

Cost Avoidance Versus Cost Savings – Tracking Real Value



Procurement and Supply Chain Management Made Simple.

Foreword – When a Saving Is Not a Saving

Procurement regularly reports savings worth millions of pounds, yet the number itself can conceal more than it reveals. A negotiated price reduction, avoided supplier increase, reduced specification, lower demand, or favourable market movement may all be described as “savings”, even though their financial effects differ greatly. The danger begins when those distinctions disappear, and management assumes every reported pound represents cash that can be removed from a budget or spent elsewhere.

The difference matters because organisations increasingly expect procurement to demonstrate measurable value. Across the United Kingdom public sector, commercial teams face pressure to show efficiency, transparency, and value for money. In contrast, private organisations face equally strong demands to protect margin, manage inflation, and improve productivity. Those pressures are legitimate, but they can also create incentives to favour impressive headline numbers over careful explanation of what has actually been achieved.

A £500,000 cost reduction is not the same as preventing a £500,000 proposed increase, just as a £500,000 productivity improvement is not automatically £500,000 of cash released. Each may create genuine value, but each belongs in a different category. The challenge for Procurement, Finance and operational management is therefore not simply to count benefits, but to establish credible baselines, attribute causation and ensure reported savings survive implementation and financial scrutiny.

The strongest procurement functions do not need exaggerated figures to show their contribution. They distinguish cost savings from cost avoidance, separate realised value from forecasts and recognise wider benefits without disguising them as cash. That discipline strengthens trust with Finance, senior leadership and budget holders. When savings are measured consistently and transparently, procurement reporting becomes more than a performance claim: it becomes reliable management information that supports better commercial decisions.

What Is a Cost Saving?

A cost saving occurs when an organisation spends less to obtain the same, or an acceptably equivalent, output. If a contract previously cost £1 million annually and a competitively sourced replacement delivers the required service for £900,000, the £100,000 reduction is a genuine saving, provided implementation costs, volume changes and service reductions have not created the difference. The strongest savings then appear in budgets, invoices, and management accounts as released cash or retained margin.

Scale makes disciplined measurement especially important. Whole of Government Accounts for 2024–25 recorded £309.0 billion of public-sector procurement of goods and services, while gross current procurement within departmental expenditure limits reached £170.9 billion. At that scale, even a one-percentage-point reduction would be worth billions of pounds, but percentage claims remain meaningless unless organisations can show, with credible evidence, what spending would otherwise have occurred under a genuinely comparable scenario.

Private-sector programmes illustrate the same principle. Sainsbury's delivered £330 million of business-wide structural cost savings in its 2025/26 financial year, and around £680 million since February 2024, keeping it on track for a £1 billion three-year target. Yet the retailer reported that those savings only partially offset unusually high operating-cost inflation. Genuine savings therefore do not guarantee a lower cost base; they must be read alongside inflation, volume, and investment decisions.

What Is Cost Avoidance?

Cost avoidance is value created by preventing a future cost from arising, rather than reducing expenditure already embedded in the organisation's current cost base. If a supplier proposes increasing an annual contract from £2 million to £2.2 million and negotiations hold the price at £2 million, procurement may reasonably record £200,000 in avoided cost. However, actual expenditure has not fallen by £200,000 against the existing baseline.

Avoidance can arise through resisting proposed increases, removing unnecessary specification, preventing demand growth, negotiating away charges, limiting indexation or changing commercial terms before liabilities crystallise. It can protect budgets just as effectively as a conventional saving. The crucial difference is counterfactual: value is measured against a credible future cost that did not occur, so evidence for the starting assumption is especially important for robust reporting overall.

HM Treasury draws an important boundary. Its Government Efficiency Framework states that lower-than-expected inflation producing a budgetary windfall is not an efficiency saving, while a contingent liability that never crystallises is normally not one either. Procurement therefore cannot label every favourable movement "cost avoidance". There should be identifiable commercial intervention, credible causation and a defensible calculation showing why expenditure would otherwise have been higher in the relevant period.

A practical example is demand management. HM Treasury illustrates a department forecasting 100 software licences but reducing the requirement to 80 through intervention while preserving the required outcome. The avoided 20 licences can constitute a monetisable non-cash-releasing efficiency. For procurement, the lesson is significant: value may come as much from challenging quantity as from negotiating unit price, but the benefit should be categorised accurately and separately.

Cost avoidance becomes especially valuable during inflationary or supply-constrained periods. Preventing a £500,000 increase matters economically even if Finance cannot remove £500,000 from an approved budget. Reporting it separately protects procurement's credibility while ensuring commercial teams receive recognition for preventing deterioration in the cost base. However, combining avoidance indiscriminately with cash savings can make an impressive benefits figure look much stronger than the organisation's underlying financial

position.

Why the Distinction Matters

Cost savings and cost avoidance answer different financial questions. Savings ask how much less the organisation spends than before, while avoidance asks how much additional cost it has prevented. Both can represent legitimate commercial value, yet only the first automatically implies a reduction from an established cost base. Senior management therefore needs separate reporting rather than a single headline number that blends fundamentally different financial effects.

This distinction matters particularly in public procurement. Section 12 of the Procurement Act 2023 requires contracting authorities carrying out a covered procurement to have regard to the importance of delivering value for money, maximising public benefit, sharing information and acting, and being seen to act, with integrity. Value for money is therefore broader than achieving the lowest price, while overstating savings would undermine the transparency and integrity that the statutory framework expressly seeks to promote.

Before becoming part of the Government Commercial Agency in April 2026, Crown Commercial Service demonstrated how to report large-scale benefits using defined comparators. In 2024–25, £33 billion of direct public-sector spend flowed through its commercial agreements, with an average commercial benefit rate of 10.49%. Its annual report recorded £4.6 billion of spend-related commercial benefits, assessed against current market comparator prices rather than presented simply as budget reductions.

That distinction protects decision quality. A procurement director reporting £10 million of “savings” may create an expectation that Finance can reduce budgets by £10 million. If £6 million is cash-releasing and £4 million is avoided escalation, the commercial contribution may still total £10 million, but only the first component necessarily creates redeployable cash immediately. Transparent categorisation keeps procurement performance grounded in financial reality and prevents budgets being cut beyond what genuinely exists.

Cashable and Non-Cashable Benefits

Cashable benefits directly reduce expenditure, leaving budget that can be withdrawn, reinvested or redirected. A £50 unit price reduced to £45 on an unchanged annual requirement of 100,000 units produces a gross £500,000 reduction. If transition costs reach £50,000, reporting £450,000 net in the first year gives decision-makers a more realistic view of the cash procurement has released for other priorities, while later years may approach the full gross figure.

HM Treasury now uses the terms cash-releasing and non-cash-releasing rather than relying solely on the familiar cashable and non-cashable labels. Its Government Efficiency Framework requires cash-releasing efficiencies to be supported by quality data, calculated net of costs, realised before being reported as achieved, and defensible to auditors. It also requires organisations to avoid adverse consequences and double counting across departments or functions. Those tests also offer a useful benchmark for private organisations.

Non-cash-releasing benefits may still possess measurable monetary value. A process improvement that allows the same workforce to handle 50% more transactions creates capacity without reducing payroll. Likewise, negotiating additional service hours at the same £1 million contract price generates more output without increasing expenditure. Neither automatically releases money, yet both improve productivity and should be recorded where the methodology clearly identifies the benefit and preserves service outcomes.

The National Health Service (NHS) applies similar logic through NHS England’s procurement value and savings methodology, which covers NHS trusts, foundation trusts, integrated care boards and NHS England. It treats savings from price reductions or rebates as cashable, while costs avoided, such as avoided inflation, are non-cashable. That classification mirrors the distinction between savings and avoidance, giving Finance and procurement a common

language for recording value consistently across a very large health system.

A mature benefits register should therefore separate cash released, monetisable non-cash-releasing value and wider non-monetisable outcomes. Combining them into a single “saving” obscures what management can actually spend elsewhere. Conversely, ignoring non-cash benefits understates procurement’s contribution. The objective is not to favour one category, but to clearly show whether £1 of reported value reduced expenditure, increased capacity, prevented cost, or delivered another evidenced organisational benefit.

Hard Savings and Soft Savings

“Hard saving” commonly refers to a financially evidenced reduction that can be traced to budgets, purchase prices or accounts. A renegotiated service dropping from £3 million to £2.7 million annually, with unchanged scope and demand, creates an obvious £300,000 gross reduction. When Finance validates the baseline and confirms the benefit reaches the budget, the saving carries much stronger assurance than an unsupported procurement estimate prepared in isolation from the management accounts.

“Soft saving” is less precise and should be used cautiously because organisations define it differently. It may describe cost avoidance, productivity improvements, additional services obtained without extra charge, reduced risk or staff time saved. Some of these outcomes are valuable and monetisable; others are qualitative. Labelling all of them as soft savings can obscure important differences, so stronger governance categorises the underlying benefit rather than relying on the label.

Heathrow provides a useful private-sector illustration of tangible operational savings. In its business planning documentation, Heathrow reported more than £150 million in savings over the sixth quinquennium (Q6) regulatory period from supplier and facilities initiatives, including renegotiated engineering arrangements, bringing trolley operations in-house, market-testing contracts, and reduced contractor costs following Terminal 1’s early closure. The example shows that savings may result from commercial redesign, not merely lower tendered prices.

Hard savings can nevertheless be overstated. A £300,000 unit-price reduction disappears if demand rises sufficiently, expensive implementation work is omitted, or quality falls and creates downstream cost. That is why net calculation and preserving outcomes sit at the heart of public-sector efficiency rules. Private organisations should apply the same discipline: a saving should represent improved economics, not an attractive subtraction between two prices captured under different assumptions.

The Importance of the Baseline

Every savings calculation starts with a baseline: the credible cost against which the improved position is measured. Without one, a percentage saving has no stable meaning. A new price of £900,000 could represent a £100,000 saving against an existing £1 million contract, no saving at all against a £900,000 budget, or £200,000 of avoidance against a defensible £1.1 million future cost forecast for exactly the same requirement.

HM Treasury requires efficiency calculations to establish a clear starting point and retain evidence supporting how that baseline was determined. The approach should normally consider baseline cost information, the counterfactual spending profile and actual outturn. This matters because procurement teams can unintentionally manufacture larger benefits by choosing whichever comparison produces the largest number rather than the one that best reflects what the organisation would otherwise have spent.

Baselines should also normalise material changes. If annual consumption increases from 10,000 to 12,000 units, comparing total invoices before and after sourcing may wrongly suggest that procurement delivered no saving despite reducing unit prices. Conversely, falling demand can create apparent savings without procurement intervention. Separating price, volume, specification, mix, inflation and one-off effects produces a much more defensible account of commercial performance clearly for management.

Inconsistent baselines also undermine aggregate reporting. In October 2023, the National Audit Office (NAO) found that central government functions hosted by the Cabinet Office, which reported £4.4 billion of savings for 2021–22, calculated benefits in different ways; the Government Communication Service, for example, compared each campaign's baseline forecast with its final approved value. The Government Internal Audit Agency concluded that existing processes did not sufficiently mitigate the risk of claims being under- or overstated.

Poor baselines create behavioural risk. If teams receive recognition for the largest declared saving, they are incentivised to select inflated reference prices, supplier opening bids, or unapproved forecasts. Better governance requires Procurement, Finance and the budget owner to agree the baseline before, or early in, the sourcing exercise. That makes the eventual savings harder to manipulate and turns benefits tracking from retrospective arithmetic into controlled financial management.

Historical Spend as a Baseline

Historical spend is often the simplest baseline because it uses amounts the organisation genuinely paid. If 2025 expenditure on a stable requirement was £4 million and the same volume and specification cost £3.6 million after retendering, the initial £400,000 difference is straightforward. Historical invoices, purchase orders, and accounts provide an audit trail that is usually far stronger than forecasts assembled only after negotiations conclude and the outcome is already known.

Simplicity can mislead when circumstances change. Historic expenditure may contain exceptional demand, emergency purchases, temporary surcharges or obsolete specifications. Commodity prices may have risen sharply, while volumes or service levels may differ. Using last year's £4 million without adjustment could therefore exaggerate or suppress procurement's contribution. A responsible baseline identifies significant changes and either normalises them or explains why the historical figure remains the fairest comparator.

Inflation deserves particular care. The Office for National Statistics may provide relevant producer, consumer, or sector indices, while contracts may include specific indexation formulae. If a £10 million contract would legitimately have risen by 4%, holding expenditure at £10 million may represent £400,000 of avoidance, but it is not a £400,000 reduction from historical spend. Separating these effects prevents one negotiation from generating two incompatible savings narratives.

Historical spend is strongest where demand, specification and commercial conditions remain broadly constant. For repetitive categories such as utilities consumption, temporary labour, packaging or standard components, analysts can often construct comparable unit-cost histories. For complex outsourced services, construction, or technology, historic totals may hide scope changes. The more the requirement evolves, the greater the need for a normalised baseline supported by quantities, service levels and contractual assumptions.

Budget as a Baseline

An approved budget can be a powerful baseline because it connects procurement performance directly to financial planning. If an organisation budgets £5 million for a requirement and procurement secures the complete requirement for £4.6 million, the £400,000 difference may become genuinely releasable, provided the budget was realistic, and the organisation removes or formally redirects the £400,000 rather than quietly absorbing it elsewhere in the original cost centre.

Budgets are not automatically objective. Some contain contingency, inflation assumptions or deliberate prudence, while others are constrained targets rather than realistic forecasts. Procurement should not claim the difference between an overstated budget and the market price merely because the arithmetic is convenient. The relevant question is what cost would credibly have occurred without the intervention, not what number happened to appear in an annual planning spreadsheet.

Public-sector practice reinforces that distinction. Cash-releasing savings must directly reduce spending and be realised within the relevant reporting period, and the Treasury framework explicitly distinguishes genuine efficiency from simple reallocations or programme cancellation. A £2 million budget reduction therefore says little about procurement performance unless the required output remains intact and Procurement can causally link the reduction to an evidenced commercial intervention.

Budget baselines work best when Finance, Procurement and operational owners align before the exercise begins. They should document planned volume, specification, inflation, known contractual uplifts and contingencies, then agree how savings will affect the budget. This prevents a common dispute in which Procurement reports £500,000 while Finance recognises £200,000 because the remaining £300,000 was never realistically available for removal from the approved financial plan itself.

The discipline matters equally in private organisations. A procurement saving that never reaches forecast operating costs, cash flow or margin may still be commercially useful, but management should understand why. Linking benefits registers to budgets turns sourcing outcomes into measurable business performance. It also discourages procurement from counting favourable price movements that Finance has already incorporated, reducing the risk that different functions claim the same benefit twice.

Market Price as a Baseline

Market pricing can provide a stronger baseline than historical spend when technology, commodities, labour rates or competitive conditions have moved materially. Comparing the organisation's negotiated price with contemporary market evidence helps answer whether Procurement outperformed what a competent buyer could otherwise obtain. That is particularly relevant when last year's price has become obsolete and continuing to use it would either overstate savings or conceal genuine commercial achievement.

Crown Commercial Service used this concept at scale. Its 2024–25 annual report stated that it based spend benefits on sampling spend through commercial agreements and calculating the average benefit against current comparator market prices. With £33 billion of direct spend through agreements and a 10.49% average commercial benefit rate, comparator selection clearly mattered to the credibility of billions of pounds of reported public-sector commercial value and benefit.

Reliable market benchmarks can come from competitive tenders, published indices, independent benchmarking, framework data, recent comparable contracts or transparent commodity markets. Each source has limitations. Published averages may not reflect volume, specification, geography, credit terms or risk transfer. A benchmark for 100 laptops cannot automatically price 20,000 units, and construction rates in central London may not apply to an otherwise similar requirement in another region.

Market comparisons should therefore be like-for-like and time-aligned. Analysts need to consider delivery terms, warranties, service levels, contract duration, payment terms, indexation, currencies and total cost of ownership. A supplier price that appears 8% below the market may no longer be advantageous once logistics, implementation and support are included. Good benchmarking informs the baseline; it does not replace professional judgement about genuine commercial comparability in each case.

Should Supplier Quotations Be the Baseline?

Supplier quotations are useful evidence, but an opening quotation should rarely become the automatic savings baseline. If a supplier initially quotes £1.2 million and agrees £900,000 after negotiation, calling the entire £300,000 difference a saving assumes the opening figure represented a price the organisation would genuinely have paid. In competitive markets, opening positions may include room to negotiate and therefore provide a weak counterfactual without corroborating evidence.

A quotation becomes more credible when it is formal, valid, commercially realistic, and reflects the price the organisation would otherwise have accepted. For example, a documented incumbent renewal offer of £2.4 million may support an avoidance calculation if the organisation negotiates £2.1 million and has evidence that continuation at £2.4 million was the genuine alternative. Even then, Finance should distinguish the £300,000 avoided increase from any cash reduction against current expenditure.

Competitive quotations can strengthen market-price baselines when requirements are genuinely comparable. Several independent bids clustering around £950,000 provide stronger evidence of prevailing market cost than a single supplier asking £1.3 million before discounting. Procurement teams should record the quotation date, scope, assumptions, and validity period, because using expired or non-comparable offers can produce a mathematically precise but commercially indefensible saving claim for senior management.

For public bodies, supplier quotations must also sit within compliant procurement processes. Alongside the section 12 objectives, the Procurement Act 2023 requires contracting authorities to treat suppliers the same unless a difference between them justifies different treatment. Savings methodology cannot justify manipulating competition, favouring a supplier, or constructing artificial comparators; benefit measurement must follow lawful procurement rather than replace its statutory obligations or the protections it gives bidders.

The best approach is triangulation. Compare supplier quotations with historical prices, approved budgets, independent benchmarks, market indices and credible counterfactuals, then select the baseline that most faithfully represents expected cost without the intervention. Document why it was chosen and have Finance or the budget owner validate it. A smaller, defensible £150,000 saving matters more for organisational credibility than an impressive £300,000 claim that collapses under scrutiny.

Price Increase Avoidance

Price increase avoidance occurs when Procurement prevents or reduces a supplier's proposed uplift without cutting the organisation's existing expenditure baseline. If an annual contract costs £5 million and the supplier seeks a 7% increase to £5.35 million, negotiating the uplift down to 2% limits the new cost to £5.1 million. Procurement has avoided £250,000 in additional expenditure, although the organisation still spends £100,000 more than before.

The distinction becomes especially important during periods of elevated inflation. The Office for National Statistics recorded Consumer Prices Index (CPI) inflation of 11.1% in October 2022, the highest annual CPI rate in the national series beginning in 1997. Organisations facing supplier demands linked to energy, labour and materials therefore encountered substantial upward pressure, making disciplined challenge of proposed increases a legitimate source of commercial value rather than merely defensive negotiation.

Avoidance should nevertheless be based on an evidenced counterfactual. A supplier asking for 10% does not automatically create a 10% avoidance opportunity if the increase is unsupported or would never have been accepted. Procurement should examine contractual entitlement, cost evidence, relevant indices, market movements and alternative supply options. Only the portion that credibly represents expenditure likely to have occurred without intervention should enter a benefits register as avoided cost.

The strongest reporting separates the original price, proposed uplift, justified uplift, negotiated outcome and resulting avoided cost. If a supplier requests £500,000 more and Procurement agrees £150,000 after evidence-based negotiation, £350,000 may represent avoidance while £150,000 remains an actual cost increase. Presenting both numbers gives management a realistic picture: Procurement protected value, but it did not create £350,000 of cash available for alternative expenditure elsewhere in the organisation.

Inflation and Indexation

Inflation complicates savings measurement because prices may rise even when procurement

performance is strong. A contract costing £10 million could increase to £10.5 million under a valid 5% indexation mechanism. Negotiating the increase to £10.3 million may create £200,000 of avoidance, yet comparing £10.3 million with the historic £10 million would show expenditure rising by £300,000. Both statements can be true, but they describe different financial effects.

Government sourcing guidance explains that indexation adjusts prices in line with a selected price index and allocates inflation risk to the contracting authority. It recommends indexation where inflation uncertainty is considerable, while recognising that different indices may apply to specific cost lines. Good contracts therefore avoid mechanically applying a broad inflation measure to every cost component when labour, commodities, energy and overheads may behave very differently.

The choice of index matters. Government inflation guidance advises selecting an index appropriate to the cost being adjusted and warns against double-counting inflation where indexation already applies. A facilities contract dominated by labour may warrant a different reference from a manufacturing contract exposed to metal prices. An irrelevant index can shift unjustified costs to the buyer and create misleading claims when Procurement later negotiates them down.

The 2022 inflation shock demonstrates the scale of the issue. CPI reached 11.1% in October 2022, compared with 4.0% in December 2023 and 2.5% in December 2024. A £20 million expenditure base exposed mechanically to an 11.1% increase would rise by £2.22 million. Procurement teams that moderated such increases created genuine value, but the avoided amount depended on contractual rights and cost exposure, not headline inflation alone.

Savings reports should therefore show inflation separately from negotiated performance. If an index-linked contract legitimately rises by £800,000 but Procurement removes £250,000 through challenge, specification change or revised indexation, the £250,000 should normally be identified as avoidance rather than a cash saving against the previous year. This approach preserves recognition for commercial work while preventing inflationary counterfactuals from being mistaken for reductions in the organisation's established expenditure base.

Demand Reduction and Specification Change

Some of Procurement's strongest value comes from changing what the organisation buys rather than negotiating harder over price. Demand reduction removes unnecessary consumption, while specification change achieves the required outcome through a less costly design, service level or product. If usage analysis reduces 1,000 licences costing £600 each to 800, annual expenditure falls by £120,000 without any supplier discount, provided operational requirements remain fully satisfied.

The Treasury's software licence example, described earlier, matters here because it treats avoided demand as a monetisable non-cash-releasing efficiency: the forecast spending never entered the budget. By contrast, cancelling licences already being paid for releases cash. Procurement can therefore create value by challenging quantity and need, not simply by negotiating a cheaper unit rate, but the classification depends on whether the demand removed was existing or merely forecast.

Specification change can produce similar effects. A requirement for premium materials, excessive response times, or unnecessary customisation may carry costs users do not value. Value engineering can remove those elements while protecting safety, quality and service. A redesign that reduces a £3 million specification by 8% could release £240,000. However, the saving is genuine only if the revised requirement still delivers the intended operational outcome and does not create downstream costs.

Demand management also requires care over attribution. Reduced consumption from business contraction, site closures, or lower customer demand is not automatically a procurement saving. Procurement should claim value where its intervention changed

behaviour or requirements: for example, by consolidating software licences, standardising products, or challenging automatic replenishment. Clear attribution prevents natural volume decline from being reclassified as commercial performance and protects trust between Procurement, Finance and operational budget holders.

Volume Changes and the Savings Calculation

Volume can distort savings calculations more easily than almost any other variable. Suppose an organisation bought 100,000 units at £10, spending £1 million, then negotiates £9 per unit but buys 120,000 units. Total expenditure rises to £1.08 million, yet Procurement has still achieved a £1 unit-price improvement. Applied to actual volume, that price benefit equals £120,000, even though overall cash expenditure has increased by £80,000.

The opposite problem occurs when volumes fall. If the unit price remains £10 but purchases decline from 100,000 to 80,000 units, expenditure falls by £200,000 without any price improvement. Unless Procurement actively caused the reduction through demand management, claiming the entire £200,000 as procurement saving would misrepresent performance. Benefits analysis should therefore separate price variance, volume variance and deliberate demand intervention rather than rely upon changes in total spend alone.

A robust calculation normally compares like-for-like unit costs and then applies the agreed volume methodology. Some organisations calculate price savings using actual purchased volume; others use an approved forecast volume to avoid rewarding unexpected demand growth. Whichever approach is chosen should be documented before results are known. Switching between forecast and actual quantities after the event creates opportunities to choose the method that produces the largest reported benefit.

Volume commitments can themselves create risk. A supplier may offer a 10% lower price in return for a minimum annual purchase that the organisation does not ultimately need. Buying £900,000 of goods instead of £800,000 genuinely required is not a saving merely because the unit rate fell. Total cost, inventory carrying cost, obsolescence and contractual commitments must be considered before volume discounts are recorded as commercial value.

For complex contracts, Procurement and Finance should build a price-volume bridge showing how expenditure moved from the old to the new. A £2 million increase might comprise £500,000 of inflation, £1.2 million of additional volume and a £300,000 procurement price saving. Such analysis explains simultaneously why spend rose and why Procurement still created value, avoiding the false choice between recognising commercial performance and acknowledging financial reality.

Should Procurement Claim Forecast Savings?

Forecast savings have a legitimate place in planning, but Procurement should not report them as achieved savings. Before a sourcing event concludes, Procurement may estimate that a £10 million requirement can be reduced by 5%, creating a £500,000 target. That figure helps prioritise resources and establish business cases, but it remains an expectation until a contract is awarded, demand materialises, and expenditure demonstrates that the benefit has actually been realised.

Public-sector efficiency rules explicitly require that savings be realised before reporting them as achieved, with calculations that an impartial third party can understand and verify, supported by quality data and documentation. For public-sector procurement, that principle provides a strong reporting standard: forecast, contracted and realised benefits should sit at different stages in the benefits register rather than being merged into one headline total.

Forecasts can change for legitimate reasons. A tender may deliver better prices than expected, demand may reduce, implementation may slip, or a business unit may reject the proposed change. Equally, a £1 million contracted annual saving that begins halfway through a financial year produces only about £500,000 in in-year benefit before considering transition costs. Reporting the full annual figure as current-year achievement exaggerates the

organisation's immediate financial position.

A sensible benefits pipeline can therefore distinguish identified opportunity, forecast benefit, contracted benefit, implemented benefit and realised benefit. Procurement deserves visibility into building a strong pipeline, particularly when sourcing programmes take many months, but management should understand how much value remains conditional. This also improves forecasting because projects that repeatedly promise £2 million but realise £1 million can be examined for optimism bias, implementation failure or flawed baseline assumptions.

When Negotiated Savings Never Reach the Budget

A negotiated price reduction does not automatically become a budget saving. Procurement may reduce a contract from £4 million to £3.6 million, seemingly creating £400,000, yet the budget holder may spend that £400,000 on additional volume, an upgraded scope, or another activity. Procurement has improved the commercial rate, but Finance cannot describe the full amount as cash released if total budgeted expenditure remains unchanged and no money becomes available for reprioritisation.

HM Treasury defines cash-releasing efficiency as a direct reduction in spending that leaves surplus budget capable of being reprioritised, reinvested or returned to the Exchequer. That distinction is valuable beyond central government. In private organisations, the equivalent test is whether the benefit reduces forecast cost, improves operating profit, or releases cash, rather than existing only as a favourable unit-price variance that the business subsequently consumes elsewhere.

Leakage can occur between contract award and purchase. Users may buy greater quantities, suppliers may levy extras, implementation can be delayed, or previously excluded requirements may return through change control. A £500,000 negotiated saving could shrink materially once £150,000 in transition costs and £100,000 in additional demand are recognised. Tracking benefits beyond signature shows whether negotiated value survives operational reality or disappears after Procurement closes the sourcing project.

BT Group provides a useful illustration of why realised cost programmes are reported with delivery costs. For the year to March 2025, BT reported £913 million in gross annualised cost savings and £448 million in associated costs to achieve them. The programme extended beyond procurement, but the disclosure demonstrates an important discipline: substantial recurring savings may require equally visible implementation expenditure before stakeholders can understand the net economic benefit of transformation.

The remedy is shared ownership. Procurement should establish the commercial benefit; Finance should validate its financial treatment; and the budget owner should confirm whether money is removed, redirected or consumed by additional requirements. A benefits register that reconciles periodically to forecasts and actual expenditure is more informative than a sourcing tracker ending at contract signature. The real test is not what Procurement negotiated, but what value the organisation ultimately retained.

Preventing Double Counting

Double counting occurs when the same economic benefit appears more than once in performance reporting. A category team may claim £300,000 from a framework price reduction while the business unit records the same £300,000 as a budget saving. If both figures enter an organisation-wide efficiency total, reported value becomes £600,000 even though only £300,000 exists. The arithmetic is simple; preventing duplication across complex organisations is considerably harder.

Government efficiency rules require scoring both cash-releasing and monetisable non-cash-releasing efficiencies once, net of double counting between organisations. HM Treasury also warns that functional efficiency reporting may overlap with departmental totals and is not automatically additive. The principle matters wherever central procurement teams, departments, shared services, subsidiaries, or collaborative purchasing bodies each have a

plausible reason to claim the same commercial outcome.

Frameworks create a common attribution challenge. A central purchasing body may negotiate prices below market comparators, while individual authorities and housing associations also record benefits when buying through the agreement. Both contributions may be operationally legitimate, but consolidated reporting should clarify who owns the financial claim. Without that rule, the same comparator benefit can appear in the purchasing body's annual report and again in every participating member's efficiency return.

Double counting also occurs across years. If a £1 million annual recurring saving begins in 2026, recording £1 million in 2026, another £1 million as a "new saving" in 2027 and again in 2028 inflates cumulative delivery unless reporting explicitly distinguishes annual run-rate from newly generated benefit. Management should know whether a £3 million figure represents three years of benefit or three separate initiatives creating additional value.

Annualising Savings

Annualising converts a saving achieved for part of a year into its expected twelve-month run-rate. If a new contract saves £50,000 each month and begins on 1 October, the financial-year benefit to 31 March is £300,000, while the annualised run-rate is £600,000. Both figures are useful, but they answer different questions and should never be presented interchangeably without clear labels explaining timing and implementation assumptions.

Annualised savings help management understand the enduring effect of an initiative that starts partway through a reporting period. They are particularly useful for comparing projects launched at different times. However, annualisation assumes the saving will continue at the stated rate. Seasonal demand, stepped pricing, implementation ramps or future indexation can make a simple monthly figure multiplied by twelve materially different from the benefit eventually realised.

BT Group's reporting illustrates careful use of the concept. In May 2024, it reported £3 billion in gross annualised savings against a transformation commitment made in May 2020, and subsequent results continued to report new savings on a gross annualised basis alongside the costs incurred to achieve them. The wording matters because annualised savings describe an ongoing run-rate, not necessarily cash saved during any single financial year.

Procurement dashboards should therefore present at least two timing measures where relevant: in-year realised savings and annualised run-rate. A contract producing £750,000 in its first nine months and £1 million on a full-year basis should show both. Doing so prevents management from assuming £1 million has already improved the current-year position while still recognising the full recurring value secured through the sourcing or negotiation exercise.

Annualisation should stop when the underlying benefit stops. A two-year contract does not justify projecting the same saving indefinitely, and a temporary supplier concession lasting six months should not be annualised as though it were permanent. Where future volumes, pricing or indexation are uncertain, the assumptions should be disclosed. Precise timing matters because a mathematically correct annualised number can still mislead decision-makers about the total economic value secured.

Recurring Versus One-Off Benefits

Recurring benefits continue across future periods as long as the underlying change remains effective. A £200,000 annual reduction in maintenance charges under a five-year contract may therefore create up to £1 million of gross nominal benefit before indexation, demand changes and implementation costs. A one-off £200,000 rebate, by contrast, improves cash only once. Treating both as equivalent obscures the durability and strategic significance of the value Procurement has created.

Sustainability has a specific meaning in government reporting: cash-releasing efficiencies described as sustainable must exist when realised and remain in subsequent years at equal

or greater value. Simple cost deferral, such as delaying a project across a financial year when expenditure merely reappears later, is expressly excluded. Procurement reporting should follow the same logic: postponing an invoice or shifting a purchase date is a timing movement, not a sustainable efficiency.

Recurring benefits can be more valuable, but they should not be multiplied mechanically across every contract year. Future indexation, volume movements, break clauses and changing requirements may alter the outcome. Discounted cash-flow analysis may also suit significant long-term decisions because £1 received or saved several years from now is not economically identical to £1 today. Headline multiplication can therefore overstate the certainty of long-duration savings.

One-off benefits still deserve recognition. Recovering a £300,000 historical overcharge, negotiating a £150,000 settlement credit, or eliminating a £75,000 mobilisation fee creates genuine cash value even though it does not recur. Separating one-off and recurring categories helps management forecast future cost bases accurately. It also prevents exceptional recoveries from being treated as evidence that the same level of procurement saving will automatically repeat in every subsequent year.

Cost Avoidance in Contract Negotiations

Contract negotiations create cost avoidance when commercial intervention prevents liabilities or price increases that would otherwise have been reasonably expected. Procurement might cap annual indexation, reject an unsupported surcharge, remove automatic renewal, negotiate lower minimum volumes or limit expensive change-control rates. The resulting value often protects future budgets rather than reducing today's expenditure, so document the counterfactual carefully, especially when reporting benefits to Finance for validation.

Indexation clauses are a prime example. Government sourcing guidance explains that indexation transfers inflation risk to the contracting authority, while fixed or firm pricing allocates risk differently. Procurement should therefore negotiate not only the percentage uplift but also the index, review date, covered cost categories, caps, floors, and mechanisms for downward movement. Small drafting differences can materially alter lifetime cost on contracts worth tens or hundreds of millions of pounds.

Consider a £20 million annual contract containing an uncapped 5% increase. That would add £1 million in the following year. Negotiating a 3% cap limits the increase to £600,000, potentially avoiding £400,000 if the 5% counterfactual is contractually and economically credible. The organisation still spends £600,000 more, so the benefit belongs in cost avoidance rather than cash-saving reporting, unless another intervention reduces expenditure below the existing £20 million baseline.

Negotiations can also prevent future liability through better commercial terms. Removing minimum purchase commitments, narrowing indemnities, capping pass-through expenses or securing inclusive implementation charges may protect substantial sums. These benefits are harder to monetise because some liabilities may never arise. As noted earlier, a contingent liability that does not crystallise is normally not an efficiency saving, an important warning against assigning speculative values to every negotiated risk reduction.

The most credible approach is to record avoidance only where the threatened cost was sufficiently probable, measurable and causally reduced by Procurement. Contract clauses, supplier notices, index calculations and negotiation records can provide the evidence. Wider risk improvements should still be recognised, but often as qualitative or risk-adjusted value rather than guaranteed savings. Procurement gains credibility when it distinguishes money genuinely prevented from being spent from theoretical exposure that merely became less likely.

Cost Avoidance in Supply Chain Management

Cost avoidance in supply chain management extends beyond negotiating supplier prices.

Preventing production stoppages, reducing dependence on vulnerable sources, maintaining appropriate inventory and securing capacity can protect organisations from expenditure that would otherwise arise. A component costing £20 may seem expensive next to a £17 alternative, but the cheaper option offers little value if unreliable supply causes lost production, emergency freight, overtime, or contractual penalties that far exceed the £3 difference.

National Grid demonstrates the scale at which supply-chain decisions matter. In 2026, it reported securing more than £28 billion in supply-chain contracts to support its United Kingdom business plans. Procurement at that scale must consider capacity, engineering capability and resilience alongside price. Securing critical supply early may prevent future scarcity premiums or project delays, but avoided disruption should not automatically be assigned a speculative monetary saving without credible evidence.

NHS Supply Chain similarly promotes Value Based Procurement, moving beyond reductions in individual product prices towards technologies capable of lowering costs across entire patient pathways while improving outcomes. Its modernisation programme aims to return at least £1 billion in recurring annual value to the NHS by 2030. The approach shows how supply-chain value can come from system performance rather than purchase price alone, provided the pathway benefits are evidenced rather than assumed.

Resilience benefits require disciplined reporting because avoided disruption is inherently counterfactual. Dual sourcing a critical component may cost £100,000 more annually yet protect against a plausible multimillion-pound shutdown. That does not make the shutdown value an achieved saving. Procurement should record the additional resilience, quantify credible risk exposure where appropriate and distinguish risk reduction from cashable benefit. Such transparency recognises strategic supply-chain value without manufacturing savings from events that never occurred.

Procurement Value Beyond Price

The lowest purchase price is only one component of procurement value. Quality, reliability, lifecycle cost, innovation, energy consumption, delivery performance, maintenance, environmental impact, social outcomes and supply-chain resilience can materially affect a contract's economics. A machine costing £900,000 may offer better value than one priced at £800,000 if its energy, maintenance, and downtime costs are sufficiently lower over the asset's operational life, which may run a decade or more.

Public procurement law reflects the same breadth. Beyond the section 12 objectives, contracting authorities must consider that small and medium-sized enterprises may face particular barriers to participation and whether those barriers can be removed or reduced. Under section 19, contracts are awarded to the most advantageous tender rather than automatically the cheapest, so value can encompass broader outcomes where requirements and award criteria support them.

Current government policy has strengthened that wider perspective. Procurement Policy Note (PPN) 026, published in August 2026, introduced a Social Value Model focused on British jobs and skills for in-scope central government organisations. The policy describes social value as considering how suppliers can support good jobs, skills and opportunities. Such outcomes have legitimate procurement relevance, but they should not subsequently be converted into fictional cash savings merely to enlarge procurement performance totals.

Heathrow provides a useful private-sector example. Research commissioned by Heathrow from Oxford Economics reported that the airport and Team Heathrow partners' purchasing generated an estimated £610 million supply-chain impact and supported 10,800 jobs across nine surrounding local authority areas in 2024. Small and medium-sized enterprises represented 59% of Heathrow suppliers and 76% of its local supply chain, showing how procurement spending can drive economic participation alongside conventional commercial objectives.

Sellafield provides another illustration. Under a £32 million, five-year communications network contract, BT committed £2 million towards local social-impact initiatives in West Cumbria. The Nuclear Decommissioning Authority reported the arrangement within its sustainability work as an example of maximising social value through procurement. The £2 million commitment has tangible value, but it remains different from a £2 million reduction in Sellafield's contract price and should therefore be reported separately.

Finance Validation of Procurement Benefits

Finance validation provides an essential independent test of procurement benefit claims. Procurement understands sourcing decisions and commercial negotiations, while Finance understands budgets, forecasts, accounting periods and whether an apparent benefit genuinely changes organisational expenditure. Neither function should operate in isolation. A £750,000 negotiated price improvement may be commercially valid, yet Finance may determine that only £500,000 is cash released after implementation costs, demand changes, or existing budget assumptions are considered.

HM Treasury's Government Efficiency Framework requires reported efficiencies to be understandable, evidence-based, supported by quality data and sufficiently robust to withstand impartial scrutiny. Achieved savings must be realised, not merely forecast. The framework also identifies the benefit owner, usually the budget holder, as someone who should work with Finance, economists, and analysts to determine methodology, baselines, supporting evidence, reporting periods, and verification and governance arrangements.

The NHS shows how to build that partnership into methodology. NHS Commercial developed its value and savings methodology with NHS England financial efficiency stakeholders, alongside NHS Supply Chain, the Department of Health and Social Care, trust procurement teams, regional procurement hubs and the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Involving finance specialists from the outset reinforces the principle that credible savings reporting requires common commercial and financial definitions.

Finance validation should not become a mechanism for rejecting every benefit that does not reduce a budget. Cost avoidance, increased capacity and improved outcomes may remain legitimate procurement value. The purpose is classification, not suppression: determining whether £1 million represents cash released, expenditure avoided, productivity gained, or another benefit. When Procurement and Finance agree those categories in advance, arguments after contract award become less frequent, and performance reports become considerably more credible.

Who Owns the Savings?

Ownership matters because procurement benefits rarely result from Procurement acting alone. Category specialists may negotiate commercial improvements, operational teams may redesign demand, Finance may remove budget, and contract managers may ensure savings survive implementation. Assigning the entire benefit to whichever function reports it first creates organisational competition rather than collaboration. A £1 million reduction should represent £1 million of organisational value, not several overlapping claims carrying different departmental labels.

The Treasury framework expects departments and arm's-length bodies to determine where accountability for reporting sits. The same principle applies to private organisations: identify a benefit owner, set clear attribution rules, and maintain one authoritative benefits register so Procurement, Finance, transformation teams, and operating departments cannot independently claim the same economic outcome or report it under different labels. Clarity at the outset prevents disputes later.

Procurement should normally own evidence showing how commercial intervention influenced price, specification, terms, or demand, while the relevant budget holder owns delivering the financial outcome. Finance should validate classification and reconcile realised value against

accounts or forecasts. Contract management then helps preserve the benefit after award. This creates shared accountability without obscuring Procurement's contribution, especially when negotiated savings disappear because business units later increase volume or change scope.

Collaborative arrangements create additional complexity. The NAO found that some £1 billion of the Counter Fraud savings included in the Cabinet Office's 2021–22 functional total came from department-led activities supported by the central function. Both contributions were real, but multiple contributors do not create multiple savings. Attribution should explain who contributed, while aggregation preserves the underlying economic value only once across the wider organisation or system.

Ownership should therefore be agreed when the opportunity is created, not when performance is reported. A benefits register can specify the procurement lead, budget owner, Finance validator, implementation owner and contract manager. It should also identify who can authorise changes to baseline or methodology. This simple governance measure prevents later disputes and encourages functions to concentrate on retaining value rather than negotiating internally over which department receives credit for creating it.

Building a Benefits Tracking Methodology

A credible benefits methodology begins with definitions. Organisations should clearly define what constitutes a cash-releasing saving, cost avoidance, monetisable non-cash benefit, one-off recovery, recurring saving, and broader qualitative value. The rules should set acceptable baselines and define how to treat inflation, volumes, implementation costs, and annualisation. Without common definitions, two procurement teams can negotiate identical outcomes yet report materially different savings simply because each applies its own arithmetic and assumptions.

Every recorded initiative should include the previous cost, approved baseline, new cost, quantity, implementation date, duration and calculation. Supporting documentation might include invoices, contracts, supplier quotations, tender submissions, indices and budget forecasts. Benefits should also show gross value, implementation cost and net value. A £1 million gross saving requiring £350,000 of transition expenditure is economically different from an initiative delivering the same £1 million without significant implementation cost.

Status is equally important. Identified opportunities should remain separate from forecast, contracted, implemented and realised benefits, and only realised, evidenced benefits should be reported as achieved. A procurement programme might therefore have £20 million identified, £15 million contracted and £9 million realised without contradiction. Showing the pipeline transparently gives senior management useful forward visibility without pretending that every opportunity has already improved the organisation's financial performance.

Governance should complete the methodology. Material benefits need periodic Finance validation, named ownership, documentary evidence and controls against double counting. Forecasts should be refreshed when volumes or implementation dates change, while realised savings should eventually reconcile with actual expenditure. The strongest methodology is not necessarily the one producing the largest percentage. It is the one senior management, auditors and budget holders can interrogate and still conclude that the reported value genuinely exists.

Reporting Savings to Senior Management

Senior management needs procurement reporting that explains value rather than overwhelms readers with sourcing activity. A dashboard might separately show £8 million in cash-releasing savings, £5 million in cost avoidance, £2 million in monetisable productivity benefit, and significant wider outcomes. Presenting £15 million simply as "procurement savings" creates a stronger headline but a weaker management tool because executives cannot identify which benefits affect expenditure, budgets or future financial capacity.

Context should accompany the headline figures. Management should see annual spend,

savings as a proportion of the relevant baseline, implementation cost, realised versus forecast value, and the split between recurring and one-off benefits. Trends matter too. If reported annual procurement value rises from £6 million to £12 million while underlying expenditure doubles, performance has not necessarily improved. Absolute savings without a denominator can produce misleading conclusions about commercial effectiveness.

Crown Commercial Service offers a useful reporting example. For 2024–25, it reported £33 billion in direct spend through its commercial agreements, a 10.49% spend-related commercial benefit rate, and £4.6 billion in spend-related commercial benefits. Importantly, those benefits were measured against market comparators rather than described automatically as cash removed from departmental budgets. The methodology therefore gives management both scale and context, rather than relying exclusively on a large monetary headline.

Reporting should also expose underperformance. A sourcing initiative forecast to save £2 million but realising £900,000 deserves explanation, not quiet substitution of another projected benefit. Reasons may include implementation delay, lower volumes, incomplete compliance or inaccurate baselines. Publishing forecast-to-realised conversion rates encourages realistic business cases and reveals where organisational behaviour prevents negotiated value from reaching accounts. Senior managers can then address benefit leakage rather than simply asking for larger future savings targets.

Wider value can sit beside financial metrics rather than inside them. Supply resilience, environmental outcomes, innovation, supplier development, and social value may deserve senior-level attention, especially when they support organisational strategy. Their presence should not require conversion into questionable monetary equivalents. A dashboard showing £10 million in validated financial benefit alongside measurable improvements in carbon, service, resilience, or employment communicates a richer, more defensible picture of procurement performance.

Common Ways Procurement Overstates Value

Procurement can overstate value by selecting an inflated baseline, counting supplier opening bids as savings, ignoring implementation costs, or treating avoided inflation as released cash. Other problems include multiplying a short-term concession across several years, claiming projected demand reductions that never occur, and reporting future annualised savings as though they were already realised. Individually these choices may appear defensible; combined across a large portfolio they can materially distort reported organisational performance.

Weak evidence is not new. Sir Peter Gershon's 2004 efficiency review set a target of £21.5 billion of annual gains by 2007–08. When the NAO examined progress in 2006, it cautioned that the £4.7 billion in gains then reported should be treated as provisional, noted difficulties in establishing baselines, and found that some departments had not deducted project costs. Ambitious targets can quickly outrun measurement discipline.

Double counting is another persistent risk. A category team may record £250,000 when a framework reduces market pricing. At the same time, the operating business reports the same £250,000 after using the agreement, and Finance later includes it within a cost-reduction programme. Functional efficiency figures are not automatically additive, and duplication must be removed before totals are combined. One economic improvement cannot legitimately become three savings merely through organisational reporting structures.

Procurement may also claim natural market movements. If a commodity price falls from £1,000 to £800 per tonne without procurement intervention, buying at £800 does not automatically create a £200 saving attributable to the sourcing team. Conversely, negotiating £780 when the prevailing comparable market is £800 may create £20 of attributable value. Separating market movement from procurement intervention produces a smaller number, but one that more accurately reflects commercial performance.

Scope reduction can create equally misleading claims. Reducing a service from seven-day coverage to five days and lowering annual cost from £1 million to £800,000 produces a £200,000 expenditure reduction, but not necessarily a like-for-like procurement saving. The financial impact should be visible, but management must understand that part or all of it arose because the organisation bought less service. Otherwise, procurement is rewarded for removing outputs rather than improving value.

Finally, procurement can overstate value by stopping measurement at contract signature. Negotiating £500,000 is not the same as realising £500,000 if implementation delays, poor compliance, or subsequent contract variations erode half the benefit. Credible procurement teams follow savings into actual expenditure. This may reduce the reported number, but the resulting performance metric becomes more useful because it measures value retained by the organisation rather than value theoretically negotiated on award day.

Measuring Procurement Without Encouraging Bad Behaviour

Performance measures influence behaviour. If procurement professionals are rewarded primarily for the largest monetary savings, they have an incentive to pursue high baselines, delay necessary purchases, pressure suppliers excessively or favour easily quantified price reductions over quality and resilience. The problem is not measuring savings; it is treating one metric as a complete representation of procurement performance. Balanced measurement reduces the chance that a target will distort commercial judgement.

Poor incentives can also damage suppliers. Extending payment terms may improve working capital while increasing financing pressure throughout the supply chain. Government policy illustrates the concern: under PPN 018, for relevant major public procurements, suppliers must demonstrate that they pay at least 95% of supply-chain invoices within 60 days and all invoices within an average of 45 days or fewer, subject to the provisions applying where performance falls below the required threshold.

Balanced scorecards can combine validated savings with contract performance, competition, supplier resilience, compliance, stakeholder outcomes and innovation. Measures should reflect what Procurement can influence and what the organisation genuinely values. A category manager delivering £2 million rather than £3 million of savings may have created greater overall value if the chosen strategy simultaneously removes significant supply risk, improves service quality and prevents costly operational interruption.

Responsible measures also recognise market development. Transport for London trialled reserved lower-value contract opportunities intended to improve access for small and medium-sized enterprises. Greater London Authority case studies reported that two awards directed £118,000 of contracts to smaller suppliers, with one also generating significant cost savings, while further opportunities worth approximately £350,000 were being developed. Competition, supplier diversity and savings need not therefore be mutually exclusive objectives.

Management should ultimately reward value quality, not creativity in measuring it. Targets can include realised financial benefits, forecast accuracy, stakeholder outcomes and sustained contract performance, while controls should discourage unsupported avoidance figures or artificial baselines. Procurement becomes more commercially mature when employees know that reporting £750,000 of rigorously evidenced value is regarded more highly than declaring £1.5 million that Finance, auditors, or operational colleagues cannot independently reproduce.

Summary – Measure the Value That Really Exists

Cost savings and cost avoidance both matter, but they represent different economic outcomes. A cash-releasing saving reduces established expenditure; cost avoidance prevents credible additional expenditure from occurring. Productivity, resilience, social outcomes and other benefits can create further value without necessarily releasing cash. The quality of procurement reporting therefore depends less on producing one impressive total than on describing each type of benefit accurately and explaining what has genuinely changed.

Baselines determine whether those claims remain credible. Historical expenditure, budgets, market benchmarks and supplier quotations can all be appropriate, but none is automatically correct. Inflation, volumes, specification, implementation costs and contract duration must be considered before a comparison becomes meaningful. The discipline is straightforward: identify the counterfactual that would most reasonably have occurred without the procurement intervention, retain evidence supporting it and resist changing methodology simply because another baseline creates a larger saving.

Finance validation and clear ownership strengthen that discipline. HM Treasury expects efficiency savings to be evidence-based, realised before reporting them as achieved, aligned to appropriate periods, and independently verifiable. NHS England similarly promotes a single methodology for procurement value and savings. These approaches reinforce a wider principle: procurement performance becomes more persuasive when commercial expertise, financial control and operational ownership converge around one defensible account of value.

The strongest procurement function does not need to inflate its contribution. It can explain where it saved money, prevented additional costs, increased capacity, and created wider organisational value. It can also acknowledge when a forecast benefit failed to materialise. That transparency turns savings reporting from a promotional exercise into genuine management information. Real procurement value is not the largest number available; it is the value that survives scrutiny.

Additional articles can be found at [Procurement and Supply Chain Management Made Simple](#). This site looks at procurement and supply chain management issues to assist organisations and people in increasing the quality, efficiency, and effectiveness of their product and service supply to the customers' delight. © Procurement and Supply Chain Management Made Simple. All rights reserved.

Sources and Further Reading

[HM Treasury \(2023, updated 2025\) – The Government Efficiency Framework](#)

[HM Treasury – Whole of Government Accounts 2024–25](#)

[Procurement Act 2023, section 12 – Covered procurement objectives](#)

[Procurement Act 2023, section 19 – Award of public contracts following a competitive tendering procedure](#)

[Crown Commercial Service – Annual Report and Accounts 2024 to 2025](#)

[Government Commercial Agency – Crown Commercial Service](#)

[NHS England – Value and savings methodology](#)

[NHS Supply Chain – Modernisation programme \(UK Government Web Archive\)](#)

[NHS Supply Chain – Value Based Procurement \(UK Government Web Archive\)](#)

[National Audit Office \(2023\) – Cabinet Office functional savings \(report\)](#)

[National Audit Office \(2023\) – Cabinet Office functional savings \(press release\)](#)

[Public Finance \(2006\) – NAO casts doubt over Gershon savings](#)

[Accountancy Age \(2006\) – Only half of Brown's savings can be validated](#)

[Office for National Statistics – Consumer price inflation, UK: October 2022](#)

[Cabinet Office – Risk Allocation and Pricing Approaches Guidance Note](#)

[Single Source Regulations Office \(2023\) – Guidance on inflation](#)

[Cabinet Office – PPN 018: How to take account of a supplier's approach to payment in the procurement of major contracts](#)

[Civil Service Procurement Pathway – PPN 018 selection stage requirements](#)

[Cabinet Office \(2026\) – PPN 026: The Social Value Model](#)

[J Sainsbury plc – Preliminary results for the 52 weeks ended 28 February 2026](#)

[BT Group – Results for the full year to 31 March 2025](#)

[BT Group \(2022\) – BT wins five-year £32 million contract for Sellafield Ltd network services](#)

[National Grid – Our UK supply chain](#)

[Oxford Economics for Heathrow \(2024\) – The economic and social impact of Heathrow Airport \(summary\)](#)

[Heathrow \(2026\) – Sustainability Performance Data Book 2025](#)

[Greater London Authority – Responsible procurement case studies 2022–23](#)

Further Reading

[National Audit Office \(2024\) – Efficiency in government procurement of common goods and services](#)

[National Audit Office \(2024\) – NHS Supply Chain and efficiencies in procurement](#)

[Cabinet Office – The Sourcing Playbook](#)

[Government Commercial Agency – Annual Report and Accounts 2025 to 2026](#)

[Greater London Authority – Responsible Procurement Case Studies Report 2024–25](#)