CTCN Perceptions:

Results of a small-scale survey conducted in September 2018 and March 2019
Results of a small-scale survey

• conducted in September 2018 and March 2019
• within the BINGO network
• 53 contacted, 46 responded
• Contact per email
• Semi-structured
Participants by geographical distribution
(n=46)

- Europe; 12; 26%
- Asia; 11; 24%
- North America; 10; 22%
- South America; 8; 17%
- Africa; 5; 11%
How many employees does the firm have?
(n = 46)

- Micro (1-9); 39; 85%
- Small (10-49); 3; 7%
- Medium (50-250); 2; 4%
- Large (>250); 2; 4%
- Micro (1-9); 39; 85%
Sectors
(n=46; up to three mentions)

- Construction: 30 mentions
- Energy Efficiency: 28 mentions
- Renewable Energy: 17 mentions
- Environmental Technology: 12 mentions
- Forestry: 10 mentions
- Waste Management: 9 mentions
- Water: 9 mentions
- Consulting: 9 mentions
- Recycling: 3 mentions
- Health: 1 mention

Number of mentions
Are you a member / partner / active in the CTCN network (n=46)

- Yes: 9 (20%)
- No: 32 (69%)
- n/a: 5 (11%)
NOT a member: what seems attractive?
(n=32, up to three mentions)

- **Other**: 4 mentions
- **Testing new markets**: 5 mentions
- **Positive impact on climate**: 9 mentions
- **Expanding know how**: 12 mentions
- **Local/Regional networking**: 12 mentions
- **Developing technology**: 20 mentions
- **Global networking**: 21 mentions
NOT a member: what seems unattractive?
(n=32, up to three mentions)

- Other: 2
- Privacy: 9
- Procurement: 32
- Cost/benefit: 32
ALREADY a member: what seems attractive? (n=9, up to three mentions)

- Label: 7 mentions
- Information: 5 mentions
- Positive impact on climate: 3 mentions
- Other: 3 mentions
ALREADY a member: what seems attractive?
(n=9, up to three mentions)

- No benefits: 9 mentions
- Not much activity: 8 mentions
- Difficult: 3 mentions
- Other: 2 mentions
General feedback

• The advantages of network membership are not clear (39 times)
• It is very complicated to become a member (membership application) (19 times)
• Bidding system itself is onerous (15 times)
• General fear that technology revealed with the answer to bid will be copied, replicated, passed on a) without notice, b) without participation, and c) without compensation (7 times)
• Network membership does not imply pre-selection or fast-track to bids (i.e. whether you become a member because you are interested, or you become a member when bidding does not make a difference) (5 times)
• Difficult matchmaking, i.e. network does not do enough to facilitate matchmaking (inversely, you a company has a partner in the “South”, it does not need the network, except it wants to bid, but there are easier ways of financing projects, especially if the partner in the “South” has a working relationship with state-entities) (2 times)
• Time lag in bidding (makes it difficult to plan) (2 times)
• No feedback if the offer doesn’t make the bid (2 times)
Suggestions

• **Two-tiered membership**: a) “members”: these companies fill out a much simplified membership form and are kept “in the loop”; b) “whitelisted” members: these companies fill out a much more elaborate form (like the actual) and hand-in much more information about themselves – the add-on is that their offers will be fast-tracked in the bidding, either by having them submit less information when bidding or by giving them default higher points.

• Organization of fora for network members (either on technology, or on regional needs, or on how to bid, or on how to manage/implement projects).

• Organization of matchmaking for network members.

• Bonus for network members that interact / incentive to cooperate.

• **Two-tiered bidding process**: a) initial, less intensive phase “interest”, b) second phase “in-depth” with all documentation.

• **Feedback on submitted offer**: performance relative to the benchmark.

• If any information that a company submits in in offer is used but company doesn’t make the bid: notification and invitation to participate “pro bono”.

• **Clear communication of the date by which a decision is expected**.