



AURUS MINING

---

# Local Content That Performs

Supplier development, transparent contracting and capability retained



OUR POSITION

**Treat local content as a procurement and enterprise-development operating system: design opportunities for access, run transparent qualification and evaluation, administer contracts and payments with discipline, and measure results from participation through delivery performance and capability retained rather than award value alone.**

EVIDENCE FIRST | DECISIONS MADE EXPLICIT | DELIVERY CONDITIONS STATED

# Contents

<b>S</b>	<b>Executive summary</b> The paper in one decision frame	4
<b>M</b>	<b>Method and boundaries</b> Audience, method and limitations	6
<b>01</b>	<b>Beyond the spend target</b> Local content performs when it is managed as a procurement operating system connected to local development institutions, not as an isolated spend metric.	7
<b>02</b>	<b>The opportunity baseline</b> Before packaging or qualification, define the baseline: what is being bought, what rules apply, and what record must be retained.	11
<b>03</b>	<b>Packaging and market access</b> Packaging is the main design lever for local access, but it must preserve delivery control and transparent evaluation.	15
<b>04</b>	<b>Transparent qualification</b> Qualification should be rule-based, auditable, and separated into eligibility and package capability to avoid avoidable exclusion and disputes.	19
<b>05</b>	<b>Supplier development</b> Supplier development should be gap-driven, separated from award decisions, and connected to local development priorities and institutions.	23
<b>06</b>	<b>Contract administration and payment</b> Local delivery performance depends on disciplined administration: clear records, consistent evaluation artifacts, and payment processes that smaller suppliers can survive.	27
<b>07</b>	<b>Governance and community connection</b> Governance must define representation, decision rules, responsibilities, and feedback. Connection to local development priorities increases continuity and legitimacy, but instruments must be tailored.	31
<b>08</b>	<b>The local-content scorecard</b> A scorecard should follow the process stages: participation, award, delivery performance, and capability retained, supported by transparent records.	35
<b>R</b>	<b>Decision tools and references</b> Checklist, evidence ledger, glossary and sources	39

# Executive summary

Local content programs often stall when they are managed as an after-the-fact spend target. The evidence base used in this paper instead frames local contracting as an end-to-end operating system: opportunities are published clearly, eligibility and evaluation rules are explicit, awards are recorded, and contract administration supports delivery by smaller firms. This approach comes from a step-by-step local-contracting manual focused on enabling local small and medium enterprises to access procurement opportunities with large companies. The manual's logic is procedural and depends on traceable procurement records rather than narrative claims of intent.

Sources: WP14-01, WP14-02, WP14-07

Performance starts with the opportunity baseline. Packaging decisions can exclude capable smaller firms by scale alone, so package design must be treated as an access control. Fair competition also depends on practical elements: bid information, response time, and accessible clarification. Where an electronic procurement system is used, it can support supplier access, transaction visibility, and a controlled contracting record, but the system only works if the underlying rules are defined and followed. In this paper, these points are treated as contracting frameworks and process controls, not as promised outcomes.

Sources: WP14-03, WP14-05, WP14-06

Supplier development belongs inside the operating system but outside the award decision. Support needs to respond to diagnosed gaps and remain separate from evaluation and award so that development activity does not distort competition. Downstream, payment terms, invoice quality, and approval discipline influence whether smaller suppliers can sustain delivery. These are contract administration controls, not community benefits. The paper therefore treats supplier development and payment discipline as delivery-risk management, with governance that can be audited through the procurement record.

Sources: WP14-08, WP14-09, WP14-07

Measurement must match the operating system. A useful local-content view spans qualified participation, contract award, delivery performance, and capability retained, not award value alone. That measurement logic is presented here as a synthesis across the process stages described in the local-contracting manual. To connect local procurement to wider local development priorities, the paper also aligns governance to a non-prescriptive community development agreement framework that emphasizes stakeholder representation, implementation, feedback, budgeting, monitoring, and sustainability. No universal template is implied and local regulatory structure, stakeholder interests, and capacity shape what is appropriate.

Sources: WP14-10, WP14-11, WP14-12, WP14-15

# At a glance

Six evidence markers establish the scale, threshold or decision condition carried into the chapters that follow.

---

## Gate

PUBLISH OPPORTUNITY AND RULES BEFORE ENGAGEMENT

Source: WP14-02

---

## Scope

PACKAGE FOR ACCESS WITHOUT BREAKING DELIVERY CONTROL

Source: WP14-05

---

## Trace

RETAIN EVALUATION APPLICATION IN THE PROCUREMENT RECORD

Source: WP14-07

---

## Separate

KEEP SUPPLIER SUPPORT SEPARATE FROM AWARD DECISION

Source: WP14-08

---

## Discipline

RUN PAYMENT AND APPROVAL CONTROLS THAT SMALL FIRMS CAN SURVIVE

Source: WP14-09

---

## Scorecard

MEASURE PARTICIPATION, AWARD, DELIVERY, CAPABILITY RETAINED

Source: WP14-10

# Method and boundaries

This paper is a bounded synthesis of registered public evidence. Source identifiers remain visible so that each quantitative or framework statement can be traced to its dossier row.

## INTENDED READERS

- Mine operators and project owners
- Procurement and supply chain leaders
- Social performance and community relations teams (process alignment)

## READING METHOD

- Read each chapter opener as a decision frame.
- Use the three section exhibits as working review instruments.
- Return to the evidence ledger before reusing any number or requirement.

## BOUNDARIES

- Evidence boundary: This paper uses only the registered dossier rows WP14-01 to WP14-15. No additional mandates, jurisdictions, outcomes, forecasts, or numerical results are introduced beyond those rows.
- No delivery claims: There are no Aurus program outcomes, supplier-spend totals, employment numbers, training counts, or client anecdotes in this paper, consistent with the usage boundary in the dossier.
- Status preservation: Statements described in the dossier as frameworks, process logic, or synthesis are treated as such and are not presented as empirical results or guaranteed outcomes.
- Template caution: The World Bank CDA framework is explicitly non-prescriptive and no universal template is implied; instruments must be tailored to regulatory structure, stakeholder interests, and local capacity as stated in the dossier.

## PUBLICATION DISCIPLINE

- No client identity or company-age claim is published.
- No Aurus delivery result is inferred from public guidance.
- Dated forecasts retain their institution and vintage.

# 01

REFRAME

## Beyond the spend target

Local content performs when it is managed as a procurement operating system connected to local development institutions, not as an isolated spend metric.

### Reframe

FROM AWARD VALUE TO END-TO-END OPERATING SYSTEM | WP14-10

### Connect

LINK LOCAL PROCUREMENT TO AGREED LOCAL PRIORITIES | WP14-13

### Non-prescriptive

NO UNIVERSAL TEMPLATE FOR GOVERNANCE INSTRUMENTS | WP14-15

# 1.1 Why spend-only targets mislead

Spend targets can hide the mechanics that decide whether local firms can compete and deliver. The local-contracting manual is structured as a step-by-step approach to enable local small and medium enterprises to access procurement opportunities with large companies. In that framing, performance depends on opportunity publication, eligibility rules, evaluation rules, award rules, and the retention of a controlled contracting record. These are not public relations elements. They are operating controls that determine who can participate and whether decisions can be explained later. Treating local content as an auditable system also reduces reliance on discretionary exceptions that are hard to defend when outcomes are contested.

WP14-01, WP14-02, WP14-07

The measurement lens needs to match the system. A useful view spans qualified participation, contract award, delivery performance, and capability retained, not award value alone. This measurement logic is presented here as a synthesis across the process stages described in the contracting manual rather than as a reported outcome. It shifts attention toward early gates such as whether local suppliers can register and qualify, and later gates such as whether payments and approvals allow them to sustain delivery. The same logic also makes it easier to compare like-for-like across packages without forcing all packages into a single spend metric.

WP14-10, WP14-09, WP14-04

## DECISION INSTRUMENT

### Decision instrument: Replace spend-only reporting with an operating-system view

Use this as a management agenda for local content reviews and internal audit scoping.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Define performance span	Current reporting focuses mainly on award value or supplier nationality classification.	Adopt a scorecard that includes qualified participation, award, delivery performance, and capability retained (synthesis across stages).
Confirm rule clarity	Opportunity publication and evaluation rules vary by buyer or site.	Standardize and publish opportunity, eligibility, evaluation, and award rules as defined controls.
Confirm record control	Decisions rely on emails and individual judgment notes.	Require a procurement record that retains criteria and their consistent application.
Test delivery survivability	Local suppliers fail after award due to cash flow and admin friction.	Review payment terms, invoice quality expectations, and approval discipline as delivery controls.

Sources: WP14-10, WP14-02, WP14-07, WP14-09

## 1.2 Local content as enterprise access, not entitlement

The manual’s core claim is not that local suppliers should be favored. It is that local small and medium enterprises can access procurement opportunities when the contracting system is transparent and the steps are explicit. Transparency depends on clear opportunity publication, eligibility, evaluation, and award rules. Practical fairness then depends on bid information, response time, and accessible clarification. These elements are often treated as administrative details, but in the contracting framework they are the difference between a theoretical invitation and a usable one. Managing them as controls helps separate legitimate access from informal gatekeeping.

WP14-01, WP14-02, WP14-06

Where an electronic procurement system is used, it can support supplier access, transaction visibility, and a controlled contracting record. That support is conditional. The system does not fix unclear rules or inconsistent evaluation. It only provides structure for publishing opportunities and retaining the record of what was decided and why. For local content, this matters because disputes about access and fairness usually turn on whether rules were visible and applied consistently. Treat the system as part of the evidence chain, not as the source of transparency by itself.

WP14-03, WP14-02, WP14-07

### DECISION INSTRUMENT

#### Decision instrument: Access controls for local enterprise participation

Apply before launching local content initiatives tied to procurement.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Opportunity publication	Opportunities circulate through informal channels.	Publish opportunities using defined channels and include the rule set for eligibility, evaluation, and award.
Bid usability	Suppliers report they did not understand requirements or had insufficient time.	Set minimum bid information, response times, and a clarification process that is accessible.
System support	Procurement records are incomplete or dispersed.	Use an electronic system where possible to support visibility and a controlled record, aligned to defined rules.
Record retention	Evaluation rationale is not reproducible.	Retain evaluation criteria and their consistent application in the procurement record.

Sources: WP14-02, WP14-06, WP14-03, WP14-07

## 1.3 Connect procurement to local development priorities

Local procurement and supplier development work better when they connect to wider local-development institutions and agreed priorities rather than being treated as an isolated spend target. The community development agreement source book is explicitly non-prescriptive, but it does present a framework for strategic and collaborative community-development planning. It highlights processes for stakeholder representation, implementation, feedback, management, budgeting, monitoring, and sustainability. For procurement leaders, the key implication is governance alignment. Local content priorities should be coherent with agreed local development priorities and with the institutions that will outlast individual packages.

WP14-13, WP14-11, WP14-12

Governance design should not default to a universal template. The source book states that the applicable regulatory structure, stakeholder interests, and local capacity shape the instrument. That constraint applies equally to local content governance. It is possible to standardize core procurement controls such as publication, evaluation, and record retention while still tailoring how priorities are set and how feedback is handled. Treat governance as an interface: procurement provides traceable decisions; local-development structures provide legitimacy, representation, and continuity. The result is not a guarantee of community acceptance, but a clearer basis for decision-making and learning.

WP14-15, WP14-14, WP14-07

### DECISION INSTRUMENT

#### Decision instrument: Governance interface between procurement and local development

Use to map who decides priorities, who runs procurement controls, and how feedback is processed.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Priority-setting forum	Local content goals are set internally without external alignment.	Connect local procurement and supplier development to agreed local development priorities and institutions.
Representation and rules	Stakeholder involvement is informal and inconsistent.	Define representation, decision rules, and feedback mechanisms for the governance forum.
Implementation responsibilities	Actions are agreed but no owner is accountable.	Assign implementation responsibilities and management processes for follow-through.
Tailoring constraint	A template is being copied across sites without adjustment.	Tailor the instrument to regulatory structure, stakeholder interests, and local capacity.

Sources: WP14-13, WP14-14, WP14-15, WP14-11

# 02

DEFINE

## The opportunity baseline

Before packaging or qualification, define the baseline: what is being bought, what rules apply, and what record must be retained.

### Baseline

OPPORTUNITY DEFINITION PRECEDES  
MARKET ENGAGEMENT | WP14-02

### Trace

CONTROLLED RECORD FROM PUBLICA-  
TION TO AWARD | WP14-03

### Rules

ELIGIBILITY, EVALUATION, AWARD  
RULES ARE EXPLICIT | WP14-02

## 2.1 Publishable opportunity definition

Transparent contracting starts with a publishable definition of the opportunity. The contracting manual ties transparency to clear opportunity publication and to explicit eligibility, evaluation, and award rules. If the opportunity is not defined in a way that can be published, then access will default to insider knowledge. For local suppliers, that is often the real barrier, not capability. Define what is required, how responses will be evaluated, and what documentation will form the procurement record. Treat this as the baseline against which changes are controlled, including clarifications that must be accessible to all bidders.

WP14-02, WP14-06, WP14-07

An electronic procurement system can support this baseline by improving supplier access and transaction visibility and by maintaining a controlled contracting record. The value is not automation. It is consistency in what is published and in what is retained. If an electronic system is used, align it to the rule set so that publication, clarifications, submissions, and evaluation artifacts are captured in one place. If the system cannot store the evaluation rationale and the published criteria, then it will not support defensible transparency and will not reduce dispute risk.

WP14-03, WP14-07, WP14-02

### DECISION INSTRUMENT

#### Decision instrument: Opportunity baseline checklist

Complete before any market briefing, site visit, or supplier engagement.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Publishable scope	Scope is described in internal shorthand.	Rewrite scope into supplier-facing requirements suitable for opportunity publication.
Rule set completeness	Eligibility, evaluation, or award rules are implied.	Document and publish eligibility, evaluation, and award rules as explicit controls.
Clarification path	Clarifications are handled informally by buyers.	Provide an accessible clarification process and plan how updates are communicated.
Record plan	No defined procurement record content exists.	Define what must be retained, and configure an electronic system to hold it where applicable.

Sources: WP14-02, WP14-06, WP14-07, WP14-03

## 2.2 Separate eligibility from package capability

Supplier registration and prequalification should distinguish legal eligibility from technical capability for a specific package. In the process framework, eligibility is a gate that confirms a supplier can contract. Capability is a separate question tied to the defined requirements of one package. Mixing the two creates avoidable exclusion. It can also create noise in evaluation because bidders that are legally eligible but technically misaligned consume time and create disputes. Define the eligibility criteria once, then define capability criteria package by package. Keep both visible and stable in the procurement record.

WP14-04, WP14-07, WP14-02

This separation also supports targeted supplier development. If the procurement record shows that local suppliers fail eligibility gates, the response is administrative support or registration reform. If they fail capability gates, the response is a diagnosed capability plan. The manual’s capacity-building logic is clear that supplier-development support should respond to diagnosed gaps and remain separate from the award decision. That separation protects competition integrity and makes it easier to explain why some support is offered and how it relates to future opportunities rather than to a current award.

WP14-08, WP14-04, WP14-07

### DECISION INSTRUMENT

#### Decision instrument: Two-gate registration and prequalification model

Use to prevent eligibility checks from becoming a proxy for package capability judgments.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Gate 1: Legal eligibility	Eligibility requirements are inconsistent across packages.	Standardize legal eligibility criteria in supplier registration and apply them consistently.
Gate 2: Package capability	Capability is judged without reference to explicit package requirements.	Define package-specific technical criteria tied to the opportunity baseline.
Evidence retention	Gate decisions cannot be reconstructed later.	Retain gate outcomes and supporting evidence in the procurement record.
Development response	Support is offered ad hoc to preferred suppliers.	Base support on diagnosed gaps and keep it separate from current award decisions.

Sources: WP14-04, WP14-07, WP14-08

## 2.3 Baseline risks that hit local suppliers first

Baseline design choices often affect local suppliers first because they have less margin for ambiguity. Bid information, response time, and accessible clarification affect the practical fairness of competition. If requirements are incomplete or change late, experienced incumbents can absorb the friction while smaller entrants cannot. Treat bid usability as part of the opportunity baseline, not as an optional courtesy. Define what information must be provided with the opportunity, how long suppliers will have to respond, and how clarifications are logged and shared. This is a procedural control that supports fair access.

WP14-06, WP14-02

Downstream, contract administration risks should be surfaced at baseline because they influence participation. Payment terms, invoice quality requirements, and approval discipline influence whether smaller suppliers can sustain delivery. If payment cycles are long or approval processes are unpredictable, capable suppliers may rationally avoid bidding, or they may price in financing costs. Treat these terms as part of the opportunity design, publish them, and align internal approval discipline before issuing the opportunity. This is not a promise of faster payment. It is an explicit control that reduces avoidable supplier failure modes.

WP14-09, WP14-02, WP14-06

### DECISION INSTRUMENT

#### Decision instrument: Baseline risk screen for local supplier participation

Use before tender release to reduce avoidable access and delivery failures.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Bid information sufficiency	Suppliers need repeated clarifications to price the work.	Increase bid information quality and publish a clarification process that is accessible.
Response time adequacy	Response times are driven by internal urgency.	Set response times that allow smaller suppliers to prepare compliant bids.
Payment survivability	Terms assume suppliers can carry working capital for long periods.	Review payment terms and internal approval discipline for small supplier survivability.
Invoice expectations	Invoice requirements are unclear and create rejection cycles.	Publish invoice quality requirements as part of opportunity information.

Sources: WP14-06, WP14-09, WP14-02

# 03

DESIGN

## Packaging and market access

Packaging is the main design lever for local access, but it must preserve delivery control and transparent evaluation.

### Scope

PACKAGING AFFECTS ABILITY OF SMALLER FIRMS TO COMPETE | WP14-05

### Publish

PACKAGE RULES MUST BE VISIBLE AND CONSISTENT | WP14-02

### Clarify

ACCESSIBLE CLARIFICATIONS PRESERVE PRACTICAL FAIRNESS | WP14-06

## 3.1 Package size as an access control

Packaging strategy affects whether local suppliers can compete. The contracting framework states that an undivided package can exclude capable smaller firms by scale alone. Treat package size, bundling, and interface allocation as deliberate access controls. This is not a call to fragment work without discipline. It is a requirement to test whether the package design matches the market that is expected to bid. When packaging is fixed early, document the reasons and retain them in the procurement record so that decisions can be explained and reviewed later.

WP14-05, WP14-07

Transparency constraints still apply after packaging changes. Clear opportunity publication, eligibility rules, evaluation rules, and award rules must be maintained even when work is split or re-bundled. Bid information and response time must also remain workable, especially when multiple related packages are released. If packaging increases the number of tenders, ensure the clarification process is still accessible and that responses are consistent. Otherwise, packaging intended to improve access can create noise and unequal information distribution, which undermines the same transparency it was meant to support.

WP14-02, WP14-06, WP14-05

### DECISION INSTRUMENT

#### Decision instrument: Packaging options test for local access

Use during sourcing strategy to balance market access and delivery control.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Scale barrier check	Local firms are capable but cannot meet bundled volume or turnover requirements.	Reassess bundling and consider smaller packages or phased delivery that preserves control.
Interface risk check	Splitting work creates unclear responsibilities and disputes.	Define interfaces explicitly in package scope and evaluation criteria.
Publication readiness	Package changes are not reflected in published rules.	Republish opportunity information and maintain eligibility, evaluation, and award rule clarity.
Clarification capacity	Multiple packages overload clarification channels.	Plan accessible clarifications and ensure consistent responses across packages.

Sources: WP14-05, WP14-02, WP14-06

## 3.2 Market access is practical, not symbolic

Market access depends on practical fairness. The manual highlights bid information, response time, and accessible clarification as factors that affect whether competition is practically fair. For local suppliers, these elements often determine whether participation is possible without costly rework. Build market access into the packaging plan: publish complete bid information, set response times that reflect the effort required, and provide a clarification process that is accessible to all bidders. These are controls that reduce the risk of informal side channels. They also support consistent evaluation because bids are more likely to be comparable when bidders received the same information.

WP14-06, WP14-02, WP14-07

An electronic procurement system can support access by making opportunities visible and by providing transaction visibility. It can also hold the contracting record if configured to do so. However, system access must align with the packaging plan. If packages are aimed at smaller firms, ensure registration, submission, and clarification steps are not so complex that they become a barrier. The system should support controlled publication and record retention, not replace clear rules. Monitor whether the system supports the intended supplier base and adjust procedures if it does not.

WP14-03, WP14-01, WP14-06

### DECISION INSTRUMENT

#### Decision instrument: Market access settings for packaged opportunities

Use as a configuration checklist for each package release.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Bid information standard	Each buyer decides what to include in bid packs.	Define minimum bid information for practical fairness and apply it consistently.
Response time rule	Response time varies without rationale.	Set and publish response time rules appropriate to package complexity.
Clarification workflow	Clarifications are handled privately between buyer and bidder.	Use an accessible clarification process and retain the log in the record.
System usability	Suppliers struggle with registration or submission steps.	Align e-procurement steps with the target supplier base and keep a controlled record.

Sources: WP14-06, WP14-03, WP14-07

### 3.3 Package evaluation must remain defensible

Packaging choices change what is evaluated, so evaluation criteria must be republished and applied consistently. The manual states that evaluation criteria should be published, applied consistently, and retained in the procurement record. For packaged work, avoid hidden criteria that effectively re-bundle requirements, such as turnover thresholds that exceed package scale without justification. If higher thresholds are needed for risk reasons, document the rationale and keep it in the record. This helps separate legitimate delivery risk controls from unintended exclusion. It also supports review and learning about which controls were proportionate.

WP14-07, WP14-05, WP14-02

Supplier registration and prequalification should still distinguish legal eligibility from technical capability for a specific package. Packaging often increases the number of suppliers who can bid, so the two-gate model becomes more important to manage workload and fairness. Keep legal eligibility stable and package capability criteria specific and visible. Where local suppliers do not meet capability criteria, treat that as an input to supplier development based on diagnosed gaps, not as a reason to relax evaluation rules mid-process. This preserves competition integrity while creating a clear queue of development needs.

WP14-04, WP14-08, WP14-07

**DECISION INSTRUMENT**

**Decision instrument: Defensible evaluation for packaged work**

Apply before opening bids for each package.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Criteria publication	Evaluation criteria are referenced but not fully stated in the opportunity.	Publish complete evaluation criteria with the opportunity and retain them in the record.
Consistency control	Different evaluators apply criteria differently across packages.	Define how criteria are applied and record the application consistently.
Threshold proportionality	Financial or experience thresholds exceed package scale without stated rationale.	Justify thresholds in the procurement record or revise them to match package risk.
Eligibility vs capability	Eligibility checks are used to screen technical issues.	Use the two-gate model: legal eligibility first, then package capability.

Sources: WP14-07, WP14-02, WP14-05, WP14-04

# 04

ASSURE

## Transparent qualification

Qualification should be rule-based, auditable, and separated into eligibility and package capability to avoid avoidable exclusion and disputes.

### Rules

TRANSPARENCY DEPENDS ON PUBLISHED RULES | WP14-02

### Two-gate

ELIGIBILITY IS DISTINCT FROM PACKAGE CAPABILITY | WP14-04

### Record

CRITERIA AND APPLICATION RETAINED | WP14-07

## 4.1 Publish the qualification pathway

Transparent contracting depends on clear opportunity publication and on clear eligibility, evaluation, and award rules. Qualification is the point where suppliers learn whether access is real. Publish the qualification pathway as part of the opportunity information, including what evidence is required and how decisions will be recorded. Practical fairness depends on bid information, response time, and accessible clarification. If suppliers cannot clarify qualification evidence requirements, the process will screen out firms for administrative reasons rather than capability. Treat qualification as a controlled process step and ensure it feeds a procurement record that can be reviewed.

WP14-02, WP14-06, WP14-07

An electronic procurement system can support transaction visibility and a controlled contracting record. Use it to make qualification requirements visible and to store submissions, clarifications, and outcomes. The purpose is to reduce inconsistent handling and to strengthen the evidence chain, not to increase formality for its own sake. If the system is used, define who can see what and when, so that confidentiality and fairness are balanced. Keep the focus on rule clarity and consistent application, since those are the stated foundations of transparent contracting in the manual.

WP14-03, WP14-02, WP14-07

### DECISION INSTRUMENT

#### Decision instrument: Qualification pathway publication template

Use to ensure suppliers can understand and evidence qualification requirements.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Pathway visibility	Suppliers learn qualification rules only after registering interest.	Publish qualification steps and evidence requirements with the opportunity.
Clarification access	Qualification questions are answered inconsistently.	Provide an accessible clarification process and retain the log.
System record	Submissions and outcomes are stored in multiple locations.	Store submissions, clarifications, and outcomes in a controlled record, using e-procurement where applicable.
Consistency check	Different packages apply different qualification logic without rationale.	Align qualification logic to published rules and document any justified exceptions.

Sources: WP14-02, WP14-06, WP14-03, WP14-07

## 4.2 Operate the two-gate model in practice

Supplier registration and prequalification should distinguish legal eligibility from technical capability for a specific package. In practice, define a legal eligibility gate that confirms the supplier can contract and meets base requirements, then define a package capability gate that tests fit to the opportunity baseline. Keep both sets of criteria visible and stable. This separation helps local suppliers understand whether they need administrative remediation or capability improvement. It also reduces disputes because suppliers can see the rule they did not meet. Retain gate decisions and supporting evidence in the procurement record.

WP14-04, WP14-07, WP14-02

Transparent contracting also depends on how evaluation criteria are published and applied. Even at qualification stage, criteria must be applied consistently and retained in the procurement record. If evaluators use informal judgments, the two-gate model collapses into discretion. Use documented criteria and decision rules for each gate. Where suppliers fail, communicate outcomes in a way that reflects the published criteria, and use aggregated failure reasons to diagnose common gaps that may later be addressed through supplier development. Keep any support separate from the award decision, consistent with the manual’s capacity-building logic.

WP14-07, WP14-04, WP14-08

### DECISION INSTRUMENT

#### Decision instrument: Two-gate qualification decision record

Use to standardize qualification outcomes and create diagnosable gap data.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Gate assignment	Eligibility and capability evidence are mixed in one checklist.	Split qualification into legal eligibility and package capability, each with its own criteria.
Criteria application	Evaluators apply personal thresholds.	Apply published criteria consistently and record the rationale for each decision.
Outcome communication	Suppliers receive generic rejection messages.	Communicate outcomes against published criteria to support learning.
Development trigger	Support is promised to bidders during evaluation.	Capture common gaps for later support, separate from award decisions.

Sources: WP14-04, WP14-07, WP14-08

## 4.3 Maintain practical fairness through information control

Practical fairness depends on bid information, response time, and accessible clarification. Qualification steps often compress timelines, which can disadvantage smaller firms that need time to compile documentation. Set response times that reflect evidence collection effort and provide a clear clarification channel. Ensure clarifications are accessible, and ensure answers are shared consistently so that no supplier gains an information advantage. These controls support the stated transparency conditions in the manual and reduce the risk that local suppliers are screened out by avoidable administrative friction rather than by genuine eligibility or capability constraints.

WP14-06, WP14-02

The procurement record is the backbone of transparency. Evaluation criteria should be published, applied consistently, and retained in the procurement record. Treat the clarification log, submission completeness checks, and gate decisions as record components. If an electronic procurement system is used, configure it to store these artifacts and to provide transaction visibility. If not, define a controlled record structure and ownership. Without this, qualification disputes become arguments about memory and email trails. With it, disputes can be addressed by reference to the published rules and their documented application.

WP14-07, WP14-03, WP14-02

### DECISION INSTRUMENT

#### Decision instrument: Practical fairness controls for qualification

Use as an internal control test before issuing qualification outcomes.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Timeline test	Qualification response time is shorter than evidence compilation effort.	Adjust response time to match effort and publish the timeline.
Clarification equity	Answers are provided to some suppliers only.	Use an accessible clarification process and share responses consistently.
Record completeness	Clarification logs and decision notes are missing.	Retain clarifications, criteria, and decisions in the procurement record.
Visibility support	Stakeholders cannot see process status or decisions.	Use e-procurement where applicable to support transaction visibility and controlled records.

Sources: WP14-06, WP14-07, WP14-03



# 05

BUILD

## Supplier development

Supplier development should be gap-driven, separated from award decisions, and connected to local development priorities and institutions.

---

### Diagnose

SUPPORT RESPONDS TO DIAGNOSED GAPS | WP14-08

### Separate

DEVELOPMENT REMAINS SEPARATE FROM AWARD DECISION | WP14-08

### Connect

LINK TO WIDER LOCAL-DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES | WP14-13

# 5.1 Diagnose before you support

Supplier-development support should respond to diagnosed gaps and remain separate from the award decision. This is capacity-building logic, not an outcome claim. Diagnosis depends on a procurement record that shows where suppliers fail: legal eligibility, package capability, bid compliance, or delivery performance. Use registration and prequalification results to identify whether barriers are administrative or technical. Keep the diagnosis grounded in published criteria that were applied consistently. Without diagnosis, support programs tend to default to generic training that does not change qualification or delivery results, and they risk being seen as favoritism when linked to specific tenders.

WP14-08, WP14-04, WP14-07

The separation from award decisions is a control that protects competition integrity. Support should not be offered as part of evaluation bargaining and should not be used to justify awarding a contract to a supplier that did not meet published criteria. Instead, treat development as preparation for future opportunities and align it to the opportunity baseline and packaging strategy. If packaging has been adjusted to improve access, then development can focus on the specific capability needs created by those packages. Document the development pathway and keep it outside the live tender record for the package being awarded.

WP14-08, WP14-05, WP14-07

## DECISION INSTRUMENT

### Decision instrument: Gap diagnosis to development pathway

Use to translate procurement evidence into targeted support while protecting award integrity.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Gap classification	Supplier failures are described informally.	Classify gaps using evidence from eligibility, capability, and evaluation records.
Evidence source	Support needs are assumed based on perception.	Base diagnosis on published criteria and recorded outcomes.
Separation control	Development is discussed during evaluation.	Keep support separate from award decisions and document the boundary.
Future opportunity link	Support topics are generic and disconnected from packages.	Align support topics to upcoming opportunity baselines and packaging choices.

Sources: WP14-08, WP14-04, WP14-07, WP14-05

## 5.2 Build capability around real opportunities

Local contracting is described as a step-by-step approach that enables local small and medium enterprises to access procurement opportunities with large companies. For supplier development, the practical implication is to anchor capability building to actual opportunity requirements, not to abstract standards. Use the opportunity baseline to identify what evidence suppliers must produce and what delivery controls they must meet. Then use the two-gate model to clarify whether the constraint is legal eligibility or package capability. This approach keeps development relevant and measurable through later participation and delivery stages, consistent with the process-stage synthesis that frames performance beyond award value alone.

WP14-01, WP14-02, WP14-04, WP14-10

Packaging strategy and fairness controls influence what capability matters. If an undivided package excludes smaller firms by scale alone, packaging changes may create accessible entry points. Supplier development can then focus on capability needed to deliver within those defined packages. Keep bid information, response time, and clarifications workable so that suppliers can practice producing compliant bids. The goal is not to privilege local firms. It is to reduce avoidable process friction and to help suppliers meet published criteria in a transparent system. Maintain clear boundaries between support and evaluation so that competition remains credible.

WP14-05, WP14-06, WP14-08

### DECISION INSTRUMENT

#### Decision instrument: Opportunity-anchored capability plan template

Use to structure supplier development around documented package requirements.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Target package set	Development targets are not tied to upcoming procurement packages.	Select target packages based on published opportunity baselines and packaging strategy.
Capability outcomes	Activities are defined without reference to qualification or delivery requirements.	Define capability outcomes as evidence and delivery controls required by the package.
Bid practice controls	Suppliers cannot translate requirements into compliant bids.	Use bid information standards, response times, and clarifications as part of capability practice.
Integrity boundary	Support influences live tender evaluation.	Document and enforce separation between support activities and award decisions.

Sources: WP14-02, WP14-05, WP14-06, WP14-08

## 5.3 Connect supplier development to local development governance

Local procurement and supplier development should be connected to wider local-development institutions and agreed priorities rather than treated as an isolated spend target. The community development agreement source book offers a non-prescriptive framework for strategic and collaborative planning, including stakeholder representation, implementation, feedback, management, budgeting, monitoring, and sustainability. Use that framing to decide where supplier development priorities are set and how they relate to community priorities, without implying a universal template. This connection reduces the risk that development support is perceived as arbitrary and helps sustain initiatives beyond a single contract cycle.

WP14-13, WP14-11, WP14-12

Governance arrangements need representation, decision rules, implementation responsibilities, and feedback mechanisms. Apply these governance elements to supplier development portfolios: who selects target capability gaps, who funds support, who delivers it, and how results are reviewed. Tailor the arrangement to regulatory structure, stakeholder interests, and local capacity. Keep procurement’s role clear: procurement defines the opportunity baselines, publishes rules, applies evaluation consistently, and retains the record. Development governance then uses that evidence to prioritize support while keeping the boundary between support and award decisions intact.

WP14-14, WP14-15, WP14-02, WP14-07

### DECISION INSTRUMENT

#### Decision instrument: Supplier development governance map

Use to formalize decision rights and feedback without forcing a universal template.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Representation	Development priorities are set by a single function.	Define stakeholder representation consistent with collaborative planning principles (non-prescriptive).
Decision rules	No criteria exist for selecting which gaps to address.	Set decision rules based on diagnosed gaps and published opportunity requirements.
Implementation owners	Support actions lack accountable owners.	Assign implementation responsibilities and management processes.
Feedback loop	Outcomes are not reviewed against procurement evidence.	Create feedback mechanisms that use procurement records and participation data to adjust priorities.

Sources: WP14-11, WP14-14, WP14-08, WP14-07

# 06

DELIVER

## Contract administration and payment

Local delivery performance depends on disciplined administration: clear records, consistent evaluation artifacts, and payment processes that smaller suppliers can survive.

### Discipline

PAYMENT AND APPROVAL DISCIPLINE  
INFLUENCE DELIVERY | WP14-09

### Record

RETAIN CRITERIA AND APPLICATION IN  
RECORD | WP14-07

### Visibility

E-PROCUREMENT CAN SUPPORT CON-  
TROLLED RECORDS | WP14-03

## 6.1 Admin controls that determine delivery survivability

Payment terms, invoice quality, and approval discipline influence whether smaller suppliers can sustain delivery. Treat these as contract administration controls, not as finance preferences. If invoices are rejected repeatedly due to unclear requirements, or if approvals are unpredictable, the supplier’s working capital becomes the bottleneck even when technical delivery is sound. Publish payment terms and invoice requirements as part of opportunity information so suppliers can price and plan. Then align internal approval discipline to those terms. This is consistent with the manual’s contract administration logic: delivery performance is affected by the buyer’s processes as much as by the supplier’s capability.

WP14-09, WP14-02

Transparent contracting also requires a controlled record that links award decisions to contract administration. Evaluation criteria should be published, applied consistently, and retained in the procurement record. Extend that discipline into administration by retaining contract variations, performance communications, and payment approvals in a controlled record. An electronic procurement system can support transaction visibility and record control where configured appropriately. The purpose is not surveillance. It is to ensure that administration actions remain consistent with the published terms and that disputes can be resolved against documented commitments and approvals.

WP14-07, WP14-03, WP14-09

### DECISION INSTRUMENT

#### Decision instrument: Small supplier survivability controls in contract administration

Use to review whether buyer-side processes create avoidable delivery failures.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Payment terms visibility	Payment terms are negotiated late or communicated informally.	Publish payment terms with the opportunity and keep them stable unless formally varied.
Invoice quality standard	Invoices are rejected due to ambiguous requirements.	Publish invoice quality requirements and provide a clear acceptance checklist.
Approval discipline	Approvals depend on individual availability and do not follow defined timing.	Set and enforce approval workflows and timing consistent with published terms.
Administration record	Variations and approvals are scattered across emails.	Retain variations and approvals in a controlled contracting record, using e-systems where applicable.

Sources: WP14-09, WP14-02, WP14-03

## 6.2 Preserve transparency after award

Transparency does not end at award. The manual’s transparency conditions emphasize clear rules and a retained record. After award, the risk is that informal administration creates de facto rule changes: scope creep, undocumented variations, or inconsistent acceptance. Preserve a controlled contracting record that includes the published criteria, the evaluation application, and the administration trail. This continuity supports fair treatment across suppliers and across packages. It also protects local suppliers from shifting requirements that they are least able to absorb. Where changes are necessary, document them as formal variations and keep them visible within the contracting record.

WP14-02, WP14-07

An electronic procurement system can support transaction visibility and controlled records. If used, define how contract administration artifacts are stored and who approves entries. Where systems are not available, create an equivalent record discipline with clear ownership and retention rules. The goal is a traceable chain from opportunity publication through eligibility, evaluation, award, and administration. This supports later measurement across participation, award, delivery performance, and capability retained, consistent with the process-stage synthesis that warns against relying on award value alone.

WP14-03, WP14-10, WP14-07

### DECISION INSTRUMENT

#### Decision instrument: Post-award transparency and record continuity

Use to ensure administration actions remain traceable and consistent with published commitments.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Record continuity	Award documentation exists but administration actions are not linked to it.	Link contract administration artifacts to the original procurement record.
Variation control	Changes are agreed informally on site.	Document changes as formal variations and retain them in the controlled record.
Visibility mechanism	Stakeholders cannot see status of approvals or variations.	Use e-procurement or a controlled log to provide transaction visibility.
Measurement readiness	Delivery data cannot be tied back to participation and award stages.	Structure records to support later scorecard measurement across stages (synthesis).

Sources: WP14-07, WP14-03, WP14-10

## 6.3 Use administration data to trigger development support

Supplier development should respond to diagnosed gaps and remain separate from the award decision. Contract administration generates high-value diagnosis data because it shows where delivery friction occurs: documentation quality, compliance, or interpretation issues. Use this data to define support topics for future opportunities, not to renegotiate current award requirements. Maintain the integrity boundary: support is offered after diagnosis and outside the live evaluation and award decisions. This keeps competition credible while still improving the capability retained in the local market over time, consistent with the measurement span across delivery performance and capability retained.

WP14-08, WP14-09, WP14-10

To make administration data usable, retain it in a controlled record and align it to published terms. Evaluation criteria should be published and retained, and the same discipline should apply to acceptance and payment decisions. Where an electronic procurement system is available, configure it so that administration events are captured with timestamps and approvers, supporting transaction visibility. The aim is practical: diagnose systemic issues such as invoice rejection cycles or unclear acceptance criteria, then adjust opportunity baseline information, clarification practices, or supplier development content accordingly. This keeps improvements grounded in evidence rather than assumptions.

WP14-07, WP14-03, WP14-06, WP14-09

### DECISION INSTRUMENT

#### Decision instrument: Administration-to-development feedback loop

Use to turn administration evidence into targeted support without compromising award integrity.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Evidence capture	Delivery issues are discussed but not recorded systematically.	Capture acceptance, nonconformance, invoice rejection, and approval timing in the controlled record.
Gap diagnosis	Support topics are chosen without reference to delivery evidence.	Diagnose gaps using administration data aligned to published terms.
Integrity boundary	Support is offered to fix current contract shortcomings in exchange for concessions.	Offer support outside award decisions and frame it for future opportunities.
Baseline improvement	The same admin issues recur across packages.	Update opportunity baseline information and clarification practices based on diagnosed issues.

Sources: WP14-09, WP14-08, WP14-07, WP14-06

# 07

GOVERN

## Governance and community connection

Governance must define representation, decision rules, responsibilities, and feedback. Connection to local development priorities increases continuity and legitimacy, but instruments must be tailored.

### Represent

GOVERNANCE NEEDS STAKEHOLDER REPRESENTATION AND RULES | WP14-14

### Non-prescriptive

FRAMEWORK IS EXPLICITLY NON-PRESCRIPTIVE | WP14-11

### Tailor

INSTRUMENT SHAPED BY REGULATION, INTERESTS, CAPACITY | WP14-15

# 7.1 Set governance that can actually decide

Governance arrangements need representation, decision rules, implementation responsibilities, and feedback mechanisms. Without these, local content decisions drift into informal negotiation, which undermines transparency and creates inconsistent outcomes. Apply governance discipline to the local contracting system: who approves packaging strategy, who sets publication standards, who owns qualification gates, and who monitors payment discipline. Keep these roles explicit and recorded. This aligns with the contracting manual’s emphasis on clear rules and a retained record, because governance decisions about rules are part of what must be defensible later when suppliers and communities question fairness or effectiveness.

WP14-14, WP14-02, WP14-07

The community development agreement source book provides a non-prescriptive framework for strategic and collaborative community-development planning. It covers processes such as stakeholder representation, implementation, feedback, management, budgeting, monitoring, and sustainability. Use that framing to build a governance forum that can decide priorities and review results, while recognizing that procurement decisions must still follow transparent contracting rules. The value of the forum is continuity and shared understanding, not control over individual award decisions. Keep procurement integrity protected by published criteria and consistent application, and use governance to agree priorities and review scorecard trends.

WP14-11, WP14-12, WP14-07

## DECISION INSTRUMENT

### Decision instrument: Governance minimum viable design for local content

Use to define a governance arrangement that can decide, implement, and learn without overriding procurement rules.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Representation	Stakeholders are consulted but not represented in a decision forum.	Define stakeholder representation and participation rules appropriate to the context.
Decision rules	Meetings discuss issues but do not produce decisions.	Set decision rules including quorum, escalation, and documentation requirements.
Responsibilities	Actions are agreed but implementation ownership is unclear.	Assign implementation responsibilities for procurement controls and development actions.
Feedback mechanisms	No structured feedback exists from suppliers or community institutions.	Establish feedback mechanisms and link them to management review and scorecard updates.

Sources: WP14-14, WP14-12, WP14-11

## 7.2 Connect to local development institutions without forcing a template

Local procurement and supplier development should be connected to wider local-development institutions and agreed priorities rather than treated as an isolated spend target. The source book’s framework supports collaborative planning but is explicitly non-prescriptive. Use it to identify which institutions and processes in the local context can host priority-setting and monitoring, such as representation structures and budgeting cycles. The goal is not to turn procurement into a community program. It is to align local content priorities with legitimate local development priorities, reducing contradictions and improving continuity across project phases.

WP14-13, WP14-11, WP14-12

A universal template is not appropriate. The source book states that the applicable regulatory structure, stakeholder interests, and local capacity shape the instrument. Apply that constraint to local content governance. In a high-capacity environment, governance can include formal monitoring and sustainability planning. In a low-capacity environment, governance may need to focus on clear representation and basic feedback loops first. Keep procurement controls constant where possible, such as published rules and retained records, and tailor the governance interface that sets priorities and reviews performance. This avoids over-design that cannot be implemented.

WP14-15, WP14-14, WP14-07

### DECISION INSTRUMENT

#### Decision instrument: Tailoring matrix for local content governance

Use to tailor governance form without weakening procurement transparency controls.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Regulatory structure	Governance design ignores local regulatory requirements or reporting expectations.	Adjust governance form to fit applicable regulatory structure.
Stakeholder interests	Key interests are not represented, leading to repeated contestation.	Map stakeholder interests and adjust representation and decision rules accordingly.
Local capacity	The design assumes monitoring and budgeting capacity that does not exist.	Scale governance processes to local capacity and phase in complexity.
Procurement integrity constant	Tailoring is used to justify informal procurement practices.	Keep opportunity publication, criteria consistency, and record retention as non-negotiable controls.

Sources: WP14-15, WP14-14, WP14-02, WP14-07

## 7.3 Use governance to protect transparency and improve access

Governance should protect the transparency conditions that enable access. Transparent contracting depends on clear opportunity publication, eligibility, evaluation, and award rules. Bid information, response time, and accessible clarification affect practical fairness. Governance can set the standards for these controls, monitor whether they are followed, and mandate corrective action when they are not. This is particularly important when packaging changes or when multiple business units buy similar categories. A governance forum can approve standard operating procedures and insist on record retention so that local suppliers encounter a consistent system rather than a different set of rules for each buyer.

WP14-02, WP14-06, WP14-07

Governance can also connect procurement evidence to supplier development priorities. Supplier-development support should respond to diagnosed gaps and remain separate from the award decision. Use governance to review diagnosis data from qualification outcomes and contract administration, then approve a development plan that targets recurring gaps. This improves capability retained without compromising award integrity. It also supports the broader measurement logic that local content should be measured across participation, award, delivery performance, and capability retained, not award value alone. In this way, governance becomes a learning system rather than a compliance ritual.

WP14-08, WP14-09, WP14-10

### DECISION INSTRUMENT

#### Decision instrument: Governance agenda for transparency and access

Use as a standing agenda to ensure governance drives procurement controls and learning.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Standards approval	Publication and evaluation standards vary by team.	Approve and maintain standards for opportunity publication, criteria, and record retention.
Fairness monitoring	Suppliers report unclear bid information or limited clarifications.	Monitor bid information quality, response times, and clarification accessibility.
Gap review	Supplier development topics are not linked to evidence.	Review diagnosed gaps from qualification and administration data and approve targeted support plans.
Scorecard review	Local content is reported as spend only.	Review scorecard trends across participation, award, delivery, and capability retained (synthesis).

Sources: WP14-02, WP14-06, WP14-08, WP14-10

# 08

MEASURE

## The local-content scorecard

A scorecard should follow the process stages: participation, award, delivery performance, and capability retained, supported by transparent records.

### Scorecard

SPAN PARTICIPATION, AWARD, DELIVERY, CAPABILITY RETAINED | WP14-10

### Trace

SCORECARD RELIES ON RETAINED PROCUREMENT RECORDS | WP14-07

### Visibility

E-PROCUREMENT CAN SUPPORT TRANSACTION VISIBILITY | WP14-03

# 8.1 Define the scorecard domains and boundaries

Local content should be measured across qualified participation, contract award, delivery performance, and capability retained, not award value alone. This is presented as a synthesis of process stages described in the local-contracting manual, not as a numerical benchmark. Define each domain in operational terms that match your procurement steps. Participation starts at supplier access and qualification gates. Award is the outcome of published evaluation and award rules. Delivery performance depends on administration controls, including payment discipline. Capability retained is the post-delivery view of whether suppliers can qualify and deliver again. Keep domains stable so trends can be interpreted and governance can act on them.

WP14-10, WP14-01, WP14-09

The scorecard needs strong evidence chains. Evaluation criteria should be published, applied consistently, and retained in the procurement record. Without record integrity, scorecard numbers become disputable and encourage data gaming. Where an electronic procurement system is used, it can support transaction visibility and a controlled contracting record. Use that capability to link participation, award, and administration events. If systems are fragmented, define a controlled record structure and ensure ownership. The scorecard should then be a view over that record, not a separate reporting exercise that requires manual reconstruction each cycle.

WP14-07, WP14-03, WP14-10

## DECISION INSTRUMENT

### Decision instrument: Scorecard domain definition sheet (non-numeric ready)

Use to define domains before selecting indicators or dashboards.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Domain 1: Qualified participation	Only award value is tracked.	Define participation as supplier access plus outcomes of eligibility and capability gates.
Domain 2: Contract award	Awards are reported without reference to published rules.	Define award as the outcome of published criteria applied consistently and recorded.
Domain 3: Delivery performance	Delivery is treated as supplier-only responsibility.	Define delivery performance to include administration controls such as payment and approval discipline.
Domain 4: Capability retained	No view exists of repeat qualification or delivery readiness.	Define retained capability as evidence of future readiness, grounded in repeated process performance.

Sources: WP14-10, WP14-04, WP14-07, WP14-09

## 8.2 Use leading indicators tied to controllable steps

Because the manual is procedural, leading indicators should attach to steps you can control. Transparent contracting depends on clear opportunity publication and on eligibility, evaluation, and award rules. Practical fairness depends on bid information, response time, and accessible clarification. These are controllable inputs, and they can be scored through compliance checks rather than outcome claims. Treat them as gates: was the opportunity published with rules, was the clarification log accessible, were response times met, and were criteria applied consistently. This approach avoids false precision while still driving behavior change. It also helps procurement teams correct process failures before they show up as delivery failures or supplier exits.

WP14-02, WP14-06, WP14-07

The two-gate registration and prequalification model offers another set of controllable indicators. Supplier registration and prequalification should distinguish legal eligibility from technical capability for a specific package. If many suppliers fail eligibility, the fix is administrative support or process redesign. If many fail capability, supplier development may be needed, but it should be based on diagnosed gaps and remain separate from award decisions. Use these gate outcomes as leading signals that shape development priorities and packaging strategy. Keep results anchored to published criteria and retained records to avoid shifting definitions over time.

WP14-04, WP14-08, WP14-07, WP14-05

### DECISION INSTRUMENT

#### Decision instrument: Leading-indicator gate set for local contracting

Use as a control panel for procurement managers. Indicators are yes-no or categorical by design.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Publication gate	Opportunities are issued without a consistent rule pack.	Require published opportunity, eligibility, evaluation, and award rules for each package.
Fairness gate	Clarifications and response times vary without control.	Control bid information, response time, and clarification accessibility as standard requirements.
Two-gate outcomes	Failure reasons are not separated into eligibility vs capability.	Record and report eligibility and capability gate outcomes separately.
Development boundary gate	Support activities influence live tender decisions.	Enforce separation between diagnosed support and award decisions.

Sources: WP14-02, WP14-06, WP14-04, WP14-08

## 8.3 Integrate scorecard review into governance and local development planning

Scorecard review needs governance that can act. Governance arrangements need representation, decision rules, implementation responsibilities, and feedback mechanisms. Use these elements to define who reviews scorecard outputs, who approves corrective actions, and how feedback from suppliers and local institutions is incorporated. The community development agreement source book provides a non-prescriptive framework for collaborative planning, including monitoring and sustainability. Use that framing to align local content scorecard review with broader local development monitoring where appropriate, while still maintaining procurement transparency controls. The goal is a repeatable review loop that changes process settings when performance trends indicate a barrier.

WP14-14, WP14-11, WP14-12

Tailoring remains essential. The source book states that a universal template is not appropriate and that regulatory structure, stakeholder interests, and local capacity shape the instrument. Apply this to scorecard governance. In some contexts, public reporting may be constrained and the scorecard remains internal. In others, a shared forum may review high-level results. Regardless of form, maintain the core procurement evidence controls: published rules, consistent criteria application, and retained records, supported by transaction visibility where systems allow. This keeps scorecard discussion grounded in what can be proven and improved.

WP14-15, WP14-07, WP14-03

### DECISION INSTRUMENT

#### Decision instrument: Scorecard governance operating rhythm

Use to define who reviews what, when, and how decisions and feedback are recorded.

TEST	EVIDENCE READING	DECISION RESPONSE
Review forum	Scorecard is produced but not reviewed in a decision setting.	Assign a forum with defined representation and decision rules to review scorecard outputs.
Action ownership	Corrective actions are agreed but not implemented.	Assign implementation responsibilities and track closure through feedback mechanisms.
Planning alignment	Local content is disconnected from wider local development monitoring.	Align scorecard review with collaborative planning and monitoring processes where appropriate (non-prescriptive).
Tailoring constraint	A fixed rhythm is imposed without regard to local capacity.	Tailor review frequency and reporting scope to regulatory structure, interests, and capacity while keeping procurement evidence controls constant.

Sources: WP14-14, WP14-12, WP14-11, WP14-15

# Decision checklist

Use these questions before the next gate, assurance review or capital commitment.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>01</b> Publish each opportunity with explicit eligibility, evaluation, and award rules and retain the published pack in the procurement record. [WP14-02, WP14-07]</p>                       | <p><b>02</b> Test packaging for scale barriers that exclude capable smaller firms and document the rationale for the final package design. [WP14-05, WP14-07]</p>  |
| <p><b>03</b> Use the two-gate model: separate legal eligibility from package-specific capability and record outcomes for both gates. [WP14-04, WP14-07]</p>  | <p><b>04</b> Set practical fairness controls: minimum bid information, workable response times, and an accessible clarification process with a retained log. [WP14-06, WP14-02]</p>  |
| <p><b>05</b> Configure e-procurement, where used, to support supplier access, transaction visibility, and a controlled contracting record across the full cycle. [WP14-03]</p>                     | <p><b>06</b> Run supplier development from diagnosed gaps and keep support separate from award decisions. [WP14-08]</p>  |
| <p><b>07</b> Review payment terms, invoice quality requirements, and approval discipline as delivery controls and publish them with opportunities. [WP14-09, WP14-02]</p>                          | <p><b>08</b> Establish governance with representation, decision rules, responsibilities, and feedback mechanisms, tailored to local regulatory structure, stakeholder interests, and capacity. [WP14-14, WP14-15]</p>      |
| <p><b>09</b> Measure local content across qualified participation, award, delivery performance, and capability retained, using the procurement record as the evidence base. [WP14-10, WP14-07]</p> | <p><b>10</b> Connect local procurement and supplier development priorities to wider local development institutions and agreed priorities using a non-prescriptive collaborative planning framework. [WP14-13, WP14-11]</p> |
| <p><b>11</b> Review scorecard trends in a decision forum and mandate corrective actions when transparency or fairness controls are not met. [WP14-14, WP14-02]</p>                                 | <p><b>12</b> Retain administration artifacts, including variations and payment approvals, in a controlled record to preserve post-award transparency. [WP14-03, WP14-07]</p>   |

# Evidence ledger 1 of 2

Only dossier rows used in this edition are listed. Concise excerpts identify each registered statement; the source audit retains the complete dossier reference.

ROW	REGISTERED EVIDENCE EXCERPT	REGISTERED SOURCE
WP14-01	IFC's local-contracting manual provides a step-by-step approach for enabling local small and medium enterprises to access procurement opportunities with large companies.	IFC, Developing a Transparent System for Local Contracting, 2008
WP14-02	Transparent contracting depends on clear opportunity publication, eligibility, evaluation and award rules.	IFC 2008
WP14-03	An electronic procurement system can support supplier access, transaction visibility and a controlled contracting record.	IFC 2008
WP14-04	Supplier registration and prequalification should distinguish legal eligibility from technical capability for a specific package.	IFC 2008, process framework
WP14-05	Packaging strategy affects whether local suppliers can compete; an undivided package can exclude capable smaller firms by scale alone.	IFC 2008, contracting framework
WP14-06	Bid information, response time and accessible clarification affect the practical fairness of competition.	IFC 2008
WP14-07	Evaluation criteria should be published, applied consistently and retained in the procurement record.	IFC 2008
WP14-08	Supplier-development support should respond to diagnosed gaps and remain separate from the award decision.	IFC 2008, capacity-building logic

# Evidence ledger 2 of 2

Only dossier rows used in this edition are listed. Concise excerpts identify each registered statement; the source audit retains the complete dossier reference.

ROW	REGISTERED EVIDENCE EXCERPT	REGISTERED SOURCE
WP14-09	Payment terms, invoice quality and approval discipline influence whether smaller suppliers can sustain delivery.	IFC 2008, contract administration logic
WP14-10	Local content should be measured across qualified participation, contract award, delivery performance and capability retained, not award value alone.	Synthesis of IFC 2008 process stages
WP14-11	The World Bank CDA Source Book presents a framework for strategic and collaborative community-development planning and is explicitly non-prescriptive.	World Bank, Mining CDA Source Book, 2012
WP14-12	The Source Book addresses processes, stakeholder representation, implementation, feedback, management, budgeting, monitoring and sustainability.	World Bank 2012, contents and objectives
WP14-13	Local procurement and supplier development should be connected to wider local-development institutions and agreed priorities rather than treated as an isolated spend target.	World Bank 2012, collaborative-development framework
WP14-14	Governance arrangements need representation, decision rules, implementation responsibilities and feedback mechanisms.	World Bank 2012, ch. 5 to 7
WP14-15	A universal template is not appropriate; the applicable regulatory structure, stakeholder interests and local capacity shape the instrument.	World Bank 2012, objectives

# Glossary

## Opportunity baseline

The publishable definition of what is being bought, including the opportunity information, eligibility, evaluation, and award rules, and the planned procurement record content. [WP14-02, WP14-07]

## Two-gate qualification

A qualification model that separates legal eligibility to contract from technical capability to deliver a specific package. [WP14-04]

## Practical fairness

Bid conditions that make competition usable in practice, including adequate bid information, response time, and accessible clarification. [WP14-06]

## Controlled contracting record

A record that retains published criteria, their consistent application, and contracting artifacts, supported by e-procurement where used. [WP14-03, WP14-07]

## Supplier development integrity boundary

A control that keeps support activities based on diagnosed gaps separate from evaluation and award decisions. [WP14-08]

## Local-content scorecard span

A measurement framing that covers qualified participation, award, delivery performance, and capability retained rather than award value alone, presented as a synthesis of process stages. [WP14-10]

## Non-prescriptive CDA framework

A community development agreement planning framework presented as explicitly non-prescriptive and focused on collaborative processes such as representation, implementation, feedback, budgeting, monitoring, and sustainability. [WP14-11, WP14-12]

## Governance minimum elements

Governance requirements that include representation, decision rules, implementation responsibilities, and feedback mechanisms. [WP14-14]

## Tailoring constraint

A design constraint that no universal template is appropriate because regulatory structure, stakeholder interests, and local capacity shape the instrument. [WP14-15]

## Packaging strategy

Contracting framework choices about bundling or splitting work that affect whether local suppliers can compete, noting that undivided packages can exclude smaller capable firms by scale alone. [WP14-05]

## Payment survivability

The ability of smaller suppliers to sustain delivery under specified payment terms, invoice quality requirements, and approval discipline. [WP14-09]

## Transparent contracting

A contracting approach that depends on clear opportunity publication and clear eligibility, evaluation, and award rules, with consistent application and record retention. [WP14-02, WP14-07]

## Transaction visibility

Visibility of procurement transactions and status supported by an electronic procurement system as part of a controlled contracting record. [WP14-03]

## Collaborative development planning

Strategic and collaborative planning processes for community development that are non-prescriptive and include monitoring and sustainability considerations. [WP14-11, WP14-12]

## Local development connection

A principle that local procurement and supplier development should connect to wider local-development institutions and agreed priorities rather than be treated as an isolated spend target. [WP14-13]

## Evaluation record integrity

The requirement that evaluation criteria are published, applied consistently, and retained in the procurement record. [WP14-07]

## Clarification log

A retained record of bidder questions and responses used to keep clarification accessible and consistent. [WP14-06, WP14-07]

## Award rule clarity

The requirement that award rules are explicit and published as part of transparent contracting. [WP14-02]

# References and limitations

## International Finance Corporation (IFC) (2008)

Developing a Transparent System for Local Contracting. Step-by-step local contracting manual covering transparency rules, supplier access, packaging considerations, qualification logic, e-procurement support, supplier development separation, and contract administration logic

## World Bank (2012)

Mining Community Development Agreements Source Book. Archived source book presenting a non-prescriptive framework for strategic and collaborative community-development planning, governance arrangements, implementation, feedback, budgeting, monitoring, and sustainability

## International Finance Corporation (IFC) (2008)

Developing a Transparent System for Local Contracting (publication page). Used as the registered evidence source for statements WP14-01 to WP14-09 and supporting transparency frameworks

## World Bank (2012)

Mining Community Development Agreements Source Book (archived PDF). Used as the registered evidence source for statements WP14-11 to WP14-15 on governance and tailoring constraints

## International Finance Corporation (IFC) (2008)

Developing a Transparent System for Local Contracting (process stages). Used as the basis for the explicit synthesis statement on multi-stage local content measurement (WP14-10)

## World Bank (2012)

Mining Community Development Agreements Source Book (chapters on governance). Used for governance minimum elements and non-template guidance

## USE LIMITATIONS

- **Evidence boundary:** This paper uses only the registered dossier rows WP14-01 to WP14-15. No additional mandates, jurisdictions, outcomes, forecasts, or numerical results are introduced beyond those rows.
- **No delivery claims:** There are no Aurus program outcomes, supplier-spend totals, employment numbers, training counts, or client anecdotes in this paper, consistent with the usage boundary in the dossier.
- **Status preservation:** Statements described in the dossier as frameworks, process logic, or synthesis are treated as such and are not presented as empirical results or guaranteed outcomes.
- **Template caution:** The World Bank CDA framework is explicitly non-prescriptive and no universal template is implied; instruments must be tailored to regulatory structure, stakeholder interests, and local capacity as stated in the dossier.

## EDITION STATUS

This technical paper is an editorial synthesis for decision support. It is not a feasibility study, investment recommendation, legal opinion or project-specific assurance statement.

AURUS MINING

---

# Local Content That Performs

Published as part of the Aurus Mining technical paper series. Mining, infrastructure, engineering and environment decisions are treated as one connected system, with evidence boundaries stated and source rows preserved.

Prepared for digital distribution in A4 format. Edition 1, 2026.

WP14 | EVIDENCE-BOUNDED TECHNICAL PAPER