

Demand Aggregation: Pooling demand, leveraging purchasing power

Demand aggregation refers to the deliberate pooling of identical or compatible requirements from multiple BUs, plants or companies in order to market them to the market as a bundled volume. In industrial procurement it is one of the most effective levers, since larger volumes typically enable better prices, terms and capacity commitments. The term covers both internal consolidation and collaboration with external partners.

Key facts

- Demand aggregation pools requirements across plants, BUs or companies into marketable volumes.
- In practice, price advantages in the single-digit to low double-digit percentage range compared with individual licence or individual plant procurement can frequently be achieved.
- A clean data basis is a prerequisite: material master data, match-and-merge rules and a common demand window.
- Typical forms are framework agreements, concept tenders, purchasing alliances and group tenders.
- KPIs such as pooled volume, savings pipeline, ordering costs and lead time make success measurable.
- Risks lie in internal coordination, supplier dependency and competition law limits on external alliances.

Definition: Demand Aggregation

Demand aggregation is the systematic consolidation of procurement requirements into a single, marketable demand package. The aim is to build a stronger negotiating position towards suppliers through the larger total volume and to exploit economies of scale in price, logistics and quality.

Internal versus external pooling

Internal demand aggregation pools requirements from a company's own plants, BUs or sites – for example at a supplier with five manufacturing locations. External pooling is done with third-party companies, for example in purchasing consortia or temporary group tenders. Internal pooling is legally unproblematic and usually the first step; external forms require careful delineation due to competition law and, in individual cases, legal review.

- Internal: plants, BUs, sites of one corporate group
- External: purchasing consortia, industry alliances, temporary cooperations
- Hybrid: platform-based pooling via marketplaces

Distinction from related terms

Demand aggregation is not synonymous with centralisation: it is not about centralising the order processing, but about consolidating the volume ahead of the award. It also differs from single sourcing, since several suppliers can remain in competition. Closely related are concepts such as competitive

participation in tenders and the supplier segmentation matrix, which is used to decide which suppliers are eligible for pooled volumes.

Methods and approach of demand pooling

Successful demand aggregation follows a structured process: identify, harmonise, pool and jointly market requirements. The quality of the data basis determines the size of the lever.

Demand analysis and data harmonisation

The starting point is a genuine demand analysis across all affected units: what is needed, in what quantities, at what dates and with which specifications? Duplicates frequently emerge here – the same part under different material numbers or designations. Match-and-merge rules help to consolidate identical or interchangeable items. Without a clean master data process, the pooling remains superficial; with it, a reliable total volume emerges.

- Demand query across all plants within the defined planning window
- Standardisation of specifications and material classes
- Match-and-merge rules for duplicate cleansing

Common specification instead of plant silos

A central lever is the harmonisation of the specification. As long as each plant demands its own drawing, tolerance or inspection instruction, the volume remains fragmented. Value analysis workshops with engineering and procurement reveal which deviations are functionally justified and which can be aligned. For manufactured parts, quality assurance requirements such as PPAP must be defined uniformly so that one supplier can supply the part for all plants.

Award and tendering

The pooled package is placed on the market via a structured tender with clear competitive participation. Defining the demand period is important: a planning window that is too narrow reduces the supplier's planning certainty, while one that is too wide increases forecast uncertainty. The award decision should not be based on price alone but should also take account of total cost, capacity and logistics performance.

Operational implementation in planning and procurement

After the award, the pooled demand must also be managed operationally. This is where demand aggregation bridges the gap from strategy to day-to-day business.

Pooling demand in the master production schedule

Pooled framework volumes are of little use if the call-offs reach the supplier in an uncoordinated manner. The master production schedule (MPS) of the participating plants should be aligned to a common demand picture. Delivery schedule tolerance bands define within which limits call-off fluctuations are possible without price adjustments or penalties – this protects both sides from costly short-term changes.

- Common call-off calendar across all sites
- Tolerance bands for quantity and schedule fluctuations
- Slot booking to spread delivery dates

Lot sizes, ordering costs and logistics

Larger pooled volumes enable larger lots and lower relative ordering costs. At the same time, the complexity of the distribution logistics increases: a central warehouse or direct deliveries to the plants? Lead time requirements differ by site; a clear supplier logistics agreement helps here. For remainders or overstocks, a proper returns process or return delivery route must be agreed with the supplier.

Pooling via digital platforms

B2B marketplaces facilitate demand aggregation by bringing together comparable requirements from multiple buyers, enabling suppliers to be offered bundled orders accordingly. For small and medium-sized enterprises, this is often the only way to reach volumes that would otherwise only be accessible to large corporations. The master data process and the interfaces for ERP integration determine the degree of automation here.

Key KPIs for demand aggregation

The success of the pooling must be measurable – both towards management and towards the participating units.

Volume and savings KPIs

Key figures are the total pooled volume, the share of pooled versus total demand of a commodity group and the savings pipeline realised from it. A clean separation between price and volume effects is important: only the price differential effect versus the baseline is a genuine savings contribution of the aggregation. The award rate (successfully pooled versus individually awarded items) also shows the level of maturity.

- Pooled volume per commodity group and period
- Price advantage versus internal baseline
- Share of pooled items in the total number

Process and supplier KPIs

Besides price, process metrics count: ordering costs per order, tender processing time, on-time delivery and lead time of the pooled framework agreements. For international pooling, supplier location risk is added as an evaluation factor. The number of active suppliers per pooled commodity group also shows whether the aggregation has led to unwanted dependency – this is where supplier de-risking bridges the gap.

Risks and controls of demand pooling

Demand aggregation promises a high leverage effect but also brings typical pitfalls – from internal politics to legal limits.

Internal acceptance and governance

Plants and BUs fear restrictions on their flexibility: tighter specifications, longer lead times, one central contract. Without clear governance and incentive models for innovation, pooling often fails due to internal resistance. Participation of the plants in the award decision has proven its worth, as have clear escalation paths for deviating requirements.

- Early involvement of the affected BUs and plants

- Transparent award decision criteria
- Defined exception and escalation processes

Supplier dependency and supply risk

Whoever pools a high volume with a single supplier increases dependency on it – in the event of failure, all plants are affected simultaneously. Supplier de-risking therefore requires at least a second source or a robust contingency strategy. For critical parts, the qualification effort (e.g. PPAP) and the time required for a second source must be factored in.

Competition law limits on external pooling

For purchasing consortia with competitors, competition law limits must be observed: the combination must not result in competition on the supplier side being materially restricted. Market share thresholds and the delineation of the cooperating activities should be legally reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Internal pooling within a corporate group is fundamentally not affected by this.

Price stability and raw material linkage

Larger framework agreements bind the parties longer to agreed prices – with volatile raw material markets this can become a disadvantage. Raw material indexation in price clauses or a clear price revision clause keeps the risk fair on both sides. Currency and customs risks must also be considered in international pooling.

Current developments: data, sustainability and platforms

Demand aggregation is changing significantly as a result of digitalisation, sustainability requirements and new forms of cooperation.

AI-supported demand detection

Modern analytics identify pooling potential automatically, for example by clustering similar parts based on drawing data or designation patterns. This significantly accelerates duplicate cleansing and also makes creeping demand visible that traditionally remains below the radar. A well-maintained master data process remains a prerequisite, as algorithms cannot compensate for poor data.

Sustainability and Scope 3 emissions

Pooled volumes also increase negotiating power on sustainability issues: suppliers can more readily be held to binding targets on Scope 3 emissions, recycling rates or energy efficiency when a large order stands behind them. Group tenders with common sustainability requirements are increasing, especially for energy, packaging and logistics services.

New forms of cooperation

Alongside classic purchasing consortia, more flexible forms are emerging: temporary alliances for individual projects, platform-based aggregation or joint supplier days of several buyers, at which suppliers are presented with pooled requirements. Such formats lower the barrier without having to build long-term structures.

Typical metrics

Pooled share of total demand: > 70 %

typical target value in consolidated commodity groups

Price advantage versus baseline: 3–15 %

rule of thumb frequently observed in practice upon first-time pooling

Reduction in ordering costs: 20–40 %

through fewer purchase orders and supplier contacts

On-time delivery of pooled framework agreements: > 95 %

depending on industry and call-off stability

Practical example: pooling of purchased parts in mechanical engineering

A mid-sized mechanical engineering company with three plants had previously procured standard components (turned and milled parts, standard parts, electrical materials) separately per plant. An analysis showed that around 60 per cent of the items were functionally identical but ran under different material numbers. After harmonising the specifications, establishing a uniform master data process and a joint tender with competitive participation across all plants, the volume was pooled in framework agreements with delivery schedule tolerance bands.

- Duplicate cleansing using match-and-merge rules and uniform material classes
- Common specification incl. uniform PPAP requirements for manufactured parts
- Framework agreements with raw material indexation and defined tolerance bands for call-offs
- KPI monitoring: pooled volume, savings pipeline, on-time delivery and lead time

Conclusion

Demand aggregation is one of the most effective procurement levers because it turns your own demand into currency. What matters is less the intention than the implementation: clean master data, harmonised specifications, coordinated planning and fair governance between the participating units. Those who also actively manage the risks – supplier dependency, competition law in external alliances, price volatility – make the pooling sustainable. For SMEs, digital marketplaces now open up access to volumes that were formerly the preserve of large corporations. The first step costs little: a stocktake of where identical requirements are being procured separately and unpooled.

Frequently asked questions

What does demand aggregation mean in procurement?

Demand aggregation means pooling identical or similar procurement requirements – within a company across plants and BUs, or jointly with other companies. The aim is a larger total volume, which enables better prices, terms and capacity commitments. It is therefore a central procurement lever alongside supplier consolidation and price negotiations.

How much savings potential does demand pooling typically deliver?

This depends heavily on the commodity group and the starting situation. In practice, for previously fragmented requirements, price advantages in the single-digit to low double-digit percentage range compared with individual order purchasing are frequently cited. In addition, ordering costs and process effort fall because fewer purchase orders and supplier contacts arise.

Is demand aggregation with other companies permissible under competition law?

Internal pooling within a corporate group is fundamentally unproblematic. External purchasing alliances with competitors can be problematic under competition law if the jointly awarded share is very large or competition on the supplier side is materially restricted. Market share thresholds and the concrete design should be legally reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

What prerequisites does demand aggregation require?

What matters is a robust requirements data basis, harmonised specifications and a functioning master data process, otherwise duplicates remain undetected. Added to this are a defined planning window for the tender and coordinated call-off planning across the plants. Internal governance and early involvement of the BUs secure acceptance.

What is the difference between demand aggregation and centralised procurement?

Centralised procurement shifts responsibility and processes into a central organisation; demand aggregation merely pools the volume ahead of the award, regardless of who places the orders afterwards. The two can be combined but are not identical. A decentralised company can still pool volume, for example via framework agreements negotiated centrally with decentralised call-offs.

How does demand aggregation work via B2B marketplaces?

Platforms bring together comparable requirements from multiple buyers and market them to suppliers as pooled volume. Buyers benefit from terms they could not achieve individually, while suppliers gain planning certainty from larger, bundled orders. Comparable specifications and clean material master data are prerequisites.