Statements:

 Social and Environmental Considerations adulterate the principle of competition.

Grounds:

Efficiency oriented competition is the fight for the best product/for the best service. It is not the fight for features which lie "beside" the product or service.

Statements:

2. Social and Environmental Considerations can be misused to choose the "wanted" supplier.

Grounds:

Social and Environmental Criterias can be set up in a way that the contracting authority will get the tenderer it has in mind in advance.

It is the invitation for manipulation.

Statements:

 Social and Environmental Considerations may reduce number of bidders.

Grounds:

A possible tenderer may not be able or may not want to fulfill social and environmental criterias.

In any case, a tenderer will not change its production line tools expecting a public contract.

This would be completely uneconomical.

Statements:

4. Social and Environmental Considerations diminish the legal protection.

Grounds:

Social and Environmental Considerations can be established in such a vague manner that no court can rule against those criterias.

Statements:

 Social and Environmental Considerations invite politicians to make politics through public tendering.

Grounds:

A politician can hardly resist if he has the opportunity to demand in a public tender the use of "clean" electricity, if his supporters produce such an energy or to give preference to a supplier which creates jobs for handicaped people if those are his supporters.

Conclusion:

A contracting authority should be well aware that by using social and environmental considerations it may not get the best product and the best supplier.

Therefore, a contracting authority should only choose environmental criterias which are linked directly with the product.

Therefore, a contracting authority should voluntarily refrain from using other social and environmental considerations.