CHAPTER 18

PROCUREMENT, PURCHASING, AND STRATEGIC SOURCING

Sixbert SANGWA

African Leadership University | Kigali, Rwanda | ssangwa@alueducation.com

PARENT BOOK

The Business Enterprise: Core Functions, Integrated Management, and Emerging Transformations

https://doi.org/10.65655/ocp.m30

VOLUME EDITOR AND PUBLISHER

Prof. Dr. Placide MUTABAZI

Open Christian Press, A publishing imprint of the Open Christian University and the Center for Faith and Work

CHAPTER DOI

10.65655/ocp.m30.c127

COPYRIGHT AND STATUS

© 2026 Sixbert SANGWA | CC BY 4.0

ABSTRACT

Procurement determines how an enterprise converts a need into an accountable commitment to external resources, capabilities and relationships. Its performance cannot be established from a purchase-price discount or tender-compliance checklist alone: specifications shape competition, supplier selection affects operational continuity, contracts allocate uncertainty, and payment practices redistribute risk. This chapter develops a critical, practically detailed account of purchasing, procurement governance and strategic sourcing across twelve approved domains. It compares transaction-cost economics, purchasing-portfolio analysis, agency theory, the relational view and responsible-sourcing scholarship, distinguishing explanatory mechanisms from normative requirements and conditional empirical results. A transparent targeted synthesis combines original academic contributions with Rwanda's public-procurement legislation, procurement-authority guidance, 2024 enterprise evidence and international procurement standards current to 2 November 2026. A constructed Rwandan institutional tender supplies auditable demand, total-cost, evaluation, conflict-of-interest and sensitivity calculations; its figures do not describe an actual award. A supplier-segmentation matrix, end-to-end decision map, request-for-proposal checklist, risk register and controlled evaluation scorecard translate theory into professional practice. Comparative discussion considers Rwanda's UMUCYO architecture alongside the World Bank's risk-based project-procurement framework and OECD competition principles. The central argument is that procurement creates durable value only when legitimate needs, credible market access, technically valid comparison, enforceable relationships, proportionate controls, human-rights considerations and supply resilience are jointly governed. This integrated account is conceptual and pedagogical, not a validated causal model.

Keywords: procurement governance; strategic sourcing; category management; total cost of ownership; supplier evaluation; competitive tendering; contract management; procurement integrity; responsible sourcing; Rwanda.

LEARNING OUTCOMES AND CONCEPTUAL ROADMAP

On completing the chapter, readers should be able to demonstrate the following assessable competencies. The learning outcomes build from conceptual distinction to critical procurement evaluation and auditable professional judgment.

Outcome	Demonstrable capability
LO1	Distinguish procurement, purchasing, strategic sourcing, category management and contract management; reconstruct requisition-to-pay controls.
LO2	Evaluate demand and supplier expenditure, identifying category, specification, data-quality and consolidation risks.
LO3	Defend make-or-buy and supplier-market decisions using capabilities, transaction costs, lifecycle economics and resilience.
LO4	Design transparent eligibility, supplier assessment and tender procedures with controls against conflicts and collusion.
LO5	Calculate and test vendor scores, lifecycle costs and operational performance under stated assumptions.
LO6	Interpret Rwandan procurement law and institutions, distinguishing international guidance from binding domestic obligations.
LO7	Critically evaluate digital and AI-assisted procurement, labor and environmental due diligence, and supplier development.
LO8	Prepare a defensible procurement decision memorandum connecting economic value, legality, fairness, risk and remedies.

The argument begins with the governance of external acquisition (18.0–18.1), develops demand intelligence and the economic boundaries of sourcing (18.2–18.3), interprets supply markets and choice (18.4–18.5), and examines competition and exchange governance (18.6–18.7). Controls, public procurement, digital systems, responsibility and resilience then qualify what counts as success (18.8–18.12). A substantial Rwandan teaching case, international comparison, integrative propositions, glossary, assessment apparatus and full references conclude the discussion. This chapter develops the operational requirements established in Chapter 17 and the commercial commitments of Chapter 16; downstream physical logistics, warehouse operations and inventory rules belong principally to Chapter 19, detailed quality management to Chapter 20, project contracting to Chapter 21, costing to Chapter 23 and statutory taxation and audit to Chapter 26.

18.0 INTRODUCTION: BUYING WELL IS NOT SIMPLY BUYING CHEAPLY

A hypothetical Rwandan educational institution is preparing to acquire fifty classroom computers, installation and three years of support. The finance officer requests the lowest quotation, teachers require accessible software and reliable devices, the information-technology unit anticipates cybersecurity and maintenance risks, and the procurement committee must preserve fair competition. One offer is materially cheaper but omits service coverage outside Kigali; another provides strong warranties but creates dependence on proprietary components. If the institution awards on price alone, it may acquire equipment that fails its educational purpose. If it awards solely on an attractive technical narrative, it may spend public or charitable resources without a contestable justification. The relevant decision is the choice of a defensible configuration of requirements, suppliers, contractual protection and implementation evidence. The example is constructed and is not an account of a real procurement.

Procurement is the governed process of identifying organizational needs, obtaining external goods, services or works, selecting and contracting with providers, confirming performance, making payment and evaluating resulting value. Purchasing refers more narrowly to the operational activities of ordering, receiving, paying and administering transactions. Strategic sourcing evaluates supply markets, alternative supplier configurations, contractual arrangements and long-term capabilities for significant categories of external expenditure. These distinctions matter because the person who processes an invoice should not be assumed to possess authority to rewrite a product specification, declare a bid compliant or waive a contract penalty.

Procurement is an enterprise system of decisions and accountability, not the property of a single office (Monczka et al., 2020; Kraljic, 1983).

Three tensions shape its theory and practice. Economically, buyer organizations seek favorable cost, quality and availability in markets characterized by search costs, asymmetric information and sometimes concentrated supply. Institutionally, they exercise delegated purchasing power that can produce favoritism, corruption and exclusion unless constrained by transparent roles, review and remedy. Normatively, procurement can produce attractive accounts for the buyer by transferring excessive burdens to poorly paid workers, small suppliers or communities. A defensible account must retain these distinct dimensions: efficiency does not prove integrity, procedural compliance does not prove value, and a morally ambitious sourcing policy does not prove that a supplier can perform (Coase, 1937; Jensen & Meckling, 1976; OECD, 2015, 2023).

18.0.1 Scholarly method, source-selection protocol and inferential limits

The chapter is a critical, purposive secondary-source synthesis, not a registered systematic review, meta-analysis, primary enterprise investigation or legal opinion. The source strategy deliberately contrasts original work on transactions, agency, portfolio choices and interfirm relations with empirical research on supplier development, disruption and environmental assessment, and with normative and binding documents issued by institutions. Targeted verification on 2 November 2026 covered source titles and DOIs at journal and publisher records; Rwanda's Law No. 031/2022, Ministerial Order No. 001/23/10/TC, RPPA guidance, the 2024 sustainable public procurement policy and 2026 parliamentary communications; and OECD, ISO, ILO, NIST and World Bank primary materials. Search terms included 'purchasing portfolio Kraljic measurement', 'supplier development social capital performance', 'upstream supply disruption complexity', 'Rwanda UMUCYO procurement law 031/2022', 'bid rigging procurement OECD 2025', 'sustainable procurement ISO 20400' and 'AI procurement risk'. The selection privileges explanatory distinctiveness, institutional authority, identifiable bibliographic metadata and relevance to the approved chapter architecture, not presumed exhaustiveness.

An official national survey can describe the distribution of enterprises in its declared statistical frame but cannot establish the performance of an unnamed bidder. An enacted law has legal authority within its defined scope; a government policy, standard or OECD recommendation has a different normative status. Peer-reviewed associations and case studies identify contingent mechanisms, not guaranteed returns from a managerial intervention. All bid figures, supplier scores and savings reported in the teaching case are constructed, and their arithmetic can be reproduced from disclosed assumptions. Claims about particular tenders, irregularities or legal sanctions are not inferred from generic risk indicators. The treatment of procurement legislation is an orientation subject to the authoritative text, subsequent amendments and procuring-entity legal review.

18.0.2 A conceptual synthesis: the warranted-acquisition principle

The proposed organizing principle is *warranted acquisition*: a purchase is defensible when an identifiable and legitimate need has been translated into a proportionate specification, a contestable market decision, a justified full-cost commitment, an enforceable delivery arrangement and preserved evidence of actual performance and remedy. The sequence is recursive rather than mechanically linear. Supplier dialogue can reveal a better technical specification; contract experience can revise demand; an integrity red flag can suspend an apparently attractive evaluation. This synthesis integrates established scholarship rather than asserting the discovery of a new empirical law. Its usefulness lies in asking, at each gate, who makes the decision, which evidence warrants it, whose interests are exposed and what would trigger correction.

The principle does not infer that procedures are valuable solely because they are documented. A complete audit trail may preserve a defective specification, and a technically excellent purchase may lack legitimate authorization. Warrant is therefore relational: justification must connect the object acquired with the organizational end it actually serves, the opportunity cost of public or private resources, the evidentiary basis for distinguishing offers, and the foreseeable effects on persons not represented in the contract. This structure places procurement between instrumental rationality, which compares means, and institutional legitimacy, which disciplines the ends and authority of organizational action (Coase, 1937; OECD, 2015).

For application, the procurement dossier should identify five distinct assertions: the requirement is necessary; the market test is fair and sufficiently informative; the choice is economically warranted within the disclosed method; the contract can be delivered and monitored; and affected parties have meaningful opportunities for review and correction. Their evidence differs. Requiring a single score to represent all five would substitute numerical convenience for sound professional judgment.

18.1 PROCUREMENT AND PURCHASING DEFINITIONS

18.1.1 The requisition-to-pay architecture and its decision gates

A standard requisition-to-pay sequence begins when an authorized user documents the needed outcome, quantity, expected consumption period, budget and permissible substitutes. Procurement validates the requirement and market approach; the competent official or committee approves sourcing; bids or quotations are solicited and assessed; contract or purchase order obligations are recorded; the receiving authority independently confirms the goods or service; accounts payable checks the relevant evidence; payment is approved; and performance information returns to the next planning cycle. Different institutions combine or separate these stages, but each transition should establish authority, evidence and a traceable decision. The process is often called procure-to-pay when it includes the ordering-to-payment system, while source-to-contract more specifically refers to upstream market engagement and contract formation (Monczka et al., 2020).

A requisition is not an order and an order is not proof of receipt. A purchase order expresses an authorized commitment under agreed terms; a delivery note is a claim of delivery; acceptance establishes that defined requirements were met, usually subject to warranties and later remedies; an invoice states the supplier's payment claim. A three-way match compares purchase order, receipt and invoice, with documented treatment of tolerances and exceptions. For services, the equivalent evidence may include an approved timesheet, milestone report, user acceptance test or quality assurance certificate. Paying solely because an invoice exists makes an enterprise vulnerable to fictitious services, duplicate invoices and unauthorized changes.

Figure 18.1. Controlled procurement decision and evidence flow



Note. Original conceptual synthesis informed by procurement process scholarship and COSO's internal-control approach (Monczka et al., 2020; COSO, 2013). Arrows are sequential within each transaction, while performance feedback can reopen earlier gates.

18.1.2 Procurement governance, authority and accountability

Governance establishes the goals, policies, delegations, challenge rights and records through which procurement power is exercised. The requesting function owns the business need, specialists define safety and technical requirements, procurement designs and administers the competition, finance checks funding and full cost, legal counsel reviews contractual exposure, and receiving staff verify delivery. The board or accountable head sets tolerances for high-value or high-risk commitments and investigates exceptions. A small enterprise may lack separate departments, but can still use an independent second approver, periodic owner review and supplier confirmation to avoid complete self-certification.

The economic and legal validity of a purchase can be undermined by weak decision rights. An engineer who specifies a unique compatible component without disclosing a financial interest can turn technical expertise into supplier favoritism. Conversely, an official who forbids all supplier interaction in the name of integrity may produce a specification that excludes genuine alternatives or cannot be fulfilled. The better institutional approach permits documented, equal-access clarification and market research before the tender, while separating legitimate information gathering from unequal disclosure of confidential evaluation plans. Agency theory explains the conflict between entrusted powers and personal incentives, but may understate professional norms and the capacity of relational trust to support responsible conduct (Jensen & Meckling, 1976; OECD, 2015).

18.1.3 Procurement objectives and trade-offs

Traditional procurement has been judged by the familiar 'right' item, quantity, condition, source, time and price. These are useful operational criteria but incomplete when carbon emissions, labor abuses, cyber exposures or supplier insolvency are material. An enterprise needs a hierarchy of constraints rather than assuming all goals can be compensated through an averaged score. Legal eligibility, safety and minimum functional capability should normally operate as non-negotiable gates. Among qualified alternatives, economic contribution, service continuity, delivery, innovation and life-cycle impacts can be evaluated through transparent weights, sensitivity tests and explicit managerial judgment. This distinction between eligibility and ranking prevents a cheap but unlawful bid from 'winning' by numerical compensation.

The trade-offs are not symmetrical. A buyer can legitimately sacrifice a small price advantage for verified warranty coverage or improved repairability, but cannot ordinarily trade away an essential safety standard merely because the offered discount is large. Equally, a locally preferred supplier should not be described as more resilient without investigating its upstream dependency, financial capacity and enforceable delivery arrangements. A procurement strategy should therefore distinguish hard constraints, continuously valued attributes and residual uncertainties that require informed decision rather than arbitrary weighting.

Organizational objectives also vary by financing and mission. A cooperative may prioritize member access and long-run local capability, a hospital may treat continuity of critical supplies as a stringent service requirement, and a manufacturing company may rank downtime exposure above unit-price variation. These differences do not excuse undisclosed post hoc criteria. Instead, they require a legitimate authority to establish material priorities at the planning stage, explain their connection with the enterprise purpose and preserve evidence for later revision.

18.2 SPEND AND DEMAND ANALYSIS

18.2.1 Spend visibility, taxonomy and source-data reliability

Spend analysis reconstructs what an organization bought, from whom, for which cost centers, at what contracted and paid prices, over which period and against which internal and supplier identifiers. Its

evidentiary unit is usually the invoice line or purchase-order line, not merely a general-ledger total. Common sources include enterprise resource planning systems, purchase orders, invoices, expense claims, payment files, corporate cards and contract registers. Cleaning is necessary because the same supplier may appear under multiple trading names, different suppliers may share an agent, taxes may be inconsistently included, and identical product categories may be coded differently. Missing records are themselves an analytical finding, not a reason to fabricate completeness.

A useful classification distinguishes direct inputs incorporated into offerings, indirect operating purchases, capital equipment, services and public works. Category hierarchies must be stable enough to reveal aggregation but specific enough to preserve technical requirements. For example, combining laboratory reagents, drinking water and software under 'general supplies' hides wildly different risk profiles. A repeatable spend cube connects category, supplier, business unit, period, currency and geographic origin. Procurement should document classification rules, currency-conversion date, returns, rebates and whether expenditure represents commitments or cash payments. Identical currency totals do not imply comparable purchasing power or equivalent service levels.

18.2.2 Pareto diagnostics, leakage and demand consolidation

ABC analysis ranks categories or suppliers by expenditure. The 80/20 heuristic can direct attention to high-spend categories, but its ratio is not an empirically guaranteed distribution and should never define the sole risk threshold. A low-spend chemical, unique equipment seal or security-system component can halt a high-value operation. Procurement therefore overlays expenditure with criticality, substitutability, lead time and consequences of failure. Contract leakage is expenditure made outside valid negotiated arrangements or without approved authority; it is not automatically recoverable 'savings', because purchases may respond to shortages or an unsuitable contract specification.

Demand aggregation can secure economies of scale, reduce duplicated tender work and improve data consistency. However, consolidated awards may exclude capable microenterprises unable to finance national coverage or absorb delayed payments. The appropriate response may be lots, framework agreements, regional delivery schedules, consortium participation or supplier-development measures, provided these are consistent with applicable law and competition rules. The economic trade-off is between scale benefits and the costs of supplier concentration, inventory, financing and exclusion. The specification process should record current consumption, avoidable usage, seasonality, substitutions, disposal and service-demand changes before volumes are locked into a contract.

Table 18.1. Spend-intelligence diagnostic for a procurement category

Test	Evidence required	Failure risk	Appropriate action
Identity and completeness	Invoice lines reconciled to ledger and vendors	Duplicate or missing supplier spend	Normalize vendor IDs and reconcile totals
Demand legitimacy	Forecast, historic use, user justification	Overbuying or artificial demand	Test volumes, alternatives and demand reduction
Contract compliance	Contract ID, rate, term and change approvals	Uncontrolled leakage and unauthorized variation	Verify root causes; correct contract or conduct
Supply exposure	Lead times, alternatives, origin, financial health	Single-source interruption	Qualify contingencies, avoid automatic consolidation
Social and ecological impact	Risk-screened source, credible evidence	Low-priced harm externalized to others	Apply proportionate due diligence and remediation

Note. Original diagnostic instrument; analytical concepts are drawn from category management, transaction-cost and responsible-business scholarship (Kraljic, 1983; Williamson, 1985; OECD, 2023).

18.2.3 Strategic category management

Category management treats families of requirements as linked decisions with shared market knowledge, rather than isolated requisitions. The category manager maintains a demand forecast, stakeholder map, sourcing objectives, contracts, market intelligence, renewal calendar, supplier development plan and risk indicators. IT equipment may require cybersecurity assurance, spare parts and software support; energy acquisition may require tariff and emissions analysis; outsourced cleaning needs workforce-safety and wage safeguards. Category decisions are best revisited at meaningful triggers, such as changing technology, recurrent exceptions, new suppliers or an altered user need, rather than only upon contract expiry.

The category plan should be analytically explicit about both the purchasing unit and the demand-generating activity. A higher classroom-computer budget, for example, may reflect increased enrolment, replacement of unusable units, more stringent accessibility requirements or avoidable duplication. Treating all four as an identical purchasing trend obscures the mechanism that managers should address. A defensible plan distinguishes the baseline quantity from its causal drivers, checks whether a substitute or repair achieves the required learning outcome, and records the opportunity cost of acquiring new assets.

Category governance also requires a periodic review of bargaining and dependency. Procurement may identify the supplier and market structure, but finance must verify payment capability, the technical unit must determine acceptable substitutes, and end users must validate the functional need. Where these interests conflict, the decision record should identify the authorized trade-off and its testable conditions. A category strategy is therefore a governed hypothesis about how a class of external resources will sustain organizational capability, not simply a list of preferred vendors.

18.3 MAKE-OR-BUY AND SOURCING DECISIONS

18.3.1 Transaction costs and organizational boundaries

Coase (1937) asked why activity is organized through firms when markets can coordinate by prices. Williamson (1985) subsequently emphasized uncertainty, bounded rationality, opportunism, asset specificity and transaction frequency as determinants of governance. Applied to procurement, the central question is not whether an external supplier quotes less than internal production cost, but whether contracting, monitoring, adaptation, switching and potential hold-up are cheaper or more capable than coordinated internal provision. A buyer may outsource routine facilities maintenance while retaining control of proprietary calibration because a failure would compromise core knowledge. Yet integration can create bureaucratic inefficiency, obsolete competencies or a lack of competitive comparison.

Transaction-cost analysis is most useful when a category entails specific investment. If a supplier installs dedicated tooling usable only for one buyer, the relationship can create quasi-rents and renegotiation exposure. Safeguards include credible minimum-volume commitments, shared investment clauses, termination compensation and alternative qualification. Treating every risk as evidence for insourcing would be mistaken: the buyer may not possess the expertise, capital or scale to perform the activity safely. The relational view instead identifies gains created between firms through complementary capabilities, relation-specific assets, joint learning and governance (Dyer & Singh, 1998). These explanations conflict where intensive collaboration enhances value but increases dependency; the managerial task is to govern that contradiction rather than declare one theory universally superior.

18.3.2 Resource and capability logic

Make-or-buy analysis must ask which capabilities are strategically valuable, hard to imitate, safety critical or necessary for retaining decision autonomy. Outsourcing cafeteria operations may be sensible for a university; outsourcing the entire capacity to verify academic accessibility and software-security compliance is more questionable if the institution loses the ability to challenge its contractor. Conversely, a small manufacturer with irregular equipment failure may obtain higher reliability from a specialist repair provider than from an expensive in-house department. Capability retention can be modular: retain requirements definition, risk ownership and acceptance, while contracting specialist implementation. This approach preserves informed buyer control without assuming that every technical activity should be performed internally.

The analytical unit is the capability system rather than the invoice item. A university purchasing a cloud service may outsource hosting, routine upgrades and monitoring while remaining responsible for data classification, educational accessibility and the lawful interpretation of assessment records. If it loses the competence to challenge service reports or plan a secure exit, an initially economical contract can convert operational savings into long-term dependence. The retained capability to specify, verify and switch is itself part of the sourcing cost.

An adequate make-or-buy comparison therefore includes at least an internal-performance counterfactual, a credible external-market option, transition and governance expenditures, and the consequences of failure under plausible stresses. This need not imply elaborate numerical models where data are scarce. Clear qualitative thresholds concerning safety, confidentiality, specialist competence and strategic autonomy can be more defensible than assigning invented probabilities to events that have not been estimated. Resource-based reasoning and transaction-cost analysis are most useful when tested against one another, because a valuable internal capability may also be costly to maintain (Williamson, 1985; Dyer & Singh, 1998).

18.3.3 Total cost of ownership and discounted lifecycle valuation

Total cost of ownership (TCO) includes acquisition expenditure and material costs of searching, contracting, transporting, installing, operating, maintaining, financing, downtime, returning and disposing of an offering, net of any defensibly recoverable residual value. The relevant boundary must be declared. An annual service contract may include reliability guarantees, while an equipment price may exclude power, licensing and repairs. Discounting is appropriate when alternatives distribute cash flows differently over time; financing and tax treatment require care to avoid double counting. For constant annual operating cost C, initial price P, residual value R in year n and discount rate r, a simplified present-cost model is: $PV(TCO) = P + \Sigma_{t=1}^{n} [C_t/(1+r)^t] - R/(1+r)^n$. This is a decision model, not a standardized accounting number. When externality prices are unknown or ethically unacceptable as monetary substitutes, assess these impacts separately rather than inventing false precision.

An illustrative procurement compares machine A, purchase price RWF 18 million and annual maintenance and electricity of RWF 3 million, with machine B at RWF 21 million and annual costs of RWF 2 million. Assume a three-year life, zero salvage, identical outputs, risk and quality, end-year cash flows, and 10% discount rate. The annuity factor is $1/1.1 + 1/1.1^2 + 1/1.1^3 = 2.48685$. Present costs are $18 + 3(2.48685) =$ RWF 25.461 million for A and $21 + 2(2.48685) =$ RWF 25.974 million for B. Machine A is less costly by about RWF 0.513 million under these restricted assumptions, despite the higher recurring expenditure. If B prevents downtime worth more than RWF 0.513 million in present value, the comparison reverses. The analysis therefore requires verified operational assumptions and a scenario analysis, not simply a life-cycle arithmetic ranking.

18.3.4 Outsourcing hazards and governance design

Outsourcing contracts create exposure to hidden subcontracting, confidentiality breaches, unequal bargaining power, staff displacement, supplier lock-in, service deterioration and inadequate exit plans. Public value-for-

money considerations may also make contract flexibility and audit access necessary even when private bargaining would favor confidentiality. Procurement should specify service outcomes, continuity duties, subcontractor oversight, intellectual-property and data access, orderly handover, dispute resolution, termination rights and responsibility for regulatory obligations. It should not prescribe detailed operational methods unnecessarily where supplier innovation can meet performance outcomes more effectively. The proportionate governance choice balances verification against the costs of intrusive monitoring.

The governance design should also distinguish subcontracting arrangements that are economically essential from unauthorized transfers of responsibility. In a maintenance contract, an accredited external specialist may provide capabilities that the prime supplier lacks. The relevant question is whether the buyer knows the responsible party, controls site and data access, verifies qualifications and retains recourse if performance fails. Prohibiting all subcontracting can reduce competition, whereas allowing an unrestricted chain of intermediaries can make warranty, labor and information-security obligations practically unenforceable.

Exit conditions deserve the same care as entry. Contract managers should identify the records, spare parts, documentation, access credentials and residual intellectual-property rights needed to transition without interrupting core services. They should also verify whether suppliers have enough time and working capital to meet agreed milestones. A contract that appears to transfer every risk to a financially weak supplier may increase the buyer's actual probability of failure. The distinction between legal wording and workable capability is central to responsible outsourcing.

18.4 SUPPLY MARKET ANALYSIS

18.4.1 Market structure, supplier concentration and information asymmetry

Supply markets differ in the number and independence of capable suppliers, entry barriers, input scarcity, geographic exposure, product standardization, switching cost, currency sensitivity and innovation. A tender with five submissions may still represent only one economic source when bidders rely on the same exclusive importer. Counting legal bidders is therefore insufficient. Procurement must identify upstream producers and authorized distributors where material, examine whether genuine alternatives exist, assess capacity and financial durability, and avoid making unsubstantiated claims about competition. Industrial-organization reasoning can clarify market power, but actual price competitiveness must be established from contestable quotations or credible benchmarks, not from market labels alone.

Information asymmetry operates in both directions. Buyers cannot fully observe quality, compliance or financial distress before award; suppliers may not know a buyer's true specifications or payment reliability. Effective market sounding reduces these gaps through publicly documented questions, demonstrations, transparent technical testing and reasonable information disclosure. Confidential information provided by one bidder should not be shared improperly, but clarification affecting common requirements should reach competitors on equivalent terms. Early engagement can improve specifications while creating bias if the incumbent effectively authors requirements that no rival can satisfy.

18.4.2 Purchasing portfolios and their limits

Kraljic (1983) organized purchasing categories by supply risk and profit impact. In the traditional two-by-two matrix, routine items warrant efficient transaction control; leverage items permit competitive aggregation where genuine alternatives exist; bottleneck items require continuity protection despite limited expenditure; and strategic items call for intensive market intelligence and relationship governance. The matrix is a starting hypothesis, not a universal rule. A category's position can change with technology, border restrictions, supplier investment or product redesign. Gelderman and van Weele (2003) documented persistent measurement and

strategy problems, reminding analysts that seemingly objective risk-impact scores depend on chosen definitions and managerial judgment.

Table 18.2. Conditional sourcing logic from the purchasing portfolio

Category	Typical condition	Primary managerial question	Suitable response and caution
Routine	Low supply risk; modest value	Can transactions be simplified safely?	Catalogues or frameworks; retain controls against small repeated fraud
Leverage	Competitive suppliers; significant expenditure	Are bids genuinely substitutable?	Competitive sourcing and demand leverage; avoid destructive supplier pricing
Bottleneck	Restricted availability; limited expenditure	What would interruption cost?	Substitution engineering, qualified buffer or alternative; avoid complacency
Strategic	High impact and supply risk	Which combination sustains performance and autonomy?	Joint planning, safeguards and dual-source feasibility; monitor dependence

Note. Conceptual adaptation of Kraljic (1983) with measurement qualifications from Gelderman and van Weele (2003). Category positions must be justified from current evidence.

18.4.3 Market mapping in Rwanda and comparable African environments

Rwanda's official Integrated Business Enterprise Survey estimates 278,060 business enterprises for 2024 and reports that 241,354 (86.8%) as informal enterprises and 36,706 (13.2%) as formal enterprises, within the survey's non-agricultural scope and official classification (National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda [NISR], 2025). These facts do not identify procurement-ready suppliers or prove that informal firms are unreliable. They do caution against systems that equate competence with possession of sophisticated digital records or historic contracts. Where the applicable legal regime permits, better market access may involve proportionate qualification, fair payment terms, multilingual information, supplier training, subdivision into functional lots and verifiable rather than merely voluminous documentation. In safety-critical procurement, reduced paperwork must not mean reduced proof of product safety.

Geography and regional integration introduce further distinctions. A distributor located in Kigali may be commercially responsive but import nearly all upstream components; an apparently regional alternative may face common border, foreign-exchange or manufacturer dependence. Supplier mapping should therefore distinguish the first contractual tier from the actual origin of critical inputs. Regional sourcing can increase options but introduces customs, standards recognition, payment, warranty and enforcement questions. These interfaces belong analytically to the sourcing decision here, while detailed border-logistics instruments are developed in Chapters 19 and 30.

The underlying IBES report identifies the 2024 enterprise frame as non-agricultural economic activities classified in ISIC sections B–S, excluding agriculture and certain public-administration or extraterritorial activities. Its formal/informal definition is not equivalent to a tendering register or a census of all potential suppliers. The report also identifies manufacturing capacity underutilization as a material issue, reinforcing the possibility that purchasing, specification and demand failures interact with productive resources rather than sitting in a separate administrative function (NISR, 2025). Inferences about how many enterprises could meet a particular tender require procurement-category and eligibility evidence beyond national firm counts.

18.5 SUPPLIER EVALUATION AND SELECTION

18.5.1 Eligibility, qualification and comparative evaluation

Supplier selection is a constrained multi-criteria decision rather than an unqualified ranking of attractive proposals. Eligibility establishes whether participation meets relevant legal, financial, licensing and conflict requirements; qualification asks whether a supplier has the personnel, competence, capacity, track record and controls to fulfil the defined requirement; technical responsiveness establishes whether the proposed offering meets mandatory specifications; and evaluation ranks technically compliant, eligible offers using the previously disclosed method. Combining all four in one discretionary score creates opportunities to rescue a preferred but ineligible bidder or invent criteria after bids are opened. For an innovative solution, an outcome-based specification may be more suitable than a brand-specific description, provided mandatory safety, interoperability and accessibility requirements remain explicit.

Qualitative evidence requires the same skepticism as price data. A 'years in business' requirement can privilege incumbency without establishing relevant capability, while a website assertion of sustainable practices does not demonstrate labor conditions in subcontracted workshops. Evidence can include accredited test results, demonstrations, audited financial information proportionate to the risk, references verified by authorized contact, sampled quality records, formal certification where justified, and site assessments conducted on the same terms. Prequalification can reduce later evaluation burden but may suppress competition if requirements are disproportionate. The highest-scoring proposal is never automatically the most defensible purchase unless the scoring model, eligibility gates and real operating assumptions themselves withstand scrutiny.

18.5.2 Weighted scoring and compensability

A weighted additive model records criterion weights w_j summing to 1 and bidder performance scores s_ij on a declared common scale: $S_i = \Sigma[j=1..m]\ w_j\ s_{ij}$. It is transparent and easily audited, but assumes that performance differences are commensurable and that strength on one criterion can compensate for weakness on another. That assumption is often indefensible for legal eligibility, cybersecurity, essential safety or absolute delivery deadlines; such criteria should first be defined as pass/fail gates. Weight assignment should be completed before submissions are opened, based on decision consequences and authorized stakeholder input. The scale must describe observable quality levels rather than invite unconstrained examiner impressions.

A second limitation concerns correlated criteria. Assigning separate weights to 'delivery reliability', 'lead-time consistency' and 'on-time delivery' may triple-count one capability. A third concerns normalization: converting bid prices to a zero-to-ten score with an undocumented formula can change awards when a new outlier bid is added. A fourth is robustness: a small change in weights or reasonable scoring may reverse a close ranking. Analytical hierarchy process (AHP) and outranking methods can articulate complex preferences, but more complicated mathematics do not remove invalid input data or delegated responsibility. Handfield et al. (2002) illustrate AHP in environmental supplier assessment; Schramm et al. (2020), in a review of 82 studies, identify the compensation effect as an important concern in multicriteria approaches. These methods can clarify trade-offs, but no mathematical procedure resolves arbitrary thresholds, biased inputs or inappropriate ethical substitution.

18.5.3 The value-versus-risk frontier

Selection should distinguish the lowest evaluated compliant price from the least expected total cost and from the highest defensible public or organizational value. In a routine standardized acquisition, competitive price may dominate after minimum capability is verified. In specialized software or maintenance, migration, failure

consequences and information security can outweigh initial discounts. When supplier performance is uncertain, expected cost can be expressed as bid price plus the probability-weighted cost of relevant failures, but probabilities must not be invented as empirical estimates. Scenario analysis is often preferable to pseudo-precise risk-adjusted scoring where the evidence is sparse. No mathematically appealing procurement solution is acceptable if it violates binding award rules or a previously disclosed evaluation method.

The frontier is especially important where outcomes are multidimensional and partly irreversible. An unsuitable medical device, compromised student-information system or hazardous chemical cannot be made safe by a lower evaluated price. The buyer should first establish the minimum performance envelope, then estimate the differential cost of alternatives that remain inside it. Where operational differences can be credibly monetized, discounted lifecycle comparisons help reveal whether an initial price premium prevents later expenditure. Where effects concern basic rights or uncertain severe harm, the appropriate response is an explicit constraint and mitigation requirement rather than a fictitious currency conversion.

Uncertainty should be addressed through thresholds and sensitivity. In a weighted decision, analysts can ask the magnitude of a legitimate pre-award weight or score difference that would reverse the supplier ordering, and whether the evidence supporting a leading score is reproducible. This identifies a decision that is robust to plausible differences in judgment as distinct from one that merely wins under a single arbitrary configuration. In public procurement, sensitivity analysis is a governance check on criteria design and reasoning; it is not permission to reweight after tender opening.

18.5.4 Contracting with supplier-development potential

An emerging supplier may not meet every desirable efficiency benchmark but can still supply reliably if development investments and risk controls are justified. Krause et al. (2007) relate supplier development, commitment, social capital and performance improvements, without proving that any single workshop universally raises quality. Buyer interventions can include shared quality planning, clearer specifications, forecast visibility, prompt payment and phased volume increases. These arrangements can strengthen local productive capacity, but buyers should avoid using supplier development as a pretext for undisclosed favorable treatment or indefinite dependence. Public awards must respect their governing competition and preference provisions; private procurement must preserve its own stated fairness and related-party constraints.

Supplier development presents a difficult distributive question. A powerful buyer may require expensive certification or technology investment while offering only short, unpredictable orders; the resulting costs are transferred to the supplier without a credible opportunity to recover them. A more defensible arrangement identifies the capability gap, agrees which party finances training or equipment, specifies milestones and verifies improvement through independent acceptance evidence. The programme should include a transparent exit path if objectives are not met and should not entrench a relationship whose performance remains inadequate.

In Rwanda, the relevance of this approach is conditioned by the large informal-enterprise segment documented by NISR (2025). Formal status is material where required by procurement and tax law, but absence of a sophisticated tender portfolio is not equivalent to absence of skill. The analytic objective is to identify lawful, proportionate methods for assessing actual competence. Public buyers must preserve the equal-treatment and preference provisions that apply to the particular tender; private buyers should prevent supplier assistance from becoming a disguised related-party transfer.

18.6 TENDERING AND COMPETITIVE PROCEDURES

18.6.1 Procurement planning and the request for proposal

A defensible tender starts well before publication. The accountable user certifies the need and funding; procurement documents market conditions, procurement method, package design, delivery milestones and evaluation methodology; technical officers approve performance specifications; and the competent approval authority authorizes solicitation. A request for proposal (RFP) should clearly state the buyer, purpose, scope, deliverables, implementation schedule, mandatory thresholds, required technical and financial submission formats, clarification procedure, questions deadline, evaluation weights or method, contract conditions, bid validity, submission rules, confidentiality expectations, treatment of variants and method for communicating the decision. In public procurement, exact requirements are determined by the current law, regulations and authorized standard documents, not by this generic educational checklist.

The specification should be neutral unless compatibility or another objectively justified condition requires restriction. A brand-specific request can impede competition, yet an artificially generic technical specification may produce unusable outcomes. Functional requirements should be testable, with measured dimensions, tolerances, cybersecurity obligations, service levels or acceptance tests as relevant. In consulting, a detailed terms of reference must define expected outputs, competence requirements, assumptions and evaluation of methodology without rewarding jargon. Good tender design prevents later disputes by making both offer preparation and decision review possible using the same published information.

Table 18.3. Request-for-proposal completeness and audit checklist

RFP control field	Minimum documentary evidence	Review question
Need and authority	Approved requisition, budget, named owner	Is the request necessary, authorized and sufficiently funded?
Scope and acceptance	Measurable deliverables, tests, locations and dates	Can all bidders understand and price the same outcome?
Market access	Notice or invitation, rational packaging, clarification channel	Are capable bidders treated on equivalent terms?
Qualification and thresholds	Proportionate eligibility, conflict, capacity and compliance tests	Are pass/fail conditions published and justified?
Evaluation procedure	Preapproved weights, scoring anchors and financial formula	Can an independent reviewer reproduce the award?
Contract and remedies	Draft terms, warranty, variation, payment, security and dispute path	Can the buyer enforce an acceptable result?
Data and ethical safeguards	Confidentiality, privacy, labor and environmental provisions	Are material harms addressed without empty declarations?
Records and challenge	Minutes, timestamps, decision notices, applicable review route	Will the decision remain accountable after the award?

Note. Original template informed by OECD (2015, 2025), World Bank (2025) and Rwanda Public Procurement Authority (RPPA, 2024) guidance. It must be adapted to the mandatory rules of each jurisdiction.

18.6.2 Bid receipt, opening, clarification and award

The fairness of a tender depends partly on the defensibility of its information architecture. Submission deadlines must be equal, bids protected against premature access, evaluator identities and conflict

declarations controlled, and clarifications logged. Clarification should resolve an ambiguity in an already submitted offer only to the extent legally permitted; it must not become unequal negotiation or an opportunity to replace a noncompliant bid after the deadline. Evaluation minutes should identify evidence, consensus or individual assessments, reasons for disqualification and treatment of arithmetic discrepancies. A recommendation is not an award until the authorized decision and any prescribed notifications, standstill, challenge or contract-formation steps are completed.

Competitive procedures are a means of discovering qualified alternatives and reducing discretionary favoritism; they are not an assurance of honest competition. The OECD (2025) identifies cover bidding, bid suppression, rotation and market allocation as forms of collusion. Warning signs include repeated winners despite apparently competitive tenders, unusual bid similarities or suspicious withdrawals. Such patterns warrant confidential preservation of evidence and referral through competent channels, not untrained public accusations against individual suppliers. Pro-competitive tender design should avoid predictable restrictions or unnecessary disclosures that facilitate coordination among bidders while preserving lawful transparency.

18.6.3 Procedure choice under differentiated requirements

Open competition generally provides broad market access when requirements can be sufficiently specified and suppliers can be compared. Restricted procedures can be reasonable for specialized markets where law permits and selection is justified. Requests for quotations can be proportionate for lower-value standardized goods; multi-stage negotiation or competitive dialogue may address complex solutions under appropriate rules. Single-source and emergency procedures can be necessary where continuity or exclusivity is genuine, but urgency created by avoidable poor planning should not automatically excuse noncompetition. The choice of method is itself a governance decision with a documented legal basis, market justification and reviewable record.

In publicly financed development projects, donor or treaty conditions can also govern. The World Bank's September 2025 seventh-edition *Procurement Regulations for IPF Borrowers* establishes an identifiable international framework for projects within its scope, emphasizing risk-proportionate market approaches and 'fit for purpose' procurement design (World Bank, 2025). These regulations do not override Rwandan domestic law for every purchase; their applicability depends on the financing arrangement and relevant legal instruments. The public procurement professional must therefore maintain a hierarchy of applicable requirements instead of copying an international template without checking the funding and jurisdiction.

18.7 CONTRACTING AND SUPPLIER RELATIONSHIPS

18.7.1 Contract architecture and allocation of risk

The contract translates a selection into enforceable promises. Its operative elements typically include parties and authority, statement of work, technical specifications, pricing and taxes, quantities, delivery or service milestones, inspection and acceptance, warranties, correction periods, service levels, payment, confidentiality, ownership of information and intellectual property, data handling, subcontracting conditions, performance security where justified, variation control, force majeure or other excusable events as defined by law, termination, dispute procedures and governing law. These terms need to be mutually coherent. A warranty with no accessible service provider, an uptime commitment with no measurement rule, or an unlimited 'penalty' without legal review may offer little usable protection.

Risk allocation should follow controllability and information, without treating the stronger party's bargaining power as moral entitlement. A supplier may reasonably control production quality but not a buyer's changing classroom schedule; the buyer may control site access but not a genuine upstream factory failure. Contracting cannot eliminate uncertainty, so the agreement should explain who must notify whom, what evidence is

required, which corrective alternatives are permissible and which losses or extensions are recognized. Procurement management must avoid both habitual adversarialism and uncritical partnership rhetoric. The former invites litigation, hidden contingencies and withheld information; the latter may mask underperformance and incumbent advantage (Williamson, 1985; Dyer & Singh, 1998).

18.7.2 Service-level agreements and measurable acceptance

A service-level agreement (SLA) specifies observable service dimensions, thresholds, measurement, review periods, exclusions, remedies and escalation. For a managed IT contract, availability must identify the measurement window, planned maintenance exclusion and source of monitoring evidence; '99% uptime' without a denominator is ambiguous. For school equipment, acceptance can test the required operating system, accessibility functionality, warranty documentation, network integration and safe installation. For cleaning, square meters serviced is not equivalent to hygiene quality; inspection protocols should distinguish visible completion from the substantive service outcome. Remedies must be proportionate and enforceable, and persistent failure should trigger root-cause review rather than automatic payment withholding without contractual authority.

Table 18.4. Contract-execution responsibility and evidence instrument

Contract event	Accountable role	Primary evidence	Escalation trigger
Mobilization	Contract manager	Signed contract, implementation schedule, security and contacts	Failure to mobilize by agreed date
Delivery or milestone	User or technical acceptance officer	Test result, inspection or approved deliverable	Material nonconformity or missed critical milestone
Variation	Authorized contract signatory	Written variation and budget justification	Scope, price or time changes beyond authority
Invoice and payment	Finance/payables reviewer	Invoice, PO or contract and acceptance record	Duplicate, mismatch or overdue justified payment
Supplier review	Procurement/category manager	Scorecard, incidents and corrective action	Repeated failure, dependency or safety incident
Closeout or exit	Contract manager and owner	Warranties, asset handover, final reconciliation and access revocation	Incomplete transition or unresolved liability

Note. Original practical instrument, drawing on transaction governance and internal-control principles (Williamson, 1985; COSO, 2013).

Measurement design can materially change the apparent quality of the same contract. Suppose a service platform is observed for a hypothetical 30-day period of 720 hours, of which 12 hours of scheduled maintenance are validly excluded by the contract. A 99.5% availability threshold then allows no more than $0.005 \times 708 = 3.54$ hours of qualifying downtime. If an operator excludes an additional eight hours without contractual authority, reported availability becomes artificially favorable. The denominator, event definitions and independent logging mechanism are therefore elements of the commercial bargain, not minor technical annexes.

Acceptance should also distinguish initial conformity from sustained performance. A device may pass installation testing but fail repeatedly after deployment; a short inspection is not proof that warranty promises have been fulfilled. The contract manager should specify evidence retention, incident categorization, cure

periods, user reporting and corrective action. For safety-critical requirements, escalation must allow timely containment even before financial responsibility is finally resolved.

18.7.3 Negotiation, influence and relational governance

Negotiation is most defensible when the buyer has already defined the economic and technical value of alternatives and knows which dimensions can legitimately change. Price should not be bargained independently of quality, risk, intellectual property, warranty, delivery, liquidity and the effect of payment terms on a supplier's working capital. In repetitive private-sector sourcing, joint forecasting and gain-sharing may create value beyond one-time discounts; in a regulated public tender, post-submission negotiation may be limited or prohibited except under designated procedures. The procurement team must therefore distinguish commercial possibilities from lawful discretion.

Relational governance develops through credible communication, reciprocal performance, fair handling of disputes and long-term learning. Dyer and Singh (1998) explain how knowledge-sharing routines and complementary assets may produce relationship-specific advantage. Yet relationship duration can also generate complacency, dependence and barriers to entry. The mature contract-management function maintains independent market intelligence, rotates evaluators where appropriate, reviews prices and alternatives against performance, and avoids equating longstanding familiarity with proven integrity. Supplier relationship management is thus a governed complement to competition, not an exemption from it.

18.8 PROCUREMENT PROCESS CONTROLS

18.8.1 Segregation of duties, approvals and exception governance

Procurement control is the design of reasonable assurance over authorization, recorded obligations, actual receipt, correct payment and compliant conduct. The Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO, 2013) integrated framework treats controls as an organization-wide system involving control environment, risk assessment, activities, information and monitoring. A purchasing control structure should prevent the same individual from independently inventing the need, selecting a supplier, confirming receipt and authorizing payment. Perfect separation is unrealistic in small entities, but a second-person review, bank verification, exception report and periodic independent reconciliation can meaningfully reduce exposure. Control intensity should reflect transaction size, complexity, irreversibility and fraud opportunity, rather than imposing one administrative burden on all purchases.

Approvals ought to be linked to delegated financial limits and substantive decision rights, not a ritual collection of signatures. Split purchases around approval thresholds, sequential emergency purchases to the same supplier, revised purchase orders after delivery and retrospective authorizations are signals requiring explanation. The purpose of an exception process is to preserve continuity with explicit accountability, not to transform an unauthorized transaction into a compliant one by adding signatures after the fact. Every material exception needs its triggering event, authorized basis, mitigating action, independent review and closure evidence.

18.8.2 Conflicts of interest, beneficial influence and procurement misconduct

A conflict of interest exists when a procurement decision maker's personal, financial or relational interests could improperly influence entrusted judgment, even before actual corruption is proved. A relative employed by a bidder, ownership through another entity, an offered gift or consultancy relationship may require declaration, recusal, reassignment or independent assessment depending on applicable rules. A disclosure is not always a cure: if the interested person defines the scoring criteria, withdrawal only from the final

committee may be too late. The timing, substantive control and documentation of mitigation determine whether the conflict has been managed.

Misconduct also includes kickbacks, confidential information leakage, collusive tendering, supplier substitution after award, false acceptance and duplicate or fictitious invoices. Fraud red flags should guide further verification, not constitute proof of individual guilt. A fair response protects records, limits unnecessary circulation of allegations, preserves the rights of those implicated and uses competent investigative and remedial channels. Procurement staff should have accessible reporting and anti-retaliation safeguards; suppliers should have lawful review routes. Neither ethics declarations nor software alerts are substitutes for independent institutional follow-through (OECD, 2015, 2025).

18.8.3 Transaction analytics as an assurance technique

Digital controls can detect duplicate invoice numbers, unusual price variation, repeated awards near thresholds, missing receipts, weekend approvals, rapid contract variations and supplier banking-detail changes. The interpretation is conditional: duplicate references may arise from supplier numbering practices, bank changes may be legitimate, and repeated awards may reflect genuine capacity constraints. Useful analytics report denominator, detection rule, false-positive burden, investigation outcome and corrective action. An automated high-risk label must be reviewed by persons authorized to understand context and handle sensitive data. Performance targets should reward justified prevention and correction, not the mere number of suspected cases produced.

To evaluate anomaly detection fairly, reviewers should maintain an adjudication dataset that records alerts examined, confirmed exceptions, false positives, unreviewed cases and their costs. In a deliberately constructed example, 100 alerts produce 12 substantiated problems after documented review. The observed positive predictive value is 12/100 = 12% among reviewed alerts. This does not measure the false-negative rate because the number of genuine problems outside the flagged population is unknown. An apparently impressive detection model can therefore generate administrative workload without demonstrating adequate coverage.

Controls should be tested for consequence rather than only technical accuracy. An alert that stops a legitimate urgent purchase may carry serious service costs, while a rule that fails to detect a fictitious supplier may expose the institution to fraud. Thresholds require category-specific calibration, lawful handling of personal and commercial data, an appeal or correction process, and independent review of unintended patterns. AI-assisted systems introduce additional concerns because historical evaluation data may encode prior bias and outputs may be difficult to explain. Automation should make professional responsibility more traceable, not obscure it.

18.9 PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE PROCUREMENT

18.9.1 Different accountability structures and common economic problems

Private enterprises normally acquire inputs for commercial or mission-related performance under corporate, contractual, competition, employment and other applicable law. Their procurement departments may have greater latitude to negotiate, retain confidential supplier information or form strategic partnerships, though owners, lenders and stakeholders can impose reporting and integrity obligations. Public procuring entities spend entrusted funds in pursuit of legally designated public purposes and must follow statutory methods, transparency, accountability, contestability, remedies and budget controls. They frequently serve multiple beneficiaries who are not equivalent to paying customers. For both sectors, the underlying need, opportunity cost, quality, supplier capability and contractual enforcement remain real; the authorized objectives and procedural constraints differ.

Public procurement ought not be understood as mechanically purchasing from the lowest bidder regardless of cost consequences. Conversely, a vague appeal to 'best value' cannot justify altering published criteria or bypassing competition. Public value includes public-service reliability, defensible access, lawful stewardship and, where authorized, proportionate environmental and social objectives. The mix must be operationalized ex ante, with auditability and consistency. Private buyers also face real ethical responsibilities and may voluntarily adopt public-style competitive safeguards for high-value related-party transactions. Tadelis (2012) develops the consequential distinction between relatively complete, standardized specifications and complex projects requiring adaptation. His argument supports differentiated contract-design analysis, not an unrestricted entitlement to negotiate outside statutory procedures.

18.9.2 Rwanda's currently governing legal and institutional context

On the official legal materials consulted through 2 November 2026, Rwanda's central public-procurement statute is Law No. 031/2022 of 21 November 2022 governing public procurement, published in the Special Official Gazette of 22 November 2022. It repealed the earlier Law No. 62/2018. Ministerial Order No. 001/23/10/TC of 10 October 2023 establishes implementing regulations, and RPPA has issued guidance clarifying key provisions. Ministerial Order No. 001/26/10/TC of 13 February 2026 addresses modalities for public tenders related to innovation. Accordingly, treating the superseded 2018 statute as current would be a material legal error (Republic of Rwanda, 2022, 2023, 2026; RPPA, 2024). Exact applicability, thresholds and procedural deadlines must always be confirmed from the authoritative instruments and current notices, rather than copied from historical manuals.

The Rwanda Public Procurement Authority develops guidance, monitoring and oversight functions, including scrutiny of market research, procurement plans, noncompetitive procedures, contract changes and compliance; UMUCYO is the country's electronic public-procurement system (RPPA, n.d.). A portal can improve traceability and participation while still depending on sound specifications, user competence, connectivity and substantive oversight. The formal availability of electronic records is not evidence that every procurement was competitive or that all suppliers had equitable practical access. A legally compliant award also requires sound contract execution, asset receipt, service results and payment discipline, which a published bid notice alone cannot prove.

18.9.3 Rwanda's 2024 sustainable procurement policy and 2026 reform debate

Rwanda's Cabinet approved a Sustainable Public Procurement Policy Framework on 18 October 2024. RPPA describes its ambition to incorporate economic, social and environmental criteria and life-cycle assessment into purchasing decisions, including local enterprise development (RPPA, 2024). Policy approval and procurement-law implementation are analytically different events. On 12 February 2026, Parliament reported a Public Accounts Committee review noting challenges including delayed implementing regulations, project preparation problems and frequent contract amendments. On 2 April 2026, Parliament called for a revision of Law No. 031/2022, specifically identifying an alignment gap between the sustainable procurement framework and the law, local-preference and implementation concerns, and outdated standard bidding documents (Parliament of Rwanda, 2026a, 2026b). These communications document parliamentary criticism and proposed reform; they do not establish that an amendment had already come into force. An accurate legal analysis must avoid treating reform demands as operative entitlements for bidders.

The institutional implications are consequential. Sustainable procurement requires a legally competent method for converting ecological, workforce and local-development objectives into transparent specifications and award criteria. Without a regulatory pathway, officials may face incentives either to ignore policy objectives or to apply them inconsistently. Conversely, overambitious documentary demands could exclude smaller firms without materially improving sustainability. Reform should be assessed by the clarity,

contestability, implementation cost and actual results of approved criteria, not merely by the presence of 'green' language in a tender.

18.9.4 International comparison: OECD and World Bank procurement disciplines

The OECD's 2015 Recommendation on Public Procurement articulates an integrated governance approach encompassing transparency, integrity, access, efficiency, electronic procurement, capacity, evaluation, risk, accountability and integration with public finance. Its 2025 bid-rigging guidelines develop tender-design and detection practices against collusion (OECD, 2015, 2025). The World Bank's September 2025 procurement regulations govern their specified investment-project-financing operations and articulate a structured, risk-based project-procurement approach (World Bank, 2025). These frameworks are influential reference points but should not be presented as direct Rwandan domestic statutes or as proof that one identical design works in every market.

The transferable intellectual lesson is disciplined proportionality. Procurement rules should support competitive access while ensuring the award process fits the technical risk and public purpose. However, international procedures can assume institutional capacity, reliable company information, documented prior contracts and digital connectivity that smaller local suppliers may lack. Comparative learning therefore asks not 'which country has the most elaborate tender system?' but 'which safeguards demonstrably protect fair opportunity, value and accountable execution at feasible administrative cost?'. The unresolved empirical question is how to identify these effects without confounding regulation with public-administration resources and economic structure.

The seventh edition of the World Bank regulations is also a useful example of changing institutional priorities rather than a timeless benchmark: its 2025 revision includes requirements concerning local labor participation in relevant internationally competitive works contracts, within its specified scope (World Bank, 2025). This illustrates how procurement governance can incorporate social participation through precise conditions, but it also underscores why a Rwandan public buyer must determine whether a given financing and contract arrangement actually triggers the requirement. The same phrase, local participation, cannot be assumed to carry identical legal effects across a national-policy statement, donor-financed works contract and private supplier agreement.

18.10 DIGITAL PROCUREMENT

18.10.1 Transaction systems, electronic sourcing and data architecture

Electronic procurement comprises digital tools used to plan requirements, identify suppliers, solicit and compare bids, issue orders, execute agreements, monitor receipts and process invoices. An e-sourcing tool supports market events and evaluation; an e-procurement or procure-to-pay platform supports operational purchase approvals and transactions; a contract lifecycle system manages negotiated obligations, expiries and variations; and supplier portals exchange qualifications and performance data. Such distinctions matter because installing an online bid portal does not automatically integrate approvals with the financial ledger or ensure that acceptance evidence reaches accounts payable. Data governance requires common supplier identifiers, role-based access, procurement-category codes, event logs, secure integration with financial systems and documented retention and deletion rules.

Rwanda's UMUCYO platform illustrates a concrete public-sector commitment to electronic tender administration (RPPA, n.d.). Its institutional importance lies partly in making stages and interactions recordable rather than wholly reliant on paper. Nonetheless, actual transparency depends on equal supplier access, the integrity of entered data, independent scrutiny of evaluations and functioning review channels. Digital traceability can expose an irregular sequence; it cannot determine by itself whether an engineering

requirement was deliberately biased or whether promised equipment performs safely. Accessibility matters as well: firms facing connectivity limits, unfamiliar tender formats or financial constraints can be excluded by burdensome technical requirements even when the portal is nominally open.

18.10.2 Automation, machine learning and generative AI

Automation can classify expenditure, check required bid fields, detect invoice anomalies and route approvals against policy. Predictive analytics can flag supplier distress or demand patterns; generative AI may summarize proposals, draft specifications or suggest contractual terms. These are different kinds of assistance. A rule-based duplicate invoice check can be directly validated against records, while a generative model may invent a compliance claim, misread a contract exclusion or implicitly favor wording associated with incumbent providers. Models trained on past awards may reproduce historic exclusion and collusion patterns. A procurement professional must therefore retain authority over eligibility, evaluation, discretionary trade-offs and binding commitments.

Tabassi's (2023) voluntary National Institute of Standards and Technology AI Risk Management Framework distinguishes governance, mapping, measurement and management of AI risks. Applied to procurement, a sensible decision protocol documents the model's purpose, source-data rights, information classifications, validation tests, privacy measures, explainability for affected bidders, audit logs, human review and procedures for challenge. Confidential bids should not be uploaded to an uncontrolled external AI service. An AI-generated scoring rationale should never replace evidence actually supplied by a bidder or silently introduce an unpublished criterion. In a regulated tender, even an apparently objective algorithm can be procedurally invalid when its weighting, data sources or error rates were not incorporated into the lawful award design.

18.10.3 Cybersecurity, continuity and vendor-platform dependence

Digital procurement expands the attack surface through supplier credentials, email instructions, invoice attachments, payment details and integration with banking systems. Common threats include business-email compromise, impersonated bank-detail changes, altered purchase orders, credential theft, fraudulent supplier onboarding and ransomware affecting contract records. Controls include secure identity verification, multifactor authentication, dual confirmation of bank changes through an independently known channel, least-privilege access, encrypted transfer of confidential bids, backup and recovery testing, supplier cybersecurity due diligence and alerts for anomalous modifications. System administrators must not be able to alter closed award records without monitored authorization. A business-continuity procedure should specify how urgent lawful procurement proceeds if the platform is unavailable and how resulting transactions are later reconciled.

The choice between a comprehensive procurement platform and modest tools also requires lifecycle economics. Subscription, configuration, integration, training, data migration, supplier onboarding, change management and future switching costs can exceed the headline software fee. For small firms, standard templates and careful financial reconciliation may produce more benefit than complex automation. Conversely, fragmented messaging and spreadsheets may become unsafe as volume, delegated authority and regulatory complexity increase. Digital investment should follow the decision-control problem and organizational capability, not technological fashion.

18.11 RESPONSIBLE SOURCING

18.11.1 Responsibility beyond the first-tier contract

Responsible sourcing seeks to prevent or address material adverse impacts of acquisition decisions on workers, customers, communities and natural systems, while maintaining legitimate enterprise and public

purposes. The OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct (2023) address risk-based due diligence across human rights, labor, environmental performance, corruption and technology. The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights establish expectations concerning state protection, enterprise respect and access to remedy (Ruggie, 2011). The ILO's 1998 Declaration, amended in 2022, identifies five fundamental principles and rights at work, including a safe and healthy working environment (ILO, 2022; OECD, 2023). These sources have different authority and applicability; a voluntary guidance document must not be described as a universally binding domestic statute.

Supplier declarations alone are insufficient. Due diligence involves identifying salient harms, prioritizing severity and likelihood, considering the buyer's involvement or leverage, preventing or mitigating impacts, tracking outcomes, communicating responsibly and enabling remedy where appropriate. For agricultural procurement, material questions can include safe chemical handling, land tenure, wage practices, forced or child labor and climate exposure. For construction, subcontracting and occupational safety may be central; for electronic equipment, worker conditions, mineral sourcing, energy efficiency and responsible disposal are relevant. Direct suppliers may not know every upstream tier, but this uncertainty calls for graduated inquiry and transparent boundaries rather than fabricated assurances of complete traceability.

18.11.2 Life-cycle costing, environmental evidence and green claims

ISO 20400:2017 provides guidance for integrating sustainability into procurement and remained published and confirmed in its 2023 review (International Organization for Standardization [ISO], 2017). It is guidance, not an all-purpose certification that a product is sustainable. Life-cycle reasoning examines acquisition, use, repair, energy and water consumption, consumables and end-of-life handling, while acknowledging uncertain data and context-specific trade-offs. An energy-efficient device imported through a carbon-intensive route may still have lower total life-cycle impacts than a less efficient local alternative, or may not; the result depends on measured electricity mix, useful life, repair rates, transport and disposal. Assertions such as 'eco-friendly' or 'carbon neutral' need a defined boundary, method and credible verification. Kozuch et al. (2024) report positive practice–performance relationships in a meta-analysis of 22 empirical studies of green procurement, but the evidence does not establish that every individual acquisition has a positive financial return or that observational associations eliminate selection and reporting biases.

Sustainable criteria can be designed as minimum technical thresholds, separately disclosed award criteria, performance clauses or contract-development requirements depending on governing law. Setting unverifiable aspirational conditions may encourage polished but empty proposals. A more defensible approach requests specified evidence, applies materiality tests, assesses small-supplier feasibility and monitors post-award performance. The buyer should also examine its own practices: unrealistic lead times, last-minute design changes and chronic late payment may make compliance difficult while shifting hidden costs to the supplier's workers (Carter & Rogers, 2008; OECD, 2023).

18.11.3 Local content, small-enterprise access and fair supplier treatment

Local sourcing can strengthen domestic productive capabilities, shorten some supply relationships and provide economic participation, but these are conditional possibilities, not guaranteed outcomes. A local distributor may resell imported materials, and a distant supplier may employ local maintenance and logistics services. The proper policy question is which legitimately authorized local-value criterion can be defined, verified and enforced without violating procurement law or concealing superior alternatives. In Rwanda, the 2026 parliamentary debate explicitly identified implementation gaps around local preference and the alignment of sustainable procurement policy with current law (Parliament of Rwanda, 2026b). It would therefore be misleading to assume that all desired local-content preferences are already operationally authorized in every tender.

For small and informal enterprises, the challenge is balancing market inclusion with performance assurance. Financial guarantees, historic-turnover requirements, complex portal entry and payment delays can exclude capable providers. Equitable procurement can explore proportionate lots, clear specifications, accessible clarification, lawful alternative guarantees, prompt payment, skills support and objective quality testing. The goal is not to waive safety, encourage nominal bidding or allocate contracts regardless of performance. It is to remove barriers that do not meaningfully predict performance while retaining genuinely necessary protections. Supplier development is most defensible when outcomes and cost-sharing are explicit and performance can be evaluated independently (Krause et al., 2007).

18.11.4 Ethical tensions and the limits of buyer leverage

Supplier responsibility is not exhausted by punitive audits or termination. A buyer may uncover serious worker-safety concerns at an important supplier. Immediate disengagement might stop the buyer's contribution to harm, but can also jeopardize workers' livelihoods if no remediation pathway is considered. Conversely, continued purchasing without credible corrective action can perpetuate serious abuse. The governing judgment involves severity, immediacy, the buyer's involvement, available leverage, the feasibility of remediation and legal obligations. A documented escalation plan should address time-bound improvements, independent verification, worker participation and circumstances requiring suspension or termination. Claims of ethical procurement require outcomes and remedy, not simply a supplier code of conduct.

This problem is not settled by a purely consequentialist calculation of expected monetary loss. Serious violations of bodily integrity or freedom from forced labor have a normative significance that a buyer cannot legitimately offset by a small unit-price advantage. Yet a rigid rule of immediate disengagement can deprive affected workers of income and eliminate the buyer's leverage to support remedy. Responsible judgment therefore requires a sequence of inquiries: identify the severity and immediacy of harm, establish what the buyer caused or contributed to, consult affected workers where safely possible, evaluate credible remediation, and specify observable conditions for continued engagement or withdrawal (Ruggie, 2011; OECD, 2023).

Operational consistency matters. An ethical supplier clause may have little practical force when purchasing managers impose unachievable deadlines or routinely delay payment. Buyers should examine the pressures created by their own forecasts, specifications and price negotiations before attributing all deficiencies to the supplier. The objective is a remedy-oriented account of responsibility in which documented corrective outcomes, rather than certificates or public declarations alone, can support a claim of improvement.

18.12 PROCUREMENT PERFORMANCE AND RESILIENCE

18.12.1 Why purchase-price savings are an incomplete performance measure

Procurement dashboards commonly report negotiated savings relative to a baseline. Such figures can be informative but are vulnerable to inflation of initial estimates, shifts in specifications, counting price reductions on quantities never purchased, changes in exchange rates or double counting of benefits already included in budgets. *Realized* savings should be reconciled to actual comparable purchases, contractual quality and financial reporting. *Cost avoidance* concerns a justified comparison against a credible expected increase; it should not be automatically represented as cash saved. An efficient sourcing event that leads to unusable equipment, stockouts or supplier insolvency is not evidence of enterprise improvement.

A balanced performance system combines cost and realized value with service reliability, product conformity, delivery timeliness, competition quality, procurement cycle time, contract compliance, supplier continuity, integrity exceptions, timely payment and material sustainability outcomes. Each measure requires an owner, numerator, denominator, time period, data source, segmentation and interpretation limit. Delivery-on-time rate can be defined as accepted deliveries by the contractually due date divided by deliveries due in the period;

in-full performance is a different construct. 'Supplier diversity' can measure participation, award distribution or value paid, which should not be conflated. A falling audit-flag count may signal improvement or simply weaker detection.

Table 18.5. Procurement performance scorecard and methodological cautions

Performance dimension	Operational indicator	Interpretation boundary
Economic value	Comparable realized net saving; lifecycle cost variance	Must reconcile quantity, scope, inflation and quality
Timeliness	Accepted orders on time / orders due	Define delays, tolerance, partial deliveries and exclusions
Quality	Accepted units or milestones / inspected units or milestones	Define defects, severity and post-acceptance warranty claims
Competition	Eligible responsive bidders per competitive event	Multiple legal bidders may share an upstream source
Contract discipline	Approved and supported contract variations / all variations	A zero-variation target may induce concealment
Integrity	Material allegations substantiated and remediated	Investigation quality matters more than raw alerts
Supplier resilience	Critical categories with tested recovery or alternatives	Backup source must be technically qualified and usable
Responsibility	Salient supplier harms tracked to verified corrective outcomes	Codes and certificates are inputs, not outcomes

Note. Original scorecard. Measures should be adapted to the procurement category and jurisdiction; their causal effects are not assumed.

18.12.2 Risk identification, treatment and interdependence

Procurement risk spans supplier failure, quality nonconformity, price and currency shocks, fraud, dependence, cyber compromise, human-rights harm, extreme weather, political disruption and unsuitable specifications. Ranking requires more than multiplying arbitrary 'likelihood' and 'impact' integers. A qualitative matrix can establish attention priorities, but multiplication of ordinal scores has no defensible expected-loss interpretation unless numerical scales are calibrated. Where evidence permits, expected loss is probability times financial consequence, with scenario dependence and correlation recognized. Risk treatment can include prevention, qualification, alternative suppliers, contractual protection, financial reserves, redesign, monitoring and a credible contingency activation authority. Some harms, such as severe safety violations, must not be accepted merely because their expected monetary cost seems small.

Supply resilience is a contingent capacity to anticipate, withstand, adapt to and recover from disruption while maintaining justified service levels. Multi-sourcing can reduce dependence on one supplier but may sacrifice scale or create common upstream dependencies. Bode and Wagner (2015) report empirical evidence associating several forms of upstream supply complexity with disruption frequency, a caution against assuming diversification always decreases risk. A second distributor sourcing from the same manufacturer may provide little protection during the manufacturer's shutdown. Evaluating alternatives requires shared-failure mapping, realistic switch times, qualification costs, inventory implications and contractual commitments, not supplier-count targets.

18.12.3 A practical risk register and intervention logic

Table 18.6. Illustrative procurement risk register for a Rwandan institution

Risk event and pathway	Indicative early warning	Preventive or contingent control	Owner and review point
Single upstream manufacturer fails	Missed upstream confirmations; prolonged replenishment	Qualified substitute; verified alternative supply origin	Procurement and IT; quarterly
Bid evaluation improperly influenced	Undeclared links; scoring revisions after opening	Declarations before specification/evaluation; independent review	Governance officer; each tender
Contract variations conceal cost escalation	Repeated scope changes and poor initial surveys	Baseline specification; change-control authority; cost reconciliation	Contract manager; each variation
Invoice or bank substitution fraud	New account and urgent payment request	Independent callback; dual approval; reconciliation	Finance; before disbursement
Inadequate device security	Unpatched firmware or unsupported components	Security tests and post-award update obligations	IT security; acceptance and periodic
Supplier labor or ecological harm	Contradictory declarations; unresolved worker concerns	Risk-based due diligence and time-bound remedy plan	Procurement and compliance; periodic

Note. Original illustrative register. No event or probability is represented as having occurred at a real Rwandan institution.

Risk ownership must remain explicit. Procurement can manage selection and contract evidence but cannot alone determine the classroom's learning requirement, test software-security configurations, recognize accounting liabilities or decide board-level risk tolerance. The institutional mechanism that matters is a decision right linked to information, challenge and remedy. In the simplest useful governance loop, demand owners identify outcomes, procurement makes supply alternatives contestable, technical teams validate capability, finance tests affordability, compliance evaluates legitimacy, and contract managers track outcomes. A defect discovered after payment should reopen an accountable corrective pathway rather than disappear into a departmental handoff.

A usable register is not a static catalogue of hazards. Each risk should specify the exposed procurement objective, the causal pathway, the evidence for its current status, the consequence threshold, an accountable decision owner and a review or activation date. For supply interruption, the practical test is whether an alternate provider is approved, technically interchangeable and capable of delivering before operational reserves are exhausted. A second supplier name in a spreadsheet does not establish that condition. The record should also disclose correlated risks, such as multiple distributors depending on the same importer or bank.

Risk review should be linked to contract performance and the enterprise's control environment. Changes in ownership, security breaches, repeated minor variations and payment delays can each justify intensified monitoring, but the response should be proportional to verified exposure. High-level governance must distinguish acceptable operating variation from events that threaten safety, legal compliance, critical service or institutional legitimacy. These are different kinds of thresholds and should not be collapsed into one ordinal risk multiplication.

18.13 RWANDA-BASED INTEGRATIVE CASE AND INTERNATIONAL COMPARISON

18.13.1 Case assumptions and lawful procedural boundary

The following scenario is entirely hypothetical. A Rwandan educational institution plans to acquire fifty networked teaching devices with installation and three years of basic support. Its approved maximum present-value budget is RWF 62 million. All offers are assumed received in one legally permissible, properly advertised competitive procedure, with the same documented specification and due date. The devices are assumed to meet mandatory safety, interoperability, accessibility and minimum cybersecurity tests, and the bidders are assumed otherwise legally eligible. No assertion is made that the selected evaluation method or weight distribution is authorized for every Rwandan public tender. In actual public procurement, the method and financial evaluation must be those established by Law No. 031/2022, the applicable ministerial order and tender documents; if this teaching instrument differs, the legally required procedure governs.

The institution has adopted, for illustration only, four graded technical criteria and one price criterion on a ten-point scale: verified functionality and quality 35%; service and warranty capability 20%; delivery and implementation reliability 15%; substantiated social and environmental provisions 10%; and comparative bid price 20%. The evaluation team documented anchored scoring descriptors before opening bids. All bidders passed mandatory thresholds; otherwise, no additive score could make a failed bid eligible. Prices are evaluated excluding identical tax effects, and the price score equals 10 × the lowest eligible bid price divided by the bidder's price. No supplier name is identifiable; A, B and C are invented alternatives.

18.13.2 Reproducible weighted vendor comparison

Table 18.7. Illustrative supplier evaluation: weighted points on a ten-point scale

Criterion (weight)	Supplier A	Supplier B	Supplier C
Functional quality (0.35)	8	9	7
Warranty/service (0.20)	8	9	6
Delivery reliability (0.15)	7	8	9
Social/environmental (0.10)	7	8	6
Bid price in million RWF	50	55	45
Price score, 10 × 45 / price (0.20)	9.000	8.182	10.000
Total weighted score (maximum 10)	7.950	8.586	7.600

Note. All bids, ratings and prices are constructed. For example, B = 0.35(9) + 0.20(9) + 0.15(8) + 0.10(8) + 0.20(8.1818) = 8.5864, rounded to 8.586. The result is valid only for the disclosed model, minimum thresholds and authorized rules.

Figure 18.2. Supplier evaluation sensitivity to disclosed criteria weights



Note. Constructed educational data; original and price-heavy weights are stated in Section 18.13.2. The diagram shows how ranking is contingent on prior policy choices and does not authorize changing tender criteria after receipt.

Supplier B ranks first, even though its quoted acquisition price exceeds C's by RWF 10 million. This is a conditional result, not an invitation to spend more whenever a supplier has a polished presentation. The evaluator should preserve underlying test evidence and signed individual score sheets, explain disagreements, and test whether revised but plausible criteria or estimates change the decision. The original scoring criterion 'warranty/service' requires verifiable local support access, response time and spare parts, not an evaluator's impression. If the apparently superior service cannot be established, the score must be corrected rather than defended by managerial intuition.

A stress test transfers 30 percentage points of weight from functional quality to price, yielding weights 0.05, 0.20, 0.15, 0.10 and 0.50, respectively. With unchanged supplier assessments, A scores 8.250, B scores approximately 8.341, and C scores 8.500, so C becomes first. Such a dramatic reweighting cannot lawfully be imposed after bids are received: the calculation is an *ex ante* design diagnostic showing how priorities determine outcomes. Modest changes should also be tested, and close results should be discussed as sensitivity rather than falsely precise superiority. The appropriate governance conclusion is to settle legitimate priorities and scoring anchors before the contest, not manipulate them to achieve a desired bidder.

18.13.3 Discounted total-cost and budget test

Assume annual maintenance and service cash outflows, paid at year-end for three years, of RWF 4 million for A, 1.5 million for B and 6 million for C. Assume comparable devices and three-year use, zero residual values, a 10% annual discount rate and no incremental downtime cost in the baseline. The three-year annuity factor is 2.486852. The corresponding present-value total costs are A: 50 + 4(2.486852) = RWF 59.947 million; B: 55 + 1.5(2.486852) = RWF 58.730 million; and C: 45 + 6(2.486852) = RWF 59.921 million. Each falls within the illustrative RWF 62 million ceiling, but B is lowest on this particular lifecycle model despite the highest purchase price. These costs should not be added to the weighted score as though independent unless the evaluation method clearly specifies and controls for double counting.

The cost advantage of B relative to A is about RWF 1.217 million over three years and relative to C about RWF 1.191 million. Neither estimate includes differences in quality-related downtime or economic consequences of failed installation. A sensitivity threshold is informative: B's annual operating cost could rise from RWF 1.5 million to about RWF 1.989 million before its TCO equalled A's, holding other assumptions fixed: solve 55 + 2.486852 C = 59.947408. The calculation exposes the limited headroom of the conclusion. A plausible adverse

service-cost revision, foreign-exchange shock, or lower actual equipment life could change the ranking. These should be documented as reasons for verification, not concealed in a single award statistic.

The bid-price criterion in the illustrative weighted score and the later present-value TCO test describe different comparisons. In a live regulated tender, a procuring entity cannot first publish a price-only financial formula and then substitute an undisclosed TCO ranking as the legal basis for award. The TCO exercise here is a planning and critical-review diagnostic illustrating a possible design improvement for future tenders, subject to applicable rules and appropriate disclosure. If lifecycle cost is an authorized award criterion, its included cash flows, discount rate, exclusions and evidence requirements must be specified before bid receipt. Using both acquisition price and TCO in one additive score would otherwise risk double counting.

The sensitivity can also be examined at less extreme discount assumptions. At 5%, the three-year annuity factor is approximately 2.72325 and discounted costs are A = RWF 60.893 million, B = RWF 59.085 million and C = RWF 61.340 million. At 15%, the factor is about 2.28323 and the same costs are A = RWF 59.133 million, B = RWF 58.425 million and C = RWF 58.699 million. Supplier B remains least costly under these restricted variations, but the advantage over C becomes much smaller at 15%. The exercise tests only the discount rate; it cannot independently establish maintenance-cost accuracy, equipment reliability or funding adequacy.

18.13.4 Conflict-of-interest protocol and award integrity

Suppose, separately and hypothetically, an evaluator discloses that a close family member works for Supplier B. The disclosure does not prove that B's bid is false or that its ranking is invalid. It establishes a decision-integrity risk requiring immediate application of the prescribed conflict rules. The review must establish whether the person influenced needs definition, specification, tender packaging, clarification access, scoring design or individual evaluation. Depending on the governing rules, appropriate measures can include recusal, removal from confidential access, independent re-scoring, a formally recorded reassignment or, where material contamination cannot be remedied, lawful suspension or recommencement. A mere declaration after scoring would not necessarily restore confidence if the person had already shaped the criteria.

The conflict record should contain the nature and date of disclosure, affected phases, authorized decision, replacement evaluator, preservation of original and revised score sheets, independent reviewer sign-off and communication consistent with confidentiality obligations. Supplier B should not be automatically punished for an evaluator's relationship without evidence or legal ground, nor should the institution conceal an unresolved conflict because B appears to offer superior value. The objective is an impartial, reviewable award that survives both price scrutiny and a credible institutional challenge.

18.13.5 Rwanda and international lessons from the case

The case translates Rwanda's documented public procurement architecture into questions about procedural competence, rather than asserting that this constructed tender has occurred under UMUCYO. The 2026 parliamentary observations about contract preparation, frequent variations and incomplete implementation of sustainable procurement are especially relevant. Poorly specified equipment can prompt variations that erase an advertised saving; vague green criteria can create unenforceable promises; limited supplier access can conceal dependence. The OECD's 2025 bid-rigging guidance adds a competition-risk lens, and the World Bank's 2025 regulations provide a comparative example of risk-proportionate project procurement. Neither comparator supplies a valid substitute for the controlling law or the actual tender documents in Rwanda (Parliament of Rwanda, 2026a, 2026b; OECD, 2025; World Bank, 2025).

A private Rwandan enterprise could adapt the same assessment logic with less statutory procedural formality while still documenting rights, financial controls and supplier treatment. A cooperative might assign authorization to member-accountable bodies and weigh agricultural supplier development as part of its purpose; a university purchasing through donor financing may need additional applicable funding conditions.

The shared principle is not one universal scorecard. It is the capacity to explain why the acquisition is necessary, the supplier comparison is technically and procedurally sound, the full costs are affordable, serious harms are constrained and actual results can be reviewed against the original promise.

18.14 INTEGRATIVE DISCUSSION, CRITICAL SYNTHESIS AND RESEARCH AGENDA

18.14.1 The limits of five major theoretical explanations

Transaction-cost economics explains why asset specificity, uncertainty and verification costs make some contracts fragile, but it does not independently determine what distribution of risk is fair. Agency theory identifies incentives for opportunism and the necessity of oversight, but can underestimate trust, professional identity and collective obligations. Kraljic's purchasing portfolio turns heterogeneous categories into managerial priorities, yet its two dimensions simplify unstable markets and require subjective calibration. The relational view explains jointly produced capability, but can overlook market exclusion and dependence on favored incumbents. Responsible procurement theory places social and environmental impacts inside acquisition decisions, yet normative commitments still require valid measurement and feasible implementation (Williamson, 1985; Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Kraljic, 1983; Dyer & Singh, 1998; Carter & Rogers, 2008).

The most defensible synthesis is neither purely adversarial contracting nor uncritical relational collaboration. Good procurement uses competitive discovery when substitution is real, relational governance when knowledge and specific investment matter, technical evidence to test performance, independent control to constrain delegated power and risk-based due diligence to address harms beyond the buyer's accounting boundary. These mechanisms are contingent and can conflict. Competition can erode cooperative learning; supplier concentration can improve quality consistency but create common-cause vulnerability; strict documentation can enhance auditability while excluding qualified small providers. The function's intellectual maturity consists in naming and governing these tensions rather than promising their disappearance.

The distinction between design completeness and adaptation provides a further empirical challenge to one-size-fits-all procurement. Tadelis (2012) argues that standardized transactions and complex projects can require different contract incentive and award arrangements: fixed-price competition gives strong cost incentives when requirements are defined, whereas unanticipated adaptation can make rigid forms costly. This insight must be read alongside the institutional need for transparency and impartiality in publicly funded decisions. It does not establish that negotiations outperform tenders in all complex cases or that flexibility can bypass Rwandan procurement law.

The wider research record also counsels theoretical pluralism. Flynn and Davis (2014) document limitations in the extent of explicit theoretical grounding in public-procurement scholarship, indicating why administrative prescriptions should not be mistaken for explanatory laws. A governance framework is strongest when it identifies the causal mechanism being proposed, the actual unit of observation, the institutional boundary and the kind of evidence capable of refuting its conclusion.

18.14.2 Cross-functional consequences and information interfaces

Procurement affects operations by determining input conformity, arrival and production continuity, thereby extending Chapter 17's flow and capacity analysis. It affects marketing and customer value because supply choices constrain whether promised availability, quality and warranty support in Chapters 13–16 are credible. Finance determines the cost of funds, payment terms, exposure and affordability; human resources supplies competences, ethical training and workload capacity; information systems protect contract records; and corporate governance constrains conflicts and related-party influence. An integrated enterprise should

monitor these interfaces through a shared requisition owner, category plan, acceptance test, contract register, financial reconciliation and feedback route rather than relying on separate functional dashboards.

This also shows why procurement cannot be evaluated exclusively at the moment of award. A bid's technical merit becomes meaningful only when users accept a conforming output, operations can employ it, finance meets justifiable payments and affected stakeholders have available remedy. Management should therefore compare promised, contracted, received and experienced value. An 'award-to-outcome' trace is a practical diagnostic: it links the original business need to the actual operational effect and discloses where assumptions or governance failed. It is proposed here as a transparent analytic instrument, not as an empirically tested index.

18.14.3 Research propositions and feasible secondary-data designs

An initial research proposition is that supplier-specific investment moderates the relationship between tender intensity and realized lifecycle value through contractual adaptation and technical verification capability. The predicted mechanism is not that competition becomes undesirable, but that contract incompleteness makes post-award learning and adjustment relatively important. A secondary-data study could connect tender characteristics with award prices, variation histories, acceptance failures and completed-service costs, while matching technically comparable categories. It would need to confront the selection process through which unusually complex projects receive different procurement methods (Tadelis, 2012).

A second proposition is that electronic procurement can improve traceability without necessarily improving supplier quality, honest competition or service outcomes. Platform adoption may coincide with training, changes in approval authority and new audit procedures. A defensible evaluation could compare staggered procurement units and examine pre-adoption differences, missing transaction records and changes in detected irregularities. An increase in reported exceptions may reflect improved detection, not worsening integrity. The outcome should therefore be specified as audit-trail completeness, value, performance or verified misconduct, rather than a generic concept of digital success.

Third, proportionate qualification and reliable supplier payment may improve effective participation by smaller domestic enterprises, conditional on technical and capital requirements. Bid submission alone is insufficient evidence of inclusion; bid eligibility, technical responsiveness, award distribution, payment timeliness and contract performance should be analyzed together. Administrative records could support a category-adjusted panel design, provided changes in tender size, local supplier availability and procurement rules are controlled as far as possible.

Fourth, multiple sourcing is expected to reduce disruption only when alternative suppliers are independent at material upstream tiers and the buyer can switch within the available recovery window. Tender records and contracting data should be combined with mapped upstream manufacturing relationships and recovery observations rather than interpreted from the number of legal vendors alone. Finally, risk-based social and environmental due diligence may predict verified remediation more strongly than checklist completion. Such a finding would remain vulnerable to differences in buyer resources, detection intensity and supplier selection. These propositions define feasible research agendas, not effects established by the present secondary-source synthesis.

Proposition 3: Proportionate qualification and supplier-payment practices will predict greater effective participation by small domestic providers, subject to category-specific safety and capital constraints. A defensible test would compare bid participation, technical responsiveness, award rates, payment delay and contract performance by size after adjusting for category, market availability and procurement value. Proposition 4: Dual sourcing will reduce disruption only where alternatives are genuinely independent at critical upstream tiers and the buyer can operationally switch. Network mapping and time-to-recovery

evidence are more informative than a simple count of contracted suppliers. Proposition 5: Risk-based human-rights and environmental due diligence will be more closely associated with verified remediation than checklist completion, but such association may reflect stronger firms self-selecting into better governance. These remain hypotheses; the current documentary synthesis does not establish causal effects.

18.14.4 Ethical and philosophical conclusion

Procurement is a revealing site of organizational moral agency because significant consequences are often attributed to impersonal procedures. The market did not 'choose' a supplier independently of the buyer's specification; a weighted model did not 'decide' which harms were compensable; a digital platform did not itself establish justice. Persons and institutions made those design choices. A sound ethical account therefore evaluates the legitimate purpose of acquisition, the fairness of access, the truth of representations, the burdens transferred to suppliers and workers, and the availability of correction. Efficiency is necessary for responsible stewardship of limited resources, but it is not sufficient to justify concealed favoritism or preventable harm. Equally, ethical rhetoric cannot substitute for technical competence and financial sustainability. Procurement integrity becomes credible when it can be demonstrated in records, outcomes and remedies.

Three forms of justification remain analytically independent. An epistemic justification asks whether the decision rests on credible and relevant evidence; an instrumental justification asks whether the chosen contract offers an efficient and technically feasible path to a legitimate objective; and a moral and institutional justification asks whether the objective, procedure and allocation of burdens respect rights, fair opportunity and accountable authority. An acquisition can pass one test and fail another. A low-priced bid may be feasible but procured through favoritism; a fair tender may yield technology that cannot be maintained; an environmentally attractive product may make unsubstantiated labor claims. No aggregate score can erase these distinctions.

The practical significance is a conception of procurement professionalism as disciplined judgment within constraints. Fairness does not mean that all prospective suppliers must win or that every bidder deserves an identical outcome. It requires intelligible rules, relevant qualification, equal application of disclosed criteria and legitimate review. Stewardship does not mean buying the cheapest object. It means explaining how scarce resources have been committed to verifiable purposes while accounting for delayed, distributed and potentially irreversible harms. Under this view, procurement is neither morally neutral administration nor a vehicle for untested social ambition; it is a governed site where organizational power must continually provide reasons for its decisions.

18.15 CHAPTER SYNTHESIS, KEY TERMS AND TEACHING APPARATUS

18.15.1 Seven core conclusions

The first conclusion is conceptual: procurement is a governed acquisition and assurance system, not a synonymous label for ordering or low-price purchasing. Its starting point is an authorized and justified organizational requirement; its endpoint is observable delivery, lawful payment, learning and remedy. The quality of this system depends on reliable demand and spending evidence, appropriate technical specifications, access to genuinely capable markets and a contract that allocates uncertain responsibilities coherently. Make-or-buy decisions, purchasing portfolios and market sourcing are consequently conditional judgments about capabilities, transaction costs and resilience, not routine choices dictated by a universal matrix.

The next conclusions concern institutional legitimacy and durable value. Supplier qualification must preserve non-negotiable legal and functional thresholds; comparative scoring must use disclosed criteria and withstand plausible sensitivity tests. Public procurement adds binding procedural and public-accountability duties to the commercial concerns shared by private buyers. Digital tools can make decisions more traceable while

reproducing bias or administrative weakness; responsible sourcing is credible only where material harms are investigated and remediated. The final test is retrospective: managers must compare the promised, contracted, received and experienced outcome, including the burdens borne by suppliers, workers and users. A defensible procurement system is therefore as capable of correcting failure as it is of authorizing expenditure.

18.15.2 Cumulative glossary

Term	Precise working definition
Procurement	Governed cycle for acquiring externally supplied goods, works and services and assuring results
Purchasing	Ordering, receipt, invoice and transactional administration within procurement
Strategic sourcing	Analysis and selection of supply markets, suppliers and contract arrangements for sustained value
Category management	Coordinated decision management of a related family of purchasing requirements
Spend analysis	Classification and interpretation of documented organizational procurement expenditure
Total cost of ownership	Declared lifecycle boundary of acquisition, use, risk and end-of-life costs net of allowed residuals
Asset specificity	Investment whose value in alternative uses is substantially lower than in a focal relationship
Supply risk	Exposure to failure, interruption, inaccessibility or adverse change in external provision
Bid rigging	Collusive coordination among ostensibly competing tender participants
Conflict of interest	Private or relational interest capable of improperly affecting entrusted procurement judgment
Three-way match	Comparison of authorized order, evidence of receipt and supplier invoice before payment
Supplier development	Buyer-supported improvement in supplier capability and performance under accountable arrangements
Due diligence	Risk-based identification, prevention, mitigation, tracking and communication of material adverse impacts
Resilience	Capacity to anticipate, absorb, adapt to and recover from disruption while sustaining justified services

Note. Chapter-specific definitions synthesize the cited procurement, governance and responsible-business literature; related finance and logistics terms are elaborated in Chapters 19, 23 and 24.

18.15.3 Foundational and critical questions

Question 1 (LO1–LO2). Explain the difference between a requisition, purchase order, acceptance record and invoice. Why should the person approving the requirement not also be the sole person authorizing payment?

Question 2 (LO3). What assumptions must hold before buying from a lower-priced external specialist is genuinely more efficient than retaining an internal capability?

Question 3 (LO4–LO5). Why should legal eligibility, minimum cybersecurity protection and essential product safety not be treated as ordinary weighted criteria?

Question 4 (LO6–LO7). Distinguish the 2024 sustainable-procurement policy, Law No. 031/2022 and the 2026 parliamentary call for legal revision. What type of authority and implementation evidence does each establish?

Question 5 (LO7–LO8). Compare the strengths and limitations of Kraljic's matrix, agency theory and the relational view for a strategically important sole-source supplier.

18.15.4 Applied quantitative and institutional exercises

Exercise A: price and lifecycle interpretation (LO3, LO5). Recompute all three present costs in Section 18.13 at discount rates of 5% and 15%, preserving year-end cash-flow conventions. Identify when the difference between B and the next-best alternative becomes immaterial and specify which additional evidence would govern the final decision. **Exercise B: tender and integrity audit (LO4, LO6, LO8).** Use Tables 18.3 and 18.7 to construct a full evaluation file. An evaluator discloses a family relationship with Supplier B after scoring; identify every procedural phase requiring review and specify what the committee must not assume about culpability. **Exercise C: responsible-sourcing diagnosis (LO2, LO7).** A cooperative purchases packaging through a Kigali distributor whose raw material comes from one external manufacturer. Draw the two-tier dependency, specify the verification needs and design a feasible corrective supplier-development plan without treating a self-reported certification as proof of outcomes.

18.15.5 Capstone assignment and educator marking guidance

Capstone procurement memorandum (LO1–LO8). Prepare a 3,000–4,000-word decision memorandum for a fictitious Rwandan institution acquiring a critical service. State the legal and funding assumptions, formulate functional requirements, build a documented supplier-market map, propose a lawful sourcing method, justify mandatory eligibility gates, present an auditable weighted matrix with a sensitivity test, calculate lifecycle cost, design a conflict-control and tender-record protocol, draft essential contract provisions, construct a risk register and propose a post-award evaluation. Compare the approach against one credible international procurement framework and identify what cannot transfer without adaptation. All assumed numerical values must be labelled; law and source claims must be evidenced.

Assessment should reward a reasoned, reproducible decision rather than the appearance of mathematical complexity. The rubric below offers a consistent 100-point basis for judging the capstone memorandum. A script that alters criteria after observing the bids, passes invented statistics as evidence, misstates the force of a legal instrument, or leaves a material conflict unresolved should require substantive correction regardless of its mechanical score.

Table 18.8. Capstone procurement decision-memorandum rubric

Assessment dimension	Points
Need, authority and legality, with justified scope and budget	15
Theoretical reasoning and supplier-market analysis	15
Reproducible scoring, lifecycle economics and sensitivity testing	25
Competition integrity, declared conflicts and auditability	15
Contract execution, controls and supplier resilience	15
Rwanda–international comparison, ethics and evidence quality	10
Academic expression, source accuracy and APA 7 referencing	5

18.15.6 Selected further reading and bridge to Chapter 19

For the analytical history of purchasing, Kraljic (1983) remains an instructive starting point, best read alongside Gelderman and Van Weele's (2003) critique of operational measurement. Williamson (1985) and

Dyer and Singh (1998) provide competing explanations of contract dependence and collaborative value. Monczka et al. (2020) develops applied purchasing procedures, while OECD (2025) is essential for contemporary bid-rigging safeguards. The reader should consult the current national legal instruments before applying any procedural advice. Chapter 19 proceeds from the sourcing and contractual decision into the physical and informational management of supply networks, transport, warehouse operations and inventory under uncertainty. The distinction is deliberate: procurement can arrange a right to receive goods; downstream coordination establishes whether those goods are available where and when productive activity needs them.

REFERENCES

Bode, C., & Wagner, S. M. (2015). Structural drivers of upstream supply chain complexity and the frequency of supply chain disruptions. *Journal of Operations Management, 36*, 215–228. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2014.12.004

Carter, C. R., & Rogers, D. S. (2008). A framework of sustainable supply chain management: Moving toward new theory. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management, 38*(5), 360–387. https://doi.org/10.1108/09600030810882816

Coase, R. H. (1937). The nature of the firm. *Economica, 4*(16), 386–405. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0335.1937.tb00002.x

Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission. (2013). *Internal control: Integrated framework*. https://www.coso.org/guidance-on-ic

Dyer, J. H., & Singh, H. (1998). The relational view: Cooperative strategy and sources of interorganizational competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Review, 23*(4), 660–679. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1998.1255632

Flynn, A., & Davis, P. (2014). Theory in public procurement research. *Journal of Public Procurement, 14*(2), 139–180. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOPP-14-02-2014-B001

Gelderman, C. J., & van Weele, A. J. (2003). Handling measurement issues and strategic directions in Kraljic's purchasing portfolio model. *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management, 9*(5–6), 207–216. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pursup.2003.07.001

Handfield, R., Walton, S. V., Sroufe, R., & Melnyk, S. A. (2002). Applying environmental criteria to supplier assessment: A study in the application of the analytical hierarchy process. *European Journal of Operational Research, 141*(1), 70–87. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-2217(01)00261-2

International Labour Organization. (2022). *ILO declaration on fundamental principles and rights at work and its follow-up (as amended in 2022)*. https://www.ilo.org/topics-and-sectors/fundamental-principles-and-rights-work

International Organization for Standardization. (2017). *Sustainable procurement: Guidance (ISO Standard No. 20400:2017)*. https://www.iso.org/standard/63026.html

Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics, 3*(4), 305–360. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(76)90026-X

Kozuch, A., Langen, M., von Deimling, C., & Eßig, M. (2024). Does green procurement pay off? Assessing the practice–performance link employing meta-analysis. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 434*, Article 140184. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.140184

Kraljic, P. (1983). Purchasing must become supply management. *Harvard Business Review, 61*(5), 109–117. https://hbr.org/1983/09/purchasing-must-become-supply-management

Krause, D. R., Handfield, R. B., & Tyler, B. B. (2007). The relationships between supplier development, commitment, social capital accumulation and performance improvement. *Journal of Operations Management, 25*(2), 528–545. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2006.05.007

Monczka, R. M., Handfield, R. B., Giunipero, L. C., & Patterson, J. L. (2020). *Purchasing and supply chain management* (7th ed.). Cengage Learning.

National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda. (2025). *Rwanda integrated business enterprise survey report 2024*. https://statistics.gov.rw/statistical-publications/business-establishment-finance-trade/business-establishment-finance-trade/integrated-business-enterprise-survey-2024

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2015). *Recommendation of the Council on Public Procurement* (OECD/LEGAL/0411). https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-0411

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *OECD guidelines for multinational enterprises on responsible business conduct*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/81f92357-en

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2025). *OECD guidelines for fighting bid rigging in public procurement (2025 update)*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/cbe05a56-en

Parliament of Rwanda. (2026a, February 12). *Parliament reviews public procurement law*. https://www.parliament.gov.rw/news-details/parliament-reviews-public-procurement-law

Parliament of Rwanda. (2026b, April 2). *Parliament calls for the amendment governing public procurement*. https://www.parliament.gov.rw/news-details/parliament-calls-for-the-amendment-governing-public-procurement-1

Republic of Rwanda. (2022). Law No. 031/2022 of 21/11/2022 governing public procurement. *Official Gazette*, Special Issue of 22 November 2022. https://extranet.who.int/cpcd/sites/default/files/public_file_repository/RWA_Rwanda_Law-No-031-2022-governing-public-procurement_2022.pdf

Republic of Rwanda. (2023). *Ministerial Order No. 001/23/10/TC of 10/10/2023 establishing regulations governing public procurement*. https://www.rppa.gov.rw/fileadmin/user_upload/RPPA/Publications/Legal_Instruments/MINISTERIAL_ORDER/Ministerial_Order_for_p.p_new_Law.pdf

Republic of Rwanda. (2026). Ministerial Order No. 001/26/10/TC of 13/02/2026 determining modalities for award of public tenders related to innovation. *Official Gazette*, Special Issue of 13 February 2026. https://www.rppa.gov.rw/fileadmin/user_upload/RPPA/Publications/Legal_Instruments/MINISTERIAL_ORDER/OG_n___Special_of_13.02.2026__Imitangire_y_amasoko_ya_Leta_ajyanye_no_guhanga_ibishya.pdf

Ruggie, J. (2011). *Report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises: Guiding principles on business and human rights* (A/HRC/17/31). United Nations. https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Issues/Business/A-HRC-17-31_AEV.pdf

Rwanda Public Procurement Authority. (n.d.). *Rwanda Public Procurement Authority: Home and services*. https://www.rppa.gov.rw/

Rwanda Public Procurement Authority. (2024). *Sustainable public procurement policy framework for Rwanda to drive green growth and inclusive development*. https://www.rppa.gov.rw/updates/sustainable-public-procurement-policy-framework-for-rwanda-to-drive-green-growth-and-inclusive-development

Schramm, V. B., Cabral, L. P. B., & Schramm, F. (2020). Approaches for supporting sustainable supplier selection: A literature review. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 273*, Article 123089. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.123089

Tabassi, E. (2023). *Artificial intelligence risk management framework (AI RMF 1.0)* (NIST AI 100-1). National Institute of Standards and Technology. https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.AI.100-1

Tadelis, S. (2012). Public procurement design: Lessons from the private sector. *International Journal of Industrial Organization, 30*(3), 297–302. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijindorg.2012.02.002

Williamson, O. E. (1985). *The economic institutions of capitalism: Firms, markets, relational contracting*. Free Press.

World Bank. (2025). *Procurement regulations for IPF borrowers* (7th ed., September 2025). https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/c84273d1b230aeb2b0b8134de5dc8cd7-0290012025/original/Procurement-Regulations-7th-Edition-Sep-2025.pdf