



Brussels, 17.5.2017
COM(2017) 242 final

ANNEX 1

ANNEX

to the

**report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council
on the review of the practical application of the European Single Procurement
Document (ESPD)**

Table n.1 Date of entry into force of national legislation transposing Directives 2014/24/EU and 2014/25/EU – State of play at 5 April 2017

Member States	Classical Directive 2014/24/EU	Utilities Directive 2014/25/EU
Belgium		
Bulgaria	15.4.2016	15.4.2016
Czech Republic	1.10.2016	1.10.2016
Denmark	1.1.2016	1.1.2016
Germany	18.4.2016	18.4.2016
Estonia		
Ireland	5.5.2016	5.5.2016
Greece	8.8.2016	8.8.2016
Spain		
France	1.4.2016	1.4.2016
Croatia	1.1.2017	1.1.2017
Italy	19.4.2016	19.4.2016
Cyprus	28.4.2016	23.12.2016
Latvia	1.3.2017	1.4.2017
Lithuania		
Luxembourg		
Hungary	1.11.2015	1.11.2015
Malta	28.10.2016	28.10.2016
Netherlands	1.7.2016	1.7.2016
Austria		
Poland	28.7.2016	28.7.2016
Portugal		
Romania	26.5.2016	26.5.2016
Slovenia	1.4.2016	1.4.2016
Slovak Republic	18.4.2016	18.4.2016
Finland		
Sweden		
United Kingdom	18.4.2016	18.4.2016

Table 2 Number of unique visitors in January 2017 to the eESPD service by Member States

Member States	Unique visitors
Romania	31561
Denmark	11217
Poland	9049
Spain	9444
Italy	6425
Greece	3858
Norway	4147
Germany	3427
France	3107
Finland	2959
Sweden	2327
United Kingdom	1945
Portugal	1221
Netherlands	1231
Bulgaria	781
Croatia	724
Slovakia	633
Hungary	617
Belgium	596
Czech Republic	543
Slovenia	443
Austria	401
Switzerland	286
Latvia	194
Ireland	177
Estonia	91
Lithuania	61
Cyprus	34
Luxembourg	29
Malta	26

Table n.3 Benefits and disadvantages reported by Member States from the use of the ESPD

Benefits	Member States
Expected reduction of administrative burden for suppliers (including SMEs)	Czech Republic, Greece, Croatia, Cyprus, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania
Expected reduction of administrative burden for buyers	Greece, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania
Better value for money deriving from the increase of market openness and competition	Italy
Increased transparency for suppliers regarding exclusion and selection criteria	Belgium
First step to achieve interoperability of e-procurement across all the EU	Portugal
Facilitates cross-border participation to public procurement procedures	Belgium, Finland
Standardised exclusion and selection criteria, in an exhaustive list	Cyprus, Finland, Portugal
Standardisation of self-declarations, nationally and across the EU	Sweden
Faster evaluation process, shorter procedure	Belgium, Finland, Lithuania, Romania
Marginal additional reduction in comparison to existing system	Spain, Netherlands
Benefits once the electronic version is available	Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, Ireland
Benefits once the automatic connection with e-procurement platforms or registries is available	Finland, Slovak Republic

Disadvantages	Member States
The form is too complicated	Austria, Germany, Spain, Finland, Poland
The form is too long	Austria, Germany, Spain
Increase of administrative burden for EOs	Austria, Denmark, Spain, Poland
Increase of administrative burden for CAs	Austria, Denmark, Finland, Spain,
Paper form is problematic, but things could improve with electronic version	Hungary
The ESPD is a step back compared to self-declarations in use prior its introduction	Austria, Germany, Spain, Finland
Easier for EOs to provide all supporting documents from the beginning	Spain, Poland
The form is too rigid	Denmark
Difficulties in an initial phase for buyers and suppliers	Greece
Not used by the majority of operators, scarce acceptance by suppliers	Germany, Spain
If the ESPD cannot be re-used for different procedures, it is difficult to convince stakeholders to use it	Malta