# EU Procurement Act
# Improving data architecture, quality and use to power up European procurement

## Purpose and scope

The Commission's proposed Public Procurement Act (COM(2026) 590, published on 9 September 2026), has a bold ambition. It would replace three directives with a single, directly applicable Regulation that lays out some much needed but ambitious digital and data changes to European procurement. These include:

i) mandatory public procurement data collection and publication across member states (so-called data spaces),

ii) a real quality-over-price floor for contract awards, and

iii) an interoperable once-only credential system, allowing suppliers to present their credentials once and bid across all European contracts.

The Commission has been bold, and we want that ambition to survive negotiations with Member States intact: this is a once-in-a-generation opportunity for reform. Getting the implementation right will be critically important to the success of this transformation. This note explores exactly that and sets out our recommendations for improving the Act text to set the right direction for impactful implementation. The strategies and approach that we explore below should hold regardless of which specific data schema, platform architecture, or governance model the Commission ultimately adopts.

## Two overarching strategies

We believe the reform should tackle the two most important issues surrounding public procurement data use: boosting both data quality and data use.

## Strategy I: Ensure data quality (especially at source)

Quality issues are hard to address after data collection, so this strategy is about improving the quality of the data at source to avoid "garbage in, garbage out."

1. Capture data right at the transaction, not the notice. Procurement data should be a by-product of doing the procurement through a user-friendly interface, which should be a core requirement for all future procurement systems in the EU.
2. Start with quality validation at data collection and complement this with validation centrally. Every submission to e-procurement systems (and other related systems) should be checked automatically and handed back to the individual who submitted it if there are quality errors. The national and European public procurement data spaces should be a secondary layer of quality validation.
3. Ask once, reuse everywhere. Information a supplier or buyer has already provided, anywhere in the system, should never need to be re-entered.
4. Record what was bought, not just which criteria applied. Analysis of procurement as a policy lever is impossible without the actual records of CPVs, quantities, or values.

## Strategy II: Establish a virtuous cycle to encourage collection and use

The reform should create a virtuous cycle by encouraging use, addressing noncompliance, and making data available so that users are motivated and give feedback to publishers.

1. Attach real consequences to data quality. A data publication obligation without a legal or operational consequence for non-compliance will be treated as optional.

2. Default to open, structured and machine-readable data through public APIs in an agreed-upon common data schema, such as Open Contracting Data Standard (OCDS). The burden of proof should sit with any exception to openness. PPDS should fully empower deep and comprehensive market intelligence.

3. Return value to whoever submits the data. The single strongest lever for data quality is giving the people entering data something useful back. Publishers will be much more incentivized to improve data quality if they get their own information back as useful dashboards and indicators vs a 'dead drop' where they feel they are simply entering information for someone else to use or check up on them.

# Recommendations Step-By-Step

## Strategy I: Ensure data quality (especially at source)

### Tactic 1: Capture data at the transaction, not the notice

Articles 134-135 describe what data must exist in the National and Union Public Procurement Data Spaces (NPPDS), but not how it should get there. If Member States build NPPDS ingestion around today's eForms model (buyers filling in a separate notice form after the fact) the result will be the disconnected, low-quality data eForms produces today. Article 110 and the interoperability network under Articles 128-130 should ensure that data flows from the transactional systems buyers already use (e-tendering, contract management, e-invoicing) directly into the NPPDS, with public summaries generated from that data rather than the reverse. The published text moves part of the way: Articles 110(7) and 134(8) now empower implementing acts to require public buyers to reuse information already provided in a public summary, and eProcurement service providers to offer a corresponding reuse service.

- **Recommendation** (legal): require that Article 110 public summaries be auto-populated from the underlying transactional record wherever a buyer's e-procurement system holds one, with manual entry as the fallback rather than the default.

  *Proposed wording: Article 110, (new) paragraph 8. Wherever a public buyer holds the information referred to in paragraphs 2 to 5 in an existing transactional procurement system, contract management system, or e-invoicing system, that information shall be populated into the relevant public summary directly from that system. Manual entry of that information shall be used only where no such system exists, or where the relevant data is not held in a structured, retrievable form.*

- **Recommendation** (technical): sequence the interoperability network's technical specifications (Art. 128-130) to treat existing national e-procurement, e-invoicing, contract-management systems and other digital building blocks as primary data sources.

  *Proposed wording: Article 128(3) (new) point (m): the designation of existing national e-procurement, e-invoicing and contract-management systems as the primary source systems from which the information specified in Article 110 is drawn into the network, with the National Public Procurement Data Spaces established under Article 134, and the Commission eProcurement platform under Article 132, treated as recipients of that data.*

**EXAMPLE: Ukraine's Prozorro**

Prozorro runs on a hybrid model: private, competing marketplaces handle the actual tender interactions (buyers announcing tenders, suppliers submitting bids) and sync that data via API to a central state-owned database in real time. Ukraine's medical procurement agency used this same data for planning and supplier engagement, and prices for some medicines dropped by up to 40% as a result of better buying strategies informed by having usable data.

open-contracting.org: Ukraine's open contracting impact

### Tactic 2: Validate at source first, centrally second

The priority should be validating data at the moment it's entered, inside the same e-procurement, contract-management or e-invoicing system. The NPPDS and PPDS should exist as a second layer of validation. The published text now requires the NPPDS to send a validation confirmation back to whoever made the information available (Article 134(6)); what is missing is the return of errors, and validation before submission rather than after.

- **Recommendation** (source validation): require, in the Article 131 obligations on eProcurement service providers, that providers validate data automatically at the point of entry against the technical validation requirements in Article 134(6)/(8), and return errors to the user immediately, in clear, actionable terms, before the record can be submitted at all.

  *Proposed wording: Article 131, (new) paragraph 6a: eProcurement service providers shall validate data submitted through their eProcurement platforms against the technical validation requirements referred to in Article 134(6), as further specified pursuant to Article 134(8), at the point the data is entered. Where that validation identifies an error, the eProcurement service provider shall return the error, in clear, actionable terms, to the public buyer or economic operator that submitted the data immediately and before the record is accepted for submission.*

- **Recommendation** (central validation): require, in Article 136, that the PPDS data exchange apply that same Article 134(6)/(8) validation as a secondary layer, returning any errors caught there back to the source.

  *Proposed wording: Article 136(2), (new) point (l): a validation-and-return function, applying the technical validation requirements referred to in Article 134(6) as a secondary layer to data not already validated at the point of entry pursuant to Article 131(6a), and returning any errors identified to the Member State or National Public Procurement Data Space from which the data was received.*

**EXAMPLE: OCP's data-quality helpdesk role in Moldova**

When Moldova built MTender, OCP's OCDS helpdesk directly evaluated the quality and validity of the country's data as it was being produced, working with the World Bank and EBRD's technical cooperation project. That hands-on validation role (checking data against the standard as it flows) is the function the Article 132 data network should perform automatically at EU scale.

open-contracting.org — Opening up Moldova's contracts: progress and challenges

### Tactic 3: Ask once, reuse everywhere

Article 133's delegated and implementing acts have to create conditions for genuine reuse across procedures and Member States. The published text already requires the electronic eligibility service to operate through or interoperate with the European Business Wallets (Article 133(1)) and eProcurement service providers to enable their use (Article 131(2)). It also introduces a per-procedure 'eligibility profile' (Article 133(2)), which risks re-creating the resubmission burden the once-only principle is meant to remove.

- **Recommendation** (retrievability): require, in Article 133(2a), that a supplier's verified credential data be retrievable by any connected buyer and pre-populate each eligibility profile without re-submission.

  *Proposed wording: Article 133, (new) paragraph 2a: Once verified through the digital business credential tool, an economic operator's evidence of compliance with exclusion grounds, selection criteria and requirements of origin shall be retrievable by any connected public buyer for any subsequent procurement procedure, and the eligibility profile referred to in paragraph 2 shall be pre-populated from that evidence, without requiring the economic operator to resubmit it.*

- **Recommendation** (Business Wallet): the published text now requires interoperability with the European Business Wallets (Articles 133(1) and 131(2)). This should be preserved through negotiation, extended to the requirements on the credential tools themselves in Article 133(5), and the 30 June 2028 availability deadline in Article 133(5)(a) aligned with the date of application of the Regulation.

  *Proposed wording: Article 133(5), (new) point (g): they shall be technically interoperable with the European Business Wallets, such that verified identity and eligibility data held in the digital business credential tool and in the European Business Wallets may be relied upon interchangeably by economic operators, without requiring them to hold separate credentials.*

**EXAMPLE: The UK's once-only supplier registration**

Under the Procurement Act 2023, suppliers register once on the Central Digital Platform and reuse that core information across multiple bids, rather than resubmitting the same organizational data for every tender. This is the practical version of what Article 133 aims for.

stotles.com — The Central Digital Platform: A Guide to the Procurement Act 2023

### Tactic 4: Record what was bought, not just which criteria applied

Article 134(5)(g) asks Member States to assess the extent to which public buyers pursue strategic procurement objectives (environmental, social, innovation) and their contribution to those objectives. In practice, what gets recorded is usually only whether a corresponding criterion was applied in the award, not what was actually procured. That leaves a basic question unanswerable: what is the volume of green procurement, regardless of whether a green criterion was invoked? A buyer can procure an inherently green product without ever applying a labeled green criterion, and the current data structure has no way to show it. A second, narrower problem compounds the first: even where a strategic criterion is applied, key fields needed for real impact analysis (quantities, units, specific CPV subcategories) are too often left incomplete, making it impossible to answer even the narrower question of what was bought, how much, and of what kind.

- **Recommendation**: require, in the Article 134(8) implementing act, that the environmental, social or innovation attribute of the goods, services or works procured be recorded as structured data, irrespective of whether a corresponding strategic criterion under Article 50, 55 or 60 was applied in the award.

*Proposed wording: further amend Article 134(8): Those implementing acts shall further specify that the information referred to in Article 134(5)(g) includes the environmental, social or innovation attributes of the goods, services or works procured, recorded irrespective of whether a corresponding criterion under Article 50, 55 or 60 was applied in the award of the contract.*

- **Recommendation**: for procedures in which a strategic criterion under Article 50, 55 or 60 was applied, make quantity, unit of measurement, and specific Common Procurement Vocabulary subcategory mandatory fields.

  *Proposed wording: further amend Article 134(8): For procurement procedures in which a criterion referred to in Article 50, 55 or 60 has been applied, the quantity, unit of measurement, and specific Common Procurement Vocabulary subcategory of the goods, services or works concerned shall be mandatory fields, subject to validation at the point of entry pursuant to Article 131(6a).*

## Strategy II: Establish virtuous cycle to encourage collection and use

### Tactic 1: Attach real consequences to data quality

A data mandate with no consequence for non-compliance will lead to minimum viable compliance. The Regulation requires Member States to impose fines for NPPDS non-compliance (Art. 134(9)), but fines are a lagging, adversarial mechanism. We recommend tying data completeness directly into the procedural steps buyers already have to follow.

- **Recommendation** (contract conclusion): anchor the standstill/notice-completeness link to Article 35(2) in the following way: *Without prejudice to the standstill period established in Directives 89/665/EEC and 92/13/EEC, the contract shall be concluded in accordance with the applicable law of the Member State of the public buyer, and only once the information required under Article 134(5) has been made available through the National Public Procurement Data Space.*

- **Recommendation** (below-threshold and PPDS-transfer deadlines): tie the existing 20-day windows in Article 134(3) to (5) and the 10-day NPPDS-to-PPDS transfer window in Article 135(2) to enforcement and to Member States' own reporting standing.

  *Proposed wording: amend Article 134(9):...Member States shall impose effective, proportionate and dissuasive fines in respect of infringements related to the obligation to* *provide access to procurement information, including failure to meet the deadlines set out in paragraphs 3 to 5.*

*Proposed wording: amend Article 137(2): Every three years, Member States shall report to the Commission on the results of the assessment and, where structural shortcomings are identified, on the measures taken, planned or envisaged to address those shortcomings, with the first report due by … [OP please insert the date three years after the entry into force of this Regulation]. A Member State shall not be treated as having satisfied this obligation in respect of any procurement information not transferred to the Public Procurement Data Space within the deadline set out in Article 135(2).*

- **Recommendation** (named indicators): specify compliance under Article 134(9) and the monitoring duties in Article 137 in terms of named, computable indicators the data must support, rather than generic publication rules.

  *Proposed wording: (new) Article 137, paragraph 1a: For the purposes of paragraph 1, second subparagraph, points (a) and (d), Member States shall ensure their National Public Procurement Data Space is capable of computing, at minimum: application of competitive procurement methods, the rate of SME participation; average time-to-award; and the share of single-bid tenders and direct awards. The Commission may adopt implementing acts specifying additional indicators.*

**EXAMPLE: UK Procurement Act 2023 — the UK6/UK7 notice sequence**
The UK ties data publication directly into the contract-award timeline through two separate notices. A Contract Award Notice (UK6) must be published after the award decision and before signature. Publishing it starts the standstill period (at least 8 working days), during which the contract cannot lawfully be signed. Only once standstill ends can signature happen; a separate Contract Details Notice (UK7) is then due within 30 days of signature (120 days for light-touch contracts). Award data has to be public before the clock toward signature even starts running.

find-tender.service.gov.uk — Notice types and sequences

### Tactic 2: Default to open, structured and machine-readable

Article 111(2)'s grounds for withholding information from public release are currently broad and open-ended. Left unrefined, this risks becoming the abused exception (particularly for the security, origin and award-criteria data categories). The default should be: open and structured unless a narrow, enumerated exception applies. That is a default on access, not a mandate to maximize the number of fields collected.

- **Recommendation** (enumerated grounds): replace the open-ended "contrary to the public interest" language directly in Article 111(2) with a finite, enumerated list of withholding grounds, each requiring the buyer to record which ground applies as a structured data field, not free text.

  *Proposed wording: amend Article 111(2): Information may be withheld from publication only where its release would: (a) impede law enforcement; (b) harm the legitimate commercial interests of a particular economic operator, public or private; or (c) prejudice fair competition between economic operators. Where a public buyer withholds information pursuant to this paragraph, it shall record, as a structured data field, which of points (a) to (c) applies. Such information shall at the same time, however, be provided to the NPPDS pursuant to Article 134 as not publicly available information.*

- **Recommendation** (API-based access): specify both API-based access and periodic bulk file downloads as the default technical interfaces for NPPDS and PPDS data (Art. 134(8), 135(3)), with portal/dashboard interfaces as an additional, complementary layer for non-technical users.

  *Proposed wording: amend Article 134(8): ...the designation and modalities of such designation of specific procurement information as publicly or not publicly available procurement information, the source of the technical validation requirements according to paragraph 6, [...]. Procurement information designated as publicly available shall be accessible both through a public application programming interface and through periodic bulk file downloads in a machine-readable format, with portal or dashboard interfaces permitted only as an additional, complementary means of access. Proposed wording: amend Article 135(3): ...specifying the procurement information which shall be provided by the Member States through the PPDS including its technical format, the minimum publication terms for procurement information not designated as publicly available and the source of the technical validation requirements according to paragraph 2. Procurement information designated as publicly available shall be accessible both through a public application programming interface and through periodic bulk file downloads in a machine-readable format, with portal or dashboard interfaces permitted only as an additional, complementary means of access.*

- **Recommendation** (priority fields): rather than mandate the broadest possible field list, name a smaller set of fields tied to specific priority use cases and require that those specific fields be complete and analyzable, even if the wider schema stays large (this narrows what must be complete, not what may be published). The published Article 135(3) now also provides for "minimum publication terms" for information not designated as publicly available, i.e. a point at which withheld information becomes public; those terms should be short and uniform.

*Proposed wording: further amend Article 134(8) and Article 135(3) (same added sentence in both): Those implementing acts shall further designate a limited set of procurement information, tied to specified analytical use cases – including the assessment of strategic procurement outcomes pursuant to Article 134(5)(g), competition analysis, and risk detection – for which completeness shall be mandatory, regardless of the completeness required of the wider schema.*

**EXAMPLE: Paraguay's DNCP open-by-default data model**

Paraguay's national procurement database publishes more than 400 fields in OCDS format, covering the full contracting cycle, by default. That default openness is what allowed a third-party tool, VIGIA, to be built entirely on the DNCP's public API, meaning most improvements DNCP makes to its own data automatically improve VIGIA too, with no separate negotiation required. The lesson here is not the field count itself — eForms already standardizes a comparable number of fields with far weaker results — but that DNCP's data is open and structured enough by default (and each field supports specific need/usecase) for a third party to build directly on it. The priority for the EU should be ensuring the fields that matter for specific use cases are both mandatory and actually completed, not maximizing the total field count.

open-contracting.org — Paraguay's procurement is open for small businesses

### Tactic 3: Return value to whoever submits the data

This is, in our view, the single most underused lever available to the Commission. Data quality improves when the people entering the data get something useful back from having entered it well. The same is true in reverse — frustration at being unable to use bad data is its own incentive to get it right. Article 137(1) already requires Member States to make the results of their own monitoring public at least once a year, and the published text adds that structural shortcomings must be addressed through a country-specific action plan. What it does not require is that this disclosure reach the level of the individual buyer or supplier who submitted the data.

- **Recommendation** (dashboards): require the Commission and Member States to build and maintain public dashboards and analytics tools directly on top of NPPDS/PPDS.

  *Proposed wording: amend Article 137(1), third subparagraph: The results of the assessment referred to in the second subparagraph shall be made publicly available through a public dashboard or analytics tool built directly on the National Public Procurement Data Space, at least once a year.*

- **Recommendation** (granularity and cadence): require buyer- and supplier-level detail, not only a national aggregate, and match the Commission's own cycle.

  *Proposed wording: further amend Article 137(1): That dashboard or analytics tool shall be granular enough to allow a public buyer or economic operator to identify what its own submitted data reveals, and shall not consist solely of a national aggregate report.*

  *Proposed wording: amend Article 137(3): The Commission shall monitor and analyze the functioning of public procurement in the Union, in particular the competition in procurement markets, on the basis of the data in the Public Procurement Data Space. The Commission shall every year provide an analysis of the public procurement system across the Union.*

**EXAMPLE: Ukraine's BI Prozorro / ProBI and the responsiveness dividend**

Ukraine's business intelligence tools built on Prozorro's open data are used by more than 30,000 people across government, oversight bodies, business, and civil society. Institutions that responded to public feedback through the companion Dozorro platform saw their procurement outcomes improve – procurement was 5% more likely to be successful when the buyer engaged with feedback, a meaningful effect across roughly a million procedures worth €26 billion a year.

open-contracting.org — How to make better public procurement decisions with business intelligence: insights from Ukraine

## Contact

Karolis Granickas
Head of Europe
Open Contracting Partnership

kgranickas@open-contracting.org