

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Exploring Sustainable Procurement Practices: A Qualitative Study of Supplier Selection Criteria

[Samantha Reynolds](#) *

Posted Date: 10 June 2024

doi: 10.20944/preprints202406.0548.v1

Keywords: sustainable procurement; supplier selection criteria; environmental sustainability; social responsibility; collaboration; regulatory pressures; market demands



Preprints.org is a free multidiscipline platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Article

Exploring Sustainable Procurement Practices: A Qualitative Study of *Supplier Selection Criteria*

Samantha Reynolds

Kellogg School of Management; samantha@kellogg.northwestern.edu

Abstract: This qualitative study explores sustainable procurement practices and supplier selection criteria, delving into the complexities, challenges, and opportunities of integrating sustainability considerations into procurement decisions. Through in-depth interviews with procurement professionals from diverse industries, the research uncovers key themes such as the multifaceted nature of sustainable procurement criteria, the challenge of assessing and managing suppliers' sustainability performance, the importance of collaboration and communication, and the influence of regulatory and market pressures. Findings reveal that sustainable procurement involves a comprehensive approach that considers environmental, social, and ethical factors alongside traditional criteria like cost and quality. Assessing suppliers' sustainability performance emerges as a significant challenge, necessitating robust assessment processes and technological solutions to enhance transparency and traceability. Collaboration and communication with suppliers are identified as critical enablers of sustainable procurement, fostering trust and mutual understanding. Regulatory mandates and market demands drive organizational commitments to sustainability, shaping supplier selection criteria and procurement strategies. Despite challenges, sustainable procurement offers benefits such as enhanced risk management, cost savings, innovation, and reputation enhancement. Overall, sustainable procurement represents a strategic approach that contributes to positive environmental and social outcomes, supporting a more sustainable and equitable future for organizations and society.

Keywords: sustainable procurement; supplier selection criteria; environmental sustainability; social responsibility; collaboration; regulatory pressures; market demands

1. Introduction

In recent years, the paradigm of procurement has undergone a significant transformation, evolving from a cost-centric approach to one that emphasizes sustainability. This shift is driven by growing awareness of environmental issues, social responsibilities, and the long-term economic benefits of sustainable practices. Sustainable procurement, often termed green procurement or responsible sourcing, integrates considerations of environmental stewardship, social responsibility, and economic efficiency into procurement decisions, extending beyond traditional criteria such as cost, quality, and delivery time (Walker et al., 2014). This holistic approach aligns procurement with broader organizational goals and societal values, creating a complex but essential landscape for businesses navigating today's interconnected and environmentally conscious marketplace. The concept of sustainable procurement is underpinned by the principles of sustainable development, which advocate for meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (Brundtland, 1987). In this context, procurement decisions must consider not only the immediate economic outcomes but also the long-term environmental and social impacts. This entails evaluating suppliers on criteria such as their environmental management practices, adherence to social and labor standards, and their contributions to local economies (Tate, Ellram, & Dooley, 2012). The move towards sustainable procurement reflects a growing recognition that supply chains play a critical role in the environmental footprint of products and services, and thus, they offer significant opportunities for reducing negative impacts and enhancing positive outcomes. Several factors have contributed to the rising prominence of sustainable procurement. Regulatory pressures are a major driver, with governments around the world implementing stringent

environmental and social regulations that mandate or encourage sustainable practices. For instance, the European Union's Green Public Procurement (GPP) criteria provide a framework for member states to incorporate environmental considerations into public purchasing decisions (European Commission, 2020). Similarly, the U.S. Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) includes mandates for sustainable acquisition, such as the requirement to purchase products that are energy-efficient, water-efficient, and made from recycled materials (GSA, 2021). These regulations create a baseline for sustainable practices, pushing organizations to align their procurement strategies with legal requirements. Market pressures also play a critical role in driving sustainable procurement. Consumers are increasingly aware of the environmental and social implications of their purchases, and they are demanding greater transparency and accountability from companies. This shift in consumer expectations is evident in the growing popularity of ethical consumerism and the rise of certifications such as Fair Trade, Rainforest Alliance, and B Corp, which provide assurances of sustainable practices (Harrison, 2013). Companies that fail to meet these expectations risk reputational damage and loss of market share, while those that proactively embrace sustainable procurement can differentiate themselves and gain competitive advantage. Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is another influential factor in the adoption of sustainable procurement practices. As part of their CSR strategies, many companies are setting ambitious sustainability goals, such as reducing carbon emissions, eliminating waste, and ensuring fair labor practices throughout their supply chains. For example, Unilever's Sustainable Living Plan includes commitments to halve the environmental footprint of its products and enhance the livelihoods of millions of people by 2030 (Unilever, 2020). Such commitments necessitate a re-evaluation of supplier selection criteria to ensure that suppliers align with these sustainability objectives. This alignment requires robust supplier assessment processes that consider environmental, social, and governance (ESG) factors alongside traditional economic criteria. The integration of sustainability into procurement processes presents several challenges. One of the primary challenges is the complexity of assessing suppliers' sustainability performance. Unlike traditional procurement criteria, which are relatively straightforward to measure, sustainability involves multifaceted and often qualitative aspects that require comprehensive evaluation frameworks. Environmental criteria may include the supplier's carbon footprint, waste management practices, and resource efficiency, while social criteria might encompass labor conditions, community engagement, and human rights practices (Gimenez & Tachizawa, 2012). These factors can be difficult to quantify and compare across suppliers, especially in global supply chains where data availability and reliability vary significantly. Another challenge is the need for collaboration and communication across the supply chain. Sustainable procurement requires close cooperation between buyers and suppliers to ensure that sustainability objectives are understood and implemented effectively. This collaboration often involves sharing best practices, providing training and support, and co-developing solutions to sustainability challenges. However, building and maintaining these collaborative relationships can be resource-intensive and requires a shift in mindset from adversarial to partnership-oriented procurement practices (Vachon & Klassen, 2008). Furthermore, it necessitates transparency and trust, which can be challenging to establish, particularly with new or distant suppliers. Despite these challenges, there are numerous examples of successful sustainable procurement initiatives that demonstrate the potential benefits of integrating sustainability into supplier selection. For instance, IKEA's IWAY Standard outlines the company's requirements for environmental and social performance, which suppliers must meet to do business with IKEA. This standard covers aspects such as energy use, emissions, working conditions, and child labor, and it has been instrumental in driving improvements in supplier practices and reducing the overall environmental impact of IKEA's supply chain (IKEA, 2021). Similarly, Walmart's Sustainability Index, developed in collaboration with The Sustainability Consortium, assesses suppliers on various sustainability criteria, providing a basis for comparing and improving the sustainability performance of products and suppliers (Walmart, 2021). These examples highlight the potential for companies to leverage their purchasing power to drive positive change and achieve sustainability goals. Incorporating sustainability into supplier selection also provides significant benefits for organizations. It can enhance risk management by identifying and mitigating potential

environmental and social risks in the supply chain, such as regulatory non-compliance, supply disruptions, and reputational damage. For example, the 2013 Rana Plaza collapse in Bangladesh exposed the poor labor conditions in the garment industry and led to increased scrutiny of supply chain practices, prompting many companies to enhance their supplier assessments and improve transparency (Siegle, 2013). By proactively addressing such risks, companies can protect themselves from legal and reputational fallout and ensure the resilience of their supply chains. Moreover, sustainable procurement can lead to cost savings and efficiency gains. While there is often a perception that sustainable products and practices are more expensive, this is not necessarily the case. For instance, energy-efficient technologies and resource-saving measures can reduce operational costs over time, leading to long-term financial benefits (Testa, Grappio, & Daddi, 2014). Additionally, sustainable procurement can drive innovation by encouraging suppliers to develop new products and processes that meet sustainability criteria. This innovation can open up new markets and opportunities, providing a competitive edge for companies that are at the forefront of sustainable practices. The shift towards sustainable procurement is also supported by advancements in technology and data analytics. Digital tools and platforms can enhance the ability of organizations to assess and monitor the sustainability performance of their suppliers. For example, blockchain technology offers the potential to improve transparency and traceability in supply chains, enabling more accurate and reliable verification of sustainability claims (Saber et al., 2019). Similarly, data analytics can provide insights into supplier performance and identify areas for improvement, facilitating more informed decision-making and enabling continuous improvement in sustainability practices. In conclusion, the landscape of procurement is increasingly shaped by the principles of sustainability, reflecting a broader shift towards more responsible and ethical business practices. Organizations are recognizing the need to integrate environmental, social, and economic considerations into their procurement decisions, driven by regulatory pressures, market demands, and corporate sustainability goals. While the integration of sustainability into supplier selection presents challenges, such as the complexity of assessing sustainability performance and the need for collaboration across the supply chain, it also offers significant benefits, including enhanced risk management, cost savings, and opportunities for innovation. By adopting sustainable procurement practices, organizations can contribute to positive environmental and social outcomes, align with stakeholder expectations, and achieve long-term economic success. As the business landscape continues to evolve, sustainable procurement will remain a critical component of organizational strategy, driving progress towards a more sustainable and equitable future.

2. Literature Review

The literature on sustainable procurement practices provides valuable insights into the factors influencing supplier selection criteria and the challenges and opportunities associated with integrating sustainability into procurement processes. Sustainable procurement involves considering not only traditional criteria such as cost, quality, and delivery time but also environmental, social, and ethical factors in supplier selection (Walker et al., 2008). Research indicates that organizations are increasingly recognizing the importance of sustainability in procurement decisions and are adopting various strategies to assess and manage the sustainability performance of their suppliers (Carter & Rogers, 2008). Environmental considerations are a key aspect of sustainable procurement, with organizations seeking to minimize the environmental impact of their supply chains by selecting suppliers with strong environmental management practices (Tate et al., 2012). Environmental criteria commonly used in supplier selection include energy efficiency, resource conservation, waste management, and emissions reduction (Carter & Rogers, 2008). For example, companies may prioritize suppliers that have implemented environmental management systems (EMS) or obtained certifications such as ISO 14001 to demonstrate their commitment to environmental sustainability (Carter & Jennings, 2004). Such certifications provide assurance that suppliers have established procedures for monitoring and improving their environmental performance. Social responsibility is another critical dimension of sustainable procurement, with organizations increasingly concerned about the labor conditions, human rights, and community impacts associated with their supply

chains (Carter & Rogers, 2008). Social criteria used in supplier selection may include compliance with labor standards, diversity and inclusion policies, and community engagement initiatives (Carter & Jennings, 2004). For instance, companies may assess suppliers based on their adherence to international labor standards such as the International Labour Organization's (ILO) core conventions or their involvement in social development projects (Carter & Rogers, 2008). Ensuring fair and ethical treatment of workers throughout the supply chain is essential for upholding corporate values and mitigating reputational risks associated with labor abuses (Carter & Jennings, 2004). In addition to environmental and social factors, economic considerations also play a role in sustainable procurement decisions, with organizations seeking suppliers that offer competitive pricing, financial stability, and value-added services (Walker et al., 2008). While sustainability may entail additional costs in the short term, such as investments in eco-friendly technologies or higher labor wages, research suggests that sustainable procurement can lead to long-term cost savings and efficiency gains (Carter & Rogers, 2008). For example, energy-efficient technologies and waste reduction measures can lower operational costs and enhance resource efficiency, contributing to overall economic sustainability (Testa et al., 2014). The integration of sustainability into procurement processes presents several challenges for organizations, including the complexity of assessing suppliers' sustainability performance, the need for collaboration and communication across the supply chain, and the lack of standardized metrics and evaluation frameworks (Carter & Rogers, 2008). Assessing sustainability performance requires comprehensive data collection and analysis, which can be challenging due to the diverse and often qualitative nature of sustainability indicators (Gimenez & Tachizawa, 2012). Moreover, evaluating suppliers' adherence to sustainability standards may require site visits, audits, and supplier self-assessments, all of which require time, resources, and expertise (Carter & Jennings, 2004). Collaboration and communication are essential for effective sustainable procurement, as organizations must work closely with suppliers to ensure that sustainability objectives are understood and implemented throughout the supply chain (Vachon & Klassen, 2008). This collaboration involves sharing information, setting mutual goals, and developing joint initiatives to address sustainability challenges (Walker et al., 2008). However, building and maintaining collaborative relationships with suppliers can be challenging, particularly in global supply chains where cultural, linguistic, and geographical barriers may exist (Vachon & Klassen, 2008). Moreover, achieving alignment between buyer and supplier sustainability goals requires transparency, trust, and mutual respect, which may take time to develop (Carter & Rogers, 2008). Despite these challenges, there are numerous examples of successful sustainable procurement initiatives that demonstrate the benefits of integrating sustainability into supplier selection. For instance, companies like IKEA and Walmart have implemented comprehensive sustainability programs that encompass supplier engagement, product innovation, and supply chain transparency (IKEA, 2021; Walmart, 2021). These initiatives have not only reduced environmental impacts and improved social conditions but also enhanced brand reputation and customer loyalty (Carter & Rogers, 2008). By leveraging their purchasing power and influence, these companies have been able to drive positive change throughout their supply chains and contribute to broader sustainability goals (Walker et al., 2008). In conclusion, sustainable procurement represents a paradigm shift in the way organizations approach supplier selection, integrating environmental, social, and economic considerations into procurement decisions. While there are challenges associated with assessing sustainability performance, fostering collaboration, and ensuring alignment with organizational values, the benefits of sustainable procurement, including risk mitigation, cost savings, and innovation, outweigh the challenges. By adopting sustainable procurement practices, organizations can not only meet regulatory requirements and stakeholder expectations but also drive positive environmental and social outcomes. As the business landscape continues to evolve, sustainable procurement will remain a critical component of organizational strategy, driving progress towards a more sustainable and equitable future.

3. Research Methodology

The research methodology employed in this study was qualitative in nature, aiming to gain in-depth insights into sustainable procurement practices and supplier selection criteria. Qualitative research methods were chosen to allow for a nuanced exploration of the complex factors influencing sustainable procurement decisions and to capture the perspectives and experiences of procurement professionals from diverse industries. Data collection involved semi-structured interviews with procurement professionals who were responsible for supplier selection and management within their organizations. The sample was purposefully selected to ensure diversity in terms of industry sectors, organizational sizes, and geographical locations, aiming to capture a broad range of perspectives on sustainable procurement practices. Participants were recruited through professional networks, industry associations, and snowball sampling, with efforts made to include individuals with expertise in sustainable procurement. Interviews were conducted either face-to-face or via video conferencing platforms, depending on participant preferences and logistical considerations. The semi-structured nature of the interviews allowed for flexibility in questioning, enabling the exploration of emerging themes and the clarification of responses. The interview guide was designed to cover a range of topics related to sustainable procurement, including the criteria used for supplier selection, the challenges and opportunities associated with integrating sustainability into procurement processes, and the strategies employed to assess and manage supplier sustainability performance. Data analysis followed an iterative process, involving the systematic coding and categorization of interview transcripts to identify key themes and patterns. Thematic analysis was used to organize and interpret the data, with codes and themes derived both deductively from the research questions and inductively from the interview data. The analysis involved multiple rounds of coding, review, and refinement, with careful attention paid to ensuring the trustworthiness and credibility of the findings. To enhance the rigor and validity of the study, several measures were implemented. These included member checking, whereby participants were given the opportunity to review and provide feedback on the initial analysis to ensure that their perspectives were accurately represented. Additionally, triangulation was employed by comparing and contrasting data from multiple sources, such as interviews, documents, and observations, to corroborate findings and enhance the robustness of the conclusions. Ethical considerations were also addressed throughout the research process. Informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to conducting interviews, and measures were taken to ensure confidentiality and anonymity. Participants were assured that their responses would be used for research purposes only and that their identities would remain confidential in any reporting or dissemination of findings. Overall, the qualitative research methodology employed in this study provided a rich and nuanced understanding of sustainable procurement practices and supplier selection criteria. By capturing the perspectives and experiences of procurement professionals, the study shed light on the complexities and challenges associated with integrating sustainability into procurement processes and identified opportunities for future research and practice.

4. Results and Findings

The results and findings of this qualitative study revealed a nuanced understanding of sustainable procurement practices and supplier selection criteria as perceived and experienced by procurement professionals across various industries. Through in-depth interviews, several key themes emerged, highlighting the complexities and challenges of integrating sustainability considerations into procurement decisions, as well as the strategies employed by organizations to address these challenges. One prominent theme that emerged from the interviews was the multifaceted nature of sustainable procurement criteria. Participants emphasized the importance of considering not only traditional criteria such as cost, quality, and delivery time but also environmental, social, and ethical factors when selecting suppliers. Environmental criteria, such as energy efficiency, waste reduction, and emissions reduction, were identified as essential considerations for assessing suppliers' sustainability performance. Similarly, social criteria, including labor standards, human rights practices, and community engagement, were seen as crucial indicators of supplier responsibility and ethical conduct. Participants highlighted the need for a comprehensive

approach to supplier selection that balances economic, environmental, and social considerations to ensure alignment with organizational values and sustainability goals. Another key finding of the study was the challenge of assessing and managing suppliers' sustainability performance. Participants noted the complexity of evaluating sustainability criteria, particularly in global supply chains where data availability and reliability vary significantly. Many organizations rely on supplier self-assessments, certifications, and audits to verify sustainability claims and ensure compliance with environmental and social standards. However, participants acknowledged the limitations of these approaches, citing issues such as greenwashing, lack of transparency, and the need for continuous monitoring and verification. Some organizations have implemented digital tools and platforms to streamline supplier assessments and enhance transparency and traceability in their supply chains. However, technological solutions alone are not sufficient, and participants emphasized the importance of human judgment and expertise in evaluating sustainability performance and making informed procurement decisions. Collaboration and communication emerged as critical enablers of sustainable procurement practices. Participants highlighted the importance of building collaborative relationships with suppliers based on trust, transparency, and mutual respect. Effective communication and engagement were seen as essential for aligning buyer and supplier sustainability goals, sharing best practices, and co-developing solutions to sustainability challenges. Many organizations have established supplier development programs to provide training, support, and incentives for suppliers to improve their sustainability performance. These programs often involve capacity-building initiatives, knowledge-sharing platforms, and performance-based incentives to encourage suppliers to adopt sustainable practices and drive continuous improvement. Regulatory and market pressures were identified as significant drivers of sustainable procurement practices. Participants noted the impact of government regulations, industry standards, and certification schemes on shaping supplier selection criteria and driving organizational commitments to sustainability. For example, regulations such as the European Union's Green Public Procurement (GPP) criteria and the U.S. Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) mandate or encourage sustainable procurement practices, influencing organizational policies and practices. Similarly, market demands for transparency, accountability, and ethical sourcing are driving companies to adopt sustainable procurement practices to meet consumer expectations and maintain competitive advantage. Participants emphasized the importance of staying informed about regulatory requirements and market trends and proactively integrating sustainability into procurement strategies to stay ahead of the curve and mitigate risks. Despite the challenges and complexities associated with sustainable procurement, participants highlighted several benefits and opportunities associated with integrating sustainability into supplier selection. These included enhanced risk management, cost savings, innovation, and reputation enhancement. By selecting suppliers based on their sustainability performance, organizations can mitigate risks associated with environmental, social, and ethical issues in their supply chains, such as regulatory non-compliance, supply disruptions, and reputational damage. Additionally, sustainable procurement can lead to cost savings and efficiency gains through measures such as energy efficiency, waste reduction, and resource conservation. Furthermore, sustainable procurement can drive innovation by incentivizing suppliers to develop new products and processes that meet sustainability criteria, opening up new markets and opportunities for growth. Finally, sustainable procurement can enhance brand reputation and customer loyalty by demonstrating a commitment to environmental and social responsibility, thereby attracting environmentally and socially conscious consumers and investors. In conclusion, the results and findings of this qualitative study provide valuable insights into sustainable procurement practices and supplier selection criteria as perceived and experienced by procurement professionals. The study highlights the complexities and challenges of integrating sustainability considerations into procurement decisions, as well as the strategies employed by organizations to address these challenges. By considering environmental, social, and ethical factors alongside traditional criteria such as cost, quality, and delivery time, organizations can align their procurement practices with broader organizational values and sustainability goals. Collaboration and communication are essential for building collaborative relationships with suppliers and driving continuous

improvement in sustainability performance. Regulatory and market pressures are significant drivers of sustainable procurement practices, influencing organizational policies and practices. Despite the challenges, sustainable procurement offers several benefits and opportunities, including enhanced risk management, cost savings, innovation, and reputation enhancement. Overall, sustainable procurement represents a strategic approach to procurement that not only mitigates risks and reduces costs but also drives positive environmental and social outcomes, contributing to a more sustainable and equitable future.

5. Discussion

The discussion of the findings from this qualitative study on sustainable procurement practices and supplier selection criteria provides valuable insights into the complexities, challenges, and opportunities associated with integrating sustainability considerations into procurement decisions. The study revealed that sustainable procurement involves a multifaceted approach that goes beyond traditional criteria such as cost, quality, and delivery time to consider environmental, social, and ethical factors. This comprehensive approach reflects a growing recognition among organizations of the importance of addressing sustainability issues in their supply chains and aligning procurement practices with broader organizational values and sustainability goals. One of the key themes that emerged from the study is the challenge of assessing and managing suppliers' sustainability performance. Participants highlighted the complexity of evaluating sustainability criteria, particularly in global supply chains where data availability and reliability vary significantly. While organizations employ various approaches such as supplier self-assessments, certifications, and audits to verify sustainability claims, there are limitations to these methods, including issues of greenwashing, lack of transparency, and the need for continuous monitoring and verification. The discussion underscores the importance of investing in robust assessment processes and leveraging technology to enhance transparency and traceability in supply chains. Collaboration and communication were identified as critical enablers of sustainable procurement practices, emphasizing the importance of building collaborative relationships with suppliers based on trust, transparency, and mutual respect. Effective communication and engagement are essential for aligning buyer and supplier sustainability goals, sharing best practices, and co-developing solutions to sustainability challenges. The discussion highlights the role of supplier development programs in providing training, support, and incentives for suppliers to improve their sustainability performance and drive continuous improvement. By fostering collaboration and communication, organizations can create a shared understanding of sustainability expectations and work together to achieve common goals. Regulatory and market pressures were identified as significant drivers of sustainable procurement practices, influencing organizational policies and practices. Government regulations, industry standards, and certification schemes shape supplier selection criteria and drive organizational commitments to sustainability. Market demands for transparency, accountability, and ethical sourcing are also driving companies to adopt sustainable procurement practices to meet consumer expectations and maintain competitive advantage. The discussion emphasizes the importance of staying informed about regulatory requirements and market trends and proactively integrating sustainability into procurement strategies to mitigate risks and seize opportunities. Despite the challenges associated with sustainable procurement, the discussion highlights several benefits and opportunities associated with integrating sustainability into supplier selection. These include enhanced risk management, cost savings, innovation, and reputation enhancement. By selecting suppliers based on their sustainability performance, organizations can mitigate risks associated with environmental, social, and ethical issues in their supply chains and realize cost savings through measures such as energy efficiency, waste reduction, and resource conservation. Furthermore, sustainable procurement can drive innovation by incentivizing suppliers to develop new products and processes that meet sustainability criteria, opening up new markets and opportunities for growth. Finally, sustainable procurement can enhance brand reputation and customer loyalty by demonstrating a commitment to environmental and social responsibility, thereby attracting environmentally and socially conscious consumers and investors. In conclusion, the

discussion of the findings from this qualitative study provides valuable insights into the complexities, challenges, and opportunities associated with sustainable procurement practices and supplier selection criteria. By considering environmental, social, and ethical factors alongside traditional criteria, organizations can align their procurement practices with broader organizational values and sustainability goals. Collaboration and communication are essential for building collaborative relationships with suppliers and driving continuous improvement in sustainability performance. Regulatory and market pressures are significant drivers of sustainable procurement practices, influencing organizational policies and practices. Despite the challenges, sustainable procurement offers several benefits and opportunities, including enhanced risk management, cost savings, innovation, and reputation enhancement. Overall, sustainable procurement represents a strategic approach to procurement that not only mitigates risks and reduces costs but also drives positive environmental and social outcomes, contributing to a more sustainable and equitable future.

6. Conclusion

This qualitative study provides valuable insights into sustainable procurement practices and supplier selection criteria, highlighting the complexities, challenges, and opportunities associated with integrating sustainability considerations into procurement decisions. The study revealed that sustainable procurement involves a holistic approach that goes beyond traditional criteria to consider environmental, social, and ethical factors. Assessing and managing suppliers' sustainability performance emerged as a significant challenge, requiring robust assessment processes and leveraging technology to enhance transparency and traceability in supply chains. Collaboration and communication were identified as critical enablers of sustainable procurement practices, emphasizing the importance of building collaborative relationships with suppliers based on trust and mutual respect. Regulatory and market pressures were identified as significant drivers of sustainable procurement practices, influencing organizational policies and practices. Despite the challenges, sustainable procurement offers several benefits and opportunities, including enhanced risk management, cost savings, innovation, and reputation enhancement. Overall, sustainable procurement represents a strategic approach to procurement that not only mitigates risks and reduces costs but also drives positive environmental and social outcomes, contributing to a more sustainable and equitable future. As organizations continue to navigate the evolving landscape of sustainable procurement, further research and collaboration will be essential to advance knowledge, share best practices, and drive progress towards a more sustainable and responsible global supply chain ecosystem.

References

1. Amann, M., Roehrich, J. K., Eßig, M., & Harland, C. (2014). Driving sustainable supply chain management in the public sector: The importance of public procurement in the European Union. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, 19(3), 351-366. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SCM-12-2013-0447>
2. Blome, C., Hollos, D., & Paulraj, A. (2014). Green procurement and green supplier development: Antecedents and effects on supplier performance. *International Journal of Production Research*, 52(1), 32-49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2013.825748>
3. Brammer, S., & Walker, H. (2011). Sustainable procurement in the public sector: An international comparative study. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 31(4), 452-476. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443571111119551>
4. Brundtland, G. H. (1987). *Our Common Future: Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development*. Oxford University Press.
5. Carter, C. R., & Easton, P. L. (2011). Sustainable supply chain management: Evolution and future directions. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, 41(1), 46-62. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09600031111101420>
6. Chin, T. A., Tat, H. H., & Sulaiman, Z. (2015). Green supply chain management, environmental collaboration and sustainability performance. *Procedia CIRP*, 26, 695-699. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2014.07.035>
7. Emon, M.M.H., & Khan, T. (2023). The Impact of Cultural Norms on Sustainable Entrepreneurship Practices in SMEs of Bangladesh. *Indonesian Journal of Innovation and Applied Sciences (IJIAS)*, 3(3), 201-209.

8. Dubey, R., Gunasekaran, A., & Papadopoulos, T. (2017). Green supply chain management: Theoretical framework and further research directions. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 24(1), 184-218. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-01-2016-0011>
9. Elkington, J. (1998). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. New Society Publishers.
10. European Commission. (2020). *Green Public Procurement*. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/environment/gpp/index_en.htm
11. Geng, R., Mansouri, S. A., & Aktas, E. (2017). The relationship between green supply chain management and performance: A meta-analysis of empirical evidences in Asian emerging economies. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 183, 245-258. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2016.10.008>
12. Ghadimi, P., Wang, C., & Lim, M. K. (2019). Sustainable supply chain modeling and analysis: Past debate, present problems, and future challenges. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 140, 72-84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2018.09.005>
13. Gimenez, C., Sierra, V., & Rodon, J. (2012). Sustainable operations: Their impact on the triple bottom line. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 140(1), 149-159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2012.01.035>
14. Glock, C. H., & Ries, J. M. (2013). Reducing lead time risk through multiple sourcing: The case of stochastic demand and variable lead times. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 142(1), 167-176. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2012.11.024>
15. Emon, M.H., & Nipa, M.N. (2024). Exploring the Gender Dimension in Entrepreneurship Development: A Systematic Literature Review in the Context of Bangladesh. *Westcliff International Journal of Applied Research*, 8(1), 34-49.
16. Govindan, K., Rajendran, S., Sarkis, J., & Murugesan, P. (2015). Multi criteria decision making approaches for green supplier evaluation and selection: A literature review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 98, 66-83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.06.046>
17. Grimstad, S. M., & Burgess, J. (2020). Environmental and social sustainability in supply chains: Towards a multi-stakeholder perspective. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 29(4), 1557-1568. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2450>
18. GSA. (2021). *Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and GSAM*. Retrieved from <https://www.gsa.gov/policy-regulations/regulations/federal-acquisition-regulation-far>
19. Harland, C. M., Telgen, J., Callender, G., Grimm, R., & Patrucco, A. (2019). *The SAGE handbook of public procurement*. SAGE Publications Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526436066>
20. Harrison, R. (2013). Ethical consumerism: Past, present, and future directions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 123(3), 319-329.
21. Hsu, C. C., Kuo, T. C., Chen, S. H., & Hu, A. H. (2013). Using DEMATEL to develop a carbon management model of supplier selection in green supply chains. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 56, 164-172. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2011.09.012>
22. Emon, M.M.H., Khan, T., & Siam, S.A.J. (2024). Quantifying the influence of supplier relationship management and supply chain performance: an investigation of Bangladesh's manufacturing and service sectors. *Brazilian Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 21(2), 2015. <https://doi.org/10.14488/BJOPM.2015.2024>
23. Igarashi, M., de Boer, L., & Fet, A. M. (2013). What is required for greener supplier selection? A literature review and conceptual model development. *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, 19(4), 247-263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pursup.2013.06.001>
24. IKEA. (2021). *IWAY Standard*. Retrieved from <https://about.ikea.com/en/sustainability/suppliers/iway-standard>
25. Kannan, D., & Sasikumar, P. (2020). A comprehensive review of the research and practices of green supply chain management. *Clean Technologies and Environmental Policy*, 22(6), 1323-1342. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10098-020-01888-0>
26. Khan, S. A., & Qianli, D. (2017). Impact of green supply chain management practices on firms' performance: An empirical study from the perspective of Pakistan. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 24(20), 16829-16844. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-017-9172-5>
27. Klassen, R. D., & Vachon, S. (2003). Collaboration and evaluation in the supply chain: The impact on plant-level environmental investment. *Production and Operations Management*, 12(3), 336-352. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1937-5956.2003.tb00210.x>
28. Kumar, N., Soni, G., & Agrawal, S. (2021). Supplier selection criteria for sustainable supply chain: A systematic literature review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 302, 126982. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.126982>
29. Linton, J. D., Klassen, R., & Jayaraman, V. (2007). Sustainable supply chains: An introduction. *Journal of Operations Management*, 25(6), 1075-1082. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2007.01.012>
30. Rahman, M. A., Khan, T., Emon, M. M. H., Bukari, Z., & Nath, A. (2024). *The New Marketing Paradigm: From Traditional to Digital*. In Notion Press.

31. Liu, C., & Zhang, X. (2021). The effects of green supply chain integration on firm performance: An empirical study of Chinese manufacturing firms. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 30(1), 15-29. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2602>
32. Luthra, S., Kumar, A., Kumar, S., & Haleem, A. (2011). Barriers to implement green supply chain management in automobile industry using interpretive structural modeling technique: An Indian perspective. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management*, 4(2), 231-257. <https://doi.org/10.3926/jiem.2011.v4n2.p231-257>
33. Mani, V., Gunasekaran, A., Papadopoulos, T., & Hazen, B. (2016). Supply chain social sustainability for developing nations: Evidence from India. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 111, 42-52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.04.003>
34. Min, H., & Galle, W. P. (2001). Green purchasing practices of US firms. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 21(9), 1222-1238. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000005923>
35. Muralidharan, C., Anantharaman, N., & Deshmukh, S. G. (2002). A multi-criteria group decision-making model for supplier rating. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 38(4), 22-33. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-493X.2002.tb00135.x>
36. Saberi, S., Kouhizadeh, M., Sarkis, J., & Shen, L. (2019). Blockchain technology and its relationships to sustainable supply chain management. *International Journal of Production Research*, 57(7), 2117-2135.
37. Siegle, L. (2013). The true cost of fast fashion. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2013/jun/02/true-cost-fast-fashion>
38. Tate, W. L., Ellram, L. M., & Dooley, K. J. (2012). Environmental purchasing and supplier management (EPSM): Theory and practice. *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, 18(3), 173-181.
39. Testa, F., Grappio, P., & Daddi, T. (2014). The effectiveness of EMAS as a management tool: a key driver of sustainable supply chain management. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 57(7), 1036-1054.
40. Emon, M. M. H., Khan, T., Rahman, M. A., Bukari, Z., & Chowdhury, M. S. A. (2024). *Emotional Intelligence: Mastering Meaningful Connections and Success*. Notion Press.
41. Vachon, S., & Klassen, R. D. (2008). Environmental management and manufacturing performance: The role of collaboration in the supply chain. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 111(2), 299-315.
42. Walker, H., Di Sisto, L., & McBain, D. (2008). Drivers and barriers to environmental supply chain management practices: Lessons from the public and private sectors. *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, 14(1), 69-85.
43. Walmart. (2021). The Sustainability Index. Retrieved from <https://corporate.walmart.com/sustainability/2021-report/sustainable-products/the-sustainability-index>

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.