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.

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 |
|---|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------------|---------------|
| 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 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| In case of one central eProcurement system: higher risk of cyber-attacks/security breaches | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| In case of one central eProcurement system: higher risks of stopping all public procurement procedures in the EU if the system fails (IT failure) | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| More harmonisation of tender requirements across Member States and emergence of best practices | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Increased transparency to prevent irregular practices | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Faster exchange of documents and information (including company evidence) | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| In case of one central eProcurement system: higher risk of cyber-attacks/security breaches | <input type="radio"/> |
| Reduced litigation | <input type="radio"/> |
| Reduced cost for economic operators to participate in procurement procedures | <input type="radio"/> |
| Wider range of procurement procedures available to economic operators (especially for SMEs) | <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

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

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 |
|--|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Reduced litigation | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" 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"/> |
| Better quality of products /services/works | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased administrative cost for EU bidders due to additional documents or evidence | <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"/> |
| Increase in price of goods and services purchased | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Boost EU employment | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 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"/> |
| Boost investments levels in the EU (e.g. reindustrialisation, reshoring, more FDI) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Meeting environmental goals (e.g. shortening supply chains, carbon footprint) | <input type="radio"/> | <input 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"/> |
| Lower number of bids received | <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"/> |
| Easier access to procurement for EU SMEs | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increase security of supply | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" 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

EuropaBio Healthcare members support the EU's objective of strategic autonomy and resilience. However Made in the EU criteria may have limitations in public procurement processes for biotech health products and may not considerably contribute to attaining the EU's objectives due to the global and complex nature of their supply chains. EuropaBio Healthcare members are concerned that EU-made requirements may add an administrative burden for companies to bid in public tenders. EuropaBio would suggest approaching the value assessment of biotech health products with broad and common criteria assessing societal, environmental and technological value and the sustainability of the products and services under public tenders. EuropaBio Healthcare members understand that EU-Made criteria may be used under certain conditions in public tenders and would call for their use together with other criteria as to provide a holistic view of the product's value.

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 |
|--|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------------|---------------|
| Reduced litigation | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Boost to EU innovation | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Wider access to cross border procurement (especially for SMEs) | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Higher price of goods/services /works purchased | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Achievement of strategic policy goals (e.g. environmental, social, innovation) | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Increased security of supply | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Improved working conditions | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Higher costs for EU bidders (additional environmental /social elements) | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| More reshoring, reindustrialisation of the EU, more FDI in the EU | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Reduced number of bids received | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Better quality of products /services/works | <input type="radio"/> |
| Higher chances of winning for EU firms | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased efforts for bidders to adjust their supply chains to be able to bid | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased administrative cost for public buyers (verification if conditions are met) | <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 checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2. The general legislative framework should further incentivise the use of green public procurement. | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 3. EU public procurement law should mandate further green public procurement obligations. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" 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:

Please specify:

Text of 5 to 1000 characters will be accepted

Text of 5 to 300 characters will be accepted

For bio-based products and biotech applications outside of healthcare, expand the scope of public procurement to cover both sustainable public procurement and green public procurement.

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 |
|---|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------------|---------------|
| Reduced litigation | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Higher SME participation | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Increased prices of products / services / works | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Better quality of products / services / works | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Boost EU employment | <input type="radio"/> | <input 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 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"/> |
| Achievement of environmental policy goals | <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 checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased costs for EU bidders | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Reduced competition | <input type="radio"/> | <input 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 type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Boost EU innovation | <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

Please note that these answers reflect the views of EuropaBio Industrial Biotech members.

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 |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Increased prices of products / services / works | <input type="radio"/> |
| Boost EU innovation | <input type="radio"/> |
| Better quality of products / services / works | <input type="radio"/> |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Reduced litigation | <input type="radio"/> |
| Higher SME participation | <input type="radio"/> |
| Higher administrative burden for EU bidders | <input type="radio"/> |
| Achievement of environmental policy goals | <input type="radio"/> |
| Boost EU employment | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased costs for EU bidders | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased chance of winning calls for tender by EU bidders | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased administrative burden for public buyers | <input type="radio"/> |
| Reduced competition | <input type="radio"/> |
| Easier access to cross border procurement within the EU | <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

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"/> |
| 2. EU public procurement law should further incentivise the use of socially responsible public procurement. | <input type="radio"/> |
| 3. The general legislative framework should mandate further socially responsible public procurement obligations. | <input type="radio"/> |

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 |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Reduced risk of labour and social law breaches | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased administrative burden for public buyers | <input type="radio"/> |
| Improved working conditions | <input type="radio"/> |
| Higher administrative burden for EU bidders | <input type="radio"/> |
| Poverty reduction and increased social inclusion | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased chance of winning calls for tender by EU bidders | <input type="radio"/> |
| Higher SME participation | <input type="radio"/> |
| Reduced competition | <input type="radio"/> |
| Boost EU industry | <input type="radio"/> |
| Make cross-border participation more difficult | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased costs for EU bidders | <input type="radio"/> |
| Boost EU employment | <input type="radio"/> |
| Reduced litigation | <input type="radio"/> |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Increased prices of products / services / works | <input type="radio"/> |
| Better quality of products / services / works | <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 |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Reduced litigation | <input type="radio"/> |
| Reduced competition | <input type="radio"/> |
| Higher SME participation | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased chance of winning calls for tender by EU bidders | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased costs for EU bidders | <input type="radio"/> |
| Boost EU industry | <input type="radio"/> |
| Poverty reduction and increased social inclusion | <input type="radio"/> |
| Reduced risk of labour and social law breaches | <input type="radio"/> |
| Better quality of products / services / works | <input type="radio"/> |
| Higher administrative burden for EU bidders | <input type="radio"/> |
| Boost EU employment | <input type="radio"/> |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Increased administrative burden for public buyers | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased prices of products / services / works | <input type="radio"/> |
| Make cross-border participation more difficult | <input type="radio"/> |
| Improved working conditions | <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

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 type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2. EU public procurement law should further incentivise the public procurement of innovation. | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 3. EU public procurement law should mandate the public procurement of innovation requirements. | <input 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 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:

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 |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Reduced competition | <input type="radio"/> |
| | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Boost EU innovation | <input type="radio"/> |
| Better quality of products / services / works | <input type="radio"/> |
| Higher SME participation | <input type="radio"/> |
| Higher administrative burden for EU bidders | <input type="radio"/> |
| Easier access to cross border procurement within the EU | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased prices of products / services / works | <input type="radio"/> |
| Boost EU employment | <input type="radio"/> |
| Boost EU industry | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased administrative burden for public buyers | <input type="radio"/> |
| Reduced litigation | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased costs for EU bidders | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased chance of winning calls for tender by EU bidders | <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

EuropaBio Industrial Biotech members would welcome guidelines on “buying innovative” adapted to the procurement of innovative products. More generally, the use of Innovation Partnerships for biotechnology and biomanufacturing innovation should be further promoted

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 |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Boost EU employment | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased costs for EU bidders | <input type="radio"/> | <input 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 type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Reduced competition | <input type="radio"/> | <input 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 type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increased prices of products / services / works | <input type="radio"/> | <input 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 type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Higher administrative burden for EU bidders | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" 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"/> |
| Boost EU industry | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Better quality of products / services / works | <input type="radio"/> | <input 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 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

Please note the answers above reflect EuropaBio Industrial Biotech members.

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

EuropaBio welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback on the revision of the Public Procurement Directives. EuropaBio and its members are committed to working together with institutional partners to ensure that biotech innovations reach patients, consumers and industry partners.

For EuropaBio Healthcare members delivering the health innovations of tomorrow demands urgent action today through reinforced global value chains and stronger EU leadership and competitiveness in biotech and life sciences innovation. EuropaBio supports the EU's ambition to become more autonomous and resilient,

however, there may be limitations on the added-value of the EU-made criteria added to MEAT or BPQR criteria due to the global and complex nature of the healthcare biotech supply chains and this may ultimately hinder access to innovation. EuropaBio Healthcare members understand that EU-Made criteria may be used under certain conditions in public tenders and would call for their use together with other criteria, such as innovative, societal, environmental and sustainability aspects that could provide a holistic view of the product's value. EuropaBio Healthcare members believe that under uncertain geopolitical conditions, the EU must prioritise strategic partnerships with like-minded countries and partners (i.e. parties to EU-bilateral trade agreements), focused on securing access to raw materials, and other essential inputs for industry such as pharmaceutical manufacturing. This will strengthen resilience and reduce upstream dependencies. These partnerships should be guided by a clear EU-level framework to avoid uncoordinated national initiatives, ensure alignment with the Union's exclusive competence on trade, and support a unified external approach to resilience. In parallel, partnerships should aim to remove trade barriers, including non-tariff barriers, to facilitate the cross-border movement of medicines and critical components. They should also promote regulatory cooperation, reducing friction in supply chains and supporting faster, more predictable market access. All trade-related measures must remain fully consistent with the EU's international obligations, reinforcing the EU's credibility as a reliable and rules-based global partner.

EuropaBio Industrial Biotech members recommend strengthening provisions and accompanying guidelines to give SMEs greater access to public procurement by reducing the cost and/or burden of participating, including by ensuring contract size is not an obstacle, giving sufficient time to prepare bids, ensuring timely payments, setting proportionate qualification and economic criteria, and dividing contracts into lots. They also call for the review of procurement guidelines to introduce the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT) criteria to ensure the value recognition of biotechnology innovation, including the biomanufacturing process.

Please upload your file(s)

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

Contact

GROW-D2@ec.europa.eu

