## Assessing Public Procurement Practice in Albania - 2017

### General Description of the Public Procurement System

#### X. Management of the Public Procurement System

Please provide a brief description of how the public procurement system is managed in your country by answering the following questions:

Is there a single state body responsible for managing the public procurement system, or is this function distributed among more than one state body? What is its/their authority and responsibilities and are legal requirements met in practice in this regard? What is the level of independence of this body/ies and are legal requirements met in practice? Is there duplication of authority?

*Please provide the answer in a maximum of 5-10 sentences.*

**Comment:** There is a single state body responsible for managing the public procurement system. According to Law no. 9643, dated 20.11.2006, “On Public Procurement”, amended, the article 13 provides that: *The Public Procurement Agency is a central body, a public legal person reporting to the Prime Minister, and financed by the State Budget.*

The Public Procurement Agency: a) Submits proposals for procurement regulations to the Council of Ministers; b) Promotes and organizes training of central and local government officials engaged in public procurement activities; c) Drafts and issues a Public Notifications Bulletin, as described in the procurement regulations. The PPA shall publish in the Public Notifications Bulletin the list of excluded economic operators pursuant to Article 45 of this law; (ç) Prepares standard tender documents to be used in awarding procedures, in accordance with the public procurement rules; (f) Encourages and supports the use of international technical standards for the preparation of national technical specifications (d) According to the request, provides advice and technical assistance to CA, which conducts a procurement procedure; (dh) Presents an annual report to the Council of Ministers regarding the overall functioning of the public procurement system; (e) Cooperates with international institutions and with other foreign entities on issues related to the PP system; (ë) Plans and coordinates foreign technical assistance to Albania in the field of PP; (g) Verifies the implementation of public procurement procedures, after the phase of the procurement contract signing, under the requirements set out in laws and regulations, the recommendations of the auditing bodies for procurement procedures, as well as maintains an ongoing relationship with the National Directorate of Standardizations; as well as monitors the public procurement system performance through information received from periodic reports obtained from Contracting Authorities, (i) In case of violation of this law and the regulations issued pursuant to it, if imposes fines under Article 72 of this law or proposes to the head of the contracting authority or the higher bodies disciplinary measures for those contracting authorities, which have committed these violations. (l) Carries out any other task, which is assigned by law; (k) Prepares and adapts its internal regulations.

The PPA can exclude an economic operator from participation in procurement procedures, irrespective of criminal proceedings, which may have started, for a period of 1 to 3 years for the following: a) Misinformation and submission of documents containing false information for purposes of qualification, as defined in Articles 45 and 46 of the law; .. ç) Non-fulfillment of contractual obligations.
for public contracts within the deadlines defined in the procurement rules. of this law; c) Conviction for crimes listed in Article 45, Paragraph 1 of this law; d) When there is a final decision of the Commission of the Competition Authority for bid rigging.

Although Public Procurement Agency, the director and the staff, are civil servants, they report directly to the Prime minister.

No there is no duplication of authority.

X. Are tenders electronic or paper based? In cases when tenders are solely electronic, are there cases of paper-based tendering? Is there insufficient enforcement of PPL?

Please provide the answer in a maximum of 3-4 sentences.

Comment: Both electronic and paper-based procedures are applied;

According to Council of Ministers Decision no. 918/2014, all procurement procedures are by electronic means, but there are some special procedures that are paper based (Negotiated procedure without prior publication of a contract notice – article 33 of Public Procurement Law; second phase of Consultancy Service and design contest procedures and energy buying procedures).

No, there is no insufficient enforcement of PPL.

X. Is public procurement conducted through a centralized, single website or are there multiple websites for conducting public procurement? Is its/their use mandatory or voluntary?

Please provide the answer in a maximum of 3-4 sentences.

Comment: The public procurement process is conducted through a centralized single website www.app.gov.al;

According to article 38 of Law 9643 “On Public Procurement”, amended, and Council of Ministers Decision no. 918 date 29.12.2014, it’s mandatory to use this website.

X. If there is a register of suppliers, what is the number of registered suppliers in it?

If possible, please provide a comparison with several (at least 5) previous years?

Comment: No, there is not a register of suppliers.

X. What is the total number of competitive procedures?

If possible, please provide a comparison with several (at least 5) previous years.

Comment: The total number of competitive procedures according to PPL is 8, as below listed:
    a) Open Procedure;
    b) Restricted procedure;
    c) Negotiated procedure with prior publication of a contract notice;
    d) Negotiated procedure without prior publication of a contract notice;
X. What is share of public procurement in the country’s GDP?

Comment: In 2017, the share of public procurement to the countries GDP was 7%.

X. What are the monetary thresholds for single source procurement (works, goods, services)? Not Available

Is the monetary threshold acceptable? Why or why not?

Comment: NA

Public Procurement Scope and Spending Breakdown

X. What share (% in terms of procurement value) of government spending is conducted through competitive public procurement procedures? The share of procured funds for 2017 is 38.6%. The actual/fact procured fund is 33.49% of government spending.

Please provide a brief analysis of this data point. If possible, provide a comparison with several (at least 5) previous years and possible explanations for the resulting trend.

Comment: These shares are not calculated in the Annual Public Procurement Reports of the Agency. For 2017 the share of competitive procedures to the total of government spending is calculated to 38.6%, compared to the actual procurement 33.49%. Throughout the years the share of procured funds increased from 20.2% in 2013, to 22.67% in 2014, to 32.75% in 2015. The year 2016, is the year with the highest share of procured funds with 40.59% of the government spending. In real terms, the share of realized procured funds follows the same trend as the procured fund in overall with 16.50% in 2013, 19.91%in 2014 and 29.42% in 2015. 2016 reaches the maximum share in the last 5 years in realistic terms with 37.91% of government spending carried through competitive public procurement procedures. The main arguments to this are linked to the increase of usage of the Public Procurement Agency and the electronic procurement by the government and an increase in overall of the funds for services requiring public procurement procedures by law. 2017 has been an electoral year for Albania, an argument for a lower level of planned procurement fund. The decrease of the realized procurement fund is strictly linked to the Decision of the Council of Ministers No. 482, date 05.07.2017 “On the temporary suspension of public procurement procedures during the year 2017”. This latter “froze” public procurement procedures for the period July – October 2017, leading to a lower number of procurement procedures carried throughout the year.

X. What share (% in terms of procurement value) of total public procurement spending is conducted through single source procurement? Not Available

Please provide a brief analysis of this data point. If possible, provide a comparison with several (at least 5) previous years and possible explanations for the resulting trend. If possible, provide a breakdown of
this data point by the list of legal exemptions considered acceptable or unnecessary by the TPPR Methodology (Pre-tendering phase, Indicator 9).

Comment: NA

X. What is the share (% in terms of procurement value) of below threshold single source procurement in total public procurement spending? **Not Available**

Please provide an analysis of this data point in 2-3 sentences (if possible, provide data from previous 5 years).

Comment: NA

X. If your country has any unreasonable exemptions to the Public Procurement Legislation (e.g. contingency funds, utilities, certain procuring entities or sectors of the economy), provide your estimate of the volume spent in this way and the share (% in terms of value) these exemptions would constitute in total procurement spending? Volume: ____ share: ____ **Not Available**

Please provide a brief analysis of this data point. If possible, provide a comparison with several (at least 5) previous years and possible explanations for the resulting trend.

Comment: The exemptions to the PPL are linked to three main areas: utilities in energy and water supply and procurement categorized as secret and of national interest to the country. There is no data available on these three areas in the Annual Reports of the Public Procurement Agency.

X. What is the volume of secret government procurement? What is the share (value in %) of secret government procurement in total public procurement expenditures? Volume: _____ share: _____

Please provide a brief analysis of this data point. If possible, provide a comparison with several (at least 5) previous years and possible explanations for the resulting trend.

Comment: **No available data.**

**Competitiveness**

X. What is the average number of bidders? ____ **Not Available**

If possible, provide a comparison with several (at least 5) previous years and possible explanations for the resulting trend. If possible, provide a breakdown of this data point by goods, works and services.

Comment: NA

X. What is the share (% in terms of procurement value) of competitive procedures with single bidders in total competitive spending? ____ **Not Available**

If possible, please provide information on the share (number) of competitive contracts won by single bidders in the total number of competitive procedures.

Comment: NA

X. What is the share (% in terms of procurement value) of competitive procedures with five or more bidders in total competitive spending? ____ **Not Available**

If possible, please provide information on the share (number) of competitive contracts with three or more bidders in the total number of competitive procedures.
X. What share (% in terms of procurement value) of public procurement contracts is won by commercial state-owned enterprises (above 50% ownership)? Not Available
Provide an analysis of this data point. If applicable, provide a comparison with several previous years. If possible, provide a breakdown of this data point by type of procedure, i.e. competitive procedures vs. direct procurement. Is there any reason to believe that state owned companies are getting preferential treatment?

Comment: NA

X. What share (% in terms of procurement volume) of public procurement contracts is won by foreign enterprises? Not Available
If possible, provide a comparison with several (at least 5) previous years and possible explanations for the resulting trend.

Comment: This data is not available as there is no available database of winners based on their origin or a database of winners in overall. However, contract notifications opened for foreign enterprises have been 0.4% of the overall competitive public procurement procedures. Due to procedures carried from 2016 to 2017, the signed contracts for procedures opened to foreign enterprises have been 0.63% to the total share of signed contracts. The share of signed contracts in procedures opened to foreign enterprises in previous years have been 3.01% in 2016, 4.05% in 2015, 2.75% in 2014 and 4.01% in 2013.

X. What is the share (%) of procuring entities which only used single source procurement in the total number of procuring entities? Not Available
If possible, provide a comparison with several (at least 5) previous years and possible explanations for the resulting trend.

Comment: Not allowed by law.

Efficiency
X. What is the share (%) of failed tenders in the total number of tenders? In 2017 the % of failed tenders in numbers was 35% in overall, with 34.5% of small value procurement and 33.2% of other failed procedures
If possible, provide a comparison with several (at least 5) previous years and possible explanations for the resulting trend. If possible, provide a breakdown of this data point by tenders with no bidders, cancelled tenders or unsuccessful tenders where no relevant competitor was found.

Comment: 2017 is the year with the highest percentage of failed procedures in the last 5 years, since 2013. Failed competitive public procurement procedures have been 33.2% in 2017, 9.6% in 2016, 14.2% in 2015, 26.6% in 2014 and 15.2% in 2013. According to the Annual Reports of the Procurement Agency the two main reasons are technical and legal. The Procurement Agency mentions the same reasons throughout the years, as main reasons: lack of competition, decisions of Public Procurement

1 Analiza Vjetore 2017 (alb), APP, Last access date; 25.01.2019, http://app.gov.al/GetData/DownloadDoc?documentId=0ef1ede8-8486-4114-8c58-e835fca3ed0e
Committee to terminate a procedure and closure of the financial year. This analysis is not currently followed up by statistical data.

However, in 2017 there is an increase also due to the DCM No. 482, date 05.07.2017 “On the temporary suspension of public procurement procedures during the year 2017”, for the period July – October 2017. In 2017, 80% if the cancelled/failed public procurement procedures are linked to procurements separated in parts (1400 procedures) and 80% of them are linked to procurement in the field of health care services and products.

In terms of small value procurements, administered through the electronic public procurement system the failed procedures throughout the last five years are as follows: 35.45% in 2017, 22.38% in 2016, 11.62% in 2015, 33.03% in 2014 and 39.78% in 2013. In 2015, the small value procurement threshold was doubled from 400 000 ALL to 800 000 ALL. In 2015 the % of failed small value procurement procedures diminished by 2/3, but increased in 2016 and 2017.

Unfortunately, in both cases there is no availability of categorized data to assess in details the reasons of termination of these procedures based on the required arguments.

**X. What share (%) of planned public procurement expenditure was saved as a result of competitive procedures? 9% in 2017.**

*If possible, provide a comparison with several (at least 5) previous years and possible explanations for the resulting trend.*

Comment: The % of savings due to the competitive procedures are in 2017 at the highest levels since 2012, where the saving was 10%. Throughout the years the saving from the limit fund for the procedures was 8.50% in 2016, 9.2% in 2015, and 8.6% in 2014. In 2013 the Public Procurement Agency registered the lowest saving in the last 6 years, with 7.3%. Consider jointly the above data and the data linked to negotiated procedures without prior publication of a contract notice the annual savings are 8.30% in 2017, 7.90% in 2016, 8.30% in 2015, 7.8% in 2014 and 6.6% in 2013.

**X. What is the share (%) of tenders where price is the only criterion compared to competitive procedures where other criteria are also used? Not available**

*If possible, provide a comparison with several (at least 5) previous years, as well as a brief analysis of this data point.*

This analysis requires assessing tenders one by one, in the absence of publicly available data.

**X. What is the share (%) of non-executed contracts in the total number of contracts? 0.9% for the year 2017**

*If relevant, provide a comparison with several (at least 5) previous years. If possible, provide a breakdown of this data point by type of procedure, i.e. competitive procedures vs. direct procurement. If possible, indicate the share (%) of non-executed contracts awarded through competitive procedures, as well as single source procurement.*

Comment: In 2017 the number of non-executed contracts is considerably low compared to the data from 2016, where the % of non-executed contracts is 20.78%. The main causes of non-executed contracts are the end of the financial year and the grievance mechanism on public procurement procedures with the Public Procurement Committee. In absence of a detailed reporting the analysis linked to the latter argument and to the competitive procedures is as follows: The results of the grievance and dispute settlement mechanism affect the number of contracts executed the following
year, by a relevant increase. The annual reports of the Public Procurement Committee, shows a total number of 1083 of complaints on public procurement procedures for 2017 and a total of 1387 for 2016. 51% of the complaints in 2016 have been rejected, allowing for further execution of the contracts. The clear effect of procedures carried year by year is in 2015, where we notice a 34.7% of additional contracts being executed compared to the award of the winner.

It is not possible to assess statistical data on non-executed contracts with direct procedures, or single source procurement.

Accountability

X. Describe the dispute settlement mechanism in public procurement, its composition, authority, level of independence, and decision-making procedures. What are the major strengths and problems in law and practice:

Comment: A Public Procurement Commission (PPC) was established for this purpose by the 2009 amendments to the Public Procurement Law. The establishment of the PPC ensures a separation of policymaking and implementation from remedies functions, bringing the system more in line with EU rules.

The PPC reviews the grievances in the PP procedures, in accordance with the Law No.9643, dated 20/11/2006, ‘On Public Procurement’ (updated). This institution is specific and a quasi-judicial state body, with jurisdiction of providing legal protection in public procurement.

It is funded by the Government Budget and depends directly from the Prime Minister. The PPC has a 5 years mandate and is a group consisting of 5 core members from which are selected the chairman and deputy chairman. PPC members are appointed by the CoM, with a proposal of the Prime Minister and they have the right to be re-elected only 1 time. The staff are treated as by the civil servant law. As described in this law, the incompatibility of the PPC member include the participation of the person in a political party, possible administrator of commercial companies and the opportunity to participate in any benefiting activity except that of being a lecturer/teacher.

The Public Procurement Committee, despite having the tools to monitor and ensure the rightful implementation of the legal framework for public procurement, does not very often assess all complaints, does not follow up on the results of their investigations by sending the cases to court, does not ensure a thorough investigation with arguments related to high number of complaints and lack of organisational capacities. Moreover they do not, in the first place, publish detailed and editable data formats and often consider the transparency standard is of their discretion.

X. What is the number of complaints submitted to the dispute resolution board (or equivalent body)? In 2017 the number of complaints was 1083 or 22.6% of the overall awarded contracts for the year.

*If possible, provide a comparison with several (at least 5) previous years and possible explanations for the resulting trend.*

Comment: The annual reports of the Public Procurement Committee, shows a total number of complaints on public procurement procedures of 1083 for 2017, 1387 for 2016, 1111 for 2015, 826 for 2014 and 511 for 2013. A lower number of complaints is seen in previous years with 538 in 2012, 483 in 2011 and 267 in 2010. The PPC was created in 2010 only, and the increased number of complaints throughout the years, is linked to the increase of trust in the work of the body and moreover to the
overall change to electronic public procurements². In 2016 and 2015 there has been a similar number of complaints in this body. In 2017 there is a slight decrease in the number of complaints, related to the legal suspension of public procurements in the second half of the year.

X. What is the share (%) of disputed tenders in the total number of tenders? 16.34% of the total number of tenders in 2017.
If possible, please provide an analysis of this data point in 2-3 sentences.

Comment: The share of disputed tenders with a Public Procurement Commission decision in 2017 shows a slight increase from 13.48% in 2016 and 13.12% in 2015. In 2017, approximately 50% are complaints on Security Guard Services, 16% on other Services, 12% on Civil Works and 22% on Goods. Moreover 26.7 % of complaints have been linked to the criteria for the selection of the winner in the tender procedure and the rest linked to the final decision of the contracting authorities. The complaints on Security Guard Services are relatively high in 2016 as well, with 60.6% of the overall number of complaints.

X. What share (%) of disputes was won by the initiator in the Dispute Resolution Board (or equivalent body)? For 2017 these data are not made available. For 2016, 61% of the decision have favored the initiator.
If possible, please provide an analysis of this data point in 2-3 sentences.

Comment: For 2016 the decisions have favored the initiator, by termination of the tender (11%), reassess of the procedure (41%) and identification of discriminatory criteria (8%). Similar shares of results based on the initiators requests in previous years: 60.1% in 2015, 50.8% in 2014 and 60.7% in 2013.

X. What share of decisions of the Dispute Resolution Board have been taken to courts? The share of decisions taken to court for 2017 are in overall 13.78%.
If possible, provide a comparison with several (at least 5) previous years and possible explanations for the resulting trend.

Comment: The share of 13.78% includes decisions taken to both levels of the Administrative Court in Albania. The share of decisions taken to the first instance administrative court is 7.4% of the overall complaints’ decisions. Throughout the years the data does not show a specific trend in the number of decisions taken to court as the share for 2016 is 14.64%, for the year 2015 is 8.75%, for the year 2014 is 19.53% and for the year 2013 is 5.69%. An interesting phenomenon is the rejection of the requests by the courts, leaving in place the decision of the Public Procurement Committee. 70% of the requests were rejected by the court in 2017 and 60% were rejected in 2016. The rejection rates are higher in the previous years, respectively 84%, 76% and 57% for 2015, 2014 and 2013. 2016 is the year with the highest number of unterminated court procedures at the end of the year (24%), compared to an average of 15% of procedures not finalized for the other years.

X. What share (%) of the total competitive procurement spending was received by companies that have donated (including private donations by their owners) to the current government? Data not available

² Public Procurement Annual Reports.
Comment: There is no available data on the donations made to governmental structures. On the other hand, there is an increase in the so called public private partnerships, where several companies offer services for public work for public buildings such as schools, hospitals, offices and they agree to be paid throughout time, according to a defined contract with the government. There is no ground for a possible link between these companies and possible doubtful public procedures, being them also competitive. However, the above mentioned cooperation may lead to biased decision-making by the government, and remains a red flag for the accountability and competitiveness of the public procurement procedures.

X. What share (%) of the total single source procurement spending was received by companies that have donated (including private donations by their owners) to the current government? Data not available

If possible, please provide an analysis of this data point in 2-3 sentences. Have there been any high profile cases of politically affiliated companies receiving single source contracts?

Comment: NA

Transparency
X. Can public procurement related data be downloaded in bulk? If yes, can data be downloaded in any of the following formats - CSV, JSON, or XML?

No

X. Are there any significant data quality issues? (Are any control mechanisms in place to ensure data quality is maintained?)

Databases of public procurement are not made available. Therefore, there is no possibility to assess the presence of any control mechanisms for data quality.

X. Please fill the Data Transparency Table below by indicating either “Yes”, “No” or “N/A” in each empty slot:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of document</th>
<th>Is this information required to be public by law?</th>
<th>Is this information publicly available?</th>
<th>Is the database complete?</th>
<th>Electronic</th>
<th>Machine-readable *</th>
<th>Free of charge</th>
<th>Exact format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPL documents</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>PDF, Word, Excel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual public procurement plans</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Webpage article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices of intended procurement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Webpage article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Webpage article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendments to tender documentation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Webpage article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender candidate applications</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bids</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender commission decisions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Webpage article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on subcontractors</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement contracts</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract amendments</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract performance information</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment receipts</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection and quality control reports</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (object, date and economic operator)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Webpage article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute resolutions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (Decision only, when finalized)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal and external audit reports</td>
<td>External Audit reports - Yes (based on criteria decided by the Tax Authority in the country and not the PPA.)</td>
<td>Yes (Only for companies fulfilling the criteria)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>PDF (webpage: <a href="http://www.qkb.gov.al">www.qkb.gov.al</a>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For the purposes of this questionnaire, machine-readable means: for quantitative data formats, such as: JSON, CSV, XML, and for text documents - document that are NOT uploaded in the form of a scanned photo or PDF file.

In the comment box below, please elaborate on any irregularities or important details related to the above table.

Comment: The PPL documents do not always follow a format. I.e. in the beginning of 2017 documents for public works when needed in excel were provided in this format. This was not happening at the end of the year for all the announcements.
Information on technical aspects, commercial secrets and confidential information of bids are not to be made publicly available, as per article 25, Law on “Public Procurement”. Information on economic aspects is not to be made publicly available.
operators that have expressed interest in a tender is to be kept a secret, in a request for further information (article 41). No further specification is made in the Law on Public Procurement, despite several updates to the law throughout years. The Law on” The right of access to information”, specifies the following: The Public Procurement Agency can provide additional public information by request, maintaining and updating a Register of Requests for Information. This latter should be available in the website of the agency.

X. In addition to what is listed in the Data Transparency Table above, are there any gaps in the public procurement database/s? (e.g. gaps in the completeness of data from specific procurers or specific time periods?)

It is not possible to assess discrepancies within the database, as far as there is no such periodical database available. The current format only provides one or more announcements (in block), in an excel file, which needs to be merged continuously with previously elaborated data for comparison.

Major Strengths and Weaknesses

X. What are the 3 major gaps between the country’s public procurement legislation requirements and their implementation in practice? (e.g. ignored provisions, legal loophole, etc.) What are your recommendations for how to align the practice with the legislation? Please provide a brief description of each in a maximum of 4-5 sentences.

1. Gap: Transparency and Accountability in Public Procurement System

Recommendation: Enhancing transparency and accountability, in particular ensuring the effective, efficient and transparent functioning of the public procurement system and public finance management, remains essential. (Albania 2018 Report European Commission)

2. Gap: The lack of rules on Public Procurement review and compliance. Improvement of inspection capacity

Recommendation: To improve the public procurement review and compliance with procurement rules; The inspection capacity in public procurement needs to be further improved. E-procurement needs to achieve more transparency and reduce opportunities for abuse.

3. Gap: Efforts are needed to improve compliance with procedures and prevent corruption in the procurement cycle.
Recommendation: Albania should in particular: fully transpose the 2014 directives on EU public procurement, including in the area of utilities, concessions and defense procurement; and systematically follow up conflicts of interest and strengthen the state’s audit capacity in this respect.

X. What are the 3 major weaknesses / challenges of the country’s public procurement system as a whole? And what are your recommendations for overcoming them? Please provide a brief description of each in a maximum of 4-5 sentences.

   
   Recommendation: Amendments to the Public Procurement Law to improve the independence of the Public Procurement Commission

2. Challenge: Processing of complaints within the legal time limit remains a challenge, partly due to the absence of standard criteria to categorize new appeals either as a normal or complex case.
   
   Recommendation: Setting up an electronic database for PPC judgments would improve the transparency of the review system.

3. Challenge:
   
   Recommendation:

X. What are the 3 major strengths / successes of the country’s public procurement system as a whole? Please provide a brief description of each in a maximum of 4-5 sentences.

1. The legal framework on public procurement is largely in line with the EU directives on classical and utilities procurement, and relevant administrative and budget provisions. The law specifies the principles of transparency, equal treatment and non-discrimination.

2. Albania has an electronic central public procurement portal for the publication of tender and contract notices as well as other important information and guidance. The system is mandatory, including for low-value procurement.

3. 