

Index

- Africa, framework agreements in, 313–314
 in Ethiopia, 60, 144–147
 defined, 144
 federal PPPDS, 146
 Oromiya PPPDS, 144–145
- aggregation rules
 CPAs and, 281–284, 285–286
 in EU Directive, 93–94
 in framework agreement procedures, 29–30
 in framework agreements, 5
 under UNCITRAL Model Law, 115, 116
- all-purpose frame contracts (APFCs), 130–132
- asymmetric competition, 197–198
- auctions, 37
 electronic reverse, 199–201, 243–244
- Australia
 panel arrangements in, 12
 panel contracts in, 44, 151–154
 establishment of, 151–152
 MULs compared to, 152–154
 open/closed, 152
- average bid methods, 201–204
- award criteria, 267–272
 for closed complete framework agreements, 268–270
 for closed incomplete framework agreements, 270–272
 item-by-item, 65
- award notices, 229–233
- awarding of contracts, 276–278. *See also*
 multi-award framework agreements;
 single-award framework agreements
 for closed complete framework agreements, 276–278
 for closed incomplete framework agreements, 278
 collusion issues and, 193–194, 195–196
- bid rotation, 184–185
 bid suppression, 184–185
 bidders, 35, 38–40
- bidding. *See also* bid-rigging schemes
 cover, 184–185
 joint, 194–195
 bidding documents, 223–229
 bidding notices, 229–233
 bid-rigging schemes
 collusion through, 190–192, 245–250
 detection of, 245–250
 enforcement actions against, 250–251
 leniency programmes and, 250
 OECD strategies for, 214–215
 practical aspects of, 248–250
 pricing behaviours in, 247
 sanctions for, 250–251
 suspension measures, 251
 suspicious patterns in, 246–247
 through bid analysis, 246–248
 through data analysis, 246–248
 under UNCITRAL Model Law, 247–248
 unusual patterns in, 246
- blanket purchase agreements (BPAs), 107
- Brazil
 CPAs in, 135–138
 framework agreements in, 135–138
 PR system in, 135–138
 benefits of, 137–138
 inefficiencies of, 137–138
 institutions and assignments in, 136–137
- bundling, 38
 in cascade method, 65
 in single-award agreements, 52–53
- buying clubs, 7
- call-offs, 195–204
- Canada
 collusion cases in, 208–209
 standing offers in, 12, 14
- cartels, collusion through, 185
- cascade method, in closed complete framework agreements, 62–66, 276–277
 allocative efficiency, 63–64

- applications of, 63–64
- bundling in, 65
- call-off stage, 63
- item-by-item award criterion, 65
- LP criterion, 65
- catalogue contracts, 12
- central procurement agencies, 40
- centralised purchasing agencies (CPAs)
 - APFCs and, 130–132
 - closed incomplete framework agreements and, 129–132
 - collusion with, 241
 - commitment in, 287–291
 - demand side, 288–291
 - supply side, 291
 - demand aggregation challenges for, 281–284, 285–286
 - design of, 280–281
 - in EU, 128–132
 - funding of, 283–284
 - GSA, 132–135
 - in Italy, 128–129
 - in Latin America, 135–143
 - in Brazil, 135–138
 - in Colombia, 142–143
 - in OECD countries, 125–126, 127–128
 - process costs for, 282–283
 - procurement markets and, 286–287
 - purpose of, 124
 - role of centralisation in, 281–282
 - simulated case study, 298–303
 - centralisation strategies, 302–303
 - demand side features, 298–299
 - first-stage competition design, 300–301
 - objectives of, 299
 - procurement strategies, 299–300, 301–302
 - second-stage competition design, 300–301
 - supply side features, 299
- SMEs and, 292–297
 - divisions of goods and services, 294–295
 - geographical lots, 295–296
 - turnover requirements, 297
- task specialisation in, 281–282
- in U.S., 132–135
- Chile, CPAs in, 138–142
- CICA. *See* Competition in Contracting Act
- Clinger–Cohen Act, 103–104, 112–113
- closed complete framework agreements
 - (Model 1 framework agreements), 16–17, 52–69
- cascade method in, 62–66, 276–277
 - allocative efficiency, 63–64
 - applications of, 63–64
 - bundling in, 65
 - call-off stage, 63
 - item-by-item award criterion, 65
 - LP criterion, 65
- design of, 260–262
 - award criteria, 268–270
 - supply diversification in, 269–270
- as framework contract, 17
- multi-award agreements, 58–61
 - economic rationale for, 59–60
 - LP criterion, 59–60
 - MEAT criterion, 59–60
 - second-stage contracts, 60–61
- procuring entity needs in, 43
- random allocation in, 68–69
- regulatory systems for, 89
- rotation method, 66–67
 - fixed shares, 67
 - queuing, 66
- single-award agreements, 52–57
 - adverse selection of users, 57
 - bundling in, 52–53
 - contract enforcement, 53–55
 - degree of competition in, 55–56
 - flexibility of, 57
 - in Italy, 52, 54
 - NFCs Monitoring System, 53–54
 - standardisation of, 55
 - transaction costs in, 52–55
- transparency requirements for, 225–227
- closed incomplete framework agreements
 - (Model 2 framework agreements), 17–19, 69–77
- accommodation in procuring entity needs, 44–49
- collusion with, 186
- CPAs and, 129–132
- design of, 264–267
 - award criteria for, 270–272
 - awarding of contracts in, 278
 - heterogeneity levels in, 264–266
 - MEAT criterion in, 272–274
 - non-price competition in, 267
 - number of awardees, 266
 - price competition in, 267
- effective competition for, 168–172
- flexibility of, 170
- in India, 151
- in Italy, 129–132
- multi-award agreements, 69–70
 - award criteria, 72–76
 - competition in, 72–76
 - evaluation criteria, 72–76
 - MEAT criterion, 75
 - standardisation of, 70
 - two-stage competition, 70–71
 - under UNCITRAL Model Law, 72

- closed incomplete (cont.)
 regulatory systems for, 89
 single-award agreements, 76–77
 for chemical reagents, 77
 standardisation of, 77
 transparency requirements for, 170–172,
 225–227
 under UNCITRAL Model Law, 170–172
 UNCITRAL recommendations, 19
- closed panel contracts, 152
- collusion, 180
 through barriers to entry, 186–188
 bid rotation, 184–185
 bid suppression, 184–185
 through bid-rigging schemes, 190–192,
 245–250
 in Canadian cases, 208–209
 through cartels, 185
 with closed incomplete framework
 agreements, 186
 in concentrated markets, 186–188
 corruption through, 180
 cover bidding, 184–185
 with CPAs, 241
 demand factors for, 184–192
 through demand fragmentation, 189–190
 through demand predictability, 188–189
 through design issues, 237–245
 electronic reverse auctions, 243–244
 market access, 239–240
 predictability-related decisions, 240–243
 in EU cases, 182
 extant and effects of, 181–184
 through fixed quantities, 189
 framework agreement procedures and,
 192–204
 asymmetric competition and, 197–198
 average bid methods, 201–204
 call-offs and, 195–204
 common components, 199–200
 degree of heterogeneity and, 196–197
 electronic reverse auctions, 199–201
 first stage of, 192–195
 information production, 200–201
 through joint bidding, 194–195
 number of awardees as factor in, 193–194,
 195–196
 private components, 199–200
 rate contracts and, 196–197
 second stage of, 195–204
 sequence of contracts as factor in, 193–194
 symmetric competition and, 197–198
 through joint ventures, 241
 through lack of substitutes, 189
 in market allocation agreements, 184–185
 market predictability and, 188–192
 market stability and, 188–192
 markets structures for, 184–192
 in Mexico cases, 209
 through pre-bidding information, 217–218
 in private procurement markets, 183
 through procedural aspects, 190–192
 public procurement policy and, 181–183,
 190–192, 221
 in rate contracts, 196–197, 206–208
 in repeated framework agreements, 204–205
 among suppliers, 181–184
 transparency paradox and, 216–219
 transparency requirements for, 190–192,
 219–233
 through award notices, 229–233
 in bidding documents, 223–229
 through bidding notices, 229–233
 contract notices and, 221–223
 disclosure of public procurement law, 221
 in EU, 224–225, 227–228
 legal information for, 221
 non-disclosure issues, 234–237
 prior announcements and, 221–223
 in solicitation documents, 223–229
 under UNCITRAL Model Law, 223–224,
 227–228, 229–233, 234–237
 in U.S., 225
 in U.K. cases, 182–183, 235
 under UNCITRAL Model Law, 219, 229–233
 in U.S. cases, 209–210
 in World Bank projects, 210
 Colombia, CPAs in, 142–143
 commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) items,
 103–104, 175–177
- commitment
 in CPAs, 287–291
 demand side, 288–291
 supply side, 291
 in mandatory framework agreements, 292
- competition, in framework agreement
 procedures, 32–34, 326–328. *See also*
 effective competition
 asymmetric, 197–198
 economic benefits of, 157–158
 in hybrid models, 80
 for ID/IQ contracts, 108–112, 159–160
 incentivisation of, 32
 information and, 38–40, 41
 for bidders, 38–40
 contract (in)completeness, 40
 about demand characteristics, 38–40
 Winner's Curse, 39
 innovation through, 158
 in MAS contracts, 108

- in multi-award agreements, 72–76, 198, 202
- for open and incomplete agreements, 77–79
- in procurement markets, 32
- product improvement through, 158
- public procurement policy and, 32, 33–34
- in rate contracts, 80
- in single-award agreements, 55–56
- symmetric, 197–198
- threats to, 158–161
- transaction costs, 40–41
- transparency requirements, 33
- under UNCITRAL Model Law, 32–33, 121–123
- Competition in Contracting Act (CICA), 100–101
- concentrated markets, collusion in, 186–188
- Consp. *See* Italy
- contract (in)completeness, 40
- contract notices, 221–223
- contract tasks, 36
- contractor team arrangements (CTAs), 107
- corruption, 180
 - through collusion, 180
- COTS items. *See* commercial-off-the-shelf items
- cover bidding, 184–185
- CPAs. *See* centralised purchasing agencies
- CTAs. *See* contractor team arrangements
- delivery-order contracts, 15
- demand and market analysis, 34–49
 - defined, 34
 - heterogeneity in, 39–40
 - of procurement markets, 34–49
 - accommodation of needs, 44–49
 - bidders, 35
 - bundling in, 38
 - in closed complete framework agreements, 43
 - in closed incomplete framework agreements, 44–49
 - contract tasks in, 36
 - efficiency in, 35–36
 - framing entity needs, 41–44
 - information in, 38–40, 41
 - in Italy, 47
 - KONEPS e-shopping mall, 43
 - under Model Law, 43
 - NHS Estate Procure 21, 43
 - of price, 37–38
 - product differentiation in, 37–38
 - production costs, 36
 - of quality, 37–38
 - requirements contract, 42
 - demand fragmentation, 189–190
 - demand predictability, 188–189
 - demand side commitment, 288–291
 - Denmark, term contracts in, 92
 - design, of framework agreements
 - for alternative procurement strategy, 258
 - award criteria, 267–272
 - for closed complete framework agreements, 268–270
 - for closed incomplete framework agreements, 270–272
 - awarding of contracts, 276–278
 - for closed complete framework agreements, 276–278
 - for closed incomplete framework agreements, 278
 - basic aspects of, 256–259
 - challenges of, 328–329
 - for closed complete framework agreements, 260–262
 - award criteria, 268–270
 - awarding of contracts in, 276–278
 - supply diversification in, 269–270
 - of closed incomplete framework agreements, 264–267
 - award criteria for, 270–272
 - awarding of contracts for, 278
 - heterogeneity levels in, 264–266
 - MEAT criterion in, 272–274
 - non-price competition in, 267
 - number of awardees, 266
 - price competition in, 267
 - collusion through, 237–245
 - electronic reverse auctions, 243–244
 - market access, 239–240
 - predictability-related decisions, 240–243
 - for CPAs, 280–281
 - demand heterogeneity, 257
 - demand side, 257–259
 - legal and regulatory systems in, 316–319
 - main drivers of, 256–259
 - for multi-award agreements, 263–264
 - process costs, 258–259
 - procurement cycle, 258
 - of SLAs, 258
 - splitting of procurement lots, 274–275
 - supply diversification, 257–258
 - supply side, 256
 - Directorate General of Supplies and Disposal (DGS&D), 148–149
 - Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS), 47
 - in EU Directive, 98–100
 - effective competition
 - barriers to entry, 161–165
 - for closed incomplete framework agreements, 168–172
 - contracting authorities and, 168–169

- effective competition (cont.)
 defined, 157
 disclosure of terms and conditions for, 165–168
 under EU Directive, 161–162
 flexibility in, 166
 under GPA, 161–162
 GSA and, 171
 for ID/IQ contracts, 171
 MAS contracts, 171
 for open incomplete framework agreements, 168–172
 risk aversion for, 173–174
 for SMEs, 162–164
 statutory preferences for, 168
 threats to, 158–161
 transparency requirements for, 170–172
 under UNCITRAL Model Law, 161–162, 165–166
 wide participation as prerequisite for, 161–168
- efficiency
 in cascade method, 63–64
 defined, 23
 of PR system, 137–138
 in procurement systems, 5, 22–24
 efficiency, of procurement markets, 35–36
 electronic reverse auctions, 199–201, 243–244
 Ethiopia, framework contracts in, 60, 144–147
 defined, 144
 federal PPPDS, 146
 Oromiya PPPDS, 144–145
 EU. *See* European Union
 EU Directive
 aggregation rules in, 93–94
 DPS in, 98–100
 effective competition under, 161–162
 framework agreements under, 78
 hybrid models under, 80–81
 main procedures of, 93–97
 first stage, 95–96
 second stage, 96–97
 regulatory systems under, 86, 87–89, 91, 93–97
 EU Remedies Directive, 91
 European Commission, 90–91, 160–161
 European Union (EU). *See also specific countries*
 classification of framework agreements in, 50
 collusion in, 182
 transparency requirements, 224–225, 227–228
 CPAs in, 128–132
 framework agreements in, 12–13
 multi-award framework agreements in, 58–61
 economic rationale for, 59–60
 LP criterion, 59–60
 MEAT criterion, 59–60
 second-stage contracts, 60–61
 regulatory systems in
 in closed complete agreements, 89
 in closed incomplete agreements, 89
 defined, 91
 development of, 86–121
 DPS and, 98–100
 dynamic purchasing systems, 87–100
 early use of, 86–87
 under EU Directives, 86, 87–89, 91, 93–97
 under EU Remedies Directive, 91
 under European Commission, 90–91
 experience in use of, 97–100
 in open incomplete agreements, 89
 scope of provisions for, 90–93
 for term contracts, 92–93
 under UNCITRAL Model Law, 87, 92
 single-award agreements in, 52–57
 adverse selection of users, 57
 bundling in, 52–53
 contract enforcement, 53–55
 degree of competition in, 55–56
 flexibility of, 57
 in Italy, 52, 54
 NFCs Monitoring System, 53–54
 standardisation of, 55
 transaction costs in, 52–55
 under UNCITRAL Model Law, 114–121
 competition requirements, 121–123
 first stage of, 117–119
 second stage of, 119–121
 transparency requirements, 121–123
- FAR. *See* Federal Acquisition Regulation
 FASA. *See* Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act
 Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), 42, 101
 reforms of, 112
 Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act (FASA), 101
 reforms of, 112
 Federal Supply Schedules (FSS) contracts, 104–108
 GSA and, 133
 fixed shares, 67
 flexibility
 of closed incomplete framework agreements, 170
 in effective competition, 166
 of framework agreements, 6–7
 of open incomplete framework agreements, 170
 in single-award agreements, 57
 of UNCITRAL Model Law, 118–119
 framework agreement procedures. *See also*
 competition, in framework agreement procedures
 administrative efficiency, 22–24
 aggregation of procurement in, 29–30

- collusion and, 192–204
 - asymmetric competition and, 197–198
 - average bid methods, 201–204
 - call-offs and, 195–204
 - common components, 199–200
 - degree of heterogeneity and, 196–197
 - electronic auctions, 199–201
 - first stage of, 192–195
 - information production, 200–201
 - through joint bidding, 194–195
 - number of awardees as factor in, 193–194, 195–196
 - private components, 199–200
 - rate contracts and, 196–197
 - second stage of, 195–204
 - sequence of contracts as factor in, 193–194
 - symmetric competition and, 197–198
- commercial purchasing, 175–176
- common variables in, 21–22
- COTS items, 175–176
- enhancing outcomes in, 172–177
- guidance on, 315–316
- low-value procurement, 26–27
- motivations for use of, 22–30
- parallel, 204–205
- process efficiencies of, 25
- public procurement methods, 4–5, 26–27
- regulation of, 315–316
- repeated, 204–205
- risk aversion for, 173–174
- risk management in, 174–175
- security of supply, 28–29
- standardisation of, 25
- urgent procurement methods, 25–26, 28
- framework agreements, 12. *See also* closed
 - complete framework agreements; closed
 - incomplete framework agreements; design, of framework agreements; legal and regulatory systems, for framework agreements; multi-award framework agreements; open incomplete framework agreements; single-award framework agreements
 - in Africa, 313–314
 - aggregation of purchases in, 5
 - in Brazil, 135–138
 - buying clubs and, 7
 - characteristics of, 12–16
 - common criticisms of, 94–95
 - common variables in, 20–22
 - consensus on, 6
 - demand and market analysis of, 34–49
 - design issues for, 6
 - in European Union, 12–13
 - Federal Acquisition Regulation and, 15
 - flexibility of, 6–7
 - hybrid models, 79–81
 - competition in, 80
 - complete-but-amendable agreements, 80–81, 82
 - EU Directive, 80–81
 - rate contracts, 79–80
 - identification stage in, 4
 - incompleteness of, 50
 - mandatory, 292
 - multi-supplier, 29
 - panel arrangements, 12
 - performance measures for, 329–330
 - procedural costs of, 4–5
 - procuring entities in, 7, 20
 - as public contracts, 91
 - public officials and, 4–5
 - in public procurement policy, 4–5, 26–27
 - purpose of, 325–326
 - single-supplier, 28–29
 - SME participation, 29
 - standing offers, 12, 14
 - subject-matter of, 4
 - suppliers and, 13–14
 - taxonomy for, 16–20
 - under UNCITRAL Model Law, 14
 - in U.S., 15
- framework contracts. *See also* multi-award framework agreements; single-award framework agreements
 - in Ethiopia, 60, 144–147
 - defined, 144
 - federal PPPDS, 146
 - Oromiya PPPDS, 144–145
- FSS contracts. *See* Federal Supply Schedules contracts
- General Services Administration (GSA), 70, 132–135
 - effective competition and, 171
 - FSS programme, 133
- Government Wide Acquisition Contracts (GWACS), 104–108
- GSA. *See* General Services Administration
- GWACS. *See* Government Wide Acquisition Contracts
- heterogeneity, in demand and market analysis, 39–40
- hybrid models, 79–81
 - competition in, 80
 - complete-but-amendable agreements, 80–81
 - for laptops, 82
 - for photocopying machines, 81
 - EU Directive, 80–81
 - rate contracts, 79–80

ID/IQ contracts. *See* indefinite delivery/
indefinite quantity contracts

IFFs. *See* industrial funding fees

indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity (ID/IQ)
contracts, 12–13, 100–114

under Clinger-Cohen Act, 103–104, 112–113

commercial items in, 103

competition for, 108–112, 159–160

COTS items in, 103–104

defined, 101

effective competition for, 171

FSS contracts, 104–108

GSA and, 132–135

GWACS contracts, 104–108

incumbency issues, 110–111

MAS contracts, 104–108

minimum quantity in, 102

misuse of, 111–112

under NDAA, 113–114

in practice, 108–112

reforms for, 102–103, 112–114

regulatory systems for, 100–114

restrictions in, 102

second-stage competition for, 171

under Small Business Jobs Act, 114

transparency requirements, 108–112

India, rate contracts in, 60, 147–151

closed incomplete framework agreements, 151

of DGS&D, 148–149

open incomplete framework agreements, 151

retail prices compared to, 150

at state-level, 149–150

under World Bank Procurement Guidelines,
150–151

industrial funding fees (IFFs), 135

information, competition in framework
agreement procedures, 38–40, 41

for bidders, 38–40

contract (in)completeness, 40

about demand characteristics, 38–40

Winner's Curse, 39

innovation, through competition, 158

integrity

collusion and, 180

compromise of, 179–180

corruption and, 180

Italy

APFCs in, 130–132

closed incomplete framework agreements in,
129–132

collusion cases in, 182

CPAs in, 128–129

procurement markets in, 47

single-award agreements in, 52, 54

item-by-item award criterion, 65

joint bidding, 194–195

Kelman, Steven, 112

KONEPS e-shopping mall, 43

Latin America

CPAs in, 135–143

in Brazil, 135–138

in Chile, 138–142

in Colombia, 142–143

Mexico, collusion cases in, 209

legal and regulatory systems, for framework
agreements

avoidance of excessive complexity in, 320–322

dedicated, necessity of, 306

design of, 316–319

elements of, 306–310

in EU

in closed complete agreements, 89

in closed incomplete agreements, 89

defined, 91

development of, 86–121

DPS and, 98–100

dynamic purchasing systems, 87–100

early use of, 86–87

under EU Directives, 86, 87–89, 91, 93–97

under EU Remedies Directive, 91

under European Commission, 90–91

experience in use of, 97–100

in open incomplete agreements, 89

scope of provisions for, 90–93

for term contracts, 92–93

under UNCITRAL Model Law, 87, 92

formal rules in, 311–315

guidance in, 311–315

long-term implications for, 330

operational issues in, 316–319

for overuse of, 319–320

policy statements, 311

under UNCITRAL Model Law, 308–310

for underuse of, 319–320

in U.S.

evolution of, 100–104

ID/IQ contracts, 100–114

leniency programmes, 250

lowest price (LP) criterion, 59–60, 65

low-value procurement methods, 26–27

LP criterion. *See* lowest price criterion

mandatory framework agreements, 292

market access, collusion through, 239–240

market allocation agreements, 184–185

market analysis. *See* demand and market analysis

MAS contracts. *See* Multiple Award Schedules
contracts

- MEAT criterion. *See* most economically advantageous tender criterion
- Mexico, collusion cases in, 209
- Model 1 framework agreements. *See* closed complete framework agreements
- Model 2 framework agreements. *See* closed incomplete framework agreements
- Model 3 framework agreements. *See* open incomplete framework agreements
- most economically advantageous tender (MEAT) criterion, 59–60, 75, 272–274
- MULs. *See* multi-use lists
- multi-award framework agreements
- assignment of awardees in, 263–264
 - closed complete, 58–61
 - economic rationale for, 59–60
 - LP criterion, 59–60
 - MEAT criterion, 59–60
 - second-stage contracts, 60–61
 - closed incomplete, 69–70
 - award criteria, 72–76
 - competition in, 72–76
 - evaluation criteria, 72–76
 - MEAT criterion, 75
 - standardisation of, 70
 - two-stage competition, 70–71
 - under UNCITRAL Model Law, 72
 - competition for, 72–76, 198, 202
 - design of, 263–264
- Multiple Award Schedules (MAS) contracts, 78–79
- competition requirements, 108
 - CTAs, 107
 - effective competition and, 171
 - first stage procedures, 105–106
 - ID/IQ contracts, 104–108
 - IFFs in, 135
 - open market items, 108
 - second stage procedures, 106–108
 - transparency requirements, 108
- multi-supplier framework agreements, 29
- multi-use lists (MULs), 152–154
- National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), 113–114
- National Framework Contracts (NFCs) Monitoring System, 53–54
- NDAA. *See* National Defense Authorization Act
- the Netherlands, collusion cases in, 182
- NFCs Monitoring System. *See* National Framework Contracts Monitoring System
- NHS Estate Procure 21, 43
- OECD countries. *See* Organisation for Economic Development countries
- open incomplete framework agreements (Model 3 framework agreements), 19–20
- competition in, 77–79
 - effective competition for, 168–172
 - under EU Directive, 78
 - flexibility of, 170
 - in India, 151
 - MAS contracts, 78–79
 - regulatory systems for, 89
 - transparency requirements for, 170–172, 225–227
 - under UNCITRAL Model Law, 78, 170–172
- open panel contracts, 152
- open-tendering, 26–27
- Organisation for Economic Development (OECD) countries
- bid-rigging schemes in, strategies against, 214–215
 - CPAs in, 125–126, 127–128
 - public procurement policy in, 84–85
- Oromiya PPPDS, 144–145
- panel arrangements, 12
- panel contracts, 44, 151–154
- establishment of, 151–152
 - MULs compared to, 152–154
 - open/closed, 152
- parallel framework agreements, 204–205
- periodic requirements arrangements, 12
- periodic/recurrent purchase arrangements, 12
- PPPDS. *See* Public Procurement and Property Disposal Services
- Price Registration (PR) system, 135–138
- benefits of, 137–138
 - inefficiencies of, 137–138
 - institutions and assignments in, 136–137
- pricing
- in bid-rigging schemes, 247
 - in closed incomplete framework agreement design, 267
 - in India, rate contracts compared to retail prices, 150
 - LP criterion, 59–60, 65
 - in procurement markets, 37–38
- private procurement markets, 183
- collusion in, 183
- procedural costs, of framework agreements, 4–5
- process costs
- for CPAs, 282–283
 - in framework agreement design, 258–259
- procurement markets
- competition in, 32
 - CPAs and, 286–287

- procurement markets (cont.)
 - demand and market analysis of, 34–49
 - accommodation of needs, 44–49
 - bidders, 35
 - bundling in, 38
 - in closed complete framework agreements, 43
 - in closed incomplete framework agreements, 44–49
 - contract tasks in, 36
 - efficiency in, 35–36
 - framing entity needs, 41–44
 - information in, 38–40, 41
 - in Italy, 47
 - KONEPS e-shopping mall, 43
 - under Model Law, 43
 - NHS Estate Procure 21, 43
 - of price, 37–38
 - product differentiation in, 37–38
 - production costs, 36
 - of quality, 37–38
 - requirements contract, 42
 - in Italy, 47
- procuring entities
 - in framework agreements, 7, 20
 - low-value, 26–27
 - urgent, 25–26, 28
- public officials, framework agreements and, 4–5
- Public Procurement and Property Disposal Services (PPPS), 145, 146
- public procurement policy
 - administrative efficiency, 5, 22–24
 - closed incomplete framework agreements and, 17–19
 - collusion and, 181–183, 190–192, 221
 - competition influenced by, 32, 33–34
 - framework agreements in, 4–5, 26–27
 - IDIQ contracts, 12–13
 - long-term implications of, 330
 - in OECD countries, 84–85
 - open-tendering, 26–27
 - purpose of, 3
 - SMEs under, 162–164
 - task-order contracts, 12–13
 - UNCITRAL guidelines, 12–13
- queuing, in rotation method, 66
- random allocation, in closed complete framework agreements, 68–69
- rate contracts. *See also* multi-award framework agreements
 - collusion in, 196–197, 206–208
 - competition in, 80
 - defined, 147–148
 - in hybrid models, 79–80
 - in India, 60, 147–151
 - closed incomplete agreements, 151
 - of DGS&D, 148–149
 - open incomplete agreements, 151
 - retail prices compared to, 150
 - at state-level, 149–150
 - under World Bank Procurement Guidelines, 150–151
 - regulatory systems. *See* legal and regulatory systems, for framework agreements
 - repeated framework agreements, 204–205
 - requirements contract, 42
 - rotation method, 66–67
 - fixed shares, 67
 - queuing, 66
 - second-stage contracts, 60–61
 - service level agreements (SLAs), 258
 - single-award framework agreements, 52–57
 - adverse selection of users, 57
 - bundling in, 52–53
 - in closed incomplete agreements, 76–77
 - for chemical reagents, 77
 - standardisation of, 77
 - contract enforcement, 53–55
 - degree of competition in, 55–56
 - flexibility of, 57
 - in Italy, 52, 54
 - NFCs Monitoring System, 53–54
 - standardisation, of closed incomplete agreements, 77
 - standardisation of, 55
 - transaction costs in, 52–55
 - single-supplier framework agreements, 28–29
 - SLAs. *See* service level agreements
 - small and medium enterprises (SMEs)
 - CPAs and, 292–297
 - divisions of goods and services, 294–295
 - geographical lots, 295–296
 - turnover requirements, 297
 - effective competition for, 162–164
 - in framework agreements, 29
 - Small Business Jobs Act, 114
 - SMEs. *See* small and medium enterprises
 - Smith, Adam, 179
 - solicitation documents, 223–229
 - standardisation
 - of framework agreement procedures, 25
 - of multi-award agreements, for closed incomplete framework agreements, 70
 - single-award agreements
 - for closed complete framework agreements, 55
 - for closed incomplete framework agreements, 77

- standing offers, 12, 14
 - suppliers
 - collusion among, 181–184
 - framework agreements and, 13–14
 - multi-supplier, 29
 - security of, 28–29
 - single-supplier, 28–29
 - under UNCITRAL Model Law, 115
 - supply side commitment, 291
 - supply vehicles, 12
 - symmetric competition, 197–198

 - task-order contracts, 12–13, 15
 - term contracts, 92–93
 - transaction costs
 - of competition, 40–41
 - in single-award agreements, 52–55
 - transparency paradox, 216–219
 - transparency requirements, 33
 - for closed complete framework agreements, 225–227
 - for closed incomplete framework agreements, 170–172, 225–227
 - for collusion, 190–192, 219–233
 - through award notices, 229–233
 - in bidding documents, 223–229
 - through bidding notices, 229–233
 - contract notices and, 221–223
 - disclosure of public procurement law, 221
 - in EU, 224–225, 227–228
 - legal information for, 221
 - non-disclosure issues, 234–237
 - prior announcements and, 221–223
 - in solicitation documents, 223–229
 - under UNCITRAL Model Law, 223–224, 227–228, 229–233, 234–237
 - in U.S., 225
 - defined, 213
 - for effective competition, 170–172
 - ID/IQ contracts, 108–112
 - MAS contracts, 108
 - for open incomplete framework agreements, 170–172, 225–227
 - in UNCAC, 218–219, 220, 223
 - under UNCITRAL Model Law, 116–117
- Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, 214
-
- U.K. *See* United Kingdom
- umbrella contracts, 12
- UNCAC. *See* United Nations Convention against Corruption
- UNCITRAL Model Law, 32–33
 - aggregation rules in, 115, 116
 - articles of, 114
 - bid-rigging schemes under, 247–248
 - closed incomplete framework agreements, 170–172
 - in closed incomplete framework agreements, 19, 72
 - collusion and, 219, 229–233
 - transparency requirements, 223–224, 227–228, 234–237
 - development of, 6
 - effective competition under, 161–162, 165–166
 - estimates under, 118
 - framework agreements defined by, 14
 - in EU, 114–121
 - competition requirements, 121–123
 - first stage of, 117–119
 - second stage of, 119–121
 - transparency requirements, 121–123
 - flexibility of, 118–119
 - legal and regulatory systems under, 308–310
 - open incomplete framework agreements under, 78, 170–172
 - partial submissions and, 43
 - on procurement techniques, 12–13
 - policy objectives of, 115
 - public procurement policy guidelines, 12–13
 - regulatory systems under, 92
 - suppliers under, 115
 - transparency requirements, 116–117, 121–123
 - in U.S., 114–121
 - competition requirements, 121–123
 - first stage of, 117–119
 - second stage of, 119–121
 - transparency requirements, 121–123
- United Kingdom (U.K.)
 - collusion cases in, 182–183, 235
 - term contracts in, 92
- United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), 218–219, 220, 223
- United States (U.S.)
 - CICA in, 100–101
 - collusion in, 209–210, 225
 - COTS items in, 175–177
 - CPAs in, 132–135
 - FAR in, 15, 42, 101
 - FASA in, 101
 - framework agreements in, 15
 - GSA in, 132–135
 - ID/IQ contracts in, 12–13, 100–114
 - under Clinger–Cohen Act, 103–104, 112–113
 - commercial items in, 103
 - competition for, 108–112, 159–160
 - COTS items in, 103–104
 - defined, 101
 - FSS contracts, 104–108
 - GWACS contracts, 104–108

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-07796-6 - The Law and Economics of Framework Agreements: Designing Flexible Solutions for Public Procurement

Gian Luigi Albano and Caroline Nicholas

Index

[More information](#)

342

United States (U.S.) (cont.)
 incumbency issues, 110–111
 MAS contracts, 104–108
 minimum quantity in, 102
 misuse of, 111–112
 under NDAA, 113–114
 in practice, 108–112
 reforms for, 102–103, 112–114
 regulatory systems for, 100–114
 restrictions in, 102
 under Small Business Jobs Act, 114
 transparency requirements, 108–112

MAS contracts, 78–79
 competition requirements, 108
 CTAs, 107
 first stage procedures, 105–106
 ID/IQ contracts, 104–108
 open market items, 108

Index

second stage procedures, 106–108
 transparency requirements, 108

regulatory systems in
 evolution of, 100–104
 ID/IQ contracts, 100–114
 under UNCITRAL Model Law, 114–121
 competition requirements, 121–123
 first stage of, 117–119
 second stage of, 119–121
 transparency requirements, 121–123

urgent procurement methods, 25–26
 security of supply in, 28

Wales, term contracts in, 92
The Wealth of Nations (Smith), 179
 Winner's Curse, 39, 132
 World Bank, 210
 World Bank Procurement Guidelines, 150–151