

Mapping of Current Initiatives on Public Procurement Assessments

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
International tools and initiatives	4
(1) OECD Methodology for Assessing Procurement Systems (MAPS)	4
(2) PEFA Performance Measurement Framework.....	5
(3) - OECD: Towards public procurement performance indicators	6
(4) Indicators of the Strength of Public Management Systems (ISPMS)	7
(5) OECD Peer Reviews	7
(6) UNEP Sustainable Public Procurement (SPP) Approach.....	8
(7) Open contracting (multi-stakeholder initiative).....	8
Donor/Agency tools and initiatives	9
(8) World Bank Country Procurement Assessment Report (CPAR)	9
(9) World Bank Assessment of Agencies' Capacity to Procure World Bank Financed Projects.....	10
(10) World Bank Procurement Risk Assessment and Management System (P-RAMS)	10
(11) World Bank Systematic Operations Risk-Rating Tool (SORT)	10
(12) World Bank Procurement Performance Measurement Framework.....	11
(13) World Bank Methodology to assess Alternative Procurement Arrangements	11
(14) EBRD Public Procurement Assessment	14
(15) EBRD Institutional Capacity Assessment (ICA)	15
(16) IDB performance indicators for public procurement	16
(17) DFAT Australia: Procurement Assessment Diagnostics Tool.....	16
(18) USAID - Procurement Performance Indicators Guide	17
(19) UNDP Public Procurement Capacity Development Guide.....	17
(20) UNOPS Procurement Efficiency Assessment Tool (PEAT)	18
(21) Electronic Government Procurement (ADB, IDB, WB)	18
National tools used domestically by developing countries	18
(22) Philippines' Agency Procurement Compliance and Performance Indicators.....	18
(23) Philippines' Procurement and Implementation Performance Study (Civil Works).....	19
(24) Bangladesh - Procurement Performance Management System Indicators.....	20
(25) Uganda's Procurement Performance Measurement System.....	20
(26) Colombia - Compra Eficiente Procurement Indicators.....	21
(27) Further country initiatives.....	21
National tools used domestically by OECD countries	21
(28) UK Office of Government Commerce Procurement Capability Reviews	21
(29) UK DFID Executive Management Committee Report.....	22
(30) New Zealand Procurement Competency Framework	22
(31) U.S. State Level Procurement Performance Measures	22
(32) Scotland – Procurement Capability Assessment (PCA)	23
(33) UK Flexible Framework.....	23
Annex I - Key characteristics of current tools and initiatives	24

Introduction

During the first meeting of the MAPS Working Group (WG), which took place 25-26 June 2015 in Paris, the members of the Working Group agreed to prepare a mapping of current initiatives on public procurement assessment to ensure that the revision of MAPS is consistent with current assessment methodologies and to learn jointly from existing good practices and experiences. While this mapping cannot be exhaustive, the ambition is to capture the most relevant tools and mechanisms presently used by countries and development partners.

Following this agreement, the consultant conducted desk studies and targeted interviews on behalf of the MAPS Secretariat. The initial mapping results were shared in October 2015 and the MAPS WG was invited to contribute to this stocktaking by sharing comments and additional information on relevant tools and experiences in applying them.

As a result, information on additional tools was provided and notably, EBRD's Institutional Capacity Assessment (ICA) methodology and the Philippines' Agency Procurement Compliance and Performance Indicators (APCPI) System have been incorporated in the mapping.

In addition, some members of the MAPS WG responded to questions highlighted in the mapping document by sharing comments, views, and country experiences. This input has been very useful in preparing the next WG meeting and is reflected in the revised document for further discussion.¹

The mapping document comprises:

- A brief description of some 30 key initiatives and tools on public procurement assessments;
- A matrix highlighting the main characteristics of these initiatives to facilitate future reference in conducting more substantive technical work (Annex I).

¹ Input was provided by the following institutions/countries represented in the MAPS WG: EBRD; EIB; GIZ; and the countries of Colombia, the Philippines, and Zambia.

International tools and initiatives

(1) OECD Methodology for Assessing Procurement Systems (MAPS)

MAPS is a globally recognised tool that developing countries and donors use to assess the quality and effectiveness of public procurement systems. The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2007), reinforced by the Accra Agenda for Action (2009), refers to MAPS as the common tool to measure progress towards achieving two global targets: 1) the strengthening of country procurement systems, and 2) the increased use of these systems in development cooperation. The Global Partnership on Effective Development Cooperation widens the scope from aid effectiveness to development effectiveness and calls on donors and developing countries to initiate processes that would eventually lead to the full use of national systems.

MAPS is organised in four pillars and twelve indicators:

Pillars and indicators of the Methodology for Assessing Procurement Systems (MAPS)	
Legislative and regulatory framework Scope of application; procurement methods and procedures Implementing regulations and supporting documents	Institutional framework and management capacity Integration of procurement into public sector governance Normative and regulatory body for procurement Institutional development capacity
Procurement operations and market practices Efficiency of procurement operations Functionality of the public procurement market Contract administration and dispute resolution	Integrity and transparency of public procurement system Effective control and audit systems Efficiency of appeals mechanisms Degree of access to information Ethics and anticorruption measures

The original MAPS comprised two sets of indicators: Part I - Qualitative baseline indicators (BLIs) and Part II - Compliance and performance indicators (CPIs). While the MAPS baseline indicators were widely used by partner countries to assess strengths and weaknesses of a system and kick-start procurement reforms, the quantitative compliance and performance indicators were underused. The baseline indicators, serving as a benchmarking tool, were later separated as a standalone document².

The original Part II consisted of a list of optional CPIs associated with the baseline indicators in Part I. The CPIs were intended to provide information based on review of representative data and surveys. The use of CPI's was supposed to be determined on a country basis taking into consideration the specific capacities and challenges that exist in the country and the decisions of those participating in the assessment. Since there are no agreed standards for performance for each country, no scoring of compliance/performance was proposed.³

During the Global Procurement Event (Manila, April 20-21, 2015) it was agreed to revise MAPS to accelerate the development of modern and more efficient country procurement systems. Strategic

² OECD: Methodology for assessing Procurement Systems (MAPS), February 2010.

³ OECD: Methodology for assessment of national procurement systems. Version 4 (July 17 2006) Part II.

objectives were defined and a Working Group and a time-bound Secretariat (managed by OECD) were established in June 2015.

(2) PEFA Performance Measurement Framework

The Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) program is a multi-donor partnership (7 donor agencies and international financial institutions) created in 2001.

The PEFA Performance Measurement Framework was developed in 2005 as a contribution to the collective efforts of many stakeholders to assess and develop essential PFM systems, by providing a common pool of information for measurement and monitoring of PFM performance progress, and a common platform for dialogue. It incorporates a PFM performance report and a set of high-level indicators, which draw on a range of international standards in selected areas of PFM. The Performance Measurement Framework was upgraded in January 2015 and is currently being tested⁴.

A PEFA assessment assesses if a country has the tools to deliver three main budgetary outcomes: aggregate fiscal discipline, strategic allocation of resources and efficient service delivery.

The Performance Measurement Framework identifies seven pillars of performance of an open and orderly PFM system as follows:

- I. Credibility of fiscal strategy and budget;
- II. Comprehensiveness and transparency;
- III. Asset and liability management;
- IV. Policy-based planning and budgeting;
- V. Predictability and control in budget execution;
- VI. Accounting, recording and reporting; and
- VII. External scrutiny and audit.

A set of high-level indicators captures the key PFM elements that are recognised as being critical for all countries to achieve sound public financial management. The operational performance of the key elements of the PFM systems, processes and institutions of a country central government, legislature and external audit are measured and the PFM-Performance Report uses this indicator-based analysis to develop an integrated assessment of the PFM system and evaluate the likely impact of PFM weaknesses on the three levels of budgetary outcomes. Repeated application of the Framework provides information on the extent to which country PFM performance is changing.

Recognizing that significant public spending takes place through the public procurement system, one of the indicators assessing predictability and control in budget execution refers to procurement: Indicator PI-23 Efficiency, transparency, competition and complaint mechanism in procurement. The following procurement related dimensions are to be assessed:

- (i) Monitoring the efficiency and effectiveness of the procurement system
- (ii) Use of competitive procurement methods
- (iii) Public access to complete, reliable and timely procurement information
- (iv) Effectiveness of an independent administrative procurement complaint system

The following elements of the framework are of particular interest to the MAPS revision process:

⁴ PEFA Secretariat: Public Financial Management Performance Measurement Framework. Upgraded January 2015. Testing Version. (www.pefa.org)

- 1) Minimum requirements and scores defined for the dimensions of indicator PI-23 (Procurement)⁵
- 2) Scoring system⁶
- 3) Quality assurance mechanism for PEFA assessments (“PEFA Check”)⁷
- 4) Secretariat Services⁸
- 5) PEFA Performance Report (including publication)⁹

(3) - OECD: Towards public procurement performance indicators

The Public Governance and Territorial Development Directorate in the OECD launched this initiative and held a meeting of global procurement experts from OECD countries¹⁰ and MDBs in Paris in October 2013. Discussions within this group to date have been highly complementary with the work on revising MAPS. The two groups agreed on continued cooperation.

Most OECD countries collect basic contract data on a regular basis and view efficiency in procurement in relation to transaction costs, lead-times to award and contract value. Information monitored include consolidation through framework agreements and use of e-procurement; cancelled processes, complaints, cost vis-à-vis benchmark prices, time spent on different steps of the process, staff time as a proxy of administrative efficiency, supplier performance, timeliness of payments and other aspects of contract management. Relatively few countries carry out satisfaction or perception surveys and availability of relevant and reliable data remains a key challenge.

Aimed at developing a set of relevant and credible indicators to measure the performance of public procurement systems in OECD countries and their evolution over time, the Public Governance and Territorial Development Directorate in the OECD has presented a first set of performance indicators for comments and discussion. These indicators focus on the following areas:

- 1) Efficiency of the public procurement cycle
- 2) Openness and transparency of the public procurement cycle
- 3) Professionalism of the public procurement workforce
- 4) Contract management¹¹

The proposed indicators are currently being tested. Since many countries lack a single data repository, data availability poses a challenge.

On a broader note, the OECD Council has adopted the *OECD Recommendation on Public Procurement*. The Recommendation reaffirms the role of public procurement as a strategic function and provides guidance on how to implement a public procurement system that uses state-of-the-art tools and techniques to use public funds sustainably and efficiently. It promotes, among others, free access to

⁵ Refinements for shadow testing have been proposed to dimension (i).

⁶ The dimension of an indicator is scored separately on a four point ordinal scale: A, B, C or D. Two methods are defined (M1 is based on the weakest link in the connected dimensions of the indicator; M2 is based on averaging the scores for individual dimensions of an indicator using a conversion table).

⁷ Process endorsement (Objective; criteria; role of the PEFA Secretariat). PEFA check does not entail the checking of evidence. Process does not include the validation of assessment results by stakeholders.

⁸ Development and Maintenance of the PEFA Framework; Support and guidance to the users of the PEFA Framework; Promotion of training programs and materials; Monitoring of the roll-out of the Strengthened Approach and application of the PEFA Framework for lesson learning and dissemination.

⁹ Re: Report structure and guidance, including section on context, economic situation, previous reforms, etc. (i.e. does not include a political economy analysis). No section on recommendations.

¹⁰ The “Leading Practitioners in Procurement” is a sub-committee of the Working Party on Public Procurement.

¹¹ Public Governance and Territorial Development OECD: Towards Public Procurement Performance Indicators: First Set of Indicators, 27 May 2014

public procurement information through an online portal including monitoring results and benchmarks related to the performance of public procurement systems.¹²

(4) Indicators of the Strength of Public Management Systems (ISPMS)

The Indicators of the Strength of Public Management Systems (ISPMS) initiative was a multi-stakeholder effort coordinated by the World Bank (Secretariat) from roughly 2012 - 2015. Its first phase was financed by – amongst others - the German Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ).

ISPMS' purpose was to determine the strength and quality of governance and public management systems in order to help a country design solutions and track improvements. To do so, current tools, surveys and frameworks were analysed. Aimed to support the consensus-building process around indicators of procurement functions, ISPMS is based on empirical evidence, internationally agreed principles, theory and practice. It identifies a results chain for public procurement that connects the key building blocks of procurement systems (legal and regulatory framework; institutional framework; technological infrastructure; and professionalism) with intermediate outcomes and development outcomes.

The ISPMS report¹³ presents the following products:

a) A list of indicators commonly used to assess the quality of procurement systems (MAPS, PEFA, CPARs) that meet the defined ISPMS criteria¹⁴, grouped along the principles of a well-performing procurement system:

- 1) Economy, efficiency, and effectiveness;
- 2) Open competition;
- 3) Integrity;
- 4) Fair, equal and equitable treatment; and
- 5) Transparency¹⁵

b) Indicator options used by several countries that have put in place national-level performance measures that track efficiency and the use of competitive practices (e.g. Uganda, Minas Gerais (Brazil), Indonesia, U.S. State-Level Procurement Performance Measures) including the Procurement Performance Indicators for the Health Sector developed by USAID.

c) A proposed set of cross-country indicators to measure the intermediate outcomes of the procurement process ("Options for Procurement Performance Indicators"). Two more indicators were proposed; these were selected from about a dozen submissions received during an iChallenge workshop that took place in October 2014.

The ISPMS report suggests testing the extent to which the proposed indicators are collectable for a sample of countries including the extent to which they can be derived from publicly available data sources in those countries that are leaders in promoting transparency.

(5) OECD Peer Reviews

The OECD has a long tradition of using Peer Reviews to compare experiences, examine "best practices", and learn valuable lessons from peers in a host of areas from economic policy to

¹² Public Governance and Territorial Development OECD: Recommendation of the Council on Public Procurement – 2015

¹³ ISPMS Secretariat: Indicators of the Strength of Public Management Systems: Procurement. Draft for comment. March 6, 2014.

¹⁴ ISPMS criteria: action-worthy; actionable; behavioral; replicable; feasible.

¹⁵ ISPMS Secretariat: Indicators of the strength of public management systems: Procurement (Draft March 6, 2014)

environmental protection. Fellow OECD members on an equal basis examine each country's policy in a particular area. Recommendations resulting from such a review can help governments win support for difficult policy changes. New developments are taken into account, including the involvement of civil society, business and labour.

Most prominently, the Peer Review of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) reviews and assesses each member's development cooperation system. The Review makes recommendations and suggestions for improvement and a follow up process ensures that lessons are translated into policies, programs, and practices of the DAC member. A DAC Peer Review Reference Guide (which is the analytical framework) and Information Note guide the process.

(6) UNEP Sustainable Public Procurement (SPP) Approach

Since 2009, UNEP and the Swiss-led Marrakech Task Force on SPP together with a number of partners have been engaged in the implementation of capacity building programs for sustainable public procurement in developing countries. During the Rio+20 conference on Sustainable Development (May 2011), a set of Policy Conclusions and Recommendations was released based on the first results of the testing of the SPP Approach¹⁶ and the sustainable public procurement initiative gained the political mandate of Rio+20. As a program of the Ten-Year Framework of Programmes (10YFP), the new SPP Program supports the implementation of Sustainable Consumption & Production in developing countries. It is coordinated by UNEP and two co-leads, ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability and the Korea Environmental Industry & Technology Institute (KEITI).

The SPP Approach is aimed at guiding policy makers and practitioners in designing and implementing sustainable public procurement policies and actions. It has four key steps, which focus on the creation of a project governance structure and initial training (Step 1); assessments to be conducted (Step 2); strategic planning (Step 3); and implementation throughout the procurement cycle (stage 4).

The assessment phase consists of a status assessment, legal review, prioritization exercise, and market readiness analysis. Details are described in UNEP's Sustainable Public Procurement Implementation Guidelines. A study demonstrating the impacts of sustainable public procurement based on eight illustrative case studies is also available.

UNEP's SPP Approach is not systematically linked to the MAPS diagnostic tool. As a result, countries embarking on public procurement reform often leave out sustainability considerations and the few countries that have started SPP implementation are presently confronted with two different assessment methodologies.¹⁷

(7) Open contracting (multi-stakeholder initiative)

Open Contracting refers to increasing disclosure and participation at all stages of public contracting (planning, formation, implementation, and completion). It asserts that contracting that is more open will help ensure that public resources are managed effectively and that citizens receive the services and goods they deserve, so development benefits all. Open Contracting is being advanced by the Open Contracting Partnership, a collaborative effort that includes a number of governments, development institutions, and non-state actors.

¹⁶ UNEP: Sustainable Public Procurement Implementation Guidelines. Introducing UNEP's Approach (2012)
<http://www.unep.org/resourceefficiency/Portals/24147/scp/procurement/docsres/ProjectInfo/UNEPImplementationGuidelines.pdf>

¹⁷ UNEP: The Impacts of Sustainable Public Procurement
<http://www.unep.org/resourceefficiency/Portals/24147/scp/procurement/docsres/ProjectInfo/StudyonImpactsofSPP.pdf>

The Open Contracting (OC) assessment methodology was developed and piloted in 2014 by the Governance Support Programme, a technical cooperation program jointly implemented by the Governments of South Africa and Germany, in partnership with the South African Office of the Chief Procurement Officer and the World Bank¹⁸. The assessment framework consists of the following elements:

- (i) Context analysis
- (ii) Indicator system – consisting of 6 indicators of disclosure to identify what and how information is currently disclosed or possible to disclose; 5 indicators of participation to identify current opportunities for members of the public to engage with government on matters of public procurement as well as future opportunities for such participation; and complementary sub-indicators
- (iii) Assessment tools to facilitate the assessment and communication with stakeholders (assessment matrix; questionnaires; information material for interview partners). To ensure consistency, MAPS indicators targeting transparency, integrity and participation as well as the MAPS “evaluation system” were incorporated in the detailed assessment framework and learnings from the Open Contracting Principles as well as the Open Contracting Data Standard development and the Open Data Readiness Assessment methodology were taken into account in the development of the methodology.

The assessment is based on desk studies, review of existing systems and data, targeted interviews, and the examination of sample procurement cases to collect information on the existing legal and regulatory framework as well as current procurement practices in the different spheres of government (national, provincial, local level). A thorough analysis and interpretation of strengths and weaknesses of the existing system vis-à-vis the international standards of transparency, accountability and participation is conducted. This leads to the identification of entry points for increased participation from the side of business and civil society.

Donor/Agency tools and initiatives

(8) World Bank Country Procurement Assessment Report (CPAR)

The CPAR is a World Bank (WB) designed analytical tool to diagnose the health of the procurement system in a country as part of the Country Assistance Strategy (CAS). It was conducted in numerous countries; however, its use has diminished since 2006 after the introduction of the OECD Methodology for Assessing Procurement Systems (MAPS).

The purpose was to assist borrowers to analyse their procurement policies, organization, and procedures to help develop or improve their systems. CPAR provides a comprehensive analysis of the country's public sector procurement system, including the existing legal framework, organizational responsibilities and control, oversight capabilities and procedures and practices. The general assessment also includes information on risks associated with the procurement process. An action plan is developed to promote improvements according to the findings. Furthermore, the CPAR served the dual purpose of ensuring that national procurement procedures are acceptable for use in National Competitive Bidding (NCB) in World Bank-financed investment projects and providing a sound basis for decisions on the management of supervision in World Bank operations.

¹⁸ GIZ: Assessment of the conformity of the South African public procurement system against the international principles of Open Contracting. Final report of February 5, 2015. A simplified version of this methodology is also available (April 25, 2015) to allow for a quick snapshot assessment.

(9) World Bank Assessment of Agencies' Capacity to Procure World Bank Financed Projects

The Assessment of Agencies Capacity is performed for each World Bank financed project as part of project preparation and appraisal. The objectives of the capacity assessment are:

- To evaluate the capability of the implementing agency and the adequacy of procurement and related systems in place;
- To administer procurement in general and World Bank-financed procurement in particular to assess the risks that may negatively affect the ability of the agency to carry out the procurement process; and
- To prepare the procurement strategy for the project.

According to the assessment, an action plan is developed and then implemented as part of the project to address the deficiencies detected and to minimise the risks identified. Furthermore, a suitable World Bank procurement supervision plan for the project is proposed considering the relative strengths, weaknesses and risks revealed by the assessment. The assessment is performed at a project level by a World Bank Procurement Specialist who conducts interviews with officials and reviews the necessary documentation.

(10) World Bank Procurement Risk Assessment and Management System (P-RAMS)

The Procurement Risk Assessment and Management System (P-RAMS) was developed to align with the World Bank's risk based approach. As a complementary tool of the traditional capacity assessment carried out during project preparation, P-RAMS helps identify procurement risks during project preparation and implementation stages and monitors them throughout the project cycle. It is built on the principles as defined in procurement capacity assessment and extends them on pre-identified risk factors to be analysed by the assessor. It is used in conjunction with the capacity assessment.

P-RAMS is used as a risk identification and management tool to complement the capacity assessment. P-RAMS helps to answer these questions:

- What are the project procurement risks?
- What mitigation measures apply to the specific risks?
- Who will be responsible for them?
- By when should they be implemented?
- How can the mitigation measures be monitored?
- What has worked in similar projects in the past?

(11) World Bank Systematic Operations Risk-Rating Tool (SORT)

The Systematic Operations Risk-rating Tool (SORT) was developed to help the World Bank consistently assess and monitor risks across all operational instruments and country programs. This in turn allows the World Bank to become more effective at supporting client countries in managing development results. The risks considered are the risks to development results associated with the operation: both the risks to not achieving the (positive) results intended by World Bank-supported operations, and the risks of World Bank-supported operations causing unintended (negative) results. The SORT provides the information needed to help clients adequately manage and, where possible, mitigate operational risks within a broader risk management framework. It identifies those risks on which the World Bank needs to focus management attention and resources – within any given operation or at the level of the country, region, global practice or crosscutting solution area.



(12) World Bank Procurement Performance Measurement Framework¹⁹

The East Asia and Pacific Procurement team has developed a comprehensive new procurement performance measurement framework and tested the methodology jointly with two partner countries. The methodology is based on an analysis of the diversity of stakeholders and their procurement-related objectives. It considers the span of the procurement cycle as well as the heterogeneity of the procurement data. It defines the following five core characteristics as key to a successful procurement operation:

- 1) Timely delivery;
- 2) Cost efficiency;
- 3) Quality;
- 4) Transparency; and
- 5) Fairness

Based on this experience, ten quantitative indicators which are relatively easy to obtain and applicable to all types of procurement have been identified. They define the minimum of what should be measured (See Annex 1, Column 3, Minimum).

Additional indicators can be defined depending on the country's or agency's strategic goals (e.g. implementation of green procurement; increasing the access of SME's; etc.). Indicators should be action-worthy, actionable, behavioural, replicable, and feasible (refer to ISPMS criteria). Questionnaires have been developed to capture perceptions of the private sector.

Methodology been applied in two middle-income countries (construction sector, i.e. procurement of works), at the sub-national level and at the sector level (power sector). Purpose: Measure performance and identify actions for improvement to achieve results/stakeholder objectives.

(13) World Bank Methodology to assess Alternative Procurement Arrangements

The new World Bank Procurement Framework for World Bank Investment Project Financing (IPF) permits the use of alternative procurement arrangements (APA) in certain, clearly defined circumstances. This includes the option of using procurement arrangements of a Borrower implementing agency, provided that the APA are acceptable to the World Bank (the decision to apply an APA will be taken at the project level, subject to Board approval). The assessment will be based on an assessment framework that is currently being tested and will be calibrated through experience before being finalised ("Methodology to assess Alternative Procurement Arrangements in Borrower Implementing Agencies").

This methodology assesses the procurement capacity and capability and the level of performance of the procurement arrangement at the borrower's implementing agency level. It takes into account the overarching public procurement framework at the national level. The assessment framework will assist World Bank staff to determine if the agency meets the minimum criteria acceptable to the World Bank. In addition, the framework helps assessing whether the agency's procurement arrangement is robust enough to be used for World Bank-financed Projects. The findings can also be used to inform procurement capacity building and institutional strengthening programs at the agency level.

¹⁹ (08) – (12): World Bank: Assessing the use of agency alternative procurement arrangements Background Document, January 2015.

The methodology seeks to ensure that procurement is conducted in accordance with the World Bank's Core Procurement Principles:

- Value for money
- Economy
- Efficiency
- Integrity
- Fit for purpose
- Transparency and fairness.

The following are the key features of the new methodology²⁰:

- The methodology uses, as its core, the MAPS structure. It augments this appraisal with additional pillars, dimensions and indicators, performance review and a revised methodology to provide appropriate assurance to the World Bank in its decision making on the use of an APA.
- In summary, the MAPS assessment tool has been modified to include five pillars instead of the traditional four pillars, reflecting the World Bank's focus on performance in determining the right procurement arrangement to be used for investment projects it finances. The methodology has also been updated to include a more detailed assessment at the agency level to measure performance.
- The assessment has two levels: (i) APA Assessment Methodology, and (ii) Optional Capacity and Capability Assessment both looking at the national and the agency level.

The assessment methodology comprises three steps:

- Step A – National and Agency Assessment assesses the regulatory framework and the operational environment at both national and agency levels. It focuses on identifying key legislation, regulation, policies, procedures and standard procurement documents to determine how comprehensive the regulatory framework is. The agency level assessment is complementary to the national level assessment. It focuses on how the agency interprets and implements the regulatory framework and how procurements are run in practice, using the agency's own policies and procedures. Information on each indicator will be assessed against the minimum criteria. This helps identify areas of relevant strength and weakness.
- Step B – Evidence Based Assessment (Quantitative) gathers quantitative data to examine the effectiveness of the agency's procurement performance within the regulatory framework. Quantitative data includes specific, measurable, numerical or statistical data such as spend data, or a measure of the frequency of occurrence. Data about the agency's selection processes and contract management is examined to determine if the procurement arrangement performs as intended.
- Step C – Perception Assessment (Qualitative) gathers qualitative data on the perceptions of the effectiveness of the agency's procurement performance within the regulatory framework. Qualitative data is descriptive and provides breadth and depth and allows the underlying reasons and root causes of capacity and capability deficits or constraints to be explored. Data is gathered through examining complaints and undertaking surveys and interviews with a variety of stakeholders (private sector companies, NGOs; example questions can be found in a questionnaire developed).

The table below compares the MAPS structure with the structure established in the APA tool, citing from the respective tool:

²⁰ Draft Guidance – Methodology to assess Alternative Procurement Arrangements in Borrower Implementing Agencies for Procurements financed under IPF (Version 1.17 – May 2015)

	MAPS	APA Assessment
Structure	Pillar (4) Indicator (12) Sub-indicator (54)	Pillar (5) Dimensions (16) Indicators (49) Sub-indicators (?) (National level: 43; Agency level: 73) In addition, <i>Optional Capacity and Capability Assessment</i> , (National level: 67, Agency level: 94)
Scoring/rating system	Scoring criteria (definition of different levels of achievement = baseline) Score 0 – 3 (3: Full achievement of stated standard; 2: Less than full achievement/needs some improvement; 1: Substantive work needed to meet the standard; 0: Failure to meet the proposed standard)	Separate for national and agency level: Definition if sub-indicator (?) is a “minimum indicator” or “desirable”; Definition of baseline, e.g. “Yes – Sample review of contracts”; Evidence Based Data Analysis, e.g. “Percentage of failed or annulled procurement out of total procurements” or “Percentage of contracts completed on schedule and within the original approved contract price” Data Minimum Requirement: 10 Evidence Based Data Analysis: 39 Example Survey Questions: 111 questions.
Pillars and Indicators/ Dimensions	I. Legislative and regulatory framework 1. Public procurement legislative and regulatory framework achieves the agreed standards and complies with applicable obligations. 2. Existence of Implementing Regulations and Documentation.	I. Legislative, Regulatory and Policy Framework 1. Public procurement legislative, regulatory and policy framework (regulatory framework) achieves the agreed standards and complies with applicable obligations. 2. Existence of Implementing Regulations, Policy and Documentation. 3. Sustainable Procurement.
	II. Institutional framework and management capacity 3. The public procurement system is mainstreamed and well integrated into the public sector governance system. 4. The country has a functional normative/regulatory body. 5. Existence of institutional development capacity.	II. Institutional Framework and Management Capacity 4. The public procurement arrangement is integrated into the public sector governance system. 5. Existence of a functional normative/regulatory body. 6. Existence of institutional development capacity.
	III. Procurement operations and market practices 6. The country’s procurement operations and practices are efficient. 7. Functionality of the public procurement market. 8. Existence of contract administration and dispute resolution provisions.	III. Procurement Administration and Market Practices 7. Effective procurement operations and practices. 8. Functionality of the public procurement market.
	IV. Integrity and transparency of public procurement system 9. The country has effective control and audit systems. 10. Efficiency of appeals mechanisms.	IV. Integrity & Transparency of the Public Procurement Arrangement 9. Effective control and audit systems. 10. Effective and efficient complaints Mechanisms.

	11. Degree of access to information. 12. The country has ethics and anticorruption measures in place.	11. Degree of access to information. 12. Existence of ethics and anticorruption measures.
		V. Procurement Operations 13. Effective procurement cycle 14. Existence of dispute resolution provisions. 15. Data, Metrics, and Reporting 16. Risk Management

(14) EBRD Public Procurement Assessment

The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) has benchmarked the public procurement systems of all 29 EBRD countries at the time. The objective has been to conduct a high level review of the public procurement “law on the books” as well as “law in practice” to support the EBRD legal transition program and technical cooperation provided.

The assessment is based on comprehensive and innovative elements of international best practice structured around the EBRD Core Principles (CP) on an Efficient Public Procurement Framework as follows²¹:

- CP1 – Accountability
- CP2 – Integrity
- CP3 – Transparency
- CP4 – Competition
- CP5 – Economy of the process
- CP6 – Efficiency of the public contract
- CP7 – Proportionality
- CP8 – Uniformity
- CP9 – Stability
- CP10 – Flexibility
- CP11 – Enforceability

The EBRD Core Principles apply to the public procurement process as a whole (pre-tendering, tendering, and post-tendering phase) and Legal Efficiency Indicators have been developed to assess the efficiency of the legal process including remedies procedure.

The assessment tool consists of a questionnaire, which is grouped into three pillars, 15 chapters, and a total of 297 questions. The EBRD core procurement principles are cross-referenced internally for evaluation purposes.

The assessment process comprises the following key steps: The relevant parts of the questionnaire are distributed to national regulatory and review bodies, contracting entities and practitioners (e.g. local law firms). Upon receipt, EBRD reviews the responses, clarifies inconsistencies and summarises the findings (including scoring). This is followed by a joint review of the assessment results together with the country and also involving local NGOs working on anti-corruption. An online database is used to facilitate communication and documentation.

²¹ EBRD Core Principles on an Efficient Public Procurement Framework

The responses are scored using a four-point scale.²² The total number of points is calculated through simple multiplication and addition. As a result, scores for compliance range from “very high” (above 90 per cent of the benchmark), “high” (76-90 per cent), “satisfactory” (60-75 per cent), “low” (50-59 per cent), to “very low (below 50 per cent). For each country, a spider diagram is prepared to visualise the maturity of the assessed public procurement system²³.

The table below illustrates the three pillars and 15 chapters and indicates the number of questions included in the questionnaire.

Pillars	Chapters	Questions
Legal and institutional framework	1. Legal and institutional framework	15
	2. Prior determination of scope and terms of procurement	18
	3. Prior disclosure of scope and terms of procurement	12
	4. Selection of procurement method	11
	5. Prescribed procedures for each procurement method	23
	6. Procurement Notification and Submissions	16
	7. Review procedures	19
	8. Procurement records	3
	Sub-Total	117
Procurement process at the contracting agency	1. The Public Procurement Lifecycle	25
	2. Pre-Tendering phase	45
	3. Tendering phase	68
	4. Post-Tendering phase	12
	Sub-Total	150
Accountability, Integrity, Transparency	1. Accountability	10
	2. Integrity	10
	3. Transparency	10
	Sub-Total	30
Number of questions	Total	297

(15) EBRD Institutional Capacity Assessment (ICA)

In support of a three-year partnership programme aimed at assisting clients in improving procurement performance and ensuring the effective, efficient and transparent implementation of EBRD financed projects EBRD developed a practical Institutional Capacity Assessment Tool Kit and Guide. The ICA Tool Kit was tested and fine-tuned with the participation of approximately thirty selected clients in eleven countries, in years 2010-2012.

The objectives of the ICA are to: (a) evaluate the capability of the clients, and the adequacy of procurement and related systems in place, to administer procurement in general and particularly for EBRD financed procurement; (b) assess the competitiveness of the client’s sector operations environment; (c) assess the risks that may negatively affect the ability of the client to carry out the procurement process, including identification of procurement practices unacceptable for use in EBRD-financed projects; and (d) develop an action plan to be implemented, as part of the project, to address the deficiencies detected by the capacity analysis and to minimise the risks identified by the risk analysis.²⁴

²² Yes (3 points); Yes, with reservations (2 points); No, with reservations (1 point); No (0 point).

²³ EBRD 2010 Regional Public Procurement Assessment. The case of Ukraine; EBRD Public procurement legal frameworks (Annex 1.2)

²⁴ EBRD: Assisting clients in improving procurement performance: Institutional Capacity Assessment (Flyer); EBRD: Capacity Assessment Toolkit. Manual and Guide Note, 02/14/2011.

The assessment focuses on 62 indicators (“items”) grouped in 9 categories, i.e. Legal framework, Organisation, Support and control, Record keeping, Staffing, Procurement planning, Procurement cycle, General assessment and Project assessment.

The relative importance of the indicator is defined by its weight, which is defined in the initial stages of implementation. For each indicator a standard of compliance or performance is established. The Tool Kit highlights mandatory items that require client’s full compliance with specific standards, in order to be considered apt to manage procurement processes. For remaining standards, a “yes” or “no” scoring system is assigned by the assessor, which allows flexibility in determining the client’s capacity to undertake procurement activities.

The Tool Kit also supports the development of action plans needed to address weaknesses or areas of opportunity identified in the assessment. The process includes consultations with the client to agree on actions to improve performance as well as a EBRD’s supervision plan to ensure consistency with the fiduciary responsibilities of EBRD. Data gathered in all assessments are integrated in a database to facilitate inquiries, research, monitoring and reporting on the findings.

(16) IDB performance indicators for public procurement

The Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) has used the MAPS Compliance and Performance Indicators (Part II of MAPS) in several partner countries to initiate reforms.

In addition, for almost two years, the IDB has supported the development of a system of performance indicators for public procurement in Latin American and the Caribbean countries. IDB has sponsored three workshops in which representatives of the LAC economies have agreed on 20 performance indicators grouped into five categories, namely:

- 1) Efficiency;
- 2) Effectiveness;
- 3) Transparency;
- 4) Competition and
- 5) Development²⁵

The performance indicators will be used in several upcoming MAPS assessments in the LAC region (Uruguay, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Panama, and Peru). Data collection is facilitated by government portals (ex: Uruguay) or based on sampling using a mix of procuring entities at the central government and the municipal levels.

(17) DFAT Australia: Procurement Assessment Diagnostics Tool

The Australian development cooperation (AusAID, now DFAT) has developed corporate guidelines on assessing and using partner government systems for public financial management and procurement. To assist the partner government to improve its own systems and to guard against an increased risk of inefficient and/or corrupt use of Australian funds, a procurement assessment diagnostics tool was developed to assess a procuring entity’s capability and capacity to implement procurement. The tool covers the procurement environment and crosscutting issues; legal aspects and transparency; the procurement cycle; organization and functions; support and control systems; record keeping; staffing; and private sector viewpoint. It includes an assessment of the risks to procurement being conducted by national institutions through its own systems and procedures, any capacity building measures to be

²⁵ IDB: Key Performance Indicators System. Measuring Performance of Public Procurement Systems in LAC Countries. (The three indicators on development were recently added to the system).

included in the aid program to address identified risks, as well as performance benchmarks and monitoring arrangements for the risks identified.²⁶

(18) USAID - Procurement Performance Indicators Guide

USAID sponsored the development of a Procurement Performance Indicators Guide to provide procurement managers in the health sector with a small set of performance indicators and information on how to implement and use the performance indicators to monitor and improve procurement system performance.

A review of existing performance indicators and documents was performed to arrive to a selection of eleven (11) indicators based on their ability to provide key performance information on five (5) different aspects of a procurement system, including cost, quality, timeliness of processes, system productivity, and system integrity. They are intended to assess progress in achieving procurement performance goals. The process consists of capturing the data to calculate the indicators, monitor and evaluate the results, identify strengths and weaknesses and develop a plan to address the identified weaknesses. The action plan is very important, as improvement is only possible through proper performance management. It is the active step of moving from performance measurement to performance management that ensures a continuously improving procurement process that will effectively support health care program supply needs.

(19) UNDP Public Procurement Capacity Development Guide

The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) Public Procurement Capacity Development Guide is a detailed step-by-step guide to assess the capacity of procurement systems. It is an adaptation of the UNDP Capacity Assessment Methodology User's Guide, which was developed for practitioners designing and conducting a procurement capacity assessment at national or sub-national level. The assessment is part of a five-step UNDP capacity development process:

- Engage stakeholders on capacity development;
- Assess capacity assets and needs;
- Formulate a capacity development response;
- Implement a capacity development response; and
- Evaluate capacity development.

The UNDP capacity assessment methodology has three parts:

- 1) The capacity assessment framework (comprising three dimensions: points of entry, core issues and functional and technical capacities);
- 2) A process for conducting a capacity assessment (three stage process: mobilise and design, conduct the capacity assessment and summarise and interpret results);
- 3) Supporting tools.

To explain how to conduct the data and information collection and analysis, the guide includes possible data collection techniques with examples to illustrate the user. It also provides possible rankings to determine judgment of value for the items subject to analysis and guidance to determine and assess the level or importance of desired capacity. Furthermore, it includes examples of pillars and dimensions that can be used to categorise the collected and analysed information. The methodology outlines a report structure that summarises and interprets the results of the assessment. This methodology is also compatible with the use of MAPS and the methodology to follow is described in the guide.

²⁶ OECD: Strengthening Country Procurement Systems: Results and Opportunities, 2011.

(20) UNOPS Procurement Efficiency Assessment Tool (PEAT)

The United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) Procurement Efficiency Assessment Tool (PEAT) is an expert-led diagnostic instrument developed for public sector entities. It is focused on the entire supply chain and provides information on the structure and regulations of the procurement system; procurement process and workflows; capacity; and results. The result is a narrative report with recommendations.

(21) Electronic Government Procurement (ADB, IDB, WB)

ADB, IDB, and World Bank have prepared a Readiness Self-Assessment document for Electronic Government Procurement (e-GP)²⁷. It is intended to help a jurisdiction to conduct a high-level review of its procurement environment to determine its level of readiness to make a transition to e-GP. The assessment addresses the strategic functions of e-GP by examining nine components that are the basis for planning the transition to e-GP. The components are the following: Government Leadership; Human Resource Management; Planning and Management; Policy; Legislation and Regulation; Infrastructure and Web Services; Standards; Private Sector Integration; and Systems.

More specifically, the assessment explores to which degree components (and a set of more detailed sub-components) are in place and supported. Four levels of readiness have been defined ranging from “no evidence” to “little”, “some” and “adequate evidence” that the subcomponent is in place and supported. Evidence refers to both, formal substance (such as regulation) and practical implementation (such as accessibility of regulation and regular updates).

The assessment is based on a questionnaire, which can be distributed in electronic format. To receive a balanced view and highlight where there are major differences in perception, a wide range of stakeholders shall be invited to submit responses. After completing the assessment, respondents, either singularly or in groups, should held discussions with an assessor to clarify issues, gain deeper understandings and test alternative viewpoints. In addition, existing reports such as audits, reviews, strategic plans, annual reports or other assessments may be used to support and qualify the views of particular respondents.

Overall, there is some overlap with MAPS (e.g. legislation; lead agency for procurement reform; complaints procedures), as well as some overlap with issues raised in open contracting assessments (e.g. data standards). In addition, the readiness assessment addresses specific issues related to the introduction of e-GP (e.g. indicators reflecting the development of infrastructure and web services). The tool also touches on some issues that are currently missing or underrepresented in MAPS such as government leadership, the existence of procurement policies and integration of reform strategies, or private sector participation. The tool uses an interesting, more high-level way of rating.

National tools used domestically by developing countries

(22) Philippines’ Agency Procurement Compliance and Performance Indicators

The Agency Procurement Compliance and Performance Indicators (APCPI) System is a methodology to assess the performance of a government agency’s procurement activities and to compare its effectiveness against that of the national public procurement systems and international best practices and standards using baseline standards and indicators.

The APCPI has the following objectives and purposes:

²⁷ ADB, IDB, WG: Electronic Government Procurement (e-GP) Readiness Self-Assessment. Reviewed November 2004.

- (a) To provide a standard procurement performance monitoring and evaluation tool for use by all procuring entities on a regular basis;
- (b) To identify strengths and weaknesses in the agency's procurement systems and to develop actions plans for improvement;
- (c) To link the information collected with other government related databases to analyse national procurement performance for more effective policy and decision making; and
- (d) To assist in strengthening the capacity of the Government Procurement Policy Board in monitoring national compliance to procurement regulations and in implementing the agency level Action Plans.

The methodology consists of 16 indicators and 40 sub-indicators representing the following four pillars:

- (i) Compliance with the Legislative and Regulatory Framework
- (ii) Agency Institutional Framework and Management Capacity
- (iii) Procurement Operations and Market Practices
- (iv) Integrity and Transparency of the Agency Procurement System

The APCPI is based on a review of actual procurement contracts and of the participation of other stakeholders such as bidders and observers of the Bids and Awards Committees. It includes a scoring system based on scoring criteria and recommended benchmarks. Scores are aggregated to obtain an overall score and a profile of strengths and weaknesses of the agency procurement system.

The process comprises a “confirmation process” in which a confirmation team takes on the role of an independent entity and carries out the task of confirming the results of the APCPI using the same set of data used in the conduct of the APCPI. Once the results are checked in terms of completeness, correctness, consistency and responsiveness, they are analysed and a specific strategy and plan of action is developed. The results of the assessment should not be used to compare the agency's score against that of other agencies but to provide a benchmark against which the agency will measure its own subsequent performance.

(23) Philippines' Procurement and Implementation Performance Study (Civil Works)

This study uses contract and bidding data to show if in fact the procurement system functions as intended. The cornerstone of this stage of the methodology is the use of evidence and data as the primary sources of information to measure results in government procurement. This stage complements the previous stages, which evaluated the organizational and regulatory side of procurement. This stage favours the use of quantitative evidence to measure indicators as much as possible. In cases where data may be hard to find or unavailable, this stage will use interviews to collect factual experiences of participants. The interviews can also complement data analysis and may be a useful barometer for the qualitative indicators on fairness and quality of inputs.

Defining success in government agency procurement is a challenging task; but, according to the study, any successful procurement operation has five characteristics as a minimum: timely, cost-efficient, quality-mindful, transparent and fair.

Figure



Source: *Philippines' Procurement and Implementation Performance Study*

(24) Bangladesh - Procurement Performance Management System Indicators

The Bangladesh Procurement Management Information System (PROMIS) is a tool to monitor online procurement performance. PROMIS has been developed based on a set of 45 indicators classified in 13 categories reflecting the procurement cycle:

- Invitation for bid;
- Bid submission;
- Bid opening and evaluation committees;
- Bid evaluation report approval;
- Contract award;
- Delivery / completion;
- Payment;
- Complaints;
- Contract amendments;
- Contract dispute resolution;
- Fraud and corruption; and
- Procurement management capacity.

These indicators are intended to be applied in goods and civil works and have been used for a number of World Bank-financed projects as part of the procurement risk mitigation plan (PRMP) in Bangladesh's portfolio. Economy, efficiency, transparency, and competitiveness are measured through the indicators and some indicators are specifically for Bangladeshi procurement law. The use of PROMIS is concentrated on traditional tenders where all process data is entered manually. Therefore, the use of PROMIS is becoming limited with the introduction and rapid expansion of electronic government procurement, which has a module for calculating the indicators mentioned above.

(25) Uganda's Procurement Performance Measurement System

Uganda's Public Procurement and Disposal of Public Assets Authority (PPDA) developed the Procurement Performance Measurement System (PPMS) in 2008 to monitor the performance of

procurement entities, enhancing the fairness, competitiveness, transparency and value for money of public procurement in Uganda. The PPMS guide aims to introduce PPMS methodology to staff, procurement officers and stakeholders including a step-by-step guide on how to use and sustain the PPMS. It defines the framework for measuring procurement performance in four main steps:

- Data collection;
- Data aggregation;
- Reporting of findings; and
- Using findings.

PPMS builds on existing monitoring tools to avoid duplications (draw conclusions upon data already collected by audits, compliance checks, monthly reports, etc.). The indicators are gathered relating to activities conducted by PPDA, the outputs produced by the activities, the intended outcomes (e.g. improved performance) and impact (e.g. more value for money). The 14 activity- and output-indicators are categorised in three objectives; the 13 outcome indicators are grouped in six objectives and five impact indicators grouped in three objectives. In total, there are 32 indicators for twelve objectives. The PPMS can look at procurement performance in a particular sector or compare performance in specific areas when policies are introduced.

(26) Colombia - *Compra Eficiente* Procurement Indicators

Colombia *Compra Eficiente* was established to create procurement policies promoting transparency and generating a more efficient market relationship in the public procurement environment. It began work on the development of procurement performance indicators that were in line with the government organization, legislation and reality. The indicators were produced together with the World Bank under Reimbursable Advisory Services (RAS).

The assessment methodology is divided into 4 dimensions: (i) value for money; (ii) integrity and transparency in bidders' competition; (iii) accountability; and (iv) risk management. The baseline is 2014 and the first results have just started to come in. Since some information is still missing, Colombia *Compra Eficiente* cannot calculate the whole set of indicators yet but the new transactional platform (SECOPII) will allow this. The indicators are based on international and multilateral experiences and the principal goal of this set of indicators is to have a direct impact on public policy decisions.

(27) Further country initiatives

Additional countries have developed assessment tools/ initiatives that might be relevant. Examples include Senegal, Zambia, Chile, Morocco, Georgia, Afghanistan, Ghana, Brazil.

National tools used domestically by OECD countries

(28) UK Office of Government Commerce Procurement Capability Reviews

Procurement Capability Reviews (PCR) were designed by the Office of Government Commerce (OGC), now the Efficiency and Reform Group (ERG). PCR was designed to assess how far procurement in central government meets the demanding standards required to deliver Government policy and achieve value for money in the present and in the future. PCRs are intended to provide an overall assessment of departmental performance in procurement, based on the PCR Assessment Model. This model aims to assess against World Class procurement standards and practice. OGC completed Procurement Capability Reviews across multiple governmental departments providing an independent, strategic review of government procurement.

The results were used by departments to recognise how others performed and identify lessons. Suppliers and non-commercial partners were able to benefit from the findings. The PCR model is based on three key areas of capability (leadership, skills development and deployment and systems and processes), and nine more specific indicators.

Expert input supported procurement directors in raising the impact and influence of the procurement function, resulting in several changes, all ultimately leading to greater value for money and improved public services:

- earlier consultation on strategy and policy decisions;
- investment in targeted development of professional expertise;
- more control over spend and access to better government deals,

(29) UK DFID Executive Management Committee Report

The Procurement and Commercial Department of the Department for International Development (DFID) publishes performance measures on a quarterly basis. The aim of their approach is not only to assess the procurement timelines and savings made, but also to assess the level of commercial thinking across the organization at a divisional level. Each Business Case that is considered has a commercial aspect that discusses possible funding options, making a recommendation for the preferred route, as well as how the program will be managed (contract management, KPIs, output based contracts, etc.). Once fully assessed, the Business Case is given a 'score'. Five business objectives are identified with 16 indicators in the commercial strategy.

The Procurement and Commercial Department is split into smaller teams that have specific metrics to report on and are currently under revision.

(30) New Zealand Procurement Competency Framework

At an individual level, the New Zealand - Procurement Competency Framework was designed to determine where individuals sit within their profession and to provide a basic roadmap for further professional development. At an agency level, to help build an effective, competent workforce of procurers who add value to procurement activities. At a manager level, to ensure their teams have adequate levels of capability appropriate to individual roles. In this way, skills gaps can be identified and guidance can be provided to individuals to help fill the gaps.

The Procurement Competency Framework was designed also at a procurer level to check if they have desired capability levels for their role. Practitioners get a better understanding of the roles and competencies required in order to better develop their career pathways.

For each level in the career trajectory, the Framework defines role behaviours; role and person characteristics in management and leadership responsibilities, decision making, accountability, personal attributes and desirable qualifications; and core and technical competencies.

(31) U.S. State Level Procurement Performance Measures

The provision of assistance to public procurement professionals to improve, enable and acknowledge their success in the public sector purchasing environment was one of the goals set by the Board of Directors of the National Association of State Procurement Officials (NASPO) in the 2004 Strategic Plan.

Ensuring that members comprehend the strategic global supply and market conditions was another main goal of the strategic plan. The U.S. State Level Procurement Performance Measures conducted a survey in 2005 to gather information on state benchmarking practices from seventeen U.S. states. Along with information found online about state procurement, the analysis of the survey concluded that while many states currently benchmark their processes, finding commonality among these measures means a further effort to define and then align them to a standard comparable measure.

The U.S. State Level Procurement Performance Measures document focuses on giving an outline of benchmarking as a four-phase process, which pretends to provide an adaptable guide to measuring key performance indicators in each state. The importance of benchmarking internally (within the state) is emphasised to be an important tool for accountability and performance improvement. The guide gives examples as a guide on how to perform the benchmarking and of some high-level performance measures that could be tracked by individual states.

(32) Scotland – Procurement Capability Assessment (PCA)

The Scottish Procurement Capability Assessment (PCA) was developed as part of the Public Procurement Reform Programme to promote the sharing of best practices and continuous improvement across the Scottish Public Sector. The PCA helps to understand the procurement capability at a local, sectorial and national level, allowing improvement plans to be implemented to ensure the promotion of efficiency and effectiveness and continuous improvement. All Scottish public bodies are expected to be using the PCA as additional support and use the management information available to monitor the way they do business at a local level, and track progress and improvements.

A systemic review of purchasing strategy, operations, resources and performance under eight key areas:

- Leadership and governance;
- Strategy and objectives;
- Sourcing strategies and collaborative procurement;
- Specification of goods and services;
- Contract and supplier management;
- People;
- Key purchasing processes and systems; and
- Performance measurement.

Each area is evaluated on a four level score and categorised with the McClelland attributes.

(33) UK Flexible Framework

The UK Government Sustainable Procurement National Action Plan defined a series of building blocks that public sector organizations can use to lead to rapid progress towards more sustainable procurement being delivered throughout the public sector. One of these building blocks is a framework of key behavioural and operational change programs (*the Flexible Framework*) which defines five stages of procurement performance (foundation level, embed level, practice level, enhance level, and lead level) and which comprises the following five key themes: People; Policy, Strategy & Communications; Procurement Process: Engaging Suppliers; and Measurement & Results.²⁸

²⁸ Department for Environment food and Rural Affairs: Sustainable national Action Plan: Recommendations from the Sustainable Procurement Task Force, 2006.

Annex I - Key characteristics of current tools and initiatives²⁹

Assessment tool														Assessment process											Follow up:							
#	Tool	Aim			Level				Indicator		Evidence Base			Assm. Owner			Validation		Stakeholder involv			Follow up										
		Quality	Performan.	Capacity	Other	Country	PP Agency	Project	Other	Compliance	KPI	Scoring	Qualitative	Quantitative	Percent.	Country	Donor(s)	Joint D/C	Internal	Stakeholder	Peer R/Sec.	Planning	Implement.	Validation	Action Pl.	Reporting	Action Plan	Monitoring	Publ/Comm			
International tools and initiatives																																
1	MAPS	•				•				•		•				•		•					•	•	•	•	•				V	
2	PEFA	•	•		PF	•					•	•		•				•			•						•				•	Testing results
3	OECD-Perf ind		•			•					•			•		•								•							•	
4	ISPMS		•		PS	•					•			•		•	•														•	
5	OECD Peer R.	•	•		DP	•							•				•				•					•	•	•	•	•		
6	UNEP: SPP			•	SPP	•	•				•		•	•	•			•		•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
7	Open Contract				OC	•	•	•		•			•				•		•				•	•	•	•	•	•		V		
Donor/Development Agency tools and initiatives																																
8	WB CPAR	•															•		•				•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
9	WB Agency C			•			•	•																								
10	WB P-RAMS				R		•	•																								
11	WB SORT				R	•	•	•	•																							
12	WB Perf Mgtm		•				•				•	•	•	•	•			•	•													
13	WB APA	•	•	•	A	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•		•					•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
14	EBRD Benchm.	•	•			•				•		•	•		•		•	•	•	•				•		•	•	•	•	•	•	
15	EBRD ICA	•	•				•	•		•		•	•				•	•									•	•				
16	IDB Perf Ind		•			•				•			•			•											•				V	
17	DFAT Australia	•		•		•	•		S	•		•		•			•		•			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
18	USAID		•		S		•			•		•		•		•		•				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
19	UNDP CapDev	•		•		•	•		I			•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
20	UNOPS PEAT																															
21	MDB E-proc				E	•					•	•	•	•	•		•						•			•				V	Revised template	

²⁹ Non-exhaustive list

Assessment tool														Assessment process																
#	Tool	Aim			Level			Indicator		Evidence Base			Ass. Owner			Validation		Stakeholder involv			Follow up			Follow up:						
		Quality	Performance	Capacity	Other	Country	PP Agency	Project	Other	Compliance	KPI	Scoring	Qualitative	Quantitative	Perception	Country	Donor(s)	Joint D/C	Internal	Stakeholders	Peer R/Sec	Planning	Implement.		Validation	Action Plan	Reporting	Action Plan	Monitoring	Publ/Comm.
National tools (developing countries)																														
22	Philipp. APCPI	•	•	•		•			•	•	•	•	•	•					•							•	•			Countries are invited to share more information.
23	Philipp. CW		•			?		S	?	?		•	•					•	?				?		?			?		
24	Bangl PROMIS		•			?			?	?								•	?				?		?			?		
25	Uganda PPMS	?	•			?								•																
26	Colombia	?	•											•						?		?								
27	Countries NN?																													
	Ghana PPME	•	•	•	SPP	•	•			•	•	•	•	•				•								•				
National tools (OECD countries)																														
28	UK PCR		•			•				•																				To be discussed: Should these tools (OECD countries) be included in this mapping exercise?
29	DFID Reports																													
30	NZ Proc comp			•																										
31	US States		•			•				•																				
32	Scotland PCA	•	•			•				•																				
33	UK Flex. Frame				SPP					•																				

- applicable
- ? = Further information needed
- A = Use of alternative procurement arrangements (country systems)
- DP = Development programs
- E = E-Government Procurement
- I = Individual level
- OC = Open Contracting
- PF = Public Finance Management
- PS = Public Sector Management
- R = Risks
- S = Sector
- SPP = Sustainable public procurement
- V = Voluntary; only few assessment reports published

