EXIMIUS
REAL ESTATE ADVISORY

SUMMARY · INTERNATIONAL MARKET STUDY

Facility management prices: a French exception or a global trend?

Comparative position of France and lessons for Maintenance as a Performance Service · September 2026

The answer on one page: price pressure is global, the fragility of the trades is French

What the study confirms

- The compression of FM prices is documented in 14 of the 17 countries studied: the same mechanism everywhere (labour 70 to 85% of the price, lowest-bid purchasing).
- Multi-service margins lie between 3.5 and 5% for all the leaders, whatever the country.
- The lowest bid does not reduce total cost: at least half of the initial saving is lost again in renegotiation (academic research).

What the study qualifies

- France is not the most “price only”: 22% of public contracts against 54% on average in the EU. The pressure comes from the private market and from indirect scoring.
- Its singularity is social: cleaning pay scale caught up by the SMIC in 2027, two thirds part-time work, weakened major players.
- A few countries have preserved a value-based logic (Singapore, Norway, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Japan), without raising margins above 5 to 6%: they have stabilised the market and shifted competition towards results.

Three figures that place France

3.5 to 5%

operating margin of the multi-service leaders, in France as elsewhere (Equans 3.5%, ABM 3.6%, Mitie 4.6%, Sodexo 4.7%, Coor 4.8%, ISS 5.0%) · Annual reports 2024-2025

22%

of French public contracts awarded on price alone, against 54% for the median EU country (Germany 56%, Norway 8%) · European Commission, Scoreboard 2024

€0.21

hourly gap between the first coefficient of the cleaning pay scale and the SMIC in 2026; caught up on 1 January 2027 (Germany: €15/h collectively agreed) · FEETS-FO, BIV

Reading: France combines public procurement that is formally virtuous with a private market (75% of cleaning revenue) without safeguards on scoring, duration or indexation. The margin lever observed everywhere is the mix of technical services, energy and commitment to results (Spie 7.1 to 7.9%, Vinci Energies 7.2%, Ventia 8.7%).

Overview: eight markets, four ways of governing price

Country	Dominant mechanism	Price alone (public)	Margin of the leaders	What to remember
France	Unregulated private market, indirect scoring	22%	3.5 to 4.7%	Cleaning pay scale at the SMIC, Atalian in restructuring
Germany	Openly lowest-bid, regulated wages	56%	n/a (Spie DE 7.9%)	Most dynamic market (€66.9 billion), “price pressure” the first obstacle
United Kingdom	Post-Carillion correction	n/a	4.6% (Mitie)	Social value ≥ 10%, Procurement Act 2023, real Living Wage
Netherlands · Norway	Market regulation	14% · 8%	4.8 to 5.0%	Best Value, code of conduct (2,000 signatories), cleaning licence
United States	Federal PBSA doctrine, LPTA regulated	25% LPTA (Defense)	3.6% (ABM) to 10% (CBRE)	Duality: pure players at 3-4%, fees and technical services at 6-10%
Japan	Labour shortage	n/a	6.1% (2024)	Contract prices +10% in the private sector in 2025, margins rising
Singapore	Codified purchasing doctrine	quality ≥ price	7.2% (ISS APAC)	Anti-dumping -20%, 3 + 3 years, bonus-malus ± 10%, indexed wage floors
Australia	Selectivity and indexation (IFM)	n/a	7.0 to 8.7%	90% of the order book indexed; public cleaning still at the lowest bid

Sources: European Commission (Scoreboard 2024), GAO 2019, annual reports 2024-2025, Lünendonk 2025-2026, JBMA 2026, BCA Singapore 2026. Margin aggregates not homogeneous, to be read as orders of magnitude.

Four routes to preserving value, none durably raises margins

Codified purchasing doctrine

- Singapore, Hong Kong, United States federal
- Quality weighted at 60% and never lower than price
- Bids more than 20% below the average capped
- Wage floors treated as compensation events

Market regulation

- Norway, the Netherlands, Germany (wages)
- Compulsory licensing of cleaning companies
- Best Value Procurement, price weighted at 30% at most
- Market code of conduct signed by 2,000 organisations

Correction after a crisis

- United Kingdom after Carillion and Interserve
- Outsourcing Playbook, social value at a minimum of 10%
- “Most advantageous” tender (MAT) since 2025
- Pass-through of costs regained: +3 points of contract price at Mitie

Demographic balance of power

- Japan, Australia (technical IFM)
- Prices +6.2% public, +10.0% private in 2025 (Japan)
- Margins from 5.3% to 6.1% in one year
- A rise endured rather than steered: the default scenario for France

What international research says: the lowest bid costs more, value brings in more

The lowest bid is paid for after signature

- At least 50% of the saving obtained at award is lost in renegotiation; screening abnormally low bids preserves performance (Decarolis, 2014).
- Adaptation costs of 7.5 to 14% of the amount of the bids on incomplete contracts (Bajari et al., 2014).
- Savings from public outsourcing: 8.5% in 2000-2004, 0.4% in 2010-2014; quality is almost never measured (Petersen et al., 2018, 49 studies).
- Carillion: bids “too low to meet the specification” (Institute for Government, 2020).

Value weighs more than cost

- A 20% fall in FM costs produces about 6% of organisational benefit; a 20% creation of value produces about 14% (Jensen, van der Voordt, Coenen, 2012).
- 80% of FM managers are still assessed first on budget (RICS, 2012).
- Preventive maintenance: 12 to 18% saving compared with corrective; predictive: 30 to 40% (FEMP, 2010).
- The 1:5:200 ratio is to be abandoned: recalculated at 1:0.4:12 (Hughes et al., 2004).

Five levers proven abroad, transposable into the MaaPS offer

Quality floor
- Quality ≥ price (Singapore), price < 50% (EFCI)
- Regulate scoring formulas and neutralisations

Abnormally low bids
- Score capped below -20% of the average
- Abnormally low bid procedure rarely used in FM in France

Duration and probation
- 3 + 3 years minimum, six half-yearly grades
- MaaPS probationary period 6 to 12 months

Indexation of costs
- Wages and regulation as compensation events
- 90% of the order book indexed at Downer; 47% of clients add clauses (IFMA)

Measured bonus-malus
- ± 10% of the fee, passed on to subcontractors
- Shared data and tripartite governance

Consistency with the MaaPS model: variable share 10 to 15%, profit-sharing 5 to 10%, probationary period 6 to 12 months, tripartite governance and a data foundation owned by the landlord are aligned with the Singaporean doctrine and British practices.

EXIMIUS
REAL ESTATE ADVISORY

Thank you for your attention

Luc Monteil · Chairman
EXIMIUS REAL ESTATE ADVISORY
60 rue François 1er, 75008 Paris
www.eximius-rea.com
Full study to download from eximius-rea.com