



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI PADOVA

Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche “Marco Fanno”

COST OVERRUN AND AUCTION FORMAT
IN PUBLIC WORKS

ALESSANDRO BUCCIOL
University of Verona & University of Amsterdam

OTTORINO CHILLEMI
University of Padova

GIACOMO PALAZZI
University of Padova

March 2011

“MARCO FANNO” WORKING PAPER N.129

Cost Overrun and Auction Format in Public Works

Alessandro Buccioli* Ottorino Chillemi†‡ Giacomo Palazzi§

March 4, 2011

Abstract

We provide an empirical investigation of cost overruns in small public procurement projects, using a panel dataset of auctions held in the Italian Veneto region between 2004 and 2006. We use this sample to study the effect on cost overruns of auction formats (average bid as opposed to first price rule) conditional on the entry mechanisms (free as opposed to limited access). It is commonly believed that cost overruns are lower under average bid auctions relative to first price auctions. We find support to this belief only when access to the auction is limited. We interpret this finding as evidence that winner's adverse selection is an important problem in auctions for small size public works, and the lack of a significant effect of the average bid format in free entry auctions may reflect collusion.

JEL classification codes: D44; H57

Keywords: cost overrun; average bid; first price; free entry; work delays

*University of Verona & University of Amsterdam

†University of Padua

‡*Corresponding author.* Address: University of Padua, Dept. of Economics, Via del Santo 33, 35123 Padova, Italy. Phone: +39 049 827.4224 . Fax: +39 049 827.4211. Email: ottorino.chillemi@unipd.it.

§University of Padua

1 Introduction

Final costs of public works are often larger than expected. The literature provides three main explanations for this fact. First, Ganuza (2007) argues that systematic cost overruns may be the outcome of an efficient choice of procurers willing to minimize the informational rent of contractors. According to this view, procurers may find it optimal to underinvest in initial project design and then recontract both the price and the project specification with the designated contractor. Second, Flyvbjerg et al. (2002) claim that contractors deliberately lie in order to obtain that their projects are approved. Third, final costs may be frequently larger than expected because of a bad winner selection. In fact, when bidders can renege on their bids, those with lower loss from reneging will bid more aggressively, which implies that the winner of a standard auction will be the bidder relatively most likely to renege (Spulber, 1990; Waehrer, 1995; Zheng, 2001; Board, 2007). One can realistically expect that in this situation recontracting will occur and cost overruns will be larger on average. In this paper we concentrate on this third explanation.

Common remedies to bidders' default are performance bonds or third party guarantees (for a theoretical analysis see Calveras et. al., 2004). However, such remedies can be relatively costly, especially when the contractors are small firms and the projects are of small size. An alternative to prevent bidders' default is to assign the project by auction formats alternative to the standard of first-price auctions (where the maximum discount wins). In the so-called "average bid auction", first proposed by Iannou and Leu (1993) in the engineering literature, the winning bid is the one closest to the average of all the bids, and the contractor receives his asked price. This format has been used in public procurement auctions in countries like the US, Italy, Belgium, Switzerland, Taiwan, etc. (for a review see DeCarolis, 2009). It can be easily seen that this auction format has a Nash equilibrium where all the bids are identical in the absence of market distortions. Hence each bidder has the same probability of having the project assigned, which weakens the selection problem (Albano et al., 2006).

In this paper we provide an empirical investigation of the effect of the average bid format on cost overruns (i.e., the distance between final and expected costs) in small projects, using a sample of public procurement auctions held in the Italian Veneto region between 2004 and 2006. The sample is a panel dataset, as we have information on a sequence of auctions held by the same procurer. This dataset is quite instructive since it comprises data on auctions with first price and average bid procedures (auction format), with and without free participation (entry mechanism), regarding works with similar characteristics.

DeCarolis (2009) performs a similar exercise, based on public procurement projects held in another Italian region (Piedmont). He finds that cost overruns are lower in average bid auctions rather than in first price auctions. Our analysis differs from his in two main directions: we use a model for panel data, which makes the analysis more robust to possible misspecification of the procurer's characteristics, and we analyze the effect of the average bid procedure conditional on the entry mechanism. We find that the average bid auction is associated with lower cost overruns than first price auctions only when entry is limited, while this effect is lost when entry is free. We interpret this finding as evidence that winner's adverse selection is an important problem in auctions for small size public works, and the lack of a significant effect of the average bid format in free entry auctions may reflect collusion.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes our dataset and its main variables. Section 3 discusses the results from our analysis, and Section 4 concludes. Finally, an appendix describes more in detail why we expect collusion to arise in auctions with average bid format.

2 Data

Our dataset consists of fixed reserve price contracts included in the database managed by the Italian Observatory for Public Contracts. The observatory records publicly procured contracts in Italy with reserve price above 150 thousand euros. We limit our attention to contracts held in a small area (the Veneto region), between the years 2004 and 2006 and completed by the end of March 2009, and with reserve price below one million euros. There are two main reasons for the choice of these sample restrictions. First, between 2004 and 2006 the law in Veneto let procurers free to choose the format of auctions with reserve price below one million euros.¹ Focusing on this sample then allows us to analyze a homogeneous set of auctions showing wide heterogeneity of formats. Second, earlier studies suggest that the distribution of extra costs and time delays varies markedly across Italian regions, often for reasons that are outside the procurer’s control (see DeCarolis and Palumbo, 2010). We choose the Veneto region for previous familiarity with these data. Indeed the observatory asked us to double-check the dataset with hard-copy data stored in regional offices, and in case make corrections; this guarantees that the quality of the dataset is generally good. This is an important issue because data on public procurement auctions often contain errors, usually arising when converting from the hard-copy to the digital format.

Our final dataset is made of 1,093 auctions held by 265 procurers. Our sample is a panel dataset, where the observation unit is the procurer, and for each procurer we observe the auctions it held between 2004 and 2006. In the sample there are four groups of auctions, differing along two dimensions: the selection procedure (first price selection as opposed to average bid selection) and the entry mechanism (free entry to the auction as opposed to limited entry). Therefore we observe auctions with first price selection and free entry (72 observations, 6.59% of the sample), auctions with first price selection and limited entry (518, 47.39%), auctions with average bid selection and free entry (371, 33.94%), and auctions with average bid selection and limited entry (132, 12.08%). In all the auctions with at least five bidders, the average bid format includes a rule according to which bids relatively far from the mean are automatically excluded.² Table 1 shows the mean value of some variables in our dataset, jointly as well as separately for the four groups of auctions. The table suggests that auctions with average bid format and (especially) free entry receive more bids on average, and auctions with free entry deal with more complex works (there are higher reserve prices and more work days are expected).³ This evidence is also confirmed by a panel probit regression analysis. Table 2 shows the output of two regressions, where the dependent variable is worth one if the auction follows an average bid selection with free entry (column 1) or a first price selection with limited entry (column 2), and 0 otherwise. The specification, identical in both columns, includes variables on the project complexity, project type, procurer’s type and year. We find that auctions with average bid selection and free entry are more likely with more complex projects (the signs on the reserve price and the expected work length are significantly positive at 5%) and when the procurer is a municipality (58% of our sample), while auctions with first price selection and limited entry are less likely with more complex jobs. It should be noticed that, in the sample we consider, the reserve price and the expected work length are set prior to the auction format, according to objective third-party estimates of the project’s complexity. The statistics in Tables 1 and 2 then

¹Public projects with reserve price above one million euros had to be procured exclusively by a first price rule. After 2006 the law changed to comply with the EU recommendation not to use the average bid format.

²In Italy the automatic exclusion rule works as follows (from DeCarolis, 2009). *Step 1*: disregard the top and bottom 10 percent (or the closest integer) of the bids. *Step 2*: compute the average A1 of the remaining bids. *Step 3*: compute A2, the average difference between A1 and all the bids that are greater than A1. *Step 4*: eliminate all the bids that are equal or larger than (A1+A2). *Step 5*: the winning bidder is the bidder with the highest bid among those not eliminated.

³All these differences are significant at the 1% level to one-sample mean comparison tests.

suggest that, although being formally free, the choice of the auction format is related to the features of the project and the procurer.

In the analysis we will focus on three main variables: 1) the winning discount, defined as the difference between the price winning the auction and the reserve price, as a ratio to the reserve price; 2) the cost overrun, defined as the difference between the final price at the end of the works and the price winning the auction, divided by the reserve price;⁴ 3) the work time delay, defined as the difference between the actual number of work days and the expected number of work days (as reported in the contract), as a ratio to the expected number of work days. By taking ratios rather than levels as dependent variables, we no longer refer to project's costs or work lengths. As a consequence, in our analysis we will focus on relative changes in prices and work lengths, while we will not be able to say anything regarding absolute (changes in) prices and work lengths. There are two reasons for dealing with ratios. First, this way we circumvent the potential endogeneity between the auction format and the project size (reserve price, expected work length) that seems to exist following our above discussion. Second, ratios take values in a more limited range than levels, and their resulting lower variability may be better captured with our statistical methods.

Table 1 informs that on average contracts are 8.27% costlier and 119.70% longer than expected. However, our data show large variability in these measures, especially on the extra work length. Figure 1 plots the distribution of the three measures in the whole sample (left panels) as well as separately for the four groups of auctions (right panels).⁵ Notice from the left panel that cost overruns and especially work delays vary markedly: they can be either positive or negative⁶, although they are more frequently positive (it happens respectively in 909 observations, or 83.17% of the sample, and in 986 observations, or 90.21% of the sample), and they often arise together (there are 817 observations, 74.75% of the sample, with positive cost overruns and positive work delays). All this variability is puzzling since, according to the law, project revisions should be allowed only when some pre-specified events occur outside the contractor's control. For instance, in the case of road works, it is stipulated that the price will be revised if unexpected geological or weather conditions severely weaken productivity. However, in informal discussions several practitioners told us that this rule is subject to manipulation. Since we do not have information on the reasons for price revisions, we treat all the deviations from the expected price as evidence of recontracting. As a robustness check of our results we will repeat our analysis by excluding from the sample the observations with the 20% largest (positive and negative) cost overruns, which are more likely to incorporate project revisions.

It is also illustrative to compare the variability of our target measures in the four groups of auctions. The right panels of Figure 1 show the empirical cumulative distribution function of the winning discount, the cost overrun, and the work delay separately for the four groups of auctions with and without free entry, and with and without average bid format. We find no systematic difference in the distributions over the four groups. We only notice that the winning discount is more highly concentrated around its mean in auctions with free entry, and the cost overrun is more highly concentrated around 0 in auctions with limited entry and average bid format. However, this evidence may depend on the heterogeneity in the four groups, noticeably the reserve price and the number of bidders. Our subsequent analysis will isolate the effect of introducing an average bid procedure, after controlling for other procurer and auction features (in particular the entry

⁴This is the standard definition of cost overrun in the literature. Alternatively one may want to divide the difference by the winning price. Using this variable, our conclusions would not change.

⁵In the figures we ignore discounts and overruns higher than 30%, and delays higher than 400%. In the sample there are 52 observations with discounts above 30% and 30 observations with delays above 400%.

⁶When the final price is lower than the winning price we should more properly talk about cost underruns rather than cost overruns. However, for sake of simplicity in this paper we call (negative) cost overruns the cost underruns.

mechanism).

The fact that we consider only projects completed by March 2009 creates potential selection problems in our dataset, as we exclude auctions held between 2004 and 2006 relative to works that are not yet completed in March 2009. The mean expected (actual) work length in our sample is 203.56 (340.63) days, which suggests that the period we consider is large enough to contain most contracts. However, it might be possible that we exclude more unfinished contracts for auctions held in 2006, thus creating a bias in the dataset. In other words, we might observe contracts with smaller cost overruns and smaller work delays in 2006 as a result of a selection bias, and interpret them as more virtuous behavior. Table 3 shows the results of some comparison t-tests over our key variables. It turns out that, although the expected work length is indeed significantly smaller in 2006, the cost overrun and the work delay are essentially identical to previous years.

3 Results

Our analysis is based on three panel regressions, where the dependent variables are, respectively, the winning discount, the cost overrun (final discount minus winning discount), and the work delay (actual minus expected work length, divided by expected work length).

Our aim is to study the correlation of these variables with some auction features known before the works begin. The specification includes a dummy variable on the auction format (average bid as opposed to first price), and variables on the project size (the logarithm of the reserve price and the expected number of work days), and competition (the number of bidders).⁷ Previous works (e.g., Bajari et al., 2008) found these variables to be important in explaining the cost overrun. However, since some of these variables show to vary largely with the mechanism of admission to the auction, we treat them separately for auctions with free entry and for auctions with limited entry. In addition, we include control dummy variables on the project category (with the dummies on water, plant, and road projects as opposed to other projects, mainly buildings) and the auction year (2004 or 2006, as opposed to 2005).

Estimation is performed using a panel regression model with fixed effects. This choice makes estimation robust to potential misspecification of procurer-specific explanatory variables. Our outcome variables may indeed be affected by some procurer's characteristics that we do not model explicitly, such as its size, or its previous experience with similar projects. In addition, statistical tests generally support this model instead of the alternative panel regression model with random effects (Hausman test) and the pooled regression model without procurer dummies (test for individual effects). Our main findings are reported in Table 4; the bottom part of the table displays the results of the two above-mentioned statistical tests. Below we comment on each column of Table 4, taking the convention that coefficients are "significantly different from zero" only if the p-value associated to their t-test is lower than 5%.

Winning discount

For auctions with limited entry, the winning discount is related positively to the number of bids (0.48), and negatively to the average bid format (-4.09) and the reserve price (-1.95). This means that having 100 more bidders increases the winning discount by an amount of 0.49%, following average bid rule rather than first price rule reduces the discount by 4.09%, and having a 1% increase in the reserve price reduces the winning discount by 1.95%.

⁷The expected number of work days and the number of admitted bids are divided by 100 to have large enough coefficient estimates.

For auctions with free entry, we find significant effect only for the reserve price (negative, -1.41) and the number of bids (positive, 0.02). Moreover, both effects are smaller than in the corresponding case of auctions with limited entry. This all suggests that it is more difficult to predict the outcome of an auction based on free entry access.

Cost overrun

In this case we obtain fewer significant correlations between the explanatory variables and the cost overrun. In auctions with limited entry, we find a positive effect of the number of bidders (0.01), and a negative effect of the average bid format (-6.56). These two variables showed significant effects, and with the same sign, also in the regression with the winning discount as dependent variable. Importantly, the coefficient on the average bid format informs that following an average bid procedure rather than a first price procedure in auctions with limited entry reduces the cost overrun by 6.56% . This decrease is quite remarkable, as it is nearly as large as the average cost overrun in the sample (8.33% ; see Table 1). In contrast, in auctions with free entry, we find significant effect of no variable.

Work delay

It seems that work delays are driven by different reasons than cost overruns. In fact, in auctions with limited entry, we find only a negative effect of the expected number of work days (-0.84), meaning that 100 more work days reduce the work delay by 0.84% . A similar significant effect (-0.91) is found also in auctions with free entry; there is no statistical difference between the two effects. Even though it is significant, this effect is practically small if compared with the average work delay in the sample (122.66% ; see Table 1). We then argue that work delays occur independently from the auction format (average bid or first price) and the auction access (free or limited entry).

Based on these findings we conclude that i) the winning discount is less predictable under free entry than under limited entry, as it shows lower or null correlation with such auction features as its format (first price or average bid), the project reserve price, and the number of bidders; ii) the auction format and the auction entry mechanism have no bearings on work delays; iii) cost overruns are lower under the average bid format only in auctions with limited entry. We interpret this latest result as evidence that winner's adverse selection is an important problem in auctions for small size public works. Indeed, some contractors may want to participate not to win the auction but to influence the average bid by submitting bids deliberately far from the expected mean. In this case the effectiveness of the average bid format to mitigate the adverse selection problem is hampered, especially in auctions with free entry where the number of bids is systematically higher than in auctions with limited entry. In addition, the lack of a significant effect of the average bid format in free entry auctions may reflect collusion. The appendix explains why we expect collusion to arise in this situation.

DeCarolis (2009) already finds that cost overruns are reduced by around 6% under the average bid format. We thus support his result only in the context of auctions with limited entry, and not also in those with free entry. It should be noticed, though, that in the environment of DeCarolis (2009) the type of auction is set by law, whereas in our dataset it is chosen by the procurer independently. This freedom of choice may bias our conclusions, since different characteristics of the procurers and the auctions seem to correlate with the choice of the auction type (see Table 1 and the related discussion in Section 2). As a robustness check, we replicate our analysis in a sub-sample of observations where differences among procurers and auctions are limited. Specifically, we consider only auctions procured by municipalities and with reserve price between 283,000 euros

(the median value in the sample) and 1 million euros. This sub-sample includes 296 out of our 1,093 observations. Column (1) of Table 5, which reports the output of the analysis on cost overruns, qualitatively confirms our previous findings; this suggests that our conclusions are not driven by the sample selection in the choice of the auction type.

We conclude this section with two further robustness checks. First, due to our concern on a potential selection problem (see Table 3 and the discussion at the end of Section 2), we repeat the analysis excluding observations from year 2006. Second, we may be concerned that our findings are partly driven by project revisions rather than price renegotiation. One may expect that this bias is stronger among auctions for which the final discount is very large or very small compared to the winning discount. For this purpose, we replicate our analysis after removing the observations with the top 10% and the bottom 10% cost overrun. These two further analyses provide for the regression on cost overruns the estimates shown in Table 5, in column (2) and (3) respectively, and they again confirm our main findings. We conclude that our results are robust to potential sample selection problems and lack of information on project revisions.

4 Conclusions

In 2004 the European Commission opposed awarding procedures with average bid format because of their anticompetitive flavor. Although being aware of the risk of sub-performance (see European Commission, 2002), the Commission argues that the right way to solve the problem of winner's default is testing bid reliability and eliminating abnormally low bids after a debate with the bidder.

The common concern among the practitioners we interacted with is that testing bid reliability is costly and requires adequate technical staff that small procurers cannot afford. Practitioners believe that the average bid auction procedure effectively limits cost overruns because it reduces the bad winner selection problem. Our analysis supports this view only in the context of auctions with limited entry, suggesting that the favorable properties of the average bid format are not robust to collusion.

Acknowledgements

We thank Francesco DeCarolis and Claudio Zoli for useful comments and Massimiliano Berto for his advice in the data quality check. We further thank the Veneto region, and in particular Claudio Grassi, Morena Quaresimin and Stefano Talato for kindly providing us with the data. Financial support from Fondazione Cariparo is gratefully acknowledged. The usual disclaimers apply.

References

- [1] Albano G, Bianchi M, Spagnolo G. Bid average methods in procurement. *Rivista di Politica Economica* 2006;96; 41-62.
- [2] Bajari P, McMillan R, Tadelis, S. Auctions versus negotiations in procurement: an empirical analysis. *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization* 2008;25; 372-399.
- [3] Board S. Bidding into the red: a model of post-auction bankruptcy. *Journal of Finance* 2007;62; 2695-2723.

- [4] Calveras A, Ganuza JJ, Hauk E. Wild bids. gambling for resurrection in procurement contracts. *Journal of Regulatory Economics* 2004;26; 41-68.
- [5] DeCarolis F. When the highest bidder loses the auction: theory and evidence from public procurement. Mimeo 2009; University of Wisconsin.
- [6] DeCarolis F, Palumbo G. Gli scostamenti dei costi e dei tempi nei lavori pubblici: una visione d'insieme. Mimeo 2010; Bank of Italy.
- [7] European Commission. Prevention, detection and elimination of abnormally low tenders in the European construction industry. DG III Working Group on Abnormally Low Tenders 2002.
- [8] Flyvbjerg B, Holm MS, Buhl S. Underestimating costs in public works projects. Error or lie?. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 2002;68; 279-295.
- [9] Ganuza JJ. Competition and cost overruns in procurement. *Journal of Industrial Economics* 2007;55; 633-660.
- [10] Iannou PG, Leu SS. Average bid method? A competitive bidding strategy. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management* 1993;119; 131-147.
- [11] Spulber DF. Auctions and contract enforcement. *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization* 1990;6; 325-344.
- [12] Waehrer K. A model of auction contracts with liquidated damages. *Journal of Economic Theory* 1995;67; 531-555.
- [13] Zheng CZ. High bids and broke winners. *Journal of Economic Theory* 2001;100; 129-171.

5 Appendix. Collusion and bad winner selection

Consider a situation where N bidders take part in a procurement auction. The production cost of performing the job is identical for all the bidders, but it is known not earlier than at the beginning of the job. At the time of bidding, all the bidders know that the production cost is a random variable $c \in [\underline{c}, \bar{c}]$, with density f and cumulative distribution function F . Bidders differ only in their cost of renegeing $g_i, i = 1, \dots, N$, i.e., the (monetary, reputation, etc.) cost they will face in case they will not complete the job after winning the auction. The procurer does not know g_i , but its cost of non-completion is higher than $\max_i g_i$, which means that completing the job is socially efficient.

A generic bidder i has two options after winning the auction and observing the production cost:

- perform the job, and earn a profit (or loss) $b_i - c$
- renege the job, and incur a loss $-g_i$

Bidder i will perform the job only if $b_i - c > -g_i$, or equivalently if $c < b_i + g_i$. Under these assumptions, bidder i 's expected surplus at the time of the auction is

$$S(b_i, g_i) = \int_{\underline{c}}^{b_i + g_i} (b_i - c) f(c) dc + \int_{b_i + g_i}^{\bar{c}} -g_i f(c) dc.$$

It is crucial to realize that $S(b_i, g_i)$ is a decreasing function in g_i for any given b_i , and strictly decreasing if $b_i + g_i < \bar{c}$.⁸ This means that, if all the bidders can commit to collude and monetary transfers among bidders are allowed, bidders will let the one with the lowest cost of renegeing win the auction, because he can pay the highest transfer to the others. Then a bad selection of the winner occurs, because the procurer would rather prefer assigning the auction to the bidder with the highest cost of renegeing (who is more likely to complete the job). Bad winner selection arises anyway, even if individual costs of renegeing g_i are private information or not. In this case a pre-auction will be held, and the designated winner will be the bidder who can afford offering the largest transfer to the others, that is, again the bidder with the lowest renegeing cost.

In the more realistic case where only a subset of bidders collude, the bidder with the lowest cost of renegeing will not necessarily win the auction. However, a bad selection occurs in average bid auctions if bidding rings arise among bidders with relatively low costs of renegeing. This is more likely when the procurer cannot restrain access to the auction and inhibit the entry of potential colluders (that is, when there is free entry). We describe this with an example.

Let $N = 3$, $g_1 = g_2 = g$ and $g_3 > g$, and suppose bids can only take the values p and $q > p$. In a Nash equilibrium without collusion all the bidders have the same probability of winning the auction. Now suppose bidders 1 and 2 collude and bid the same price, while bidder 3 does not collude. If bidder 3 and each member of the cartel bid p , all the bidders have the same probability ($\frac{1}{3}$) to win. An identical outcome arises if all the bidders bid q . If instead bidder 3 bids p and the members of the cartel bid q (or vice versa), bidder 3 loses since his bid is farther from the average bid. Then there is a Nash equilibrium where bidder 1 has the same probability of winning as bidder 2, while bidder 3 (the bidder with the highest cost of renegeing) has the lowest probability of winning. In this case collusion induces a bad winner selection.

In what follows we derive formally the equilibrium strategies. Let $C(b)$ denote the probability of the cartel playing $b \in \{p, q\}$, and $B(b)$ denote the probability of bidder 3 playing $b \in \{p, q\}$. Then the expected surplus of bidder 3 is $S(p, g_3) \frac{1}{3}C(p)$ when bidding p , and $S(q, g_3) \frac{1}{3}C(q)$ when bidding q ; the expected surplus of the cartel is $S(p, g) (\frac{2}{3}B(p) + B(q))$ when bidding p , and $S(q, g) (\frac{2}{3}B(q) + B(p))$ when bidding q .

Since in equilibrium it must be indifferent to bid p or q , solving the system of equations

$$\begin{cases} S(p, g_3) \frac{1}{3}C(p) = S(q, g_3) \frac{1}{3}C(q) \\ S(p, g) (\frac{2}{3}B(p) + B(q)) = S(q, g) (\frac{2}{3}B(q) + B(p)) \\ C(p) + C(q) = 1 \\ B(p) + B(q) = 1 \end{cases}$$

yields the equilibrium bidding strategies, that is, the probability of bidding p for the members of the cartel, $C(p)$, and for bidder 3, $B(p)$:

$$\begin{cases} C(p) = \frac{S(q, g_3)}{S(q, g_3) + S(p, g_3)} \\ B(p) = \frac{3S(p, g) - 2S(q, g)}{S(p, g) + S(q, g)} \end{cases} .$$

Some restriction on p and q must hold in order to have $C(b)$ and $B(b)$ well-defined probabilities.

⁸ In this case $\frac{\partial S(b_i, g_i)}{\partial g_i} = -g_i f(b_i + g_i) + g_i f(b_i + g_i) - \int_{b_i + g_i}^{\bar{c}} f(c) dc < 0$.

Table 1. Sample means

	Full sample	Average bid		First price	
		Free entry	Limited entry	Free entry	Limited entry
reserve price (k euros)	338.906	411.471	360.977	418.459	270.252
expected n. work days	203.556	221.914	214.992	223.194	184.765
n. bidders	31.269	72.057	17.455	38.000	4.641
winning discount (%)	11.982	11.869	13.605	10.505	11.854
cost overrun (%)	8.328	7.903	5.415	9.017	9.278
work delay (%)	122.662	125.849	83.813	133.393	128.787
<i>n. observations</i>	<i>1093</i>	<i>371</i>	<i>132</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>518</i>

Note: the reserve price is the price announced by the procurer. The expected number of work days is the number of work days reported in the contract. The winning discount is the difference between the price winning the auction and the reserve price, as a ratio to the reserve price. The cost overrun takes the difference between the final price at the end of the works and the price winning the auction, divided by the price winning the auction. The work delay is the difference between the actual number of work days and the expected number of work days, as a ratio to the expected number of work days.

Table 2. Panel probit regression output

Dependent variable	Average bid, free entry	First price, limited entry
log (reserve price), limited entry	1.110*** (0.130)	-1.685*** (0.154)
n. expected work days/100, limited entry	0.001** (0.001)	-0.002*** (0.001)
auction category: water	0.417 (0.292)	-0.074 (0.295)
auction category: plant	0.066 (0.263)	-0.064 (0.236)
auction category: road	0.129 (0.137)	-0.117 (0.137)
procurer category: health care	-0.092 (0.448)	-0.091 (0.482)
procurer category: municipality	0.608** (0.272)	-0.535* (0.296)
procurer category: district/region	0.128 (0.488)	-0.024 (0.558)
procurer category: road	0.264 (0.618)	-0.811 (0.734)
year: 2004	0.223 (0.143)	-0.557*** (0.150)
year: 2006	-0.028 (0.141)	-0.045 (0.139)
constant	-7.768*** (0.814)	10.404*** (0.934)
n. auctions	1093	1093
n. procurers	265	265
avg. n. auctions per procurer	4.12	4.12

Note: ***: significant at 10%; **: significant at 5%; *: significant at 1%

Standard errors in round parentheses. The dep. variables are dummy variables.

Table 3. Comparison by year

mean		test	p-value
2006	2004-2005		
<i>Expected work length (days)</i>			
190.648	211.366	-2.984	0.003
<i>Cost overrun (%)</i>			
8.502	8.222	0.320	0.749
<i>Work delay (%)</i>			
116.510	126.384	-0.387	0.699

Note: tests are the result of the two-sample comparison t test between the mean in 2006 and the mean in 2004-2005; the alternative hypothesis is that the mean in 2006 is different from the mean in the other years. For a definition of cost overrun and work delay, see the note to Table 1.

Table 4. Panel regression output (fixed effects)

%	Winning discount	Cost overrun	Work delay
average bid auction, limited entry	-4.092*** (1.091)	-6.562*** (1.980)	-45.348 (66.589)
log (reserve price), limited entry	-1.951*** (0.604)	0.638 (1.096)	14.286 (36.863)
n. expected work days/100, limited entry	0.005 (0.003)	0.013** (0.005)	-0.841*** (0.184)
n. bidders/100, limited entry	0.488*** (0.059)	0.195* (0.107)	3.474 (3.610)
average bid auction, free entry	-0.413 (1.163)	-0.940 (2.111)	-17.529 (70.995)
log(reserve price), free entry	-1.414** (0.579)	1.204 (1.051)	25.445 (35.350)
n. expected work days/100, free entry	0.001 (0.004)	0.000 (0.007)	-0.908*** (0.234)
n. bidders/100, free entry	0.016** (0.007)	0.006 (0.013)	-0.215 (0.421)
auction category: water	-0.290 (1.432)	0.848 (2.599)	311.894*** (87.413)
auction category: plant	2.991*** (1.018)	-0.897 (1.848)	-4.519 (62.141)
auction category: road	-2.108*** (0.560)	-0.393 (1.015)	4.465 (34.152)
year: 2004	-2.855*** (0.586)	-3.191*** (1.064)	-10.421 (35.790)
year: 2006	0.705 (0.534)	-0.703 (0.969)	-34.118 (32.602)
constant	20.474*** (3.296)	3.308 (5.982)	190.881 (201.197)
n. auctions	1093	1093	1093
n. procurers	265	265	265
avg. n. auctions per procurer	4.12	4.12	4.12
Fraction of variance due to ind. effects	0.401	0.596	0.374
Hausman test	68.870	10.090	28.480
(random effects Vs. fixed effects panel)	[0.000]	[0.687]	[0.008]
Test individual effects=0	1.610	2.540	1.570
(pooled OLS Vs. fixed effects panel)	[0.000]	[0.000]	[0.088]

Note: ***: significant at 10%; **: significant at 5%; *: significant at 1%

Standard errors in round parentheses. p-values in squared parentheses.

Table 5. Panel regression output (fixed effects); robustness check

Dep. variable: cost overrun (%)	(1)	(2)	(3)
average bid auction, limited entry	-9.518** (4.373)	-5.143** (2.439)	-4.267*** (1.105)
log (reserve price), limited entry	0.827 (2.802)	0.090 (1.310)	0.114 (0.618)
n. expected work days/100, limited entry	0.025 (0.015)	0.014* (0.007)	0.012*** (0.003)
n. bidders/100, limited entry	0.366 (0.234)	0.200 (0.137)	0.188*** (0.060)
average bid auction, free entry	3.868 (4.184)	-1.554 (2.157)	-1.127 (1.238)
log(reserve price), free entry	1.830 (2.757)	0.806 (1.258)	1.154* (0.597)
n. expected work days/100, free entry	-0.004 (0.010)	0.001 (0.008)	-0.007* (0.004)
n. bidders/100, free entry	-0.011 (0.025)	0.021 (0.0139)	0.007 (0.007)
auction category: water	1.738 (4.150)	1.306 (2.981)	0.359 (1.467)
auction category: plant	-5.989 (3.899)	-1.818 (2.564)	0.389 (1.131)
auction category: road	0.165 (1.899)	-1.121 (1.262)	-0.354 (0.575)
year: 2004	-1.645 (2.083)	-2.814*** (1.045)	-1.494** (0.596)
year: 2006	1.039 (1.919)	- -	0.094 (0.547)
constant	-2.790 (16.413)	5.796 (7.180)	3.596 (3.379)
n. auctions	296	681	877
n. procurers	108	215	229
avg. n. auctions per procurer	2.74	3.17	3.83
Fraction of variance due to ind. effects	0.588	0.600	0.492
Hausman test	6.70	2.19	12.010
(random effects Vs. fixed effects panel)	[0.917]	[0.000]	[0.527]
Test individual effects=0	1.77	6.77	1.840
(pooled OLS Vs. fixed effects panel)	[0.000]	[0.872]	[0.000]

Note: ***: significant at 10%; **: significant at 5%; *: significant at 1%

Standard errors in round parentheses. p-values in squared parentheses.

In column (1), we consider only auctions held by municipalities and with reserve price between 283,000 euros and 1 million euros. In column (2), we consider only auctions held between 2004 and 2005. In column (3), we remove the 10% top and 10% bottom cost overruns.




Figure 1: Distribution of the winning discount, the cost overrun and the work delay