

Targeted consultation on the Guidance on Public Procurement of Innovation

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Information about the consulted stakeholder

* Name of your organisation

1000 character(s) maximum

FIEC - the European Construction Industry Federation

* Which category fits the best the type of your organisation?

- Contracting authority/entity
 Supplier

Supplier

- SME
 Start-up
 Other

Please specify

European business federation whose members are national business federations whose members are construction companies of all sizes and active in all fields (buildings and civil engineering)

* Where are you from?

Belgium

General questions

Does this guidance correctly identify and explain the most important aspects of public procurement of innovation?

- Yes.
 No.

Is this guidance of direct use to you?

- Yes.
- No.

If not, please let us know how it can be improved?

5000 character(s) maximum

But it can help public buyers to use more the available provisions of the 2014 public procurement directives.

Are the examples sufficiently relevant and useful?

- Yes.
- No.

What further elements would you need?

5000 character(s) maximum

Some examples are fine. In some others, it is difficult to understand what has really been innovative... They would need to be more clearly presented / explained.

Detailed questions

Getting acquainted with public procurement of innovation

Are the reasons for doing public procurement of innovation correctly identified?

- Yes.
- No.

Would you add any reasons to the business case for public procurement of innovation?

- Yes.
- No.

Which ones?

5000 character(s) maximum

The guide should insist on the search for quality and sustainability, taking into account LCC approaches.

Is there anything missing in the definition of public procurement of innovation in this document?

- Yes.
- No.

Please let us know how it can be improved?

5000 character(s) maximum

Technical innovation does not concern only public procurement, SMEs or start-ups. It concerns society as a whole. Innovation is part of a global sustainable development strategy.

Do you have any other comments on this section?

- Yes.
- No.

Please specify them.

5000 character(s) maximum

We appreciate that the guide very explicitly mentions that the main break to innovation, in spite of the many options provided by the 2014 public procurement directive, is the risk-aversion of public buyers.

However, some elements mentioned are a bit simplistic: i.e. the price criterion has not disappeared from the new directives, it has just been rephrased under the umbrella of MEAT. There are now 3 options under this umbrella: price only, price with LCC approach and best price/quality ratio.

Making innovation part of the policy

Does the document offer a good enough overview of policy challenges and a way to overcome them?

- Yes.
- No.

If not, please let us know how it can be improved?

5000 character(s) maximum

More or less... it is too abstract in general

Are the examples for policies actions adequate?

- Yes.
- No.

If not, please let us know which ones are not and what could be improved?

5000 character(s) maximum

They are not sufficiently accurate.
The South Korean example on the insurance scheme is interesting.
As public authorities have a strong risk-aversion, they need an insurance coverage to engage into innovative projects.

Should the diversity of situations of public buyers across the EU be further taken into account?

- Yes.
 No.

If yes, how?

5000 character(s) maximum

For instance, central buyers (big) versus local buyers (small)

Do you have any other comments on the policy section of the Guidance?

- Yes.
 No.

Attracting innovators

Have you ever used any of these tools in practice?

- Yes.
 No.

Do you have suggestions of any other tools not directly stemming from the EU public procurement law that can be used to the same effect?

- Yes.
 No.

Please provide examples.

5000 character(s) maximum

Allowing variants, as they promote innovation.

How would you strike a balance between using specific tools designed to attract innovators and additional administrative burden it may bring. Any indications to be recommended?

5000 character(s) maximum

NA

Attracting innovation

Do you consider the list of innovation friendly instruments listed in the document as sufficiently exhaustive?

- Yes.
 No.

What other instruments would you be interested in?

5000 character(s) maximum

Innovative project insurance scheme could be added to the list.

Is the degree of detail sufficient to grasp the main idea for targeted public to be able to start its own implementation process?

- Yes.
 No.

Do you find the examples appropriate?

- Yes.
 No.

If not, please let us know which ones are not and what could be improved?

5000 character(s) maximum

More or less: some should be more detailed, more explicite. There should be more examples in general.

Would you have other examples to propose, either to complement those already mentioned in the document or to illustrate other parts of the text?

- Yes.
 No.

Do you have any other comments on this section?

- Yes.
- No.

Please specify.

5000 character(s) maximum

Again, some elements are just "good intentions" which are unfortunately far from reality: e.g. MEAT instead of price only or advanced payments to SMEs.

If you have any questions please send an email to GROW-G4-consultations@ec.europa.eu

Contact

GROW-G4-CONSULTATIONS@ec.europa.eu
