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# FOREWORD

This data report provides statistics on the organization, management and performance of different ways of providing maintenance services within the municipal park and road sector(s) in Denmark. The statistics relies on data collected in the period from November 2014 to February 2015 through an online survey send to managers in all 98 municipalities in Denmark.

The data report is a part of a research project with the title *’Innovations in the organization of public-private collaboration in an international perspective with focus on technical maintenance services’* (acronym: INOPS).[[1]](#footnote-1) Overall, INOPS seeks to address the following three primary research questions in relation to marketization of maintenance services within the municipal park and road sector:

1. *Which forms of contracting out and public–private co-operations are used and considered by municipalities in Denmark, Sweden, Norway and England?*
2. *Which driving forces, considerations and rationales are in play in the various countries when municipalities develop and implement various forms of public–private co-operation?*
3. *What are the requirements/conditions, advantage and disadvantages of various forms of contracting out and public–private co-operation within the individual countries and between the countries?*

A part of the output from INOPS is altogether four data report including data for Denmark, Norway, Sweden and England. The data underlying the reports provide one source for addressing the three research question.

INOPS is carried out in collaboration between researchers from Denmark, Norway, Sweden and England. INOPS has been led by Andrej Christian Lindholst and Morten Balle Hansen, Aalborg University. Partners in Sweden have been Ylva Norén Bretzner and Johanna Selin, School of Public Administration, Gothenburg as well as Bengt Persson and Thomas Barfoed Randrup, Swedish Agricultural University, Alnarp. The partner in Norway has been Merethe Dotterud Leiren, Norwegian Centre for Transport Research. Partners in England have been Mel Burton and Nicola Dempsey, University of Sheffield and Peter Neal, Peter Neal Consulting Ltd. Partners in Denmark have been Ole Helby Petersen, Roskilde University and Kurt Houlberg, KORA. The project has been co-financed by Hedeselskabet Strategi & Innovation and Aalborg University. Hedeselskabet Strategi & Innovation has been represented by Lisbeth Sevel.

Without the contributions from a long list of people and organizations it would not have been possible to carry out the various research tasks in INOPS. The partners in INOPS especially thank all employees in the municipal park and road departments that devoted some of their time to answer our survey. The partners would also thank colleagues at Aalborg University and managers in municipal park and road departments which provided feedback in the design of the survey as well as on the findings from the survey.

# INTRODUCTION

This data report provides descriptive statistics on the organization, management and performance of different ways of providing maintenance services within the municipal park and road sector(s) in Denmark. The statistics summarise data collected between November 2014 and February 2015 through an online survey send to municipal park and road managers in all 98 municipalities in Denmark. The report does not provide any in-depth analysis of the data.

The data report is structured in two main sections. The section on ‘Methods and Materials’ shortly explains how the survey designed, how data was collected and how the resulting dataset was analysed. In addition, the section evaluates the representativeness of the dataset. The section on ‘Data’ report key descriptive statistics for all questions in the survey. The section firstly presents key statistics on the characteristics of the survey’s primary respondents as well as the included municipalities in the dataset. Secondly, the section presents key statistics on how the provision of maintenance services for parks and roads are organized and managed. Thirdly, the section presents key statistics on the performance of various ways of organizing and managing the provision of maintenance services for parks and roads.

Separate appendices contain the original Danish version of the survey and the text used for invitation and reminder of respondents.

The provided statistics in the report are not intended to be read in any particular order, i.e. from start to the end. A reader is welcomed to use the list of tables to find statistics of particular interest. It should be noted that the dataset provides almost endless opportunities for generating statistics and the present report only contains the most fundamental key statistics for individual questions in the survey. Further analysis will be done in subsequent publications, communications and eventual upon request.

# MATERIALS AND METHODS

The dataset for the present report was collected as part of a larger research project (INOPS) on the use of various arrangements for providing parks and roads maintenance services at the level of local governments / municipalities in Denmark Sweden, Norway and England. The dataset for the report was generated through a survey distributed electronically to all Danish municipalities in the period from November 2014 and until February 2015.

Time line of data collection:

14. November, 2014: Invitations send out to contacts in all municipalities.

24. November, 2014: First round of reminders send out to contacts in all non-responding and partial responding municipalities

7. December, 2014: Second round of reminders send out to all to contacts in non-responding and partial responding municipalities

21. January, 2015: Third round of reminders send out to all to contacts in non-responding and partial responding municipalities

February, 2015: Phone calls to remaining non-responding municipalities.

5. March, 2015: End of data collection.

Items in the survey were designed to uncover key dimensions of the ways service provisions are organized and managed and how various types of organization and management perform. Earlier research was reviewed in order to provide a theoretical framework for important constructs and guide the operationalization of these constructs. Several pilot tests with respondents and researchers were carried out based on draft versions and later a revised electronic version of the survey. Both the number, wording and response scales for items in the survey were adjusted according to the provided feedback. In the final survey, most items used 11-point numeric response scales with two anchors. Both one-dimensional (e.g. from ‘not at all’ to ‘very high degree’) and two-dimensional scales (e.g. from ‘very un-satisfied’ to ‘very satisfied’) were used pending on the individual item. The survey also included some items which used categorical response scales (e.g.’ yes’ or ‘no’) as well as ordinal scales. An open response option (for comments) was furthermore included for all items.

The target population for the survey was all 98 Danish Municipalities (N=98). Primary respondents for Danish municipalities were midlevel managers in the municipal organization with responsibilities for roads and/or park services. One, two, or in some cases up to three, midlevel managers were chosen as respondents from each municipality due to their expected insights in more operational dimensions as well as more strategic dimensions of service provisions. Due to variations in internal organisation of park and road responsibilities it was necessary to identify more than one respondent for many municipalities. List of respondents and contact details was collected through contact with professional associations, use of phone books for professionals in the service sector(s), as well as inspection of websites and direct contact to some municipalities. Altogether 182 respondents were included in a final list.

Data collection was carried out electronically in the survey program ‘SurveyXact’. An initial invitation was subsequently followed by two rounds of electronic reminders targeted respondents that didn’t respond firstly as well as respondents that had provided partial answers. Finally, non-responding municipals were contacted by phone for a last reminder.

The final dataset was created by merging replies from altogether 115 respondents which provided complete or partial complete data entries in the online survey. In this process one respondent was identified as the primary respondent for the municipality. Key criteria for selection of primary respondents were: position in the hierarchy, job title and responsibilities of the respondent’s department. Any non-completed questions from a primary respondent were eventually filled with completed questions from other (secondary) respondents in the same municipality.

The average age of primary respondents for each municipality was 53 years with a standard deviation of 9.3 years (N = 60). The average tenure in the public sector and current municipality for respondents were respectively 19.2 years (N = 60, S.D. = 9.1) and 11.3 years (N = 58, S.D. = 8.7). 76 % of primary respondents were furthermore identified as males (23 % were females and 1% provided no information on gender).

The final dataset included data for organization of parks and/or roads services in altogether 75 out of a total of 98 Danish municipalities equal to 76.5% of all Danish municipalities. 73 municipalities provided specific data for the organisation of road maintenance and 73 municipalities provided specific data for the organisation of park maintenance. Statistical tests for differences between the included cases in the dataset (75 municipalities) and cases not represented in the dataset (23 municipalities) revealed no significant statistical differences regarding geographical distribution across the five main regions in Denmark, municipal size (measured by inhabitants in 2014) as well as the level of involvement of private contractors (measured by the share of maintenance budgets allocated to private contractors). Chi-test was used for testing bias in geographical distribution with municipals divided into five regional categories and measures of bivariate correlation were used for test of bias in municipal size measured by inhabitants. Statistics for chi-test of difference between expected and observed cases in the regional distribution were chi-square = 2.133, p = .711 (two sided). Statistics for the bivariate correlation between cases in the dataset and size of municipalities were found non-significant with a p-value = .310. Differences between the average uses of private contractors for parks and roads (estimated with register based data) was also found insignificant (p = .158 for parks and p = .141 for roads). Given the acceptable representation of municipalities in the final dataset (76.5 %) and the computed non-bias toward municipal size, geographical distribution and average use of private contractors our survey should provide a fairly representative dataset for all municipalities in Denmark.

The software package SPSS 23.0 has been used for organizing all data and as the primary tool for statistical analysis and computation of statistics. The report relies mainly on descriptive statistics in the presentation of survey data, but some explorative and comparative analysis is provided as well. All statistics is summarized in tables and/or figures. The original survey items, upon which the data generation and statistics is based, are found in a separate appendix (not included in this document).

# DATA

## CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS AND MUNICIPALITIES

### Summary

This section provides short descriptive statistics on the respondents and the municipalities in this survey as well as providing analysis of the representativeness of the dataset.

A total of 75 out of all 98 Danish municipalities equal to 77 % of all Danish municipalities are represented in the dataset. Analysis for representativeness regarding geographical distribution and municipal size revealed no statistical significant bias.

The average age for primary respondents are 53 years and about two-third of all respondents is aged between 43.7 and 62.3 years. 76 % of all primary respondents are men. Virtual all respondents are aged 40 years or older. The average length of employment in the current municipality for primary respondents is 11.3 years while the average employment in the public sector is 19.2 years. Only 13 % of primary respondents have been employed in the public sector for 10 years or less while 59 % have been employed in their current municipality for 10 years or less.

The three most widespread managerial responsibilities for the departments of primary respondents are: Operational planning (respectively 88 % for parks and 89 % for roads), Budget planning (87 % and 88 %) and monitoring of maintenance (respectively 83 % and 81 %). The least widespread responsibility is general planning, strategy and development (respectively 36 % and 45 %).

**General characteristics of Danish Municipalities**

Table 1 shows key characteristics of Danish municipalities within the five administrative regions in Denmark. Overall, differences in Danish municipalities’ size, measured by the number of inhabitants and physical area are relatively small. The average number of inhabitants is 57,547. Seven municipalities have populations larger than 100,000 inhabitants. Copenhagen municipality has by far the largest population (570,000 inhabitants). Seven municipalities, of which five are islands, have populations less than 20,000 inhabitants. 30 out of the remaining 82 municipalities have populations between 50,000 and 100,000 while 52 have populations between 20,000 and 50,000 inhabitants. On the *average* at the regional level the most densely populated (686.5 inhabitants per km2) as well as the geographically smallest municipalities (2,558 km2) are located in the Capital Region while the least densely populated (73.8 inhabitants per km2) are located in North Denmark and the geographically largest municipalities (12,737 km2) located in the Central Region. The three geographically largest municipalities, Ringkøbing-Skjern (1470 km2), Viborg (1409 km2) and Herning (1321 km2) are located in Central Denmark.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 1.  Characteristics of Danish municipalities. | | | | | | | | |
| *Regional location* | | Number of municipalities | *Municipal size within region  (population) a* | | Municipal size within region (area, km2) | | | Population per area (km2) within region | |
| Mean | Total | | Mean | Total | Mean | |
|  | South Denmark | 22 | 54,732 | 1,204,111 | | 569 | 12,524 | 96.1 | |
|  | Capital Region | 29 | 60,550 | 1,755,974 | | 88 | 2,558 | 686.5 | |
|  | North Denmark | 11 | 52,849 | 581,340 | | 716 | 7,879 | 73.8 | |
|  | Central Denmark | 19 | 67,340 | 1,279,467 | | 670 | 12,737 | 100.5 | |
|  | Region Zealand | 17 | 48,160 | 818,732 | | 425 | 7,223 | 113.4 | |
|  | *All of Denmark* | 98 | 57,547 | 5,639,625 | | 438 | *42,924* | 131.4 | |
| *Note: all figures based on 2014 data from Statistics Denmark.* | | | | | | | | | |

**Gender characteristics of primary respondents**

Table 2 provides an overview of the distribution of gender for primary respondents for all cases in the dataset.

About three-fourths of the primary respondents are males. For one case (municipality) no direct or indirect information on gender was provided.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 2. Respondents: Distribution according to gender | | | |
| Gender of primary respondent | | Frequencies | |
| Absolute | Relative |
|  | Female | 17 | 23% |
|  | Male | 57 | 76% |
|  | No information | 1 | 1% |
| Total | | 75 | 100% |
| N = 75  The table shows the distribution of primary respondents according to gender.  Data is based on the following question: What is your gender? Altogether 60 replies were provided for primary respondents. For remaining respondents (not providing direct information about gender) the gender was determined by the name of the respondent.  Survey item: Q66d | | | |

**Age characteristics of primary respondents**

Table 3 provides an overview of the age of primary respondents for each municipality in the dataset. For altogether 60 cases (municipalities) information on the age of the primary respondent was provided.

Almost all primary respondents are aged 40 years or more. The average age is 53 years and two-third of all respondents is aged between 43.7 and 62.3 years.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 3. Respondents: Distribution according to age groups | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | | Distribution in age groups | | | | | | | | |
| N | Mean | S.D. |  | Age  30 – 34 | | Age  35 – 39 | Age  40 - 44 | Age  45 - 49 | Age  50 - 54 | Age  55 - 59 | Age  60 – 64 | Age  65 or more |
| 60 | 53 | 9.3 | Absolute | 0 | | 3 | 10 | 12 | 12 | 9 | 9 | 5 |
| Relative | 0% | | 5% | 17% | 20% | 20% | 15% | 15% | 8% |
| N = 60  The table shows the distribution of primary respondents according to age group.  Data is based on the following question: “In what year were you born?”  Survey item: Q66c | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Employment characteristics of primary respondents**

Table 3 provides an overview of the distribution of primary respondents according to years of employment in their current municipality and in the public sector in general.

The average length of employment in the current municipality for primary respondents is 11.3 years while the average employment in the public sector is 19.2 years. Only 13% of primary respondents have been employed in the public sector for 10 years or less while 59% have been employed in their current municipality for 10 years or less.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 4. Respondents: Distribution according to years of employment in current municipality and the public sector | | | | | | | | | |
| Years of employment in | N | Mean | S.D. | Distribution for years of employment in municipality and the public sector | | | | | |
|  | 0 - 5  years | 6 - 10  years | 11 - 20  years | 21 - 30  years | more than 30 years |
| *Current municipality* | 58 | 11,3 | 9,1 | Absolute | 15 | 19 | 16 | 5 | 3 |
| Relative | 26% | 33% | 28% | 9% | 5% |
| *The public sector* | 60 | 19,2 | 8,7 | Absolute | 2 | 6 | 32 | 13 | 7 |
| Relative | 3% | 10% | 53% | 22% | 12% |
| N = 60  The table shows the distribution of primary respondents according to years of employment in their current municipality and in the public sector in general.  Data is based on the following questions: “In how many years have you all in all been employed in the municipality where you are currently employed?” and “In how many years have you all in all been employed in the public sector?”  Survey items: Q66a and Q66b | | | | | | | | | |

**Regional distribution of municipalities in the dataset**

Table 4 provides an overview of the distribution of municipalities in the dataset and all municipalities in Denmark according to national regions. For altogether 75 cases (municipalities) information was provided.

Regional representativeness is highest for the region of Central Denmark with data for 84% of all municipalities in the region and lowest in Region Zealand with data for 65% of all municipalities in the region. Altogether 77% or 75 out of all 98 Danish municipalities are included in the dataset.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 5. Distribution of municipalities in the dataset according to national region | | | | | |
| National region | Frequencies | | | | Regional representativeness\* |
| All municipalities | | Municipalities in dataset | |
| Absolute | Relative | Absolute | Relative |
| *South Denmark Region* | 22 | 22% | 17 | 23% | 77% |
| *Capital Region of Denmark* | 29 | 30% | 22 | 29% | 76% |
| *North Denmark Region* | 11 | 11% | 9 | 12% | 82% |
| *Central Denmark Region* | 19 | 19% | 16 | 21% | 84% |
| *Region Zealand* | 17 | 17% | 11 | 15% | 65% |
| All | 98 | 100% | 75 | 100% | 77% |
| N = 98  The table shows the distribution of municipalities in the dataset and all municipalities in Denmark according to national regions.  Data is based on the identification of each municipality according to their regional location in Demark.  \* ‘Regional representativeness’ indicate the number of municipalities in the dataset as percentage of all municipalities according to region. | | | | | |

**Responsibilities of primary respondent’s departments**

Table 5 provides an overview of the distribution in the responsibilities of the respondent’s department. Information on the responsibilities of the department was provided for altogether 75 cases (municipalities).

The three most widespread responsibilities for the departments of primary respondents are: Operational planning (respectively 88% for parks and 89% for roads), Budget planning (87% and 88%) and monitoring of maintenance (83% and 81%). The less widespread responsibility is planning, strategy and development (36% and 45%).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 6. Distribution in the dataset of overall responsibilities of the respondents’ departments | | | | | |
|  |  | Parks | | Roads | |
| Responsibility |  | Absolute | Relative | Absolute | Relative |
| Planning, strategy and development | | 27 | 36% | 34 | 45% |
| Administration |  | 49 | 65% | 54 | 72% |
| Operational planning |  | 66 | 88% | 67 | 89% |
| Monitoring of maintenance | | 62 | 83% | 61 | 81% |
| Provision of maintenance operations (provider function) | | 48 | 64% | 49 | 65% |
| Budget planning and responsibility | | 65 | 87% | 66 | 88% |
| No responsibilities |  | 2 | 3% | 2 | 3% |
| All municipalities |  | 75 | 100% | 75 | 100% |
| N = 75  The table shows the distribution in the dataset of the overall responsibilities of the respondent’s department.  Data is based on replies to questions whether the respondent’s department had responsibility for seven different tasks within park and road administration.  Survey item Q2 | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Characteristics of municipal size of municipalities in the dataset**

Table 6 provides a comparison of mean municipal size in the dataset with the mean municipal size of all Danish municipalities.

The average population of municipalities included in the dataset is 61,400. The average population of all Danish municipalities is 57,547. Independent T-test shows no statistical significant difference in population size between the municipalities who are represented in the dataset and the 23 municipalities who isn’t.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 7. Comparison of mean municipal size (population) in the dataset | | | |
|  | | Population 2014 | |
| SURVEY DATA AVAILABLE | N | Mean | S.D. |
| No | 23 | 44,984 | 40,321 |
| Yes | 75 | 61,400 | 73,683 |
| *All* | *98* | *57,547* | *67,524* |
| N = 98  Data is based on population size of Danish municipalities for 2014 (Source: Danmarks statistik).  Independent T-test shows no statistical significant differences between means for cases with available survey data and cases with no available survey data, t(96) = -1.020, p =.310. | | | |

**Average budget allocations for private contractors (register based data)**

Table 8 shows the average allocation of budget (percentage of overall maintenance budget) for private contractors for park maintenance (un-weighted, 2014) for municipalities included and not included in the dataset The average budget allocation for private contractors is based on register based data from dst.dk. The average budget allocation for private contractors is higher for municipalities not included compared to municipalities included in the dataset. Independent t-test shows that the difference is insignificant (p = .156). The average for the sample (34.1 %) is furthermore very close to the average for all municipalities (36.0 %).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 8.  Average budget allocations for private contractors (un-weighted) for park maintenance in 2014 for municipalities in the dataset. | | | |
|  | | Average use of private contractors for park maintenance (2014) | |
| SURVEY DATA AVAILABLE | n | Mean | S.D. |
| No | 23 | 42.0 % | 23.0 % |
| Yes | 75 | 34.1 % | 23.3 % |
| *All municipalities* | *98* | *36.0 %* | *23.1 %* |
| Note: data based on available register based data from dst.dk.   Independent T-test shows no statistical significant differences between means for cases with available survey data and cases with no available survey data, t(96) = -1.429, p = .156. | | | |

Table 9 shows the average allocation of budget (percentage of overall maintenance budget) for private contractors for road maintenance (un-weighted, 2014) for municipalities included and not included in the dataset. The average budget allocation for private contractors is based on register based data (dst.dk). The average budget allocation for private contractors is higher for municipalities not included compared to municipalities included in the dataset. Independent t-test shows that the difference is insignificant (p = .141). The average for the sample (47.7 %) is furthermore very close to the average for all municipalities (46.2 %).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 9.  Average budget allocations for private contractors (un-weighted) for road maintenance in 2014 for municipalities in the dataset. | | | |
|  | | Average use of private contractors for road maintenance (2014) | |
| SURVEY DATA AVAILABLE | n | Mean | S.D. |
| No | 23 | 41,4 % | 12,0 % |
| Yes | 75 | 47,7 % | 19,1 % |
| *All municipalities* | *98* | *46,2 %* | *17,9 %* |
| Note: data based on available register based data from dst.dk.   Independent T-test shows no statistical significant differences between means for cases with available survey data and cases with no available survey data, t(96) = -1.484, p = .141. | | | |

## SERVICE PROVISION: PROVIDERS, PURPOSE AND SUPPORT

### Summary

This section provides data and statistics on who provides maintenance services, the purpose of using different services providers as well as the internal backing for the use of different types of services providers.

85% of all Danish municipalities use a mix of private contractors and in-house providers for park and/or road maintenance services. The percentage of municipalities that only or partial use private contractors are slightly higher for road maintenance services (92%) than for park maintenance services (81%). The percentage of municipalities that only use in-house providers is higher for park maintenance services (19%) than for road maintenance services (8%). A mix of private contractors and in-house providers is the most frequent arrangement for provision of park maintenance (70%) as well as road maintenance (81%) among Danish municipalities. Only very few municipalities use other types of provision for park and/or road maintenance.

The (un-weighted) average allocation of maintenance budget for private contractors is 27.2% for park services and 47.2% for road services. The variation in the allocation of maintenance budgets between private contractors and in-house provision is considerable for both park services (S.D. = 32.1) and road services (S.D. = 26.8%). The respondents’ evaluation of the optimal allocation of budgets between private contractors and in-house provision indicate that private contractors’ share of budgets should increase for park maintenance services while the optimal share is approximately at level of the actual share for road maintenance services. The highest ranked purpose for using private contractors is *‘low maintenance costs’* and *‘test and benchmark of prices’* while the highest ranked purposes for using in-house provision is ‘to ensure flexible maintenance’ and to ‘ensure capacity to carry out maintenance work’. The political support for contracting out (mean = 6.8) is found to be scored slightly higher than for the administrative to support (mean = 6.1). The degree of continued debates about the use of contracting out is also scored slightly higher for the political level (mean = 6.0) compared to the administrative level (mean = 5.6). The political support for using use in-house provision (mean = 6.8) is found to be scored at the same level as the administrative support (6.9). The degree of continued debates about the use of in-house provision is scored higher for the political level (mean = 6.5) compared to the administrative level (mean = 5.7).

### The use of different of types of service providers

Table 10 provides an overview of Danish municipalities’ use of different provider types for provision of park and road maintenance services. 85% of the municipalities use both private contractors and in-house providers for park and/or road maintenance services.

The percentage of municipalities that only or partial use private contractors is slightly higher for road maintenance services (92%) compared to park maintenance services (81%). The percentage of municipalities that only use in-house providers is higher for park maintenance services (19%) than for road maintenance services (8%). A mix of private contractors and in-house providers is the most frequent arrangement for provision of park maintenance (70%) as well as road maintenance (81%) among Danish municipalities. Only very few municipalities use other types of provision for park and/or road maintenance (3%).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 10. The use of different provider types for provision of parks and road maintenance services | | | | |
| Type of provider | | Park maintenance | Road maintenance | Park and/or Road maintenance |
| N = 74 | N = 73 | N = 75 |
| Use private contractors (only or partly) | | 81 % (60) | 92 % (67) | 96 % (72) |
|  | *Only use private contractors* | *11 % (8)* | *11 % (8)* | *11 % (8)* |
|  | *Partly use private contractors* | *70% (52)* | *81 % (59)* | *85 % (64)* |
| Use in-house provider (only or partly) | | 89 % (66) | 89 % (65) | 89 % (67) |
|  | *Only use in-house provider* | *19 % (14)* | *8 % (6)* | *4 % (3)* |
|  | *Partly use in-house provider* | *70% (52)* | *81 % (59)* | *85 % (64)* |
| Other type of provision*\** | | 3 % (2)a | 1 % (1)b | 3 % (2)b |
|  | *Only use other type of provision* | *0 % (0) a* | *0 % (0)b* | *0 % (0) a* |
|  | *Partly use other type of provision* | *3 % (2)a* | *1 % (1)b* | *3 % (2)a* |
| *N = 75*  *Data is based on categorical questions (yes / no / don’t know) on whether the municipality used different types of providers for park and/or road maintenance services.*  *\* ‘Other type of provision’ include: ‘public-private company’, ‘other municipal provider’, Inter-municipal company as well as ‘other arrangements’.*  *a Include: private land owner association (lodsejerforening) and inter-municipal company.*  *b Include: Inter-municipal company.*  *Survey Item: Q4* | | | | |

Figure 1 illustrates the distributions of Danish municipalities’ use of private contractors and in-house providers for park and road maintenance services.

Figure 1.   
The use of private contractors and/or in-house providers for park and road maintenance

N = 75

**Distribution (un-weighted) of parks and roads maintenance budgets between provider types**

Table 11 provides an overview of the current distribution of parks and roads maintenance budgets between different types of service providers.

The (un-weighted) average allocation of maintenance budget for private contractors is 27.2% for parks and 47.2% for roads. The variation in the allocation of maintenance budgets between private contractors and in-house provision is considerable for both park services (S.D. = 32.1) and road services (S.D. = 26.8%).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 11. Current distribution (un-weighted) of parks and roads maintenance budgets between different types of service providers | | | | | | |
|  | Parks | | | Roads | | |
| Statistics**\*** | Private contractors | In-house provider | Other type of provider\*\* | Private contractors | In-house provider | Other type of provider\*\* |
| N | 74 | 74 | 74 | 72 | 72 | 73 |
| Mean | 27.2 % | 72.6 % | .2 % | 47.2 % | 52,7 % | 0 % |
| S.D. | 32.1 % | 32.1 % | 1.3 % | 26.8 % | 26.8 % | 0 % |
| Median | 15.0 % | 82.5 % | 0 % | 48.0 % | 52.0 % | 0 % |
| Low value | 0 % | 0 % | 0 % | 0 % | 0 % | 0 % |
| High Value | 100 % | 100 % | 10 % | 100 % | 100 % | 0 % |
| *N= 75*  *The table reports the current distribution of maintenance budgets on different types of providers.*  *Data is based on self-reported estimates based on the size of budgets distributed for different arrangements.*  *\*\* ‘other type of provider includes: ‘public-private company’, ‘other municipal provider’, inter-municipal company as well as ‘other arrangements’.*  *Survey Item: Q5* | | | | | | |

**Optimal allocation of maintenance budgets on different types of service providers**

Table 12 provides an overview of primary respondents’ opinion on the optimal allocation of maintenance budgets between different types of service providers.

In the case of park maintenance budgets, the optimal allocation to private contractors is 33.9% on the average while 51.9% on the average for road maintenance budgets. Allocation of budgets to other types of service providers is the minimal on the average.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 12.  Opinion on optimal allocation of maintenance budgets on different types of service providers | | | | | | | |
|  |  | **Provider type\*** | | | | | |
|  |  | Private contractor | In-house | Shared municipal company/provider | Other public authority | Public-private company | Other type of provider organization |
| Parks | Mean | 33.9% | 61.8% | .7% | 0% | 1.9% | 1.8% |
|  | S.D. | 29.9% | 32.5% | 5.3% | 0% | 13.3% | 13.2% |
|  | Median | 25% | 75% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
|  | Low value | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
|  | High value | 100% | 100% | 40% | 0% | 100% | 100% |
| Roads | Mean | 51.9% | 45.5% | .7% | 0% | 1.9% | 0% |
|  | S.D. | 25.9% | 26.4% | 5.3% | 0% | 13.3% | 0% |
|  | Median | 50% | 50% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
|  | Low value | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
|  | High value | 100% | 100% | 40% | 0% | 100% | 0% |
| N = 57  The table reports statistics on respondents’ opinion about what the optimal distribution would be for maintenance budgets on different types of providers.  .  Survey items: Q64a and Q64b. | | | | | | | |

Paired t-tests between the data underlying Table 11 and Table 12 show that the difference in means between actual and optimal distribution of park maintenance budgets for in-house providers is statistically significant at p-level = .05, where t(56) = 2.367, p = .02. The statistics for the difference in means between distribution of actual and optimal park maintenance budgets for private contractors is non-significant at p-level = .05, where t(56) = 1.379, p = .173. The same tests for current and optimal road maintenance budgets for respectively private contractors and in-house providers show no statistical significant differences.

### Purposes for using private contractors and in-house providers

Table 13 provides an overview on the importance of altogether seven different purposes for using private contractors for provision of maintenance services for parks and roads. Purposes are measured on a response scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The highest ranked purposes are *‘low maintenance costs’* (mean = 7.5) and *‘test and benchmark prices’* (mean = 7.5) while *‘development of internal organization and work routines’* (mean = 5.0) and *‘development and renewal of areas and services’* (mean = 4.6) are the lowest ranked. In general there is high variation among the municipalities in the importance of the various purposes for using private contractors. The variation is smallest for *‘low maintenance costs’* (S.D. = 2.0) and highest for *‘provide work the municipality cannot do’* (S.D. = 3.0).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 13. Purposes for using private contractors (parks and roads) | | | | |
| Purpose\* | | N | Mean | S.D. |
|  | *Low maintenance costs* | 67 | 7,5 | 2,0 |
|  | *Test and benchmark prices* | 66 | 7,5 | 2,2 |
|  | *Provide work the municipality cannot do* | 65 | 6,7 | 3,0 |
|  | *Effective management of maintenance* | 66 | 5,2 | 2,8 |
|  | *High maintenance quality* | 64 | 5,1 | 2,7 |
|  | *Develop internal organization and work routines* | 64 | 5,0 | 2,3 |
|  | *Develop and renew areas and services* | 64 | 4,6 | 2,3 |
| *N = 67*  *The table reports about the purposes for using private contractors in both departments of parks and roads.*  *Data is based on responses on the degree the respondent finds various purposes a key part of the municipality’s rationale for using private contractors for parks and road maintenance services.*  *All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘Very high degree’).  Survey item: Q24* | | | | |

Table 14 provides an overview on the importance of altogether 11 different purposes for using in-house provision for maintenance of parks and roads. Purposes are measured on a response scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The highest ranked purposes are *to ensure flexible maintenance* and *ensure capacity to carry out maintenance work* while *to ensure democratic control* and *development and renewal of areas and services* are the lowest ranked. The variation in the importance of the various purposes for using in-house provision differs to some degree between the various purposes. The variation between the municipalities is smallest for *‘to ensure flexible maintenance’* (S.D. = 1.6) and highest for *‘provide work only the municipality can do’* (S.D. = 2.9).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 14. Purposes for using in-house provision (parks and roads) | | | | |
| Purpose\* | | N | Mean | S.D. |
|  | *To ensure flexible maintenance* | 61 | 8,8 | 1,6 |
|  | *Ensure capacity to carry out maintenance work* | 61 | 8,1 | 1,9 |
|  | *Effective management of maintenance* | 61 | 7,7 | 2,3 |
|  | *High maintenance quality* | 61 | 7,6 | 2,1 |
|  | *Ensure good job conditions* | 61 | 7,5 | 2,0 |
|  | *Low maintenance costs* | 61 | 7,3 | 2,2 |
|  | *Develop internal organization and work routines* | 61 | 7,1 | 2,3 |
|  | *Test and benchmark prices* | 61 | 6,8 | 2,6 |
|  | *Provide work only the municipality can provide* | 61 | 6,6 | 2,9 |
|  | *Develop and renew areas and services* | 60 | 6,5 | 2,4 |
|  | *To ensure democratic control* | 59 | 6,5 | 2,5 |
| N = 61  The table reports about the purposes for using in-house provision in case of both parks and roads.  *Data is based on responses on the degree the respondent finds various purposes a key part of the municipality’s rationale for using in-house provision for parks and road maintenance services.*  *All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘Very high degree’).*  *Survey item: Q28* | | | | |

### Political and administrative support

Table 14 provides an overview of degree of political and administrative support for contracting out and debates about contracting out in the municipalities. The degree of debate and support is measured on a response scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The mean score for political aim to contract out (6.8) is slightly higher than the mean score for the administrative aim to contract out (6.1). The degree of continued debates about contracting out is scored slightly higher for the political level (mean = 6.0) compared to the administrative level (mean = 5.6).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 15. Political and administrative support for contracting out | | | | |
| Dimension | | N | Mean | S.D |
|  | Political aim to contracting out | 68 | 6.8 | 2.4 |
|  | Administrative aim to contracting out | 66 | 6.1 | 2.2 |
|  | Continued political debates about contracting out | 66 | 6.0 | 2.9 |
|  | Continued administrative debates about contracting out | 67 | 5.6 | 2.6 |
| *N = 68*  *The table reports about the political and administrative support for contracting out.*  *All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘Very high degree’).*  *Survey Item: Q23* | | | | |

Table 15 provides an overview of degree of political and administrative support for in-house provision and debates about in-house provision in the municipalities. The degree of debate and support is measured on a response scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The mean score for political aim to use in-house provision (6.8) is slightly lower than the mean score for the administrative aim to use in-house provision (6.9). The degree of continued debates about the use of in-house provision is scored higher for the political level (mean = 6.5) compared to the administrative level (mean = 5.7).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 16. Political and administrative support for in-house provision | | | | |
| Dimension | | N | Mean | S.D |
|  | Political aim in the municipality | 48 | 6.8 | 2.5 |
|  | Administrative aim in the municipality | 48 | 6.9 | 2.3 |
|  | Continued political debates in the municipality | 48 | 6.5 | 2.7 |
|  | Continued administrative debates in the municipality | 47 | 5.7 | 2.6 |
| *N = 48*  *The table reports about the political and administrative support for in-house provision.*  *All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘Very high degree’).*  *Survey item: Q36* | | | | |

## MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION

### Summary

This section provides data and statistics on the management and organization of the provision of park and road maintenance services.

The average size of maintenance budgets is found to be around 16.5 mill. DKK/year for parks departments and 48.9 mill. DKK/year for road departments. The average maintenance budget at the department level per inhabitant in the municipality is 275 DKK/year for parks and 887 DKK/year for roads.

Measured in a scale from 0 (not at all) to 10 (very high degree) the most important features of formal contract relations between park and road departments in Danish municipalities and private contractors are *‘juridical clauses / agreements’* (mean score = 7.8) and ‘*service specifications based on quantities and instruction and performance measures’* (mean score = 7.7)*.* The two least important features are: ‘*contractor’s involvement / contact with users’* (mean score = 2.9) and *‘economic incentives for investment, improvements and optimization’* (mean score = 2.8).

Measured in a scale from 0 (not at all) to 10 (very high degree) the most important features in the management approach toward private contractors are *‘use of face-to-face meetings and communications’* (mean score = 8.3) as well as *‘compliance to formal operational specifications’* (mean score = 7.3) and *‘fulfilment of strategic and long-term aims’* (mean score = 7.3). *‘Adherence to 'hard' sanctions for noncompliance’* is a less important feature in the management approach (mean score = 4.9).

The mutual institutionalization of behavioural norms in relations between municipalities and private contractors providing park and road maintenance services (measured on a scale from 0 = ‘not at all’ to 10 = ‘very high degree’) is strongest for norms related to the necessity of *‘collaboration’* (mean score = 8.1) and *‘flexibility’* toward change (mean score = 7.5). The institutionalization is weakest for norms related to ‘*trust’* (mean score = 5.4). While the institutionalization of norms for collaboration and flexibility varies in a minor degrees (respectively, S.D. = 1.4 and 1.7) between the municipalities the norms related to trust varies to a greater extent (S.D. = 2.7).

In the formal organisation of management of in-house providers the most two most frequently used instruments are: ‘*separate top management’* (85% of all municipalities) and ‘*separate budgeting / financial statements’* (82% of all municipalities). *‘Competitive tendering of in-house tasks’* is also commonly used (73% of all municipalities). The two least frequently used instruments are ‘*formal provider-purchaser split’* (49% of all municipalities) and ‘*a* *company ownership structure’* (6% of all municipalities).

The degree of separation of in-house provision, i.e. internally organized maintenance operations, from other responsibilities within municipal park and road sector (measured on a scale from 0 = ‘not at all’ to 10 = ‘very high degree’) is highest for responsibilities regarding *‘general planning, strategy and development’* (mean scores = 6.8 for parks and 7.0 for roads)and *‘administration and authority / legal tasks’* (mean score = 6.5 for both parks and roads)*.* The degree of separation is lowest for *“general maintenance planning”*, including: area registration, quality descriptions / service standards, maintenance plans, purchaser function (mean scores = 4.3 for parks and 4.7 for roads). In general the degree of separation of in-house provision varies immensely between the municipalities for both park and road services.

Measured in a scale from 0 (not at all) to 10 (very high degree) the most important features in the management approach toward in-house providers are *‘use of face-to-face meetings and communications’* (mean score = 8.4) as well as *‘fulfilment of strategic and long-term aims’* (mean score = 8.0) and *‘compliance to formal operational specifications’* (mean score = 7.6). *‘Adherence to 'hard' sanctions for noncompliance’* is a less important feature in the management approach (mean score = 2.2).

The mutual institutionalization of behavioural norms in relations within the municipality toward the department with responsibility for in-house provision of park and road maintenance services (measured on a scale from 0 = ‘not at all’ to 10 = ‘very high degree’) is strongest for norms related to the necessity of *‘collaboration’* (mean score = 8.2) and *‘solidarity’* (mean score = 7.9). The institutionalization is relatively weakest for norms related to ‘*trust’* (mean score = 6.9) and *‘lack of opportunism’* (mean score = 7.0). While the institutionalization of norms for collaboration and solidarity varies to in lesser degrees (respectively, S.D. = 1.7 and 1.9) between the municipalities the norms related to and lack of opportunism trust varies to a larger extent (respectively, S.D. = 2.4 and 2.6).

Park maintenance services provided in-house are found to be significantly more *‘difficult to monitor’* (34 % of all services) and less *‘easy to describe clearly and unambiguously’* (60% of all services) compared to services provided by private contractors (respectively 24% and 66% of all services). There are found no significant differences for road maintenance services provided in-house and by private contractors in the difficulties with monitoring and easiness of describing services clearly and unambiguously.

### Formal management of private providers

Table 17 provides an overview of the importance of eight possible formal contract dimensions for managing and organizing provision of park and road maintenance services by private contractors. All dimensions is measured on a response scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The two highest scored formal dimensions are ‘*juridical clauses / agreement’* (mean score = 7.8) and ‘*service specification based on quantities and instruction and performance measures’* (mean score = 7.7)*.* The two lowest scored formal dimensions are: ‘*contractor’s involvement / contact with users’* (mean score = 2.8) and *‘economic incentives for investment, improvements and optimization’* (mean score = 2.8)*.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 17. Formal contract dimensions for managing and organizing provision of park and road maintenance services by private contractors | | | |
| Importance of formal dimension\* | Descriptive statistics | | |
| N | Mean | S.D. |
| *Juridical clauses / agreement (§§)* | 67 | 7.8 | 2.3 |
| *Service specification based on quantities and instruction and performance measures* | 67 | 7.7 | 2.3 |
| *Formal sanctions in case of non-compliance* | 67 | 6.7 | 2.9 |
| *Competence requirements* | 67 | 6.6 | 2.4 |
| *Service specification based on functionality and purpose* | 66 | 6.4 | 3.0 |
| *Formal collaboration and joint planning* | 66 | 6.0 | 3.0 |
| *Contractor’s involvement / contact with users* | 65 | 2.9 | 2.8 |
| *Economic incentives for investment, improvements and optimization* | 66 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| *N=67*  *The table reports about the contract dimensions for managing and organizing provision of park and road maintenance services by private contractors.*  *\* All items measured on a scale from 0 to 10 (0 = ‘not at all’, 10 = ‘very high degree’) on the question. “On a scale from 0 to 10, please indicate in which degree the following content is a central part of your department’s arrangements with private contractors”.   Survey item: Q6* | | | |

### Formal management of in-house providers

Table 18 provides an overview of the frequencies of Danish municipalities’ use of eight possible formal instruments for managing and organizing in-house providers of road and park maintenance services.

The two most widespread instruments among the municipalities are ‘*separate top management’* (85% of all municipalities) and ‘*separate budgeting / financial statements’* (82% of all municipalities). The two least frequently used instruments are: ‘*formal provider-purchaser split’* (49% of all municipalities) and ‘*a* *company ownership structure’* (6% of all municipalities). *‘Competitive tendering of in-house tasks’* is also commonly used (73% of all municipalities).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 18. Formal instruments for managing and organizing in-house providers | | | | | | | |
| Formal instruments (municipal parks and roads service providers)\* | | Frequencies  (relative / absolute)\*\* | | | | | |
| Yes | | No | | Don’t know / no answer | |
|  | Separate top management | 85 % | 57 | 9 % | 6 | 6 % | 4 |
|  | Separate budgeting / financial statement | 82 % | 55 | 12 % | 8 | 6 % | 4 |
|  | Competitive tendering of in-house tasks | 73 % | 49 | 24 % | 16 | 4 % | 3 |
|  | Business plans | 69 % | 46 | 24 % | 16 | 7 % | 5 |
|  | Allowed to carry out tasks for other clients | 69 % | 46 | 25 % | 17 | 6 % | 4 |
|  | Separate monitoring function of maintenance operations | 63 % | 42 | 30 % | 20 | 7 % | 5 |
|  | Formal Purchaser-Provider split | 49 % | 33 | 42 % | 28 | 9 % | 6 |
|  | Company ownership structure (100% owned by municipality) | 6 % | 4 | 88 % | 59 | 6 % | 4 |
| N = 67  \* *The table shows the distribution of answers (‘yes’, ‘no’ and ‘don’t know’) for eight key management instruments on the question: “Which of the following management instruments does the municipality use for managing and organizing the in-house service provision of parks and roads maintenance?”*  *\*\* The relative frequencies count the share of the group of municipalities with in-house providers that use a particular management instrument.   Survey item: Q26* | | | | | | | |

### Size of park and road maintenance budgets

Based on survey data Table 19 shows the average size of total budgets (in mill. DKK) for maintenance of parks and roads at the level of departments and at the level of municipalities.

The average size of maintenance budgets for parks departments is indicated to be around 16.5 mill. DKK/year and 48.9 mill. DKK/year for road departments. On the average the budgets at the department level for road maintenance is three times as high as the average budget for park maintenance. The average maintenance budget at the department level per inhabitant in the municipality is 275 DKK/year for parks and 887 DKK/year for roads.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 19. Size of park and road maintenance budgets (mill. DKK) | | | | |
|  | Parks - Maintenance budgets | | Roads - Maintenance budgets | |
| Department\* | Municipality\*\* | Department\* | Municipality\*\* |
| N | 64 | 49 | 64 | 40 |
| Mean | 16.5 | 19.9 | 48.9 | 66.9 |
| S.D. | 26.0 | 36.1 | 39.6 | 70.8 |
| *The table shows the average size of total maintenance budgets for parks and roads at the level of departments and the municipality as a whole.*  *\* Department refers to the department’s maintenance budgets for parks or roads where the respondent is employed.*  *\*\*Municipality refers to the municipality’s overall maintenance budgets for parks and roads.  Survey item: Q3* | | | | |

### Management approach and relations to providers

Table 20 shows the average degree in which four important management instruments characterize Danish municipalities’ management of private contractors providing park and road maintenance services. Characteristics are measured on an 11-point scale from 0 to 10 with anchors (0 = not at all, 10 = very high degree).

The most important features in the management approach toward private contractors are *‘use of face-to-face meetings and communications’* (mean score = 8.3) as well as *‘compliance to formal operational specifications’* (mean score = 7.3) and *‘fulfilment of strategic and long-term aims’* (mean score = 7.3). *‘Adherence to 'hard' sanctions for noncompliance’* is a less important feature in the management approach (mean score = 4.9).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 20. Characteristics of Danish municipalities’ management of private contractors | | | | |
| Management instrument | | N | Mean | S.D. |
|  | *Adherence to 'hard' sanctions for noncompliance* | 65 | 4,9 | 2,3 |
|  | *Focus on compliance to formal operational specifications* | 67 | 7,3 | 1,8 |
|  | *Use of face-to-face meetings / communications* | 66 | 8,3 | 1,3 |
|  | *Focus on strategic and long-term aims* | 64 | 7,3 | 1,9 |
| *N = 67*  *The table shows the degree in which various management instruments characterize Danish municipalities’ management of private contractors providing park and road maintenance.*  *\* All items measured on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’) for four questions regarding the degree various management instruments characterize the municipality’s management of private contractors providing park and road maintenance.  Survey Item: Q10* | | | | |

Table 21 shows the average degree in which four important management instruments characterize Danish municipalities’ management of the in-house provision of park and road maintenance services. Characteristics are measured on an 11-point scale from 0 to 10 with anchors (0 = not at all, 10 = very high degree).

The most important features in the management approach toward in-house providers are *‘use of face-to-face meetings and communications’* (mean score = 8.4) as well as *‘fulfilment of strategic and long-term aims’* (mean score = 8.0) and *‘compliance to formal operational specifications’* (mean score = 7.6). *‘Adherence to 'hard' sanctions for noncompliance’* is a less important feature in the management approach (mean score = 2.2).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 21. Management of in-house provider | | | | |
| Management dimension | | N | Mean | S.D. |
|  | *Adherence to 'hard' sanctions for noncompliance* | 56 | 2,2 | 2,2 |
|  | *Focus on compliance to formal operational specifications* | 55 | 7,6 | 2,0 |
|  | *Use of face-to-face meetings / communications* | 55 | 8,4 | 1,5 |
|  | *Focus on fulfilment of strategic and long-term aims* | 54 | 8,0 | 1,8 |
| *N = 56*  *The table shows the degree in which various management instruments characterize Danish municipalities’ management of in-house provision of park and road maintenance.*  *\* All items measured on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’) for four questions regarding the degree various management instruments characterize the municipality’s management of in-house provision of park and road maintenance.  Survey item: Q32* | | | | |

Table 22 shows the degree in which contract management capacity for managing private contractors is evaluated as sufficient. The degree of sufficiency is measured on an 11-point scale from 0 to 10 with anchors (0 = not at all, 10 = very high degree).

The table shows that, on the average, *‘knowledge and experience’*, *‘methods and systems’* and *‘managerial routines and procedures’* are evaluated sufficient in relatively high degrees (mean scores between 7.0 and 7.4) while *‘organisational resources’* are evaluated as less sufficient by a relatively lower mean score (5.7).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 22. Contract management capacity for managing private contractors | | | | |
| Dimension of capacity\* | | N | Mean | S.D. | |
|  | *Sufficient knowledge and experience* | 65 | 7.4 | 1.8 | |
|  | *Sufficient methods and systems (GIS and ICT)* | 65 | 7.3 | 1.8 | |
|  | *Sufficient managerial routines and procedures* | 64 | 7.0 | 1.9 | |
|  | *Sufficient organisational resources (time and staff)* | 65 | 5.7 | 2.5 | |
| *N = 65*  *The table shows average scores for the evaluation of the degree in which the contract management capacity for managing private contractors is sufficient.*  *\* All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘Very high degree’).*  *Survey item: Q20.* | | | | |

### Organizational and managerial separation of in-house provision of maintenance

Table 23 shows the degrees in which the in-house service provision of park and road maintenance at the operational level are organizationally and managerially separated from other responsibilities related to park and road services. The degree of separation is measured on an 11-point scale from 0 to 10 with anchors (0 = not at all, 10 = very high degree).

For both park and road services the separation is most profound for tasks related to *‘general planning, strategy and development’* as well as *‘administration and authority/legal tasks’.* The separation is less profound for tasks related to *‘general maintenance planning’,* *‘monitoring of maintenance’* as well as *‘planning and administration of budgets’.* The variations among municipalities in the separation measured by standard deviations are very high for all types of responsibilities (S.D. ranging from 3.4 to 3.8).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 23. The degree of organizational and managerial separation of in-house provision of maintenance | | | | | | | |
| Degree of separation of in-house provision of maintenance from … \* | | Parks | | | Roads | | |
| N | Mean | S.D. | N | Mean | S.D. |
|  | *General planning, strategy and development* | 58 | 6.8 | 3.5 | 59 | 7.0 | 3.4 |
|  | *Administration and authority / legal tasks* | 58 | 6.5 | 3.5 | 60 | 6.5 | 3.5 |
|  | *General maintenance planning\*\** | 58 | 4.3 | 3.5 | 60 | 4.7 | 3.4 |
|  | *Monitoring of maintenance (besides self-monitoring)* | 57 | 4.8 | 3.7 | 58 | 5.1 | 3.6 |
|  | *General planning and administration of budgets* | 58 | 4.8 | 3.8 | 60 | 5.1 | 3.8 |
| *N = 58 (Parks), N = 60 (Roads).*  *The table shows the degree of organizational and managerial separation of in-house provision of maintenance from other responsibilities related to park and road services.*  *\* All items measured on an 11-point scale from 0 to 10 with anchors (0 = not at all, 10 = very high degree).*  *\*\* General maintenance planning includes: area registration, quality descriptions / service standards, maintenance plans, purchaser function).*  *Survey Item: Q27.* | | | | | | | |

### Transactional characteristics of park and road maintenance services

Table 24 shows the evaluation of general transactional characteristics of maintenance services provided by private contractors.

Approximately two-thirds of park and road parks maintenance services provided by private contractors are evaluated as *‘easy to describe clearly and unambiguously’.* 47% of park maintenance and 42% of road maintenance is evaluated as *‘difficult to provide without joint planning and communication’* while24% of park maintenance and 31% of road maintenance are evaluated as *‘difficult to monitor.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 24. General transactional characteristics of maintenance services provided by private contractors | | | | | | | | |
|  | | **Parks** | | | **Roads** | | |
| The percentage of services that are: | | Difficult  to monitor | Difficult to provide without joint planning and communication | Easy to describe clearly and unambiguously | Difficult  to monitor | Difficult to provide without joint planning and communication | Easy to describe clearly and unambiguously |
| N |  | 41 | 43 | 45 | 50 | 52 | 53 |
| Mean | | 24% | 47% | 66% | 31% | 42% | 65% |
| S.D. | | 22% | 28% | 23% | 24% | 26% | 24% |
| N = 45 (Parks) N = 53 (Roads)  *The table shows the general transactional characteristics of park and road maintenance services provided by private contractors.*  *\* The table reports the percentage of services (provided by private contractors) which are difficult to monitor, difficult to provide without joint planning and communication, and easy to describe clearly and unambiguously.  Survey item: Q19* | | | | | | | |

Table 25 shows the evaluation of general transactional characteristics of maintenance services provided in-house.

60% of park maintenance and 61% of road maintenance provided in-house are evaluated as *‘easy to describe clearly and unambiguously’.* 41% of park maintenance and 37% of road maintenance is evaluated as *‘difficult to provide without joint planning and communication’.* 34% of park maintenance and 30% of road maintenance is evaluated as *‘difficult to monitor.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 25. General transactional characteristics of maintenance services provided in-house | | | | | | | | |
|  | | **Parks** | | | **Roads** | | |
| The percentage of services that are**\***: | | Difficult  to monitor | Difficult to provide without joint planning and communication | Easy to describe clearly and unambiguously | Difficult  to monitor | Difficult to provide without joint planning and communication | Easy to describe clearly and unambiguously |
| N |  | 44 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 46 | 46 |
| Mean | | 34% | 41% | 60% | 30% | 37% | 61% |
| S.D. | | 29% | 28% | 27% | 24% | 25% | 26% |
| *N = 45 (Parks) N = 46 (Roads)*  The table shows the general transactional characteristics of park and road maintenance services provided in-house.  *\* The table reports the percentage of services (provided in-house) that are difficult to monitor, difficult to provide without joint planning and communication, and easy to describe clearly and unambiguously.*  *Survey item: Q35* | | | | | | | |

### Mutual institutionalization of behavioural norms

Table 26 shows the mutual institutionalization of six behavioural norms in relations between municipalities and private contractors providing park and road maintenance services. The behavioural norms is operationalized by altogether six different items which measure the presence of norms in favour of ‘collaboration’, ‘mutuality’, ‘flexibility’, ‘lack of opportunism’, ‘trust’, and ‘solidarity’ in the relation. The degree of institutionalization is measured on an 11-point response scale where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The evaluation shows that *‘collaboration’* (mean score = 8.1) and *‘flexibility’* (mean score = 7.5) characterise the relations with private contractor in relatively high degrees while *‘trust’* (mean score = 5.4) characterize the relations in a lower degree although the variation among municipalities for trust is relatively high (S.D. = 2.7).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 26. The degree of institutionalization of behavioural norms in relations with private contractors | | | | |
| Dimension of behavioural norms\* | | N | Mean | S.D. |
|  | *Collaboration* | 68 | 8,1 | 1,4 |
|  | *Mutuality* | 66 | 6,6 | 2,2 |
|  | *Flexibility* | 66 | 7,5 | 1,7 |
|  | *Lack of opportunism* | 64 | 6,8 | 2,2 |
|  | *Trust* | 64 | 5,4 | 2,7 |
|  | *Solidarity* | 66 | 6,8 | 2,3 |
| *N = 68  The table shows the degree of institutionalization of six behavioural norms in relations with private contractors.*  *Data is based on responses to the degree whether the following survey items characterize the relation(s) with private contractors: “We both believe that collaboration is necessary for each of us can be successful”, “We are both concerned whether our partner achieves her aims”, ”We are both ready to change circumstances for service provisions if it makes the work easier for one part”, “None of us would exploit a weakness or mistake by the other for own advantage”, “We both think it is alright to own one another a favour”, and ”We both believe that problem-solving is a joint responsibility regardless who of us that has the blame”. See appendices for original Danish formulations of items.*  *\* All items measured by a specific question on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’).  Survey item: Q9* | | | | |

Table 27 shows the institutionalization of behavioural norms of relations within the municipality toward the department with responsibility for in-house provision of park and road maintenance services. The degree of institutionalization is measured on an 11-point response scale where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The relational quality is operationalized by altogether six different items. The relational quality is operationalized by altogether six different items whish measure the presence of norms in favour of ‘collaboration’, ‘mutuality’, ‘flexibility’, ‘lack of opportunism’, ‘trust’, and ‘solidarity’ in the relation. The evaluation shows that ‘need for collaboration’ (mean score 8.2), ‘solidarity’ (mean score 7.9), ‘flexibility’ (mean score 7.5) and ‘mutuality’ (mean score 7.4). Although relatively highly scored, ‘trust’ and ‘lack of opportunism’ get the lowest scores (mean scores 6.9 and 7.0) among the six items and have the highest variation among municipalities (S.D. = 2.4 and 2.6).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 27. The degree of institutionalization of behavioural norms in the internal relations with an in-house provider | | | | |
| Dimension of behavioural norms\* | | N | Mean | S.D. |
|  | *Collaboration* | 58 | 8,2 | 1,7 |
|  | *Mutuality* | 57 | 7,4 | 1,9 |
|  | *Flexibility* | 58 | 7,5 | 1,9 |
|  | *Lack of opportunism* | 58 | 7,0 | 2,6 |
|  | *Trust* | 58 | 6,9 | 2,4 |
|  | *Solidarity* | 58 | 7,9 | 1,9 |
| *N = 58*  *The table shows the degree of institutionalization of six behavioural norms in the municipalities’ internal relations with an in-house provider.*  *Data is based on responses to following survey items: “We both believe that collaboration is necessary for each of us can be successful”, “We are both concerned whether our partner achieves her aims”, ”We are both ready to change circumstances for service provisions if it makes the work easier for one part”, “None of us would exploit a weakness or mistake by the other for own advantage”, “We both think it is alright to own one another a favour”, and ”We both believe that problem-solving is a joint responsibility regardless who of us that has the blame”. See appendices for original Danish formulations of items.*  *\* All items measured on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’).  Survey item: Q31* | | | | |

### Organizational change and economic pressure

Table 28 shows the degree of experienced (past five years) and expected (next five years) internal organizational changes. The degree of internal organizational change is measured on an 11-point response scale where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

On average, the degree of both past (mean = 7.6) and future (mean = 7.5) change is evaluated relatively high. The variation among the municipalities in experienced and expected organizational change is relatively high (means = 2.6 and 2.5).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 28. Experienced and expected organizational change | | | |
| Dimension | N | Mean | S.D. |
| *Experienced changes in organization and responsibilities in past five years* | 57 | 7,6 | 2,6 |
| *Expected changes in organization and responsibilities in the next five years* | 56 | 7,5 | 2,5 |
| N=57  The table shows the average degree of experienced and the expected organizational change in Danish park and road departments.  *\* All items measured on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.*  Survey item: Q65. | | | |

Table 29 shows the degree in which budget pressures have been experienced in the past five years and the degree budget pressures are expected for next five years. The degree of budget pressures are measured on an 11-point response scale where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

On average, the degree of both past and future budget pressures is evaluated as high (means scores = 8.6 and 8.2).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 29. Experienced and expected budget pressures | | | |
| Dimension | N | Mean | S.D. |
| *Experienced budget pressures in the past five years* | 57 | 8,6 | 2,0 |
| *Expected budget pressures in the next five years* | 57 | 8,2 | 2,1 |
| N=57  The table shows the experienced and expected budget pressures.  *\* All items measured on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’).*  Survey item: Q65. | | | |

## PROCUREMENT, MARKETS AND CONTRACTS

### Summary

The use of public procurement and private contractors for provision of maintenance services is widespread among Danish municipalities. The use is slightly more profound for road services than for park services.

93% of all municipalities have procured road maintenance services to private contractors one time or more within the past ten years while the similar figure is 79% for park services. In the case of road services more than 60% have procured maintenance services four times or more, while the corresponding figure for park services is 36%. In the case of parks maintenance services 18% haven’t procured maintenance services to private contractors, while in the case of road services only 4% haven’t procured maintenance services.

For those municipalities where respondents have indicated that they knew whether internal a control bid / calculation was used (46 municipalities) a majority of 61% indicates that a control bid / calculation has been used. Only few municipalities which use private contractors indicate that they don’t use procurement.

A majority of the municipalities evaluate their procurement and contract documents as well as their services specifications as *“good, but can be improved”* (respectively 62% and 59%). A good share of the municipalities also evaluate their procurement and contract documents as well as their services specifications as *“excellent and need only minor adjustments”* (respectively 20% and 22%). Only few municipalities evaluate their procurement and contract documents as well as their services specifications as either *“should be improved significantly”* or *“is very poor and should be thoroughly revised”.*

The degree of juridical/legal barriers/problems in using private contractors is on the average evaluated as low. On a scale from 0 (not at all) to 10 (very high degree) mean scores for the degree of barriers/problems with finding and collaborating with private contractors as well as the provision of maintenance services is low. Mean scores range from 2.6 to 3.0. The survey shows that Danish municipalities on the average have little juridical/legal problems or barriers when using private contractors for provision of park and road maintenance services.

The use of five different types of analysis in procurement preparation/planning was measured on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 10 (very high degree). When preparing procurement of park and road services the most pronounced types of analysis are *“legal and procurement options”* and analysis of *“own experiences”* (respectively mean scores = 7.0 and 6.9) while the use of *‘analysis of markets‘*(mean score = 5.5) and *‘analysis of other municipalities experiences’* are the two least prominent types of analysis.

The degrees of competition and economic interdependency between municipalities and private contractors were measured on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 10 (very high degree). The average degree of market competition was evaluated as relatively high (mean score = 7.0). The degree of expected disturbance from sudden failure from a contractor had a mean score of 6.0, but considerable variation exists among the municipalities (S.D. = 2.5). Contractors are on the average evaluated to experience a relatively high degree of economic losses if the municipality terminate the contract prematurely (mean score = 7.5).

The most common ordinary contract period for park maintenance contracts is four years (in 18 cases) and the most common extension period is two years (24 cases). Only in very few cases is the ordinary contract period indicated to be longer than four years (2 cases). The most common ordinary contract period for road maintenance contracts is four years (in 23 cases) and the most common extension period is two years (in 34 cases). In five cases the ordinary contract period is indicated to be 12 years. However, comments in the survey indicate that contract periods longer than 10 years are more widespread. The average contract period for roads is almost a year longer (4.1 years) than the average contract for parks (3.2 years). The longest contract period for roads is 12 years and the longest for parks is 6 years. The average period for optional extension of the contract is 1.5 years for park maintenance contracts and 1.6 years for road maintenance contracts. The average period for optional extension of the contract is 1.5 years for park maintenance contracts and 1.6 years for road maintenance contracts.

### Procurement and markets

Table 30 shows the distribution of municipalities that in the past ten years procured road and park services and which currently use private contractors.

The table shows that for municipalities which currently use private contractors 79 % of the municipalities have procured park services and 93 % have procured road services at least one time within the past ten years. In the case of road services more than 60 % have procured maintenance services four times or more, while the corresponding figure for park services is 36%. In the case of parks services 18 % haven’t procured maintenance services, while in the case of road services only 4 % haven’t procured maintenance services.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 30. Distributions of municipalities that in the past ten years procured road and parks services and which currently use private contractors | | | | | |
|  | | Parks  Absolute / relative distributions | | Roads  Absolute / relative distributions | |
| Procured one time or more in the past ten years | | 48 | 79 % | 64 | 93 % |
|  | *One time* | *13* | *21 %* | *5* | *7 %* |
|  | *Two times* | *7* | *11 %* | *8* | *12 %* |
|  | *Three times* | *6* | *10 %* | *9* | *13 %* |
|  | *Four times or more* | *22* | *36 %* | *42* | *61 %* |
| Not procured services | | 11 | 18 % | 3 | 4 % |
| No answer | | 2 | 3 % | 2 | 3 % |
| N | | 61 | 100 % | 69 | 100 % |
| Don’t use private contractors | | 14 |  | 6 |  |
| *N = 75*  *The table shows the distributions of municipalities that procure park and road maintenance services and which are currently using private contractors for provision of maintenance services.*  *Survey item: Q11* | | | | | |

Table 31 shows the use of internal control bid/calculation in procurements of parks and/or road maintenance by road and park departments in Danish municipalities.

For those municipalities where respondents have indicated that they knew whether internal a control bid / calculation was used a majority indicates that it has been used (61% or 28 out of 46 municipalities). A relatively high proportion of respondents indicated that they didn’t know whether internal control bid / calculations were used or provided no answer (31% or 21 out of 67). The table also shows that 5 out of the 72 municipalities (equal to 7%) who use private contractors indicate that they don’t use procurement.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 31. Use of internal control bid / calculation in procurements of parks and/or roads maintenance | | | |
|  |  | Frequencies | |
|  |  | Absolute | Relative |
|  | Yes | 28 | 42% |
|  | No | 18 | 27% |
|  | Don't know | 19 | 28% |
|  | No answer | 2 | 3% |
| Total | | 67 | 100% |
|  | Use private contractor, but not procuring services | 5 |  |
|  | Don’t use private contractors (within parks and roads) | 3 |  |
| Total | | 75 |  |
| *N = 75*  *The table shows the distribution of municipalities which use internal control bids / calculation when they procure maintenance service for parks and/or roads.  Survey item: Q16* | | | |

Table 32 shows the evaluation of the quality of Danish municipalities’ procurement and contract documents as well as their service specifications.

The majority of the municipalities evaluate their procurement and contract documents as well as their services specifications as *“good, but can be improved”* (respectively 62% and 59%). A good share of the municipalities also evaluate their procurement and contract documents as well as their services specifications as *“excellent and need only minor adjustments”* (respectively 20% and 22%). Only few municipalities evaluate their procurement and contract documents as well as their services specifications as either *“should be improved significantly”* or *“is very poor and should be thoroughly revised”.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 32. Evaluation of the municipality’s procurement and contract documents and service specifications | | | | |
| Evaluation (Roads and Parks) | Quality of | | | |
| Procurement and contract documents | | Service specifications | |
| Absolute | Relative | Absolute | Relative |
| Is very poor and should be thoroughly revised | 2 | 3% | 0 | 0% |
| Should be significantly improved | 8 | 12% | 9 | 14% |
| Is good, but can be improved | 40 | 62% | 38 | 59% |
| Is excellent and needs only minor adjustments | 13 | 20% | 14 | 22% |
| Don’t know | 2 | 3% | 3 | 5% |
| Total (N) | 65 | 100% | 64 | 100% |
| *N = 65*  *The table shows the distributions of municipalities that evaluate the quality of procurement and contract documents and service specifications for roads and parks maintenance services according to four ordinal scaled categories.   Survey item: Q12* | | | | |

Table 33 shows the degree of use of various types of analysis and information in planning of procurement of park and road maintenance services. The degree of use are evaluated by an 11-point response-scale with anchors where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

All types of analysis are used fairly well. The use of analysis of *“legal and procurement options”* and analysis of *“own experiences”* are the most dominant ways of analysis in procurement planning (mean scores between 7.0 and 6.9) while the use of analysis of markets is the least prominent ways (mean = 5.5).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 33. Use of analysis in procurement planning | |  |  |  |
| Use of …\* | | N | Mean | S.D. |
|  | *Analysis of legal and procurement options* | 61 | 7.0 | 2.1 |
|  | *Analysis of own experiences* | 61 | 6.9 | 2.3 |
|  | *Advice from external consultants* | 60 | 6.2 | 2.4 |
|  | *Analysis of other municipalities' experiences* | 61 | 5.9 | 2.4 |
|  | *Analysis of markets\*\** | 60 | 5.5 | 2.7 |
| N = 61  The table shows the degree for municipalities’ use of various analyses when they procure services for maintenance of parks and/or roads.  *\* All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’).*    *\*\* Paired T-tests shows that the degree of use of ‘analysis of markets’ is significantly lower from the use of analysis of ‘legal and procurement options, t(59) = -4.58, p = .000, ‘own experiences, t(59) = -5.82, p = .000, and from the use of external consultants t(59) = -1.83, p = .072. The degree og use of analysis of markets is statistically insignificant from the degree of use of analysis of other municipalities experiences t(59) = -1.19, p = .238.   Survey item: Q18* | | | | |

Table 34 shows the municipalities’ evaluation of three key transactional dimensions of market relations. The dimensions are evaluated by an 11-point response-scale with anchors where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The average degree of market competition is evaluated as relatively high (mean = 7.0). The degree of expected disturbance from sudden failure from contractor has the lowest mean score (6.0), but has the highest variation among the municipalities (S.D. = 2.5). Contractors are on the average expected to experience a relatively high degree of economic losses if the municipality terminate the contract prematurely (mean score = 7.5).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 34. Evaluation of three transactional dimensions of market relations | | | | |
| Transactional dimension\* | | N | Mean | S.D. |
|  | *Degree of market competition* | 61 | 7.0 | 2.2 |
|  | *Degree of expected disturbances from sudden/unexpected failure from contractor* | 59 | 6.0 | 2.5 |
|  | *Degree of contractor's expected economic loss from premature contract termination by municipality* | 58 | 7.5 | 2.0 |
| *N = 61*  *The table reports the municipalities evaluations of three transactional dimensions of markets relations*  *\* All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘Very high degree’).*  *Survey item: Q17* | | | | |

Table 35 shows Danish municipalities’ evaluation of the degree of juridical/legal barriers/problems for using private contractors for provision of park and road maintenance. The degree of barriers/problems is measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors where 0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’.

The degree of juridical/legal barriers is measured by three different items. Mean scores for all three items are low (ranging from 2.6 to 3.0). However, the variation among municipalities in the degree of juridical/legal barriers/problems is relatively high (S.D. = 2.7 for two times and 2.5 for one item). The table shows that on the average Danish municipalities have little juridical/legal problems or barriers when using private contractors for provision of park and road maintenance.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 35. Juridical / legal barriers for using private contractors (parks and roads) | | | | |
| Have juridical concerns and legal regulations given your municipality … | | N | Mean | S.D. |
|  | *Problems with finding the best possible private contractor?* | 65 | 3,0 | 2,5 |
|  | *Problems with collaborating optimally with private contractors?* | 65 | 3,0 | 2,7 |
|  | *Problems that has affected maintenance operations negatively?* | 65 | 2,6 | 2,7 |
| N = 65  The table shows the level of juridical and legal problems with using private contractors of provision of road and park maintenance services.  *\* All items measured by an 11-point response-scale with anchors (0 = ‘not at all’ and 10 = ‘very high degree’).  Survey item: Q25* | | | | |

### Contracts

Table 36 shows the number of contracts park and road departments in Danish municipalities has with private contractors. In case of both parks and roads a large part of the departments indicates that their department have only one contract with a private contractor (55 % for parks and 40 % for roads). Furthermore, no information is available on the number of private contractors for a relatively large group of departments. Five of the departments indicated that they have a ‘bundled’ contract which encompass both park and road maintenance services.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 36. Number of contracts with private contractors | | | | | | |
|  |  | | Parks | | Roads | |
| Number of contracts | | | Absolute | Relative | Absolute | Relative |
|  | | *One contract* | 18 | 55% | 12 | 40% |
|  | | *Two contracts* | 10 | 30% | 9 | 30% |
|  | | *Three contracts or more* | 5 | 15% | 9 | 30% |
| Total N (with data provided)\* | | | 33 | 100% | 30 | 100% |
|  | | Don't know / no answer | 27 |  | 37 |  |
| Total N (all cases using private contractor) | | | 60 |  | 67 |  |
| *N = 33 (Parks), N = 30 (Roads)*  *The table shows how many contracts road and park departments in Danish municipalities have with private contractors.*  *\* Altogether five municipalities indicated use of 'bundled contracts' comprising provision of both road and park maintenance by a single private contractor.  Survey item: Q14* | | | | | | |

Table 37 shows the distribution of ordinary contract period and the optional extension period for park maintenance contracts. The most common ordinary contract period is four years (in 18 cases) and the most common extension period is two years. Only in very few cases is the ordinary contract period indicated to be longer than four years (2 cases).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 37. Contract period for park maintenance contracts | | | | | | | | |
| Length (in years) **\*** | | Ordinary contract (N) | Option for extension (N) | | | | | |
| No option | One year | Two years | Three years | No data | Total (N) |
|  | *One* | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
|  | *Two* | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
|  | *Three* | 10 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | - | 10 |
|  | *Four* | 18 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 1 | - | 18 |
|  | *Five* | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 1 |
|  | *Six* | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 |
| Total | | 40 | 3 | 8 | 24 | 3 | 2 | 40 |
| *N = 40*  *The table reports the contract period for park maintenance contracts*  *\* Data on contract length for park maintenance contracts were provided for 40 municipalities out of 60 municipalities indicating use private contractors for provision of park maintenance.   Survey item: Q15a* | | | | | | | | |

Table 38 shows the distribution of ordinary contract period according to number of years and the optional extension period for road maintenance contracts. The most common ordinary contract period is four years (in 23 cases) and the most common extension period is two years (in 34 cases). In five cases the ordinary contract period is indicated to be 12 years. In addition to the statistics in Table 38 additional 7 municipalities indicated in open commentaries in the survey that they use performance contracts for road maintenance with contract length between 10 to 15 years. Information (comments) in the survey indicates that at least 14 Danish municipalities use performance contracts for road maintenance.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 38. Contract period for road maintenance contracts | | | | | | | | |
| Period (in years)\* | | Ordinary contract (N) | Option for extension (N) | | | | | |
| No option | One year | Two years | Three years | No data | Total (N) |
|  | *One* | 7 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 7 |
|  | *Two* | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | - | 7 |
|  | *Three* | 10 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | - | 10 |
|  | *Four* | 23 | 1 | 4 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 23 |
|  | *Five* | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 2 |
|  | *Six* | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 |
|  | *Ten* | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 |
|  | *Twelve* | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 |
| Total | | 56 | 8 | 8 | 34 | 2 | 4 | 56 |
| *N = 56   The table reports the contract period for road maintenance contracts*  *\* Data on contract length for road maintenance contracts were provided for 56 municipalities out of 67 municipalities indicating use of private contractors for provision of road maintenance.   Survey item: Q15b* | | | | | | | | |

Table 39 shows the average contract period for parks and roads maintenance contracts. The average contract period for roads is almost a year longer (4.1 years) than the average contract for parks (3.2 years). The longest contract period for road maintenance is 12 years and the longest for park maintenance contracts is 6 years. The average period for optional extension of the contract is 1.5 years for park maintenance contracts and 1.6 years for road maintenance contracts.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 39. Average contract period (in years) for parks and roads maintenance contracts | | | | |
|  | Parks | | Roads | |
| Statistics | Ordinary contract | Option for extension | Ordinary contract | Option for extension |
| N | 40 | 38 | 56 | 53 |
| Mean | 3.2 | 1.7 | 4.1 | 1.6 |
| S.D. | 1.2 | 0.7 | 2.9 | 0.8 |
| Minimum | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Maximum | 6 | 3 | 12 | 3 |

*N = 40 (Parks), N = 56 (Roads).  
  
The table reports the average contract period (in years) for parks and roads maintenance contracts in Danish municipalities.  
  
Survey item: Q15a and Q15b.*

## OUTCOMES, EFFECTS AND PERFORMANCE

### Summary

Measured on a scale from 0 (very unsatisfactory) to 10 (very satisfactory), municipalities are on the average most satisfied with performance of private contractors provision of park and road maintenance services related to the *“quality of maintenance services”* (mean score = 7.1 for parks and 7.4 for roads) and the *“price / cost levels”* (mean score = 7.1 for parks and 7.4 for roads). Municipalities are least satisfied with the performance related to *“development and innovative thinking”* (mean score = 5.5 for parks and 5.6 for roads). For five out of the six performance dimensions there is no significant difference between the scores for private contractors’ provision of road and park maintenance services. The satisfaction with *‘follow-up and problem solving’* is statistically significantly higher for road maintenance (mean score = 6.7) compared to park maintenance (mean score = 6.2).

Measured on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 10 (very high degree), municipalities are on the average most satisfied with performance of in-house provision of park and road maintenance services related to *“flexibility and change”* (respectively mean scores for parks and roads are 8.3 and 8.6). The performance of *“price and cost levels”* in in-house provisions of park and road maintenance has the lowest mean scores (respectively 7.4 and 7.5). Comparisons of performance between road and park maintenance services shows that only the performance of *‘flexibility and change’* is significantly higher for road maintenance service compared to park maintenance services.

Estimates for the quantified economic effects from the municipalities’ last round of procurement of park and road maintenance services were provided for 35 municipalities in the case of park maintenance and for 47 municipalities in the case of road maintenance. The average (un-weighted) cost change was a 5.1 % reduction for park maintenance and a 5.8 % reduction for road maintenance. The average cost change for both park and road maintenance was 5.5 %. The maximum cost reduction was 50 % and the maximum cost increase was 16 %. In cases where only a single procurement round has been carried out within the past ten years the average cost change is an 11.4% reduction. The average cost change is a 3.8% reduction in cases where four or more procurement rounds has been carried out within the past ten years. Statistical analysis shows that cost reductions are significantly (p < .05) lower when the number of past procurements increases.

The effects from the use of private contractors on in-house service provisions of parks and road maintenance was evaluated on a scale from 0 (affected very negatively) to 10 (affected very positively) for five performance dimensions. The effects were generally evaluated as neutral or slightly positive. The mean scores were highest for *“price and cost levels in service provisions”* (= 6.7) and lowest for *“staff’s well-being and work motivation”* (= 4.8).

The effects from the use of private contractors on municipal planning and management of parks and road maintenance was evaluated on a scale from 0 (affected very negatively) to 10 (affected very positively) for eight performance dimensions. The mean scores were highest for *“organizational methods and routines”* (= 6.4) and lowest for *“ability to serve the political level”* (= 5.4).

### Performance evaluations

Table 40 shows the evaluation of six performance dimensions of park and road maintenance services provided by private contractors. Performance is measured by the level of satisfaction on an 11-point scale where 0 = ‘very unsatisfactory’ to 10 = ‘very satisfactory’.

Municipalities are on the average most satisfied with the *“quality of maintenance services”* (mean score = 7.1 for parks and 7.4 for roads) and the *“price / cost levels”* (mean score = 7.1 for parks and 7.4 for roads) in case of both park and road maintenance. Municipalities are least satisfied with *“development and innovative thinking”* in case of both park and road maintenance (mean score = 5.5 for parks and 5.6 for roads). For five out of the six performance dimensions there is no significant difference between the scores for private contractors’ provision of road and park maintenance services. The satisfaction with “follow-up and problem solving” is statistically significantly higher for road maintenance (mean score = 6.7) compared to park maintenance (mean score = 6.2).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 40. Performance evaluations of private contractors’ provision of road and park maintenance services | | | | | | | |
| Performance dimension\* | | Park maintenance (N=53) | | | Road maintenance (N=62) | | |
| N | Mean | S.D. | N | Mean | S.D. |
|  | Quality of maintenance services | 53 | 7.1 | 1.7 | 62 | 7.4 | 1.6 |
|  | Price / cost levels | 53 | 7.1 | 1.7 | 62 | 7.4 | 1.4 |
|  | Flexibility and change | 53 | 6.7 | 1.8 | 61 | 6.9 | 1.8 |
|  | Follow- up and problem solving | 52 | 6.2 | 2.0 | 60 | 6.7 | 1.9 |
|  | Development and innovative thinking | 48 | 5.5 | 2.0 | 58 | 5.6 | 2.3 |
|  | Satisfaction of long-term service objectives | 47 | 6.0 | 2.1 | 55 | 6.2 | 2.3 |
| Total N=53 (parks). N = 62 (Roads).  The table reports the evaluation of six performance dimensions of park and road maintenance services provided by private contractors. Paired samples T-tests for each performance dimension shows no statistical significance at p-levels < .1 between road and park maintenance except for ‘follow-up and problem solving’, where p = .020 and t(44) = -2.409.  *\* Data based on self-reported evaluations based on responses for all items on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = ‘very unsatisfactory’ and 10 = ‘very satisfactory’).  Survey item: Q7 and Q8.* | | | | | | | |

Table 41 shows the scores for road and park departments in Danish municipalities’ satisfaction with the performance of in-house provision of road and park maintenance services. Performance is measured by the level of satisfaction on an 11-point scale where 0 = ‘very unsatisfactory’ to 10 = ‘very satisfactory’.

In general, the municipalities are highly satisfied with in-house provision of both park and road maintenance. *“Flexibility and change”* in in-house provisions of park and road maintenance has the highest mean scores (respectively 8.3 and 8.6). *“Price and cost levels”* in in-house provisions of park and road maintenance has the lowest mean scores (respectively 7.4 and 7.5).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 41. Performance evaluations of in-house provision of road and park maintenance services | | | | | | | |
| Performance dimension | | Park maintenance (N=57) | | | Road maintenance (N=60) | | |
| N | Mean | S.D. | N | Mean | S.D. |
|  | Quality of maintenance services | 57 | 8.0 | 1.6 | 60 | 7.9 | 1.5 |
|  | Price / cost levels | 57 | 7.4 | 1.7 | 60 | 7.5 | 1.9 |
|  | Flexibility and change | 57 | 8.3 | 1.5 | 59 | 8.6 | 1.2 |
|  | Follow- up and problem solving | 57 | 7.9 | 1.5 | 59 | 8.0 | 1.7 |
|  | Development and innovative thinking | 57 | 7.7 | 1.8 | 60 | 7.7 | 1.9 |
|  | Satisfaction of long-term service objectives | 55 | 7.6 | 1.8 | 56 | 7.7 | 1.8 |
| Total N=57 (parks). N = 60 (Roads)  The table reports the evaluation of six performance dimensions of park and road maintenance services provided in-house. Paired T-tests for each performance dimension shows no statistical significance at p-levels < .1 between road and park maintenance expect for ‘flexibility and change’ where p = .052 and t(54) = .475.  *\* Data based on self-reported evaluations based on responses for all items on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = ‘very unsatisfactory’ and 10 = ‘very satisfactory’).   Survey item: Q29 and Q30* | | | | | | | |

### Cost effects

Table 42 shows the quantified economic effects from the municipalities’ last round of procurement of park and road maintenance services. Estimates were provided for 35 municipalities in the case of park maintenance and for 47 municipalities in the case of road maintenance.

The average (un-weighted) cost change is a 5.1 % decrease for park maintenance and a 5.8 % decrease for road maintenance. The average cost change for both park and road maintenance is 5.5 %.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 42. Quantified economic effects from contracting out after last procurement | | | |
|  | Change in cost levels | | |
| Parks | Roads | Parks and Roads |
| N (valid) | 35 | 47 | 82 |
| Mean (un-weighted) | - 5.1 % | - 5.8 % | - 5.5 % |
| Std. dev. | 10.0 % | 11.6 % | 10.8 % |
| Min. value (decrease) | - 30 % | - 50 % | - 50 % |
| Max. value (increase) | 16 % | 10 % | 16 % |
| N=82  The table reports about the quantified economic effects from contracting out after last procurement.  All data based on cases with self-reported estimates. Respondents were asked to provide estimates on the effect on the total price and cost level for services contracted out after the last round of procurement.  Survey item: Q13 | | | |

Figure 2 shows the distribution of cost changes for all cases (N = 82). The highest cost decrease is 50 % while the highest cost increase is 16 %.

Figure 2. Cost changes from last procurement in 82 cases of contracting out park and road maintenance (N = 82),

Table 43 shows the direction of self-reported estimates for cost change from the municipalities’ last round of procurement of park and road maintenance services.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 43. Direction of self-reported estimates on cost change from last times services were contracted out | | | | | | |
|  | Frequencies | | | | | |
| Parks | | Roads | | Parks and Roads | |
| Absolute | Relative | Absolute | Relative | Absolute | Relative |
| N | 61 | 100% | 69 | 100% | 130 | 100% |
| Decreased costs | 15 | 25% | 22 | 32% | 37 | 28% |
| No cost change | 18 | 30% | 22 | 32% | 40 | 31% |
| Increased costs | 2 | 3% | 3 | 4% | 5 | 4% |
| Don't know | 11 | 18% | 16 | 23% | 27 | 21% |
| No answer | 14 | 23% | 6 | 9% | 20 | 15% |
| N = 130  The table reports about the direction of self-reported estimates on cost change form last times services were contracted out.  Data is based on the number of responses to questions on the effects on the total price and cost level for services contracted out after the last round of procurement for park and roads.  Survey item: Q13 | | | | | | |

Table 44 shows the distribution of the direction in cost change in the last round of procurement of roads and parks maintenance according to the number of procurements in the past ten years. The table is based on data from all municipalities which provided estimates for the effect from the last round of procurement on costs levels for the procured parks and road maintenance services.

Estimates from 45 % of the municipalities indicated a decrease in costs. Estimates from 49 % of municipalities indicated no change in costs while estimates from 6% of the municipalities indicated a cost increase. In the group which had one round of procurement in the past ten years the majority (77 %) indicated a cost decrease. In the group which had two rounds of procurement in the past ten years the majority (69 %) indicated a cost decrease while the remaining (31 %) indicated no cost change. In the group which had three rounds of procurement in the past ten years the majority (62 %) indicated no cost change while the remaining (38 %) indicated a cost decrease. In the group which had four rounds or more of procurement in the past ten years the majority (58 %) indicated a no cost change, while 30% indicated a cost decrease and 12 % indicated a cost increase.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 44. Distribution of direction in cost change for contracting out roads and parks according to the number of procurements in the past ten years | | | | | | | | |
| Number of procurements in the last ten years | Decreased costs | | No cost change | | Increased costs | | Total (row) | |
| Absolute | Relative | Absolute | Relative | Absolute | Relative | Absolute | Relative |
| *Four times or more* | 13 | 30 % | 25 | 58 % | 5 | 12 % | 43 | 100 % |
| *Three times* | 5 | 38 % | 8 | 62 % | 0 | 0 % | 13 | 100 % |
| *Two times* | 9 | 69 % | 4 | 31 % | 0 | 0 % | 13 | 100% |
| *One time* | 10 | 77 % | 3 | 23 % | 0 | 0 % | 13 | 100 % |
| Total (row) | 37 | 45 % | 40 | 49 % | 5 | 6 % | 82 | 100 % |
| N=82  The table reports about the distribution of direction in cost change for contracting out roads and parks according to the number of procurements in the past ten years.  Survey items: Q11 and Q13 | | | | | | | | |

Table 45 shows the distribution of average cost changes according to the number of procurements in the past ten years. The average cost change is an 11.4 % reduction in cases with a single procurement round in the past ten years. The average cost change is a 3.8 % reduction in cases where four or more procurements has been carried out within the past ten years. The table shows that cost reductions are significantly lower with an increasing number of procurements.

Table 45.   
Distribution of average cost changes according to the number of procurements in the past ten years.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of procurements  in the past ten years | Mean change | N | S.D. |
| One | - 11.4 % | 13 | 10.5 |
| Two | - 7.9 % | 13 | 9.2 |
| Three | -3.2 % | 13 | 5.9 |
| Four or more | -3.7 % | 43 | 11.9 |
| Total | -5.5 % | 82 | 10.8 |
| *Note: The linear difference between the four categories is significant at the p-level < .05.* | | | |

Table 46 shows self-reported estimates on the economic effect from the use of partly or complete competitive tendering on the total costs (including operational and administrative costs) for maintaining the department’s road and/or parks. Estimates were provided for 27 municipalities in the case of park maintenance and for 30 municipalities in the case of road maintenance.

Based on reported estimates, the average (un-weighted) cost change is calculated to a 4.1 % decrease for park maintenance and a 5.3 % decrease for road maintenance. The average (un-weighted) cost change for both park and road maintenance is a 4.7 % decrease.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 46. Quantified economic effects from the use of competitive tendering on total costs for provision of park and road maintenance | | | |
| Statistics | Change in internal cost levels\* | | |
| Parks | Roads | Parks and Roads |
| N | 27 | 30 | 57 |
| Mean (un-weighted) | -4.1 % | -5.3 % | -4.7% |
| S.D. | 9.3 % | 8.2 % | 8.8 % |
| Min. value | - 30 % | - 20 % | - 30 % |
| Max. value | 16 % | 8 % | 16 % |
| *N = 57*  *\* All data based on cases with self-reported estimates. Respondents were asked to provide estimates on the effect on the total price and cost level for in-house service provision (including operational and administrative costs) as a result of expose to competition (i.e. competitive tendering).*  *Q33* | | | |

Table 47 shows the direction of estimates for the effect from the use of partly or complete competitive tendering on the total costs for provision of park and road maintenance. The table include all municipalities which indicated a use of competitive tendering of park and road maintenance services provided in-house.

44% provided no estimate or indicated a ‘don’t know’ for park services while 42% provided no estimate or indicated a ‘don’t know’ for road services. For those municipalities which provided an estimate for park maintenance 10 out of 27 (equal to 37%) indicated a cost decrease while for those municipalities which provided an estimate for road maintenance 14 out of 30 (equal to 47%) indicated a cost decrease.

The majority of estimates for park and road services indicated a neutral cost effect (30 out of 57 cases equal to 53%). A large set of cases indicates decrease costs (24 out of 57 cases equal to 42%) while a small set indicated a cost increase (3 out of 57 cases equal to 5%).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 47. Economic effects from the use of competitive tendering on total costs for provision of park and road maintenance | | | |
| Effect on total cost levels\* | Frequencies  (relative / absolute) | | |
| Parks (N=49) | Roads (N=49) | Parks and Roads (N=98) |
| Increased | 4 % (2) | 2 % (1) | 3 % (3) |
| Neutral | 31 % (15) | 29 % (15) | 30 % (30) |
| Decreased | 20 % (10) | 27 % (14) | 24 % (24) |
| Don’t know | 22 % (11) | 18 % (9) | 20 % (20) |
| No answer | 22 % (11) | 24 % (12) | 23 % (21) |
| N=98  \* *The table shows the distribution of categorized answers on questions related to the effect from the use of competitive tendering on the total cost levels for provisions of park and road maintenance services. A total of 49 municipalities indicated that they competitively tender parks (49 cases) and road (49 cases) maintenance services provided by the in-house provider.* | | | |

### Competition effects on internal service management and provision

Table 48 shows Danish municipalities’ evaluation of the effects from the use of private contractors on in-house service provisions of parks and road maintenance.

On a scale from 0 (affected very negatively) to 10 (affected very positively), the effects are generally evaluated as neutral or slightly positive. The mean scores are highest for *“price and cost levels in service provisions”* (6.7) and lowest for *“staff’s well-being and work motivation”* (4.8). The variation in the evaluations are largest for *“staff’s well-being and work motivation”* (S.D. = 2.3)and *“flexibility in service provisions”* (S.D. = 2.2)*.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 48. Effects from the use of private contractors on in-house service provisions of parks and road maintenance | | | | |
| Dimension of in-house service provision\* | | N | Mean | S.D. |
|  | *Price and cost levels in service provisions* | 45 | 6,7 | 1,7 |
|  | *Quality levels in service provisions* | 48 | 5,9 | 1,7 |
|  | *Operational methods and routines for providing services* | 46 | 5,9 | 1,7 |
|  | *Flexibility in service provisions* | 47 | 5,2 | 2,2 |
|  | *Staff’s well-being and work motivation* | 47 | 4,8 | 2,3 |
| N=48  The table reports about the effects from the use of private contractors on in-house service provisions of parks and road maintenance.  \* *The table shows findings generated from data for the following question. “In which degree do you find that competitive tendering has affected in-house service provisions negatively or positively regarding: price and cost levels, quality level, flexibility, operational methods, staff on a scale from 0 to 10 where 0 = ‘affected very negatively’ and 10 = ‘affected very positively’.*  *Survey item: Q34.* | | | | |

Table 49 shows Danish municipalities’ evaluation of the effects from the use of private contractors on municipal planning and management of parks and road maintenance.

On a scale from 0 (affected very negatively) to 10 (affected very positively), the effects are all evaluated as slightly positive. The mean scores are highest for *“organizational methods and routines”* (6.4) and lowest for *“ability to serve the political level”* (5.4). The variation in the evaluations are largest for *“management of maintenance budgets”* (S.D. = 2.0)smallest *“ability to get new ideas and think differently”* (S.D. = 1.4)*.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 49. Effects from the use of private contractors on municipal planning and management of parks and road maintenance | | | | |
| Management dimension\* | | N | Mean | S.D. |
|  | *Organizational methods and routines* | 67 | 6.4 | 1.5 |
|  | *Management of maintenance budgets* | 67 | 6.3 | 2.0 |
|  | *Focus on planning and development of services* | 67 | 6.3 | 1.6 |
|  | *Management of maintenance operations* | 67 | 6.2 | 1.7 |
|  | *Information and knowledge on services* | 67 | 6.2 | 1.7 |
|  | *Ability to get new ideas and think differently* | 67 | 6.2 | 1.4 |
|  | *Ability to serve citizens and users* | 65 | 5.5 | 1.8 |
|  | *Ability to serve political level* | 66 | 5.4 | 1.8 |
| N=67  *\* Data based on self-reported evaluations based on responses for all items on an 11-point response scale with anchors (0 = ‘affected very negatively’ and 10 = ‘affected very positively’).*  *Survey item: Q21* | | | | |

# SURVEY

**Q1**

**Dit stillingsniveau i kommunen**

**Q1a**

**Hvilket af følgende stillingsniveauer beskriver bedst din nuværende position i din kommune**

|  | Direktør/chef/leder på forvaltningsniveau eller tilsvarende (fx for ’chef for teknisk forvaltning’) | Leder/chef på afdelings-/centerniveau eller tilsvarende (fx chef for ’park- og natur’) | Gruppe/teamleder eller tilsvarende (fx formand eller arbejdsleder) | Medarbejder (ingen ledelsesansvar) | Andet (beskriv venligst) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ \_\_ |

Q1b

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

Q2

**Hvilke opgaver har din afdeling ansvar for?***(Sæt kryds ved de opgaver som din afdeling har ansvar for eller sæt kryds hvis din afdeling ikke har et ansvar for opgaver på et område)*

|  |
| --- |
| **Q2a (V5-V11)**  **Opgaver på parkområdet** |
| ❑ Overordnet planlægning, strategi og udvikling (fx ift. kommuneplan og lokalplaner)  ❑ Myndighedsopgaver og administration (fx ift. lovgivning)  ❑ Overordnet driftsplanlægning (fx arealregistrering, kvalitetsbeskrivelser, driftsplaner, bestilling af driftsopgaver)  ❑ Kontrol og tilsyn med driftsopgaver  ❑ Den daglige og praktiske udførsel af driftsopgaver  ❑ Overordnet budgetlægning og opfølgning på driftsbudgetter  ❑ Min afdeling har ikke ansvar for opgaver på parkområdet |
| **Q2b (V12)**  **Beskriv eventuelt andre vigtige ansvarsområder din afdeling har på parkområdet**  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| **Q2c (V13-V19)**  **Opgaver på vejområdet** |
| ❑ Overordnet planlægning, strategi og udvikling (fx ift. kommuneplan og lokalplaner)  ❑ Myndighedsopgaver og administration (fx ift. lovgivning)  ❑ Overordnet driftsplanlægning (fx arealregistrering, kvalitetsbeskrivelser, driftsplaner, bestilling af driftsopgaver)  ❑ Kontrol og tilsyn med driftsopgaver  ❑ Den daglige og praktiske udførsel af driftsopgaver  ❑ Overordnet budgetlægning og opfølgning på driftsbudgetter  ❑ Min afdeling har ikke ansvar for opgaver på parkområdet |
| **Q2d**  **Beskriv eventuelt andre vigtige ansvarsområder din afdeling har på vejområdet**  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

**Q2e**

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
| **Q3**  **Driftsbudgetter**  **Angiv hvor stort årligt budget i ’runde tal’ du anslår at henholdsvis din afdeling og din kommune anvender til driftsopgaver på...**  *(Angiv anslået budget for indeværende år i mio. DKK, med maksimalt én decimal. Det er bedre at give dit umiddelbare bud end intet svar).* |

**Q3a (V22-V23)**

**Parkområdet**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Min afdeling har et årligt driftsbudget på ca.: |  |
| Min kommune har et årligt driftsbudget på ca.: |  |

**Q3b (V24-V25)**

**Vejområdet**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Min afdeling har et årligt driftsbudget på ca.: |  |
| Min kommune har et årligt driftsbudget på ca.: |  |

**Q3c**

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
| **Q4**  **Hvem løser driftsopgaver for din afdeling?**  (Sæt gerne flere krydser / kryds af ved de typer af organisationer som din afdeling dagligt anvender til at løse væsentlige driftsopgaver) |

**Q4a (V27-V32)**

**Parkområdet**

❑ Private entreprenører

❑ Kommunal drift (fx intern bestiller-udfører model, 100% selvejet aktieselskab, intern drift, o.l.)

❑ Fællesejet kommunalt selskab/entreprenør

❑ Anden offentlig myndighed

❑ Fællesejet offentligt-privat selskab/entreprenør

❑ Anden type af organisation

**Q4b (V33-V38)**

**Vejområdet**

❑ Private entreprenører

❑ Kommunal drift (fx intern bestiller-udfører model, 100% selvejet aktieselskab, intern drift, o.l.)

❑ Fællesejet kommunalt selskab/entreprenør

❑ Anden offentlig myndighed

❑ Fællesejet offentligt-privat selskab/entreprenør

❑ Anden type af organisation

**Q4c**

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Q5**  **Fordeling af driftsbudget**  **Hvordan er din afdelings budget til driftsopgaver fordelt mellem forskellige typer af organisationer?**   *(Angiv den anslåede fordeling i 0-100 procent af det samlede budget for driften på forskellige organisationer for indeværende år. Det er bedre at angive en anslået fordeling end intet svar)* |

**Q5a (V41-V46)**

**Parkområdet**

|  | (Summen skal tilsammen give 100) |
| --- | --- |
| Private entreprenører | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Kommunal drift | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Fællesejet kommunalt selskab/entreprenør | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Anden offentlig myndighed | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Fællesejet offentligt-privat selskab/entreprenør | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Anden type af organisation (benævn denne kort i feltet forneden) | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
|  | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

**Q5b (V48-V53)**

**Vejområdet**

|  | (Summen skal tilsammen give 100) |
| --- | --- |
| Private entreprenører | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Kommunal drift | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Fællesejet kommunalt selskab/entreprenør | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Anden offentlig myndighed | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Fællesejet offentligt-privat selskab/entreprenør | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Anden type af organisation (benævn denne kort forneden) | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |  |

**Q5c**

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **I det følgende stiller vi en række spørgsmål til jeres anvendelse af private virksomheder/entreprenører til drift af parkområdet og/eller vejområdet i jeres kommune.** |

**Q6**

**Formelle aftaler i samarbejdet**

**Q6a (V55-V62)**

**Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad følgende indhold indgår som en central del af din afdelings samarbejde(r) med de(n) private entreprenør(er)**

|  | **Slet  ikke 0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved  ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Formaliserede og nedskrevne bestemmelser af juridisk karakter (fx en underskrevet kontrakt) | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Beskrivelser af opgaverne som omfatter overordnede målsætninger, funktionalitet og retningslinjer for drift og udvikling af områder og anlæg | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Beskrivelser af opgaverne som omfatter detaljerede tilstands- og udførselskrav samt mængdeangivelser | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Bestemmelser om sanktionsmuligheder såfremt at driften ikke lever op til den aftalte kvalitet og mængde | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Aftale om tæt samarbejde og fælles planlægning af drift og udvikling | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Aftale om at de(n) private entreprenør(er) har direkte kontakt med borgere og brugere (fx indgår i dialog med skoler, daginstitutioner eller brugerråd). | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Aftale om særlig økonomisk ramme med incitamenter til optimering, forbedringer og investeringer | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Krav til ekspertise og kompetencer (fx krav om en bestemt fagprofession eller uddannelsesmæssig baggrund) | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

**Q6b**

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

**Q7**

**Tilfredshed med de private til parkdrift**

**Q7a (V65-V70)**

**Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 hvor tilfreds eller utilfreds du er med det arbejde de(n) private entreprenør(er) udfører på parkområdet for jeres afdeling i forhold til:**

|  | **Meget utilfreds 0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **Meget tilfreds 10** | **Ved  ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Den gennemgående kvalitet i driften | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Det gennemgående pris- og omkostningsniveau i driften | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Fleksibilitet i forhold til ønsker om ændringer og/eller forbedringer i driften | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Opfølgning og løsning af problemer og mangler i driften | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Udvikling og nytænkning af driften | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Opfyldelsen af jeres langsigtede målsætninger for områder og anlæg | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| **Q7b**  **Er der andre relevante forhold du er tilfreds/utilfreds med (beskriv i feltet forneden)?** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Q8**

**Tilfredshed med de private til vejdrift**

**Q8a (V72-V77)  
Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 hvor tilfreds eller utilfreds du er med det arbejde de(n) private entreprenør(er) udfører på vejområdet for jeres afdeling i forhold til:**

|  | **Meget utilfreds 0** | | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **Meget tilfreds 10** | **Ved  ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Den gennemgående kvalitet i driften | ❑ | | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Det gennemgående pris- og omkostningsniveau i driften | ❑ | | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Fleksibilitet i forhold til ønsker om ændringer og/eller forbedringer i driften | ❑ | | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Opfølgning og løsning af problemer og mangler i driften | ❑ | | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Udvikling og nytænkning af driften | ❑ | | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Opfyldelsen af jeres langsigtede målsætninger for områder og anlæg | ❑ | | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Er der andre relevante forhold du er tilfreds/utilfreds med (beskriv i feltet forneden)? |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Q9 Holdninger i samarbejdet med private**

**Q9a (V78-V83)  
Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener at følgende udsagn kendetegner forholdet mellem din afdeling og de(n) private entreprenør(er)?**

|  | **Slet ikke  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Vi er begge af den opfattelse at det er nødvendigt at samarbejde for at vi hver især kan opnå vores mål | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Vi er begge optaget af at den anden part opnår sine mål | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Vi er begge parate til at ændre på forhold i driften, hvis det gør arbejdet lettere for den ene part | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Ingen af os vil udnytte en svaghed eller fejl hos den anden til egen fordel | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Vi synes begge at det er helt fint at skylde hinanden en tjeneste | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Uanset hvem der har ansvaret for en fejltagelse, så mener vi begge at løsning af problemer er et fælles ansvar | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

**Q10**

**Tilgang til styring af private**

**Q10a (V85-V88)**

**Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener at følgende udsagn kendetegner din afdelings tilgang til styringen af jeres private entreprenør(er) i driften?**

|  | **Slet ikke  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I tilfælde af at driften ikke lever op til et krav som aftalt (fx kvalitetsniveau) anvender vi gerne ’hårde’ bods- og sanktionsmuligheder (fx reduceret betaling) | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Vi mødes ofte og taler sammen om driften | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Vi går op i at driften lever op til det grundlag (fx kvalitetskrav eller arbejdsmængder) vi har beskrevet i vores driftskontrakter | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Vi har fokus på at samarbejde om at opfylde de strategiske målsætninger for områder og anlæg | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Q11 Anvendelse af udbud**  **Hvor mange gange er driftsopgaver i de områder og anlæg din afdeling har ansvaret for blevet udbudt i konkurrence inden for de seneste 10 år?** |

**Q11a (V90)**

**Parkområdet**

❑ 1 gang

❑ 2 gange

❑ 3 gange

❑ 4 gange eller mere

**❑ ved ikke**

**Q11b (V91)**

**Vejområdet**

❑ 1 gang

❑ 2 gange

❑ 3 gange

❑ 4 gange eller mere

❑ ved ikke

Q11c

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

**Q12  
  
  
'Kvalitet af udbuds- og kontraktmateriale'**

**Q12a (V93)  
Hvilket af de følgende udsagn mener du bedst beskriver jeres udbuds- og kontraktmateriale?**

❑ Udsagn A: Vores udbuds- og kontraktmateriale er i det store hele godt og vi forventer kun at det behøver mindre tilpasninger/ændringer ved et kommende udbud.

❑ Udsagn B: Vores udbuds- og kontraktmateriale er i det store hele godt, men kan stadig forbedres og vi forventer at det behøver nogle tilpasninger/ændringer ved et kommende udbud.

❑ Udsagn C: Vores udbuds- og kontraktmateriale bør forbedres og vi forventer at det behøver betydelige tilpasninger/ændringer ved et kommende udbud.

❑ Udsagn D: Vores udbuds- og kontraktmateriale er ringe og bør i det store hele udskiftes ved et kommende udbud.

❑ Udsagn E: Ved ikke

**'Kvalitet af opgavebeskrivelsen'**

**Q12b (V94)**

**Hvilket af de følgende udsagn mener du bedst beskriver jeres opgavebeskrivelser?**

❑ Udsagn A: Vores opgavebeskrivelser er i det store hele gode og vi forventer kun at de behøver mindre tilpasninger/ændringer ved et kommende udbud.

❑ Udsagn B: Vores opgavebeskrivelser er i det store hele gode, men kan stadig forbedres og vi forventer at de behøver nogle tilpasninger/ændringer ved et kommende udbud.

❑ Udsagn C: Vores opgavebeskrivelser bør forbedres og vi forventer at de behøver betydelige tilpasninger/ændringer ved et kommende udbud.

❑ Udsagn D: Vores opgavebeskrivelser er ringe og bør i det store hele udskiftes ved et kommende udbud.

❑ Udsagn E: Ved ikke

**Q12c**

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Q13 Økonomiske effekter af seneste udbud**  Q13a (V96-V101)  **I hvilken størrelsesorden anslår du i procent at de udbudte driftsopgaver er blevet billigere eller dyrere efter seneste gang de var i udbud?**  *(Overvej ændringer i jeres samlede anslåede omkostninger til driften før og efter udbuddet)* |

**Parkområdet**

|  |
| --- |
| Samlet set er driften af de udbudte opgaver ca. blevet: |
| \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ % billigere |
| \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ % dyrere |
| ❑ Hverken billigere eller dyrere  ❑ Ved ikke |
| Beskriv hvilke årsager du mener, der har påvirket forskellen i jeres omkostninger til driften før og efter udbuddet (beskriv også gerne årsager såfremt at driften hverken er blevet dyrere eller billigere).  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Eventuelle kommentarer til dit overslag:  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

Q13b (V102-V107)

**Vejområdet**

|  |
| --- |
| Samlet set er driften af de udbudte opgaver ca. blevet |
| \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ % billigere |
| \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ % dyrere |
| ❑ Hverken billigere eller dyrere  ❑ Ved ikke |
| Beskriv hvilke årsager du mener, der har påvirket forskellen i jeres omkostninger til driften før og efter udbuddet (beskriv også gerne årsager såfremt at driften hverken er blevet dyrere eller billigere).  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Eventuelle kommentarer til dit overslag |

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
| **Q14 Antal driftskontrakter**  **Hvor mange driftskontrakter har din afdeling indgået med private virksomheder?** |

Q14a (V108)

**Parkområdet**

❑ Ingen

❑ 1

❑ 2

❑ 3

❑ 4 eller flere

Q14b (V109)

**Vejområdet**

❑ Ingen

❑ 1

❑ 2

❑ 3

❑ 4 eller flere

Q14c (V110)

**Har I indgået en samlet kontrakt på vej- og parkområdet?**

❑ Ja

❑ Nej

❑ Ved ikke

Q14d

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Q15 Kontraktperiode (antal år)**  **Hvor lang er kontraktperioden og muligheden for forlængelse (option) almindeligvis for din afdelings driftskontrakter med private?**  *(Hvis I har flere driftskontrakter med forskellig længde, så angiv længden på de(n) væsentligste driftskontrakt(er)* |

Q15a (V112-V114)  
**Parkområdet**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Den aftalte kontraktperiode er | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Evt. mulighed for forlængelse af kontraktperioden (option) er på | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

Q15b (V115-117)

**Vejområdet**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Den aftalte kontraktperiode er | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Evt. mulighed for forlængelse af kontraktperioden (option) er på | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

Q15c

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

**Q16   
Kontrolbud   
  
Q16a (V119)**

**Har kommunen udarbejdet kontrolbud i forbindelse med udbud af driftsopgaver?   
(med kontrolbud menes en beregning af hvad det vil koste kommunen selv at udføre opgaverne)**

❑ Nej

❑ Ja

❑ Ved ikke

Q16b

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

**Q17**

**Markedssituation og driftssikkerhed   
  
Q17a (V121-V123)**

**Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener at følgende udsagn beskriver 'markedssituationen' for de driftsopgaver I udbyder?**

|  | **Slet  ikke 0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved  ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Får I almindeligvis tilstrækkeligt med kvalificerede tilbud (konkurrence) på de opgaver I udbyder? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Vil I uden væsentlige forstyrrelser af driften eller økonomiske omkostninger kunne finde en ny entreprenør til at løse driftsopgaver såfremt at de(n) nuværende entreprenør(er) pludseligt svigter? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Tror du at det vil medføre økonomiske tab for de(n) privat(e) entreprenør(er) såfremt at din afdeling/kommune bragte driftskontrakt(erne) uventet til ophør før tid? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Q17b

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

**Q18  
Planlægning/udarbejdelse af udbud**

**Q18a (V125-V129)**

**Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener følgende metoder anvendes når I planlægger/udarbejder udbud af driftsopgaver**

|  | **Slet  ikke 0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved  ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Der anvendes grundige analyser af hvad markedet kan tilbyde | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Der anvendes grundige analyser af egne erfaringer | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Der anvendes rådgivning fra eksterne konsulenter/rådgivere | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Der anvendes grundige analyser af andre kommuners erfaringer | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Der anvendes grundige analyser af udbudstekniske og juridiske muligheder | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Q18b

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Q19 Opgavernes klarhed og kontrollerbarhed**  **Angiv i nærmeste procentandel i hvilket omfang du anslår at den drift, der er overdraget til private entreprenører omfatter opgaver, som i praksis er...** |

**Q19a (V131-V133)**

**Parkområdet**

|  | **0 %** | **10 %** | **20 %** | **30 %** | **40 %** | **50 %** | **60 %** | **70 %** | **80 %** | **90 %** | **100 %** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ... overvejende svære at føre tilsyn med / kontrollere kvaliteten af | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... overvejende svære at udføre tilfredsstillende uden forudgående fælles tilrettelæggelse og dialog | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... overvejende lette at beskrive klart og entydigt | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

**Q19b (V 134-V136)**

**Vejområdet**

|  | **0 %** | **10 %** | **20 %** | **30 %** | **40 %** | **50 %** | **60 %** | **70 %** | **80 %** | **90 %** | **100 %** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ... overvejende svære at føre tilsyn med / kontrollere kvaliteten af | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... overvejende svære at udføre tilfredsstillende uden forudgående fælles tilrettelæggelse og dialog | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... overvejende lette at beskrive klart og entydigt | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Q19c

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

**Q20  
'Styringskapacitet'**

**Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener at følgende udsagn beskriver din afdelings kapacitet til administration og styring af den del af driften, der er overdraget til de(n) private entreprenør(er)  
   
Q20a (V138-V141)**

|  | **Slet ikke  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Vi har tilstrækkelige organisatoriske ressourcer (fx tid og mandskab) til administration og styring | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Vi har tilstrækkeligt med erfaringer og viden til administration og styring | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Vi har tilstrækkelige værktøjer, metoder og systemer (fx GIS og IT-systemer) til administration og styring | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Vi har tilstrækkelige (fælles) rutiner og procedurer til administration og styring | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Q20b

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

**Q21**

**Organisatoriske effekter fra samarbejde med private  
  
I hvilken grad mener du at anvendelsen af og/eller samarbejde med private entreprenører har påvirket din afdeling positivt eller negativt i forhold til...  
Q21a (V143-V151)**

|  | **Påvirket meget  negativt  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **Neutralt**  **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **Påvirket  meget positivt**  **10** | **Ved  ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ... jeres arbejdsmetoder og rutiner | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... jeres viden og information om forholdene i områder og anlæg | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... jeres evne til at tænke nyt og anderledes | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... jeres fokus på planlægning og udvikling af områder og anlæg | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... jeres styring af driftsopgaverne | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... jeres styring af driftsøkonomien | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... jeres evne til at betjene det politiske niveau i kommunen | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... jeres evne til at betjene borgere og brugere | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Beskriv eventuelt andre vigtige erfaringer I har haft med private entreprenører |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Q21b

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

**Q22   
Erfaringer med anvendelse af private**

**I hvor mange år kan du huske at din afdeling som minimum har anvendt private i driften?  
Q22a**

|  |
| --- |
| Ca. år \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
|  |

Q22b

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Q23 Intern opbakning til anvendelse af private**  **Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener, at anvendelsen af private entreprenører i driften (af de områder og anlæg din afdeling har ansvaret for) er...**  **Q23a (V156-V159)** |

|  | **Slet  ikke 0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved  ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ... et internt politisk ønske i kommunen | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... et internt ønske i forvaltningen i kommunen | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... løbende til politisk debat internt i kommunen | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... løbende til debat internt i forvaltningen | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Q23b

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

**Q24  
Formål med anvendelse af private**

**Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener, at følgende formål er en central del af kommunens overvejelser for at anvende private entreprenører i driften (af de områder og anlæg din afdeling har ansvaret for)  
  
Q24a (V161-V167)  
Formålet er...**

|  | **Slet  ikke 0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved  ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ... at opnå en høj kvalitet i driften | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... at opnå en billig drift | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... at opnå en effektiv styring af driften | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... at markedsteste og sammenligne priserne på driftsopgaver | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... at få udført driftsopgaver som kommunen ikke umiddelbart selv kan løse | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... at udvikle og forny områder og anlæg | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... at udvikle vores interne organisation og arbejdsmetoder | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Q24b  Nævn andre eventuelle formål og/eller begrundelser du finder vigtige |

|  |
| --- |
| **Q25 Lovgivning og anvendelse af private**  **Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener, at gældende lovgivning og regler giver problemer for følgende forhold**  **Q25a (V168-V170)** |

|  | **Slet  ikke 0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved  ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Har gældende lovgivning og regler givet jer problemer med at finde den bedste entreprenør til at løse jeres driftsopgaver? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Har gældende lovgivning og regler givet jer problemer i forhold til at kunne samarbejde optimalt med de private entreprenører om løsning af driftsopgaverne? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Har forhold af juridisk karakter givet jer problemer (fx retssager og tvister) som har påvirket udførslen af driftsopgaver negativt? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Q25b

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **I det følgende stiller vi en række spørgsmål til den del af driften, der er organiseret i regi af kommunen på vejområdet og/eller parkområdet (fx intern drift, via bestiller-udførermodel, selvejet kommunalt aktieselskab, o.l.).** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Q26 Styringsværktøjer ift. den kommunale drift**  **Hvilken af følgende styringsværktøjer anvender kommunen i ledelse og organisation af den kommunale drift på vej- og/eller parkområdet?** |

Q26a (V175-V182)

|  | **Ja** | **Nej** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Virksomhedsplaner (fx angivelse af hovedopgaver, strategi, udviklingsmål, økonomi, m.m.) | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Adskillelse af ansvar for 'bestilling' af driftsopgaver fra ansvaret for 'udførsel' af driftsopgaver | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Selvstændigt budget og årsregnskab | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Selvstændig ledelse | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Separat kontrol og tilsyn med udførsel af driftsopgaver | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Konkurrenceudsættelse af opgaver (hel eller delvis) | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Mulighed for at den interne drift byder ind på opgaver hos andre 'kunder' (fx skoler, institutioner eller andre kommuner) | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Organisering som 100% kommunalt ejet aktieselskab | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Q26b

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Q27 Adskillelse af driften fra andre opgaver**  **Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad den kommunale udførsel af driftsopgaver er organisatorisk adskilt fra følgende opgaver**  *('organisatorisk adskilt' betyder her at det daglige ansvar for en opgave er tydeligt placeret og løses i en anden organisatorisk/forvaltningsmæssig enhed end den del der udfører driftsopgaverne, eksempelvis som opgavedelingen i en typisk bestiller-udfører model, ved oprettelsen af et kommunalt aktieselskab til varetagelse af driften eller ved en opdeling mellem interne underafdelinger).* |

Q27a (V184-V188)

**På parkområdet**

|  | **Slet  ikke 0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved  ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Overordnet planlægning, strategi og udvikling (fx ift. kommuneplan og lokalplaner) | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Myndighedsopgaver og administration (fx ift. lovgivning) | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Overordnet driftsplanlægning (fx arealregistrering, kvalitetsbeskrivelser, driftsplaner, bestilling af driftsopgaver) | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Kontrol og tilsyn med driften (udover egenkontrol i driften) | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Overordnet budgetlægning og opfølgning på driftsbudgetter | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Q27b (V189-V193

**På vejområdet**

|  | **Slet  ikke 0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved  ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Overordnet planlægning, strategi og udvikling (fx ift. kommuneplan og lokalplaner) | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Myndighedsopgaver og administration (fx ift. lovgivning) | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Overordnet driftsplanlægning (fx arealregistrering, kvalitetsbeskrivelser, driftsplaner, bestilling af driftsopgaver) | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Kontrol og tilsyn med driften (udover egenkontrol i driften) | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Overordnet budgetlægning og opfølgning på driftsbudgetter | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Q27c

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Q28**  **Formål med kommunal drift** |

**Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener at følgende formål er en central del af kommunens overvejelser for at anvende kommunal drift (i de områder og anlæg din afdeling har ansvaret for)  
  
Q28a (V196-V206)**

**Formålet er:**

|  | **Slet  ikke 0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved  ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| at opnå en høj kvalitet i driften | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| at opnå en billig drift | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| at opnå en effektiv styring af driften | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| at opnå en fleksibel drift (fx at kunne ændre i driften efter behov) | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| at kunne sammenligne priserne på driftsopgaver | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| at få udført driftsopgaver som ikke kan løses af andre | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| at udvikle og forny områder og anlæg | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| at udvikle vores interne organisation og arbejdsmetoder | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| at sikre gode arbejdsforhold | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| at bevare evnen til at løse driftsopgaver ('forsyningssikkerhed') | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| at sikre demokratisk styring og kontrol | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Q28b  Nævn andre eventuelle formål og/eller begrundelser du finder vigtige |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Q29 Tilfredshed med kommunal drift (vejområdet)** |

**Q29a (V207-V212)**

**Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 hvor tilfreds eller utilfreds du er med den kommunale drift på vejområdet i forhold til...**

|  | **Meget utilfreds  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **Meget tilfreds 10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Den gennemgående kvalitet i driften | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Det gennemgående pris- og omkostningsniveau i driften | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Fleksibilitet i forhold til ønsker om ændringer og/eller forbedringer i driften | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Opfølgning og løsning af problemer og mangler i driften | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Udvikling og nytænkning af driften | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Opfyldelsen af jeres langsigtede målsætninger for områder og anlæg | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Q29b  Er der andre forhold som du er tilfreds/utilfreds med? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Q30 Tilfredshed med kommunal drift (parkområdet)** |

**Q30a (V214-V219)**

**Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 hvor tilfreds eller utilfreds du er med den kommunale drift på parkområdet i forhold til...**

|  | **Meget utilfreds  0** | **1** | | **2** | | **3** | | **4** | | **5** | | **6** | | **7** | | **8** | | **9** | | **Meget tilfreds 10** | | **Ved**  **ikke** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Den gennemgående kvalitet i driften | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ |
| Det gennemgående pris- og omkostningsniveau i driften | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ |
| Fleksibilitet i forhold til ønsker om ændringer og/eller forbedringer i driften | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ |
| Opfølgning og løsning af problemer og mangler i driften | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ |
| Udvikling og nytænkning af driften | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ |
| Opfyldelsen af jeres langsigtede målsætninger for områder og anlæg | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ | | ❑ |
| Q30b  Er der andre forhold som du er tilfreds/utilfreds med? |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Q31 Holdninger i samarbejdet** |

**Q31a (V221-V226)**

**Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener at følgende beskrivelser kendetegner de interne forhold i kommunen til den kommunale drift (på park- og/eller vejområdet)?**

|  | **Slet ikke  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alle er af den opfattelse at det er nødvendigt at samarbejde for at vi hver især kan opnå vores mål | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Alle er optaget af at alle parter opnår deres mål | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Alle er parate til at ændre på forhold i driften, hvis det gør arbejdet lettere for den ene eller anden part | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Ingen er indstillet på at udnytte en svaghed eller fejl hos en anden til egen fordel | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Alle er af den opfattelse at det er helt fint at skylde hinanden en tjeneste | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Alle er indstillet på at uanset hvem der har ansvaret for en fejltagelse, så er løsning af problemer et fælles ansvar | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

**Q31b  
Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Q32 Tilgang til styring af intern drift** |

Q32a (V228-V231)

**Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener at følgende udsagn kendetegner tilgangen til styringen af den kommunale drift**

|  | **Slet ikke  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I tilfælde af at driften ikke lever op til et krav som aftalt (fx kvalitetsniveau) anvender vi gerne ’hårde’ bods- og sanktionsmuligheder (fx reduceret betaling) | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Vi går op i at driften lever op til det grundlag (fx kvalitetskrav eller arbejdsmængder) vi har beskrevet i vores driftskontrakter | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Vi mødes ofte og taler sammen om driften | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Vi har fokus på at samarbejde om at opfylde strategiske målsætninger for områder og anlæg | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Q32b

**Angiv evt. Kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Q33**  **Samlede økonomiske effekter fra konkurrenceudsættelse**  **I hvilken størrelsesorden anslår du i procent at hele driften (af jeres afdelings områder og anlæg) er blevet billigere eller dyrere på grund af konkurrenceudsættelse?**  (Overvej både ændringer i jeres anslåede omkostninger til selve driftsopgaverne og jeres administration af driftsopgaverne) |

Q33a (V233-V238)

**Parkområdet**

|  |
| --- |
| Samlet set er driften ca. blevet |
| \_\_\_\_ % billigere |
| \_\_\_\_ % dyrere |
| ❑ Hverken billigere eller dyrere  ❑ Ved ikke |
|  |
| Beskriv eventuelt hvad du mener er årsagerne til at driften er blevet dyrere/billigere på grund af konkurrenceudsættelse  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Eventuelle kommentarer til dit overslag \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

Q33b (V239-V244)

**Vejområdet**

|  |
| --- |
| Samlet set er driften ca. blevet |
| \_\_\_\_ % billigere |
| \_\_\_\_ % dyrere |
| ❑ Hverken billigere eller dyrere  ❑ Ved ikke |
| Beskriv eventuelt hvad du mener er årsagerne til at driften er blevet dyrere/billigere på grund af konkurrenceudsættelse  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Eventuelle kommentarer til dit overslag  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

**Q34**

**Effekter fra konkurrenceudsættelse på kommunale drift**

**Q34a (V245-V249)**

**Angiv i hvilken grad mener du at konkurrenceudsættelse har påvirket den kommunale drift positivt eller negativt i forhold til...**

|  | **Påvirket meget  negativt  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **Påvirket  meget positivt**  **10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ... pris- og omkostningsniveau i opgaveløsningen | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... kvalitetsniveau i opgaveløsningen | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... fleksibilitet i opgaveløsningen | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... metoder og rutiner, der anvendes i opgaveløsningen | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... medarbejdernes trivsel og arbejdsglæde | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

**Q34b**

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Q35**  **Opgavernes klarhed og kontrollerbarhed**  **Angiv i nærmeste procentandel i hvilket omfang du anslår at de opgaver, der udføres i den kommunale drift, som i praksis er...** |

**Q35a (V251-v253)**

**Parkområdet**

|  | **0 %** | **10 %** | **20 %** | **30 %** | **40 %** | **50 %** | **60 %** | **70 %** | **80 %** | **90 %** | **100 %** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ... overvejende svære at føre tilsyn med / kontrollere kvaliteten af | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... overvejende svære at udføre tilfredsstillende uden forudgående fælles tilrettelæggelse og dialog | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... overvejende lette at beskrive klart og entydigt | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

**Q35b (V254-V256)**

**Vejområdet**

|  | **0 %** | **10 %** | **20 %** | **30 %** | **40 %** | **50 %** | **60 %** | **70 %** | **80 %** | **90 %** | **100 %** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ... overvejende svære at føre tilsyn med / kontrollere kvaliteten af | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... overvejende svære at udføre tilfredsstillende uden forudgående fælles tilrettelæggelse og dialog | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... overvejende lette at beskrive klart og entydigt | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

**Q35c (V257)**

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Q36**  **Opbakning til kommunal drift** |

**Q36a (V258-V261)**

**Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener at anvendelsen af kommunal drift i de områder og anlæg din afdeling har ansvaret for er...**

|  | **Slet  ikke 0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved  ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ... et internt politisk ønske i kommunen | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... et internt ønske i forvaltningen i kommunen | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... løbende til politisk debat internt i kommunen | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... løbende til debat internt i forvaltningen | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

**Q36b (V262)**

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Q37 (V263-V265) Erfaring med kommunal drift** |

**I hvor mange år kan du huske at din afdeling som minimum har anvendt kommunal drift?**

|  |
| --- |
| Ca. \_\_\_\_\_\_ år |
|  |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **I det følgende stiller vi en række spørgsmål til jeres anvendelse af et fælleskommunalt selskab/entreprenør til driftsopgaver på vejområdet og/eller parkområdet.** |

**Q38  
  
Erfaringer med anvendelse af fælleskommunal entreprenør/selskab  
I hvor mange år kan du huske at din afdeling som minimum har anvendt fælleskommunal entreprenør/selskab i driften?**

|  |
| --- |
| Ca. år |
|  |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Q39**  **Formål med anvendelse af fælleskommunalt selskab/entreprenør**  **Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener at følgende formål er en central del af kommunens overvejelser for at anvende et fælleskommunalt selskab/entreprenør i driften af de områder og anlæg din afdeling har ansvaret for** |

**Formålet er...**

|  | **Slet  ikke 0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved  ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ...at opnå en høj kvalitet i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at opnå en billig drift | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at opnå en effektiv styring af driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at opnå en fleksibel drift (fx at kunne ændre i driften efter behov) | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at markedsteste og/eller sammenligne priserne på driftsopgaver | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at få udført driftsopgaver som kommunen ikke selv kan løse | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at udvikle og forny områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at udvikle vores interne organisation og arbejdsmetoder | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ... at opnå stordriftsfordele | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ... at undgå kommunesammenlægning | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Nævn andre eventuelle formål og/eller begrundelser du finder vigtige |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Q40  
Tilfredshed med fælleskommunalt selskab/entreprenør (parkområdet)**

**Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 hvor tilfreds eller utilfreds du er med det arbejde den fælleskommunale selskab/entreprenør på parkområdet udfører i forhold til...**

|  | **Meget utilfreds  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **Meget tilfreds 10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Den gennemgående kvalitet i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Det gennemgående pris- og omkostningsniveau i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Fleksibilitet i forhold til ønsker om ændringer og/eller forbedringer i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Opfølgning og løsning af problemer og mangler i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Udvikling og nytænkning af driften af jeres områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Opfyldelsen af jeres langsigtede målsætninger for jeres områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Er der andre forhold som du er tilfreds/utilfreds med? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Q41  
Tilfredshed med fælleskommunalt selskab/entreprenør (vejområdet)**

**Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 hvor tilfreds eller utilfreds du er med det arbejde den fælleskommunale selskab/entreprenør på vejområdet udfører i forhold til...**

|  | **Meget utilfreds  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **Meget tilfreds 10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Den gennemgående kvalitet i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Det gennemgående pris- og omkostningsniveau i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Fleksibilitet i forhold til ønsker om ændringer og/eller forbedringer i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Opfølgning og løsning af problemer og mangler i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Udvikling og nytænkning af driften af jeres områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Opfyldelsen af jeres langsigtede målsætninger for jeres områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Er der andre forhold som du er tilfreds/utilfreds med? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

**Q42  
Holdninger i samarbejdet**

**Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener at følgende beskrivelser kendetegner forholdet mellem din afdeling og den fælleskommunale entreprenør?**

|  | **Slet ikke  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Vi er begge af den opfattelse at det er nødvendigt at samarbejde for at vi hver især kan opnå vores mål | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Vi er begge optaget af at den anden part opnår sine mål | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Vi er begge parate til at ændre på forhold i driften, hvis det gør arbejdet lettere for den ene part | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Ingen af os vil udnytte en svaghed eller fejl hos den anden til egen fordel | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Vi synes begge at det er helt fint at skylde hinanden en tjeneste | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Uanset hvem der har ansvaret for en fejltagelse, så er løsning af problemer et fælles ansvar | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

**Q43  
Tilgang til styring**

**Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener at følgende udsagn kendetegner jeres tilgang til styringen af den fælleskommunale entreprenør i driften?**

|  | **Slet ikke  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I tilfælde af at driften ikke lever op til et krav som aftalt (fx kvalitetsniveau) anvender vi gerne ’hårde’ bods- og sanktionsmuligheder (fx reduceret betaling) | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Vi mødes ofte og taler sammen om driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Vi går op i at driften lever op til det grundlag (fx kvalitetskrav eller arbejdsmængder) vi har beskrevet i vores driftskontrakter | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Vi har fokus på at samarbejde om at opfylde de strategiske målsætninger for områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Q44**  **Opgavernes klarhed og kontrollerbarhed**  **Angiv i nærmeste procentandel i hvilket omfang du anslår at de opgaver, der udføres af det fælleskommunale selskab/entreprenør, som i praksis er:** |

Q44a

**Parkområdet**

|  | **0 %** | **10 %** | **20 %** | **30 %** | **40 %** | **50 %** | **60 %** | **70 %** | **80 %** | **90 %** | **100 %** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ... overvejende svære at føre tilsyn med / kontrollere kvaliteten af | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ | (12) ❑ |
| ... overvejende svære at udføre tilfredsstillende uden forudgående fælles tilrettelæggelse og dialog | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ | (12) ❑ |
| ... overvejende lette at beskrive klart og entydigt | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ | (12) ❑ |

Q44b

**Vejområdet**

|  | **0 %** | **10 %** | **20 %** | **30 %** | **40 %** | **50 %** | **60 %** | **70 %** | **80 %** | **90 %** | **100 %** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ... overvejende svære at føre tilsyn med / kontrollere kvaliteten af | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ | (12) ❑ |
| ... overvejende svære at udføre tilfredsstillende uden forudgående fælles tilrettelæggelse og dialog | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ | (12) ❑ |
| ... overvejende lette at beskrive klart og entydigt | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ | (12) ❑ |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **I det følgende stiller vi en række spørgsmål til jeres anvendelse af den eksterne offentlig entreprenør til driftsopgaver på vejområdet og/eller parkområdet.** |

**Q45  
Erfaringer med anvendelse af ekstern offentlig entreprenør   
I hvor mange år kan du huske at din afdeling som minimum har anvendt ekstern offentlig entreprenør i driften?**

|  |
| --- |
| Ca. år |
|  |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Q46**  **Formål med anvendelse af ekstern offentlig entreprenør**  **Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener at følgende formål er en central del af kommunens overvejelser for at anvende en ekstern offentlig entreprenør i driften af de områder og anlæg din afdeling har ansvaret for** |

**Formålet er...**

|  | **Slet  ikke 0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved  ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ...at opnå en høj kvalitet i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at opnå en billig drift | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at opnå en effektiv styring af driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at opnå en fleksibel drift (fx at kunne ændre i driften efter behov) | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at markedsteste og/eller sammenligne priserne på driftsopgaver | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at få udført driftsopgaver som kommunen ikke selv kan løse | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at udvikle og forny områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at udvikle vores interne organisation og arbejdsmetoder | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Nævn andre eventuelle formål og/eller begrundelser du finder vigtige |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Q47**  **Tilfredsheds med ekstern offentlig entreprenør**  **Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 hvor tilfreds eller utilfreds du er med det arbejde den eksterne offentlige entreprenør udfører:** |

**Q47a  
På parkområdet i forhold til...**

|  | **Meget utilfreds  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **Meget tilfreds 10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Den gennemgående kvalitet i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Det gennemgående pris- og omkostningsniveau i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Fleksibilitet i forhold til ønsker om ændringer og/eller forbedringer i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Opfølgning og løsning af problemer og mangler i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Udvikling og nytænkning af driften af jeres områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Opfyldelsen af jeres langsigtede målsætninger for jeres områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Er der andre forhold som du er tilfreds/utilfreds med? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Q47b

**På vejområdet i forhold til...**

|  | **Meget utilfreds  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **Meget tilfreds 10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Den gennemgående kvalitet i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Det gennemgående pris- og omkostningsniveau i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Fleksibilitet i forhold til ønsker om ændringer og/eller forbedringer i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Opfølgning og løsning af problemer og mangler i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Udvikling og nytænkning af driften af jeres områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Opfyldelsen af jeres langsigtede målsætninger for jeres områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Er der andre forhold som du er tilfreds/utilfreds med? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

**Q48  
Holdninger i samarbejdet**

**Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener at følgende beskrivelser kendetegner forholdet mellem din afdeling og den eksterne offentlige entreprenør**

|  | **Slet ikke  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Vi er begge af den opfattelse at det er nødvendigt at samarbejde for at vi hver især kan opnå vores mål | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Vi er begge optaget af at den anden part opnår sine mål | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Vi er begge parate til at ændre på forhold i driften, hvis det gør arbejdet lettere for den ene part | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Ingen af os vil udnytte en svaghed eller fejl hos den anden til egen fordel | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Vi synes begge at det er helt fint at skylde hinanden en tjeneste | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Uanset hvem der har ansvaret for en fejltagelse, så er løsning af problemer et fælles ansvar | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Q49**  **Tilgang til styring**  **Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener at følgende udsagn kendetegner din afdelings tilgang til styringen af den eksterne offentlige entreprenør i driften** |

|  | **Slet ikke  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I tilfælde af at driften ikke lever op til et krav som aftalt (fx kvalitetsniveau) anvender vi gerne ’hårde’ bods- og sanktionsmuligheder (fx reduceret betaling) | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Vi mødes ofte og taler sammen om driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Vi går op i at driften lever op til det grundlag (fx kvalitetskrav eller arbejdsmængder) vi har beskrevet i vores driftskontrakter | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Vi har fokus på at samarbejde om at opfylde de strategiske målsætninger for områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Q50**  **Opgavernes klarhed og kontrollerbarhed**  **Angiv i nærmeste procentandel i hvilket omfang du anslår at de driftsopgaver den eksterne offentlige entreprenør udfører for din afdeling i praksis er...** |

Q50a

**Parkområdet**

|  | **0 %** | **10 %** | **20 %** | **30 %** | **40 %** | **50 %** | **60 %** | **70 %** | **80 %** | **90 %** | **100 %** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ... overvejende svære at føre tilsyn med / kontrollere kvaliteten af | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ | (12) ❑ |
| ... overvejende svære at udføre tilfredsstillende uden forudgående fælles tilrettelæggelse og dialog | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ | (12) ❑ |
| ... overvejende lette at beskrive klart og entydigt | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ | (12) ❑ |

Q50b

**Vejområdet**

|  | **0 %** | **10 %** | **20 %** | **30 %** | **40 %** | **50 %** | **60 %** | **70 %** | **80 %** | **90 %** | **100 %** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ... overvejende svære at føre tilsyn med / kontrollere kvaliteten af | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ | (12) ❑ |
| ... overvejende svære at udføre tilfredsstillende uden forudgående fælles tilrettelæggelse og dialog | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ | (12) ❑ |
| ... overvejende lette at beskrive klart og entydigt | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ | (12) ❑ |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **I det følgende stiller vi en række spørgsmål til jeres anvendelse af en fællesejet offentligt-privat entreprenør på vejområdet og/eller parkområdet til driftsopgaver.** |

**Q51**

**Erfaringer med anvendelse offentligt-privat selskab   
I hvor mange år kan du huske at din afdeling som minimum har anvendt offentligt-privat selskab i driften?**

|  |
| --- |
| Ca. år |
|  |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Q52**  **Formål med anvendelse af offentligt-privat selskab**  **Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener at følgende formål er en central del af kommunens overvejelser for at anvende en fællesejet offentlig-privat entreprenør i driften (af de områder og anlæg din afdeling har ansvaret for)** |

**Formålet er...**

|  | **Slet  ikke 0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved  ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ...at opnå en høj kvalitet i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at opnå en billig drift | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at opnå en effektiv styring af driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at opnå en fleksibel drift (fx at kunne ændre i driften efter behov) | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at markedsteste og/eller sammenligne priserne på driftsopgaver | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at få udført driftsopgaver som kommunen ikke selv kan løse | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at udvikle og forny områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at udvikle vores interne organisation og arbejdsmetoder | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Nævn andre eventuelle formål og/eller begrundelser du finder vigtige |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Q53**  **Tilfredshed med offentligt-privat selskab**  **Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 hvor tilfreds eller utilfreds du er med det arbejde den fællesejede offentlige-private entreprenør udfører:** |

Q53a

**På parkområdet i forhold til:**

|  | **Meget utilfreds  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **Meget tilfreds 10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Den gennemgående kvalitet i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Det gennemgående pris- og omkostningsniveau i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Fleksibilitet i forhold til ønsker om ændringer og/eller forbedringer i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Opfølgning og løsning af problemer og mangler i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Udvikling og nytænkning af driften af jeres områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Opfyldelsen af jeres langsigtede målsætninger for jeres områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Er der andre forhold som du er tilfreds/utilfreds med? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Q54b

**På vejområdet i forhold til...**

|  | **Meget utilfreds  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **Meget tilfreds 10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Den gennemgående kvalitet i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Det gennemgående pris- og omkostningsniveau i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Fleksibilitet i forhold til ønsker om ændringer og/eller forbedringer i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Opfølgning og løsning af problemer og mangler i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Udvikling og nytænkning af driften af jeres områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Opfyldelsen af jeres langsigtede målsætninger for jeres områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Er der andre forhold som du er tilfreds/utilfreds med? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

**Q55**

**Holdninger i samarbejdet**

**Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener at følgende beskrivelser kendetegner forholdet mellem din afdeling og den fællesejede offentlige-private entreprenør**

|  | **Slet ikke  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Vi er begge af den opfattelse at det er nødvendigt at samarbejde for at vi hver især kan opnå vores mål | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Vi er begge optaget af at den anden part opnår sine mål | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Vi er begge parate til at ændre på forhold i driften, hvis det gør arbejdet lettere for den ene part | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Ingen af os vil udnytte en svaghed eller fejl hos den anden til egen fordel | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Vi synes begge at det er helt fint at skylde hinanden en tjeneste | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Uanset hvem der har ansvaret for en fejltagelse, så er løsning af problemer et fælles ansvar | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Q56**  **Tilgang til styring**  **Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener at følgende udsagn kendetegner din afdelings tilgang til styringen af den fællesejede offentlige-private entreprenør i driften** |

|  | **Slet ikke  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I tilfælde af at driften ikke lever op til et krav som aftalt (fx kvalitetsniveau) anvender vi gerne ’hårde’ bods- og sanktionsmuligheder (fx reduceret betaling) | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Vi mødes ofte og taler sammen om driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Vi går op i at driften lever op til det grundlag (fx kvalitetskrav eller arbejdsmængder) vi har beskrevet i vores driftskontrakter | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Vi har fokus på at samarbejde om at opfylde de strategiske målsætninger for områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Q57**  **Opgavernes klarhed og kontrollerbarhed**  **Angiv i nærmeste procentandel i hvilket omfang du anslår at de driftsopgaver den fællesejede offentlige-private entreprenør udfører for din afdeling i praksis er...** |

Q57a

**Parkområdet**

|  | **0 %** | **10 %** | **20 %** | **30 %** | **40 %** | **50 %** | **60 %** | **70 %** | **80 %** | **90 %** | **100 %** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ... overvejende svære at føre tilsyn med / kontrollere kvaliteten af | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ | (12) ❑ |
| ... overvejende svære at udføre tilfredsstillende uden forudgående fælles tilrettelæggelse og dialog | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ | (12) ❑ |
| ... overvejende lette at beskrive klart og entydigt | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ | (12) ❑ |

Q57b

**Vejområdet**

|  | **0 %** | **10 %** | **20 %** | **30 %** | **40 %** | **50 %** | **60 %** | **70 %** | **80 %** | **90 %** | **100 %** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ... overvejende svære at føre tilsyn med / kontrollere kvaliteten af | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ | (12) ❑ |
| ... overvejende svære at udføre tilfredsstillende uden forudgående fælles tilrettelæggelse og dialog | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ | (12) ❑ |
| ... overvejende lette at beskrive klart og entydigt | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ | (12) ❑ |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

|  |
| --- |
| **I det følgende stiller vi en række spørgsmål til jeres anvendelse af anden type af organisation på vejområdet og/eller parkområdet** |

**Q58  
Erfaringer med anvendelse af anden type organisation**

**I hvor mange år kan du huske at din afdeling som minimum har anvendt en anden type organisation i driften?**

|  |
| --- |
| Ca. år: |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
| **Q59 Formål med anvendelse af anden type organisation**  **Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener at følgende formål er en central del af kommunens overvejelser for at anvende en anden type af organisation i driften (af de områder og anlæg din afdeling har ansvaret for)** |

**Formålet er...**

|  | **Slet  ikke 0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved  ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ...at opnå en høj kvalitet i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at opnå en billig drift | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at opnå en effektiv styring af driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at opnå en fleksibel drift (fx at kunne ændre i driften efter behov) | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at markedsteste og/eller sammenligne priserne på driftsopgaver | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at få udført driftsopgaver som kommunen ikke selv kan løse | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at udvikle og forny områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| ...at udvikle vores interne organisation og arbejdsmetoder | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Nævn andre eventuelle formål og/eller begrundelser du finder vigtige |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
| **Q60**  **Tilfredshed med anden type organisation**  **Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 hvor tilfreds eller utilfreds du er med det arbejde den anden type af organisation udfører:** |

Q60a

**På parkområdet i forhold til:**

|  | **Meget utilfreds  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **Meget tilfreds 10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Den gennemgående kvalitet i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Det gennemgående pris- og omkostningsniveau i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Fleksibilitet i forhold til ønsker om ændringer og/eller forbedringer i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Opfølgning og løsning af problemer og mangler i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Udvikling og nytænkning af driften af jeres områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Opfyldelsen af jeres langsigtede målsætninger for jeres områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Er der andre forhold som du er tilfreds/utilfreds med? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Q60b

**På vejområdet i forhold til...**

|  | **Meget utilfreds  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **Meget tilfreds 10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Den gennemgående kvalitet i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Det gennemgående pris- og omkostningsniveau i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Fleksibilitet i forhold til ønsker om ændringer og/eller forbedringer i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Opfølgning og løsning af problemer og mangler i driften | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Udvikling og nytænkning af driften af jeres områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Opfyldelsen af jeres langsigtede målsætninger for jeres områder og anlæg | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Er der andre forhold som du er tilfreds/utilfreds med? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
| **Q61**  **Holdninger i samarbejdet**  **Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener at følgende beskrivelser kendetegner forholdet mellem din afdeling og den anden type af organisation** |

|  | **Slet ikke  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Vi er begge af den opfattelse at det er nødvendigt at samarbejde for at vi hver især kan opnå vores mål | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Vi er begge optaget af at den anden part opnår sine mål | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Vi er begge parate til at ændre på forhold i driften, hvis det gør arbejdet lettere for den ene part | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Ingen af os vil udnytte en svaghed eller fejl hos den anden til egen fordel | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Vi synes begge at det er helt fint at skylde hinanden en tjeneste | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |
| Uanset hvem der har ansvaret for en fejltagelse, så er løsning af problemer et fælles ansvar | (0) ❑ | (1) ❑ | (2) ❑ | (3) ❑ | (4) ❑ | (5) ❑ | (6) ❑ | (7) ❑ | (8) ❑ | (9) ❑ | (10) ❑ | (11) ❑ |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
| **Q62**  **Tilgang til styring**  **Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvilken grad du mener at følgende beskrivelser kendetegner jeres tilgang til styringen i driften af den anden type af organisation** |

|  | **Slet ikke  0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I tilfælde af at driften ikke lever op til et krav som aftalt (fx kvalitetsniveau) anvender vi gerne ’hårde’ bods- og sanktionsmuligheder (fx reduceret betaling) | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Vi mødes ofte og taler sammen om driften | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Vi går op i at driften lever op til det grundlag (fx kvalitetskrav eller arbejdsmængder) vi har beskrevet i vores driftskontrakter | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Vi har fokus på at samarbejde om at opfylde de strategiske målsætninger for områder og anlæg | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
| **Q63**  **Opgavernes klarhed og kontrollerbarhed**  **Angiv i nærmeste procentandel i hvilket omfang du anslår at de driftsopgaver andre typer af organisationer udfører i praksis er...** |

Q63a

**Parkområdet**

|  | **0 %** | **10 %** | **20 %** | **30 %** | **40 %** | **50 %** | **60 %** | **70 %** | **80 %** | **90 %** | **100 %** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ... overvejende svære at føre tilsyn med / kontrollere kvaliteten af | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... overvejende svære at udføre tilfredsstillende uden forudgående fælles tilrettelæggelse og dialog | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... overvejende lette at beskrive klart og entydigt | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

Q63b

**Vejområdet**

|  | **0 %** | **10 %** | **20 %** | **30 %** | **40 %** | **50 %** | **60 %** | **70 %** | **80 %** | **90 %** | **100 %** | **Ved ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ... overvejende svære at føre tilsyn med / kontrollere kvaliteten af | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... overvejende svære at udføre tilfredsstillende uden forudgående fælles tilrettelæggelse og dialog | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| ... overvejende lette at beskrive klart og entydigt | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
| **Q64**  **Hvem bør udføre driftsopgaverne i fremtiden?**  **Angiv i procent i hvilket omfang du mener at følgende typer af organisationer bør udføre jeres driftsopgaver i fremtiden** |

Q64a (V266-V271)

**Parkområdet**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Private entreprenører | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ % |
| Kommunal drift | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ % |
| Fællesejet kommunalt selskab/entreprenør | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ % |
| Anden offentlig myndighed | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ % |
| Fællesejet offentligt-privat selskab/entreprenør | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ % |
| Anden type organisation | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ % |

Q64b (V272-V277)

**Vejområdet**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Private entreprenører | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ % |
| Kommunal drift | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ % |
| Fællesejet kommunalt selskab/entreprenør | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ % |
| Anden offentlig myndighed | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ % |
| Fællesejet offentligt-privat selskab/entreprenør | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ % |
| Anden type organisation | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ % |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
| **Q65 (V279-V282)**  **Generelle forhold**  **Angiv på en skala fra 0 til 10 i hvor høj grad du vurderer at følgende forhold gør sig gældende for din afdeling** |

|  | **Slet  ikke 0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **I meget høj grad 10** | **Ved  ikke** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Har din afdelings rammevilkår og opgaver (fx politiske prioriteringer, lovkrav el. brugerønsker) forandret sig i de seneste 5 år? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Forventer du at din afdelings rammevilkår og opgaver (fx politiske prioriteringer, lovkrav el. brugerønsker) vil forandre sig i de kommende 5 år? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Har din afdelings budgetter samlet set været under pres de seneste 5 år? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |
| Forventer du at din afdelings budgetter samlet set vil være under pres i de kommende 5 år? | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ | ❑ |

**Angiv evt. kommentarer til dit svar her:**

**Q66**

**Til sidst vil vi gerne stille dig en række spørgsmål vedrørende din baggrund og ansættelse**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Q66a V284  I hvor mange år har du i alt haft ansættelse i den kommune, hvor du er ansat nu? | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Q66b V285  I hvor mange år har du i alt haft ansættelse i det offentlige? | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Q66c V286  I hvilket år er du født? | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Q66d V287  Hvad er dit køn? | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
|  |  |

**Q67**

**Ønsker du at modtage et sammendrag af undersøgelsens resultater når denne er afsluttet?**

❑ Ja

❑ Nej

|  |
| --- |
| **Tak for din deltagelse!** |

1. The original Danish title of the research project is: *’Innovationer i organiseringen af det offentlige-private samspil i et internationalt perspektiv med fokus på kommunaltekniske driftsopgaver’* with the abbreviated title *’innovationer i det offentlige private samspil’.* The Danish acronym for the title is: ’INOPS’. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)