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## Context (Brief description of context)

**INTRODUCTION**

The MAPS User’s Guide recommends the preparation of a Concept Note to appropriately scope, prepare, and resource the MAPS assessment based on the country’s needs and objectives. It is a major innovation of the revised MAPS to have the country competent authority explain and designate priorities and expectations in launching the assessment exercise.

The content of a Concept Note is therefore highly context-specific. This template provides the main sections of a Concept Note and guides through the development of the tool. The questions listed below are further outlined in the MAPS User’s Guide.

**COOPERATION AND SUPPORT**

The Concept Note should be developed in close cooperation with any internal and, when applicable, any external partner that assists in carrying out the MAPS assessment. The MAPS Secretariat will offer support to users of the MAPS methodology upon request, including advice to country teams for planning and management of a MAPS assessment as well as quality review of Concept Notes and Terms of References for MAPS assessments.

## Objective and background (Why?)

1. What is the primary objective(s) of conducting a MAPS assessment in (country)?
2. Has the country conducted a MAPS assessment (or other assessments related to public procurement) in the past, and what were the results?
3. Which parts of the MAPS methodology should be applied to deliver the desired outcomes (core, supplementary modules)?[[1]](#footnote-1)

## Tasks to meet the objectives (What?)

The concept note should outline the tasks to meet the objectives of the assessment and to ensure compliance with the MAPS methodology as described in detail in the Terms of References (Template attached). The tasks revolve around the following key functions:

1. Planning and Preparing the Assessment
2. Conducting the Assessment (and in which language will it be carried out?[[2]](#footnote-2))
3. Reporting

## Focus of the assessment (Scope?)

1. Are there any specific issues to focus on?
2. Which parts of the government should be covered (e.g. federal/state, provincial and/or local level; state owned enterprises)?
3. Which quantitative indicators will be used for performance measurement (defined set of quantitative indicators, or additional quantitative indicators)?

## Information sources (How?)

1. Which information sources are available to gather required information?
2. To what extent should the assessment include the review of actual procurement cases (refer to MAPS Indicator 9)? In particular, how should this sample be designed, how representative should it be? Which of the country’s procuring entities shall be included (i.e. list of ministries/departments, provinces, local government, state owned enterprises and/or central procurement bodies)?

## Leadership and Assessment Team (Who?)

The concept note should demonstrate the objectivity, impartiality and professionalism of the assessment. To this end, assessors must have extensive knowledge and experience on public procurement, be free of conflicts of interest and carry out an objective and impartial work.

1. Who will lead the MAPS assessment? Will an Assessment Steering Committee be established? How will it be composed, who will be the chair/members?
2. Who will conduct the assessment? Will the Assessment Team consist of country representatives, representatives from external partners (if applicable) and one (or several) experts/consultants?
3. What are the different roles of the members of the Assessment Team?

If the individual members of the assessment team, including the team leader, are already known when the concept note is being finalised, the CVs of the respective members should be included as an annex.

## Stakeholders (Whom to engage?)

1. Who are the key stakeholders that should be involved in the assessment?
2. How can the findings of the “Analysis of the country context” (MAPS Section II) be used to identify (additional) key stakeholders that are formally and informally inked to the public procurement structures in the country?

**Checklist**

**This checklist provides general guidance on categories of stakeholders that should be involved in a MAPS assessment:**

* **Authority in charge of the assessment (typically the regulatory authority, ministry, or centre of government)**
* **Institution in charge of the normative/regulatory function for public procurement**
* **Procurement appeals body**
* **Selected number of procuring entities including state owned enterprises**
* **Centralised procurement body, if any**
* **Authorities responsible for budgeting, payment and financial procedures**
* **Authorities in charge of internal and external controls and audits**
* **Anti-corruption agencies**
* **Competition bodies, e.g. Competition Commission**
* **Authority responsible for Public Private Partnerships**
* **Public Service Commission**
* **Training institutions**
* **Procurement professional body**
* **Representatives of the private sector**
* **Representatives of civil society**
* **Research institutions, Academia**
* **Media**
* **External partners engaged in public procurement in the country (if applicable)**

## Validation of assessment results

1. How will the findings be validated and recommendations be discussed?
2. Should the assessment involve a MAPS quality review process? The MAPS quality assurance mechanism involves a review of compliance of the assessment process and assessment report with the MAPS methodology and the quality review of assessment results by the MAPS Secretariat and an Assessment’s Technical Advisory Group (ATAG).

## Communication and Cooperation

1. How will cooperation with internal and external partners (international organisations, development agencies, existing local coordination groups, research institutions, or similar, as applicable) be organised? What will it entail?
2. How will the assessment results be communicated, published and used?

## Outputs and timetable

The following table can be used to summarise the outputs to be achieve as well as responsible parties and deadlines for the MAPS assessment.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Output* | *Responsible* | *Cooperation with* | *Deadlines [ENTER DATES]* |
| Concept Note | Government | Internal and External partner, as applicable |  |
| Organizational and logistical arrangements (including selection of experts/consultants and ensuring that required information and data is available) | Government | Internal and External partner, as applicable, and  Assessment Steering Committee |  |
| Analysis of County Context | Assessment Team | Assessment Steering Committee |  |
| Assessment of the Public Procurement System   * Develop and regularly update assessment schedule * Collect data (qualitative and quantitative data)   Apply the MAPS indicators using the three-step approach (refer to MAPS User’s Guide, paragraphs 13-24) | Assessment Team | Assessment Steering Committee |  |
| Developing Recommendations for Prioritised Reform | Assessment Team | Assessment Steering Committee |  |
| Validation of Findings | Government, facilitated by Assessment Team | Stakeholders  External partner  Peer Reviewers |  |
| Assessment Report   * Draft * Review/Comments * Final report | Assessment Team | Assessment Steering Committee  In case of MAPS Quality assurance:  MAPS Secretariat/ Assessment Technical Advisory Group | Draft Report:  Comments:  Final Report: |
| Publication of MAPS Assessment Report | Government/ MAPS Secretariat |  |  |

The following table provides a general overview of the succession of the different activities. [TO BE ADAPTED TO MATCH CONCRETE DATES]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Task / Week | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 |
| 1.     Concept Note, Logistics[[3]](#footnote-3)4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.     Analysis of Country Context |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.     Assessment: Data Collection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.     Assessment: Analysis (3-steps) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.     Recommendations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.     Validation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7.     Report Writing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8.     MAPS Quality Assurance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.     Final Report, Publication |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## External support and budget

1. What are the total cost of the assessment?
2. How much external support (if any) and budget will be needed?
3. Who will contract external experts (consultants), if any?
4. Who will be responsible for logistical arrangements (e.g. office space, scheduling interviews)?

The following table can be used to estimate the budget: [SHOULD BE ADAPTED]

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Unit cost | | Units | Total |
| Government staff | Cost/month | | Months | EUR |
| Assessment Steering Committee |  | |  |  |
| Assessment Team |  | |  |  |
| Administrative support including local travel |  | |  |  |
| Sub-Total Government Staff | | | |  |
| Staff of external partners (as applicable) | Cost/month | Months | | EUR |
| Facilitator |  |  | |  |
| Adviser/Analyst? |  |  | |  |
| Administrative support | | | |  |
| Sub-Total External Staff | | | |  |
| Expert Costs | Daily rate | | Days | EUR |
| External Expert(s):  *[Individual rows should be listed for each type of expert, if there are differences in terms of rates or number of days.]* |  | |  |  |
| Sub-total External Experts | | | |  |
| Travel Costs (Travel, accommodation, per diem) | Cost/trip | | Trips | EUR |
| Travel costs Government staff |  | |  |  |
| Travel costs External expert(s) |  | |  |  |
| Local travel |  | |  |  |
| Sub-Total Travel costs | | | |  |
| Other Expenditure (costs for consultations, etc.) | | | | |
| Consultation conference; Validation workshop (participants, interpretation, venue); etc. |  | |  |  |
| Video conferences (per hour / line) |  | |  |  |
| Other expenditures: |  | |  |  |
| Sub-Total “Other Expenditure” | | | |  |
| TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS |  | |  |  |

# Annex 1 – Composition of Assessment Steering Committee/Team/ATAG**[[4]](#footnote-4)2**

**Members of Assessment Steering Committee:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Function | Institution | Name | Designation | Email |
| Chair |  |  |  |  |
| Members: | | | | |
| Country Representative(s) |  |  |  |  |
| External Partner(s) |  |  |  |  |

**Members of Assessment Team:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Function | Institution | Name | Designation | Email |
| Lead |  |  |  |  |
| Members: | | | | |
| Country Representative(s) |  |  |  |  |
| External Partner(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Consultant(s) |  |  |  |  |

**Members of Assessment Technical Advisory Group:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Member institution** |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Some of the supplementary MAPS modules are available at [www.mapsinitiative.org](http://www.mapsinitiative.org). Others are being developed to complement the core assessment methodology. These modules focus on specific policy areas of public procurement and can be used by countries depending on their particular needs. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. It is strongly suggested that reports are either carried out or translated into English, for increased ATAG participation and wider dissemination and use. The MAPS Secretariat will be able to review assessments in English, French and Spanish. Reports in other languages must be translated to English in order to be reviewed by the Secretariat. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. 4 Additional time may need to be considered to account for the mobilisation of the assessment team. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. 2 To be completed, as applicable [↑](#footnote-ref-4)