



GovTech
& PUBLIC SECTOR
INNOVATION



TRUST
VALLEY



World Bank GovTech Innovation Challenge 2026

Sm@rt Programmer

Challenge Statement - Version 3.1-EN

Last updated : 25 June 2026

Note: This challenge statement reflects the perspective of the General Inspectorate of Finance (Inspection Générale des Finances, IGF) and is provided for reference purposes. Innovative approaches and alternative methods to achieve the intended outcomes are encouraged.

Sm@rt Programmer

1. Executive Summary

As part of the GovTech Innovation Challenge, the *General Inspectorate of Finance (Inspection Générale des Finances, IGF)* of Morocco is seeking innovative companies to develop an integrated solution covering the first two phases of the audit cycle, namely annual audit programming and operational mission team planning.

This challenge focuses on the scope of strategic public institutions and enterprises and aims to introduce a risk-based approach underpinned by resource optimisation.

The challenge is structured around two inseparable components:

1. **Risk-Based Programming and Predictive Monitoring (P1):** The solution must enable strategic organisations to be evaluated and ranked according to configurable risk criteria and anticipate risk developments through a predictive monitoring system.
2. **Mission Team Planning (P2):** Once the audit programme is approved, the solution must enable mission teams to be assembled, taking into account competencies, availability and audit project history, including historical analysis of finance inspectors' past audit projects over a one-year planning cycle.

Challenge elements:

- Multi-criteria evaluation of strategic public institutions and enterprises, with adjustable and configurable criteria and historical analysis of programming and audit data
- Tool-generated suggestions for improving and enriching risk criteria
- Predictive monitoring system to anticipate risk developments
- Competency/audit project matching engine, incorporating availability and audit project history for mission team assembly
- Production of the mission team planning document for strategic public institutions and enterprises, for sign-off by the Inspector General

2. Context and Challenge Statement

2.1 Annual Programming (P1)

The IGF carries out approximately 200 audit projects each year covering the full spectrum of public organisations. Annual programming is a strategic and confidential

process. It relies on criteria evaluated manually, consolidated in spreadsheets without automated integration of external data.

This challenge is specifically focused on the audit scope of strategic public institutions and enterprises, which require more refined risk analysis and continuous monitoring between audit cycles. This sub-set demands an active monitoring approach, which constitutes an operational expression of the principle of permanent oversight of public finances, in line with the good governance and accountability requirements enshrined in the applicable constitutional and regulatory framework.

Component P1 articulates two levels of analysis:

- **Risk Observation:** calculation of a multi-criteria score based on documented, configurable indicators, incorporating historical audit project data and information available in public systems.
- **Predictive Monitoring System:** proactive detection of weak signals or atypical developments in available data (financial, sectoral, governance) enabling the IGF programming committee to be alerted ahead of the formal programming cycle.

2.2 Team Planning (P2)

Once the annual programme is approved, the Planning Committee assembles mission teams. This process relies on an internal CV database and Excel tracking spreadsheets updated manually.

Planning must account for sectoral competencies, experience by audit project type, availability and the finance inspector's audit project history (type and difficulty of previous audit projects), incorporating historical analysis of past mission assignments (teams assembled, audit project results, lessons learnt).

Key contextual characteristics:

- Target scope: strategic public institutions and enterprises within the meaning of Organic Law 02-12 on appointments to senior positions, as amended and supplemented.
- Current programming criteria: 5 formalised criteria, manually evaluated on a spreadsheet
- No automated integration with public or internal data sources (financial IS, HR IS)
- Travel and availability data available in SAP and internal archives
- Historical audit project analysis available in internal archives

- Strong data sovereignty requirement: mandatory in-house hosting and processing
- Validation required from the General Directorate of Information Systems Security (Direction Générale de la Sécurité des Systèmes d'Information, DGSSI) and the National Commission for the Control of Personal Data Protection (Commission Nationale de Contrôle de la Protection des Données à Caractère Personnel, CNDP) for inspectors' personal data and strategic programming data
- The solution is a decision-support tool
-

Success Indicators (KPIs):

- Reduction in time spent on prioritisation analysis during annual programming
- Reduction in the team planning cycle
- Systematic coverage of all strategic public institutions and enterprises within the PoC scope
- Demonstration of the explainability and full traceability of scores produced

3. Experience and Lessons Learnt

The IGF has been conducting prioritisation analyses based on internal criteria for several years, consolidated manually in spreadsheets. The Planning Committee manages assignments based on the internal CV database and the informal knowledge accumulated by its members. These approaches have demonstrated their value but have reached their limits given the volume to be processed, the dispersion of sources and the absence of automation.

4. Expected Outcomes

The IGF wishes to develop a solution covering both components of this challenge (P1 and P2) within a defined scope. The two components are designed to work together but may be developed sequentially within the PoC framework.

4.1 Component P1: Multi-criteria Scoring and Predictive Monitoring

The IGF wishes to improve the analytical quality of its annual programming for strategic public institutions and enterprises, drawing on internal data and relevant public sources. The aim is to have an objective and traceable analysis that enriches the professional judgement of the Programming Committee without replacing it.

Expected outcomes:

- A multi-criteria analysis of strategic public institutions and enterprises based on existing criteria and available data
- A continuous monitoring capability to detect emerging risk signals between programming cycles, based on public and internal data
- The ability for the Programming Committee to modify criteria and their weighting

4.2 Component P2: Optimisation of Mission Team Planning

The IGF seeks to significantly reduce the time taken to assemble mission teams and to better leverage the diversity of available profiles and competencies.

Expected outcomes:

- A decision-support tool for mission team assembly incorporating competencies, experience by audit project type, the audit project history of finance inspectors (type and difficulty of previous audit projects), historical analysis of past mission assignments (teams assembled, audit project results, lessons learnt) and their availability.
- The ability for the Planning Committee to validate, adjust and annotate assignment proposals, with full traceability

Note: This description reflects the perspective of the IGF and is provided for reference purposes. Innovative approaches and alternative methods to achieve the intended outcomes are encouraged.

5. Potential impacts and Benefits

For the Programming Committee: Access to an objective, traceable and flexible analytical basis for programming decisions. Reduction in manual analysis time and improved coverage across all strategic organisations. Integration of a continuous monitoring capability between programming cycles.

For the Planning Committee: Significantly reduce the time taken to assemble mission teams. Better leverage multidisciplinary profiles and individual specialisations.

For finance inspectors: Improved visibility over the criteria influencing programming decisions. Access to a configuration lever to evolve criteria based on field experience. Reduction in planning conflicts and improved predictability of assignments.

6. Potential Risks

Technical risks:

- Variable quality and availability of data
- Integration complexity with heterogeneous information systems
- Risk of bias in scoring if historical audit project data is incomplete or inconsistently structured
- Complexity of predictive modelling for strategic public institutions and enterprises with highly varied risk profiles

Operational risks:

- Over-reliance on automated scoring to the detriment of professional judgement
- Risk of model drift if criteria are not regularly updated by users
- Confidentiality: access to programming and assignment data must be strictly controlled and traceable

Organisational risks:

- Potential resistance if the scoring system challenges established institutional balances in programming
- Need for a clear governance process to oversee user modifications to criteria
- Buy-in from both committees (programming and planning) is essential to ensure effective use of the solution

Appendix & Resources

- [Annex B](#)
 - Schema and fields for available travel and availability data
 - Structure and fields of the existing CV database
 - Schema of the current workload and assignment tracking Excel file
- [Annex C](#)
 - Format of the planning document submitted to the Inspector General
- [Annex D](#)
 - List of available and accessible public data sources for strategic organisations within the PoC scope