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FOREWORD

1. The Working Group on Benchmarking, Monitoring and Evaluation has developed three distinct products that are described individually in Parts I, II and III of this document. The purpose of this introductory foreword is to provide an overview of these products as well as the vision that links them to each other and to the broader objective of strengthening public sector procurement systems.

2. The Products: Included in this document are complete descriptions of the three products that together form the outputs of the Working Group. Each product is briefly described below:

a) The Baseline Indicators Tool: This is a tool that broadly describes the key elements of a well functioning public procurement system. It has been developed in a highly consultative manner to bring in the perspective of donors, developing country governments and implementing agencies and organizations. The focus level of the tool is on the system. The process of using the tool involves making a comparative assessment of existing elements of a procurement system using the key baseline indicators (standards or benchmarks) that have been defined. It enables identification of comparative strengths and weaknesses in the design of national systems. It does not in itself measure performance, although it does enable one to make a qualitative judgment on the level of achievement or conformity of the system with a set of predetermined benchmarks. The value of such a tool is in identifying exactly where the existing system fails to achieve a baseline. It can help inform discussions on where to focus limited capacity and resources in developing an implementation strategy to strengthen the system in the country. Creating such a tool in the context of the Procurement Round Table initiative has improved its initial design by incorporating feedback from a wide range of participants, and helped attract broader acceptance of the final product.

b) A Methodology for Measuring and Monitoring of Procurement Performance: In the context of the Working Group, the task of development of key performance measurement indicators was delegated to a group consisting of an international implementing agency, the International Trade Centre, and three partner developing countries (Morocco, Madagascar and Uganda) selected to represent a range of development levels in both Anglophone and Francophone countries. This group proposed a set of performance measurement indicators for which the countries agreed data existed in their particular systems. Such data is generated by the process of procurement implementation generally at the transaction level of contracts. In most countries, this data is generated by multiple implementing organizations and it is rarely collected and analyzed at a central level. The methodology presented by the Working Group is considered to contribute to the oversight and management needs within the country as well as to the information needs that donors have with regard to assessing performance and progress in a given country. Part II of this document defines a minimum set of performance measurement indicators, which can be modified or expanded as the procurement system develops and matures. Initially this performance data can help track changes in actual performance that are linked to the strategy being implemented to strengthen the public procurement system. Subsequently, it will help client countries determine if their efforts to improve performance by strengthening structures and capacity are having the desired impact. Such performance data will also enable donors to make informed decisions that will help focus donor resources and foster greater reliance on the public sector procurement system in the concerned country.
c) **A Performance Assessment System**: The performance measurement indicators above focus both on what data should be monitored by the central oversight and management organizations in the country to provide for consistent application of the system, and to measure the impact and effectiveness of reform initiatives. The third product of the Working Group is a system developed by the IDEAS Centre under the Swiss/Ghana Partnership for Promoting Transparency and Accountability in Public Procurement targeted at oversight and management within the procuring entities themselves. This system uses qualitative criteria but also relies on quantitative data as well. It is intended to be a management tool at the agency level, enabling an agency to identify its areas of strength and weaknesses and to monitor changes in performance. In addition, the results generated by the system can be collected for analysis by the central oversight organizations as a means of monitoring the performance of all implementing agencies across the system. The resulting performance assessment will provide an important management and quality enhancement tool within the implementing agency and it will allow comparisons to be made between implementing agencies on their ability to manage procurement. It is based on a relatively low level technology using Excel software. This performance assessment system will initially be tested in Ghana, one of the countries participating in the Procurement Round Table Initiative, and the software and assessment process will be made available later without charge to other client countries upon request.

The following depicts the three key outputs of the Benchmarking, Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group

3. In summary, the three outputs are designed to work together and separately. The Baseline Indicators look at the system as a whole, but do not measure actual performance. The performance indicators focus on key activities where data will be collected and aggregated for use in analysis and management of the performance of the country's system. The data collection and performance assessment systems are both a means of collecting data at the points where it is generated and, forwarding it for analysis, and a way of using that data at the individual agency level as an agency level performance management tool.
PART I
BASELINE INDICATORS TOOL FOR ASSESSMENT OF A NATIONAL PUBLIC PROCUREMENT SYSTEM

1. Introduction

4. As a result of the harmonization discussions during the first High Level Forum held in Rome in February 2003, donors and their developing country partners were encouraged to work together with the final objective of defining the conditions under which the fiduciary standards of donors could be met (totally or in part) through reliance on the recipient country’s systems, including the public procurement system. To make progress towards this objective, a tool for the assessment and comparison using baseline standards of quality for procurement systems has been developed. This tool will provide the flexibility for use in the very diverse conditions and different levels of capacity of national, sub-national, and local systems in different countries.

2. Background

5. During the first joint OECD/DAC - World Bank sponsored Procurement Roundtable held in January 2003, the participants (composed of representatives from client countries, donor organizations and interested international organizations) considered four thematic areas of importance to the overarching theme of development of public procurement systems. Two of these themes formed the work program of the Working Group on Performance Measurement, Benchmarking and Monitoring and Evaluation of Public Procurement Systems. The participants of this Working Group agreed to focus on two deliverables: 1) the development of a system of baseline indicators for the assessment of the structure of country systems; and 2) a methodology for measuring the performance of the country system against the objectives of achieving economy, efficiency, transparency and equal opportunity to bidders.

6. Accordingly, this paper addresses the first deliverable and defines a set of baseline indicators for the assessment of the structures of a country system. This paper builds upon the comments and considerations of the Working Group as provided during the Procurement Roundtable meetings and comments provided through continuing consultations. The proposed system remains a draft and is a work-in-progress that will not be finalized until it reflects the concurrence of those participating through the Procurement Roundtable process. This process will include piloting, feedback and adjustment to the system.

3. Objectives and Expected Results

7. The system of indicators is a tool to assess the existing elements of a procurement system against a defined set of standards or baseline indicators that are derived from a "model system" as developed and agreed by the participants in the Roundtable process. Such a tool helps identify when an element of the national public procurement system meets or exceeds the baseline or where it needs improvement or modification in order to meet the baseline. Traditionally, such systems are used to help managers identify where to make changes in order to achieve better performance outcomes. They can also help identify potential risk areas inherent in the existing system by identifying variances from the baseline. The system
of indicators does not measure performance. It must be coupled with other management tools (like the performance measurement tool) in order to help guide actions on where to make changes and what changes need to be made. Determinations as to whether better performance outcomes are achieved as a result of changes implemented need to be based on, among other things, collection and analysis of actual performance data.

8. Under the OECD/DAC - World Bank Procurement Roundtable initiative, the participants agreed that the development and application of such a system of indicators would contribute in the following ways:

- Governments would have a tool which would help identify needed changes and contribute to the development and implementation of a prioritized capacity development and change management strategy.
- Governments would be able to coordinate, prioritize and focus donor assistance on supporting the strategy.
- Governments would be able to measure the impact of their strategy by comparing implementation progress against the indicators.
- The system of indicators will provide supporters of reform with clear arguments for change, to focus political attention and mobilise commitment.
- The system of indicators will support the harmonisation of public procurement rules and procedures around recognized standards;
- The output of the system of indicators for public procurement, as an integral part of the public financial management system, will provide valuable information to the overall assessment of the public finance system;
- The system will provide information to support strategic policy decisions with regard to each country and provide information on the structure of the national procurement system which can be used together with the other components (performance indicators and treatment of international competitive bidding) on the level of acceptability and reliance on the national procurement system (in part or in its totality) as compliant for handling donor financing, either being channelled as budget support or allocated for particular projects and programmes.

4. Analytical Approach

Coverage of the system

9. This tool is predominantly based on macro indicators, which are intended to look at key elements of a public procurement systems. The work of the participants in the Roundtable has been to identify and agree upon these key elements and the appropriate indicators that define the well designed system.

10. Parallel work has been carried out to develop a framework for monitoring performance data at the transactional level. A comparison between the two levels will demonstrate how performance at the transactional level is linked to the elements of the procurement system at the macro level.

11. The following four key areas (Pillars) have been identified as a way of organizing the basic elements of a national public procurement system. Under the Pillars, a number of Indicators have been defined.
Pillar I. The Legislative and Regulatory Framework;

1. Procurement legislative and regulatory framework complies with applicable obligations deriving from national and international requirements.
2. Availability of implementing regulations, documentation and tools to support implementation.

Pillar II. The Institutional Framework and Management Capacity;

3. Degree of mainstreaming and integration into Public Financial Management System
4. Existence of a Functional Management/Regulatory Body
5. Existence of Institutional Development Capacity

Pillar III. The Procurement Operations and Market Practices;

6. Efficiency of Procurement Operations and Practices
7. Functionality of the Public Procurement Market

Pillar IV. The Integrity of the Public Procurement System

9. Existence of Effective Control and Audit Systems
10. Existence and Efficiency of the Appeals Mechanism
11. Degree of Access to Information
12. Existence of Ethics and Anti-corruption Measures

Methodological basis for the system of indicators

a) The indicators defined are intended to evaluate procurement systems at a fairly macro level and are designed to give a broad, overview of the comparative strengths and weaknesses of the system concerned.

b) A simple “yes” or “no” cannot answer most of the questions. In general, they are complex and require professional judgement in giving an answer that, fairly and objectively, assesses the national procurement system against the baseline.

5. STRUCTURE OF A PUBLIC PROCUREMENT SYSTEM

12. For the purpose of the system of indicators, the structure of a public procurement system with the definition of the four Pillars and the twelve indicators is based on factors and features agreed by the participants in the design process to be essential for defining the standard of a national public procurement system at the macro level.

Policy Objectives

The conceptual approach and basic assumptions on what should constitute a sound public procurement system are:
The overriding objectives of a national public procurement system is to deliver *economy and efficiency* in the use of public funds while adhering to the fundamental principles of *non-discrimination and equal treatment, due process, access to information and transparency*. Performance and efficiency in procurement operations are ultimately measured at the transactional level of market interaction between public purchasers and suppliers and the delivery of the required goods, works and services to meet the obligations of the government to the citizens.

The legal and institutional frameworks set the basic conditions for the manner in which procurement may be undertaken procedurally; the results that can be expected; and the potential efficiency gains that can be achieved. Within this environment, the commitment of public sector staff in managing and adhering to the requirements of the procurement process and taking advantage of the competition in the market is decisive to the outcome in terms of the overriding objectives of economy, efficiency, non-discrimination, equal treatment and transparency.

That the development of any public procurement system, legally and institutionally, is formed and guided by a wide-spread and genuine understanding of the conditions and prerequisites needed for the creation of an efficient, transparent and credible public procurement system, capable of generating efficiency and cost-effective procurement in the best interests of the contracting entities and of the country as a whole.

**Determining Baselines**

13. The key activity is to define baseline levels against which the existing elements of the procurement system will be compared with respect to each of the agreed indicators. The baseline represents a desirable “*good practice standard*” under each indicator.

14. If the baseline is considered the desirable standard, there is also a need to identify where, how and why the system under review fails to achieve this standard. In doing so, the system of indicators provides a profile or mapping of the existing system that identifies strengths (fully achieved) and weaknesses (fails to achieve) along with a descriptive analysis (the where, how and why).

**Proposed Levels of Achievement**

Procurement System Fully Achieves the Baseline (FA)

Procurement System Substantially Achieves the Baseline (SA)

Procurement System does Not Achieve the Baseline (NA)

15. A proposed guide for using the tool is provided below. This guide seeks to facilitate consistency in the application of the tool. However as stated previously, judgement must be used and explanatory notes are anticipated.

**Proposed Assessment Guide**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Achievement</th>
<th>Assessment Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>All baseline elements are substantially met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>More than 70% of baseline elements substantially met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Less than 70% of baseline elements are substantially met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. It is clearly possible for users of the system to assign numeric or alpha scoring systems, for their own internal purposes and for tracking changes over time.

**Weighting of Indicators**

17. Users of the system of indicators may also wish to assign weights to the various indicators to reflect their own priorities regarding relative importance of the individual indicators and the defined baseline elements. Weighting will work best when applied against numeric scoring.

6. **THE BASELINE INDICATORS SYSTEM**

18. The assessment of a public procurement system will be conducted using the following twelve (12) Indicators. These have been identified as the core components of a public procurement system and are grouped into four Pillars.

**Pillar I. The Legislative and Regulatory Framework**

19. The legal and regulatory framework is often seen as the starting point for the development of a governance system. With regard to procurement, it sets the rules of the process and provides the legal basis for ensuring rights of participants and establishing their responsibilities. It is a fundamental element that links the procurement process to the overall governance structures within the country and defines obligations of the government to comply with internal and external requirements.

**Indicator 1. Public Procurement legislative and regulatory framework achieves the agreed standards and complies with applicable obligations.**

**Baseline:**

a) Scope of application and coverage of the legislative and regulatory framework

- Contracting entities at all levels, including government authorities, municipalities, regional authorities and utilities/state-owned enterprise, are covered.
- All areas of procurement; works, goods and consulting services are included;
- Procurement using public funds, irrespective of contract value, is included;
- The applicable legislative and regulatory framework is structured, consistent, and accessible to users and all interested stakeholders;

b) Procurement methods

- Stated preference for the use of open, competitive procurement unless otherwise justified in accordance with the legislative and regulatory framework
- International competitive tendering methods defined for specified contracts (e.g. where monetary thresholds exist) that are consistent with international standards;
- Defined basis for the procurement method, if other than open competition;
- Negotiated procedures and Direct purchasing only under well defined and justified circumstance, subject to controls;

c) Advertising rules and time limits

- Mandatory and accessible publication of opportunities for competitive procurement
- Mandatory publication of result information on contract awards based on defined thresholds;
− Minimum time limits for submission of tenders and applications, which should be consistent with method of procurement, national conditions and when applicable, international requirements.

d) Rules on participation and qualitative selection
− Fair, predictable and defined rules for participation that rely on qualifications and ability to perform the requirement;
− Limited and controlled use of price preferential clauses;
− Debarment process if covered, on defined basis, allowing for due process and appeal
− Rules for participation of government-owned enterprise that provide for equal treatment in competitive procurement

e) Tender documentation and technical specifications
− The minimum content of the tender documentation is specified;
− Neutral technical specification with reference to international standards where possible;
− Content of tender documentation is relevant to meeting requirement and implementing the process.

f) Tender evaluation and award criteria
− Objective, fair and pre-disclosed criteria for evaluation and award of contracts;
− Clear methodology for evaluation of tenders based on price and other fully disclosed factors leading to award of contracts;
− Requirement to maintain confidentiality during the evaluation process.

g) Submission, receipt and opening of tenders
− Public opening of tenders in a defined manner that ensures the regularity of the proceedings;
− Clear requirement to maintain records of proceedings and process that are available for review/audit;
− Requirement to maintain security and confidentiality of tenders prior to bid opening;
− Submission and receipt modalities of tender documents are well defined.

h) Complaint review procedures
− Inclusion of complaint and remedy procedures that provide for fair, independent and timely implementation.

Indicator 2. Existence of Implementing Regulations and Documentation

The existence and availability of implementing procurement regulations, such as operational procedures, handbooks, model tender documentation and standard conditions of contract is important for a correct and consistent application of the legislative and regulatory framework as well as for an effective undertaking of the procurement operations.

Baseline: The existence and availability of the following regulations or documents:

a) Implementing regulation that provides defined processes and procedures not included in higher level legislation;
b) Model tender documents for goods, works, and services;
c) Procedures for pre-qualification;
d) Procedures suitable for contracting for services or other requirements where technical capacity is a key criteria.
e) User’s Guide or manual for contracting entities;
f) General Conditions of Contracts for public sector contracts covering goods, works and services consistent with national requirements and international requirements when applicable.

**Pillar II. Institutional Framework and Capacity**

21. Modernizing and maintaining a country’s public procurement system is an on-going and very complicated process. It benefits strongly from the existence of focal points within the government administration with sufficient capacity and qualifications to manage the procurement system and the monitoring of public procurement implementation. All bodies with legitimate interest in public procurement, such as the contracting entities, private sector entities; the government and the judicial system will benefit from support of a varying nature. The Institutional Capacity section is designed to look at the central government institutional framework and examine capacity to oversee, manage and support efficient implementation as well as to provide leadership in modernizing and maintaining the public procurement system. This can be adapted to look at other levels of government, especially in highly decentralized systems.

**Indicator 3. Mainstreaming Procedures into Public Financial Management**

22. Public procurement should be an integral part of the overall public financial management and public sector governance systems in a country. A well functioning procurement system will provide information to support the process of budget development and execution and will benefit from the public financial management system with regard to timely appropriations and availability of funds to support the award and payments of contracts. Lack of integration between the budgeting process and procurement process can result in cancellations and/or insufficient funds to make timely payments, resulting in increased costs and inefficiencies in the use of public funds.

Baseline:

a) Procurement planning and data on costing is part of the budget formulation process and contributes to multi-year planning;
b) Budget law and financial procedures support timely procurement, contract execution and payment;
c) No initiation of procurement actions without existing budget appropriations;
d) Contract execution is subject to budgetary controls to ensure sufficient funding for contract.
e) Budgeting system provides for timely release of funds to make payments against contractual obligations.
f) Systematic completion reports are prepared for certification of budget execution and for reconciliation of delivery with budget programming.
Indicator 4. Functional Management/Normative Body (the Body)

23. Most countries benefit from the existence of a management bodies within the central government to provide a range of functions that support the consistent development, maintenance and application of the legislative and regulatory requirements of a procurement system. The existence and capacity of such bodies becomes increasingly important in governments with higher levels of decentralization. Such organizations provide guidance on interpretation of rules and support training and capacity development. Increasingly such bodies need to develop and oversee the implementation of the use of technology to support procurement, including development and support to e-procurement solutions.

Baseline: The assessment is based on the following factors.

a) The status and basis for the functional normative bodies is covered in the legislative and regulatory framework.

b) The responsibilities address a defined set of functions which include, but are not limited to: the provision of advice to contracting entities; drafting amendments to the legislative and regulatory framework and implementing regulations; providing monitoring of public procurement; providing procurement information; managing statistical data bases; reporting on procurement to other parts of government; developing and supporting implementation of initiatives for improvements of the public procurement system; and providing implementing tools and documents to support training and capacity development of implementing staff.

c) Organisation, funding and staffing and the level of independence and authority (formal power) of the bodies to exercise duties is sufficient and consistent with the responsibilities.

d) Responsibilities provide for separation and clarity so as to avoid conflict of interest and direct involvement in the execution of procurement transactions.

Indicator 5. Existence of Institutional Development Capacity

24. The public procurement system is defined by a legislative and regulatory framework that can be complex and often requires the exercise of judgement in the application of the appropriate procedures. The performance of the system relies heavily on the capacity of the participants, both public and private sector, to understand and implement the procedures. Performance is also reliant upon the capacity of the various stakeholders who interact with the system.

Baseline: The assessment of institutional capacity is based on the following factors:

a) A system exists for collection and dissemination of procurement information, including tender invitations, requests for proposals and contract award information.

b) A sustainable strategy and training capacity exists to provide training, advice and assistance to develop the capacity of government and private sector participants to understand the rules and regulations and the how they should be implemented.

c) Systems and procedures exist for collection and monitoring of national procurement statistics.

d) Quality control standards are disseminated and used to evaluate performance of staff and address capacity development issues.

Pillar III. Procurement Operations and Public Procurement Market Practice

25. Public procurement requires performance from both the public sector and private sector participants. A functioning and competitive private sector market is therefore a key partner to the public
procurement system in a well functioning system. The market must have confidence in the competence of the contracting authorities at all levels within the system to implement and administer the public procurement system in accordance with the legislative and regulatory framework in order for the market to be an effective partner.

**Indicator 6. Efficient Procurement Operations Capacity and Practice**

26. Procurement operations capacity and practices are at the core of a well functioning procurement system. They are dependent upon the staffing, knowledge, skills and capabilities of the human resources and on the incentives and controls in the systems that influence human behavior and institutional performance.

**Baseline:** The assessment at the contracting entity level is based on the following:

a) The level of procurement competence among government officials within the entity is consistent with their procurement responsibilities.

b) The procurement training and information programmes implemented for government officials, as well as for private sector participants is consistent with demand.

c) The existence of administrative systems for public procurement operations, and information databases to support monitoring of performance and reporting to and responding to the information needs of other related government systems.

d) The existence and implementation of internal control mechanisms for the undertaking of procurement operations at the contracting level, including a code of conduct, separation of responsibilities as a check/balance mechanism and oversight/control of signature/approval authority.

e) The existence of norms for safekeeping records and documents related to transactions and contract management.

f) Provisions exist for delegation of authority to others consistent with capacity to exercise responsibilities.

**Indicator 7. Functionality of the Public Procurement Market**

27. Market performance is dependent upon the capacity and depth of the market in the country.

**Baseline:** The assessment of the public procurement market is based on the following:

a) The public procurement market in the country has sufficient numbers of participants to provide for competition, when competition is on a domestic basis and comparative pricing is achieved for goods, works and services when compared to prices paid for similar requirements in the domestic markets.

b) The quality and consistency of submissions by the private sector to the government enables the application of the process leading to the award and completion of contracts.

c) The participation rate of bidders in response to competitive tender invitations is consistent with the capacity of the marketplace.

d) The private sector confidence in the legal and regulatory framework governing the procurement process is evidenced by their participation and their use of complaints or protests mechanisms.

28. Contract administration is a key element of managing the outputs of a public sector procurement system. It provides oversight on quality, timely performance and provides for early access to information that is needed for good management. In the context of major public investment projects, contract administration is critical to successful implementation. During the process of implementation and administration of contracts, disputes commonly arise. Appropriate procedures to resolve such disputes fairly and in a timely manner become an important aspect of contract administration.

Baseline:

a) Procedures are defined for undertaking contract administration responsibilities which include inspection and acceptance procedures, quality control procedures and methods to review and issue contract amendments in a timely manner.

b) Dispute resolution procedures are included in the contract document providing for an efficient and fair process to resolve disputes arising during the performance of the contract.

c) Procedures exist to enforce the outcome of the dispute resolution process.

Pillar IV. The Integrity and Transparency of the Public Procurement System

29. A cornerstone of a well-functioning public procurement system operating with integrity (fair, transparent, and credible) is the availability of mechanisms and capacity for independent control and audit of procurement operations to provide for accountability and compliance. Similarly, there must be a system for participants to lodge complaints and challenge decisions with administrative and judicial review bodies having appropriate levels of independence, that also have the legal power to impose corrective measures and remedies against contracting entities in breach of the legal and regulatory framework. Fraud and corruption, including the issue of conflict of interest, should be addressed in legislation as well as through special measures in order to create a sound and fair environment for public procurement operations.

Indicator 9. Effective Control and Audit System

30. Internal and external controls at the implementing agency level and an effective external audit system are key elements of a governance and public financial management system and are particularly important to the effective and efficient operations of the public procurement system.

Baseline: The assessment of the control and audit standard in public procurement is based on the following factors:

a) A legal framework, organisation, policy and procedures for internal and external control and audit of public procurement operations exists and operates to provide a functioning control framework;

b) Enforcement and follow-up on findings and recommendations of the control framework provide an environment that fosters compliance.

c) The internal control system provides timely information on compliance to enable management action.

d) The internal control systems are sufficiently defined to enable performance audits to be conducted.

e) Auditors are sufficiently informed about procurement requirements and controls systems to conduct quality audits that contribute to compliance.
**Indicator 10. Efficiency of Appeals Mechanism**

31. The appeal mechanisms, which include a complaint review and remedy system, provide an important contribution to the compliance environment and integrity of the public procurement system. Such a system must be seen to operate efficiently, fairly and providing balanced unbiased decisions.

**Baseline:** The assessment of the complaint review and remedy system is based on the following factors.

a) The existence and operation of a complaint review system that gives participants in the public procurement process a right to file a complaint within the framework of an administrative and judicial review procedure;

b) Decisions are deliberated on the basis of available information and the final decision can be reviewed and ruled upon by a body (or authority) with enforcement capacity under the law;

c) The complaint review system has the capacity to handle lodged complaints efficiently and a means to enforce the remedy imposed.

d) The system operates in a fair manner, with outcomes of decisions balanced and justified on the basis of available information.

e) Decisions are published and made available to the public.

f) Administrative review body, or authority is separate from the regulatory body, executing agency and the audit/control agency.

**Indicator 11. Degree of Access to Information**

32. Access to information is a key element of an open and transparent governance system. In procurement, the value and need for access to information is critical in all aspects of the system and to the many stakeholders that participate or benefit from the operation of the system. Although access to information is covered under various baselines, the importance of this element justifies a dedicated indicator. As governments move towards implementation of e-procurement solutions, access to information is increasingly critical to a successful strategy and solution.

**Baseline:**

a) a) Access to information by stakeholders in the process is supported by publication and distribution of information through available media with support from information technology when feasible.

b) b) Systems exist to collect key data related to performance of the procurement system and to report regularly.

c) c) Records are maintained to validate data.

**Indicator 12. Ethics and Anti-corruption Measures**

33. The procurement system should be perceived to operate with integrity, providing for clear definitions of unacceptable practices and stating the consequences to participants in the procurement system who engage in fraudulent, corrupt or unethical behaviour.
Baseline:

a) The legal and regulatory framework for procurement, including tender and contract documents, includes provisions addressing the issue of corruption, fraud, conflict of interest and unethical behaviour and states actions which can be taken with regard to such behaviour (either directly or by reference to other laws).

b) The legal system defines responsibilities, accountabilities and penalties for individuals and firms involved in fraud or corruption cases.

c) Evidence of enforcement of rulings and penalties exists.

d) Special measures exist for the government to prevent and detect potential fraud and corruption in public procurement (e.g. procurement audits).

e) Stakeholders (private sector and civil society) support the creation of a procurement market known for its integrity and ethical behaviours.

f) Existence of a secure mechanism to report fraudulent, corrupt or unethical behavior.

g) Existence of Codes of Conduct/Codes of Ethics for participants that are involved in aspects of the public financial management systems that also provide for disclosure for those in decision making positions.

7. METHODOLOGY FOR USE OF THE BASELINE INDICATORS SYSTEM

34. The baseline indicators system is a tool that enables the end user to compare elements of a public procurement system against an agreed set of baseline indicators that define what is considered to be necessary in any public procurement system, for that system to provide for "economy and efficiency in the use of public funds while adhering to the fundamental principles of non-discrimination, equal treatment, due process, access to information and transparency."

35. The baseline indicators have been determined in a multi-national process to define the "model system" in the most generic terms, consistent with the principles and objectives of a public procurement system with regard to the service it provides to the overall public financial management and governance of a country.

Proposed Methodology

- **Starting the process.** The first step in employing the baseline indicators system is to examine and compare the elements of a country's public sector procurement system against the defined elements of the tool. As each country is unique, differences or variances should be noted. The degree of difference can range from a total absence to minor variations in what exists in the country versus the defined baseline. A narrative report should accompany the assessment which can identify specific aspects of variance and the degree of variance from the defined baselines. The Assessment Guide provided as part of the tool can be used, but will lack depth if not accompanied by a narrative report. Users of the baseline indicators system should review the tool and determine if weighting of the various indicators will be useful to the process. The system is designed to enable weighting and scoring, but it is not an essential feature of the system.

- **Who will conduct the assessment?** The baseline indicators system is a tool that can be used by any country. However, in the context of supporting the decision making process by the donor community on reliance on the country system in a recipient country, one of the following three methods for conducting the assessment is recommended:
1. As a joint assessment by the concerned country and donor(s) active in the country
2. As a self-assessment by the concerned country, shared with donors
3. As an external assessment conducted by donor(s) active in the country and shared with the country

**Relationship to the CPAR.** The indicators will become a key element of the existing Country Procurement Assessment Review (CPAR) process. The CPAR process has already been accepted by an important segment of the broader donor community under the leadership of the Heads of Procurement (HOP) of the multilateral development banks. Most of the participants in the HOP group are also participants in the Joint World Bank and OECD/DAC Procurement Roundtable process thereby facilitating a wide acceptance and use of the baseline indicators. The baseline indicators will improve the CPAR process by incorporating the set of agreed baseline indicators; something that has been missing in the past. As most developing partner countries have already undergone a procurement assessment, the existing CPARs may serve as a basis of information to conduct an initial desk review using the baseline indicators. This will inform subsequent reviews to focus on key areas in the procurement system to better support any ongoing reform efforts.

**How often will the baselines be assessed?** The initial assessment provides a snapshot of the system at that point in time. This snapshot can be modified continuously as the country's system changes. However, current practice is that a full assessment only needs to be done every 3-5 years or whenever a significant change has taken place in a country. Donor organizations may wish to initiate an assessment or update to an existing assessment to support the decision making process when updating a country strategy or changing its lending portfolio in a given country.

**Who will have access to the results of the assessment?** It is recommended that all donors active in a given country be provided access to the assessment results regardless of the method (see a-c above) used to conduct the assessment. This will avoid multiple reviews by different groups. In each of the options above, the assessment becomes a output which identifies areas where the country system does not meet the commonly agreed baseline. In countries not seeking donor funds, this output can be used simply to benchmark against the "good practice standards" and support government decision making. In other countries, it can be used to focus and coordinate donor support for an agreed reform program.

**Linking the Baseline Indicators Assessment into the Country Dialog on Public Financial Management**

- In a developing partner country, the donor organizations and the country counterparts would use the assessment and accompanying narrative to open a dialog on the results. This dialog would contribute to the development of a prioritized and sequenced set of proposed actions that the country should take to address the issues identified.

- Although the discussions regarding the outcome of the baseline process will likely take place initially in the context of those specifically concerned with procurement, it is recognized that developing a sequenced set of actions for the country to pursue will need to be viewed in the much broader context of the public financial management system as a whole to ensure that the final action plan is consistent with the country strategy and that individual actions are mutually supportive and do not drain limited resources and capacity. The procurement baseline indicators are designed to contribute to a broader set of indicators that look at the entire public financial management system.

- As a follow on process, donors will agree individually or as a group, in discussions with the recipient country counterparts, the level of reliance on the country public procurement system
they are willing to accept based on current conditions in the country. Ideally, this would be done as a coordinated activity so that all donors would agree to the same acceptance/reliance level (recognizing that some donors may be willing to go beyond the agreed level.) Again, such actions will need to be fully integrated and supportive of the broader process taking place in the country surrounding acceptance and reliance on the country's overall public financial management systems.

- Donors should agree upon a process for increasing levels of reliance on country public financial management systems linked to implementation of the prioritized and sequenced action plan.

**Performance Measurement**

- Donors must also agree with the partner country counterparts, upon a system to collect performance data that will enable the country to monitor performance and the impact of changes to the existing system. A framework and methodology for data collection to support monitoring of performance has been developed and includes key minimum data collection requirements needed to monitor performance of the system. In addition, it provides donors with a means of determining the implementation and impact of the prioritized and sequenced action plan. It is on the basis of monitoring actual performance data that donor organizations would increase their level of reliance on the public procurement system. Monitoring of actual performance data may be focused on central government, local governments, specific sectors or even on individual agencies. The performance measurement methodology is specifically designed to be modified to the demand and can be implemented at several levels to serve various management and monitoring needs. The performance measurement methodology is described in Part II of this document, titled "A Framework Methodology for Monitoring of Procurement Performance in the Public Sector".

**Capacity Development and Donor Commitment**

- A major objective of development of tools for assessment and performance measurement is to further the overall development of capacity within a country. The tools only help to identify strengths and weaknesses in a system. They feed into a decision making process within the country to develop a strategy to address weaknesses and develop and strengthen the system. A sustainable development strategy is dependent upon capacity development.

- Commitment on the part of donors in facilitating achievement of desired outcomes is as critical as commitment and ownership on the part of the client countries to achieving desired outcomes. Such commitment on the part of donors is demonstrated through resources and technical assistance to the country to achieve a well defined, sequenced and integrated development strategy.
PART II
MEASURING AND MONITORING OF
PROCUREMENT PERFORMANCE IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR

1. Introduction

36. The proposed performance measurement methodology provides the framework for implementing a system that will contribute to monitoring institutional reforms, improving information availability on performance, enabling an increased focus on capacity building and promoting increased quality in public sector procurement in developing countries.

37. In addition, this methodology should: (a) help decision-makers to assess the ability of “actors on the ground” to implement and put into practice a country’s legal and organizational framework for public sector procurement; (b) allow development partners to monitor country procurement reform projects and (c) facilitate efforts to build the international donor community’s confidence in partner countries’ public finance management systems, thereby contributing to a greater reliance on partner country systems.

38. The proposed methodology is a complement to the system of baseline indicators which have been developed to benchmark the elements of a public sector procurement system. The baseline indicators are not able to measure and monitor actual performance or changes in performance over time. It is through the monitoring of performance data and the analysis of such data that managers increase their ability to determine the impact and effectiveness of changes that are made to the public procurement system or other elements of the public financial management system.

2. Methodology and Approach

39. In order to be effective, the methodology and approach for performance monitoring must:

   i) Be simple and practical.

   ii) Take into account the realities of partner countries and reflect the operational concerns of the parties directly involved.

   iii) Be structured around key features and good practices of public sector procurement.

   iv) Make use of concepts, techniques and tools that are widely available and part of current practice in public sector management and quality management.

3. Guiding principles

40. The monitoring methodology being proposed in this paper provides a logical and open framework enabling its progressive implementation and customisation to be adapted to a given partner country’s institutional and legal environment. It focuses primarily on process data that measures how the procurement system is performing with regard to implementation of its procedures leading to the award of contracts.
41. It is important to point out that the scope of application of the methodology covers the entirety of public sector procurement transactions. It should not matter if these transactions are above or below a monetary threshold. The type of contracting authority is irrelevant: it may be a central public administration department, a local authority or a parastatal entity.

4. Initial Steps

42. Performance monitoring relies on the collection and analysis of performance data. In the case of any country or organization, such monitoring should begin with an inventory of data that currently is being generated and is related to topic being monitored. In the case of public procurement, generally accepted principles of records management indicate that most procurement performance data is available in the records of transactions or contracts implemented by the public sector implementing organizations. Normally the procurement process in a country follows a set of defined steps which are set forth in its laws and regulations. The process is generally documented in a file and supports the award of a contractual agreement. As contractual agreements are legal documents, each contract should also have a specific file or record. The maintaining of such documentation facilitates both internal and external control and audit of the procurement process and provides the data that can be aggregated and analyzed for purposes of monitoring performance.

43. As a result of the consistency that exists from country to country with regard to the procurement process, it is possible to identify specific data that should be generated and can be monitored to determine aspects of performance of the process. The final set of indicators to be adopted in a given country situation should be relatively limited in order to facilitate implementation. Through the Procurement Round Table process, a minimum level of performance data required for monitoring process aspects of the public procurement system has been identified. These fourteen indicators, set forth below, should be considered when establishing a data collection system for monitoring of procurement performance.

**Key Performance Process Monitoring Indicators:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCESS INDICATOR</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE DATA</th>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>RELATED TO BASELINE INDICATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement of bid opportunities</td>
<td>Percentage of open bidding procedures publicly advertised</td>
<td>Fairness, openness and level of competition</td>
<td>Legal and Regulatory (1) Access to Information (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of Awards</td>
<td>Percentage of contract awards (should be based on monetary threshold) publicly disclosed</td>
<td>Transparency of system</td>
<td>Legal and Regulatory (1) Access to Information (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time for preparation of bids</td>
<td>Average number of days between invitation to bid and bid opening</td>
<td>Fairness, effectiveness of competition</td>
<td>Legal and Regulatory (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidder participation</td>
<td>Average number of bidders submitting a bid in each bid process</td>
<td>Effectiveness of competition and Fairness</td>
<td>Functionality of Public Procurement Market (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid Acceptance</td>
<td>Average number of bids/proposals received that are responsive to requirements in the bidding documents</td>
<td>Efficiency and Effectiveness</td>
<td>Implementing regulations and tools (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of procurement</td>
<td>Percentage of usage for each authorized method of procurement</td>
<td>Effective use of competition</td>
<td>Legal and Regulatory (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid processing lead-time</td>
<td>Average number of days from bid opening to the issuance of a contract award</td>
<td>Efficiency and Effectiveness</td>
<td>Institutional Capacity (5) Efficiency of Procurement Operations and Practices (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancelled bidding procedures</td>
<td>Percentage of bid processes declared null before contract signature</td>
<td>Fairness and Efficiency</td>
<td>Institutional Capacity (5) Efficiency of Procurement Operations and Practices (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protests</td>
<td>Percentage of bidding procedures with protests</td>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>Legal and Regulatory (1) Efficiency of Procurement Operations and Practices (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution of Protests</td>
<td>Percentage of protests resulting in modification to outcome of bidding process</td>
<td>Fairness and Transparency</td>
<td>Legal and Regulatory (1) Efficiency of Procurement Operations and Practices (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract amendment</td>
<td>Average increase per contract awarded</td>
<td>Efficiency and Effectiveness</td>
<td>Contract Administration and Dispute Resolution (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract dispute resolution</td>
<td>Percentage of contracts with unresolved disputes</td>
<td>Fairness, Efficiency and Effectiveness</td>
<td>Contract Administration and Dispute Resolution (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion rate</td>
<td>Percentage of contracts resulting in full and acceptable performance</td>
<td>Efficiency and Effectiveness</td>
<td>Functionality of Public Procurement Market (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late payment</td>
<td>Percentage of payments made late (e.g. exceeding contractually specified payment schedule)</td>
<td>Efficiency and Effectiveness</td>
<td>Mainstreamed into PFM (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Main features of the indicators**

   a) The above indicators are areas where data should be available and can be collected and analyzed.

   - They have been selected and designed in order to reflect aspects of actual and overall procurement process performance and to measure the main factors contributing to the latter.
In addition to this, and given the current conditions prevailing in most of the recipient countries, the selected performance indicators primarily focus on procurement process efficiency and effectiveness, but also measure other key principles of a well performing system.

b) They are generic in order to be customised at country level

- The indicators are integrated into the public expenditure chain and derive from a framework that refers to a set of common procurement practices and legal concepts. They are generic, and will need to be customised in each case so as to be anchored in the country’s current national public finance and procurement rules and regulations.

c) They provide an overview

- The proposed indicators aim to provide information giving a clear, understandable and balanced overview of all procurement transactions to key stakeholders involved in the procurement decision-making process (top public sector managers, officials, policy-makers, etc.).

d) They are quantitative, and thus comparable

- The indicators are based on key features of the procurement process that can be measured and compared over time.

e) They are practical and implementable:

- The source data for the indicators can be expected to be “automatically” extracted on an ongoing basis from existing standard records and other supporting documents (and/or from IT systems, where available).

6. Conditions & requirements

a) Upgrading of management information systems at the national level

Work may have to be undertaken to upgrade the relevant information systems in order to facilitate ongoing data capture and processing so as to generate the information on a continuing basis. Some of the relevant issues are as follows:

1. Aligning the management information system with how the processes operate in the public sector
2. Availability of source data

Key information may need to be coded on the basis of elements such as:

- Budget appropriations (and related expenditures) and sources of funding;
- Procuring entities;
- Categories of purchased items;
- Contractors (and related economic sectors) and origins; and
- Procurement contracts (and related transactions).
3. Collecting source data on a continuous & reliable basis

45. Wherever the supporting forms and documents are not immediately available as needed, collecting the data the first time in order to establish a baseline against which to measure later progress (on the basis of set targets) may require an initial one-time data collection exercise to be carried out using ex-post methods.

b) Setting up a reporting mechanism at national level

46. A limited set of indicators will need to be collected at the level of each procuring entity, primarily for internal management purposes, and then disseminated and aggregated at the central level (e.g. by an oversight body) for policy monitoring purposes. (See Part III - Data Collection and Assessment System)

47. The fact that the proposed methodology will support better internal management at procuring entities will enhance its acceptability and sustainability.
PART III
A DATA COLLECTION AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT SYSTEM
FOR IMPLEMENTING ENTITIES

1. INTRODUCTION

48. The purpose of this part of the paper is to describe the data collection and assessment software tool developed within the framework of the OECD/DAC-World Bank Procurement Round Table process in general and more specifically in the context of an ongoing pilot financed by the Swiss Government in Ghana being implemented with the support of the Ideas Centre. The software developed for this pilot facilitates the collection of data to measure the quality of procurement at the level of the Procurement Entity (PE) i.e. the public institution carrying out public procurement.

49. The software measures issues related to the Procurement Entities (PE’s) organisation, how it handles the programme design stage, the public procurement process and contract management. It uses, a set of key organisational and managerial criteria upon which a PE must rely to ensure that its public procurement is conducted efficiently. This set of criteria is based on international procurement standards, best procurement practice, various management performance standards, Ghana procurement laws and ISO and EFQM standards, which were reduced to 80 Key Performance Criteria (KPC’s) during an extensive international consultative process, involving among others the World Bank, DFID, ITC and the OECD.

50. These key criteria are defined and organised in the Public Procurement Model of Excellence (PPME) which forms the structure of the software.

51. The methodology used is inspired by the European Foundation for Qualitative Management (EFQM) and is aimed basically to be a self-assessment approach for public institutions that are responsible for public procurement. The current PPME model, while designed to capture qualitative data, has been customized to capture data on quantitative areas related to the country level performance indicators defined in Part II of this document.

2. OBJECTIVES AND EXPECTED RESULTS

52. The Public Procurement Model of Excellence (PPME) has been designed to achieve the following four main objectives:

1. To help in the implementation of a change process to improve procurement at the entity, regional and national level.

2. To provide objective information for assessing the conformity of the procurement processes to the requirements of the public procurement system.

3. To evaluate performance of procurement at various levels and provide recommendations to improve the process.
4. Last but not least, to lead to the certification of the procurement entities within the country.

53. To achieve these objectives the PPME provides the **following results:**

1. **A “stand alone” assessment report:** On the performance of a particular PE on the basis of pre established criteria. This report provides the management of the PE with recommendations to improve its performance.

2. **Comparative assessment results:** This report provides managers at various levels (at Ministerial level, at regional level or at National level) with an analytical tool looking at the performance of a particular PE, comparing its individual results with the results of a group of PEs at various levels (Ministerial, regional or national), identifying problems and providing recommendations to improve the procurement process.

54. These results are achieved through collection of data on Key Performance Criteria (KPC) covering **four main areas** which are related to quality performance in public procurement:

   - Management system of the Procurement Entity (PE).
   - Design of the programme/project to be procured.
   - Procurement process itself.
   - Contract management.

3. **ANALYTICAL APPROACH**

55. **Presentation of Results:** The PPME has been designed as a tool that generates information on the level of performance of procurement entities which can be viewed at two different levels, either by individual institutions (procurement entities) or across institutions (group of procurement entities). It allows sorting of data according to **8 different criteria:** by Ministry, by Region, or by District, as well as by type of institution (e.g. state-owned enterprise), by type of procurement (e.g. works only), by procurement method (e.g. ICB), by source of funding (e.g. IFI), or by implementing agencies as illustrated in Annex III. For example, the PPME could be used to assess the PEs within the Ministry of Education using NCB procedures to procure goods.

56. After **selecting** the institutions with the help of the above mentioned **sorting criteria**, the PPME allows for **viewing** the comparative results from two different angles:

   - **By Key Performance Criteria**

     For example, for all procurement entities in the Roads and Transport sector dealing with works only in a given region, one might want to know how well they perform in the area of Management, in the subcategory Finance and more specifically how regular procurement and financial audits are being conducted. If this sector is performing badly, it might be useful to look for information such as the funding source and by whom the actual procurement process is being implemented.

   - **On basis of Value for Money**

     Or a government or a financial institution might want to know what the general trend is either for an individual PE or for all PEs in that country in complying with **Value for Money Principles**.
57. Comparative results are useful only if acted upon. Knowledge of general trends on how public advertisement is being conducted can help in understanding why some PEs are good in this area and why others are performing poorly. This information can provide feedback on major areas of PE weakness and what ought to be put in place to assist them in improving on these performance criteria. Comparative results can thus greatly contribute in assisting government and/or financial institution in their decision making process.

**How Procurement Entities are Assessed:**

1) The Evaluation Grid

58. PEs are assessed with the help of an Evaluation Grid, in which Key Performance Criteria (KPC’s) are listed. For every Key Performance Criterion (KPC) the assessor needs to obtain evidence and give a rating as well as a recommendation for improvement if needed and its priority.

2) How to ensure objectivity

59. The KPC’s are formulated as statements (rather than questions) to provide as much objectivity as possible. Instead of asking a question such as “are bidders informed of bid results and contract award” whereby the answer can be a “yes” or “no” reply, the assessor must look for evidence to ensure that this activity is being conducted all the time.

3) Existence of evidence

60. The assessor carrying out the assessment will seek to find for each KPC the existence of evidence which confirms that this activity is done (or not) and also whether it is done all the time and whether it is part of the usual management of the organisation.

4) Rating and Recommendations

61. Once the assessor has determined the existence (or not) of evidence and its systematic application, for each KPC, then the assessor will be in a position to provide a rating, between 0-10. Depending on the rating given for a KPC, the assessor will make appropriate recommendations. Recommendations are compulsory for any rating between 0-4 which the system generates. The recommendations are then prioritised from “High”, “Medium” to “Low”. For each recommendation the PE will be given a deadline to take the required action. The overall rating and recommendations are communicated as feedback to the management of a particular procurement entity at the end of the assessment.

62. The assessment will become a tool for the PEs themselves, which they will use on their own to run self-assessments as a part of the internal process management. Self-assessment is a major step in thinking within an organization as it requires the involvement of managers at different levels and calls for their commitment and leadership. Through the self-assessment process, managers become more accountable and better understand their role in contributing to improving the organisation. Self-assessment is a powerful tool in itself as it enables a culture for learning and sharing from each other not only within a PE but also among procurement entities. In other words, those who are performing poorly can learn from those who are performing better. At the same time, this approach is also a useful tool to assist government and/or financial institution in the monitoring and evaluation of performance of procurement entities. The following provide a graphic representation of the process.
4. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PPME

63. The PPME is an Excel-based light application which can be stored on a floppy disk. The use of Excel makes the application user-friendly for the assessor and easy to be implemented by the government. The tool is split in two parts to enable it to be used properly by both the assessors and the government responsible for its management. The first part of the tool is for use by the procurement entity in supporting management oversight of performance within the entity. The second part of the application is targeted for government use to collect specific data from all assessments centrally for performance measurement of the system as a whole.

64. As the PPME is designed to be a system to be used by government to monitor the performance of the procurement entities at a country level, some conditions must be met to ensure that it is implemented correctly.

65. We consider the following as key to guarantee its success in the long-term:

- **Government’s commitment**: The role of government is crucial when implementing the system, since it conveys a clear message on the importance the Government attaches to the programme.

- **Adequate Human Resources**: For conducting assessments on a country basis, government has to consider adequate human resources. In our approach we recommend that 3 assessors be assigned
for each assessment in order to guarantee greater objectivity. In each team of assessors, there is one Lead Assessor who has the task of organizing and planning the assessments to be conducted.

- **Comprehensive Training & Ownership:** The PPME requires that assessors have appropriate skills and use particular techniques. To become an assessor the individual has to have some expertise in the field of procurement and be able to attend a week of training. This training programme consists not only of acquiring assessment techniques and skills but also it is based on the PPME Model and Tool.

- **Appropriate Planning & Organisation:** For the monitoring and evaluation of PEs on a yearly basis and to be able to conduct this at regular pace, a government will have to plan a large number of assessments. To be able to manage such a large number of assessments requires good planning and organisation as well as a clear process to guide Lead Assessors in their duties. An overall step-by-step approach for governmental bodies who will be managing the whole process has been developed.

5. **CONCLUSION**

66. The proposed monitoring tool has been constructed on the basis of Ghanaian reality and the needs identified in Ghana to accompany the implementation of the new public procurement law and procedures.

67. The tool will be field-tested, currently planned during the month of November 2004. It will be revised to take into account the various lessons learned during the test and should be available for use by others as from the month of December 2004.