



MAPS

Methodology for Assessing
Procurement Systems

Entity Level Assessment (ELA)

SUPPLEMENTARY MODULE

June 2023 (Draft version for piloting)



Table of Contents

Purpose and Use of the Methodology.....	3
MAPS Analytical Framework.....	3
MAPS Module for Entity Level Assessments.....	3
Compliance with MAPS Methodology	5
Preamble	6
Analysis of Context.....	7
Pillar I. Legal, Regulatory, and Policy Framework.....	8
ELA-Indicator 1. National procurement laws apply to the entity.	8
ELA-Sub-indicator 1(a) – Application of national legal framework.....	8
ELA-Indicator 2. National procurement regulations and tools apply to the entity.	8
ELA-Sub-indicator 2(a) – Application of national regulatory framework	8
ELA-Indicator 3. Horizontal policy objectives and international obligations apply to the entity.	9
ELA-Sub-indicator 3(a) – Application of national policy and international obligations.....	9
Pillar II. Institutional Framework and Management Capacity	10
ELA-Indicator 4. Entity procurement is well integrated into the entity financial management system.	10
ELA-Sub-indicator 4(a) – Procurement planning and the budget cycle.....	10
ELA-Sub-indicator 4(b) – Financial procedures and the procurement cycle	11
ELA-Indicator 5. The country has an institution in charge of the normative/regulatory function: ...	11
ELA-Indicator 6. The entity has a clear mandate and organisation to conduct procurement.....	11
ELA-Sub-indicator 6(a) – Mandate and management structure to undertake procurement.....	11
ELA-Sub-indicator 6(b) – Procurement cycle management.....	12
ELA-Indicator 7. Entity procurement is embedded in an effective information system.	13
ELA-Sub-indicator 7(a) – Publication of procurement information supported by information technology	13
ELA-Sub-indicator 7(b) – Use of e-Procurement.....	14
ELA-Sub-indicator 7(c) – Strategies to manage procurement data	15
ELA-Indicator 8. The entity’s procurement system has a strong capacity to develop and improve. 16	16
ELA-Sub-indicator 8(a) – Procurement training.....	16
ELA-Sub-indicator 8(b) – Professional procurement staff	17
ELA-Sub-indicator 8(c) – Monitoring performance to improve the system	17
Pillar III. Public Procurement Operations and Market Practices	19



ELA-Indicator 9. Entity’s procurement practices achieve stated objectives.....	19
ELA-Sub-indicator 9(a) – Planning, strategizing, and preparing the procurement process.....	19
ELA-Sub-indicator 9(b) – Selection and contracting	20
ELA-Sub-indicator 9(b1) – Procurement method, documents, specifications, evaluation, and award criteria	21
ELA-Sub-indicator 9(b2) – Advertisement, submission and opening of tenders.....	22
ELA-Sub-indicator 9(b3) – Evaluation and contract award	23
ELA-Sub-indicator 9(c) – Contract management	24
ELA-Indicator 10. The entity’s procurement market is fully functional.....	26
ELA-Sub-indicator 10(a) – Dialogue and partnerships between public and private sector.....	26
ELA-Sub-indicator 10(b) – Private sector’s organisation and access to the market	27
ELA-Sub-indicator 10(c) – Key sectors and sector strategies.....	27
Pillar IV. Accountability, Integrity and Transparency of the Public Procurement System.....	28
ELA-Indicator 11. Transparency and civil society engagement foster integrity in entity procurement.	28
ELA-Sub-indicator 11(a) – Enabling environment.....	28
ELA-Sub-indicator 11(b) – Direct engagement of civil society.....	29
ELA-Indicator 12. The entity has effective control and audit systems.....	29
ELA-Sub-indicator 12(a) – Organisation and coordination of controls and audits	29
ELA-Sub-indicator 12(b) – Enforcement and follow-up on findings and recommendations.....	30
ELA-Indicator 13. Procurement appeals mechanisms are effective and efficient.....	30
ELA-Sub-indicator 13(a) – Challenges and appeals.....	30
ELA-Indicator 14. The entity has ethics and anticorruption measures in place.	32
ELA-Sub-indicator 14(a) – Legal framework and conflict of interest policy.....	32
ELA-Sub-indicator 14(b) – Provisions on prohibited practices in procurement documents	33
ELA-Sub-indicator 14(c) – Effective sanctions and enforcement systems.....	33
ELA-Sub-indicator 14(d) – Anti-corruption framework.....	34
ENTITY Sub-indicator 14(e) – Secure mechanism for reporting prohibited practices or unethical behaviour	35
Annex 1 – MAPS Entity Level Indicator System	36
Annex 2 – MAPS Assessment Criteria expressed in Quantitative Terms.....	38



INTRODUCTION

Purpose and Use of the Methodology

The Methodology for Assessing Procurement Systems (MAPS) is intended to provide a harmonised tool for use in the assessment of public procurement systems. The methodology has been designed to enable a country, with or without support of external partners, to assess its procurement system to determine its strengths and weaknesses: the resulting information can serve as the basis for the design of harmonised system development and reform initiatives to improve capacity and to address weaknesses. The assessment provides the country with information it can use to monitor the performance of its system and the success of the reform initiatives in improving performance. In identifying weaknesses in the current system in a country, external partners are also provided with information that helps them determine risks to the funds they provide to partner countries.

The MAPS core methodology provides a comprehensive approach for assessing procurement systems. It defines the structure to conduct a country context analysis, presents a refined indicator system for assessing the quality and performance of the system in terms of outcomes and results and describes the key elements of the assessment process. The assessment report provides context to the assessment and exhibits the detailed results of the evaluation.

MAPS Analytical Framework

The MAPS analytical framework consists of a core assessment methodology and several supplementary modules.

The MAPS core methodology provides a comprehensive approach for assessing procurement systems. It defines the structure to conduct a country context analysis, presents a refined indicator system for assessing the quality and performance of the system in terms of outcomes and results and describes the key elements of the assessment process. The MAPS core methodology is the basis of any MAPS assessment.

Supplementary modules complement the core assessment methodology. The modules focus on specific policy areas of public procurement and can be used by countries depending on their needs. To facilitate a coherent and holistic approach to public procurement assessments and reform, the application of this MAPS module should follow or be embedded in a comprehensive assessment using the MAPS core methodology.

MAPS Module for Entity Level Assessments

The MAPS Entity Level Assessment (ELA) module is intended to provide a harmonized tool for assessing procurement arrangements and performance of individual agencies (procuring entities).



Typically, entity level assessments are heavily dependent on information provided by a MAPS core assessment. Therefore, a comprehensive MAPS assessment is required before the entity level assessment tool is applied. The findings of this core assessment should be used to ensure a proper understanding of the country context and the specific environment public procurement operates in. The integrated application of the entity module will sharpen its focus and help avoiding the duplication of efforts. The MAPS ELA module has not been designed as a stand-alone assessment tool.

The table below highlights the sections and indicators of the core methodology that assess specific aspects that are highly relevant to entity level assessments. It illustrates the information readily available establishing the starting point for the modular based assessment.

MAPS Core Assessment: Sections specifically linked to Entity Level Assessments	
Analysis of Country Context	<p>The Analysis of Country Context provides information to ensure that any MAPS assessment is based on a good understanding of the context in which public procurement institutions and other stakeholders operate in a particular country.</p> <p>It focuses on several potentially important factors, all of which are highly relevant to entity assessments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Political, economic, and geostrategic situation of the country 2. Public procurement system and its links with the public financial management and public governance system 3. National policy objectives and sustainable development goals 4. Public procurement reform
Assessment of Public Procurement Systems	<p>Assessments based on the MAPS core assessment tool provide a wealth of information and data on the quality and performance of the country's public procurement system. The key findings, recommendations, and programmes the government is implementing to improve the system are elaborated in the MAPS assessment report and further detailed in annexes.</p> <p>This information is highly relevant to the assessment of entity level procurement. The MAPS assessment report covering the national procurement system should be thoroughly reviewed before and when applying the entity assessment module to get a complete picture and assess whether an entity's procurement system is sound and performing well.</p>

The MAPS ELA module aims to:

- › Assess the entity's procurement arrangements, in particular variations from the national framework
- › Assess the entity's procurement practices (e.g. compliance with obligations; performance measurement)
- › Identify strengths and weaknesses of the entity's procurement system
- › Facilitate the development of sustainable performance improvements and the monitoring of implementation



- › Facilitate communication of measurable results
- › Strengthen management capacity
- › Complement the MAPS core methodology
- › Support sector level assessments
- › Support the implementation of SDG 12.7 and related goals.¹

The module covers the following issues, drilling down to how they specifically affect the target entity:

- › The legal, regulatory and policy framework applicable to the entity
- › Linkages with budget and financial procedures
- › Procurement organization, information systems, and capacities of the entity
- › Entity's procurement practices and performance including links to the supply market
- › Transparency, accountability, and ethics and anticorruption measures

The entity module comprises 31 sub-indicators to be assessed. The indicators rest on the four pillars of the MAPS methodology: a) the existing legal and policy framework; b) the institutional framework and management capacities; c) procurement operations and market practices; and d) accountability, integrity, and transparency of the procurement system.

Compliance with MAPS Methodology

This supplementary module assessment must fully comply with the latest version of the methodology. In addition to what is described in this document and annexes, compliance with the methodology includes what is prescribed in the MAPS User's Guide (core MAPS, Section I), as well as in the templates and guidance provided by the MAPS Secretariat.

Both the methodology and all associated material including guidance and templates is available online on www.mapsinitiative.org

The MAPS Secretariat offers support to all users of MAPS including:

- › Advice to country teams for planning and management of a MAPS assessment including quality review of concept notes and terms of references for MAPS assessments
- › Advice to MAPS assessment teams on the MAPS methodology
- › Quality review of MAPS assessment reports (in collaboration with the MAPS Technical Advisory Group) to provide certification of assessments that meet the quality standards specified.
- › A fully self-paced e-learning programme covering all essentials of MAPS freely available to anyone

¹ Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 12.7: Promote public procurement practices that are sustainable, in accordance with national policies and priorities.



ENTITY LEVEL ASSESSMENT

Preamble

Countries may operate with a centralised or a more decentralised approach to procurement. Regardless of the system, public procurement is conducted in government organizations (public entities). These entities can belong to any level of government (national, provincial, or municipal level). They can represent different arms of government (branches, ministries, departments, etc.) or they could be constituted as state-owned enterprises or bodies. The MAPS ELA module can be equally applied to all government organizations to assess the effectiveness, efficiency, and transparency of procurement operations.

Procurement of government agencies is intrinsically tied to the national legal, regulatory and policy framework for public procurement and the general environment in which procurement officers and market participants operate. This context includes aspects of transparency, value for money, good governance, efficiency, accountability, and sustainable development, amongst others.

The MAPS core methodology provides a comprehensive approach for the analysis of the country context and the assessment of the country's public procurement systems. It should be carried out before or simultaneously when an entity level assessment is conducted to ensure that the entity level assessment is based on a good understanding of the context in which government agencies and their stakeholders operate. The national legal, regulatory and policy framework for public procurement will be applicable to most government agencies and having the findings of a MAPS core assessment at hand substantially reduces the effort to complete an entity level assessment.

However, the legal framework applicable to an individual entity can be different depending on its sector or mandate and capability requirements and procedures can deviate depending on the nature and volume of procurement to be conducted. The MAPS ELA module reviews these conditions and assesses the actual performance of agencies' procurement operations. The MAPS core indicators guide the assessment tool. It zooms in on areas that are instrumental to developing effective and efficient entity procurement systems. The assessment is based on evidence. It relies on available documentation and data (from e-Procurement or other IT systems or manual/semi-electronic sources of information) and includes the review of a sample of procurement cases complemented by interviews and surveys with government and non-government stakeholders.

MAPS is a universal tool. It is relevant for all countries, irrespective of income level or development status. To ensure that its application is equally effective in small, fragile, or conflict-affected states it is important to recognize that development of a country and its agencies is an evolving process. Prioritization and well-sequenced improvement plans following the assessment are critical, especially in resource-constrained environments.



Analysis of Context

The application of MAPS should be preceded by a context analysis to ensure that the assessment is based on a good understanding of the context in which public procurement institutions and other stakeholders operate in a particular country. During the assessment and in developing responses to the findings, the political and institutional environment can be considered to ensure that the reforms are anchored in countries' needs.

Section II of the MAPS core methodology outlines the information that should be gathered at the country level (refer to Section II – Analysis of Country Context). The context analysis comprises, for example, a mapping of key stakeholders that are formally and informally linked to public procurement structures. The assessment report is structured as follows:

1. Brief review of the most relevant aspects of the country's political, economic, and geostrategic situation;
2. The public procurement system and its links with the public finance management and the public governance systems;
3. National policy objectives with a focus on issues that influence public procurement; and
4. Public procurement reform including government ownership, reform priorities, key stakeholders, incentives and challenges that may impact the success of reforms.

Similarly, at the entity level, a context analysis should be part of the assessment. Specific characteristics of the respective sector and its key players, mandate and objectives of the entity to be assessed, and its organizational culture and leadership style are among the various factors that may impact the quality and performance of entity procurement and the political and institutional room for improvements to the system. The entity's key stakeholders should be mapped to provide for inclusiveness and participation in the entity level assessment process. This analysis of the entity context complements the country context analysis at hand and should be structured as follows:

1. Brief review of the most relevant aspects of the respective sector(s) to generate specific insights about what shapes the sector (e.g., sector objectives; key actors and their interests, power and incentives; constraints) with a focus on implications that affect procurement at the entity
2. Brief review of the most relevant aspects of the entity to shed light on its objectives, structure, and dynamics (e.g. entity mandate and goals; organizational structure including how procurement is positioned; incentives and constraints; history and relevance of procurement at the entity) to better understand the potential for change.
3. List of key stakeholders that should be engaged during the entity level assessment.



Pillar I. Legal, Regulatory, and Policy Framework

The MAPS core methodology, Pillar I, assesses the existing legal, regulatory and policy framework for public procurement. It comprises three indicators and a total of eighteen sub-indicators.

This entity level assessment reviews (1) whether the national framework applies to the entity assessed, and (2) whether instruments, tools or policies exist at the entity level that go beyond the arrangements provided at the national level.

ELA-Indicator 1. National procurement laws apply to the entity.

This indicator assesses the existing legal framework for entity procurement. It comprises one sub-indicator (a).

ELA-Sub-indicator 1(a) – Application of national legal framework

The purpose of the sub-indicator is to determine whether the national legal framework for public procurement applies to the entity. If verified, the comprehensive findings of the MAPS core assessment need to be considered to identify the formal rules and procedures governing entity procurement including its evaluation of how they compare to international standards.

If the national legal framework does not apply, or the sector/entity has additional laws that affect the procurement framework, a detailed review of the entity's procurement rules must be carried out using all sub-indicators of indicator 1 of the MAPS core methodology. The assessor should identify the reasons for this deviation from the national framework.

ELA-Sub-indicator 1(a): Assessment criteria

(a) The national legal framework for public procurement applies to entity procurement.

ALTERNATIVELY (if the national legal framework does not apply or additional laws exist that affect the entity's procurement framework): Application of indicator 1 of the MAPS core methodology.

ELA-Indicator 2. National procurement regulations and tools apply to the entity.

This indicator assesses the existing regulatory framework and tools for entity procurement. It comprises one sub-indicator (a).

ELA-Sub-indicator 2(a) – Application of national regulatory framework

The purpose of the sub-indicator is to determine whether the national regulatory framework for public procurement applies to the entity. If verified, the comprehensive findings of the MAPS core assessment need to be considered to clarify the existence, availability, and quality of implementing regulations, operational procedures, handbooks, and model procurement documents including standard conditions of contract.



If the national regulatory framework does not apply, a detailed review of the entity's procurement regulations and tools must be carried out using all sub-indicators of indicator 2 of the MAPS core methodology.

Even if the national regulatory framework applies, the entity may have tools and documentations customized to its types of procurement (e.g., model procurement documents, manuals, directives). Those should be identified and reviewed as well.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 2(a): Assessment criteria

- (a) The national regulatory framework for public procurement applies to entity procurement.
- (b) The entity has policies, procedures, model procurement documents, standard contract conditions, or other tools that surpass the national regulatory framework.

ALTERNATIVELY (if the national regulatory framework does not apply or additional regulations exist that affect the entity's procurement framework): Application of indicator 2 of the MAPS core methodology.

ELA-Indicator 3. Horizontal policy objectives and international obligations apply to the entity.

This indicator assesses the existence and relevance of horizontal policy objectives and international obligations for entity procurement. It comprises one sub-indicator (a).

ELA-Sub-indicator 3(a) – Application of national policy and international obligations

The purpose of the sub-indicator is to determine whether horizontal policy objectives – such as goals aiming at increased sustainability, support for certain groups of society, etc. – and obligations deriving from international agreements exist and apply to the entity.

If policy objectives and/or international obligations exist and apply to the entity, the findings of the MAPS core assessment and, as available, more specific information included in a supplementary MAPS assessment of Sustainable Public Procurement (SPP) need to be taken into account to determine (a) the content of national policies, implementation plans and provisions; and (b) the actions taken by the entity to support the implementation of sustainable development strategies.

Even if there is no national policy framework to be observed, the entity might have its own strategies to make procurement more sustainable. These strategies, procedures, and tools should be reviewed using all relevant indicators of the MAPS core assessment methodology (Indicators 3) or by conducting a supplementary SPP assessment, as appropriate.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 3(a): Assessment criteria

- (a) National policy objectives and international obligations related to public procurement apply to the entity.
- (b) The entity has a strategy in place to implement SPP in support of broader national policy objectives.
- (c) The entity has appropriate procedures, model procurement documents, and other tools in place to operationalize, facilitate and monitor the application of SPP.

ALTERNATIVELY (if the national policy framework governing sustainable procurement and obligations deriving from international agreements do not apply to the entity): Application of indicator 3 of the MAPS core methodology.

Link: MAPS Sustainable Public Procurement (SPP) Module



Pillar II. Institutional Framework and Management Capacity

The MAPS core methodology, Pillar II, assesses how the procurement system as defined by the legal and regulatory framework in a country is operating in practice through the institutions and management systems that are part of the overall public sector governance in the country. It comprises five indicators and a total of fourteen sub-indicators.

This entity level assessment reviews (1) the interactions between procurement and financial management; (2) the organisational and operational structure of procurement; (3) the use of information systems; and (4) the capacity to enhance procurement performance at the entity level.

ELA-Indicator 4. Entity procurement is well integrated into the entity financial management system.

This indicator focuses on the degree of integration of the entity's procurement system with financial management ranging from planning and budget preparation to the processing of payments. It comprises two sub-indicators to be assessed individually (a-b).

ELA-Sub-indicator 4(a) – Procurement planning and the budget cycle

As elaborated in the MAPS core methodology, annual or multi-annual procurement plans should be prepared to support budget planning, formulation, and execution. Multi-year budgeting and financing is encouraged to optimise the procurement cycle.

This indicator assesses whether the entity's procurement plans are prepared on time to support budget planning and whether this integrated planning process results in the timely provision of funds. The appropriated funds should cover the full amount of the procurement contract or the portion of the contract to be performed within the budget period.

The procurement plans should be sufficiently detailed to facilitate the definition of packages (procurement lots), the selection of procurement methods, and the calculation of completion schedules and cost estimates. The entity's procurement plans should be regularly updated and used to provide information on the completion of major contracts. Provided standard forms should be utilised.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 4(a): Assessment criteria

- (a) Annual or multi-annual procurement plans are prepared on time in support of the budget planning and formulation process, and they contribute to multi-year planning.
- (b) Budget funds are committed or appropriated timely and cover the full amount of the contract (or amount to cover the portion of the contract to be performed within the budget period).
- (c) Procurement plans are sufficiently detailed and updated.
- (d) Standard templates are used.



ELA-Sub-indicator 4(b) – Financial procedures and the procurement cycle

This indicator assesses whether the entity’s financial procedures adequately support the procurement process. Safeguards in the system should preclude the initiation of procurement actions unless funds have been allocated to the procurement in question. Once procurement decisions are made, corresponding actions on the budget and financial side should be triggered. Procedures for processing invoices and authorization of payments should meet the obligations for timely payments.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 4(b): Assessment criteria

- (a) No solicitation of tenders/proposals or call offs from framework agreements take place without certification of the availability of funds.
- (b) The procedures for processing of invoices and authorization of payments meet obligations for timely payments stated in the contract and are publicly available and clear to potential bidders.*

***(b) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 4(b) Assessment criterion (b):**

- Invoices paid on time (in % of total number of invoices paid).

Source: PFM systems.

ELA-Indicator 5. The country has an institution in charge of the normative/regulatory function: [This indicator is comprehensively assessed in the MAPS core assessment methodology.]

ELA-Indicator 6. The entity has a clear mandate and organisation to conduct procurement

This indicator reviews the entity’s mandate, organizational structure, and procedures to undertake procurement. This includes an assessment of assigned responsibilities and authorities along the different stages of the procurement cycle. There are two sub-indicators to be assessed (a-b).

ELA-Sub-indicator 6(a) – Mandate and management structure to undertake procurement

This indicator assesses whether the entity is mandated by law to act as a procuring entity. It reviews the entity’s responsibilities and formal powers related to procurement.

Responsibilities could, for example, include the requirement to establish a designated, specialized procurement function with an appropriate management structure, capacity, and capability to undertake its duties efficiently and effectively.

Formal powers refer to the entity’s authority, e.g., the authority to award and execute contracts, accept contractual obligations, initiate payments, and pursue litigation. Decision-making authority should be delegated to the lowest competent levels consistent with risks associated and the monetary sums involved, and existing rules and thresholds should be reviewed.

If legislation requires the review or approval of procurement activities or decisions of the entity by external compliance or tender boards, commissions, or line ministries, the assessor should examine the



efficiency and effectiveness of the process. Similarly, if a centralised procurement body has been established to enhance the effectiveness of a decentralised system (e.g., to consolidate procurement needs across public entities or to manage highly complex procurement), accountabilities and potential deficiencies should be assessed.

Procurement officers should act as the lead in procurement issues and should be immune from political interference.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 6(a): Assessment criteria

- (a) The entity has a clear mandate, formal powers, and clear responsibilities to undertake procurement.
- (b) The entity has established a designated, specialized procurement function with the necessary management structure, capacity, and capability.
- (c) Decision making authority is delegated to the lowest competent levels consistent with the risks associated and the monetary sums involved.
- (d) Collaboration with a centralised procurement body, if available, enhances the efficiency of procurement.

ELA-Sub-indicator 6(b) – Procurement cycle management

This sub-indicator focuses on the entity’s management of the procurement cycle.

The different steps of the procurement cycle and procedures need to be clearly defined. The process includes needs assessment, planning, strategy, specifications², preparation of procurement documents, bid process management, bid opening, bid evaluation, contract award and execution, contract management including quality control and inspection, mechanism for dispute resolution, and oversight in line with the legislative framework.

Key functions should be assigned and duly staffed. Responsibilities of the different functions including approval requirements should be clearly defined and there should be an appropriate segregation of duties. For example, the procurement and contract management functions should be clearly separated to ensure in-built checks and balances.

In accordance with sub-indicator 6(a), decision-making authority along the procurement cycle should be delegated to the lowest competent levels (to the extent that the entity has power to decide). There should be no unnecessary levels of approval or cumbersome procedures. Thresholds should be regularly reviewed and updated. It needs to be clearly defined who has authority to sign contracts and subsequent amendments.

Clear procedures should exist and be applied with to ensure integrity, in particular confidentiality and regulated communications with bidders, to avoid abuse and undue interference throughout the entire procurement process.

The assessor should review whether the different steps of the procurement cycle, key functions, responsibilities, timelines, and authorities are clearly defined in accordance with the legal framework and the guidance provided by the institution(s) entrusted with the normative/regulatory function. It should also be assessed whether these instructions have been disseminated and are accessible to all staff. The

² In this context, the term “specifications” includes all technical requirements, including for work contracts, and terms of reference for consulting services.



procedures should cover the entire procurement cycle, including record keeping, contract management, and dispute resolution. Methods to review and issue contract amendments and inspection, quality control and acceptance procedures should be described. The assessor should determine whether staff consult the available manuals/instructions.

The assessor should also establish if the entity has access to quality legal advice and input. In addition, the assessor should determine whether the entity uses procurement agents to undertake procurement activities, as needed.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 6(b): Assessment criteria

- (a) The different steps of the procurement cycle and procedures are clearly defined in accordance with the legal framework and the guidance provided by the institution(s) entrusted with the normative/regulatory function.
- (b) Key functions are assigned, appropriately separated, and duly staffed.
- (c) Responsibilities including approval requirements are clearly defined; thresholds are regularly reviewed and updated.
- (d) The entity's procurement manual or other guidance/instructions cover the entire procurement cycle (including contract administration, inspection, quality control, acceptance, and methods to review and issue contract amendments).
- (e) The entity's manual/instructions cover timelines throughout the procurement process.
- (f) Available manual/instructions are disseminated, accessible to all staff, and consulted by staff.
- (g) The entity has access to quality legal advice and input.
- (h) The entity uses procurement agents to undertake procurement activities, as needed.

ELA-Indicator 7. Entity procurement is embedded in an effective information system.

The MAPS core methodology, indicator 7, assesses the extent to which the country has systems to publish procurement information, to efficiently support the different stages of the procurement process through application of digital technologies, and to manage data that allows for analysis of trends and performance of the entire public procurement system.

The entity level assessment reviews whether the information systems provided are appropriately utilised by the entity or whether systems exist at the entity that go beyond the arrangements provided at the national level. There are three sub-indicators to be assessed (a-c).

ELA-Sub-indicator 7(a) – Publication of procurement information supported by information technology

This sub-indicator assesses whether the procurement information system established in the country is fully used by the entity and provides comprehensive public access to the entity's procurement information.

Alternatively, the assessor should review whether, if not at the national level, there is an information system at the entity that meets the requirements defined in indicator 7(a) of the MAPS core tool.



ENTITY Sub-indicator 7(a): Assessment criteria

The entity uses a system that meets the following requirements:

- (a) Information on procurement is easily accessible in media of wide circulation and availability. Information is relevant, timely and complete and helpful to interested parties to understand the procurement processes and requirements and to monitor outcomes, results, and performance.
- (b) The country's (or entity's) information system is fully utilised by the entity, provides up-to-date information and is easily accessible to all interested parties at no cost.
- (c) The system provides for the publication of the entity's procurement information, as follows: *
 - Procurement plans
 - Information related to specific procurements, as a minimum: Advertisements or notices of procurement opportunities, contract awards including procurement method and amendments, information on contract implementation including payments, appeals decisions.
 - Linkages to rules and regulations and other information that is relevant to promote competition and transparency.
- (d) In support of the concept of open contracting more comprehensive information is published on the centralised online portal, if available, in each phase of the procurement process including the full set of procurement documents, evaluation reports, full contract documents including technical specification and implementation details (in accordance with legal and regulatory framework).
- (e) Information is published in an open and structured machine-readable format, using identifiers and classifications (open data format). *
- (f) Responsibility for the management and operation of the system is clearly defined.

***(c) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 7(a) Assessment criterion (c):**

- **Entity procurement plans published (in % of total number of required procurement plans)³**
- **Key procurement information published along the procurement cycle (in % of total number of contracts)⁴:**
 - **Invitation to bid/Request for proposal⁵ (in % of total number of contracts)**
 - **Contract awards (purpose, supplier, value, variations/amendments)**
 - **Details related to contract implementation (milestones, completion, and payment)**
 - **Annual procurement statistics**
 - **Appeals decisions related to entity posted within the timeframes specified in the law (in %).**

Source: Centralised online portal.

***(e) Recommended quantitative indicator to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 7(a) Assessment criterion (e):**

- Share of procurement information and data published in open data formats (in %).

Source: Centralised online portal.

ELA-Sub-indicator 7(b) – Use of e-Procurement

This sub-indicator assesses the extent to which e-Procurement is currently used by the entity. It reviews the entity's capacity, skills, and technical facilities to plan, develop and manage the e-Procurement system and it looks at suppliers' abilities to participate in public procurement carried out electronically.

As highlighted in the MAPS core assessment methodology, sub-indicator 7(b), e-Procurement is usually implemented gradually. The assessor should determine in which form e-Procurement has been implemented at the entity (e.g., portal for publishing procurement information, supplier registries, transaction-based e-Procurement through e-Tendering, e-Catalogues, e-Reverse Auctions, or e-Contract Management, or more sophisticated integrated systems) and can enable sharing reusable open data on public procurement.

³ PEFA PI-24-3 (2)

⁴ PEFA PI-24-3 (3, 4, 5, 6)

⁵ Actual procurement documents



The sub-indicator assesses whether entity officials have the capacity to plan, develop and manage the e-Procurement system taking the national road map or the general framework for e-Procurement into account (if these services are not provided by another public entity). It reviews whether staff members are adequately skilled to use the system reliably and efficiently. The availability of adequate technical facilities (such as personal computers, internet connections, storage, copiers, scanners, etc.) should also be assessed.

Additional efforts on the part of the entity may be necessary to ensure that all companies have equal access to procurement supported by electronic means, including micro, small and medium-sized enterprises.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 7(b): Assessment criteria
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) e-Procurement is used or progressively implemented at the entity. * (b) Entity officials have the capacity to plan, develop and manage the entity's e-Procurement system, as required (e.g., by a national road map or general framework). (c) Procurement staff members are adequately skilled and equipped to use the e-Procurement system reliably and efficiently. (d) Suppliers (including micro, small and medium-sized enterprises) participate in a public procurement market increasingly dominated by electronic means. * (e) In case e-Procurement has not yet been implemented, the entity has adopted an e-Procurement roadmap based on an e-Procurement readiness assessment.
<p>*(a) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 7(b) Assessment criterion (a): Uptake of e-Procurement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of e-Procurement procedures in % of total number of procedures - Value of e-Procurement procedures in % of total value of procedures <p>Source: e-Procurement system.</p>
<p>*(d) Recommended quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 7(b) Assessment criterion (d):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bids submitted online (in %) - Bids submitted online by micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (in %) <p>Source: e-Procurement system.</p>

Link: MAPS Module on e-Procurement

ELA-Sub-indicator 7(c) – Strategies to manage procurement data

This sub-indicator assesses the availability and use of statistical information to evaluate policies, analyse trends, and determine levels of participation, economy of procurement, and compliance with requirements.

To ensure comprehensiveness and efficiency, the system should be based on data available in e-Procurement or other information technology systems (or otherwise manually or semi-electronically).⁶

⁶ Only needed if the system used is not a national system that has already been assessed using the MAPS core methodology



Regular reports should be produced on procurement performance and senior management should review them. The entity should also consider the publication of annual procurement statistics and report to comprehensively inform and engage the private sector and the general public.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 7(c): Assessment criteria

- (a) There is a system in operation to collect data on the procurement of goods, works and services including consulting services with support from e-Procurement or other information technology.
- (b) The system manages data for the entire procurement process and allows analysis of trends, levels of participation, efficiency and economy of procurement and compliance with requirements.
- (c) Reliability of the information is high (verified by audits).
- (d) Analysis of information is routinely carried out and fed back into the system. *
- (e) Annual procurement statistics and reports are published in the public domain without charge.

***(d) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 7(c) Assessment criterion (d):**

- **Total number and value of contracts⁷**
- **Procurement as share of entity's budget (in % of total budget)**
- **Total value of contracts awarded through competitive methods in most recent fiscal year⁸**

Source: e-Procurement system.

ELA-Indicator 8. The entity's procurement system has a strong capacity to develop and improve.

This indicator focuses on the entity's efforts and ability to develop and improve its procurement operations. The following aspects are to be considered at the entity level:

- 1) Training of staff involved in procurement;
- 2) Actual availability of professional procurement staff; and
- 3) Importance placed on improving procurement performance.

There are three sub-indicators to be assessed (a-c).

ELA-Sub-indicator 8(a) – Procurement training

As elaborated in the MAPS core assessment methodology, sub-indicators 5(b) and 8(a), training programmes for new and existing staff involved in government procurement are essential to maintain the supply of qualified procurement officials. Ideally, a national strategy, tools and documents are in place to support training and capacity development.

Sub-indicator 8(a) assesses, whether entity staff members are sufficiently trained on the national procurement framework (or the procurement framework applicable to the entity) and whether this training includes the development of skills and competencies to conduct procurement efficiently and in compliance with the rules.

The assessor should review training programmes offered to procurement officers, technical departments, management, and other entity staff or external members of committees that have been assigned procurement related functions at the entity (e.g., evaluation committees), if not done at the national level.

⁷ PEFA PI-24-1

⁸ PEFA I-24-2



ENTITY Sub-indicator 8(a): Assessment criteria

- (a) Substantive permanent training programmes of suitable quality and content for the needs of the entity are in place.
- (b) Entity staff with procurement related functions are sufficiently trained and their skills and competencies are adequately developed to efficiently implement the national/entity procurement framework. *
- (c) External members of committees that have been assigned procurement related functions at the entity are sufficiently trained on the national/entity procurement framework.
- (d) Routine evaluation of training and periodic adjustment based on feedback and needs is carried out (if not done at the national level).

*(b) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 8(a) Assessment criterion (b):

- **Budget spent on procurement training per procurement staff**
- **Number of relevant procurement training days per staff**

Source: HR department.

ELA-Sub-indicator 8(b) – Professional procurement staff

The MAPS core assessment methodology, sub-indicator 8(b), assesses whether procurement is recognized as a profession in the country's public service. This would, among others, typically involve the definition of positions at different professional level with job descriptions specifying the required qualifications and competencies. The remuneration and career progression should reflect the particular professional status.

Even if a national scheme is not in place, the assessor should review the existence of job descriptions at the entity. These job descriptions should specify required qualifications including minimum experience and competencies for all professional and management positions in procurement and the functions to be performed.

The sub-indicator also looks at appointments and promotions, which should be competitive and require suitable qualifications and professional certification. Staff performance should be evaluated on a regular and consistent basis and staff development and training should be provided (refer to sub-indicator 8(a)).

ENTITY Sub-indicator 8(b): Assessment criteria

- (a) There are job descriptions for all professional and management positions in procurement and they specify the required qualifications and competencies and functions to be performed (if provided for at the national level).
- (b) Appointments and promotion are competitive and based on qualifications and professional certification.
- (c) Staff performance is evaluated on a regular and consistent basis.
- (d) A competitive compensation is offered that allows attracting and retaining qualified procurement staff.

Link: MAPS Module Professionalization

ELA-Sub-indicator 8(c) – Monitoring performance to improve the system

As elaborated in the MAPS core assessment methodology, sub-indicator 8(c), the evaluation of the effectiveness of individual procurements and of the system can be a major driver of performance improvements. Agencies are at the forefront of performance measurement and continuous improvement programmes.

This sub-indicator assesses whether the entity, including its top-management, places a high level of importance on improving the performance of its procurement system. It reviews whether the entity has



established and consistently applies a performance measurement system that focuses on both quantitative and qualitative aspects.

The information should be used to prepare strategic plans including results frameworks to improve the system. Goals should be realistic and achievable, and the measures should be sequenced and coordinated effectively with other related programmes. The implementation of strategic plans should be monitored and evaluated against specific performance indicators and targets.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 8(c): Assessment criteria

- (a) The entity has established and consistently applies a performance measurement system that focuses on both quantitative and qualitative aspects.
- (b) The entity uses the information to support strategic policy making on procurement.
- (c) Strategic plans including results frameworks are in place and used to improve the system.
- (d) Responsibilities are clearly defined.



Pillar III. Public Procurement Operations and Market Practices

The MAPS core methodology, Pillar III, assesses the operational efficiency, transparency, and effectiveness of the procurement system by selecting and reviewing a sample of actual procurement cases of several procuring entities. It also looks at the market as one means of judging the quality and effectiveness of the system when putting procurement procedures into practice. Pillar III of the MAPS core methodology comprises two indicators and a total of six sub-indicators.

This entity level module provides a more comprehensive approach to evaluating procurement related results at the level of the individual entity assessed. It also reviews whether the market in which the entity operates is fully functional. The application of indicators 9 and 10 relies on empirical research, including interviews with stakeholders or supplier surveys.

ELA-Indicator 9. Entity's procurement practices achieve stated objectives.

The objective of this indicator is to collect empirical evidence on how procurement principles, rules, and procedures formulated in the legal and policy framework are implemented in practice by the individual entity assessed. The indicator focuses on procurement-related results that in turn impact the achievement of institutional goals.

The application of indicator 9 requires the selection and the review of a sample of actual procurement transactions (files). Sampling methods and size should be carefully considered since they determine the representativeness and certainty of the assessment results.

In addition to reviewing files, this part of the assessment uses the information technology systems that are in operation at the entity, such as e-Procurement (refer to sub-indicator 7(c)). It is also linked to sub-indicator 8(c), which reviews whether performance related data is regularly analysed and used to improve procurement performance. Indicator 9 comprises five sub-indicators to be assessed individually (a, b1 – b3, and c).

ELA-Sub-indicator 9(a) – Planning, strategizing, and preparing the procurement process

Sub-indicator 9(a) assesses whether a thorough needs analysis has been conducted followed by a competition-mindful market research, in particular for higher value/risk procurement. Strategy documents should be produced to a suitable standard. They should consider potential risks and options to identify optimal procurement strategies, e.g., options to increase efficiency through enhanced competition or framework agreements or opportunities to increase sustainability.

The sub-indicator assesses whether requirements and/or desired outcomes of the individual procurement have been clearly described. It should also be evaluated whether desired economic, environmental, or social impacts have been defined in line with institutional goals or national policy objectives.



The assessor should also determine whether the entity adheres to the annual or multi-annual procurement plan as agreed upon during budget formulation to ensure the availability of funds (refer to sub-indicator 4(a)). Statements of confidentiality and conflict of interest declarations should be completed and recorded as required (refer to sub-indicator 14(a)).

ENTITY Sub-indicator 9(a): Assessment criteria

- (a) Needs analysis and market research guide a proactive identification of optimal procurement strategies.
- (b) For higher value/risk procurement, a detailed market analysis and a strategic plan are prepared to manage risks and identify opportunities to increase efficiency and sustainability. *
- (c) The requirements and desired outcomes of contracts are clearly defined.
- (d) Sustainability criteria, if any, are used in a balanced manner and in accordance with institutional goals/national priorities. *
- (e) The annual or multi-annual procurement plan as agreed upon during budget formulation is adhered to.
- (f) Statements of confidentiality and conflict of interest declarations are completed and recorded as required. *

* (b) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 9(a) Assessment criterion (b):

- Share of entity procurement influenced by procurement unit (in % of total procurement spend)
 - Penetration of procurement influence into the highest risk and highest value areas of entity spend: Share of high risk/high value contracts influenced by procurement unit (in % of total high risk/high value procurement).
 - Share of procurement cases in which differentiated procurement strategies were developed for high risk/high value procurement (in % of total high risk/high value procurement)
- Source: e-Procurement system

* (b) Recommended quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 9(a) Assessment criterion (b):
 Number of repetitive procurement processes to buy the same item (annually)
 Source: e-Procurement system

* (d) Recommended quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 9(a) Assessment criterion (d):
 Share of processes with sustainability criteria (in % of total number of procurement processes).
 Source: e-Procurement system

* (f) Recommended quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 9(a) Assessment criterion (f):
 Share of procurements with conflict-of-interest declaration completed as required (in % of total number of processes)
 Source: e-Procurement system

ELA-Sub-indicator 9(b) – Selection and contracting

Sub-Indicator 9(b) focuses on selection and contracting. To adequately capture the sub-indicator's complexity, it is further subdivided reflecting the following distinct stages of the procurement process:

- 1) Procurement method, documents, specifications, evaluation, and award criteria
- 2) Advertisement, submission and opening of tenders
- 3) Evaluation and contract award

The three sub-indicators 9(b1), 9(b2), and 9(b3) are assessed individually.



ELA-Sub-indicator 9(b1) – Procurement method, documents, specifications, evaluation, and award criteria

This sub-indicator focuses on the objective of achieving value for money through appropriate selection of procurement methods and approaches, clear and complete procurement documents, competition, transparency, and fairness in selecting suppliers.

The sub-indicator assesses whether procurement methods are chosen, documented, and justified in accordance with the purpose and in compliance with the legal framework. The entity should not limit competition more than permitted by the regulatory framework.

It is assessed whether participation is fair and based on qualification and in accordance with rules on eligibility and exclusions. Multi-stage procedures, for example pre-qualification or competitive dialogue, can be used in complex procurements as prescribed in the legal framework. If bidders are required to register as a condition of eligibility this should not constitute a barrier to participation.

The assessor should review whether model procurement documents exist at the entity for the procurement of goods, works, services including consulting services (including standard contract conditions) and whether the appropriate model documents are used⁹. Procurement documents should be clear, proportionate to the need, and contain the information needed for suppliers to respond as defined in the legal framework. Procedures for bid submission, receipt and opening should be clearly described in the procurement documents allowing bidders or their representative to attend bid openings, and civil society to monitor, as prescribed in the legal framework.

The indicator assesses whether the requirements and desired outcomes of contracts are clearly defined either in tight product/service specifications or through an output/outcome-based definition of requirements (functional specifications) and whether neutral specifications are used.

The assessor should also review whether evaluation and award criteria are objective, relevant and precisely specified in the procurement documents. When non-price attributes and/or life-cycle costs are used as award criteria, appropriate techniques should be chosen and clearly described in the procurement document to determine best value for money.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 9(b1): Assessment criteria

- (a) Procurement methods are chosen, documented, and justified in accordance with the purpose and in compliance with the legal framework.
- (b) The entity does not limit competition more than permitted in the legal framework.
- (c) Multi-stage procedures are used in complex procurements to ensure only qualified and eligible participants are included in the competitive process.
- (d) Standard procurement documents exist and are appropriately used by the entity.
- (e) The procurement documents are clear, proportionate to the need, and contain the information needed for suppliers to respond as defined in the legal framework.
- (f) Requirements and desired outcomes of contracts are clearly defined, and specifications are neutral.
- (g) Evaluation and award criteria are objective, relevant and precisely specified in the procurement documents.
- (h) When non-price attributes and/or life-cycle costs are included as award criteria, appropriate techniques are chosen and clearly described in the procurement documents to determine best value for money.

⁹ Or standard industry documents such as FIDIC (International Federation of Consulting Engineers) if no model procurement documents exist at the national or entity level.



ELA-Sub-indicator 9(b2) – Advertisement, submission and opening of tenders

The sub-indicator assesses whether the chosen procurement procedures, bid submission, receipt and opening result in an appropriate level of competition.

The assessor should review whether the entity's procurement opportunities are advertised in accordance with the legal and regulatory framework, whether procurement documents are readily available to interested bidders at a price that reflects the cost of preparing/distributing the document (if there is a charge), and whether bidders are given sufficient time to obtain documents, respond to the advertisement/request for bid/proposal, or revise their bids/proposals following amendments to the procurement documents and the issuance of clarifications to bidders.

The sub-indicator assesses whether clarifications, minutes of pre-bid conferences, if any, and amendments to the procurement documents are promptly and completely communicated to all potential bidders who obtained the procurement documents, in a written form as detailed in the procurement document. The entity should maintain complete and accurate records of all communications with potential bidders (before and after the deadline for submission).

The assessor should determine whether bids received prior to the deadline are securely stored. The storage facility should be safe and there should be a protocol establishing who and how can access the bids.

The sub-indicator also assesses whether bids are opened in a defined and regulated proceeding immediately following the closing date for bid submission or as defined in the procurement document. Bid-opening records should be retained and, in case of a public opening, distributed to the bidders.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 9(b2): Assessment criteria

- (a) Procurement opportunities are advertised in accordance with the legal framework. *
- (b) Procurement documents are readily available to interested suppliers at a price that reflects the cost of preparing/distributing the document (if there is a charge),
- (c) Bidders are given sufficient time to submit their bids/proposals or revise them following amendments to the procurement documents and the issuance of clarifications to bidders.
- (d) Requests for clarification are answered promptly and completely in written form as detailed in the procurement documents. *
- (e) Minutes of a pre-bid conference, if any, clarifications, and amendments to the documents are promptly communicated to all suppliers who obtained the procurement documents and accurately recorded.
- (f) The bids received are securely stored.
- (g) The bids are opened in a defined and regulated proceeding immediately following the closing date for bid submission or as defined in the procurement document. *
- (h) Bid-opening records are retained and, in case of a public opening, distributed to the bidders.
- (i) Bidders or their representatives are allowed to attend bid openings, and civil society to monitor bid submission, receipt and opening, as prescribed by the legal and regulatory framework.

*(a) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 9(b2) Assessment criterion (a):

- Share of procurement opportunities published by number (in % of total number of contracts)
- Share of procurement opportunities published by value (in % of total value of contracts)
- Average number of responses per procurement process

Source: e-Procurement system

*(d) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 9(b2) Assessment criterion (d):

- Average number of days to respond to written requests for clarification
- Share of tenders with request for clarification (in % of total number of tenders)



Source: e-Procurement system

*(g) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 9(b2) Assessment criterion (g):

Degree of competition:

- Average number of bids received
- Average number of bids received (International competition)
- Average number of bids received (National competition)

Source: e-Procurement system

ELA-Sub-indicator 9(b3) – Evaluation and contract award

This sub-indicator assesses whether appropriate and fair techniques have been applied in the bid evaluation and award stage to determine best value for money and whether the procurement process has been carried out effectively, efficiently and in a transparent way.

The assessor should review whether evaluations are conducted by qualified staff/committees and whether they are properly documented. The evaluation report should contain all essential information (i.e. clear and complete description of the evaluation process including reasons for rejecting any bids as non-responsive, how the award criteria were applied, and how the successful bidder's qualifications were verified). The evaluation report should conclude with a clear recommendation regarding the award of the contract. The report should be duly signed by all members of the evaluation committee and be approved by the appropriate approval authority.

The sub-indicator assesses whether the contract is awarded to the bidder whose bid/proposal has been determined to offer the lowest evaluated price/cost (if price/cost is the sole criterion) or whose bid/proposal has been determined to offer best value for money based on the award criteria and evaluation techniques defined in the procurement document¹⁰. Throughout the bid evaluation and award process confidentiality needs to be ensured. All members of the evaluation committee should have signed a statement of confidentiality and impartiality.

The assessor should determine whether the entity has timelines for evaluation and contract awards and whether contracts are awarded within these set timelines and within the bid/proposal validity period with substantially the same scope as defined in the procurement documents.

Successful and unsuccessful bidders should be informed about the award decision as required by the regulatory framework (in accordance with a standstill period, if applicable). Unsuccessful bidders should be granted debriefing as defined in the regulatory framework.

The sub-indicator also assesses whether the contract is issued in accordance with the procurement proceedings and whether it is duly signed (executed). Quality control procedures and dispute resolution procedures should be clearly defined in the contract conditions.

The entire selection and award process including the publication of contract awards should be carried out effectively, efficiently and in a fair and transparent way in compliance with the procurement documents and the legal framework.

¹⁰ Some legal frameworks use the term "most economically advantageous tender" (MEAT).



ENTITY Sub-indicator 9(b3): Assessment criteria

- (a) The evaluation is conducted by qualified staff and properly documented; the evaluation report contains all essential information and a clear recommendation for contract award.
- (b) The evaluation report is signed by all members of the evaluation committee and approved by the appropriate approval authority.
- (c) The contract is awarded to the bidder whose bid/proposal has been determined to offer the lowest evaluated price/cost (if price/cost is the sole criterion) or whose bid/proposal offers best value for money based on the award criteria and evaluation techniques defined in the procurement document. *
- (d) Tenders are awarded within the bid/proposal validity period.
- (e) Successful and unsuccessful bidders are informed as required by the legal framework.
- (f) The contract is issued according to the procurement proceedings and executed by the appropriate approval authority.
- (g) Throughout the bid evaluation and award process confidentiality is ensured; members of the evaluation committee have signed a declaration of confidentiality and impartiality.
- (h) Contract awards are published as prescribed.
- (i) The entire selection and award process is carried out effectively, efficiently and in a transparent way in accordance with the legal framework. *

* (c) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 9(b3) Assessment criterion (c):

- Share of contracts awarded without competition¹¹ (in % of total number of contracts)
- Share of contracts awarded without competition¹² (in % of total value of contracts)
- Average number of responsive bids received (for each procurement method)
- Share of processes with only one responsive bidder (in % of all tenders)

Source: e-Procurement system

* (i) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 9(b3) Assessment criterion (i):

- Share of procurement processes that are successfully awarded (in % of total number of tenders)
- Share of procurement processes that failed (in % of total number of tenders)
- Share of procurement processes that have been awarded within defined timeframes (in % of total number)
- Share of contracts awarded through a competitive procedure publicly advertised for the required number of days as per policy (in % of total number of contracts)
- Share of contracts awarded through a competitive procedure publicly advertised for the required number of days as per policy (in % of total value of contracts)
- Share of contracts based on framework agreements
- Average time to procure goods, works, and services including consulting services:
 - Average number of days between bid/proposal opening and completion of evaluation
 - Average number of days between bid/proposal opening and contract signing date
 - Average number of days between submission of evaluation report and contract signing date
 - Average number of days between advertisement/solicitation and contract signature (for each procurement method used)

Source: e-Procurement system

ELA-Sub-indicator 9(c) – Contract management

This sub-indicator assesses the extent to which goods, works and services including consulting services procured are delivered according to the contract agreement in terms of time, quality, cost, and other conditions stated in the contract to support the efficient and effective delivery of public services. The sub-indicator assesses cost and time overruns including for payments to be made to suppliers.

¹¹ Single-source procurement as share of total number of contracts (excluding items below the value stated in the legal framework)

¹² Single-source procurement as share of total value of contracts (excluding items below the value stated in the legal framework)



The sub-indicator establishes whether the functions necessary to ensure complete and timely implementation of the contract are carried out in accordance with international standards, the entity's internal procedures (refer to sub-indicator 6(b)) and in line with the legal framework and the contract itself. If dispute resolution is delegated to a third party, the third party's independence and impartiality should be assessed.

Contract management plans should be in place for major contracts. All actions of contractual importance should be accurately documented during implementation and records should be easily accessible in a single file.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 9(c): Assessment criteria

- (a) Contract performance is monitored.
- (b) Contracts are implemented in a timely manner. *
- (c) Contracts are implemented within the originally approved contract price. *
- (d) Inspection, quality control, supervision of works and final acceptance of products is carried out in accordance with the contract.
- (e) Invoices are examined and payments are processed as stipulated in the contract. *
- (f) Contract amendments are reviewed, issued and published in a timely manner. *
- (g) Disputes are handled in accordance with the contract conditions. *
- (h) Opportunities for direct involvement of relevant external stakeholders in public procurement are utilised when appropriate according to local law and in accordance with legal provisions protecting sensitive information.*
- (i) The records are complete and accurate and easily accessible in a single file¹³. *
- (j) The entity protects all records as defined in the legal framework.
- (k) The entity published implementation data as required by the legal framework.

*** (b) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 9(c) Assessment criterion (b):**

- Share of contracts not delivered on time (schedule overruns); (in % of total number of contracts)
 - Average delay in number of days (all contracts with schedule overruns)
- Source: e-Procurement system

*** (c) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 9(c) Assessment criterion (c):**

- Share of contracts with prices above original budget estimate (in % of total number of contracts)
 - Share of contracts by number with prices above original contract price (in % of total number of contracts)
 - Share of contracts by value with prices above original contract price (in % of total value of contracts)
- Source: e-Procurement system

*** (e) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 9(c) Assessment criterion (e):**

- Average number of days to pay an invoice received
 - Share of invoices outstanding 90 days or more
 - Share of invoices in dispute by number (in % compared to total number of invoices paid)
 - Share of invoices in dispute by value (in % compared to total value of invoices paid)
 - Share of invoices outstanding 90 days or more in dispute (in % compared to total number of invoices outstanding 90 days or more)
- Source: e-Procurement system or PFM system

*** (g) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 9(c) Assessment criterion (g):**

- Share of contracts in dispute (in % of total number of contracts)
- Share of disputes that go to arbitration (in % of total number of dispute resolution cases)
- Share of arbitration cases fully enforced (in % of total number of arbitration cases)

¹³ Procurement records should include as a minimum all documents listed in indicator 1(k) of the MAPS core methodology



- Share of disputes resulting in sanctions/penalties against the contractor (in % of total number of arbitration cases)
Source: e-Procurement system

***(i) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 9(c) Assessment criterion (i):**
- Share of contracts with complete and accurate records and databases (in % of total number of contracts reviewed)¹⁴
Source: Sample of procurement cases

***(f) Recommended quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 9(c) assessment criterion (f):**
- Share of contract amendments (in % of total number of contracts)
- Average increase of contract value (in % of original contract value)
Source: e-Procurement

***(h) Recommended quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 9(c) assessment criterion (h):**
Share of contracts with direct involvement of civil society.¹⁵
Source: e-Procurement or sample of procurement cases

ELA-Indicator 10. The entity's procurement market is fully functional.

The objective of this indicator is primarily to assess the market response to procurement solicitations undertaken by the entity. While this response may be influenced by many factors related to the general economic climate and business environment, national policies to support the private sector, and the existence of strong financial institutions, the indicator focuses on issues and market segments that relate to the specific demand of the entity and its attractiveness as a good reliant client. There are three sub-indicators to be assessed (a-c).

ELA-Sub-indicator 10(a) – Dialogue and partnerships between public and private sector

This sub-indicator assesses whether the entity supports an open dialogue between the government and the private sector regarding national procurement objectives and programmes to improve the efficiency of public procurement practices. The assessor should review if the entity engages in forums for dialogue and in information or training programmes to enhance cooperation with private institutions, including approaches tailored to the needs of small businesses to facilitate their participation in the public procurement market or processes.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 10(a): Assessment criteria

- (a) The entity engages in an open dialogue with the private sector through established and formal mechanisms; the dialogue follows clear rules of ethics. *
- (b) The entity supports programmes to help build capacity among private companies, including for small businesses, and training to facilitate their participation in the public procurement market or processes.
- (c) These initiatives are well coordinated with national programmes to increase the functionality of the public procurement market.

***(a) Recommended quantitative indicator to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 10(b) Assessment criterion (a):**
Perception of openness and effectiveness of the entity in engaging with the private sector (in % of responses).
Source: Survey.

¹⁴ PEFA Indicator PI-24.1

¹⁵ Preferably split into the different process phases to cover the concept of open contracting more specifically.



ELA-Sub-indicator 10(b) – Private sector’s organisation and access to the market

The indicator assesses whether private sector capacity and participation leads to a sufficient level of competition in entity procurement. The entity should help create adequate conditions to facilitate access to the market. For example, procurement methods and procedures should be chosen that are proportionate to the risk and value of the procurement in question and payments should be processed in a timely manner as stated in the contract to help ease the cost of doing business with the entity (refer to indicator 9). When e-Procurement is used, the system should be user-friendly, with special emphasis to facilitating participation by small companies.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 10(b): Assessment criteria

- (a) The private sector is competitive, willing, and able to participate in the procurement market, as relevant to the entity. *
- (b) The entity’s procurement practices help improve the private sector’s access to the government marketplace.

* (a) Recommended quantitative indicator to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 10(b) Assessment criterion (a):

- Share of registered suppliers that are participants and awarded contracts (in % of total number of registered suppliers)
- Total number and value of contracts awarded to domestic/foreign firms (and in % of total)
- Share of contracts awarded to the top 10 and top 20 suppliers (individually in % of total value of contracts)

Source: e-Procurement system/Supplier Database.

ELA-Sub-indicator 10(c) – Key sectors and sector strategies

Based on the entity’s priority spend areas, key sectors associated with the procurement of goods, works, and services including consulting services should be identified. This information can be used to conduct targeted assessments of relevant sector markets and to secure collaboration with sector market participants in a specific and meaningful way, e.g., to foster integrity, sustainability and/or innovation in procurement.

The indicator also assesses whether the entity has a risk management system in place that covers procurement related risks. Risk management procedures should cover risk identification, assessment, mitigation, allocation (detailing responsibility for managing a risk), and monitoring and control.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 10(c): Assessment criteria

- (a) Key sectors associated with the entity’s procurement market are identified.
- (b) Risks associated with certain sectors and opportunities to influence sector markets are assessed and sector market participants are engaged in support of entity’s procurement policy objectives.

Link: MAPS Module Sector Level Assessment



Pillar IV. Accountability, Integrity and Transparency of the Public Procurement System

The MAPS core methodology, Pillar IV, assesses the integrity of the public procurement system. It reviews the appropriateness of controls and anti-corruption measures, and it covers means to enhance transparency, e.g., procurement appeals mechanisms and increased engagement of stakeholders. Pillar IV comprises four indicators and a total of seventeen sub-indicators.

This entity level assessment reviews (1) the extent to which the entity implements the measures defined in the legal framework and (2) whether instruments, tools or policies exist at the entity level that go beyond the arrangements provided at the national level to ensure accountability, integrity, and transparency in entity procurement.¹⁶

ELA-Indicator 11. Transparency and civil society engagement foster integrity in entity procurement.

Civil society, in acting as a safeguard against inefficient and ineffective use of public resources, can contribute to making procurement more competitive and fairer, improving contract performance, and securing results. This indicator assesses whether the entity supports an enabling environment for civil society to better understand and effectively engage in public procurement at the entity level. There are two sub-indicators to be assessed (a-b).

ELA-Sub-indicator 11(a) – Enabling environment

This indicator assesses whether the entity supports broader government programmes or implements own programmes in accordance with the legal framework to consult relevant stakeholders and to build their capacities to understand, monitor, and improve public procurement in general and more specifically regarding entity procurement. Input, comments, and feedback received from civil society on matters related to entity procurement should be considered.

The indicator also reviews the degree and timeliness of information provided by the entity in each phase of the procurement process related to specific procurements, in accordance with legal provisions protecting sensitive information to promote competition and transparency (refer to sub-indicator 7(a)).

ENTITY Sub-indicator 11(a): Assessment criteria

- (a) A transparent and consultative process is followed when formulating changes to the entity procurement system.
- (b) Programmes are in place to build the capacities of relevant stakeholders to understand, monitor, and improve entity procurement.

¹⁶ Should the national legal framework not apply to entity procurement, a detailed review of the entity's procurement rules must be carried out using all indicators of Pillar IV of the MAPS core assessment methodology.



- (c) There is ample evidence that the entity considers the input, comments, and feedback received from civil society.
- (d) The entity provides adequate and timely access to information as a precondition for effective participation.

ELA-Sub-indicator 11(b) – Direct engagement of civil society

This indicator assesses the extent to which the entity implements the legal and regulatory provisions for direct engagement of civil society in individual procurements. Direct engagement could focus on the planning process, for example requiring public consultation prior to large-scale or environmentally or socially sensitive procurements. In some countries citizens are, under clearly specified conditions and subject to signing a statement of confidentiality, permitted, or encouraged to act as observers in certain stages of the procurement proceedings. Citizens could also be permitted to get officially involved in the monitoring of performance and contract completion.

The assessor should assess evidence for direct participation of citizens in procurement processes at the entity.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 11(b): Assessment criteria

- (a) The entity implements the legal and policy framework aimed at enabling citizen participation in procurement.
- (b) There is ample evidence for direct participation of citizens in entity procurement processes through consultation, observation, and monitoring during the following phases of a procurement process, as appropriate*:
 - Planning phase (consultation)
 - Bid/proposal opening (observation)
 - Contract management and completion (monitoring)
 - Other stages of the procurement proceedings, when appropriate according to local law and in accordance with legal provisions protecting sensitive information.

*(b) Recommended quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 11(b) Assessment criterion (b): Share of contracts with direct involvement of civil society (Refer to sub-indicator 9(c), assessment criterion (h))¹⁷
Source: e-Procurement or sample of procurement cases

ELA-Indicator 12. The entity has effective control and audit systems.

The objective of this indicator is to determine whether internal and external control and audit mechanisms and functions as defined in the legal framework are in place at the entity. It is assessed whether the entity supports and acts on the findings and recommendations of audit reports in a timely manner. This indicator consists of two sub-indicators (a-b).

ELA-Sub-indicator 12(a) – Organisation and coordination of controls and audits

This sub-indicator focuses on the organisation and coordination of internal controls and internal and external audit mechanisms.

As for internal control and internal audits, the indicator assesses whether mechanisms and functions are in place at the entity as defined in the legal framework. Written procedures should be complied with and

¹⁷ Preferably split into the different process phases to cover the concept of open contracting more specifically.



regular reporting to management should take place. Auditors should be sufficiently skilled/trained on procurement related matters to conduct high quality procurement audits including performance audits.

The assessor should review whether procurement operations are subject to regular external audits (e.g. carried out by an independent body such as the country's supreme audit institution). Audits should be carried out at least annually and be of appropriate scope and quality. It should be determined whether audits confirm that complete and accurate records are kept as defined in the legal framework.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 12(a): Assessment criteria

- (a) Internal control and internal audit mechanisms are in place at the entity as defined in the legal framework.
- (b) Internal oversight of entity procurement is carried effectively and reports on compliance, effectiveness and efficiency of procurement operations are regularly produced and submitted to management.
- (c) Independent external audits are carried out regularly; there is evidence of audit reports, and they are of appropriate scope and quality with regard to entity procurement.
- (d) Audit reports confirm that generally complete and accurate records are kept as defined in the legal framework.

ELA-Sub-indicator 12(b) – Enforcement and follow-up on findings and recommendations

Indicator 12(b) assesses whether the entity supports and acts on the findings and recommendations of audit reports related to procurement within a timely manner and whether there is evidence for the implementation of audit recommendations.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 12(b): Assessment criteria

- (a) Audit recommendations are responded to and implemented within the timeframes established in the law. *
- (b) There is a system in place to follow up on the implementation of audit recommendations.

***(a) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 12(b) Assessment criterion (a):**
Share of internal and external audit recommendations implemented within the timeframes established in the law (in %). Source: Ministry of Finance/Supreme Audit Institution.

ELA-Indicator 13. Procurement appeals mechanisms are effective and efficient

This indicator assesses whether participants in procurement proceedings have the right to challenge and appeal decisions or actions taken by the entity. It analyses the efficiency of this process, its outcomes and redress mechanisms at the entity. There is one sub-indicator to be assessed (a).

ELA-Sub-indicator 13(a) – Challenges and appeals

This sub-indicator is closely linked to indicators 1(h) and 13 of the MAPS core assessment methodology. Indicator 1(h) assesses the legal framework, in particular the right to challenge decisions or actions and to appeal; the matters that are subject to review; and the different stages in the review process including timeframes. Indicator 13 focuses on the process for challenges and appeals, the independence and capacity of the appeals body, and the decisions taken by the appeals body.



If not at the national level, there should be a policy that provides participants in entity procurement proceedings with the opportunity to challenge decisions or actions taken by the entity. The policy should define roles and responsibilities, timeframes for submission and response to complaints, and appeals mechanisms.

In many countries, the first review is carried out by the procuring entity. The indicator assesses whether the entity, if in charge of reviewing complaints, takes appropriate actions within the defined timeframes and in accordance with the legal/policy framework. For example, the entity must decide if the application shall be entertained or dismissed and if procurement proceedings shall be suspended. The applicant and other participants in the procurement proceedings must be notified. Decisions must be taken and issued.

The legal framework usually provides for the right to appeal a decision following a first review to an independent body (appeals body) within specified timeframes. The assessor should determine whether the entity generally implements decisions taken by the independent appeals body in a timely manner. The entity should track submitted challenges (first tier), appeals (second tier; by independent body), and decisions and there should be a complaint redress mechanism in place to ensure continuous learning.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 13(a): Assessment criteria

- (a) Participants in procurement proceedings have the right to challenge and appeal decisions taken by the entity. *
- (b) Entity decisions are rendered on the basis of available evidence submitted by the parties in accordance with the legal framework and within the defined timeframes. *
- (c) The entity tracks challenges, appeals and decisions. *
- (d) The entity implements decisions taken by the independent appeals body in a timely manner. *
- (e) The entity has a complaint redress mechanism in place.

***(a) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 13(a) Assessment criterion (a):**
 - Share of complaints (in % of total number of contracts)

***(b) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 13(a) Assessment criterion (b):**
 - Outcome of complaints:
 Dismissed; Rejected; Resulting in modification of procurement documents, evaluation reports, or award decisions; Resulting in suspension of procurement proceedings (in % of total number of complaints)
 - Share of complaints resolved within the defined timeframes (in % of total number of complaints)

***(c) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 13(a) Assessment criterion (c):**
 - Share of appeals (in % of total number of contracts)
 - Share of appeal decisions where the decision issued at first review was confirmed/ was overturned (in % of total number of appeal decisions)
 - Remedies: Categories as defined in the legal framework (in % of all decisions issued by appeals body)

***(d) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 13(a) Assessment criterion (d):**
 - Number of decisions enforced within defined timeframes (in % of decisions issued by appeals body)

Source for all: e-Procurement or entity tracking system



ELA-Indicator 14. The entity has ethics and anticorruption measures in place.

This indicator reviews the nature and scope of anticorruption measures at the entity. It focuses on policies and practices to manage conflict of interest situations, prevent prohibited practices, impose sanctions, and establish a comprehensive anti-corruption framework at the entity. There are four sub-indicators to be assessed (a-d).

The assessment of this indicator is based on the assessment of indicator 14 of the MAPS core methodology.

ELA-Sub-indicator 14(a) – Legal framework and conflict of interest policy

This indicator assesses whether the legal provisions that define fraudulent, corrupt, and other prohibited practices (“prohibited practices”) and set out the responsibilities and sanctions of government employees, individuals or firms indulging in such practices apply to the entity. It determines whether legal provisions include mechanisms to identify and declare conflict of interest situations, to mitigate risks and make this information easily accessible to decision makers or if the entity has its own conflict of interest policy.

Entity staff should not be involved in procurement in which businesses are part in which the staff member or their family has a financial interest or may directly benefit from such procurement. Such situations should be disclosed, i.e. conflict of interest declaration should be completed and recorded prior to each procurement.

A policy should be in place that covers the acceptance of items of value and states that staff members are prohibited from accepting items of value, e.g., gifts, entertainment, meals, or travel from potential or current suppliers.

If the national framework applies, refer to the MAPS core assessment and only highlight in the report the differences or specific considerations for the entity assessed.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 14(a): Assessment criteria	
(a)	The legal/regulatory framework that defines prohibited practices and which sets out sanctions applies to the entity.
(b)	The entity has policies and mechanisms in place to identify, declare, and manage conflict of interest situations effectively. *
(c)	Conflicts of interest declarations are completed and recorded prior to each procurement, according to the law.*
(d)	Entity staff members are not permitted to accept items or hospitality of value.
*(c) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 14(a) Assessment criterion (c): Refer to assessment criterion 9(c): Conflicts of interest declarations are completed and recorded. Source: Sample of procurement cases.	
*(b) Recommended quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 11(b) Assessment criterion (b): Perception that the entity enforces the conflict-of-interest policy in practice. Source: Survey	



ELA-Sub-indicator 14(b) – Provisions on prohibited practices in procurement documents

This sub-indicator reviews whether the entity's procurement and contract documents include provisions on prohibited practices as specified in the legal/regulatory framework.

The entity should require bidders to issue a self-declaration assuring that the bidder has not engaged in any prohibited practices and has not been prosecuted or convicted of fraud, corruption, or other prohibited practices.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 14(b): Assessment criteria

- (a) The entity's procurement and contract documents include provisions on fraud, corruption and other prohibited practices as specified in the legal framework.
- (b) Bidders are required to issue a self-declaration assuring that the bidder has not engaged in any prohibited practices and has not been prosecuted or convicted of fraud, corruption, or other prohibited practices.

ELA-Sub-indicator 14(c) – Effective sanctions and enforcement systems

This indicator assesses whether there is evidence that any discovered prohibited practices at the level of the entity have been dealt with appropriately under the applicable national system. This should include the reporting of credible allegations of fraud, corruption and other prohibited practices and follow-up actions according to laws on prohibited practices by application of stated penalties (prosecution, conviction, prohibition from participation in future procurements).

The entity should have a system in place for suspension/debarment that ensures due process. The assessor should verify that the entity consistently applies this system in accordance with the legal framework.

The indicator assesses whether the entity tracks cases of fraud, corruption and other prohibited practices including sanctions and if actions are taken to address underlying problems and causes to prevent corruption at the entity.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 14(c): Assessment criteria

- (a) There is a system that requires the reporting of credible allegations of fraud, corruption and other prohibited practices and follow-up actions including convictions related to entity procurement and there is evidence that this system is systematically applied. *
- (b) There is a system for suspension/debarment that ensures due process and is consistently applied by the entity.
- (c) The entity takes action to address underlying problems and causes to prevent prohibited practices.

* (a) Recommended quantitative indicator to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 14(c) Assessment criterion (a):

- Firms/individuals found guilty of fraud, corruption, and other prohibited practices in procurement:
Number of firms/individuals prosecuted/convicted; prohibited from participation in future procurements (suspended/debarred).

Source: e-Procurement or entity tracking system.

- Entity staff found guilty of fraud, corruption, and other prohibited practices in public procurement:
Number of entity staff prosecuted/convicted.

Source: Normative/regulatory function/Anti-Corruption Body.



ELA-Sub-indicator 14(d) – Anti-corruption framework

This sub-indicator looks to verify that the entity supports the country’s anticorruption framework and has measures in place to prevent and detect fraud, corruption, and other prohibited practices. As part of the anticorruption framework, a mechanism is in place and utilised for systematically identifying corruption risks (e.g. around red flags) and for mitigating risks identified in the procurement cycle.

It assesses whether the entity offers integrity training programmes to its staff and whether the procurement workforce regularly participates in this training.

The indicator reviews whether suppliers actively support integrity and ethical behaviour in public procurement, e.g., through internal compliance measures, and if external independent organisations such as civil society organisations, anti-corruption entity, or media exercise social audit and control, in accordance with the law.

A code of conduct or ethics for entity staff should be of obligatory compliance with provisions for those involved in public financial management, including procurement, and consequences should be administrative and/or criminal.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 14(d): Assessment criteria

- (a) The entity has a comprehensive anticorruption framework and measures in place, including systematic risk assessments, to prevent and detect fraud, corruption, and other prohibited practices. *
- (b) The entity offers special integrity training programmes, and its procurement workforce regularly participates in this training.
- (c) Suppliers and business associations actively support integrity and ethical behaviour in entity procurement, e.g., through internal compliance measures. *
- (d) There is evidence that civil society contributes to shape and improve integrity of entity procurement.
- (e) There is a code of conduct for entity staff with provisions for those involved in public financial management, including procurement.
- (f) Conflict of interest statements, financial disclosure forms, and information on beneficial ownership are systematically filed, accessible, and utilised by decision makers to prevent corruptions risks throughout the public procurement cycle. *

*(a) Quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 14(d) Assessment criterion (a):

- Number of fraud and corruption cases detected (in % of total number of contracts)
- Value of fraud and corruption cases detected (in % of total value of contracts)
- Number of fraud and corruption cases prevented, i.e. identified before award (in % of total number of contracts)
- Value of fraud and corruption cases prevented, i.e. identified before award (in % of total value of contracts)

Source: Entity tracking system

*(c) Recommended quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 14(d) Assessment criterion (c):

Number of suppliers that have internal compliance measures in place (in %).

Source: Supplier database.

*(f) Recommended quantitative indicators to substantiate assessment of sub-indicator 14(d) Assessment criterion (f):

Number of entity staff that have filed financial disclosure forms (in % of total number of staff required by law to file).

Source: Normative/regulatory function.



ENTITY Sub-indicator 14(e) – Secure mechanism for reporting prohibited practices or unethical behaviour

This sub-indicator assesses the following: 1) whether the entity provides through its legislation and institutional set-up, a system for reporting fraudulent, corrupt, or other prohibited practices or unethical behaviour; and 2) whether such legislation and systems provide for confidentiality and the protection of whistle-blowers. The system should be seen to react to reports as verified by subsequent actions taken to address the issues reported. In case a reporting intake system is established, and data is generated indicating the number of investigations conducted and actions taken, this information should be considered.

ENTITY Sub-indicator 14(e): Assessment criteria

- (a) There are secure, accessible, and confidential channels provided for reporting cases of fraud, corruption or other prohibited practices or unethical behaviour.
- (b) There are legal provisions to protect whistle-blowers, and these are considered effective.
- (c) There is a system in place and functioning for follow-up on disclosures.



ANNEXES

Annex 1 – MAPS Entity Level Indicator System

Pillar I – Legal, Regulatory, and Policy Framework	
1	National procurement laws apply to the entity.
	1(a) – Application of national framework
2	National procurement regulations and tools apply to the entity.
	2(a) – Application of national regulatory framework
3	Horizontal policy objectives and international obligations apply to the entity.
	3(a) – Application of national policy objectives and international obligations
Pillar II – Institutional Framework and Management Capacity	
4	Entity procurement is well integrated into the entity financial management system.
	4(a) – Procurement planning and the budget cycle
	4(b) – Financial procedures and the procurement cycle
5	[The country has an institution in charge of the normative/regulatory function.] N.A.
6	The entity has a clear mandate and organisation to conduct procurement.
	6(a) – Mandate and management structure to undertake procurement
	6(b) – Procurement cycle management
7	Entity procurement is embedded in an effective information system.
	7(a) – Publication of procurement information supported by information technology
	7(b) – Use of e-Procurement
	7(c) – Strategies to manage procurement data
8	The entity's procurement system has a strong capacity to develop and improve.
	8(a) – Procurement training
	8(b) – Professional procurement staff
	8(c) – Monitoring performance to improve the system
Pillar III – Procurement Operations and Market Practices	
9	Entity's procurement practices achieve stated objectives.
	9(a) – Planning, strategizing, and preparing the procurement process
	9(b) – Selection and contracting
	9(b1) – Procurement method, documents, specifications, evaluation and award criteria
	9(b2) – Advertisement, submission and opening of tenders
	9(b3) – Evaluation and contract award
	9(c) – Contract management
10	The entity's procurement market is fully functional.
	10(a) – Dialogue and partnerships between public and private sector
	10(b) – Private sector's organisation and access to the public procurement market
	10(c) – Key sectors and sector strategies
Pillar IV – Accountability, Integrity and Transparency of the Public Procurement System	
11	Transparency and civil society engagement foster integrity in entity procurement.
	11(a) – Enabling environment
	11(b) – Direct engagement of civil society
12	The entity has effective control and audit systems.
	12(a) – Organisation and coordination of controls and audits
	12(b) – Enforcement and follow-up on findings and recommendations



13	Procurement appeals mechanisms are effective and efficient.
	13(a) – Challenges and appeals
14	The entity has ethics and anticorruption measures in place.
	14(a) – Legal framework and conflict of interest policy 14(b) – Provisions on prohibited practices in procurement documents 14(c) – Effective sanctions and enforcement systems 14(d) – Anti-corruption framework 14(e) – Secure mechanism for reporting prohibited practices or unethical behaviour

DRAFT



Annex 2 – MAPS Assessment Criteria expressed in Quantitative Terms

Indicator		Quantitative Indicators (Minimum) ¹⁸	Recommended Quantitative Indicators
4(b)	Financial procedures and the procurement cycle	4(b) Assessment criterion (b): Invoices paid on time (in % of total number of invoices paid). Source: PFM systems.	
7(a)	Publication of public procurement information supported by information technology	7(a) Assessment criterion (c): Entity Procurement Plans published (in % of total number of required procurement plans). Source: Centralised online portal.	7(a) Assessment criterion (e): Share of procurement information and data published in open data formats (in %). Source: Centralised online portal.
		7(a) Assessment criterion (c): Key procurement information published along the procurement cycle (in % of total number of contracts): Invitation to bid/Request for proposal; Contract awards (purpose, supplier, value; amendments/ variations); Details related to contract implementation (milestones, completion and payment); Annual procurement statistics. Source: Centralised online portal.	
		7(a) Assessment criterion (c): Appeals decisions related to entity posted within the timeframes specified in the law (in %). Source: Centralised online portal.	
7(b)	Use of e-Procurement	7(b) Assessment criterion (a): Uptake of e-Procurement: - Number of e-Procurement procedures in % of total number of procedures Source: e-Procurement system.	7(b) Assessment criterion (d): Bids submitted online (in %) Source: e-Procurement system.
		7(b) Assessment criterion(a): Uptake of e-Procurement: - Value of e-Procurement procedures in % of total value of procedures Source: e-Procurement system.	7(b) Assessment criterion (d): Bids submitted online by micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (in %). Source: e-Procurement system.
7(c)	Strategies to manage procurement data	7(c) Assessment criterion (d): - Total number of contracts - Total value of contracts - Procurement as share of entity's budget (in % of total budget) - Total value of contracts awarded through competitive methods in most recent fiscal year. Source: e-Procurement system.	

¹⁸ Whenever a quantitative indicator refers to “total number” or “total value” of contracts, a more granular analysis could be considered (e.g.: separate analysis of goods, works, services including consulting services).



8(a)	Procurement training	8(a) Assessment criterion (b): Budget spent on procurement training per procurement staff	
		8(a) Assessment criterion (b): Number of relevant procurement training days per staff	
		Source: HR department	
9(a)	Planning, strategizing, and preparing the procurement process	9(a) Assessment criterion (b): Share of entity procurement influenced by procurement unit (in % of total procurement spend)	9(a) Assessment criterion (b): Number of repetitive procurement processes to buy the same item
		9(a) Assessment criterion (b): Penetration of procurement influence into the highest risk and highest value areas of entity spend: Share of high risk/high value contracts influenced by procurement unit (in % of total high risk/high value procurement).	9(a) Assessment criterion (d): Share of processes with sustainability criteria (in % of total number of procurement processes).
		9(a) Assessment criterion (b): Share of procurement cases in which differentiated procurement strategies were developed for high risk/high value procurement (in % of total high risk/high value procurement)	9(a) Assessment criterion (f): Share of procurements with conflict-of-interest declaration completed as required (in % of total number of processes)
		Source: e-Procurement system	Source: e-Procurement system
9(b2)	Advertisement, submission and opening of tenders	9(b2) Assessment criterion (a): - Share of procurement opportunities published by number (in % of total number of contracts) - Share of procurement opportunities published by value (in % of total value of contracts) - Average number of responses per procurement process	
		9(b2) Assessment criterion (d): - Average number of days to respond to written requests for clarification - Share of tenders with request for clarification (in % of total number of tenders)	
		9(b2) Assessment criterion (g): Degree of competition: - Average number of bids received - Average number of bids received (International competition) - Average number of bids received (National competition)	
		Source: e-Procurement system	
9(b3)	Evaluation and contract award	9(b3) Assessment criterion (c): - Share of contracts awarded without competition (in % of total number of contracts) - Share of contracts awarded without competition (in % of total value of contracts)	
		9(b3) Assessment criterion (c): Average number of responsive bids received (for each procurement method)	
		9(b3) Assessment criterion (c):	



		Share of processes with only one responsive bidder (in % of all tenders)	
		9(b3) Assessment criterion (i): - Share of procurement processes that are successfully awarded (in% of total number of tenders) - Share of procurement processes that failed (in % of total number of tenders)	
		9(b3) Assessment criterion (i): Share of procurement processes that have been awarded within defined timeframes (in % of total number of processes)	
		9(b3) Assessment criterion (i): - Share of contracts awarded through a competitive procedure publicly advertised for the required number of days as per policy (in % of total number of contracts) - Share of contracts awarded through a competitive procedure publicly advertised for the required number of days as per policy (in % of total value of contracts) -Share of contracts based on framework agreements	
		9(b3) Assessment criterion (i): Average time to procure goods, works, and services including consulting services: - Average number of days between bid/proposal opening and completion of evaluation - Average number of days between bid/proposal opening and contract signing date - Average number of days between submission of evaluation report and contract signing date - Average number of days between advertisement/solicitation and contract signature (for each procurement method used)	
		Source: e-Procurement system	
9(c)	Contract management	9(c) Assessment criterion (b): - Share of contracts not delivered on time (schedule overruns); (in % of total number of contracts) - Average delay in number of days (all contracts with schedule overruns) Source: e-Procurement system	9(c) Assessment criterion (f): - Share of contract amendments (in % of total number of contracts) - Average increase of contract value (in % of original contract value) Source: e-Procurement
		9(c) Assessment criterion (c): - Share of contracts with prices above original budget estimate (in % of total number of contracts) - Share of contracts by number with prices above original contract price (in % of total number of contracts) - Share of contracts by value with prices	9(c) Assessment criterion (h): Share of contracts with direct involvement of civil society (preferably split into the different process phases to cover the concept of open contracting more specifically)



		<p>above original contract price (in % of total value of contracts)</p> <p>Source: e-Procurement system</p>	Source: e-Procurement or sample of procurement cases
9(c)	Contract management	<p>9(c) Assessment criterion (e):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Average number of days to pay an invoice received - Share of invoices outstanding 90 days or more - Share of invoices in dispute by number (in % compared to total number of invoices paid) - Share of invoices in dispute by value (in % compared to total value of invoices paid) - Share of invoices outstanding 90 days or more in dispute (in % compared to total number of invoices outstanding 90 days or more) <p>Source: e-Procurement system or PFM system</p>	
		<p>9(c) Assessment criterion (g):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Share of contracts in dispute (in % of total number of contracts) - Share of disputes that go to arbitration (in % of total number of dispute resolution cases) - Share of arbitration cases fully enforced (in % of total number of arbitration cases) - Share of disputes resulting in sanctions/penalties against the contractor (in % of total number of arbitration cases) <p>Source: e-Procurement system</p>	
		<p>9(c) Assessment criterion (i):</p> <p>Share of contracts with complete and accurate records and databases (in % of total number of contracts reviewed)</p> <p>Source: Sample of procurement cases</p>	
10(a)	Dialogue and partnerships between public and private sector		<p>10(a) Assessment criterion (a): Perception of openness and effectiveness in engaging with the public and private sector (in % of responses).</p> <p>Source: Survey.</p>
10(b)	Private sector's organisation		<p>10(b) Assessment criterion (a):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Share of registered suppliers that are participants and awarded contracts (in % of total number of registered suppliers) - Total number and value of contracts awarded to domestic/foreign firms (and in % of total)



			<p>- Share of contracts awarded to the top 10 and top 20 suppliers (individually in % of total value of contracts)</p> <p>Source: e-Procurement system/ Supplier Database.</p>
11(b)	Direct engagement of civil society		<p>11(b) Assessment criterion (b): Refer to sub-indicator 9(c), assessment criterion (h):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Share of contracts with direct involvement of civil society.¹⁹ <p>Source: e-Procurement or sample of procurement cases</p>
12(b)	Enforcement and follow-up on findings and recommendations	<p>12(b) Assessment criterion (a): Share of internal and external audit recommendations implemented within the timeframes established in the law (in %).</p> <p>Source: Ministry of Finance/Supreme Audit Institution.</p>	
13(a)	Challenges and appeals	<p>13(a) Assessment criterion (a): Share of complaints (in % of total number of contracts)</p>	
		<p>13(a) Assessment criterion (b): - Outcome of complaints: Dismissed; Rejected; Resulting in modification of procurement documents, evaluation reports, or award decisions; Resulting in suspension of procurement proceedings (in % of total number of complaints)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Share of complaints resolved within the defined timeframes (in % of total number of complaints) 	
		<p>13(a) Assessment criterion (c): - Share of appeals (in % of total number of contracts)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Share of appeal decisions where the decision issued at first review was confirmed/ was overturned (in % of total number of appeal decisions) - Remedies: Categories as defined in the legal framework (in % of all decisions issued by appeals body) 	
		<p>13(a) Assessment criterion (d): - Number of decisions enforced within defined timeframes (in % of decisions issued by appeals body)</p>	

¹⁹ Preferably split into the different process phases to cover the concept of open contracting more specifically.



		Source: e-Procurement or entity tracking system	
14(a)	Legal framework and conflict of interest policy	14(a) Assessment criterion (c): Refer to assessment criterion 9(c): Conflicts of interest declarations are completed and recorded. Source: Sample of procurement cases.	14(a) Assessment criterion (b): Perception that the entity enforces the conflict-of-interest policy in practice. Source: Survey.
14(c)	Effective sanctions and enforcement systems		14(c) Assessment criterion (a): - Firms/individuals found guilty of fraud and corruption in procurement: Number of firms/individuals prosecuted/ convicted; prohibited from participation in future procurements (suspended/debarred). Source: e-Procurement or entity tracking system. - Entity staff found guilty of fraud and corruption in public procurement: Number of entity staff prosecuted/convicted. Source: Normative/regulatory function/Anti-Corruption Body.
14(d)	Anti-corruption framework	14(d) Assessment criterion (a): - Number of fraud and corruption cases detected (in % of total number of contracts) - Value of fraud and corruption cases detected (in % of total value of contracts) - Number of fraud and corruption cases prevented, i.e. identified before award (in % of total number of contracts) - Value of fraud and corruption cases prevented, i.e. identified before award (in % of total value of contracts) Source: Entity tracking system	14(d) Assessment criterion (c): Number of suppliers that have internal compliance measures in place (in %). Source: Supplier database.
			14(d) Assessment criterion (f): Number of entity staff that have filed financial disclosure forms (in % of total number of staff required by law to file). Source: Normative/regulatory function.

