

Barriers to the implementation of e-procurement in Local Government

Results and analysis of the research undertaken with
Local Government in late 2004

Author
Stephen Ashcroft

©The content of this report is the intellectual property of Stephen Ashcroft
and cannot be disclosed, used, published or transmitted to any third party
without the express written permission of the author.
April 2005.

Stephen Ashcroft
Email: s.ashcroft@brianfarrington.com
Telephone: +44 (0)1744 20698

Barriers to the implementation of e-procurement in Local Government

Results and analysis of the research undertaken with Local Government in late 2004

Preface

The following Viewpoint article published in *Supply Management* in April 2005 highlights key conclusions from the research detailed in this summary report.

E-procurement inertia

Research suggests the use of e-procurement in local government is inconsistent. And there is even confusion as to what the term actually refers to, says Stephen Ashcroft

E-procurement for local government has been a regular topic in the UK. It was an integral part of the National Procurement Strategy for Local Government (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2003) and the Byatt Report (Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions, 2001).

These two reports highlighted what needed to be done within local government, and e-procurement was seen as a means of implementing good procurement practice. Both reports indicated that change from traditional ways of working would not happen overnight, but they did propose timescales and milestones in support of their recommendations.

As part of my own research into this issue for a Masters degree, I sent an e-mail questionnaire to 388 local government chief executives. I received 107 responses, and 36 agreed to take part in telephone interviews. From an analysis of responses, I could draw the following conclusions:

1. Procurement is not seen as a strategic activity.
2. Central government targets on e-procurement implementation will not be met.
3. E-procurement strategy is rarely documented.

Examples to illustrate this downbeat view of e-procurement in local government? According to my research, 65 per cent of local authorities had not introduced e-procurement by late 2004. But what is e-procurement? My interviews demonstrated that the definition and scope of e-procurement has no universal understanding or agreement.

E-procurement, for example, was stated to have been introduced by one respondent who had merely introduced purchasing cards for colleagues who had devolved purchasing authority. Furthermore, an interviewee who stated they had not implemented e-procurement had actually introduced a purchasing cards system, but did not consider such an initiative to be e-procurement.

Among all the types of e-procurement, reverse auctions have a high profile in both academic and business debates. Reverse auctions are widely publicised by e-

Barriers to the implementation of e-procurement in Local Government

procurement solution providers and advisers to public-sector buyers as well as by “pathfinder users” such as the Ministry of Defence.

The OGC has conducted a number of high-profile campaigns to publicise the process and benefits of their reverse auction solutions to the public sector. Therefore I expected a positive response to this specific question.

Disappointingly, only 15 per cent of local authorities who had implemented e-procurement included reverse auctions as a solution. This suggests they are not “pathfinders” in regard to new business practices and do not readily embrace change, but view it with caution. Inertia may also be a contributory factor.

The majority of respondents did not understand the concept or practice of reverse auctions. Even respondents who had an insight to e-procurement were generally sceptical about the financial benefits of reverse auctions.

When chief executives were asked “Do you believe your authority will meet the government targets in regard to e-procurement?” nearly three-quarters of respondents said “Yes”. The response indicates that local authorities, in many cases, have not commenced or do not have plans to commence the implementation of e-procurement, but the majority believe that they will achieve targets. From the analysis of the results, there appears to be little evidence to substantiate this claim.

So what is to be done? Local authorities should introduce rigour and discipline into their approach to e-procurement implementation. This approach will impact on the activities of stakeholders, suppliers and colleagues as much as those charged with implementation.

Stephen Ashcroft is a business consultant at Brian Farrington Ltd. His questionnaire can be seen at www.brianfarrington.com/research, and the results and analysis are available from s.ashcroft@brianfarrington.com

Barriers to the implementation of e-procurement in Local Government

Results and analysis of the research undertaken with Local Government in late 2004

Introduction

This summary report details the relevant questions and analysis in support of the study of the barriers to the implementation of e-procurement in Local Government. The results of the respondents for each relevant question are cross referenced as appropriate.

1 Question 1 'Has your Authority introduced e-procurement?'

388 Chief Executives of Local Authorities received the email questionnaire. 107 Local Authorities provided a response.

Here, deliberately, e-procurement was not defined in the questionnaire. Therefore there is a bias within the response, elucidated by the follow up telephone interviews. Of the 35% replying 'Yes' it became clear that some had only implemented one facet of e-procurement e.g. purchasing cards. It then became clear through the subsequent telephone interviews that some of the 65% of respondents answering 'No' had, in effect, also introduced a facet of e-procurement. These responses, from among all types of respondents from Chief Executives to Procurement Officers, are indicative of a lack of clarity in their understanding of the breadth of e-procurement.

In summary 65% of Local Authorities have not introduced and 35% have introduced e-procurement. The writer undertook 36 telephone interviews with respondents to the questionnaire. The telephone interviews demonstrated that the definition and scope of e-procurement has no universal understanding or agreement. E-procurement, for example, was stated to have been introduced by one respondent who had merely introduced purchasing cards for colleagues who had devolved purchasing authority. Furthermore, a telephone interviewee who stated they had not introduced e-procurement had already introduced purchasing cards but did not consider such an initiative as e-procurement. Hence, the potentially contradictory nature and scale of introduction of e-procurement cannot be conclusive simply using the responses to this question.

The following table, Table 1, provides a break down of statistics by type of Local Authorities to identify and isolate any pattern of response where the answer to Question 1 was 'Yes'.

Type of Local Authority in England	Percentage of Local Authorities in that Type / %	Percentage of Local Authorities in that type who responded Yes to question 1 / %
1. Counties	8.7	15.6
2. Districts	61.3	37.5
3. London Boroughs	8.5	18.7
4. Metropolitan Boroughs	9.2	18.7
5. Unitaries	12.1	3.1
6 Not Known (respondent did not detail name/type of Authority)	0	6.2
Total	100	100

Table 1. Types and percentages of Local Authorities in England and percentages of Local Authorities in each type who responded 'Yes' to Question 1.

The analysis displayed in Table 4 indicates that the take up of e-procurement is, relatively, low in District and Unitary Authorities and higher in London Borough Authorities, Metropolitan and County Authorities.

Respondents to this questionnaire were then directed in the questionnaire that if they answered 'No' to Question 1 that they should proceed to Question 7. Questions 2 to 6 addressed issues for the 35% of respondents who had answered 'Yes' to question 1 and hence have or believe they have introduced e-procurement within their organisation. The analysis of Questions 2 to 6 therefore deal with only that proportion of respondents not the total of all responses to all questions.

2 Question 2 'When did your Authority 'go live' with e-procurement?'

This question was constructed to identify the date at which e-procurement was implemented, meeting the objectives defined and agreed at the pre-implementation of e-procurement planning phase.

The respondents were required to choose one of four time periods, namely 'before 2002', '2002', '2003', and '2004'. The conclusion is that the 'go-live' activity of e-procurement peaked in 2003. The 14% (that responded stating '2003') equates to only 5 Local Authorities. The question was posed to focus on the timescales stipulated by central government for the 'go live' target timescales for Local Authorities.

The responses may be interpreted as an indication of varying perceptions of an achievable or required implementation date. There is no indication of any consistent activity to meet central Government targets.

3 Question 3 'Was there a business plan to support the introduction?'

This question was raised in recognition of the time and resource demands as well as the potential cultural and work practices that would be influenced and changed by the implementation of e-procurement. A strategic initiative such as this would, typically, necessitate a business plan requiring the involvement of senior staff to ensure its robustness.

This response indicates that the vast majority of respondents (97%) who had introduced e-procurement based the initiative on a documented business case. The writer did, when undertaking telephone interviews ask for a copy of documents including business plans. No business plan documents were released but other types of documents were. This will be commented upon later.

4 Question 4a 'Has your Authority appointed an e-procurement champion?'

The response to this question would facilitate an understanding of the profile of e-procurement within a Local Authority. The function of the champion was a specific area of interest to observe where 'best practice' would suggest the champion should be positioned within the hierarchy of the organisation.

The response indicates that 1 in 4 Local Authorities who introduce e-procurement do not appoint a champion to drive and be responsible for the initiative. This requires further consideration. The majority (62%) of Local Authorities who have implemented e-procurement but do not have an e-champion are District Councils. It can be postulated that when a strategic initiative, such as e-procurement, is introduced into an organisation senior management accountability is vital to success. Appointment of a champion is a means of ensuring accountability. A parallel can be drawn with the position of Head of Legal Services (or equivalent title). This person may, for example, be accountable for the opening and management of tenders when a major procurement is undertaken. Here, a clear and defined role ensures that internal and external stakeholders are in no doubt who is accountable for the success of the related activity. Appointing a champion for e-procurement could be deemed to be good practice although it is no guarantee of success.

5 Question 5 'Are your e-procurement systems integrated with the Authority's accounting financial systems?'

It was anticipated that there were only two options to respond to this question; 'Yes' or 'No'. Surprisingly, 71% of respondents failed to answer the question. No definitive conclusions can be drawn from this. However the telephone interviews with respondents indicated that e-procurement initiatives did not always integrate with the accounting/financial systems. A frequent comment was that e-procurement would be implemented and integrated to the financial system 'later'.

In seeking to account for the biased response it may be postulated that respondents had:

- a lack of knowledge of financial systems generally.
- not liaised with finance to ascertain the facts.
- not understood the specific implications of question 5.
- a view that a bolt on e-procurement 'module' was not seen as an integral feature of a financial system.
- concluded that procurement systems often have a low IT priority and, in consequence the integration had not taken place.

6 Question 6 'What percentage of the Authority's procurement activity is undertaken electronically?'

This question was posed as part of the research to gain an understanding of the impact of e-procurement on procurement activity. Here again this question did not provide subject definitions. However, procurement activity undertaken electronically could include any or all of the typologies identified at Chapter 3, section 3.8.

69% of the respondents who stated that they have implemented e-procurement did not answer this question. The remainder (37 respondents) provided the data leading to the results detailed in Table 2, below.

Percentage of Respondents	Percentage of the Authority's procurement activity undertaken electronically
2.7	None
56.7	0-25
27.0	26-50
10.8	51-75
2.7	76-100

Table 2. Percentage of an Authority's procurement activity undertaken electronically compared, as a percentage, to the respondents response.

Subsequent telephone interviews indicated that the generation and provision of management information was a demanding activity and frequently the total procurement expenditure, the number of suppliers and the amount of procurement activity undertaken was often unknown. However, some respondents, notably Unitary and Metropolitan Authorities, were more specific in their response. The responses, more broadly, indicate the lack of management information available to the respondents. This may be due to the limitations of the reporting systems of the organisation. However, knowledge of procurement information could be described as patchy in contrast to, for example, Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) ratings where the Audit Commission (Audit Commission website) award and publish a rating of a Local Authorities' performance in delivering services. As is often commented in management publications 'what gets measured gets done' whereby mandatory reporting requirements make it imperative to

respond. This will undoubtedly be the case when CPA ratings must include procurement activity commencing in 2005.

A respondent, for example, with 76-100% of procurement activity undertaken electronically was a District Council with estimated expenditure of £7m. This respondent also stated that the perceived financial benefits of e-procurement in this current financial year would be less than £100,000 (i.e. circa 1.4% savings). This example, viewed in isolation of any other benefits, indicates that implementing e-procurement may not provide large scale financial benefits. However, in Local Government there is the added pressure of service delivery and other value for money considerations being relevant when considering the management of third party expenditure. There is the obvious disadvantage that the benefits of procurement, including e-procurement may be lost because of a focus on other issues.

7 Question 7b 'Do you have plans for its introduction?'

This question was directed at those respondents who had answered 'No' to Question 1 'Have you introduced e-procurement?' 66% stated that they were planning to introduce e-procurement although 3 % (all District Councils) stated that they had no plans to introduce e-procurement. It could be postulated that some respondents did not know if there were any documented plans within the organisation or that plans were being formulated. This could indicate organisational dysfunctionality.

Telephone interviews with 5 respondents who had not introduced e-procurement should be put in the context of 31 respondents, who undertook telephone interview, who had introduced e-procurement. The subjective view from this limited number of sources indicated that having no current plans was not necessarily a barrier to achieving the central government targets on e-procurement. One respondent stated that if necessary 'they would throw money and consultants at the problem before April 2006'.

8 Question 7 C 'When do you plan to introduce it?'

The original assumption was that respondents who have had plans would answer this question. 22% state 2004, which in reality would mean the fourth quarter of 2004. 49% stated 2005 and 7% stated 2006. The remaining 12% did not provide an answer to this question. No pattern could be identified between types of Authorities and the timing of their plans.

The responses suggest that many respondents are optimistic and also comfortable with meeting a target (i.e. introducing e-procurement by 2006) without an overt plan. This perspective on meeting targets appears to be applicable across all the different types of Authority.

Telephone interviews with 4 respondents indicated that Authorities would plan a start of an e-procurement implementation. The question would have been strengthened by asking when the planned e-procurement would be going live.

9 Question 8 'What is your estimate of the cost of the introduction?'

The majority, 62% of respondents to this question, indicated that the cost of introducing e-procurement would be under £1m. Supplementary questions at the telephone interview stage demonstrated that no respondents knew the precise figure because the business practice of 'Cost Benefit Analysis' had not been undertaken.

The total of 37 respondents provided the results as identified in Table 3, below.

Percentage of Respondents	Estimate of the cost of the introduction of e-procurement
21.6	None provided
35.1	Under £100,000
27.0	£100,000 -£1m
13.5	£1m - £5m
2.7	Over £5m

Table 3. Estimated cost of the introduction of e-procurement by percentage of respondents.

The 16.2% of respondents who indicated a cost of introduction of greater than £1m were all from County Councils or Metropolitan Councils. This could indicate a direct relationship between the cost of implementing e-procurement to the size of the Local Authority and the amount of third party expenditure. For example, in a telephone interview, a County Council who indicated a cost of over £5m to implement e-procurement had an estimated annual expenditure with third parties of £119m; a ratio of implementation costs to third party expenditure of some 1 to 24. Another telephone interview with a respondent from a Borough Council with a third party expenditure of £12m indicated that the cost of implementing of e-procurement would be close to £1m; a ratio of implementation costs to third party expenditure of 1 to 12. The range between these figures would be a useful basis of an evaluation tool designed to assess, later, whether e-procurement delivers overall value for money.

10 Question 10 'What barriers do you think there are to achieve e-procurement targets in your Authority?'

This question lies at the heart of this dissertation. All 107 respondents provided a response as illustrated in the Table 4, below:

Percentage of Respondents	What barriers do you think there are to achieve e-procurement targets in your Authority?
5.6	a) None provided
0.9	b) Needs to be countrywide for it to be of benefit
7.4	c) Initiative/information overload
8.4	d) Supplier readiness and commitment
11.2	e) Managing impact on local suppliers
13.1	f) IT issues/current IT systems/ IT security
16.8	g) Resources/ budget issues
35.5	h) Managing staff/cultural change

Table 4. Barriers to achieve e-procurement targets by percentage of respondents.

Table 4 identifies 7 perceived barriers to achieving e-procurement targets. 6 of the options with the exception of a) none provided and b) needs to be countrywide for it to be of benefit, were the writer's perception of barriers informed by his literature review. In addition, respondents were provided with the opportunity to provide alternatives and provide, as appropriate rankings. There was a disappointing response because only one respondent independently of the writer identified a barrier. It must be concluded that no consideration had been given to this matter in the respondent Local Authorities.

The research has not identified a conclusive list of potential barriers to achieve e-procurement targets, neither is there any pattern in the type of authority. Facet d) in Table 4, suppliers, their readiness and commitment were a major source of concern to respondents and therefore perceived as a key barrier to achieving e-procurement targets. However, the main perceived barriers, 76.6%, are from intra-organisational sources. In the ranking of perceived importance, the types of barriers can be grouped into one of three over-arching sources, namely 'technology', 'finance' and the highest ranked barrier source 'staff/culture'. The dyadic relationship between buyer and supplier is outweighed by the barriers arising from internal stakeholders identified as IT, finance and (procurement related) staff.

11 Question 11a 'Has the Authority developed a procurement strategy to assist the achievement of the e-procurement targets?'

This question provided a positive response of 72%. 25% said 'No' and 3% did not answer. The type of Authority that dominates with 75% of the 'No' response, is District Councils. It should be recognised in this context that District Councils are the highest number of all Local Authorities. It could be postulated that any centralised approach to managing a transformational change such as implementing e-procurement has not yet embraced the majority of Local Authorities.

The writer accessed Local Authority websites (including many who did not contribute to the research). Documents provided by respondents following telephone interviews were also studied. The conclusions indicate that procurement strategies are, in only a limited number of cases, in place and include rationale to support e-procurement targets. for the majority of Local Authorities who responded to the questionnaire. This response needs to be considered in relation to the percentage (25%) of Local Authorities with an e-procurement champion addressed earlier at Question 4a.

The response to Question 1, (see earlier analysis and conclusions) shows that 35% have not introduced e-procurement but, as stated above, 25% who have a procurement strategy have not yet adopted a strategy to cope with e-procurement targets.

It may be concluded from the responses to this question, and cross referenced with answers to Questions, for example, 1 and 4a that e-procurement is an initiative engineered by central Government to add to the list of other initiatives that have had varying degrees of success. Other initiatives that could be cited include Partnering, Investors In People, Corporate Social Responsibility, Environmental Management, Social Enterprises and Quality Assurance Systems. This is a strong indication that there is an initiative overload and furthermore, when these initiatives are introduced the various implementation considerations have not been identified.

12 Question 13 ‘What are the perceived financial benefits of e-procurement in this financial year?’

The responses to this question are analysed according to those respondents who have implemented e-procurement and those who have yet to implement e-procurement. 45% of all respondents stated that the perceived financial benefits are less than £100,000.

The total of 37 respondents who have implemented e-procurement provided the raw data analysed in Table 5, below.

Percentage of Respondents	Perceived financial benefits of e-procurement in this financial year
21.6	None provided/Not Known
51.3	Under £100,000
21.6	£100,000 -£1m
5.4	£1m - £5m
0	Over £5m

Table 5. Perceived financial benefits of e-procurement in this financial year compared to percentage of respondents.

Marginally over half the respondents, 51.3%, perceived the financial benefits of e-procurement in this financial year to be under £100,000 and 21.6% of respondents perceived financial benefits of between £100,000 and £1m. Hence, a total of 72.9% respondents perceived financial benefits to be less than £1m.

The two respondents who indicated financial benefits of between £1m and £5m were London Borough Councils. Information from a telephone interview with a respondent from a County Council revealed that they indicated a cost of over £5m to implement e-procurement and an estimated expenditure with third parties of £119m indicated financial benefits of under £100,000. This reinforces that the absence of a Cost Benefit Analysis is a serious process weakness because, here, there is no demonstrable value for money.

The research shows, that in a majority of instances there is a disconnect between third party expenditure, perceived savings and the cost of implementation of e-procurement. If such analysis was mandatory, for example, made a reporting requirement to ODPM it would give clarity to the benefits or disadvantages of introducing e-procurement.

13 Question 15 'Do you as Chief Executive/Senior Officer see e-procurement as a success?'

57% of the 107 respondents to this question stated 'Yes', 18% stating 'No' and 25% not providing a response. In isolation, this response may be viewed as an unenthusiastic and/or mal-informed interpretation of the value of implementing e-procurement. However, the 43% of respondents who were not affirmative applies to all respondents who completed the questionnaire. When only the responses to this Question 15 were cross referenced to respondents who answered 'Yes' to Question 1 to having introduced e-procurement, an overwhelming 98% confirmed that they see e-procurement as a success. Hence, the vast majority of respondents who have introduced e-procurement see it as a success with a less favourable opinion from respondents who have not yet introduced e-procurement.

14 Question 16 'Have internal audit reviewed the e-procurement strategy?'

40% of respondents answered 'Yes', 39% stated 'No' and 22% did not answer this question. Telephone interviews with representatives from the 40% of respondents who answered 'Yes', confirmed that they were unable to release the audit report because it was not in the public domain. This position demonstrates that internal audit reports are unlikely to be provided for matters of academic research.

15 Question 17a 'Is e-procurement planned to impact on your procurement resource?'

The majority of the respondents, 70% said 'Yes' with only 17% stating 'No' and 13% not answering. This question is directly related to Question 17b, below.

16 Question 17b If 'Yes' [to Question 17a], will the impact be; major decrease, a major increase, a minor decrease, a minor increase.

This question was answered by those respondents who stated 'Yes' to Question 17a. Table 6, below, identifies the results of the responses to this question.

Percentage of Respondents	If 'Yes', will the impact be; major decrease, a major increase, a minor decrease, a minor increase.
19.4	None provided/Not Known
36.1	Major increase
16.6	Minor increase
5.5	Major decrease
22.2	Minor decrease

Table 6. Impact on the respondent's procurement resource compared to percentage of respondents.

The analysis of results stated in Table 9 shows that the respondents believe that there is a correlation whereby implementing e-procurement would lead to planning an increase in procurement resource. The majority of respondents, 52.7% (adding the percentage of responses stating 'major increase' and 'minor increase' together) planned an increase in procurement resource. Only 27.2% (adding the percentage of responses stating 'major decrease' and 'minor decrease' together). Surprisingly, perhaps, 19.4% of respondents who answered 'Yes' to Question 17a 'Is e-procurement planned to impact on your procurement resource' did not provide an answer to this question in regard to the scale of the impact.

The writer's telephone interviews indicated that, in some cases, there would be a decrease in senior procurement resource but an increase in operational resource in order to, for example, resolve procurement matters requiring specialist staff for purchasers with delegated authority who could no longer undertake maverick spend. In consequence, central contracts would be more fully utilised and the procurement function involved in sourcing products and services that previously would not have had such visibility. A comment, which may of course be biased or ill informed, was made by an interviewee of a London Metropolitan Authority that any perceived savings in more efficient and effective procurement processes would be mitigated by the increase in costs of recruiting support staff, for example, in accounts payable.

The writer concludes that the implementation of e-procurement will therefore lead to increased procurement resource is flawed logic. Furthermore, if a natural consequence of an e-procurement initiative was an increase in resource, the business case and procurement strategy which led to such an outcome, should have been rigorously challenged.

17 Question 18a 'Does e-procurement in your Authority include reverse auctions?'

Amongst all the types of e-procurement (see section 3.7.1 for a list of typologies identified by the writer) reverse auctions have a high profile in both academic and business debates on e-procurement. Reverse auctions are widely publicised by e-procurement solution providers and advisors to public sector buyers as well as by pathfinder 'users' such as the Ministry of Defence. The Office of Government Commerce has conducted a number of high profile marketing campaigns to publicise the process and benefits of their reverse auction solutions to the public sector. Hence in designing the questionnaire the writer's expectations for this specific question was for a positive response.

Disappointingly, only 15% of those Authorities who have implemented e-procurement include reverse auctions as a procurement solution. There was no pattern in regard to the type of Local Authority that had undertaken reverse auctions. It could be postulated that Local Authorities are not pathfinders in regard to new business practices and that change is not readily embraced but viewed with caution. Inertia may also account for this conclusion.

Telephone interviews indicated that the majority of respondents did not understand the concept or practice of reverse auctions. Where the writer had discussions with a respondent who had an insight to e-procurement, the financial benefits of reverse auctions were viewed sceptically. A respondent from a District Council ended the interview with the statement that they were taking their lead from the local Purchasing Consortium who was reviewing options including reverse auctions.

In the cases where reverse auctions had been undertaken by respondent's Authorities their value was fully recognised. The positive responses were exclusively from London Metropolitan Authorities and were informed conclusions.

18 Question 20 'Did the Office of Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) support the introduction of e-procurement?'

36% of all the respondents stated 'Yes', 32% stated 'No' and the remaining 33% did not provide an answer to this question. However, when cross referencing the response to this Question 20 with those of the respondents who answered 'Yes' to Question 1 'Has your Authority introduced e-procurement?' results were more encouraging. For this cross referenced

group of respondents 46% stated 'Yes' with both 'No' and 'No answer given' receiving 27% each of the responses.

This question did not provide prescriptive definitions of e-procurement hence the writer chose to pursue the detail through telephone interviews. As anticipated, there was no universal and agreed interpretation of the support nor of the Local Authorities' expectations of the value of involving ODPM.

The writer suggests that, based on the findings of this research and the telephone interviews, that ODPM do not engender the confidence that they can provide the support and process solutions to Local Authorities. A theme from respondents interviewed by telephone, which of course, may be biased or ill informed, was that ODPM appear to have limited resource both in terms of capacity and capability and takes a fragmented approach to interaction with Local Government on the issue of implementation of e-procurement and the National Strategy. However, the writer has concluded that any vacuum created by ODPM will be filled by private sector management consultants.

19 Question 21 'Does your e-procurement strategy offer opportunities to local SMEs and Social enterprises?'

Only 7% of respondents with an e-procurement strategy said 'Yes'. A key plank of the ODPM strategy for Local Government is the increased involvement of Small Medium Enterprises (SMEs) and Social Enterprises (SEs). These research findings are a disappointing outcome, taking into account the efforts made by a variety of central Government bodies and QuANGOs to develop opportunities for SMEs and SE in public sector procurement.

20 Question 22 'There are currently a number of Government e-initiatives in Local Government. Do you believe your Authority will meet the Government targets in regard to e-procurement?'

74% of respondents said 'Yes' with 19% stating 'No' and 13% not answering. The response indicates that Local Authorities that in many cases (as illustrated by the respondents' responses to Question 1) do not have plans for or have commenced the implementation of e-procurement but the nearly three-quarter majority believe that they will achieve targets. There appears to be, from the analysis of the results of this questionnaire, little evidence to substantiate this claim.

The positive stance in regard to meeting e-procurement targets applies to all types of Local Authorities.

Questions, queries, comments?

Stephen Ashcroft, the author of this research summary report, can be contacted by:

Email: s.ashcroft@brianfarrington.com

Telephone: +44 (0)1744 20698

Stephen is a management consultant and training specialist with Brian Farrington Ltd (www.brianfarrington.com) working on international procurement and supply chain assignments in the public and private sector.