



The Effect of Introducing Mandatory Clauses on Procurement Documents: An Evaluation of the Perception of Procurement Professionals in Alberta, Canada

Dr. Olawale AMUZAT ¹, Ndifreke Akaninyene ENO, Ph.D ²

¹ Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Business School, Binary University of Management and Entrepreneurship, Malaysia

² Department of Marketing, Faculty of Business Administration, University of Uyo

Abstract:

The study sought to evaluate the effect of introducing mandatory clauses on procurement documents as perceived by the procurement professionals in Alberta, Canada. A descriptive research design was adopted for the study. The location of the study was Alberta, Canada. The population consisted of procurement officials in Alberta. Purposive sampling technique was used to select a total of 12 respondents. Research instruments, (self-administered questionnaires) via email, Face to face and/ or zoom interviews with key stakeholders were used for the study. From executive management, management. Focus group discussions with procurement professionals. across ministries and project Managers. The data were analysed as interviews and focus group discussions, qualitative, thematic analysis and transcription. Cronbach's alpha co-efficient was used to check internal consistency and reliability of scale. From the study it was concluded that there is much effect of introducing mandatory clauses on procurement documents perceived by procurement professionals. Mandatory requirements are important to highlight as a proposal which must meet these to be compliant. One of the recommendations made from the study states that managers should always have in their consciousness, the need to improve the outcome of the project though such value initiatives as effective time management, cost reduction, continuous improvement, rewarding those that finish the project before time, good relationship among the parties, further innovations, flexibility and many more.

Keywords: Mandatory Clause, Procurement Document, Evaluation, Perception, Procurement professionals, Alberta and Canada.

Citation: AMUZAT, O. ., & ENO, N. A. . (2024). The Effect of Introducing Mandatory Clauses on Procurement Documents: An Evaluation of the Perception of Procurement Professionals in Alberta, Canada.

American Journal of Economics and Business Management, 7(4), 8–19.
Retrieved from

<https://globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/ajebm/article/view/2736>

Received: 21 February 2024

Revised: 29 February 2024

Accepted: 20 March 2024

Published: 08 April 2024



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors.
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-4.0 International License (CC - BY 4.0)

Introduction

Project Managers in an informal way. Although the effects of introducing mandatory clauses on the procurement documents are partially investigated to create efficiency, consistency is required, and the use of YES/NO feedback is re-emphasized with simple questions., The effect of the introduction of the Pricing Strategy on proposal and exploring the impact of critical success factors on vendor selection has briefly been identified by management in Procurement Department, but more proactive measures need to be explored or investigated to get the desired results. It comes to the researcher's notice that the work so far done in the identified areas in Public Procurement is inadequate, and the area needs further exploration, especially at Alberta Infrastructure, Procurement Department. Hence, the present research has been proposed to fill the gap in the research carried out earlier.

Vendor selection is a fundamental issue in supply chain management which contributes significantly to the overall supply chain performance. Public Sector spends a high percentage of Taxpayers' funds on parts and material supplies, and the material costs, which represent a larger portion of total costs and savings, are of particular importance. To minimize risk in selecting the best vendor, then the right dimensions of critical success factors need to be employed by due diligence at all levels. This calls for proper attention by the purchasing department as well as the senior management in the organization. The research on the effects of introducing mandatory clauses on the procurement documents are partially investigated to create efficiency, consistency is required, and the use of YES/NO feedback is re-emphasized with simple questions.,

Statement of Problem

Procurement professionals, through Management approval have the right to reject any non-compliant proposal as long the theory of fairness is exhibited in Public Procurement. This issue has been explored where the infrastructure department experienced delays in Procurement or faulty Procurement due to inappropriate drafting of procurement documents by project managers. This is what brings about the introduction of mandatory clause to promote fairness and boundaries to a procurement document.

Objective of the Study

The study sought to:

1. To evaluate the effects of introducing mandatory clauses on Procurement documents perceived by Procurement professionals.

Research Questions

1. Will there be any effect of introducing mandatory clauses on the procurement documents?

Procurement Risk Perspectives

Procurement, as the acquisition and management of external resources, is a function of strategic and operational importance to any organization in a modern economy. This is equally the case whether it is managed by procurement professionals through a central procurement organization or distributed organizationally on some other model. Procurement's role is to ensure that an organization has a predictable supply of the external inputs it requires, offering demonstrable value for Money and delivered in a cost-effective manner to support the attainment of the organization's objectives. While its traditional role is in dealing with upstream suppliers in a supply chain context, it may also deal with downstream transactions, e.g., for logistic support in the distribution of the finished product. By its nature, procurement exposes an organization to risk. Procurement practices have, for this reason, been developed with inbuilt controls designed to deal with that risk; for example, purchasing through public or selective tendering, in the right circumstances, will encourage competition and diminish the scope for corruption and collusion in acquisition processes.

Risk in procurement, however, is often considered from a transactional viewpoint where risk management is focused on the things that can "go wrong" in the procurement process. This view is concerned with events that may contribute towards:

Breakdown of the process.

Failure to comply with required processes; and,

Inadequacy of process to achieve the commercial outcome required.

Although this perspective is valid and important, it does not address the strategic objectives of the procurement function or core business of an organization. It is generally

the concern of those who are direct stakeholders or practitioners in the process. It is generally not seen by Boards, CEOs and Senior Executives as a matter that requires their attention unless it arises in the context of a project of strategic importance or as an issue in corporate governance.

By integrating Procurement and Risk Management in their activities, procurement professionals and practitioners will be better positioned to engage with top management concerning their organizations' strategic agenda and corporate governance. To add value to the CEO, this needs to be delivered through the clear articulation of procurement strategy and how it will support organizational outcomes.

In terms of specific procurement activities, a systematic approach where commercial risk is identified, assessed, and managed to an acceptable level will deliver bottom-line benefits to the organization. This will enhance the opportunity for procurement professionals to become more involved in major and complex procurement decisions. This approach may be limited by the maturity of risk management at the organizational level, providing the purchasing professional with a challenge and an opportunity to take a leading role in contributing toward effective risk management across the enterprise.

Evaluation Principles: The Government of Saskatchewan is committed to the following general principles that provide a foundation for all public procurement:

- a. Open, transparent, and fair processes; Flexible approaches to doing procurement.
- b. Consistency and clarity in how we do business.
- c. Best possible value for money and a focus on outcomes and business solutions.
- d. Demonstrated Respect for our suppliers by engaging in meaningful consultation.
- e. Easy access to public tender information and opportunities.
- f. Innovation that fosters economic development and competitiveness.
- g. Respect for our trade obligations; and continuously improving how we do business.

Evaluation Strategies: If something is essential to the public entity, it should be weighted sufficiently to reward bidders who meet the need or penalize those who don't. For example, is a delivery date important enough that the public entity would consider paying more for a product or service to ensure it is delivered by a specific date? If the answer is yes, then the public entity should consider rating delivery. In a procurement process with rated criteria, the successful bidder would be the highest rated one, based on all rated evaluation elements. Where cost is the sole evaluation factor, the successful bidder would be the bidder that provided the product at the lowest total cost.

Evaluation: All submissions in response to a procurement competition are subject to evaluation after opening and before award of contract. The bid request documents should clearly identify the requirements of the procurement, the evaluation method, and evaluation criteria based on the guiding principles as outlined in this guide. To be effective, evaluation criteria should clearly relate back to the requirements identified in the competition and should reflect the business problem and the importance of each requirement as identified in the competition document. When crafting evaluation plans and criteria, there should be consideration given to how innovation, creativity and alternative solutions will be evaluated and compared.

The government of Saskatchewan (2015) strongly recommended that for procurement of over fifty million dollars, a Fairness Advisor be considered and be engaged as early as possible in the procurement process. Employing a Fairness Advisor may improve the confidence of all parties that the process will be fair, open, respectful, and transparent.

The Fairness Advisor is an independent third party whose typical role is to observe the

procurement process, report on whether the process described in the procurement documents was followed, and advise the project team as needed on fairness issues. The Fairness Advisor's role may include, but is not limited to:

- a. Providing an unbiased and impartial opinion on the fairness of the observed procurement process.
- b. Reviewing any procurement documents at the Fairness Advisor's discretion, including invitation documents and their addenda, the process framework, and evaluation worksheets.
- c. Attending meetings where evaluation findings and recommendations are formally presented, monitoring the fairness of such proceedings and the findings made there, and attending and monitoring any other meetings related to the fairness of the process at the Fairness Advisor's discretion.
- d. Participating in meetings in person and by telephone as scheduled, identifying priority fairness-related issues and fairness-related critical paths and constraints.
- e. Managing assignments in a timely and cost-effective manner; and
- f. Preparing and submitting reports to the project team.

The involvement of a fairness advisor in a procurement process in no way diminishes or absolves any project team member of their accountabilities or responsibilities. (Government of Saskatchewan, 2015).

Evaluation Principles

Confidentiality of Information: The Procurement Accountability Framework advised that responses and evaluation documentation must be dealt with in strict confidence due to the proprietary nature of Responses and the competitive process.

Confidentiality of information in Responses received is paramount; therefore, everyone involved in the evaluation (directly or indirectly) must be aware of the confidentiality requirement and ensure information is not divulged inappropriately. (Alberta Infrastructure, 2022)

The integrity of Evaluation: The integrity of Response evaluation and vendor selection is critical in any public procurement organization. It is the duty of the Purchasing Officer to ensure the following principles are adhered to:

- a. Successful or unsuccessful vendors must not be determined in a covert or discriminatory fashion.
- b. No vendor is to be given an advantage over another.
- c. Subjective opinions and/or preferences must not influence the Contract award.
- d. Changes to vendors' Responses must not be allowed outside a Modified RFP process or a Rectification Period that was provided for in the Solicitation.
- e. Clarification of vendors' Responses must not result in accepting new information after the solicitation closing date and time that would alter a price proposed or any other element of a Response.
- f. Changes in Evaluation Criteria or methods of pricing in a Response must not be allowed after the solicitation closing date and time.
- g. Vendors' Responses must be evaluated carefully to ensure all requirements (which are mandatory) of the Solicitation Document are met, and

h. The business and technical evaluation by the end-user or Evaluation Team must be conducted in a fair (equitable) and transparent manner, in accordance with the criteria set out in the Solicitation Document and the evaluation plan. (Alberta Infrastructure, 2022).

Notifying and Debriefing Vendors

The best practice in the Government of Alberta has always been to notify and debrief the unsuccessful vendors before requesting approval to Contract with the preferred vendor. Successful debriefs another step in confirming that the decision at arriving at the preferred vendor is solid, which bolsters confidence in the Contract award recommendation for those individuals responsible for approving it. As of July 2017, the Canadian Free Trade Agreement requires the Government of Alberta, on request of a vendor, to provide the losing vendor with an explanation of why it did not win the contract award.

Notifying and debriefing vendors promptly will assist them in managing their business in relation to upcoming work by either having the proposed resources available if they are the preferred vendor or bidding the proposed resources on other procurement opportunities available to them if they are unsuccessful.

Using References in Bid Evaluations

The use of references in public sector bid evaluations has been subject to multiple bid protests in recent decades. The case law, which is discussed in greater detail below, reflects the following governing principles that apply to the use of references during bid evaluations.

a. The improper use of reference information can result in re-evaluation orders, the nullification of contract award decisions, and, in some jurisdictions, lost profit damages awarded against the purchasing institution. Evaluators should therefore avoid using reference information to evaluate bids in an inconsistent, arbitrary, subjective, or non-transparent manner.

b. The use of references should be limited to situations where the collection of information from references would be sufficiently reliable and relevant to enable a defensible evaluation. Purchasing institutions must establish evaluation rules that clearly define how collected reference information will impact the scoring of bidders since that information must be used in a consistent and rational manner.

c. The information required from references and the procedures around the collection and use of reference information should be clearly identified in the solicitation document to allow bidders to select the appropriate references for the specific required criteria and to allow evaluators to use that information based on clearly established procedures.

d. Purchasing institutions should establish clear rules for providing references for their own evaluation procedures to incumbent bidders or to bidders who have worked for them in the past. When providing references to their own bidders, purchasing institutions should avoid creating more lenient standards for their own references than those applied to third-party references.

e. Evaluation committees may not divide up the reference check process among evaluators since this creates the risk of biasing the collection of information. All evaluators should have equal access to all reference information.

f. Evaluators should maintain detailed contemporaneous records of how reference information was used as part of their evaluation process.

In its May 2019 determination in *BEM Systems, Inc.*, the New York Office of the State Comptroller rejected a contract award due to a flawed evaluation process. The dispute dealt with a Department of Transportation (DOT) RFP for system implementation consulting services. A losing proponent challenged the evaluation process. As the

determination detailed, the Department used a multi-staged best and final offer (BAFO) process, which short-listed finalists and allowed those finalists to submit revised proposals for the final evaluation. A losing bidder challenged the evaluation result after its debriefing. The Comptroller found that the two-staged BAFO RFP process that allowed short-listed finalists to submit revised final offers was an acceptable practice under applicable procurement laws.

With respect to the use of reference information, the Comptroller found that some of the evaluators "provided scores for references when no reference checks were conducted and no process for independently scoring reference checks existed in the technical evaluation plan." Furthermore, the decision detailed the lack of proper recordkeeping during the evaluation process, which raised significant concerns about how the individual and group rescored was conducted after the demonstration stage and after the BAFO submissions.

The Comptroller, therefore, concluded that, based on its review of the evaluation records, it was "unable to confirm that DOT's evaluation and selection decisions were in accordance with the evaluation methodology set forth in the RFP and the evaluation plan and whether the evaluation conducted resulted in the best value award."

With Reference to item 3, however, it makes one query if the Alberta Infrastructure procedure is robust enough since we do not really disclose how we would use reference checks, but one of the reasons for this research and possible of looking into it. As a best practice, reference checks (which are based on information) are recommended and should be included as an activity to be performed as part of the evaluation. A pre-established set of questions is included in the evaluation plan template to enable consistency in conducting reference checks, which provides credibility to the process.

The purpose of conducting reference checks as part of the evaluation process is to:

Validate the accuracy of the information in the Response; and verify past performance of the vendor and/or the vendor's resources to ensure past performance was satisfactory.

Request for Proposal (RFP)

An RFP is a document utilized to solicit written solution-oriented proposals from potential suppliers. Both non-cost and cost criteria are evaluated, in addition to responsiveness and responsibility, to achieve the best Value. A successful RFP process will:

1. Support the principles of a fair, open, and transparent procurement.
2. Will provide the public entity with a business solution; and
3. Will comply with the expectations of government policy and procurement law.

Methodology

Descriptive research design was adopted for the study. The location of the study was Alberta, Canada. The population consisted of procurement officials in Alberta. Purposive sampling technique was used to select a total of 12 respondents. Research instruments Questionnaire, self-administered questionnaires via email, Face to face and/ or zoom interviews with key stakeholders. From executive management, management. Focus group discussions with procurement professionals. across ministries and project Managers. The data were analysed as interviews and focus group discussions, qualitative, thematic analysis and transcription. Cronbach's alpha co-efficient was used to check internal consistency and reliability of scale.

Result

Table 1: Key informants interviewed in the study

Category	Code
Management (3)	3 (P1, P2, P3)
Procurement Professional (6)	6 (P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9)
Project Management (3)	3 (P10, P11, P12)
Total	12

Objective 1: Evaluate the effects of introducing mandatory clauses on procurement documents.

The themes identified for objective 3 were as follows:

- I. Mandatory clauses on procurement documents
- II. Submitting years of experience or professional designation
- III. Similarity in a reference project done by the proponent.

Data from themes were presented under three categories of respondents who participated in the qualitative study as follow: Management, Procurement professionals and project managers. This presentation enables the reader to appreciate the various responses that came from respondents and how they enable a deeper understanding of the subject matter.

Mandatory clauses on procurement documents

In responding to the questions, respondents were very firm about having mandatory clauses on the procurement documents because it helps to streamline the procurement process. The question was meant to unearth respondents' understanding of why mandatory clauses on procurement documents needs to be followed without exceptions, those intended to benefit from it; major sponsors, internal and external stakeholders involved. It was important for the respondents to unravel their understanding of the concept and how they think it should function.

Management

Responses from Management (FG1, FG2 and FG3) revealed that they knew what the importance of mandatory clauses on procurement documents was about, and how it impacts critical success factors of selecting future vendors in the industry. One of the executive managements agrees that:

'... It makes it easy to shortlist the proponents that are qualified and can do the job instead of going through a long list of components, The word mandatory is non-negotiable, and if anything goes wrong, the project is in trouble. These are non-negotiable clauses that they must comply with.' P1

Another management had this to say:

'...There are so many generic RFPs, if you do have mandatory classes, you devote your attention of the proponent for what they need to focus on. You must do that you cannot deviate from the same way the classes establish critical things that can knock off the proponent from that selection process, and it could be as simple as not complying with the change order process.' P2

Another management had this to say:

'... Mandatory clauses in procurement documents are very important. It gives a perspective that whoever is reading that procurement document will know what is required or not. There's a big difference between discretionary and mandatory. It equally helps in evaluation because some are either mandatory or discretionary requirements. It provides clarity.' P3

Executive management concluded that mandatory clauses help the bidders to see what the expectation is, what the objective is in terms of any project or any document that they're going through.

Project Manager

Project Managers (P11 and P12) agreed that mandatory clauses on procurement documents improves clarity on procurement documents. One of the Project Managers agrees that:

'... We should not keep our documents too prescriptive. Focusing on mandatory aspects on things that are significant or the success of any project that adheres with the standards or the guidelines. We don't want to leave it too open, keeping a proper balance is the key. We should always be careful so as not restricting the capacity of the vendor to provide their expertise.' P11

Another project manager had this to say.

'... It's a good idea to have and it must have a minimum score depending on the evaluation criteria or Yes/No answer to eliminate the bidders that do not meet the minimum requirement.' P12

Procurement Professional

Procurement professionals (P4, P5 and P8) agreed that mandatory clauses on procurement documents makes it easy to disqualify the non-compliant bidders and streamline evaluation process as facilitator. One procurement professional agrees that:

'... the thing with mandatory criteria is that they're kind of absolute criteria and results in Pass or fail of the entire submission. It is an important item because you are saying that it has more weight than every other criterion. Non-compliance leads to eliminating them from any further consideration in the evaluation.' P4

Another procurement professional had this to say.

'... in an RFP, we don't require bid security, so part of the mandatory requirement is to have the proponents submit a pre-qualification letter from their security wherein once if the proponent is successful with the project. That's the assurance from the client that once we get that pre-qualification letter from the security, we know that the proponent must assure the client will provide those bonding requirements.' P5

Another procurement professional had this to say.

'... mandatory clauses sometimes eliminate a good vendor or deserving vendors as well. Certain processes are important like in construction management, we have a mandatory bid bond and there have been instances when people don't submit it. Although they are the lowest compliant bidder but not compliant. Although they were the lowest but some of these clauses are important just to safeguard our procurement processes. Because we're responsible to the public and accountability is very key.' P8

There is a flip side to it especially when requesting for a specific designation and vendor is unable to provide but can suggest alternatives based on expertise in a mandatory requirement. Evaluator will eliminate their entire submission from further consideration, whereas if you were to add it as part of your qualifications and that person didn't have it, then they would just lose a few points. Flexibility in procurement documents and using the right language "shall", "must" is important.

Submitting years of experience or professional designation.

In responding to the questions, respondents have agreeable opinion on submitting years of experience or professional designation. It was important for the respondents to unravel their understanding of the concept and how they think it should function.

Management

Responses from Management (P1, P2 and P3) revealed that they understand what opinion on submitting years of experience or professional designation was about and not take it for granted when selecting future vendors in the industry. One of the executive managements agrees that:

'... years of experience should be important and count towards professional designation. Mostly obtained from having several years and experience on the job. Experience is crucial especially in complex projects but with time designation will come into play which becomes addition. Some licensed professionals require education to sign a document. Education might take precedence.' P1

Another management had this to say:

'... depending on the industry, the experience counts. Education will give you an advantage. Most leadership value the experience that someone brings to the table there, then the education becomes additional. Some other organization give value to the education, but that does not mean the person will be the assigned a senior role and might not lead the project. That person will be assigned a mentor.' P2

Another management had this to say:

'... i like the fact that when you're submitting your team, I can show the number of years of experience. Experience acquired over time is far relevant and hands on. You must have this designation for you to be able to sign in some specialized field. The year of experience is very important and professional designation.' P3

Project Manager

Project Managers (P10 and P11) agreed that opinion on submitting years of experience or professional designation should be taken seriously when selecting future vendors in the industry. One of the Project Managers agrees that:

'... Knowing that a contractor has experience in their field in the industry gives more comfort. I believe there is a direct correlation between experience and education.' P10

Another project manager had this to say.

'...If they have both, that would be the excellent but tailored more towards experience. The designation complements the experience.' P11

Procurement Professional

Procurement professionals (P4, P5, P6 and P9) agreed that opinion on submitting years of experience or professional designation should be taken seriously when selecting future vendors in the industry. One procurement professional agrees that:

'... usually when we're looking at a resume, we look at years of experience, their education, and then the actual demonstration of what they can do, their skills. Lot of times we do end up putting a lot of emphasis on how many years and how much schooling they've had. In a practical scenario, that doesn't necessarily mean that the person with the most years is the best at the job.' P4

Another procurement professional had this to say.

'... the proponent who submitted the required qualifications based on those criteria identified in the RFP e.g., the years of experience, the credentials and affiliation of their proposed team will get the high score, or even the perfect score if they provided all those kinds of requirements identified in the RFP.' P5

Another procurement professional had this to say.

'... i agree 100% education is important plus years of experience. Education just guides you and updating yourself would be much more beneficial. But those things keep changing every time new innovations, new things, new technology, new way of doing things.' P6

Another procurement professional had this to say.

'...some project team give importance to the designation but backed with year of experience because you get that knowledge over the years doing all those different variety of projects. It's important to have a balance. The evaluators marking them strictly because they don't have a designation but get some points because of experience.' P9

In an evaluation meeting, we set up an established evaluation criterion, and it's important that we have something concrete to select the right vendor.

Similarity in a reference project done by the proponent.

In responding to the questions, respondents have **similarity in a reference project done by the proponent**. Similarity is the commitment to deliver, that commitment must be there, like some of the key parameters, performance indicators. Every member of the project team must play their own critical role. On the job, you must develop a kind of a benchmark schedule that you can monitor constantly.

Management

Responses from Management (P1, P2 and P3) revealed that the similarity in a reference project done by the proponent is making sure that they apply the total cost of ownership like they were really in charge. You know for all, everything that has to do with the project. One of the executive managements agrees that:

'...We would want to have consistency in describing some of the terms described in reference project. In the actual description, it may mean from design until construction handover of the project, so consistency should be we would want to have similarities in such a way that if we say consistency, if we say completion, it must be.' P1

Another management had same opinion:

'...Every project to meeting starts at targets and so I feel that for every project, regardless of the complexity, location.' or whether it's a small project must establish a variable base monitoring and control process to keep the shipments in track to follow up with the shipment to understand that there is an obligation for them to deliver and to make sure that that communication is being established among all the seasons.' P2

Another management had this to say:

'... What I would like to see for any reference project is to make sure that the project kind of itemizes the project goal and vision right for the project there must be a goal and vision of the project that was done and mentioning the key deliverables, the timeframe.' P3

Executive line of thought has a strategy approach to it that when projects are being given out, it should be evaluated based on experience on similar projects and subsequently check if the project methodology was utilized, and that project methodology must align with the specific reference project.

Project Managers

Responses from project managers (P4, P5 and P6) revealed that the **similarity in a reference project done by the proponent is making** sure that project managers use their technical expertise to help understand how they will be able to manage situations as they arise through. One of the project managers agrees that:

'... The similarity I would like to see in a reference project done by proponent would be in terms of the evaluation. It would be the similarity in complexity. Scope, size, and quality.'

P4

Another project manager had this to say.

'... When reviewing proposals and comparing them, it's very important to find those compliance points that are more apples to apples. This vendor has been involved with.in relation to our scope of work right to make sure that they have capacities, knowledge, experience that meets all the requirements.'

P5

Another project manager had this to say.

'... It means they are proposing the project when we evaluate their proposal. When evaluating the proposal submitted, I look at the nature of the project. How much of the renovation work they have done. I investigate the scale, budget and how long it took. how many changes was received, and any variance identified.'

P6

Procurement Professional

Procurement professionals (P5, P6 and P7) agreed that the similarity in a reference project done by the proponent should be in alignment if the reference project is done within few years. Similarity in terms of scope, budgets, and team members. If they have similar team members, that could attract bonus. One procurement professional agrees that:

'... I would like to see that the proponents communicate their challenges, their limitations if they're having all their success. if they don't communicate this, there would be challenges. Verbal beats written is very important.'

P5

Another procurement professional had this to say:

'...when we're evaluating projects, we want to see that the project experience is comparable to what we're doing on the project we're proposing, so it should have a similar scope, budget, deliverables, disciplines required or the challenge.'

P6

Another procurement professional had this to say:

'...most of the time these requirements are being formulated by the project team and part of the requirements is for the proponent to provide the reference project in their proposal. Is the project relevant in terms of the scale, which includes the cost, complexity, size, duration and the project delivery method for the specific proposal or project.'

P7

The findings revealed that the processes could offer significant relevance if there is a top-down approach to controlling its applications and implementations within the organization, but they can be equally confusing if they are not well managed (Genaro and Loureiro, 2015). Participant #3 argued that the reason why procurement documents like RFP/RFQ need mandatory clauses is because every milestone in the project is expected to come to an agreement and contribute to the relevance and core goals of the project. In his arguments, he posited that if you do not do that, you might risk not having right vendor to support your execution process and manage the complexities of the project. The arguments here was that the complexity of projects would determine what level of mandatory clauses and evaluation criteria to include in the procurement documents. The participants were particular about the need for an organizational management model as a tool for stakeholders to address non-compliances (Raelin and Coghlan, 2006).

Conclusion

The study also concludes that there is much effect of introducing mandatory clauses on procurement documents perceived by procurement professionals. Mandatory requirements are important to highlight as a proposal which must meet these to be compliant. As the regards the effects of introducing mandatory clauses on the

procurement document there will be remarkable effect and is highly recommendable.

Recommendation

1. With regards to government procurement policies, it is important to develop and approve the customized Request for Proposal (RFP) following RFP standards to get great proposals and reduce risk.

2. Managers should always have in their consciousness, the need to improve the outcome of the project through such value initiatives as effective time management, cost reduction, continuous improvement, rewarding those that finish the project before time, good relationship among the parties, further innovations, flexibility and many more.

REFERENCES

1. Alberta Infrastructure, (2022). *Procurement Process*. Report of Auditor General, June.
2. Genaro, A.F.S. and Loureiro, G., (2015). *Stakeholder management as an approach to integrated management system (IMSSTK)*. In Curran et al. (Edts), *Transdisciplinary Lifecycle Analysis of Systems*, IOS Press,
3. Government of Saskatchewan, (2015). *Multi-Staged Procurement*.
4. Raelin, J.A. and Coghlan, D. (2006) Developing Managers as Learners and Researchers: Using Action Learning and Action Research. *Journal of Management Education*, 30, 670-689.