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Abstract

This paper examined challenges and opportunities of managing procurement records in Tanzania. The study used exploratory case design whereby fifteen procuring entities were purposively sampled from Dar es Salaam. Data were collected through in-depth expert interviews supplemented by direct on-site observations. Data analysis was done by thematic analysis where thematic categories were descriptively described, analysed, and qualitatively interpreted. Findings of the study revealed that management of procurement records in the selected procuring entities is faced by a number of challenges, namely: disintegrated regulatory and institutional frameworks; lack of procurement records management guidelines; inappropriate staffing of personnel; inadequate and insufficient records storage space, equipment, and facilities; and insufficiency of security and safety measures. It has been revealed that, despite challenges, there are some opportunities. For procuring entities that have no direct
contacts with the Records and Archives Management Department (RAMD), could use the regulatory requirements to establish effective procurement recordkeeping systems in order to comply with the records and archives management (RAM) best practices and standards. Procuring entities could capitalise on empowering institutional actors in the RAM professionalism or best practices and therefore improve knowledge, skills, and competences on efficient management of procurement records. Since records are institutional resources, procuring entities are required to budget funds to procure adequate storage space, equipment and facilities for all types of procurement records. Lastly, once storage space, equipment and facilities are adequately available, procuring entities could capitalise on instituting safety and security measures in managing procurement records and archives.
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### 1.0 Introduction

Tanzania has considered and taken several initiatives to revitalise the management of procurement records in the public offices. The foremost initiative was to enact the public procurement legislation (Cap. 410) in 2001 that adopted a regulatory provision that mandates Tanzania Procuring entities to maintain and archive procurement records. In 2002, the national RAM legislation (Cap. 309, Act No. 3 of 2002) was enacted to establish the Records and Archives Management Department (RAMD) in order to provide for the proper administration and management of public records and archives throughout their records life-cycle. Furthermore, in 2011 the President’s Office (Public Sector Management) initiated the National Records and Archives Management Policy in the order to foster efficient management of records and archives in Tanzania. However, the policy was preceded by the
enactment of RAM legislation. Due to this precedence, the existing national RAM legislation is not broad enough to cover and guide the management of both public and private records (URT, 2011).

It is more than a decade since the start of implementation of records management initiatives in the management of procurement records in Tanzania procurement recordkeeping systems. However, weaknesses have been observed in the procurement recordkeeping systems. These weaknesses inter alia were observed on the availability of complete procurement records and on the proper arrangements of procurement records in Tanzania procurement recordkeeping systems (URT, 2016a; 2017a; URT, 2016b; URT, 2017b). Most of the audited Tanzania procuring entities have been recorded and documented with improper procurement recordkeeping on the completeness and arrangements of the available procurement records (URT, 2007; URT, 2016a; URT, 2017a; URT, 2016b; URT, 2017b).

Despite weaknesses found in the Tanzania procurement recordkeeping systems; yet, procurement is a functional process that needs a great deal of records in the business transactions in order to legitimize the processes and activities thereto. In-so-much, an efficient recordkeeping system is a necessary evil. Therefore, to study management of procurement records practices is vital. However, few empirical studies on management of procurement records were carried out in Tanzania. For instance, a study was conducted in one case in an institution in Dar es Salaam where poor procurement recordkeeping was recorded and documented due to inadequate staffing in the procurement management unit (PMU) as functional unit (Stephen, 2013). In another instance, challenges facing recordkeeping were studied at Kisarawe District Council in the Cost Region. The study recorded and documented a very poor score of 20 per cent in recordkeeping (Naluyaga, 2014). Individual studies to assess the efficiency of the national procurement and supply systems were conducted by the World Bank in 1996 and 2003 respectively. Both studies had recorded and documented weak
Empirical evidence support that, there is: inadequate staffing of personnel for the management of records in Tanzania public offices (Stephen, 2013; Marwa, 2015), inadequate records storage space, equipment and facilities (Ndenje-Sichalwe, 2010; Marwa, 2015), and insufficient security and safety measures in managing records (Ndenje-Sichalwe, 2010). Based on these empirical evidence; the general impression is that, little has been done with respect to efficient RAM practices in Tanzania (Ndenje-Sichalwe, 2010; Lufunyo, 2013; Marwa, 2015). Empirically, it is evident that Tanzania public offices are being faced by acute regulatory and institutional resource challenges which include lack of skilled personnel, inadequacy of recordkeeping space, and lack of informed records security and safety policy for the general public records and archives management. However, little is known on the challenges and opportunities of management of procurement records in Tanzania procurement recordkeeping systems. Therefore, this paper emanates from a study that intends to examine the challenges and opportunities of management of procurement records in Tanzania procuring entities.

Institutionalization of records and archives management (RAM) has been recognised by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) since 1980’s. In response to the institutionalization of RAM, the UNESCO Division of General Information Programme developed a coordinated long-term Records and Archives Management Programme – RAMP (Ketelaar, 1985). The RAMP was aimed, among other things, to promote the formulation of policies and plans and disseminate methods, norms and standards of records and archives management (Ketelaar, 1985). Globally, records and archives management has received an attention due to its significance in supporting and informing the broader and more complex areas of information management, enterprise content management, knowledge management, document management, collaborative working processes and business processes management, among others (Biraud,
Within the RAM discourse, various authoritative professional authors in this field have researched, written and provided thesis and anti-thesis within and across the contexts of professionalism frontiers. From the Schellenberg (1956) who pioneered the records life-cycle concept to others who refined it and provided varied interpretations on the RAM principles and models (Charman, 1984; Atherton, 1985; McKemmish and Piggot, 1994; Upward, 1994; Upward, 2000a; Upward, 2000b; Shepherd and Yeo, 2003; Penn, Pennix and Coulson, 1994; Goodman, 1994). Records and archives management have been studied and treatises written across Africa (Asogwa, 2012; Mampe and Kalusopa, 2012; Unegbu and Adenike, 2013) and Tanzania in particular (Chachage, 2005; Ndenje-Sichalwe, 2010). In Tanzania, for instance, the RAM practices have been researched and discussed on either successes or failures (Ndibalema, 2001; Lyaruu, 2005; Ndemanyisho, 2014). The nature of records and the relationships among records and between them and the activities from which they result are subjects of continuing debate (Yeo, 2007; Yeo, 2008). The debate on the RAM discourse in the management and care of procurement records is still on (Kendo and Getuno, 2016; Namukasa, 2017).

Public procurement is based on legitimacy of procedures. For legitimate procurement procedures and adequate public records, Article 9 of the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) requires, inter alia, soundness of procurement records (United Nations, 2013). The soundness of procurement records was established under Article 25 of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) Procurement Modal Law 1994 as amended which states that procuring entity shall maintain a record of the procurement proceedings (United Nations, 2014). This international regulatory and institutional requirement found in the UNCITRAL Public Procurement Modal Law was adopted under Section 61(1) of Act No. 7 of 2011 with attendant Regulation 15(1) of Government Notice No. 446 of 2013 with amendments. Proper records management controls, managing who can
access and modify key documents and records have been identified as an integral part of achieving compliance (Alfresco, 2009; Weisinger, 2011).

It has been studied, recorded and documented that most of African countries have been characterized by records management crisis (International Records Management Trust – IRMT, 1999a; World Bank and IRMT, 2000). Generally, records management has been faced by regulatory and institutional crisis. In Kenya; for example, records of procurement transactions in many cases were found to be inaccurate or incomplete whilst in some cases they were absent altogether (Njeru, 2015; Nyaboke-Marendi, 2015). Poor management of procurement records has been observed in Uganda (Republic of Uganda, 2008; Republic of Uganda, 2009; Republic of Uganda, 2010; Tumuhairwe and Ahimbisibwe, 2016; Namukasa, 2017). Problems in procurement records management were also observed in Tanzania (World Bank, 2003; United Republic of Tanzania – URT, 2007; Stephano, 2013; Naluyaga, 2014; URT, 2014a; URT, 2015a; URT, 2016a; URT, 2017a; URT, 2014b; URT, 2015b; URT, 2016b; URT, 2017b). However, Tanzania has recognised the impact of poor records management on the efficiency of government operations and on accountability. Therefore, Tanzania has been working to strengthen its records and archives management systems (IRMT, 2011; URT, 2011). Tanzania has taken several initiatives to improve management of procurement records in several perspectives. The foremost initiative, since the enactment of the public procurement law in 2001, was to incorporate a provision that provides for the governance and regulating management of procurement records and archives (vide Act No. 3, 2002; Act No. 21, 2004; Act No. 7, 2011 with amendments). In 2011, through the President’s Office (Public Sector Management) Tanzania had initiated the National Records and Archives Management Policy of 2011 to foster proper management of records and archives. The policy was preceded by the enactment of the Records and Archives Management (RAM) Act No. 3 of 2002. However, the enactment of records and archives management legislation did not consider most of
It is more than a decade now since the start of implementation of records management initiatives in the management of procurement records in Tanzania procurement recordkeeping systems. However, weaknesses have and continue to be observed in the procurement recordkeeping systems. These weaknesses inter alia are observed on the availability of complete procurement records and on the proper arrangements of procurement records in the Tanzania procurement recordkeeping systems (URT, 2016a; 2017a; URT, 2016b; URT, 2017b). The audited Tanzania procuring entities have been observed, recorded and documented with improper procurement recordkeeping on the completeness and arrangements of the available procurement records (URT, 2007; URT, 2016a; URT, 2017a; URT, 2016b; URT, 2017b).

Most of the audited Tanzania procuring entities had improper management of procurement records (URT, 2014a; URT, 2015a; URT, 2016a; URT, 2017a). Apart from improper management of procurement records, there is an issue of records and archive management having two legislations. Here, Act No. 7, 2011 as amended is mandating procuring entities to maintain and archive records of the procurement processes whilst Act No. 3, 2002 is providing for management of public records and archives throughout their life-cycle. Despite the existence of established regulatory and institutional frameworks, Tanzania procuring entities had no guidelines on how to manage and care for procurement records. There are regulatory and institutional constraints within the institutional arrangements that would be either challenges or opportunities in the management and care of procurement records in Tanzania procuring entities. However few known studies have been conducted to study challenges facing procurement records management in Tanzania procuring entities.

Therefore, by trying to fix the gap in empirical literature, this paper tries to examine the challenges and opportunities in managing procurement records in Tanzania procuring entities by exploring selected cases.
deliberately drawn from the Tanzania procuring entities found in the city of Dar es Salaam. The paper is organised into six main sections. First, there is introduction that provides for the background and identifies the gap that this paper tries to fill. Second section provides for the theoretical and empirical frameworks; whereas, third section describes the methodology section which is followed by findings and discussion. Lastly, the paper has a conclusion.

2.0 Theoretical and Empirical Frameworks

This paper is anchored on the theory of constraint (TOC) in line with the elements of the Resource Based Theory (RBT). The TOC has been widely known as a management philosophy coined by Goldratt (1990) that aims to initiate and implement breakthrough improvement through focusing on a constraint that prevents a system from achieving a higher level of performance. Essentially, the TOC states that every firm must have at least one constraint. Constraint is defined as any element or factor that limits the system from doing more of what it was designed to accomplish (Goldratt and Cox, 1992). If the TOC is integrated with the Resource Based Theory (RBT) it could be used to examine the challenges and opportunities in the management of procurement records in the Tanzania procuring entities. According to the TOC in conjunction with the RBT, the procuring entities – as public institutions must be faced by one or more constraints in dealing with management and care of procurement records.

Records management, by its nature; is a system (Read and Ginn, 2007; Read and Ginn, 2011). Records management, as a system, like any other systems in the operations of organisations in accomplishing its tasked goals is faced by constraints in making things happen as per their organisational mandates (Goldratt, 1990; Goldratt and Cox, 1992). The owner of a system is assumed to establish its goal (Goldratt and Cox, 1992). The fundamental goal of most records management systems is to ensure that records are created, received, maintained, used, and disposed in an efficient way (vide ISO-14589:1 2001, 2016).
Management and care of procurement records in Tanzania, as a phenomenon, is influenced by a number of factors (sic, constraints). This paper has focused on only four constraints inter alia: regulatory and institutional frameworks; capacity of personnel involved in managing procurement records; adequacy of records storage space, equipment and facilities; and sufficiency of security and safety measures. Out of these constraints there evolve challenges and opportunities. The challenges and opportunities in managing procurement records need to be tapped in order to improve the efficiency of RAM practices in management and care of procurement records. Therefore, there is an essence of applying theory of constraints (TOC) in examining challenges and opportunities culminating management of procurement records in Tanzania procuring entities.

Various empirical studies have been conducted on the fields of RAM. Studies on the RAM practices have been carried out in the United Nations (Biraud, 2013), in the North America and Europe (Foscarini, 2009; Hay-Gibson, 2011), and in the United States (Schwella, Burger, Fox and Müller, 1996). Sabokrooh (1989) conducted a specialised study in records management in teaching hospitals in the Islamic Republic of Iran. Whereas, there are found specific studies on RAM practices in the East and Southern Africa Regional Branch of the International Council on Archives (ESARBICA) member countries (Wamukoya and Mutula, 2005), in the sub Saharan Africa (Asogwa, 2012), in Botswana (Mampe and Kalusopa, 2012), and in South Africa (Kanzi, 2010; Marutha, 2013) based on successes or failures.

Studies on the RAM have been conducted in Kenya (Chimwani, Iravo, and Tirimba, 2014; Kendo and Getuno, 2016), in Uganda (Luyombya, 2010; Namukasa, 2017), in Ghana (Tagbotor, Adzido, and Agbanu, 2015), and in Tanzania (Kitalu, 2001; Ndibalema, 2001; Chachage, 2005; Lyaruu, 2005; Ndenje-Sichwale, 2010; Ndemanyisho, 2014) to name a few empirical studies. However, most of these reviewed studies were on the mainstream records and archives management but not
specific on the management and care of procurement records. However, very few empirical studies, as reviewed before this study, were focused and specialised on management and care of procurement records.

Procurement process is an activity that generates, receives, uses and maintains multitudes of records in the business transaction processes and their associated activities within and across the envisaged stages. Therefore, to study procurement records management practices is very vital. For instance, challenges facing public institutions in implementing procurement legislation were studied at the Office of the Registrar of Political Parties in the city of Dar es Salaam. This study recorded, revealed and documented poor procurement records keeping due to inadequate staffing in the procurement functional unit (Stephen, 2013). In another case study, challenges facing procuring entities in complying with procurement regulations were studied at Kisarawe District Council. It was observed, recorded and documented a very poor score of 20% in recordkeeping (Naluyaga, 2014). Ndemanyisho (2014) and Marwa (2015) studied recordkeeping at individual cases whereby they observed, recorded and documented poor records management practices respectively. The general observable impression is that, little has been done with regard to compliance with respect to the records and archives management systems (Ndenje-Sichalwe, 2010; Lufunyo, 2013; Ndemanyisho, 2014; Marwa, 2015).

3.0 Methodology

This paper is based on an explorative case study. Exploratory case study was a precursor study to refine and define questionnaire statements to be used for the survey study which is the second phase of this study that had been proposed to be conducted into two stages. The explorative case study was used to examine challenges and opportunities of managing procurement records in the selected Tanzania procuring entities in the city of Dar es Salaam. The explorative case study
methodology was considered appropriate to give this study an in-depth expert insight on the challenges and opportunities for managing procurement records. Explorative case study has been considered sufficient due to the fact that some researchers who investigated existing records and archives management practices in Tanzania have successfully used it (Chinyemba and Ngulube, 2005; Ngulube and Tafor, 2006; Ndenje-Sichalwe, 2010).

The paper has used a convenient sample of fifteen case institutions. Case institutions were purposively chosen from a population of 193 public procuring entities found in the city of Dar es Salaam. Dar es Salaam has been considered since it has almost 41% of the total procuring entities in Tanzania (URT, 2015c). It is Dar es Salaam where most of the audited procuring entities had been observed to have weaknesses in management and care of procurement records (URT, 2014a; URT, 2015a; URT, 2016a; URT, 2017a).

This paper needed primary data. Data were collected using the in-depth expert interviewing protocol through the interview guide. There was also an observation checklist (IRMT, 1999b; OECD, 2009) that was used to collect direct on-site observations. Collection of data through the use of these two methods was done to ensure triangulation of data. The in-depth expert interviews were conducted with fifteen selected heads of internal audit units (HIAUs) and three heads of procurement management units (HPMUs) within and across fifteen case institutions, and two consultants who were doing procurement audit. Case respondents were coded as: HIAU (with subscript 1 to 15) representing heads of internal audit units; HPMU (with subscript 1 to 3) represented heads of PMUs; and CONS (with subscript 1 to 2) representing consultants. The direct on-site observations were conducted in the fifteen conveniently chosen case institutions. In the case of direct on-site observations, the observation checklists were used to record the observed data.

This study collected qualitative data. Data from the in-depth expert
interviews and direct on-site observations were collated during analysis and reported back into themes and categories. The analysis was qualitative in terms of thematic categories based on the envisioned challenges and opportunities. Themes and categories were descriptively described, analysed and interpreted with interpretations within and across the presentation of findings.

4.0 Findings and Discussions

Findings from interviews supplemented by direct on-site observations do hereby provide the essence of challenges and opportunities facing the management and care of procurement records in the studied cases. Thematic categories presented here for the envisaged findings and discussions are, inter alia, the challenges and opportunities in managing procurement records based on: regulatory and institutional frameworks; capacity of institutional actors; records storage space, equipment, and facilities; and security and safety measures for managing procurement records and archives. These are the constraining factors according to the TOC in line with the elements of the RBT.

4.1 Challenges

4.1.1 Regulatory and Institutional Frameworks

The records and archives management (RAM) phenomenon is built upon regulatory and institutional frameworks (IRMT, 1999a; Smith, 2007; Read and Ginn, 2007; Read and Ginn, 2011). The RAM frameworks are provided inter alia in the public procurement legislation (vide Act No. 7, 2011 as amended) and the records and archives management legislation (vide Act No. 3 of 2002) and their attendant regulations. For procurement business transactional processes and the associated activities, institutional arrangements that are routinely involved in the procurement records life-cycle are inter alia: the accounting officers who have the overall responsibility for the public procurement management (vide Section 36(1) of Act No. 7, 2011 as amended), heads of Procurement Management Units (vide Section 38 (l) of Act No. 7, 2011 as amended), and user departments (vide Section
39(1) (i) of Act No. 7, 2011 as amended). It has been recorded and documented that:

Records and archives management has to be managed under regulatory and institutional frameworks. There must be established rules of the game whereby the institutional actors and their associated organs to create, receive, use, maintain, dispose or archive records. This is the essence of efficient RAM in an organisation (source: HIAU3).

In every institutional setting, there is a need of framework that is sufficient for proper records and archives management. Once the regulatory is disintegrated there are the possibilities of disintegration of activities leading to poor coordination between the key actors within the organisational setup (source: HIAU5).

Institutional actors within every procuring entity must be defined by within the regulatory framework and their jurisdictional functions aligned within the context of effective RAM. There must be checks and balances within the regulatory and institutional frameworks (source: HIAU7).

Despite institutional arrangements as established under Act No. 7 of 2011 (as amended) that are either creating, receiving or using procurement records; the majority of records are supposed to be managed and cared by the heads of PMUs as mandated under Section 38 (l) of Act No. 7 of 2011 (as amended). Functionally, the PMUs are doing a lot in managing the entire procurement process and activities (vide S. 38 (a) of Act No. 7, 2011 as amended). This is evidenced as:

It is envisaged that procurement activities are performed by the PMUs. Other functional departments should always be informed on the matters and issues related to records and archives from the central repository office – the PMU (source: HIAU1).

Maintenance and archive of records in every procuring entity is under the PMU and user departments. Despite this observation,
management and care of records should be instilled across institutional actors within the PE’s institutional arrangements where procurement activities are carried out (source: HIAU_8).

The regulatory and institutional challenge to be found in this scenario is the fragmentation of regulatory frameworks. In general, there is a mandatory requirement given under Act No. 7 of 2011 (as amended under Act No. 5, 2016) that procuring entities should maintain procurement records for specified time periods. Here, institutional actors do create, receive, use, and maintain procurement records in their day-to-day procurement transactional processes and activities as they are provided in the institutional mandates as established by the given legislations. Most of functional activities in managing and caring procurement records are vested under the PMU. The following evidence substantiates this claim:

PMUs are compelled by law [Act No. 7, 2011 as amended] to maintain and archive records. Failure of which is non-compliance with the given legislation. However, most of them [PMUs] have no guidelines on effecting efficient management and care of the envisioned procurement records (source: summarised form CONS_1 and CONS_2).

Likewise, Section 9 of Act No. 3 of 2002 provides that heads of public offices (sic, accounting officers) shall be responsible for the creation and maintaining of adequate documentation of the functions and activities of their respective public offices through the establishment of good recordkeeping practices, inter alia: creating and managing current records with appropriate filing system; drafting retention and disposal schedules; and transferring semi-current records into the custody of the Director of Records and Archives Management Department – RAMD (vide Section 9 (a), (b), (c), and (d) of Act No. 3, 2002).

We, the heads of PMUs, do maintain and archive procurement records on behalf of the accounting officers. Basically, our duties are to ensure that records are kept for preservation for the duration required in providing the needed support to the
procurement transactional processes and activities (source: summarised from HPMU\textsuperscript{1, 2, and 3}).

Essentially, the heads of public offices are required to co-operate with the Director of the RAMD in the management of semi-current records (vide Section 10 of Act No. 3, 2002). However, findings of the interviews and direct on-site observations have revealed that this institutional mandate is still a challenge to most of the studied case institutions. This is supported by revelations of the respondents:

This PE does not have direct contact with the RAMD. Even the name [RAMD] is sought new to me (source: HPMU\textsuperscript{1}).

What is this thing, RAMD? Anyway, I do create, receive, use, maintain, archive and sometimes dispose records; but, this organisation has no direct contacts with the RAMD on matters related to semi-current or else non-current records (source: HPMU\textsuperscript{3}).

The existence of the dual legislations on records and archives management posits other regulatory and institutional challenges. One, the overall custodian of records in any public office is the head of public office (vide S. 9 of Act No. 3, 2002) despite this fact records are managed on his behalf by heads of PMUs, user departments, and other functional units within the procuring entities. Two, procurement records within and across the procuring entities’ institutional arrangements are managed by designated institutional actors on behalf of the accounting officers. However, the line distinguishing the institutional mandate of the accounting officers and other institutional actors in creating, receiving, using, maintaining, and disposing procurement records is not clearly set between the dual legislations.

The challenge is: which proceeds the latter and in what institutional capacity? The dual legislations exhibit a clear gap on how to differentiate the regulatory and institutional capacities in management and care of procurement records. All case respondents have had opinion
that procurement records should be governed, administered, and managed by the aforesaid regulatory and institutional frameworks. However, the existence of dual legislations on the same issue should be harmonised to foster efficient management of procurement records. The procurement auditors (CONS\textsubscript{1} and CONS\textsubscript{2}) and HPMU\textsubscript{3} respectively had the following to substantiate this claim:

Many of the institutional actors are unaware on the existence of dual regulatory requirements for proper management of procurement records and archives management respectively. Despite, regulatory framework must ensure existence of institutional frameworks to support efficient procurement recordkeeping (source: CONS\textsubscript{1}).

[Most of] institutional actors are bound to create, receive, use, maintain and dispose records, as routine activity, due to the nature of the procurement functional activities. However, the requirements for the accounting officers to liaise with the Director of RAMD on matters of managing procurement records are not taken into account. This is a critical challenge to most of the Tanzania procuring entities (source: CONS\textsubscript{2}).

Institutional actors are unaware of the dualism of regulatory frameworks operating under the same institutional arrangements in the procurement records management (source: HPMU\textsubscript{3}).

Findings from 73.33\% studied case institutions indicate that there is no direct interface between accounting officers and the director of RAMD for the matters related to managing semi-current and non-current procurement records. Procurement records do not undergo the normal recordkeeping activities as they are specialised and being kept for preservation by specific institutional actors within the procuring entities’ institutional arrangements. Due to the re-arrangements of the procurement institutional frameworks, respondents have failed to identify when the accounting officers do co-operate with the RAMD on
matters related to the management of procurement records. There is a regulatory gap that has been substantiated as:

The PPRA had [until this study was conducted] not made procurement records guidelines. This management gap has made a number of procuring entities manage and care procurement records through business as usual method. There are no rules that guide institutional actors on how procurement records should be managed and cared in terms of organisation, filing, keeping (for preservation) and appraising (source: CONS2).

To this date, the responsible institution in the mezzo level had not initiated the use of procurement records management guidelines as required by Regulation 88(5) of the GN No. 446, 2013 as amended by GN No. 333, 2016. This is a clear challenge that exists between the principal legislation(s) and how procurement records have to be efficiently managed and cared. In principle, most of the Tanzania procuring entities are being faced by this regulatory challenge.

4.1.2 Capacity of Institutional Actors

For generality of staffing, the institutional actors in the PMUs for the studied case institutions are sufficient as required. This is in compliance with Section 37(1) of Act No. 7 of 2011 (as amended) that requires every procuring entity to have a PMU which is staffed to an appropriate level. However, thirteen (86.67%) of the studied cases were observed to have had no personnel who were technically knowledgeable, skilled and competent in the RAM. This is contrary to Section 37(2) of Act No. 7 of 2011 (as amended) that categorically requires PMU to have procurement and other technical specialists together with the necessary supporting and administrative staff. In the other extreme, only two (13.33%) of the studied cases had been found to have specialised personnel with technical and administrative knowledge, skills, and competence in the RAM. This observation is vividly substantiated as:

Most of PMUs in Tanzania had strived hard to maintain the required number of professional [specialists] staff in line with the requirements of the [appropriate] staffing levels (source:
The [critical] issue on the PMU staffing is centred on employing technical and administrative staffs that are required by the procurement law to support the proper functioning of the PMUs (source: HPMU).

The technical and administrative staffs that are dearly needed by the PMUs in procuring entities’ institutional arrangements include the RAM personnel. However, few are employed and are staffed with the specialised RAM professionalism (source: HPMU).

It is evident that the significant challenge on the capacity of institutional actors is lack of or inadequate RAM personnel. Most of the studied cases were observed to have had appropriate number of specialists in the procurement and supply chain management cadres, but not on the RAM cadre. This posits an institutional challenge on balancing the organisational human resource in terms of adequacy and sufficiency in ensuring proper management of procurement records. These findings are similar with that of Stephen (2013) and Marwa (2015) that revealed inadequate staffing of RAM personnel at the studied cases in Dar es Salaam.

4.1.3 Records and Archives Storage Space, Equipment and Facilities
Findings indicate that two (13.33%) of the studied cases had adequate and sufficient records storage space, equipment and facilities. Each of these two studied cases has two specialised containers and a records registry where procurement records are kept and archived. However, the critical challenge here is on the randomness of the semi- and non-current procurement recordkeeping where entry is not strict to the extent that recorded and archived files are not properly organised and arranged ensemble for easy accessibility and retrieval. These observations are similar with the study conducted in Botswana by Kalusopa and Ngulube (2012).
Kalusopa and Ngulube (2012) revealed that storage and preservation of records were weak. The studied institutions had no recordkeeping management units. Due to weak storage and preservation of records, it was established that the institutions needed rationalisation of their storage requirements and improve the accessibility of semi-current records that were bundled together with current files on shelves. With regard to the adequacy of the equipment, the studied institutions revealed that 71.1% of the institutions reported that they used equipment that did not sufficiently cater for records storage whilst 28.9% indicated sufficiency. Some of these findings concur with Kemoni (2007). Other studies, like those of Wamukoya and Mutula (2005) in the ESARBICA and Nengomasha (2009) in Namibia, confirm the pattern.

4.1.4 Security and Safety of Records and Archives
Findings have indicated that two (13.33%) of studied cases had somehow security and safety measures for the procurement records and archives. Here, there are specialised containers and records registry offices where procurement recorded and archived files were kept under lock. Records and archives in these two studied cases were well secured with safety considerations at hand. Accesses to the records and archived files were strict. Thirteen (86.67%) of the studied cases had been observed to have no security and safety measures for the procurement records. These observations are compliant with the findings of Kitalu (2001), Ndibalema (2001), Lyaruu (2005), Ndenje-Sichalwe (2010), and Marwa (2015) respectively. Generally, procurement records were observed to be kept and stored without considering their nature, complexity, and vitality. The procurement records security and safety risks were observed to be high.

4.2 Opportunities
5.2.1 Regulatory and Institutional Frameworks
Despite the disparity in observations by eleven (73.33%) cases, it was observed that four (26.67%) cases have direct liaisons with the RAMD
on matters related to the management of procurement records and archives thereto. This is an indication of compliance of 26.67 per cent with the requirements of Section 10 of Act No. 3 of 2002. Coupled with the requirements of Section 10 of Act No. 3 of 2002, procuring entities are obliged to comply with Section 61(1) of Act No. 7 of 2011 as amended provides:

A procuring entity shall maintain a record of its procurement proceedings in which it is involved, including decisions taken and the reasons for it and such record shall be kept for a period of not less than five years from the date of completion of the contract and be made available when required to the Minister and the Controller and Auditor General (S. 61(1), Act No. 7 of 2011).

Findings indicate that studied cases are compliant with the given provision. There is an indication of 100 per cent compliance with creating and using records. However, the critical challenge is on how procurement records are kept, cared and maintained. Findings through direct on-site observations have revealed that most of the procurement transactional records (especially current and some of the semi-current records) were kept and stored in the PMU offices and some copies of these recorded and documented procurement record files were kept by the user departments within and across the studied cases. Whereas, some top secret and classified recorded and documented procurement record files were kept by the accounting officers. These included project procurement contracts and procurements contracts under public-private partnerships (PPPs) to mention a few examples.

Despite the existence of recorded and documented procurement record files within the procuring entities’ institutional arrangements, the completeness of recorded information in the record files is an issue to be checked. More often, during audit exercise you may find out missing documents within the given procurement record files (source: CONS$_2$).

However, most of the interviewed internal auditors (HIAU$_{1,2,...,15}$) had an opinion that the PMUs were compliant with their mandates provided
under Section 38 (l) of Act No. 7 of 2011 (as amended) in maintaining and archiving records of the procurement and disposal process. Also, some user departments were observed to have complied with requirements of Section 39(1) (i) of Act No. 7 of 2011 (as amended) that requires these institutional actors to maintain and archive records of contracts management. What have been observed is on the degree of compliance with the proper procurement recordkeeping. Complying with the requirements of the procurement legislation in line with the records and archives management legislation on the same matters related to records and archive management in the public procurement sector is dwindling between low and moderate. These findings comply with the observations of the PPRA audits (URT, 2014a; URT, 2015a; URT, 2016a; URT, 2017a) and the CAG audits (URT, 2014b; URT, 2015b; URT, 2016b; URT, 2017b) respectively. Generally, efficient procurement recordkeeping is moderate for the PMUs and low for the user departments.

4.2.2 Capacity of Institutional Actors
Institutional actors are people who are stationed and working within and across the procuring entities. Institutional actors are the creators, receivers, users, maintainers, and disposers of records in the institutional settings. Records, of any kind, whether mainstream, general or specialised are created, used, maintained, and disposed by people within and across the institutional arrangements. This setting, as generally accepted by the records and archives management practices and standards, is the requirement of the RAM professionalism. That, institutions in their day-to-day businesses, processes, and activities require institutional actors to deal with records and archives as institutional assets (sic, resources). The findings from all fifteen cases indicate that institutional actors are mandated to create, use, maintain, and archive records for their routine and strategic business transactions in the course of either initiating procurement transactions or decision making or reviewing the performance of the institutional processes and activities (for audit purposes).
It is established that sufficiency of institutional actors for proper management of procurement records in the studied fifteen cases is between moderate and large. However, the study revealed that the perceived knowledge of the institutional actors on records and archives management is low as most of the personnel have not received any specialised training on records and archives management – as a profession requiring specialised training. Despite this observation, the study revealed that most of the personnel dealing with procurement records management are moderately to largely skilled and competent to manage the record creation and use requirements for the level of enabling the execution of the day-to-day procurement business transactional processes and activities. Internal auditors have the following to say:

This organisation has enough personnel in the PMU and user departments to manage functional activities. However, the issue is sufficiency of knowledgeable, skilled and competent personnel on the RAM activities (source: HIAU₅).

We do not have problems with specialists in the procurement functional cadres within the PMUs. The problem with our organisation is staffing the administrative and supportive cadres including RAM within the PMUs and across the user departments (source: summarised from HIAU₁₀, HIAU₁₃ and HIAU₁₅).

The direct observed challenge here is on how to maintain and care for procurement records. Most of the studied cases had been observed to have no records appraisal and retention schedules. Due to inadequate knowledge, skills and competence on the RAM best practices; observations revealed that filing (classification and arrangement) and preservation (or conservation) of procurement records were ineffectively and inefficiently done. This is attributed to the inadequacy of administrative and supportive staff with RAM professional or technical requisites.
4.2.3 **Records and Archives Storage Space, Equipment and Facilities**

Proper records and archives management requires space for storage (keeping) of records in their basic forms. Essentially, institutions need adequate and sufficient space for keeping and storing records in their forms either current, semi-current, or non-current (extinct) records. However, findings in the previous studied cases in Dar es Salaam has shown that non availability of working tools and equipment in the recordkeeping systems is a common phenomenon (Kitalu, 2001; Ndibalema, 2001; Lyaruu, 2005; Ndenje-Sichalwe, 2010, Marwa, 2015). Inadequacy and insufficiency storage space, equipment and facilities could be used as an institutional resource challenge. Here, top management would be motivated to use the status of inadequacy and insufficiency to streamline their financial budgets in fostering the acquisition of records storage space, equipment and facilities respectively. However, the situations in the studied cases seem otherwise.

4.2.4 **Security and Safety of Records and Archives**

Findings reveal that the studied cases have insufficient security and safety measures. These finding are similar with that of Ndenje-Sichalwe (2010). However, good records management practice means identifying vital records and information and then developing a records security policy (Kalusopa and Ngulupe, 2012). In practice, records need proper arrangement for securing them. Therefore, according to Kalusopa and Ngulube (2012), Institutions are obliged to develop policies and standards to support the protection and security of records throughout their life-cycles until they can safely destroy or delete them. In principle, the studied cases had no policies and standards for protection and security of records through the records continuum model. Records, either active or inactive, need maintenance of the high level of security both externally and internally at all times (Smith, 2007). As advocated by Smith (2007), one should not contemplate transferring records to a records centre if it is not completely secure.

1.0 **Conclusion**
Based on the findings, it is hereby concluded that management of procurement records in the studied cases in Tanzania is faced by a number of constraints, inter alia: disintegrated regulatory and institutional frameworks; lack of procurement records management guidelines; inappropriate staffing of personnel specialised on records and archives management; inadequate and insufficient records storage space, equipment, and facilities; and insufficiency of security and safety measures for managing procurement records and archives. Despite these challenges, there were envisaged opportunities. In theory, the studied challenges and opportunities need some policy analysis and regulatory frameworks harmonisation.

There should be public procurement management and public records and archives management policy analysis and harmonisation for implementation with revised or amended national RAM legislation to encompass the essence of procurement recordkeeping systems in Tanzania. In the managerial perspectives, for procuring entities that have not directly liaised with the RAMD could use the regulatory requirement to establish effective procurement recordkeeping systems in order to comply with RAM best practices and standards. This will improve the practices of managing procurement records within the Tanzania procuring entities. The Tanzania procuring entities are envisaged to capitalise on empowering institutional actors in the RAM professionalism, best practices and standards and therefore improve knowledge, skills, and competences on efficient management of procurement records.

Since records are institutional resources, Tanzania procuring entities are required to think of budgeting funds to procure adequate storage space, equipment and facilities for all types of procurement records. Once storage space, equipment and facilities are adequately available; procuring entities could capitalise on instituting safety and security measures in managing procurement records within and across their institutionalised procurement processes and activities and ensure
effective and efficient management of procurement records. Contextually, this study was limited to fifteen case institutions found in Dar es Salaam. However, case institutions were carefully selected. Therefore, the findings of this study could be extended to other procuring entities across Tanzania.
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