

Methodology for Assessing Procurement Systems (MAPS) - Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (MAPS Secretariat)



Objective and features

1. Objective

MAPS serves as a reform tool for all countries to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of public procurement, ensure integrity and transparency in the use of public funds, understand how procurement systems contribute to sustainability and broader policy objectives, and encourage dialogue between stakeholders.

2. Institutional coverage

National and subnational governments.

3. Technical coverage

Starting with a country context analysis to frame the assessment, the core MAPS focuses on four pillars. Each pillar has a set of indicators and sub-indicators.

There are 14 indicators with a total of 55 sub-indicators organized in four pillars:

- Pillar I: Legal, Regulatory and Policy Framework (3 indicators, 18 sub-indicators)
- Pillar II: Institutional Framework and Management Capacity (5 indicators, 14 sub-indicators)
- Pillar III: Procurement Operations and Market Practices (2 indicators, 6 sub-indicators)
- Pillar IV: Accountability, Integrity and Transparency (4 indicators, 17 sub-indicators).

4. Application method

Self-assessment or by any external entity.

Methodology

5. Methodology

The public procurement system is assessed using the following three-step approach:

1. Review of the system, applying assessment criteria expressed in qualitative terms – review of the existing regulatory and policy framework, as well as institutional and operational arrangements, to determine whether the prescribed standard has been attained.
2. Review of the system, applying a defined set of quantitative indicators – focuses on the application of a (minimum) set of 15 quantitative indicators related to the prevailing procurement practices in the country. Additional indicators are available and may be used as appropriate. Each indicator is measured against specific principles. The baseline data, drawn from the quantitative indicators from the assessment, is used to identify strengths and gaps. Quantitative indicators are not benchmarked against set standards but can be used by the country to define baselines, set national targets, and measure progress over time.
3. Identification of substantive or material gaps (gap analysis) – if the system is not meeting the stated criteria, if an essential indicator is missing, and if procurement practices differ from the regulatory framework, such gaps are labeled substantive and can be addressed to improve the quality and performance of the system. Red flags are assigned to highlight any element that can impede the achievement of public procurement goals but that cannot be mitigated directly or indirectly (e.g., conflicting national laws or international agreements, political economy).

As applicable, recommendations are provided for a prioritized reform strategy intended to address any weaknesses identified.

6. Benchmarking system

Benchmarking system (based on international good practice) with narrative evaluation. Scoring has been removed from the revised MAPS (2018) as the tool is not to be used to compare countries, but rather to guide procurement reforms in a country.

7. Linkage to PEFA framework

All quantitative indicators have been aligned with procurement data required in PEFA assessments (PEFA performance indicator on procurement [PI-24]) for consistency in assessments and policy formulation. Some sub-indicators have references to other PEFA performance indicators such as performance information for service delivery (PI-8), internal control on non-salary expenditure (PI-25), internal audit (PI-26), external audit (PI-30), and legislative scrutiny of audit reports (PI-31).

8. Complementarity with PEFA framework

MAPS assessment provides a more detailed and in-depth analysis of a country's procurement systems.



Development and use

9. Development and coordination

MAPS was developed in 2003/2004 by a joint initiative of the World Bank (WB) and the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) to assess and improve public procurement systems in developing countries by providing a common tool to analyze information on key aspects of any procurement system. It is born out of international high-level commitments by the donors to use country procurement systems more frequently.

A revision was carried out between 2015 and 2018 with emphasis on value for money, transparency, fairness, and good governance. This revision aimed to make MAPS universally applicable (compared with developing countries of 2003/04 MAPS). The revised methodology was refined after testing in countries at different development levels. Contextual elements (national policy objectives, support for private sector, civil service reform, etc.) have been integrated to ensure that the application of MAPS contributes to achieving effectiveness. The revised MAPS draws heavily from Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); Recommendation of the Council on Public Procurement – OECD (2015); UNCITRAL Model Law on Public Procurement (2011); EU Directives on Public Procurement (2014); and the procurement frameworks used by multilateral development banks, countries, and implementing institutions. MAPS had a public consultation at the end of its last update.

Six supplementary modules are being added to the revised MAPS (e-procurement, procuring entities, professionalization, public-private partnerships and concessions, sector markets, and sustainable public procurement). In carrying out assessments, the MAPS Secretariat coordinates with stakeholders based on country context, wherever applicable.

10. Assessment management

Before the assessment is carried out, the scope, time, assessment team, stakeholders, and data collection mechanisms are defined. MAPS can be applied using the core methodology and/or the supplementary modules, depending on the requirements. Peer reviews as part of quality assurance should also be defined prior to the assessment process. A MAPS Assessment Steering Committee is recommended to be set up to foster cross-departmental cooperation and to demonstrate commitment by the government. The MAPS Secretariat can provide training to the assessors to enhance their understanding of the tool and its recommended usage.

Assessors gather information through reports from international agencies, statistics from the government, previous studies, and interviews with relevant stakeholders. Certain indicators that cannot be assessed through documentary evidence require surveys/interviews with stakeholders and participants in public procurement. List of resources to be consulted are detailed in the user guide. MAPS assessors can rely on several sources to substantiate their assessment, such as the Government at a Glance (OECD), Country Classifications (WB and others), the Corruption Perception Index (Transparency International), the Global Competitiveness Report (World Economic Forum), the Human Development Index (UN), and databases on international memberships and treaties such as the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) and the Agreement on Government Procurement (GPA from the WTO), among others.

A robust quality-assurance approach involves a review of compliance with the assessment process and compliance of the assessment report with the MAPS methodology, and the quality review of assessment results by the MAPS Secretariat and a designated MAPS Technical Advisory Group. The MAPS Secretariat will review every MAPS assessment, and if it has been carried out correctly, the Secretariat will issue certification that the assessment meets the specified quality standards.

A validation exercise with the stakeholders may be conducted to agree on the findings of the assessment, according to the agreement at the time of planning the assessment.



11. Uses by the government and members of the PFM community

Governments use MAPS to assess the value for money, transparency, fairness, and good governance of public procurement systems. Based on the strengths and gaps identified, the governments develop strategies and implement procurement reforms. Development partners (e.g., WB, GIZ, IDB, AfDB, AFD, USAID, and the Caribbean Development Bank) use MAPS at the time of planning interventions to assess the maturity of procurement systems in a country.

12. Sequencing with other tools

MAPS is an important input for assessments such as Governance Risk Assessment (Co7) and Country/Sector Procurement Risk Assessment (Co8). It is also advisable to conduct MAPS assessment after completing a broad-based PFM assessment to drill down on the procurement function.

13. PFM capacity building

MAPS Pillar II focuses on the capacity of the officials involved in public procurement. Recommendations from the assessment can be used as input for capacity development interventions, where applicable.

14. Tracking of changes and frequency of assessments

MAPS allows countries to draw baselines and targets. Progress made between assessments can be tracked against these baselines. A full update of a MAPS assessment should be performed whenever major changes in legislation occur or whenever other substantive elements of the system change and/or affect the system performance. OECD recommends periodic evaluation as it identifies the MAPS framework as not just a diagnostic tool but a reform tool.

15. Resource requirements

Time and resource requirements for the assessment depend on the evolution and maturity of the country and scope of the assessment (all modules vs. specific modules), stakeholder coordination, buy-in/willingness of the country, and data availability or access to information. Average time for each MAPS assessment would be around six to nine months.

Transparency



16. Access to methodology

Methodology is [available](#).

17. Access to assessment results

Some MAPS assessments are publicly [available](#). Earlier assessments are not yet available on the website. However, some recent reports based on the revised MAPS framework are published and the new MAPS Secretariat will populate the website with the assessments that it approves.