

Suggestions from “Food for thought” sessions

Suggestions des sessions “Nourrir la réflexion”

Take stock of where the JV is at in implementing its initial mandate and how the Paris Declaration objectives are being met.

1. Capacity development as common requirement/ challenge

The JV should play a key role in strengthening a coordinated donor approach to capacity development efforts: sharing/disseminating information on initiatives, good practices, lessons learned.

2. Requirement to better define CPIs

Organising brainstorming workshops, provide technical assistance

This would also constitute an entry point to address the need for integrated procurement information systems that can provide adequate and accurate procurement information.

3. E-Procurement (this is the same thing that needs to be on the agenda even if not all the same)

JV could play an important catalytic role as a forum for sharing experiences and information.

Re: Workplan

C2 must continue to be a catalyst for country level activities to improve procurement systems.

1. Assessment Tool is already fine

- No need for additional dictionary
- No need for further specification and definitions

2. JV to be a forum for exchanging key procurement reform challenges/problems, best practices and trends

3. Pushing compliances

- e.g. pushing procurement publications

4. Fostering local markets

- e.g. increase capacity of local private sector

5. Developing procurement career system

6. Deliver and “selling” tangible outcomes/benefits of procurement reform e.g. better service delivery, better prices

NIGER

- Partage expériences et comparaison
- Connaissance standards internationaux
- Bénéficiaire outils
- Renforcement capacité
- Validation résultats pilot exercices
- 1^{er} étape : stock taking
Analyser les résultats des exercices de pilotage et éventuellement adapter la méthodologie

BANGLADESH

- JV should validate the self-assessments of the pilot countries
- Capacity development – JV should monitor these efforts

RWANDA

Will the JV formally validate all these pilot exercises?

To avoid BIASED evaluation, Rwanda planned to use an international Tam but World Bank advised against it

- Better to have Rwanda to do the exercise itself
- Rwanda credited its own team

QUESTION: How and who will validate the pilot exercise assessment?

NIGER

- Méthodologie n. 4 est incomplète Mandat du JV doit être d'abord de compléter la méthodologie

Present mandate version n 5

- Objects against a mandate for the JV to validate the assessments

Next mandate

Monitoring

+ for implementation of the tool

Facilitateur

+ capacity development action

Sharing of experiences

YEMEN

Short term: evaluate existing systems

Adopt the existing system

RWANDA

Develop performance indicators now only baseline indicators are well established.

NIGER

No, already in pilot exercise now both evaluation systems have been used.

Already in present mandate both performance and baseline indicators should be finalized.

NIGER

Pas indicateur d'impact à présent

p.c. sur le terrain, pour la population

Impact sur le PFM sur le développement

f.c. 90% of all procurement should use published notices

f.c. min. 3 offers needed

but what if only 1 company exists? Basis for performance indicators should be adapted to the results of each country.

Basis for performance indicators should be not absolute, but relative.

NIGER

Risk that donor will determine minimum basis fc Min 50% published notice as condition

RWANDA

Current capacities still very low

JV's mandate to promote creation and use of information systems for monitoring procurement

Conclusion:

1st Mandate: Finalise what we started: make a revised and final version of methodology

2nd Mandate: Monitor a forum for capacity development action

TABLE NOTES – Wolf Kruska

Monitoring	5b*
And	and link 2b
Toolkit	
Reconstitution	harmonization
Promote acceptance	between donors
Expansion of	Building consessions
Methodology use	

* establishing a common understanding to assess/measure 5b in the same way

The JV – to play the role, a strong role, of harmonizing, show acceptance, promote use of results for harmonisation

Baseline

(fix indicators)

Establish BLIs for all countries



Compliance

Connects to performance



Use

Harmonised behavior

Performance the country factor

JV: Code of compliance/performance

JV: Monitor not only the money flowing but also is money flowing towards capacity development – because

JV: Additional guidance in assessment process

**Series of topics that the Joint Venture can provide best practices as guidelines/principles
(Ruby Alvarez)**

1. Performance indicators

- Monitor competition
- What is the benchmark?
- Performance audit – How do you measure performance in procurement

2. Internal controls

3. Contract administration and management

- Transparency during contract implementation in infrastructure/medicine

4. Good complaints mechanism

- What are the good practices and principles?
- Independent review system – written decisions should be publically available
- Invite the best judicial and legal experts
- Train procurement officials to write decisions

5. Record keeping in Procurement

6. Blacklisting

- Due process should be respected

7. Using past performance as a criteria for eligibility for bid evaluation

- Formal past performance system
- Open compilation vs restricted or adequate competition
- Inclusive rather than exclusive short list

Way forward after 2008.

- 1. Whether others exist outside this group of donors partner governments who should be at the table, seek views on BLI/CPIs methodology.
Group might include NGOs, private sector what about other players like China who are substantial global powers.**
- 2. Some confusion exists around what is being assessed. It appears that we are assessing partner country system against various Pillars P indicators to see how a system measures up. Are we also assessing how this measures up in terms of international best practice.
No agreement that the current BLIs/CPIs represent best practice or allow you to conduct an assessment of sufficient depth. As currently drafted the ADB couldn't just accept a self-assessment using there indicators which don't assess risk.**

In summary

Need a definition of what good practice is that all can agree with.

- Currently we don't have a framework that allows a donor to be happy say if a partner government receives a suitable assessment. Then donor funds will flow through country systems.**
- Concerns that time is running out for achieving Paris Decorator targets without an agreed way forward.**
- Insufficient guidance on how validation process works.**
- A concern also exists that country level assessments are insufficient. For example, if you looking at doing something in health in Indonesia then you would wish to conduct an assessment of the health department, could you just apply the CPI's?**
- A feeling exists this wouldn't be sufficient.**