



**Universiteit  
Leiden**  
The Netherlands

**Public procurement distance: analysing European public procurement policy implementation in 27 EU member states**

Schermerhorn, A.E.

**Citation**

Schermerhorn, A. E. (2025, October 7). *Public procurement distance: analysing European public procurement policy implementation in 27 EU member states*. Eburon Academic Publishers, Utrecht. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4262551>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4262551>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

## PROCES VERBAAL VAN AANBESTEDING.

Op heden den \_\_\_\_\_ is ingevolge de daarvan in de Departement en der Monden van de Maas en van den Boven-IJssel, angeplakte Biljetten, en gedane Advertisfementen in de Nederlandsche Staats-courant, door den Directeur van den Waterstaat overgegaan, tot het openen der verzegelde inschrijvingen van de gegadigden, welke zich bereid hebben getoond, tot het aannemen der werken in het bovenstaande beftek vervat, en waar van de kosten zijn gefierd op eene Somma van

Bij de opening der voorsz. biljetten is bevonden dat dezelve behelsden inschrijvingen, waarvan is geformeerd de navolgende staat:

Namen der inschrijvers.	Aanwijzing van het werk.	Bedrag der begrooting van kosten.	Bedrag der gedane inschrijvingen.	Vermindering.

# Appendices



## *Appendix A*

### **LETTER TO RESPONDENTS**

Dear colleague,

I am a PhD student at Leiden University, the Netherlands, with Prof. Dr. Bernard Steunenberg as my supervisor. I am doing PhD research into procurement based on European legislation above the threshold values in the European member states and how it is applied in practice.

I am keen to find out whether our work becomes easier, or we can do our work better if we strictly observe procurement legislation or if it is easier/better if we don't stick to it too closely. Since this is a question that affects us all, the results are also of great importance to you. I would greatly appreciate it if you help me out by completing the attached questionnaire and participate in this unique project!

I guarantee that you will remain anonymous, and your responses will be handled with the utmost confidentiality. I will only use the assembled and accumulated results (not the individual answers) once. I found your e-mail address on the TED website of the European Union. By completing this survey, you give me express permission to use the results for this research. I will create a summary of the results in due course and will be happy to send this to you free of charge.

Why not take part? Completing the questions will only take twenty minutes or so!  
Click here to complete the questionnaire in your own language.  
Or copy and paste the following URL into the address bar of your Internet browser.

Thank you very much! I hope you enjoy completing the questionnaire!

drs. Alexander Schermerhorn  
PhD Student at Leiden University, the Netherlands

**NB:** All questions in this questionnaire are related to tenders above the European thresholds, when you answer the questions, you may ignore procurement projects with lower values.  
Click here to opt out of these e-mails



## Appendix B

# QUESTIONNAIRE

TABLE B1

### Survey public procurement European Union

Thank you for participating in my research into whether our work becomes easier, or we can do our work better if we strictly observe procurement legislation or if it is easier/better if we don't stick to it too closely. All questions in this questionnaire are related to tenders above the European thresholds. When answering the questions, you may ignore procurement projects with lower values. I hope you enjoy answering my questions! If you are interested in a free summary of the results, you can indicate this on the last page. Click the button to start the questionnaire.

#### Question

<b>1</b>	<b>Are you principally engaged in tenders focusing on: (more than 1 answer possible)</b>
1.1	Works
1.2	Services
1.3	Supplies
1.4	Utilities
<b>2</b>	<b>Which of the following subjects are part of your duties: (More than 1 answer possible)</b>
2.1	Drawing up tender documentation
2.2	Drawing up draught contracts
2.3	Application of procurement rules and case law
2.4	Drafting selection criteria
2.5	Drafting award criteria
2.6	Answering questions from interested market players in the Information Notice
2.7	Conclusion of the contract with the successful tenderer
2.8	Following up the contractual agreements with suppliers
2.9	Hiring external procurement consultants and legal advisers
2.10	Supporting legal procedures
<b>3</b>	<b>Please indicate which of each of the following statements applies to you:</b>
3.1	I apply the procurement rules more flexibly if only one interested supplier submits a tender.
3.2	The more submissions I get, the more strictly I will apply the procurement rules.
3.3	I use external (contracted) legal advisers
3.4	I use external (contracted) procurement consultants during the tendering process
3.5	I use internal (from my own organisation) legal advisers during the tendering process
3.6	I use internal (from my own organisation) procurement consultants during the tendering process

- 3.7 A tenderer has made an honest mistake, such as failing to submit one or more requested documents or a textual contradiction written in the tender which means this tenderer has not responded in accordance with the specifications. If this is the case, I contact the tenderer and give him the opportunity to correct the error.

**4 Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Statements concerning your procurement activities:**

- 4.1 I am able to steer the content of tenders in the direction I require
- 4.2 I take the public interest into consideration
- 4.3 One or more tenders I have supervised have lead to a lawsuit at some point
- 4.4 I take the opinions of the market players into account
- 4.5 I take into account the preferences of national politics with regard to procurement
- 4.6 I always implement procurement legislation literally
- 4.7 Procurement legislation does not give me enough room to manoeuvre
- 4.8 I allow variants to give tenderers the chance to come up with alternative solutions
- 4.9 I let tenderers give an oral presentation of the solution as part of the award process
- 4.10 I work together with other contracting authorities as much as possible in order to be able to take advantage of joint procurement
- 4.11 I am generally satisfied with the procurement result ("The supplier delivered what I expected to receive when I purchased it")
- 4.12 I have to do work that is not part of my duties
- 4.13 European procurement rules are too complex
- 4.14 The mainly written procedures limit my freedom to manoeuvre

**5 Why do you apply the procurement rules: (More than 1 answer possible)**

- 5.1 Because the law must be observed
- 5.2 Because this way I help implement government policy
- 5.3 Because this way I avoid getting into trouble with my employer
- 5.4 Because this way I avoid problems with the market players
- 5.5 Because this way I avoid legal procedures and lawsuits
- 5.6 Because this way I can procure more professionally and efficiently

**6 Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. You release a tender but you cannot award it to a successful tenderer. This is because:**

- 6.1 Because my employer wanted this
- 6.2 Because there was a threat of a complaint or legal proceedings by a potential supplier
- 6.3 Because there was political pressure to stop the tender =>please answer question 6a
- 6.4 Because the media (radio, TV, newspaper, Internet, social media) published information about the relevant tender

**6a Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. What do you think was the underlying reason for this political pressure: (Referral from 6.3)**

- 6a.1 Favouritism
- 6a.2 There is a relationship between politicians and the successful supplier



6a.3 Stakeholders were paid money

6a.4 The preferred supplier was awarded the contract directly

**7 Do you pay attention to the following social objectives in your tenders:**

7.1 Sustainability

7.2 Social return

7.3 Innovation

7.4 SME participation

**8 Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. What, in your opinion, are the consequences of the inclusion of subjects relating to sustainability, innovation, social return and SME participation for your tenders:**

8.1 It results in high costs

8.2 It makes my tenders more complex

8.3 It improves society

8.4 It results in happier end users

8.5 It wastes time

8.6 It gives a better procurement result

**9 Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements regarding avoiding tenders:**

9.1 If I can split things into lots to stay below the tendering threshold, I will do so

9.2 If I can directly award to my preferential supplier then I will do so

9.3 If I can keep ordering from my current supplier at the end of the term of the contract, I will do so

9.4 If I can draw up the contractual conditions broader than strictly required for the tender, I will do so

9.5 If I can order just before the end of the term, I will do so

9.6 If I can avoid a time-consuming public or restricted tender by choosing to award directly via a negotiation procedure, I will do so

**10 Indicate whether you recognise this from your own practice and your own experiences with tenders you have supervised:**

10.1 I sometimes buy from a supplier without first releasing an obligatory tender

**11 Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. In order to achieve the desired outcome of a tender have you ever:**

11.1 Consulted with certain suppliers

11.2 Made using the national language compulsory

11.3 Sent the Information Notice as late as possible

11.4 Unticked the GPA box

11.5 Given more points to your preferred supplier

11.6 Given the current supplier who you are happy with more points

11.7 Changed the award conditions after all tenders were received

<b>12</b>	<b>Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. In the tenders that you deal with, does the following ever occur:</b>
12.1	The costs and risks of the projects to be tendered are underestimated
12.2	The scope of the projects to be tendered is broader than necessary
12.3	The turnaround times of the projects to be tendered are deliberately underestimated
<b>13</b>	<b>If one of these issues (costs and risks underestimated, scope unnecessarily broad, turnaround times deliberately underestimated) occurs every now and then, who requests this and what kind of tenders are they: (More than 1 answer possible. Choose the answers most relevant to you)</b>
13.1	Persons from the organisation I work for
13.2	Market players/suppliers
13.3	Politicians/policymakers
13.4	The media (radio, TV, newspaper, Internet, social media)
13.5	I want this myself
13.6	This mostly occurs when procuring works
13.7	This mostly occurs when procuring services
13.8	This mostly occurs when procuring supplies
<b>14</b>	<b>Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements If an issue from question 12 (Costs/risks greater; scope broader; turnaround times too short) occurs what does this mean for your work:</b>
14.1	This results in extra work for me
14.2	I have less influence on the award outcome
14.3	I am not able to serve the public interest properly
14.4	I have no choice in this and must accept it
14.5	This does not affect my work
14.6	This results in higher procurement costs
14.7	This increases my freedom to manoeuvre
14.8	I will apply the procurement rules even more strictly
14.9	This increases the risk of lawsuits and complaints
14.10	This decreases the quality of the procured supplies/works or services
14.11	This increases the quality of the end result
<b>15</b>	<b>Could you estimate how much higher the procurements costs are if a situation like that in question 12 (Cost/risks greater; scope broader; turnaround times too short) occurs:</b>
15.1	Between 1% and 10% higher
15.2	Between 11% and 25% higher
15.3	More than 25% higher
<b>16</b>	<b>Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each statement about procurement abroad: (across the borders of your own country but within the EU)</b>
16.1	I sometimes award a tender to a supplier from another EU member state rather than one from my own country

16.2	I sometimes award a tender to a supplier from a country that is not a member of the European Union
16.3	When I award a tender to a foreign supplier, I do this because the quality is better
16.4	When I award a tender to a foreign supplier, I do this because the price is lower
16.5	When I award a tender to a foreign supplier, I do this because they can offer a particular type of knowledge
16.6	I prefer suppliers from my own country
16.7	International tenders cause language issues
16.8	International tenders cause supply issues
16.9	International tenders cause quality issues
16.10	I do not speak or write English
16.11	When I procure from a foreign supplier I only do this because politicians/policymakers and/or my organisation tell me to do so
16.12	International tenders are conducted in English
<b>17 Are you:</b>	
17.1	Male
17.2	Female
<b>18 What is your profession: (Only 1 answer possible)</b>	
18.1	Purchaser employed by a contracting authority
18.2	External procurement consultant
18.3	Lawyer employed by the contracting organisation
18.4	External legal adviser
18.5	Contract manager
18.6	In addition to my usual daily activities, I sometimes deal with procurement through tendering (part time)
<b>19 For which public authorities do you work or consult most often: (Only 1 answer possible)</b>	
19.1	National government
19.2	Regional government
19.3	Local government
19.4	Utilities
19.5	Other
<b>20 What is your level of education: (Only 1 answer possible. Select highest level achieved)</b>	
20.1	Higher
20.2	Secondary
20.3	Primary
<b>21 In addition, I have also: (Only 1 answer possible)</b>	
21.1	Followed additional procurement training aimed specifically at European procurement

21.2	Followed additional procurement training but not specifically aimed at European procurement
21.3	Learned about European procurement in practice without procurement training
<b>22</b>	<b>How many tendering projects do you supervise on average each year: (Only 1 answer possible)</b>
22.1	2 or fewer tenders
22.2	3-5 tenders
22.3	6-10 tenders
22.4	11-20 tenders
22.5	More than 20 tenders
<b>23</b>	<b>Your age:</b>
23.1	Up to 35
23.2	Between 35 and 50
23.3	50+
<b>24</b>	<b>For which supplies, services and works do you mainly supervise tenders: (More than 1 answer possible. Choose that which most closely applies to your position)</b>
24.1	Infrastructure (Such as: road, water, construction, real estate)
24.2	I(C)T
24.3	Science and education
24.4	Healthcare, welfare, social services
24.5	Utilities (Such as: electricity, telecommunications, public transport, post)
24.6	Culture, sports, recreation
24.7	Agriculture, livestock farming, hunting, fishing, mining, nature management
24.8	Financial economic services
24.9	Defence
24.10	Uniformed services except for defence (Such as: police fire brigade, civil protection)
24.11	Employment services
24.12	Non-financial business services (such as: administration, organisational consultation, support, facilities)
24.13	Logistics and transport
24.14	Media
24.15	Judicial services (Such as judiciary, prosecution service)
<b>25</b>	<b>How long have you worked with European tenders: (Only 1 answer possible)</b>
25.1	1 year or less
25.2	1-3 years
25.3	3-5 years
25.4	5-10 years
25.5	Longer than 10 years

---

<b>26</b>	<b>Please estimate the annual costs for contracting external advisers: (Only 1 answer possible)</b>
26.1	Up to 5,000 Euro a year
26.2	5,000 Euro to 10,000 Euro a year
26.3	10,000 Euro to 25,000 Euro a year
26.4	25,000 Euro to 50,000 Euro a year
26.5	50,000 Euro to 100,000 Euro a year
26.6	More than 100,000 Euro a year
26.7	I don't know

---

**27** Thank you for answering my questions! Below you will find 2 general questions, could you please read these and respond to them?  
This survey is completely anonymous, the outcome cannot be traced back to individual persons. I do have a request however (without obligation): to further substantiate my research with individual interviews with people working in the field of tendering and procurement, I am looking for people to interview (in English, French or Dutch). People like you, for example. The answers will be processed anonymously. If you are happy for me to interview you, please enter your email address below. I will not mention your name in my research but only quote you anonymously within the relevant context, ensuring it cannot be traced back to you as an individual. Thank you very much for your cooperation, I really appreciate it! If yes: please enter your e-mail address below and I will contact you ASAP. If no: do not enter anything and continue to the next question.  
I am looking for case studies and stories that can substantiate and illustrate my research. Could you provide me (anonymously, of course) with a case study or story about a procurement case that appeals to the imagination? (It doesn't matter if it was successful or failed) I shall ensure that the story cannot be traced back to you as an individual. May I contact you for more information about your case? If you are happy for me to do this, please enter your e-mail address in the field below. If yes, could you give a brief 20-word summary of the case? If no, you may skip this question and go to the last question.  
Thank you very much for your cooperation! I would be happy to mail you a summary of the results of this research in due course. If you are interested, please enter your e-mail address or another e-mail address (which I will use only once for this purpose) where you wish to receive the document.

**Member states:**  
Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom

---



## Appendix C

### FREQUENCY TABLES

This appendix contains the frequency tables that are referred to in Chapters 5 and 6. *n* is the total count of answers to the relevant question. Rounding differences may occur in the totals of the tables.

TABLE C1

Distribution of respondents per procurement segment (n= 21,874)

Segment	Percentage
Works	25
Services	39
Supplies	29
Utilities	7
<i>Total</i>	<i>100</i>

TABLE C2

Distribution by sector (n= 15,022)

Sector	Percentage
Infrastructure (such as road, water, construction, real estate)	22
Utilities (such as electricity, telecom, public transport, postal services)	11
I(C)T	11
Non-financial business services (such as administration, organisational consultation, support, facilities)	9
Healthcare, welfare, social services	9
Education and science	8
Culture, sports, recreation	7
Financial economic services	6
Logistics and transport	5

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Uniformed services except for defence (Such as: police fire brigade, civil protection)	3
Agriculture, livestock farming, hunting, fishing, mining, nature management	3
Media	2
Employment services	2
Judicial services (Such as judiciary, prosecution service)	1
Defence	1
<i>Total</i>	<i>100</i>

TABLE C3

**Sex (n= 6,923)**

<b>Sex</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Male	64
Female	36
<i>Total</i>	<i>100</i>

TABLE C4

**Age (n= 6.923)**

<b>Age (in years)</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Up to 35	9
Between 35 and 50	43
50+	48
<i>Total</i>	<i>100</i>

TABLE C5

**Highest level of education achieved (n= 6,874)**

<b>Education</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Higher	86
Secondary	13
Primary	1
<i>Total</i>	<i>100</i>



TABLE C6

**Number of calls for tenders per year (n= 6,874)**

<b>Number of tenders</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
=< 2	26
3-5	24
6-10	16
11-20	13
> 20	21
<i>Total</i>	<i>100</i>

TABLE C7

**Seniority (n= 6,874)**

<b>Seniority in years</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
=< 1	6
1-3	7
3-5	18
5-10	34
>10	35
<i>Total</i>	<i>100</i>

TABLE C8

**Public administration tier (n= 6,713)**

<b>Administration tier</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
National government	17
Regional government	13
Local government	39
Utilities	12
Other	20
<i>Total</i>	<i>100</i>



**TABLE C11**  
**Adjustment of outcome in desired direction (n= 7,419)**

<b>Influence on outcome</b>							
	Consulted with certain suppliers	Made using the national language compulsory	Sent the Information Notice as late as possible	Unticked the GPA box	Given more points to your preferred supplier	Given the current supplier who you are happy with more points	Changed the award conditions after all tenders were received
Completely disagree	46	27	80	67	81	74	92
Partly disagree	11	6	9	5	9	12	4
Neutral	14	14	8	26	7	9	3
Partly agree	23	18	2	1	3	4	1
Completely agree	7	36	1	1	1	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

**TABLE C12**  
**Reason for political pressure to stop tender process (n= 754)**

<b>Reason (Percentage)</b>				
	Favouritism	There is a relationship between politicians and the successful supplier	Stakeholders were paid money	The preferred supplier was awarded the contract directly
Completely disagree	31	30	48	36
Partly disagree	9	9	9	11
Neutral	25	24	31	27
Partly agree	23	25	6	17
Completely agree	11	13	5	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>



TABLE C15

Reason for cross-border procurement (n= 6,943)

Reasons and effects (Percentage)										
	When I award a tender to a foreign supplier, I do this because the quality is better	When I award a tender to a foreign supplier, I do this because the price is lower	When I award a tender to a foreign supplier, I do this because they can offer a particular type of knowledge	I prefer suppliers from my own country	International tenders are conducted in English	International tenders cause language issues	International tenders cause supply issues	International tenders cause quality issues	I do not speak or write English	When I procure from a foreign supplier I only do this because politicians/policymakers and/or my organisation tell me to do so
Completely disagree	16	14	13	21	36	13	17	21	44	43
Partly disagree	5	7	5	10	8	10	14	16	15	12
Neutral	41	39	43	38	34	38	48	50	22	33
Partly agree	22	26	26	20	10	27	16	10	11	7
Completely agree	16	15	13	11	12	12	5	3	8	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

TABLE C16

Costs of hiring external consultants (n= 3,774)

Costs per year in EUR	Percentage
5,000 max	25
5,000-10,000	17
10,000-25,000	13
25,000-50,000	9
50,000-100,000	5
100,000+	7
Do not know	24
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>



TABLE C19

**Correction of unintentional error (n= 10,417)**

<b>Correction</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Completely disagree	25
Partly disagree	12
Neutral	18
Partly agree	29
Completely agree	16
<i>Total</i>	<i>100</i>

TABLE C20

**Direct procurement without tender procedure (n= 8,380)**

<b>Direct procurement</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Completely disagree	56
Partly disagree	14
Neutral	11
Partly agree	14
Completely agree	5
<i>Total</i>	<i>100</i>

TABLE C21

**Summarising statistics**

<b>Dependent variable</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>sd</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>n</b>
I always implement procurement legislation literally	3.97	1.008	1	5	9,210
I apply the procurement rules more flexibly if only one interested supplier submits a tender	2.13	1.285	1	5	10,418
The more submissions I get, the more strictly I will apply the procurement rules	2.43	1.482	1	5	10,418
Costs and risks of the projects to be tendered are underestimated (project effect)	3.08	1.206	1	5	7,419
Scope of the projects to be tendered is broader than necessary (project effect)	2.62	1.143	1	5	7,419
Turnaround times of the projects to be tendered are deliberately underestimated (project effect)	2.41	1.213	1	5	7,419

<b>Dependent variable</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>sd</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>n</b>
If project effect consequence – This results in extra work for me	3.65	1.067	1	5	7,178
If project effect consequence – I have less influence on the award outcome	2.70	1.063	1	5	7,178
If project effect consequence – I am not able to serve the public interest properly	3.16	1.096	1	5	7,178
If project effect consequence – I have no choice in this and must accept it	3.08	1.106	1	5	7,178
If project effect consequence – This does not affect my work	2.64	1.086	1	5	7,178
If project effect consequence – This results in higher procurement costs	3.33	1.026	1	5	7,178
If project effect consequence – This increases my freedom to manoeuvre	2.36	.968	1	5	7,178
If project effect consequence – I will apply the procurement rules even more strictly	3.06	1.079	1	5	7,178
If project effect consequence – This increases the risk of lawsuits and complaints	3.43	1.034	1	5	7,178
If project effect consequence – This decreases the quality of the procured supplies/works or services	3.18	1.053	1	5	7,178
If project effect consequence – This increases the quality of the end result	2.49	1.003	1	5	7,178
I am generally satisfied with the procurement result ("The supplier delivered what I expected to receive when I purchased it")	3.77	.863	1	5	9,210
Sustainability (discretionary policy instruments)	1.96	1.043	1	4	7,988
Social return (discretionary policy instruments)	2.26	.994	1	4	7,988
Innovation (discretionary policy instruments)	2.58	1.100	1	4	7,988
SME participation (discretionary policy instruments)	2.35	1.097	1	4	7,988
Discretionary policy instruments in tenders – It results in high costs	3.10	1.109	1	5	7,605
Discretionary policy instruments in tenders – It makes my tenders more complex	3.29	1.165	1	5	7,605
Discretionary policy instruments in tenders – It improves society	3.51	.995	1	5	7,605
Discretionary policy instruments in tenders – It results in happier end users	3.32	1.009	1	5	7,605
Discretionary policy instruments in tenders – It wastes time	2.41	1.101	1	5	7,605
Discretionary policy instruments in tenders – It gives a better procurement result	3.30	1.007	1	5	7,605



<b>Dependent variable</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>sd</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>n</b>
I sometimes award a tender to a supplier from another EU member state rather than one from my own country	2.72	1.353	1	5	6,943
I sometimes award a tender to a supplier from a country that is not a member of the EU	2.37	1.233	1	5	6,943
When I award a tender to a foreign supplier, I do this because the quality is better	3.18	1.233	1	5	6,943
When I award a tender to a foreign supplier, I do this because the price is lower	3.21	1.188	1	5	6,943
When I award a tender to a foreign supplier, I do this because of a particular type of knowledge	3.21	1.144	1	5	6,943
I prefer suppliers from my own country	2.89	1.254	1	5	6,943
International tenders are conducted in English	2.53	1.374	1	5	6,943
International tenders cause language issues	3.15	1.167	1	5	6,943
International tenders cause supply issues	2.76	1.059	1	5	6,943
International tenders cause quality issues	2.57	1.024	1	5	6,943
I do not speak or write English	2.23	1.326	1	5	6,943
When I procure from a foreign supplier I only do this because politicians/policymakers and/or my organisation tell me to do so	2.18	1.201	1	5	6,943
<b>Independent variable</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>sd</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>n</b>
I use external (contracted) legal advisers	2.45	1.424	1	5	10,417
I use internal (from my own organisation) legal advisers during the tendering process	3.45	1.514	1	5	10,417
I use internal (from my own organisation) procurement consultants during the tendering process	3.13	1.565	1	5	10,417
I use external (contracted) procurement consultants during the tendering process	2.22	1.384	1	5	10,417
I work together with other contracting authorities as much as possible in order to be able to take advantage of joint procurement	3.06	1.285	1	5	9,210
I take the public interest into consideration	3.96	1.089	1	5	9,210
I am able to steer the content of tenders in the direction I require	2.77	1.243	1	5	9,210
Procurement legislation does not give me enough room to manoeuvre	3.31	1.162	1	5	9,210
A tenderer has made an honest mistake, opportunity to correct the error	3.00	1.430	1	5	10,417
If I can split into lots to stay below the tendering threshold, I will do so	2.12	1.351	1	5	7,605

<b>Independent variable</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>sd</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>n</b>
If I can directly award to my preferential supplier then I will do so	2.05	1.329	1	5	7,605
If I can keep ordering from my current supplier at the end of the term of the contract, I will do so	2.33	1.347	1	5	7,605
If I can draw up the contractual conditions broader than strictly required for the tender, I will do so	2.38	1.282	1	5	7,605
If I can order just before the end of the term, I will do so	2.65	1.324	1	5	7,605
If I can avoid a time-consuming public or restricted tender by choosing to award directly via a negotiation procedure, I will do so	2.69	1.442	1	5	7,605
I sometimes buy from a supplier without first releasing an obligatory tender	1.98	1.293	1	5	8,380
I have to do work that is not part of my duties	2.64	1.334	1	5	9,210
European procurement rules are too complex	3.44	1.202	1	5	9,210
One or more tenders I have supervised have led to a lawsuit at some point	2.24	1.592	1	5	9,210
I take the opinions of the market players into account	3.28	1.027	1	5	9,210
I take into account the preferences of national politics with regard to procurement	3.26	1.232	1	5	9,210
The mainly written procedures limit my freedom to manoeuvre	2.93	1.223	1	5	9,210
I allow variants to give tenderers the chance to come up with alternative solutions	2.89	1.252	1	5	9,210
I let tenderers give an oral presentation of the solution as part of the award process	2.34	1.309	1	5	9,210
Cannot award it to a successful tenderer – Because there was a threat of a complaint or legal proceedings by a potential supplier	2.19	1.239	1	5	8,051
Cannot award it to a successful tenderer – Because there was political pressure to stop the tender	1.88	1.140	1	5	8,051
Cannot award it to a successful tenderer – Because my employer wanted this	2.08	1.226	1	5	8,051
Cannot award it to a successful tenderer – Because the media (radio, TV, newspaper, Internet, social media) published information about the relevant tender	1.71	.986	1	5	8,051
Reason political pressure: Favouritism	2.75	1.398	1	5	754
Reason political pressure: Relationship between politicians and the successful supplier	2.82	1.412	1	5	754
Reason political pressure: Stakeholders were paid money	2.13	1.232	1	5	754

<b>Independent variable</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>sd</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>n</b>
Reason political pressure: Preferred supplier was awarded contract directly	2.51	1.356	1	5	754
To achieve desired outcome – Consulted with certain suppliers	2.32	1.408	1	5	7,419
To achieve desired outcome – Made using the national language compulsory	3.30	1.625	1	5	7,419
To achieve desired outcome – Sent the Information Notice as late as possible	1.35	.784	1	5	7,419
To achieve desired outcome – Unticked the GPA box	1.64	.969	1	5	7,419
To achieve desired outcome – Given more points to your preferred supplier	1.35	.801	1	5	7,419
To achieve desired outcome – Given the current supplier who you are happy with more points	1.45	.868	1	5	7,419
To achieve desired outcome – Changed the award conditions after all tenders were received	1.13	.501	1	5	7,419



## Appendix D

### INDICATORS MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

The table below contains the indicators for public procurement distance and the corresponding questions that are referred to in Chapters 4 and 6.

TABLE D1

#### Indicators dependent variable

Indicator	Nr	Question
<b>Mandatory policy</b>		
Literal application of the rules	<b>4</b>	<b>Statement concerning your procurement activities:</b>
	4.6	I always implement procurement legislation literally
Project effects	<b>12</b>	<b>Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. In the tenders that you deal with, does the following ever occur:</b>
	12.1	The costs and risks of the projects to be tendered are underestimated
	12.2	The scope of the projects to be tendered is broader than necessary
	12.3	The turnaround times of the projects to be tendered are deliberately underestimated
End result	<b>4</b>	<b>Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statement. Statement concerning your procurement activities:</b>
	4.11	I am generally satisfied with the procurement result ("The supplier delivered what I expected to receive when I purchased it")
<b>Discretionary policy</b>		
Policy instruments	<b>7</b>	<b>Do you pay attention to the following social objectives in your tenders:</b>
	7.1	Sustainability
	7.2	Social return
	7.3	Innovation
	7.4	SME participation

<b>Cross border policy</b> Cross-border awarding	<b>16</b>	<b>Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with this statement about procurement abroad: (across the borders of your own country but within the EU):</b>
	16.1	I sometimes award a tender to a supplier from another EU member state rather than one from my own country

The table below shows the expectations and corresponding questions used for measuring influence on public procurement distance that are referred to in Chapters 4 and 6.

TABLE D2

## Expectations &amp; questions independent variables

Nr	Expectation (chapter 3)	Nr	Question
1a	As a government organisation's procurement expertise increases, procurement distance decreases (capacity)	<b>3</b>	<b>Please indicate which of each of the following statements applies to you:</b>
		3.3	I use external (contracted) legal advisers
		3.4	I use external (contracted) procurement consultants during the tendering process
		3.5	I use internal (from my own organisation) legal advisers during the tendering process
		3.6	I use internal (from my own organisation) procurement consultants during the tendering process
1b	As collaboration between contracting authorities increases, public procurement distance decreases (collaboration)	<b>4</b>	<b>Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:</b>
		4.10	I work together with other contracting authorities as much as possible in order to be able to take advantage of joint procurement
2a	As procurement officers' tacit knowledge about procurement increases, procurement distance decreases (tacit knowledge)	<b>22</b>	<b>How many tendering projects do you supervise on average each year?</b>
		22.1	2 or fewer tenders
		22.2	3-5 tenders
		22.3	6-10 tenders
		22.4	11-20 tenders
		22.5	More than 20 tenders
		<b>25</b>	<b>How long have you worked with European tenders (seniority)?</b>
25.1	1 year or less		

Nr	Expectation (chapter 3)	Nr	Question
		25.2	1-3 years
		25.3	3-5 years
		25.	5-10 years
		25.5	Longer than 10 years
2b	As procurement officers are better trained, procurement distance decreases (formal knowledge)	<b>21</b>	<b>I have:</b>
		21.1	Followed additional procurement training aimed specifically at European procurement
		21.2	Followed additional procurement training but not specifically aimed at European procurement
		21.3	Learned about European procurement in practice without procurement training
3	As procurement officers' intrinsic motivation to serve the public interest increases, procurement distance decreases (intrinsic motivation)	<b>4</b>	<b>Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statement:</b>
		4.2	I take the public interest into consideration
4a	As policy discretion increases, public procurement distance increases (discretionary leeway)	4.1	I am able to steer the content of tenders in the direction I require
		4.7	Procurement legislation does not give me enough room to manoeuvre
4b	As procurement officers' influence on the procurement processes increases, procurement distance increases (public procurement officers)	<b>18</b>	<b>What is your profession:</b>
		18.1	Purchaser employed by a contracting authority
		18.3	Lawyer employed by the contracting organisation
		18.5	Contract manager
		18.6	In addition to my usual daily activities, I sometimes deal with procurement through tendering (parttime)
4c	As the own organisation's influence on the procurement processes increases, public procurement distance increases (own organisation)	<b>6</b>	<b>You release a tender but you cannot award it to a successful tenderer. This is because:</b>
		6.1	Because my employer wanted this
4d	As the influence of politics on the procurement processes increases, public procurement distance increases (politics)	6.3	Because there was political pressure to stop the tender

Nr	Expectation (chapter 3)	Nr	Question
4e	As the influence of market parties on the procurement process increases, the public procurement distance increases (market parties)	6.2	Because there was a threat of a complaint or legal proceedings by a potential supplier
4f	As the media's influence on the procurement processes increases, public procurement distance increases (media)	6.4	Because the media (radio, TV, newspaper, internet, social media) published information about the relevant tender
5a	Within the public sectors, the public procurement distance is smaller compared to the utility sectors (sector)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Public sector</li> <li>– Utilities</li> </ul>
5b	Public procurement distance is greater at the municipal level than at the regional or national level (public administration tier)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– National level</li> <li>– Regional level</li> <li>– Municipal level</li> </ul>
5c	In countries that belong to the world of law observance, procurement distance is smaller than in countries that belong to other worlds (compliance)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Law observance: Denmark, Finland, Sweden</li> <li>– Domestic politics: Austria, Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, United Kingdom</li> <li>– Transposition neglect: France, Greece, Luxembourg, Portugal</li> <li>– Dead letters: Czech Republic, Ireland, Italy, Hungary, Slovakia, Slovenia</li> </ul>
5d	In Northern European countries, public procurement distance is smaller compared to Eastern, Western, Southern and Central European countries (geography)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– North: Denmark; Finland; Sweden</li> <li>– West: Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, United Kingdom</li> <li>– South: Cyprus, Greece, Italy, Malta, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain</li> <li>– Central: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovakia</li> <li>– East: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania</li> </ul>
5e	In countries with unitary administration systems, public procurement distance is smaller compared to countries with federal administration systems (public administration system)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Unitary: Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, United Kingdom</li> <li>– Federal: Austria, Belgium, Germany, Spain</li> </ul>



## Appendix E

# MEASURING EUROPEAN PUBLIC PROCUREMENT POLICY

This appendix contains the frequency tables that are referred to in Chapter 6.

TABLE E1  
Measuring mandatory public procurement policy

Dependent variable ⇔ ↓ Independent variables	Literal application of the rules			Project effects			End result		
	Always apply procure- ment regulations literally			Project effects factor			Satisfaction with the pro- curement result		
Administrative organisation	<i>b</i>	<i>b*</i>	(S.E.)	<i>b</i>	<i>b*</i>	(S.E.)	<i>b</i>	<i>b*</i>	(S.E.)
<b>Capacity (expectation 1a)</b>									
External legal advisors	.011	.016	.011	.004	.006	.011	-.009	-.016	.009
External procurement advisors	-.016	-.022	.011	.024	.034	.011	-.013	-.022	.010
Internal legal advisors	.016	.023	.010	-.016	-.024	.010	-.011	-.019	.009
Internal procurement advisors	.017	.026	.010	.020	.032	.010	.001	.002	.008
<b>Collaboration (expectation 1b)</b>									
collaboration between contracting authorities	-.007	-.008	.011	.045	.059***	.011	.079	.119***	.009
<b>Professionalism</b>									
<b>Tacit knowledge (expectation 2a)</b>									
3-5 tenders dummy	-.076	-.032	.037	.129	.056**	.037	-.008	-.004	.032
6-10 tenders dummy	-.119	-.043**	.043	.124	.046**	.043	-.022	-.009	.037
11-20 tenders dummy	-.085	-.029	.046	.113	.039	.046	.021	.008	.040
More than 20 tenders dummy	.011	.005	.042	.239	.102***	.042	.022	.011	.036
1-3 years' seniority dummy	-.018	-.005	.073	.048	.013	.074	.112	.034	.064
3-5 years' seniority dummy	-.029	-.011	.064	-.024	-.009	.065	.101	.045	.056
5-10 years' seniority dummy	.014	.006	.061	.006	.003	.061	.113	.064	.053
More than 10 years' seniority dummy	.041	.019	.061	-.037	-.018	.062	.157	.089**	.054

<b>Formal knowledge (expectation 2b)</b>									
Procurement training dummy	.065	.029	.034	-.070	-.032	.035	.113	.060***	.030
Solely procurement training dummy	-.053	-.023	.034	-.029	-.013	.034	.067	.034	.030
<b>Professionalism and intrinsic motivation</b>									
<b>Serving the public interest (expectation 3)</b>									
Serving the public interest	.109	.113***	.013	.003	.003	.013	.064	.080***	.011
<b>Policy discretion actors</b>									
<b>Discretionary leeway (expectation 4a)</b>									
Being allowed to steer tender procedures in terms of content	-.068	-.085***	.011	.073	.094***	.011	.052	.077***	.010
Public procurement regulations allow little discretionary leeway	.028	.032	.011	.088	.106***	.011	-.057	-.079***	.010
<b>Public procurement officers (expectation 4b)</b>									
Procurement officers dummy	.019	.009	.032	.040	.020	.032	.067	.038	.028
Lawyers (internal) dummy	-.107	-.028	.053	.122	.033	.053	-.077	-.024	.046
Contract managers dummy	.048	.016	.043	.033	.011	.044	-.054	-.021	.038
<b>Culture and segmentation</b>									
<b>Sector (expectation 5a)</b>									
Public sectors dummy	-.048	-.017	.039	.049	.018	.040	-.036	-.015	.034
<b>Public administration tier (expectation 5b)</b>									
National dummy	.030	.012	.035	.014	.006	.035	.002	.001	.030
Regional dummy	-.024	-.009	.038	-.012	-.005	.038	-.033	-.014	.033
<b>Compliance (expectation 5c)</b>									
Domestic politics dummy	-.812	-.400***	.091	.169	.086	.092	-.063	-.037	.079
Transposition neglect dummy	-.164	-.058	.086	.223	.081	.087	-.041	-.017	.075
Dead letters dummy	-.339	-.118***	.066	.297	.108***	.066	.017	.007	.057
<b>Geography (expectation 5d)</b>									
West dummy	.350	.174***	.091	-.129	-.067	.092	.070	.041	.080
East dummy	-.220	-.037**	.083	.166	.029	.084	.128	.026	.073
South dummy	.648	.238***	.084	-.407	-.155***	.084	-.032	-.014	.073
Central dummy	.554	.186***	.058	-.150	-.052	.059	-.185	-.074***	.051
<b>Public administration system (expectation 5e)</b>									
Unitary countries dummy	-.381	-.172***	.046	.091	.043	.047	-.001	.000	.040

(\*\*p&lt;.01, \*\*\*p&lt;.001)

TABLE E2  
Measuring discretionary strategic policy instruments

Dependent variable ⇨ ⇩ Independent variables	Discretionary policy instruments											
	Sustainability			Social return			Innovation			SME participation		
Administrative organisation	b	b*	(S.E.)	b	b*	(S.E.)	b	b*	(S.E.)	b	b*	(S.E.)
<b>Capacity (expectation 1a)</b>												
External legal advisors	-0.034	-0.047**	.011	-0.032	-0.040**	.012	-0.039	-0.056***	.011	-0.027	-0.035	.012
External procurement advisors	.004	.005	.011	-0.001	-0.001	.012	.012	.017	.011	-0.035	-0.044**	.012
Internal legal advisors	-0.020	-0.029	.010	-0.021	-0.029	.011	-0.045	-0.069***	.010	-0.001	-0.002	.011
Internal procurement advisors	-0.033	-0.051**	.010	-0.021	-0.030	.011	-0.014	-0.023	.010	-0.000	.000	.011
<b>Collaboration (expectation 1b)</b>												
collaboration between contracting authorities	-0.023	-0.029	.011	-0.043	-0.051***	.012	-0.033	-0.044**	.011	-0.033	-0.039**	.012
<b>Professionalism</b>												
<b>Tacit knowledge (expectation 2a)</b>												
3-5 tenders dummy	-0.102	-0.043**	.038	-0.093	-0.036	.040	-0.067	-0.030	.037	-0.146	-0.057***	.040
6-10 tenders dummy	-0.079	-0.028	.044	-0.125	-0.041**	.047	-0.056	-0.021	.042	-0.270	-0.090***	.047
11-20 tenders dummy	-0.055	-0.018	.047	-0.169	-0.052**	.050	-0.031	-0.011	.046	-0.220	-0.069***	.050
More than 20 tenders dummy	-0.003	-0.001	.043	-0.068	-0.026	.046	.010	.004	.041	-0.352	-0.134***	.045
1-3 years' seniority dummy	-0.155	-0.040	.075	-0.038	-0.009	.080	-0.110	-0.029	.073	-0.045	-0.011	.080
3-5 years' seniority dummy	-0.163	-0.060	.066	-0.032	-0.011	.070	-0.084	-0.033	.064	-0.029	-0.010	.070
5-10 years' seniority dummy	-0.172	-0.081**	.062	-0.057	-0.025	.066	-0.096	-0.047	.060	.040	.017	.066
More than 10 years' seniority dummy	-0.186	-0.089**	.063	-0.048	-0.021	.067	-0.112	-0.056	.061	.006	.003	.067
<b>Formal knowledge (expectation 2b)</b>												
Procurement training dummy	-0.123	-0.055***	.035	-0.120	-0.049**	.038	-0.119	-0.055***	.034	-0.079	-0.033	.037
Solely procurement training dummy	-0.080	-0.034	.035	-0.061	-0.024	.037	-0.062	-0.028	.034	.005	.002	.037
<b>Professionalism and intrinsic motivation</b>												
<b>Serving the public interest (expectation 3)</b>												
Serving the public interest	-0.080	-0.083***	.013	-0.117	-0.113***	.014	-0.047	-0.051***	.013	-0.036	-0.035	.014

<b>Policy discretion actors</b>												
<b>Discretionary leeway (expectation 4a)</b>												
Being allowed to steer tender procedures in terms of content	-.008	-.010	.011	.003	.004	.012	-.019	-.025	.011	-.027	-.031	.012
Public procurement regulations allow little discretionary leeway	.035	.040**	.011	.028	.029	.012	.036	.043**	.011	.014	.015	.012
<b>Public procurement officers (expectation 4b)</b>												
Procurement officers dummy	.104	.050**	.033	.020	.009	.035	.137	.068***	.032	-.107	-.048**	.035
Lawyers (internal) dummy	.122	.032	.054	.013	.003	.058	.090	.025	.052	.080	.020	.058
Contract managers dummy	.049	.016	.044	-.062	-.019	.047	.021	.007	.043	.009	.003	.047
<b>Culture and segmentation</b>												
<b>Sector (expectation 5a)</b>												
Public sectors dummy	-.004	-.001	.040	-.143	-.046**	.043	.067	.025	.039	-.080	-.026	.043
<b>Public administration tier (expectation 5b)</b>												
National dummy	.085	.034	.035	.140	.052***	.038	-.046	-.019	.034	-.051	-.019	.038
Regional dummy	.050	.018	.039	.049	.016	.041	-.063	-.024	.038	-.024	-.008	.041
<b>Compliance (expectation 5c)</b>												
Domestic politics dummy	-.406	-.200***	.093	-.925	-.419***	.099	-.333	-.171***	.090	-.457	-.209***	.099
Transposition neglect dummy	.119	.042	.088	-.210	-.068	.094	.211	.077	.085	-.087	-.029	.094
Dead letters dummy	-.329	-.114***	.067	-.365	-.117***	.072	-.262	-.095***	.065	-.159	-.051	.072
<b>Geography (expectation 5d)</b>												
West dummy	.183	.091	.093	.247	.113	.099	-.160	-.083	.090	.280	.129**	.099
East dummy	.333	.056***	.085	.017	.003	.091	-.073	-.013	.083	.288	.045**	.091
South dummy	.685	.251***	.086	.043	.014	.092	-.005	-.002	.083	.848	.289***	.091
Central dummy	.641	.215***	.059	.231	.071***	.064	.292	.102***	.058	.439	.137***	.063
<b>Public administration system (expectation 5e)</b>												
Unitary countries dummy	-.133	-.060**	.047	-.825	-.343***	.050	-.174	-.082***	.046	.021	.009	.050

(\*\*p&lt;.01, \*\*\*p&lt;.001)

TABLE E3  
Measuring discretionary cross-border policy

<b>Discretionary cross-border procurement</b>			
<b>Dependent variable</b> ⇔	Cross-border awarding		
↓ <b>Independent variables</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>b*</b>	<b>(S.E.)</b>
<b>Administrative organisation</b>			
<b>Capacity (expectation 1a)</b>			
External legal advisors	.005	.006	.015
External procurement advisors	-.018	-.019	.015
Internal legal advisors	.042	.046**	.014
Internal procurement advisors	.017	.020	.013
<b>Collaboration (expectation 1b)</b>			
collaboration between contracting authorities	.018	.017	.015
<b>Professionalism</b>			
<b>Tacit knowledge (expectation 2a)</b>			
3-5 tenders dummy	.019	.006	.051
6-10 tenders dummy	.081	.022	.059
11-20 tenders dummy	.062	.015	.063
More than 20 tenders dummy	.212	.064***	.057
1-3 years' seniority dummy	-.141	-.027	.101
3-5 years' seniority dummy	-.069	-.019	.088
5-10 years' seniority dummy	-.027	-.009	.083
More than 10 years' seniority dummy	-.028	-.010	.084
<b>Formal knowledge (expectation 2b)</b>			
Procurement training dummy	.095	.031	.047
Solely procurement training dummy	.131	.042**	.047
<b>Professionalism and intrinsic motivation</b>			
<b>Serving the public interest (expectation 3)</b>			
Serving the public interest	.111	.085***	.018
<b>Policy discretion actors</b>			
<b>Discretionary leeway (expectation 4a)</b>			
Being allowed to steer tender procedures in terms of content	.014	.013	.015
Public procurement regulations allow little discretionary leeway	-.005	-.004	.015

<b>Public procurement officers (expectation 4b)</b>			
Procurement officers dummy	.024	.009	.044
Lawyers (internal) dummy	.293	.057***	.072
Contract managers dummy	.061	.015	.060
<b>Culture and segmentation</b>			
<b>Sector (expectation 5a)</b>			
Public sectors dummy	-.317	-.083***	.054
<b>Public administration tier (expectation 5b)</b>			
National dummy	.183	.055***	.047
Regional dummy	.068	.018	.052
<b>Compliance (expectation 5c)</b>			
Domestic politics dummy	.278	.101	.125
Transposition neglect dummy	.577	.151***	.118
Dead letters dummy	-.304	-.078**	.090
<b>Geography (expectation 5d)</b>			
West dummy	.267	.098	.125
East dummy	.421	.052***	.115
South dummy	.398	.108**	.115
Central dummy	.077	.019	.080
<b>Public administration system (expectation 5e)</b>			
Unitary countries dummy	-.161	-.054	.063

(\*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001)

TABLE E4

## Correlation coefficients European public procurement policy

	Always apply pro- curement regulations literally	Costs and risks stated too low and too optimistically	Scope made greater than actually necessary	Lead times are delib- erately estimated too low	Satisfaction with the procurement result	Sustainability	Social return	Innovation	SME participation	Cross-border awarding
Always apply pro- curement regulations literally										
Costs and risks stated too low and too optimistically	-.123**									
Scope made greater than actually necessary	-.120**	.521**								
Lead times are delib- erately estimated too low	-.122**	.468**	.518**							
Satisfaction with the procurement result	.090**	-.060**	-.052**	-.070**						
Sustainability	.050**	-.029*	-.010	-.004	-.069**					
Social return	-.013	.007	-.029*	-.004	-.054**	.445**				
Innovation	.029**	-.003	-.017	-.004	-.074**	.589**	.491**			
SME participation	.046**	-.056**	-.031**	-.012	-.074**	.410**	.350**	.368**		
Cross-border awarding	-.017	.066**	.052**	.038**	-.004	-.004	-.018	-.017	.022	

\*p&lt;.05, \*\*p&lt;.01

