This is not an ADB material. The views expressed in this document are the views of the author/s and/or their organizations and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Asian Development Bank, or its Board of Governors, or the governments they represent. ADB does not guarantee the accuracy and/or completeness of the material's contents, and accepts no responsibility for any direct or indirect consequence of their use or reliance, whether wholly or partially. Please feel free to contact the authors directly should you have queries.

Regional e-GP for the Pacific

Current Landscape, Common Challenges and Options for Collaboration

5th October 2026

A Regional Solution for Stronger Public Procurement

Agenda

From where the region stands today to practical options for working together

01

Current e-GP Landscape

Where PICs stand today: uneven digital maturity, partial tools and limited procurement data

02

Common Implementation Challenges

Structural and practical constraints shared across the region

03

Opportunities for Collaboration

What a shared regional platform makes possible, and the features it can offer

04

Implementation Options & Way Forward

Three implementation options, the recommended pathway and next steps

Current e-GP Landscape in the Pacific

- ✓ **Varied digital maturity:** PICs range from largely paper-based processes to basic e-tendering tools; no country yet operates a full-lifecycle e-GP platform.
- ✓ **Partial commercial tools:** a few PICs use TenderLink, Tender.net or In-Tend, mainly to publish notices and receive electronic bids.
- ✓ **Key functional gaps:** no procurement planning, evaluation workflows, contract management, supplier performance monitoring or analytics; no IFMIS integration.
- ✓ **Manual systems:** can be time-consuming and harder to standardise; limited digital records make it more difficult to track procurement performance.
- ✓ **Weak data visibility:** little reliable procurement data for planning, policy development or regional comparison.
- ✓ **Building momentum:** the World Bank–ADB EAPPA (2024) found a shared regional e-GP the most viable and cost-effective option, in line with the 2050 Strategy for the Blue Pacific Continent.

Common Implementation Challenges

Whichever route a country takes, introducing e-GP in the Pacific runs into a common set of constraints shaped by small markets, dispersed geographies and limited ICT capacity.

Connectivity & Infrastructure

Costly, unreliable bandwidth, especially in outer islands, can disrupt bid submission and system availability.

Legal & Regulatory Readiness

Procurement laws and regulations may not yet recognise e-bids, e-signatures or e-payments; targeted updates are often needed.

Data Security & Hosting

Procurement data must be securely hosted, protected by strong cybersecurity and managed in line with national laws.

Financial Sustainability

Low procurement volumes make national systems costly; there is a risk of a funding gap when partner financing ends.

Adoption & Change Management

Limited in-house expertise and staff turnover; officials and MSME suppliers need sustained training to move from paper to digital.

Institutional Coordination

Aligning ministries, procurement agencies, oversight bodies and partners on roles, priorities and the pace of reform.

Opportunities for Collaboration

A shared, multi-tenant regional platform lets each PIC keep its own data, rules and workflows while sharing the cost and the benefits.

Shared Infrastructure

Economies of scale: one platform, hosting and security stack. Per-country cost falls as more PICs join.

Shared Expertise

Pooled specialists and regional training (e.g., USP) raise procurement capacity in every country at once.

Shared Data

Common data standards enable regional analytics and stronger oversight that no single country could produce.

Shared Services

A Shared Service Centre provides onboarding, helpdesk and operational support across all countries.

Shared Marketplace

Register once, bid across PICs: wider competition and new markets for MSMEs.

Proven elsewhere: the OECS e-PPSS shows a regional host can run one shared platform across small states.

Unique Features of the Regional e-GP System

Each feature directly tackles a procurement capacity constraint that PICs face today.

01 Bid & Contract Builder

Drafts tender and contract documents from standard templates and relevant past tenders.

Addresses: limited drafting expertise

02 Specification Builder

Library of past specifications plus AI-assisted market research for current, neutral specs.

Addresses: weak spec-writing capacity

03 Price Discovery Tool

Price ranges and benchmarks from past awards and supplier catalogues.

Addresses: no market price data for budgeting

04 Assisted Tendering

Regional team publishes tenders and handles bid documents for agencies not yet ready to self-serve.

Addresses: very small procurement teams

05 e-Catalogue & Framework Ordering

Order common items from pre-agreed framework contracts instead of repeated small tenders.

Addresses: workload from low-value buying

06 Planning & Demand Aggregation

Consolidated procurement plans flag chances for joint buying across agencies and countries.

Addresses: small, fragmented volumes

07 Automated Compliance Checks

Guided evaluation workflows, compliance checks and audit trails built into each step.

Addresses: staff turnover, thin oversight

08 Low-Bandwidth & Offline-Ready

Lightweight, mobile-friendly design with offline bid preparation.

Addresses: unreliable connectivity

Building these features into separate national systems would be costly for each country. A shared platform delivers them once, at a manageable cost for all.

Implementation Options: Three Pathways Assessed

Option 1: Enhancing Existing E-GP Platforms

Build on tools already used in PICs (TenderLink, Tender.net, In-Tend).

Pros: familiar to users; existing arrangements; lower change-management effort.

Cons: basic features only; past scale-up efforts did not progress; no proven multi-country path.

Option 2: Adopt a Modern COTS e-GP Solution

Procure a mature, full-lifecycle commercial platform configured for multi-country use.

Pros: proven functionality, structured vendor support, predictable upgrades.

Cons: higher licensing and operating costs; vendor lock-in; less flexibility.

Option 3: Develop a Lightweight, Modular, Fit-for-Purpose Platform

Custom, AI-accelerated, cloud-ready platform built for Pacific needs.

Pros: low-bandwidth design; MVP in 4–5 months; full ownership of code; no lock-in.

Cons: needs strong governance, independent QA and sustained maintenance funding.

Recommended Pathway: Option 3, a Fit-for-Purpose Platform

WHY OPTION 3	HOW IT MEETS THE NEEDS OF PICs
Built for Pacific Conditions	Lightweight, bandwidth-efficient and mobile-friendly; works with intermittent connectivity and offline bid preparation.
Faster Time to Value	AI-assisted development can deliver an MVP of core tendering features in 4–5 months, then grow functionality with adoption.
Lower, Scalable Cost	Could cut development and implementation costs by up to USD 1M; no recurring licence fees; investment grows with participation.
Regional Ownership	Full control of code, data and roadmap under a regional custodian; no vendor lock-in; support services can be competitively procured.
Fits the Phased Roadmap	Modular design lets each PIC adopt modules at its own pace, matching the Phase 1–3 functional scope.
Enables Unique Features	Bid and spec builders, price discovery and marketplace tools can be built in, with potential to become a global digital public good.

Conditions for success: strong governance, clear architecture and security standards, independent QA and code audits, and a sustained maintenance fund.

The Way Forward
Working Together



Participation is voluntary and countries can join at their own pace. Bids for the technology partner are targeted for December 2026, with Phase 1 rollout from mid-2027.

1. Confirm your preferred implementation pathway and level of participation

2. Designate a national e-GP focal point and consider joining the pilot

3. Engage on governance TORs and regulatory alignment