



MAPS assessment report structure

- Executive summary: main findings and recommendations
- Introduction: context, objectives, methodology, challenges
- Country context: general situation, public procurement
- Assessment findings, structured by pillars, indicators, sub-indicators and evaluation criteria: situation, gaps, recommendations
- Consolidated recommendations, by pillar
- Draft action plan
- Appendices, in separate volume



Room for improvement in many fields

MAPS Pillar	Criteria fully met	Criteria partly met	Criteria not met	Criteria not applicable	Total
Legal and Policy Framework	9	27	30	1	67
Institutional Framework	0	18	30	7	55
Procurement Operations	0	8	18	0	26
Accountability, Integrity and Transparency	2	18	42	0	62
Total	11	71	120	8	210
Percentage	5%	34%	57%	4%	100%



Legal & policy framework: main gaps and risks

- Legal framework incomplete, incoherent: source of confusion; risks of disregard; difficult to enforce proper approaches
- Narrow range of award procedures: difficult to optimize approaches, risk of ineffective and inefficient procurement
- Secondary legislation missing, incomplete or late; lack of officially endorsed standard documents and guidance materials: widely varying practices,
- Complaints review cumbersome, time consuming, unpredictable: no effective access to justice for tenderers and others



Legal & policy framework: recommendations

- Adopt a new, comprehensive public procurement law, applicable to all procuring entities and all public contracts, with only rare, specific and very clear exceptions, if any
- Widen the range of award procedures to make it easier to pick the one best suited to the value, nature and complexity of the contract and to the conditions on the supply market
- Arrange for speedy and competent handling of complaints by an independent review body



Institutional framework: key findings

- Gaps, overlaps in allocation of key public procurement functions (e.g. policy making, regulatory development, capacity building, oversight, complaints resolution); weak resources: not clear who's in charge of what; work done twice or not at all
- Internal organisation of procuring entities inefficient, lack of staff skills
- No use, no benefits of centralized procurement, framework agreement
- No e-procurement, not even national website for notices &c



Institutional framework: actions needed

- Define responsibilities for key functions like policy making, regulatory development, capacity building, oversight, and resolution of complaints, and assign them to competent public bodies at national level
- Reorganize & build capacity of procuring entities & their staff
- Develop the use of framework agreements and centralized purchasing
- Successively introduce electronic procurement, starting with a national website for notices and procurement documents



Procurement operations: shortcomings

- Many procurement officials have weak knowledge, skills & experience, limited access to training & advice
- Little choice of guidance materials, standard documents
- Cumbersome, time consuming procedures; lack of adequate administrative tools
- Weak skills, inadequate practices for drafting requirements (technical specifications; qualifications needed etc.) & setting selection & award criteria
- Limited means to distribute & access information
- Weak competition, weak supply market



Procurement operations: what to improve

- Raise the skills of procurement officials in planning and preparation as well as in contract management, and provide them with guidance materials and standard document
- Promote wider enterprise participation and greater competition, by setting fair and reasonable requirements and award criteria and applying them in a consistent and transparent manner, and making information easily accessible



Transparency & integrity: data inaccessible, monitoring & sanctions ineffective

- Procurement data scarce or missing, difficult to access: plans, tender notices, tender documentation, contract awards; complaints made & decisions taken; procurement outcomes
- Lack of opportunities for systematic policy consultations
- Unclear distribution of responsibilities; someone else can always be found to blame, if at all, if something goes wrong – few effective sanctions meted out
- Oversight & monitoring fragmented, incomplete; no internal audit; external audit not fully independent



Transparency & integrity: what to do?!

- Institute systematic policy consultations with the business community and civil society
- Simplify and clarify principles of integrity and accountability
- Eliminate gaps and overlaps in the roles of oversight bodies and raise the level of transparency of their work, with focus on the achievement of good public procurement outcomes and the prevention of bad practices
- Ensure that actual cases of fraud & corruption are identified, properly investigated and effectively sanctioned