PUBLIC PROCUREMENT PROCEDURES AND PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION FOR THE DIGITAL AGE: A SRI LANKAN PERSPECTIVE

Poboda Kalharani Masakorala

(179122L)

Degree of Master of Business Administration in Information Technology

Department of Computer Science & Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

August 2021

PUBLIC PROCUREMENT PROCEDURES AND PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION FOR THE DIGITAL AGE: A SRI LANKAN PERSPECTIVE

Poboda Kalharani Masakorala

(179122L)

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Business Administration in Information Technology

Department of Computer Science & Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

August 2021

Declaration

"I declare that this is my own work, and this thesis/dissertation does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a Degree or Diploma in any other University or institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief, it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgement is made in the text.

Also, I at this moment grant to the University of Moratuwa the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my thesis/dissertation, in whole or in part in print, electronic, or another medium. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books).

UOM Verified Signature

…….. 14.08.2021

P.K.Masakorala Date

The above candidate has carried out research for the Master's thesis under my supervision.

UOM Verified Signature

14/8/21

Dr. C. R. De Silva Date

Abstract

Procurement of information systems is a complex process as information systems include different systems ranging from off-the-shelf products to highly specialized systems for niche sectors. The inherent challenges of the procurement of information systems combined with the complex nature of public procurement make public procurement of information systems an area that should be further researched. This study is focused on identifying recommendations to overcome challenges faced in the public procurement of information systems. A literature survey was conducted to identify stakeholders' problems in the public procurement of information systems. The remainder of this research was done using the Modified Delphi method. The first round of Delphi was done using face-to-face interviews with a selected portion of an expert panel. Questions used in face-to-face interviews were formulated using the information gathered in the literature survey. Expert opinions on the solutions to the listed problems and problems they encountered in their careers were then formulated into a close-ended questionnaire. It was distributed in the second Delphi round to the full panel of experts. The outcome of the second Delphi round is a set of recommendations that can be used to overcome challenges faced in the public procurement of information systems. The recommendations are categorized under the main categories tender specifications, bid-evaluation criteria, government regulations, project management, collaboration among procurers and bidders, and competence of procurers. Further, the recommendations were ranked according to their level of importance. Furthermore, it was identified that there is no significant difference of opinion between the two stakeholder groups, procurers and bidders. The findings of this research can be adopted to improve the existing public procurement procedure and project implementation of information systems. There is a high efficacy to the generated recommendations as they were generated by the consensus of an expert panel of procurers and bidders.

Keywords: Public procurement, Information systems, Delphi method

Dedication

To

My Husband, Parents & Brothers

for their unwavering support

Acknowledgement

I express my sincere gratitude to everyone who helped me complete this study on "Public procurement procedures and project implementation for the digital age: a Sri Lankan perspective".

Firstly, my special gratitude to my supervisor Dr C. R. De Silva, for his constant guidance, encouragement and support until the end of my study.

Secondly, I express my gratitude towards lecturers at the University of Moratuwa for sharing their invaluable knowledge from the outset of the MBA program.

Finally, I would like to thank the panel of experts who participated in my survey, willingly allocating time from their work schedules to fulfil the research requirements.

Table of Contents

Declaration i
Abstract ii
Dedication iii
Acknowledgement iv
List of Figures vii
List of Tables viii
List of Abbreviations x
List of Appendices xi
1. Introduction 1
1.1. Background 1
1.2. Motivation 2
1.3. Problem Statement 3
1.4. Research Objectives 4
1.5. Research Significance 4
1.6. Research Outline 4
2. Literature Review 5
2.1. Factors/ Type affecting the research problem 5
2.1.1. Failure of e-governance implementation 5
2.1.2 .Improvement of ICT infrastructure to avoid failure of e-governance implementation 5
2.1.3. Influence of public procurement on the improvement of ICT infrastructure 6
2.2. Existing case studies/ related work 8
2.2.1 Bidding Documents – Tender Specifications 8
2.2.2 Bidding Documents – Bid Evaluation Criteria 10
2.2.3 Government Regulations 11
2.2.4 Collaboration among Procurers and Bidders 12
2.2.5 Project Management 13
2.2.6 Competence of Procurers 13
2.3 Evaluation of related works/ approaches 15
2.4 Testing and analysis approaches 22
2.4.1 Delphi method 22
2.4.2 Attitude scales 23
2.4.3 Expert panel 24
2.4.4 Consensus measurement 24
2.4.5 Importance Rank 25
2.4.6 Mann-Whitney U test 25
2.5 Limitations in existing work and new challenges 25
3. Methodology 27
3.1. Research Methodology 27
3.2 Conceptual Framework 29

3.3 Data Collection Methods 30
3.3.1 Primary Data 30
3.3.2 Secondary Data 31
3.4 Sampling Design 31
3.4.1 Target Population 31
3.4.2 Sampling Size 32
3.5 Research Instruments 33
3.5.1 Distribution Methods 33
3.5.2 Pre survey/ Delphi Round 01 33
3.5.3 Questionnaire Design/ Delphi Round 2 34
3.6 Summary 35
4. Data Analysis 36
4.1. Data collection of first Delphi round 36
4.2. Presentation of qualitative analysis 37
4.3. Data collection of second Delphi round 48
4.4. Descriptive analysis 49
4.4.1. Age 49
4.4.2. Gender 50
4.4.3. Occupation 51
4.4.4. Years of experience in public procurement 52
4.4.5. Number of projects 53
4.5.Statistical analysis to clarify expertise of 0-5 years of experience/ projects group. 54
4.6. Statistical analysis of Delphi round 2 60
4.6.1. Consensus Measurement 61
4.6.2. Importance ranking 102
4.6.3. Inter-group comparison. 105
4.7. Summary 119
5. Conclusion 120
5.1. Summary 120
5.2. Recommendations 128
5.3. Research Limitations 129
5.4. Future research directions 130
References 131
Appendix A – Pre-survey questionnaire 135
Appendix B – Invitation letter to participate in Delphi survey 138
Appendix C – Delphi questionnaire 140

List of Figures

Figure 2.1: Aspects of public procurement of information systems 8
Figure 3.1: Research methodology 28
Figure 4.1: Age groups of Delphi panellists 49
Figure 4.2: Gender of Delphi panellists 50
Figure 4.3: Occupation of Delphi panellists 51
Figure 4.4: Years of experience in public procurement 52
Figure 4.5: Number of projects handled by Delphi panellists 53
Figure 4.6: Number of projects vs years of experience 54
Figure 4.7: Responses for recommendation 01 61
Figure 4.8: Responses for recommendation 2 62
Figure 4.9: Responses for recommendation 3 63
Figure 4.10: Responses for recommendation 4 64
Figure 4.11: Responses for recommendation 5 65
Figure 4.12: Responses for recommendation 6 66
Figure 4.13: Responses for recommendation 07 67
Figure 4.14: Responses for recommendation 08 68
Figure 4.15: Responses for recommendation 09 69
Figure 4.16: Responses for recommendation 10 70
Figure 4.17: Responses for recommendation 11 71
Figure 4.18: Responses for recommendation 12 72
Figure 4.19: Responses for recommendation 13 73
Figure 4.20: Responses for recommendation 14 74
Figure 4.21: Responses for recommendation 15 75
Figure 4.22: Responses for recommendation 16 76
Figure 4.23: Responses for recommendation 17 77
Figure 4.24: Responses for recommendation 18 78
Figure 4.25: Responses for recommendation 19 79
Figure 4.26: Responses for recommendation 20 80
Figure 4.27: Responses for recommendation 21 81
Figure 4.28: Responses for recommendation 22 82
Figure 4.29: Responses for recommendation 23 83
Figure 4.30: Responses for recommendation 24 84
Figure 4.31: Responses for recommendation 25 85
Figure 4.32: Responses for recommendation 26 86
Figure 4.33: Responses for recommendation 27 87
Figure 4.34: Responses for recommendation 28 88
Figure 4.35: Responses for recommendation 29 89
Figure 4.36: Responses for recommendation 30 90
Figure 4.37: Responses for recommendation 31 91
Figure 4.38: Responses for recommendation 32 92
Figure 4.39: Responses for recommendation 33 93
Figure 4.40: Responses for recommendation 34 94
Figure 4.41: Responses for recommendation 35 95
Figure 4.43: Responses for recommendation 36 96
Figure 4.44: Responses for recommendation 37 97
Figure 4.45: Mann-Whitney U test outcome for recommendation 2 113
Figure 4.46: Mann-Whitney U test outcome for recommendation 1 115

List of Tables

Table 2.1: Evaluation of related works/ approaches 15
Table 3.1: Questionnaire mapping table 34
Table 4.1: Participant profiles 36
Table 4.2: Presentation of qualitative analysis 38
Table 4.3: Age groups of Delphi panellists 50
Table 4.4: Gender of Delphi panellists 50
Table 4 5: Occupation of Delphi panellists 51
Table 4.6: Years of experience in public procurement 52
Table 4.7: Number of projects handled by Delphi panellists 53
Table 4.8: Hypothesis test summary of Mann-Whitney U test 55
Table 4.9: Frequency response for recommendation 01 61
Table 4.10: Frequency response for recommendation 02 62
Table 4.11: Frequency response for recommendation 03 63
Table 4.12: Frequency response for recommendation 04 64
Table 4.13: Frequency response for recommendation 05 65
Table 4.14: Frequency response for recommendation 06 66
Table 4.15: Frequency response for recommendation 07 67
Table 4.16: Frequency response for recommendation 08 68
Table 4.17: Frequency response for recommendation 09 69
Table 4.18: Frequency response for recommendation 10 70
Table 4.19: Frequency response for recommendation 11 71
Table 4.20: Frequency response for recommendation 12 72
Table 4.21: Frequency response for recommendation 13 73
Table 4.22: Frequency response for recommendation 14 74
Table 4.23: Frequency response for recommendation 15 75
Table 4.24: Frequency response for recommendation 16 76
Table 4.25: Frequency response for recommendation 17 77
Table 4.26: Frequency response for recommendation 18 78
Table 4.27: Frequency response for recommendation 19 79
Table 4.28: Frequency response for recommendation 20 80
Table 4.29: Frequency response for recommendation 21 81
Table 4.30: Frequency response for recommendation 22 82
Table 4.31: Frequency response for recommendation 23 83
Table 4.32: Frequency response for recommendation 24 84
Table 4.33: Frequency response for recommendation 25 85
Table 4.34: Frequency response for recommendation 26 86
Table 4.35: Frequency response for recommendation 27 87
Table 4.36: Frequency response for recommendation 28 88
Table 4.37: Frequency response for recommendation 29 89
Table 4.38: Frequency response for recommendation 30 90
Table 4.40: Frequency response for recommendation 32 92
Table 4.41: Frequency response for recommendation 33 93
Table 4.42: Frequency response for recommendation 34 94
Table 4.43: Frequency response for recommendation 35 95
Table 4.44: Frequency response for recommendation 36 96
Table 4.45: Frequency response for recommendation 37 97
Table 4.46: Summary of percentage agreement 98

Table 4.47: Importance rank of recommendations according to the mean 103
Table 4.48: Inter-group comparison under General category 106
Table 4.49: Inter-group comparison under Tender specifications category 108
Table 4.51: Inter-group comparison under Government regulations category 112
Table 4.52: Inter-group comparison under Collaboration among procurers and bidders category 114
Table 4.53: Inter-group comparison under Project management category 116
Table 4.54: Inter-group comparison under Competence of procurers category 118
Table 5.1: Summary of recommendations obtained from the Delphi survey 121
Table 5.2: List of recommendations 129

List of Abbreviations

CIO	Chief Information Officer
EMAT	Economically Most Advantageous Tender
ERP	Enterprise Resource Planning
ICT	Information & Communication Technology
IT	Information Technology
IS	Information Systems

List of Appendices

Appendix A – Pre-survey questionnaire 135
Appendix B – Invitation letter to participate in Delphi survey 138
Appendix C – Delphi questionnaire 140