**APPENDIX F**

**Chart 8. Field research notes (for maturity model adjustments)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **# Evaluation Question** | **State**  **Secretary** | **Municipal Secretary** | **Ministry**  **1** | **Ministry**  **2** |
| 1 | Since the question highlights a 2nd line unit, the question could be asked after the 3rd line item. Check the possibility of changing the order of items in the model spreadsheet. Insert the expression "2nd line" in the evaluation element. | Insert into the model, prior to the discussion about the internal audit unit (3rd line), to differentiate from the actions of the 2nd line unit based on this discussion. The differentiation for maturity level 4 seems appropriate. |  |  |
| 2 | This item should be placed in sequence after the previous item of the Integrity Management Unit. Thus, if the position of the previous item changes. | The discussion about risk management for the Integrity Plan was conducted assertively, indicating the maintenance of this criterion to qualify for maturity level 4. |  |  |
| 3 | This could be the first question on the spreadsheet. Insert the expression "3rd line" in the evaluation question. | For the development of the Manual, make it more explicit the implementation of risk management for specific contracts or for the contracting process as a whole. However, the change in the text of this item, made after the first application of the model, proved to be appropriate to make the discussion smoother. |  |  |
| 4 | Possibility of grouping this item with transparency items and placing it towards the end of the spreadsheet. | Start the model with this evaluation item (3rd line), followed by the discussion of the other 2nd line items. | It was decided to maintain the publication in active transparency for maturity level 4, considering it as public information. | The discussion on Active Transparency of Risk Maps supports the decision to maintain, for the maturity level 4 of this question, its publication in active transparency. |
| 5 | Possibility of grouping this question with transparency questions and placing it towards the end of the spreadsheet. As a broad preventive action, it could also be considered to impact the planning stage. | Despite acknowledging the current legal risk in the direct administration of disqualifying suppliers based on integrity risks, it was decided to maintain this possibility at maturity level 4, to indicate a new frontier with the possibility of jurisprudence change. | Despite the current legal risk, in the entities of public administration, of disqualifying bidders based on integrity risks, it was decided to maintain this possibility at maturity level 4, to indicate a new frontier with the possibility of changing jurisprudence or norms. |  |
| 6 | It is recommended to change the text presented at each level, aligning it with the texts of item 4 to provide a similar approach only in distinct stages. Change the order so that this item and item 4 come in sequence. With the possibility of arrangements such as participatory budgeting, it is relevant to characterize at level 4 that the participatory arrangement must impact specific contracts, indicating shared planning. | There is the action of collecting information and classifying bidders, which appears in all four maturity levels, which can be confusing when one or the other occurs. Organize the texts of the maturity levels so that the lower levels discuss information collection with or without inquiries, and classify suppliers at level 4. |  |  |
| 7 | Reorder the question in the spreadsheet so that it appears immediately before the items on accountability. | Modify the text of the maturity levels to anticipate efforts to promote the implementation of Programs by bidders as a maturity level above having nothing (1). |  | It was decided to keep the item regarding the requirement of Integrity Programs. |
| 8 | Change the model by placing "open data" instead of "open format" at level 4. Modify the text of levels 2 and 3 to explicitly state that the publication of the Annual Procurement Plan would be sufficient only for maturity level 2. | It was decided to maintain at maturity level 4 the possibility of extending the effects of the code of conduct to the employees of contracted companies, considering the preventive purpose of these codes. |  |  |
| 9 |  |  | It is observed that in the proposed configuration, simply having a consultation channel that works could already qualify for maturity level 3, and the impact on contracts would only be measured at maturity level 4. Therefore, it was decided to readjust the maturity levels, so that only level 3 would be reached if the channel had specific disclosure for contracting agents, and the effectiveness of the channel would be a requirement for maturity level 4, assessed only if the channel had an impact on the procurement process. |  |
| 10 | There was a need to discuss the existence of certain contractual execution information. However, this would require detailing with new transparency verification questions, which would deviate too much from the focus of the maturity model. | It was deemed appropriate to establish at maturity level 4 the possibility of conducting integrity training for employees of contracted companies to ensure their alignment with the values and principles required within the organization. |  |  |
| 11 | Change the text of the evaluation question and maturity levels to make it clear that the risk management to be evaluated in this item is regarding specific contracts. | It is recognized that the use of non-permanent staff in municipalities is generally intense. Check the relevance of maintaining the evaluation item or if it can be consolidated into another item. Since maturity levels 3 and 4 point to the existence of supervision regulations, in theory, this could be covered by the Regulation of the entire inspection process. | The mere existence of permanent staff already qualifies for maturity level 4, making this question of little utility. Remove it. | The mere presence of permanent staff already qualifies for maturity level 4, making this item of little utility. |
| 12 | Add the qualification phase, in addition to pre-qualification. |  | The mere existence of permanent staff already qualifies for maturity level 4, making this question of little utility. Remove it, and the integrity risk of the participation of non-permanent staff can be mitigated with regulations on the appointment of managers and contract supervisors. | The mere presence of permanent staff already qualifies for maturity level 4, making this item of little utility. Remove it, and the integrity risk of non-permanent staff participation can be mitigated with regulations on the appointment of managers and contract supervisors. |
| 13 |  | The distinctive item for maturity level 4 is the existence of evaluation of contract supervisors, which would encompass the idea of supervision of agents without an effective link from the other evaluation item (10 and 11). |  |  |
| 14 |  |  | The texts of the maturity levels were revised to also include the previous items that were discarded. | Maturity levels texts need to be revised to make the classification at each level clearer. |
| 15 | Change the text of maturity level 3 and remove the reference to large contracts. Insert in maturity levels 3 and 4 the question of regulating the evaluation of supplier’s programs as a differentiator. | The discussion led to an analysis of the relevance of maintaining this evaluation item in terms of cost/benefit of implementation. | Evaluation question removed from the model. The evaluation of integrity risks for contracting agents can be addressed in regulations regarding the appointment and selection of these agents (previous question). | Evaluation question removed from the model. The evaluation of integrity risks for contracting agents can be addressed in regulations regarding the appointment and selection of these agents (previous item). |
| 16 |  | The text of maturity level 4 could be clearer that the qualification requires assigning a unit the competence to supervise/coordinate administrative disciplinary processes. |  |  |
| 17 |  | Similarly to the previous item, the text of maturity level 4 could be clearer that the qualification requires assigning a unit the competence to supervise/coordinate administrative disciplinary processes. |  |  |
| 18 |  | The item generated relevant discussion, with significant potential as an inducer of discussion in units that are still at maturity levels 1 and 2. |  |  |
| 19 |  | To clarify the qualification at the various levels, the texts of each level were realigned, with a distribution analogous to the previous item. However, a substantial difference from the previous item is that for maturity level 4, in addition to publication in active transparency, it also requires that the final evaluation address integrity criteria. |  |  |
| 20 |  | In the case of creating a manual for applying the MGIC Model, an exemplary list of integrity indicators for the contracting flow can be included to support adequate qualification in the proposed maturity levels. |  |  |
| 21 | Analyze the relevance of maintaining or not this question, or if it could be covered by the existing one regarding the regulation of selection and appointment of employees. |  |  |  |
| 22 | Analyze the relevance of maintaining or not this question, or if it could be covered by the existing one regarding the regulation of selection and appointment of employees. |  |  |  |
| 23 | Analyze the relevance of maintaining or not this question, or if it could be covered by the existing one regarding the regulation of selection and appointment of employees. |  |  |  |
| 24 | Insert in maturity level 4, as a differentiator, the existence of a central unit that coordinates and standardizes the flow of accountability processes. | The existence of the reporting channel and the regulation of the treatment already qualify the entity at maturity level 3. Level 4 is already achieved with the simple inclusion in the regulation of the treatment to be given in the case of contracts. Thus, the levels were realigned, combining levels 1 and 2 and inserting in a new level 4 the possibility of verifying the effectiveness of the implementation of this process. | The existence of the reporting channel and the regulation of the treatment already place the entity at maturity level 3. Level 4 is already achieved with the simple inclusion in the regulation of the treatment to be given in the case of contracts. Thus, it was sought to realign the levels, combining levels 1 and 2 and inserting in a new level 4 the possibility of verifying the effectiveness of the implementation of this flow. |  |
| 25 | Insert in maturity level 4, as a differentiator, the existence of a central unit that coordinates and standardizes the accountability. | It is relevant to characterize at maturity level 4 that the participatory arrangement must impact specific contracts, characterizing shared planning. | The idea of impact on the contract flow exposed in the text may make the analysis too broad. Modify the text to make it clear that participatory arrangements should demonstrate specific action in the planning or selection of public contracts. | Reorganize the maturity levels to make the classification at each level clearer. |
| 26 |  | The action of the FUNDEB council in certain contracts already placed the entity at maturity level 3. Thus, the maturity levels were realigned, indicating at level 2 this sporadic and unregulated action of certain councils; including at level 3 if the action of these councils in monitoring contracts is systematic and regulated; and at level 4 when there is a specific tool or arrangement for the shared management of certain contracts. | Reorganize the texts of the maturity levels to make the classification at each level clearer. | Reorganize the texts of the maturity levels to make the classification at each level clearer. |
| 27 |  |  |  |  |
| 28 |  |  |  |  |
| 29 |  |  |  |  |
| 30 | Reorganize the order of items in the model and place this question next to the one on occurrence recording, as these were discussions that ended up being addressed together in the panel. | There was a need to discuss the existence of certain contractual management information. However, this would require detailing with new transparency verification questions, and would deviate too much from the focus of the maturity model. |  |  |
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