

ANNEX G

*Detailed Data from the 2010 OECD Survey
on Public Procurement*

This annex provides data for each responding country on the transparency of the public procurement cycle, as well as the online availability of public procurement information and the central government review and remedy mechanisms available for bidders. The data underlie the summaries of data presented in Chapter IX, specifically, for Indicators 41 and 42.

Table G.1. Mechanisms to routinely involve citizens in key stages of the procurement cycle at the central level of government (2010)

	Consultations on definition of needs	Oversight of bid opening process	Public hearing on terms of a contract	Complaints and dissatisfaction during implementation	Monitoring contract delivery
Australia	●	○	○	●	●
Austria	○	○	○	○	○
Belgium	○	●	○	○	○
Canada	○	○	○	○	○
Chile	○	○	○	○	○
Czech Republic	●	○	●	●	●
Denmark	○	○	○	○	○
Estonia	○	○	○	○	○
Finland	○	○	○	○	○
France	○	○	○	○	○
Germany	○	○	○	○	○
Greece	○	○	○	○	○
Hungary	○	○	○	○	○
Iceland	○	○	○	○	○
Ireland	○	○	○	○	○
Israel	●	○	○	○	○
Italy	○	○	○	○	○
Japan	●	●	○	●	○
Korea	●	●	●	●	●
Luxembourg	○	○	○	○	○
Mexico	○	●	●	○	○
Netherlands	○	○	○	○	○
New Zealand	○	○	○	○	○
Norway	○	○	○	○	○
Poland	○	●	●	●	●
Portugal	○	●	○	●	●
Slovak Republic	○	○	○	○	○
Slovenia	○	●	○	○	●
Spain	○	○	○	●	○
Sweden	○	○	○	○	○
Switzerland	○	○	○	○	○
Turkey	○	●	○	○	○
United Kingdom	○	○	○	○	○
United States	●	●	●	●	●
Brazil	○	●	●	●	●
Egypt	○	○	○	○	○
Ukraine	○	○	○	○	○
Total OECD34					
● Mandatory	2	3	1	2	1
● Voluntary	4	6	4	6	6
○ No participation	28	25	29	26	27

Note: Information is not available for Israel on oversight of bid opening process, public hearing on terms of a contract, complaints and dissatisfaction on the implementation, and monitoring contract delivery.

Source: OECD 2010 Survey on Public Procurement.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932392381>

Table G.2. **Central government review and remedy mechanisms available for public procurement (2010)**

	Special review bodies	Courts	Alternative dispute mechanisms
Australia	○	●	●
Austria	●	●	●
Belgium	●	●	●
Canada	●	●	●
Chile	●	●	●
Czech Republic	●	●	●
Denmark	○	●	○
Estonia	●	●	○
Finland	○	●	○
France	○	●	●
Germany	●	●	○
Greece	○	●	○
Hungary	●	●	●
Iceland	●	●	●
Ireland	○	●	○
Israel	○	●	●
Italy	○	●	●
Japan	●	●	○
Korea	●	●	●
Luxembourg	○	●	●
Mexico	●	●	●
Netherlands	○	●	○
New Zealand	○	●	●
Norway	●	●	●
Poland	●	●	○
Portugal	○	●	●
Slovak Republic	●	●	○
Slovenia	●	○	○
Spain	●	●	●
Sweden	○	●	○
Switzerland	●	●	○
Turkey	●	●	○
United Kingdom	○	●	●
United States	●	●	●
Brazil	○	●	○
Egypt	●	●	○
Ukraine	●	●	○
Total OECD34	20	33	20

● Yes.

○ No.

Source: OECD Public Procurement Survey.


StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932392400>

Table G.3. Online availability of selected public procurement information in central governments (2010)

	Specific guidance on application procedures	Laws and policies	General information for potential bidders	Procurement plan	Selection and evaluation criteria	Contract award	Tender documents	Justification for awarding contract to selected contractor	Contract modifications	Tracking procurement spending
Australia	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	●	n.a.
Austria	●	○	●	●	●	●	●	n.a.	●	n.a.
Belgium	●	○	●	●	●	●	●	○	○	n.a.
Canada	●	●	●	n.a.	●	●	●	○	n.a.	n.a.
Chile	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Czech Republic	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Denmark	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	n.a.
Estonia	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	●	○	●
Finland	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	●	n.a.	n.a.
France	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	●	○
Germany	n.a.	●	●	n.a.	●	●	●	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Greece	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	n.a.	n.a.
Hungary	●	●	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	○
Iceland	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Ireland	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	n.a.
Israel	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	●	n.a.
Italy	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	●	○
Japan	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○
Korea	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Luxembourg	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	○	○
Mexico	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Netherlands	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	n.a.
New Zealand	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	○	n.a.
Norway	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	○	○
Poland	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	n.a.
Portugal	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	●
Slovak Republic	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	n.a.	●	n.a.
Slovenia	●	○	●	●	●	●	●	○	●	○
Spain	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	●	●	n.a.
Sweden	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	n.a.	n.a.
Switzerland	●	●	●	n.a.	●	●	●	●	n.a.	●
Turkey	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	○	●
United Kingdom	●	●	●	●	n.a.	●	n.a.	●	n.a.	n.a.
United States	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	n.a.	n.a.	●
Brazil	○	●	●	n.a.	●	●	●	○	●	n.a.
Egypt	●	●	●	n.a.	●	●	●	n.a.	●	n.a.
Ukraine	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	n.a.	n.a.
Total OECD34										
● Yes	32	31	33	31	32	33	28	18	17	10
○ No	1	3	1	0	1	1	5	12	9	7

n.a.: Not applicable (e.g. information not public).

Source: OECD 2010 Survey on Public Procurement.


StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932392419>

Table G.4. Most common services offered by the governmental single-entry e-procurement website (2010)

	Applications that facilitate the interface with potential bidders							Contract management tools				Internal use
	Searching for tender announcements	Downloading all documents related to tenders	Prequalification systems	2-way communication with citizens, bidders and general public	Electronic submission of bids	Electronic reverse auction	E-catalogue	Tracking record of contracts/outcomes	Electronic payment schemes (e.g. e-invoicing)	Statistics and database related to past procurement	Contract management plan templates	Online training materials
Australia	●	●	●	●	●	○	○	○	○	●	○	○
Austria	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Belgium	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Canada	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Chile	●	●	○	●	●	○	●	○	●	●	●	●
Czech Republic	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Denmark	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Estonia	●	●	●	○	○	○	○	●	○	●	○	●
Finland	●	●	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	●	○	○
France	●	●	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	○	●
Germany	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Greece	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Hungary	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Iceland	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Ireland	●	●	●	●	●	○	○	○	○	●	○	○
Israel	●	●	●	○	○	●	○	●	●	●	●	○
Italy	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	●	○	○
Japan	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Korea	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Luxembourg	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Mexico	●	●	○	●	●	●	●	●	○	○	○	○
Netherlands	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
New Zealand	●	●	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	●	○	○
Norway	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Poland	●	○	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	●
Portugal	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○
Slovak Republic	○	●	○	●	●	●	○	●	○	●	●	●
Slovenia	●	●	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	●	○	○
Spain	●	●	●	●	●	○	●	●	○	●	○	○
Sweden	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Switzerland	●	●	○	●	●	○	○	●	○	○	○	●
Turkey	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	●	○	●	○	●
United Kingdom	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
United States	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	○	○
Brazil	●	●	○	○	○	●	●	○	●	●	○	●
Egypt	●	●	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ukraine	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	○	○
Total OECD34												
● Yes	21	19	8	12	11	7	6	11	4	14	4	8
○ No	1	3	14	10	11	15	16	11	16	8	18	14
n.a.: Not applicable	132	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12

Note: In the majority of cases, an n.a. response indicates country does not have a single-entry procurement website. However, e-procurement services may be available on other websites.

Source: OECD Public Procurement Survey.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932392438>