P-ISSN : 2579-969X ; E-ISSN : 2622-7940

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PROCUREMENT PRACTICES: CENTRAL VS. LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN INDONESIA

Reynaldy Dwi Putra[1)], Diana Sari[2)].
[1-2] Fakultas Pascasarjana, Universitas Widyatama
email: reynaldy.dwi@widyatama.ac.id

Abstrak

Penelitian ini menganalisis perbedaan praktik pengadaan barang/jasa publik antara pemerintah pusat dan pemerintah daerah di Indonesia dengan fokus pada kerangka regulasi, kapasitas kelembagaan, dan efektivitas implementasi. Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk mengkaji pengaruh desentralisasi terhadap kinerja pengadaan dan kualitas tata kelola pemerintahan pada berbagai tingkat pemerintahan. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan deskriptif-analitis melalui analisis isi terhadap peraturan perundang-undangan, laporan kelembagaan, dan asesmen internasional yang relevan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa meskipun terdapat kerangka regulasi pengadaan yang bersifat nasional dan seragam, implementasinya masih menunjukkan kesenjangan antara pemerintah pusat dan pemerintah daerah. Pemerintah pusat cenderung memiliki tingkat efisiensi dan kepatuhan yang lebih tinggi, didukung oleh sistem digital yang terintegrasi dan kapasitas kelembagaan yang lebih kuat. Sebaliknya, pemerintah daerah menghadapi kendala berupa keterbatasan kesiapan infrastruktur, kapasitas sumber daya manusia, serta ketidakkonsistenan dalam penerapan prosedur pengadaan. Kebaruan penelitian ini terletak pada analisis komparatif yang mengintegrasikan dimensi regulasi, kelembagaan, dan teknologi dalam tata kelola pengadaan. Penelitian ini menyimpulkan bahwa reformasi pengadaan berbasis kapasitas dan penguatan kelembagaan unit pengadaan daerah merupakan faktor kunci dalam mewujudkan sistem pengadaan yang transparan, adil, dan efisien.

Kata Kunci: *akuntabilitas, desentralisasi, efisiensi, pengadaan, tata kelola*

Abstract

This study examines the differences in public procurement practices between the central and local governments in Indonesia, focusing on the legal framework, institutional capacity, and implementation effectiveness. The study aims to understand how decentralization affects procurement performance and governance quality across government levels. Using a descriptive-analytical approach and content analysis of official regulations, institutional reports, and international assessments, the research identifies disparities despite a unified regulatory framework. The central government achieves higher efficiency and compliance due to integrated digital systems and stronger institutional structures, while local governments face challenges related to infrastructure readiness, limited expertise, and inconsistent adherence to procedures. The novelty of this research lies in providing a comprehensive comparative analysis that combines regulatory, institutional, and technological dimensions of procurement governance, offering a broader understanding than previous studies that examined these aspects separately. The results show that capacity inequality and fragmented digital systems hinder uniform procurement performance nationwide. The study concludes that capacity-based procurement reform and institutional strengthening of regional procurement units are essential to achieve an equitable, transparent, and efficient procurement system. It recommends further research focusing on quantitative assessment of digital readiness and human resource capability to support sustainable public procurement governance in Indonesia.

Keywords: *accountability, decentralization, efficiency, governance, procurement*

1. INTRODUCTION

Public procurement plays a pivotal role in Indonesia's public financial governance as it absorbs nearly one-third of government expenditure and directly influences the quality of public services and economic development. To ensure efficiency, transparency, and accountability, Indonesia has established a unified regulatory framework through Presidential Regulation No. 16 of 2018 and its amendments, which standardize procurement procedures for both central and local governments. Despite this uniform framework, disparities in institutional capacity, human resources, and technological readiness remain major obstacles that hinder consistent implementation across government levels.

Previous studies on Indonesia's procurement system have predominantly focused on regulatory compliance, digital transformation, or corruption prevention, often treating these issues separately. Reports by the World Bank, ADB, and OECD have acknowledged significant progress in electronic procurement implementation but also emphasized persistent gaps in interoperability, data governance, and regional capacity. However, limited research has provided a comprehensive comparison between central and local government procurement systems in terms of legal, institutional, and performance dimensions. This gap represents the state of the art where this study is positioned.

The novelty of this research lies in integrating legal, institutional, and technological perspectives to assess how decentralization affects procurement effectiveness and governance quality. Unlike prior studies that analyzed single dimensions, this study provides a holistic understanding of how governance disparities emerge under a uniform regulatory framework. The main problem addressed is the inconsistency of procurement implementation between central and local governments, which undermines the overall integrity and efficiency of national procurement governance.

The purpose of this study is to analyze and compare the structure, mechanism, and performance of procurement practices between the central and local governments in Indonesia. The findings are expected to contribute to the strengthening of procurement governance through evidence-based recommendations, particularly in enhancing institutional capacity, digital system integration, and the professionalization of regional procurement units.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Basic Concept of Government Goods and Services Procurement (PBJP)

Government Procurement of Goods and Services (PBJP) is a strategic process in public financial management aimed at obtaining goods, services, and public works efficiently, effectively, transparently, and accountably. Generally, PBJP plays a vital role in supporting national development and public service delivery through the optimal use of state financial resources (LKPP, 2021). According to Presidential Regulation No. 16 of 2018 and its amendments, PBJP in Indonesia is designed as an integrated system that ensures the realization of good governance principles. Procurement is not only about fulfilling institutional needs but also about achieving the highest possible value for money for society. Conceptually, PBJP includes several key principles:

a. Efficiency and effectiveness, meaning procurement must deliver optimal results with minimal resource use;
b. Transparency and openness, ensuring that the entire process is publicly accessible through information systems and official announcements;
c. Competition and fairness, which guarantee equal opportunities for all qualified suppliers without discrimination;
d. Accountability, meaning every stage must be legally and administratively justifiable.

In addition, procurement modernization is realized through the implementation of electronic systems (e-procurement) based on the SPSE platform and the e-catalogue, which serve as key instruments to enhance efficiency and prevent corruption. These systems were developed by the National Public Procurement Agency (LKPP) to ensure transparency, data consistency, and nationwide price comparison (World Bank, 2019).

Theories and Models of Public Procurement Governance

Public procurement governance is an integral part of public governance, emphasizing accountability, transparency, and efficiency in the use of public resources. Theoretically, public procurement is viewed as an instrument to achieve value for money not merely an administrative activity but also a means of achieving development goals and strengthening public trust. According to the World Bank, 2019), an effective public procurement system is built upon a foundation of strong governance, with oversight mechanisms, participation, and integrity ensuring that each process provides maximum benefit to society. Public procurement governance is often analyzed through several major theoretical approaches:

a. Agency Theory, which explains the relationship between the principal (government) and the agent (procurement officer), who often face information asymmetry. Oversight mechanisms and incentives are required to ensure the agent acts in the public interest;
b. Institutional Theory, which views procurement as a social practice influenced by norms, organizational culture, and institutional pressures. Standards, regulations, and procedures are formed to create legitimacy and consistency across institutions;
c. Good Governance Theory, which emphasizes six key principles in procurement: transparency, accountability, participation, effectiveness, efficiency, and rule of law. This theory forms the foundation of Indonesia's modern PBJP policy;
d. Value for Money Model, which evaluates procurement success based on the balance between cost, quality, and social benefits, rather than the lowest price alone.

In addition to these theories, the OECD, 2019 and UNDP (2020) introduced the Public Procurement Governance Model, which emphasizes three main aspects:

a. Strong institutional and regulatory frameworks;
b. Transparent and efficient digital systems; and
c. Accountability through public oversight and open data.

This model serves as a reference for many countries, including Indonesia, in strengthening procurement governance based on technology and institutional integrity.

Decentralization and Distribution of Authority in Governance

Decentralization is a strategic policy in public governance aimed at bringing public services closer to citizens and improving efficiency and effectiveness in government administration. In Indonesia, this concept is rooted in Law No. 23 of 2014 on Regional Government, which stipulates that governance is carried out based on the principles of autonomy and co-administration, with proportional division of authority between the central and regional governments.

Conceptually, decentralization takes several main forms:

a. Political decentralization, which delegates authority to regional governments to formulate policies that meet local needs through regional legislative and executive bodies.
b. Administrative decentralization, which transfers authority from the central government to regional governments to carry out specific governmental functions, including financial and procurement management.
c. Fiscal decentralization, which grants regional governments the authority to manage local revenues, expenditures, and development budgets.
d. Economic and social decentralization, which empowers local communities in regional development to ensure balanced growth across regions (Fernanda et al., 2023).

In the context of governance, decentralization is a crucial mechanism for realizing good governance at the local level. Through regional autonomy, governments have the flexibility to design policies suited to local characteristics while remaining within the framework of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI). This division of authority also forms the foundation of procurement management, where regional governments hold full responsibility for the process, implementation, and supervision of procurement within their jurisdictions, while the central government plays a role in guidance

and the establishment of general regulations (Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Nomor 77 Tahun 2020 Tentang Pedoman Teknis Pengelolaan Keuangan Daerah., 2020).

3. RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a descriptive-analytical research method with a comparative study approach. This approach is chosen because the research focuses on comparing the systems, procedures, and implementation effectiveness of government procurement between the central government and regional governments in Indonesia. This method is used to analyze and describe the similarities and differences in procurement practices at both levels of government, as well as to understand the institutional, policy, and resource factors that influence their implementation effectiveness. The research design includes the following components:

a. Research Objective: to analyze the differences in structure, mechanisms, and performance of goods and services procurement between the central and regional governments, based on regulations, digital systems (SPSE, SIRUP, e-Catalogue), and institutional capacity (UKPBJ);
b. Research Approach: descriptive-analytical, using narrative analysis based on regulatory documents, institutional reports (LKPP, World Bank, ADB, OECD), and previous studies;
c. Types and Sources of Data: secondary data obtained from official government documents (Presidential Regulations, Minister of Home Affairs Regulations, LKPP reports), audit reports (BPK, APIP), as well as academic research and international institutional reports related to Indonesia's public procurement system;
d. Data Collection Techniques: conducted through literature review and content analysis of legal documents, policy reports, and relevant academic publications;
e. Data Analysis Technique: using comparative thematic analysis, which involves categorizing and comparing findings based on themes such as effectiveness, efficiency, procedural compliance, and accountability.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Profile and Characteristics of the Procurement System in Central and Regional Governments

The government procurement system in Indonesia shares similar foundational principles but differs in institutional structure, authority, and capacity between levels of government. The central government conducts procurement based on the State Budget (APBN) through ministries and agencies (K/L), while regional governments use the Regional Budget (APBD) implemented by provincial and district/city governments. Although both refer to Presidential Regulation No. 16 of 2018 and Presidential Regulation No. 46 of 2025 on Government Procurement of Goods and Services, differences arise in organizational structure, implementation mechanisms, and managerial capacity.

At the central level, procurement units are embedded within ministry/agency structures and supported by Procurement Service Units (UKPBJ) that have attained the status of centers of excellence. In regional governments, UKPBJ units have also been established, but their levels of maturity vary ranging from fully standardized institutions to those still functioning mainly in administrative roles. According to (LKPP (2023), disparities remain between central and regional UKPBJ units in terms of human resource capacity and infrastructure, particularly regarding procurement officer certification, technology utilization, and market analysis capability.

Furthermore, the central government generally enjoys stronger digital system support and oversight through applications such as SPSE, SIRUP, and the National e-Catalogue, while regional implementation depends heavily on network stability, infrastructure readiness, and officials' digital literacy (World Bank, 2021). This situation results in differences in efficiency and speed of procurement processes. To illustrate the comparison more clearly, table 1 summarizes the main profiles and characteristics of procurement systems between central and regional governments:

Table 1
Comparison of Procurement System Profiles and Characteristics: Central vs. Regional Governments

Aspect	Central Government	Regional Government
Legal Basis	Presidential Regulation No. 16 of 2018 and No. 46 of 2025	Same regulations, applicable nationally
Funding Source	State Budget (APBN)	Regional Budget (APBD)
Procurement Implementers	Ministries/Agencies and Central UKPBJ	Provincial/District/City Governments and Regional UKPBJ
Institutional Structure	Integrated and more established; UKPBJ plays a strategic role in contract management and innovation	Varies; some UKPBJ units still focus on administrative functions and have not yet become full centers of excellence
Procurement Human Resources	Higher certification and competence levels; regular access to LKPP training and supervision	Skill gaps and limited number of certified officers in several regions
Electronic Procurement System (SPSE)	Fully implemented and connected with national financial systems (SPAN, SIRUP, National e-Catalogue)	Implementation uneven; constrained by network reliability and local IT capacity
Oversight and Accountability	Internal audit by ministry/agency inspectorates (APIP) and external audit by BPK/LKPP; integrated reporting	Supervision by regional inspectorates; quality of reporting and audit follow-up varies
Main Challenges	Complex project volumes and inter-agency coordination	Limited human resources, fiscal capacity, and digital infrastructure
Innovation and Reform Focus	Data integration and contract transparency (Open Contracting)	Capacity building for regional UKPBJ and development of local/sectoral e-catalogues

Source: Perpres 16 Tahun 2018, Perpres 46 Tahun 2025, Perka LKPP 12 Tahun 2021, World Bank (2021).

The fundamental differences between central and regional procurement systems indicate that procurement reform still requires a capacity-based approach. The central government is better prepared to integrate digital systems and ensure cross-agency oversight, whereas regional governments continue to face challenges in building professional and adaptive procurement systems. Nevertheless, various initiatives such as LKPP's capacity development programs for regional UKPBJ units and the expansion of sectoral e-catalogues demonstrate steady progress toward more equitable and standardized procurement governance nationwide.

Comparison of Procurement Procedures and Mechanisms

The procedures and mechanisms for government procurement of goods and services (PBJP) in Indonesia are generally regulated at the national level through Presidential Regulation No. 16 of 2018 and Presidential Regulation No. 46 of 2025, which amended the previous regulation. These regulations affirm that both central and regional governments must adhere to the principles of efficiency, effectiveness, transparency, openness, competition, fairness, and accountability (Indonesia, 2018; Indonesia, 2025). Although they share the same legal framework, variations occur at the implementation level, particularly in institutional capacity, utilization of electronic systems, and supervision mechanisms.

In general, procurement at both levels of government follows four main phases: (1) procurement planning, (2) supplier selection, (3) contract implementation, and (4) monitoring and reporting. However, the central government has a more structured inter-ministerial coordination mechanism that is integrated with the national financial system through SPAN (State Treasury and Budget System), while regional governments still depend on regional financial systems and the varying readiness of digital infrastructure across regions (World Bank, 2019).

Furthermore, procurement at the central level tends to involve larger and more complex projects, which are often carried out through open tenders using a fully digital e-procurement system (SPSE) and the National e-Catalogue. Meanwhile, at the regional level, the methods used are more varied such as direct appointment or self-management (swakelola) depending on project scale and availability of local suppliers (LKPP, 2023). Another difference lies in the oversight systems: the central government is directly supervised by the Inspectorate General, BPK (Audit Board of Indonesia), and LKPP, while regional governments are monitored by Regional Inspectorates whose coordination mechanisms still need strengthening. To clarify these distinctions, table 2 compares procurement procedures and mechanisms between central and regional governments:

Table 2
Comparison of Procurement Procedures and Mechanisms: Central vs. Regional Governments

Stage/Aspect	Central Government	Regional Government
Legal Basis and Technical Guidelines	Presidential Regulation No. 16/2018; Presidential Regulation No. 46/2025; LKPP Regulation No. 12/2021; Ministry/Agency SOPs	Presidential Regulation No. 16/2018; Presidential Regulation No. 46/2025; Minister of Home Affairs Regulation No. 77/2020; LKPP Guidelines for Regional Governments
Financial System and Data Integration	Integrated with SPAN and national SIRUP; automatic reporting to the Ministry of Finance	Uses SIMDA Finance; SIRUP integration depends on regional readiness
Procurement Planning (RUP)	Prepared via SIRUP by PA/KPA within each ministry/agency; coordinated by LKPP and DJPb	Prepared by SKPD through regional SIRUP; validated by regional UKPBJ and TAPD
Supplier Selection Methods	Dominantly open tender, e-reverse auction, and e-purchasing via National e-Catalogue	Varied: open tender, direct appointment, direct procurement, and self-management (swakelola)
Contract Implementation	Executed by PPK and supervised by APIP of each ministry/agency; payments via SPAN	Executed by PPK within SKPD; payments processed through regional treasury mechanisms
Use of e-Procurement	Fully implemented (SPSE v.4.5 or higher, National e-Catalogue, integrated e-Contract)	Gradually implemented; some regions have yet to adopt e-Contract and local e-Catalogue features
Oversight and Audit	Supervised by BPK, LKPP, and Inspectorate General of each ministry/agency; online reporting system	Supervised by Regional Inspectorate, BPKP, and BPK; manual monitoring still dominant
Main Challenges	Complex inter-agency coordination and large project volumes requiring high specialization	Limited number of certified personnel, internet access issues, and weak IT infrastructure
Current Reform Focus	National data integration, spending efficiency, and open contracting	Strengthening regional UKPBJ capacity, improving human resources, and expanding local/sectoral e-Catalogues

Source: Perpres 16 Tahun 2018, Perpres 46 Tahun 2025, LKPP (2023), World Bank (2021).

From table 2, it is clear that while procurement systems and regulations are normatively uniform, implementation at the regional level still faces institutional and technological gaps. The central government exhibits a more standardized, efficient, and fully digitalized procurement pattern, whereas regional governments are still in transition toward digital transformation and UKPBJ professionalization. Therefore, strengthening human resource capacity, standardizing electronic systems, and enhancing oversight functions are key factors to achieving balanced procurement quality across Indonesia.

Analysis of Procurement Implementation Effectiveness and Efficiency

Effectiveness and efficiency are two key indicators of successful implementation of government procurement (PBJP). Effectiveness reflects how well the procurement objectives are achieved according to the plan including timeliness, quality of outcomes, and benefits for users of goods and services. Meanwhile, efficiency measures the extent to which the procurement process produces maximum output with minimal use of resources such as cost, time, and labor (LKPP, 2023). According to Presidential Regulation No. 16 of 2018, procurement must be guided by the value for money principle achieving a balance between quality, cost, and social benefit for the public. At the central government level, ministries and agencies (K/L) generally demonstrate higher efficiency because the procurement process is fully digitalized through SPSE, the National e-Catalogue, and e-Contracts, all under the direct supervision of LKPP and the Ministry of Finance (Indonesia, 2018). In contrast, regional governments still face challenges related to time management and quality outcomes due to differences in human resource capacity and digital infrastructure readiness (World Bank, 2019).

Empirical studies show that procurement efficiency at the central level is supported by standardized systems and strong control mechanisms, while at the regional level, administrative factors such as delays in planning, budget revisions, or limited local supplier availability often hinder performance. Moreover, variations in the competence of procurement officers also affect the effectiveness of contract implementation and project completion (Darmawan, 2022). To illustrate these findings, table 3 compares the effectiveness and efficiency of procurement implementation between central and regional governments:

Table 3
Analysis of Procurement Effectiveness and Efficiency: Central vs. Regional Governments

Analytical Aspect	Central Government	Regional Government
Time and Process Performance	Faster process due to integrated SPSE and e-Catalog systems; contract completion generally meets annual targets	Delays still occur in RUP preparation and tender execution due to slow internal coordination
Procurement Output Quality	High technical standards with quality control teams in each ministry/agency; specifications are generally well met	Varies depending on PPK and local supplier capability; product/service quality differs among regions
Cost Efficiency	Optimized pricing through e-Catalog and open tenders; efficiency reaches 5–10% of annual budget allocations (LKPP, 2023)	Lower efficiency due to limited supplier choices and underutilization of regional e-Catalogues
Technology Utilization	Fully end-to-end with SPSE, SIRUP, and e-Contract; real-time and transparent data	Partially semi-manual; network connectivity and system integration are uneven
Procedural Compliance Level	High; supported by supervision from LKPP, BPK, and Inspectorate General	Varies; regional inspectorates lack full capacity for data-driven electronic monitoring
Value for Money	Measured through spending efficiency and user satisfaction indicators; approaching OECD standards (OECD, 2019)	Inconsistent; social and economic benefit evaluations are not yet systematically measured
Main Challenges	Complex multi-year projects and inter-agency coordination	Limited certified personnel, low technological readiness, and restricted fiscal capacity

Source: Perpres 16 Tahun 2018, Perpres 46 Tahun 2025, LKPP (2023), OECD (2019), World Bank (2021)

From the comparison above, it is evident that the central government performs better in terms of efficiency and procedural compliance, while regional governments still struggle with effectiveness due to human resource, infrastructure, and institutional capacity constraints. Nevertheless, ongoing digital reform initiatives such as sectoral e-Catalogue expansion and the strengthening of regional UKPBJ roles indicate significant progress toward a more efficient and transparent procurement system across Indonesia.

5.CONCLUSION

This study concludes that although Indonesia's government procurement system is based on a unified regulatory framework namely Presidential Regulation No. 16 of 2018 and Presidential Regulation No. 46 of 2025 there are clear differences in institutional structure, human resource capacity, and implementation effectiveness between the central government and regional governments.

From an institutional perspective, the central government has a more integrated organizational structure supported by Procurement Service Units (UKPBJ) that function as centers of excellence. In contrast, most regional UKPBJ units still play administrative roles and have not yet reached a fully professional standard.

In terms of mechanisms and procedures, the central government has implemented a comprehensive end-to-end electronic procurement system (e-procurement) integrated with the national financial systems SPAN and SIRUP. Meanwhile, regional governments' use of technology remains inconsistent, depending on infrastructure readiness and the digital literacy of procurement officers.

From the standpoint of effectiveness and efficiency, procurement at the central level tends to be faster, more standardized, and cost-efficient. Regional governments, on the other hand, still face challenges such as process delays, limited local suppliers, and lack of planning consolidation.

Regarding procedural compliance and accountability, the central government demonstrates higher compliance with PBJP regulations due to multi-layered supervision by LKPP, BPK, and the Inspectorate General. In contrast, weak inspectorate functions and limited human resources in regional governments result in significant variations in compliance levels.

This study emphasizes the importance of adopting a capacity-based approach in procurement reform, focusing on equal professionalization of UKPBJ units, integration of digital systems across government levels, and strengthening of regional oversight functions.

Furthermore, reinforcing good governance principles particularly transparency, accountability, and value for money is essential to narrow the gap between central and regional governments. Initiatives such as expanding sectoral e-Catalogues, providing continuous training for procurement officials, and implementing open contracting at the local level represent strategic steps toward achieving a more efficient, transparent, and equitable national procurement governance system.

6.REFERENCES

Darmawan, D. (2022). Compliance Level Analysis of Announcement of General Procurement Plan in Indonesia. *Integrated Journal of Business and Economics*, *6*(2), 142. https://doi.org/10.33019/ijbe.v6i2.439

Fernanda, M., Frinaldi, A., & Magriasti, L. (2023). Desentralisasi Dan Otonomi Daerah Dalam Upaya Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Daerah Yang Baik. *JISIP (Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Pendidikan)*, *7*(3), 2409. https://doi.org/10.58258/jisip.v7i3.5423

https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/439371614331153341/pdf/Assessment-of-Data-Connectivity-and-Interoperability-between-SPSE-and-SPAN.pdf "Assessment of Data Connectivity and Interoperability between SPSE and SPAN. Accessed on October 1st, 2025.

https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/project-documents/52109/52109-001-tacr-en_5.pdf

"Strengthening the Asia Pacific Public Procurement, Construction, and Infrastructure Capacity: Indonesia—E-procurement system assessment (Technical assistance consultant's report)". Accessed on October 1st, 2025.

https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2021/03/oecd-economic-surveys-indonesia-2021_04b8c118/fd7e6249-en.pdf "Economic Surveys: Indonesia 2021. Accessed on October 1st, 2025.

https://www.opengovpartnership.org/members/indonesia/commitments/ID0135/ "Encouraging Transparency and Participation in Procurement (Indonesia)" Accessed on October 1st, 2025.

Ikhtisar Hasil Pemeriksaan Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan Republik Indonesia Semester II Tahun 2022.

Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) – Open Government Partnership. (2023). Indonesia Results Report 2020–2022. Washington, DC: OGP.

International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD). (2024). Green public procurement in Indonesia. Winnipeg: IISD.

Laporan Lembaga Kebijakan Pengadaan Barang/Jasa Pemerintah tentang Kinerja Pengadaan Barang/Jasa Pemerintah Tahun 2023.

Laporan Lembaga Kebijakan Pengadaan Barang/Jasa Pemerintah tentang. Laporan Kinerja UKPBJ Tahun 2023.

MAPS Initiative; Lembaga Kebijakan Pengadaan Barang/Jasa Pemerintah (LKPP); World Bank; Asian Development Bank. (2021). Indonesia:

Assessment of the Public Procurement System (MAPS 2018 methodology). Jakarta: LKPP.

OECD. (2019). Fiscal Decentralisation and Inclusive Growth in Asia. Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2019). Public Procurement for Innovation: Good Practices and Strategies. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Open Contracting Partnership; Indonesia Corruption Watch (ICW). (2025). Fraud Risk Monitoring in Indonesian Public Procurement: Insights for Civic Monitors. Washington, DC: Open Contracting Partnership.

Open Contracting / Indonesia Corruption Watch. (2025). 6 Steps for Civic Monitors to Identify Fraud Risks in Procurement in Indonesia. Jakarta: ICW.

Papatung. (2023). Analisis faktor penyebab terjadinya ketidaksesuaian dokumen persiapan pengadaan pada OPD. Jurnal PAPATUNG.

Peraturan Lembaga Kebijakan Pengadaan Barang/Jasa Pemerintah Nomor 4 Tahun 2024 tentang Perubahan Atas Peraturan Lembaga Kebijakan Pengadaan Barang/Jasa Pemerintah Nomor 12 Tahun 2021 tentang Pedoman Pelaksanaan Pengadaan Barang/Jasa Pemerintah Melalui Penyedia

Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Nomor 77 Tahun 2020 tentang Pedoman Teknis Pengelolaan Keuangan Daerah.

Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 12 Tahun 2021 tentang Perubahan atas Peraturan Presiden Nomor 16 Tahun 2018 tentang Pengadaan Barang/Jasa Pemerintah.

Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 16 Tahun 2018 tentang Pengadaan Barang/Jasa Pemerintah.

Peraturan Presiden Nomor 46 Tahun 2025 tentang Perubahan Kedua atas Peraturan Presiden Nomor 16 Tahun 2018 tentang Pengadaan Barang/Jasa Pemerintah.

Prihanto, H., & Usmar. (2020). Faktor yang menunjang kualitas pengadaan barang dan jasa pemerintah. Jurnal Akuntansi/Ekonomi (Universitas Prof. Dr. Moestopo).

Saragih, J. P. (2019). Desentralisasi fiskal dan tantangan peningkatan kemandirian daerah di Indonesia. Jurnal Ekonomi dan Pembangunan Indonesia, 19(1), 45–56.

Suardi, I. (2024). Procurement governance in reducing corruption in public procurement, Indonesia. Journal of Public Policy/Governance.

Surat Edaran Deputi Bidang Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Sumber Daya Manusia LKPP Nomor 3 Tahun 2023 Tentang Contoh Bukti Dukung Model Kematangan Unit Kerja Pengadaan Barang/Jasa Level Proaktif dan

Tamaela, E., Rantererung, C. L., & Baharuddin. (2025). Analisis kualitas layanan pengadaan barang dan jasa di Sekretariat Daerah Kabupaten Intan Jaya. J-MEBI: Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Ekonomi dan Bisnis Indonesia.

Undang-Undang Nomor 23 Tahun 2014 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah.