

MARKET BRIEFING · IRISH PUBLIC PROCUREMENT

Ireland Now Has a Procurement Strategy. We Measured the Starting Line Seventeen Days Before It Was Published.

Reading the 51 actions of Procuring for our Future 2026–2030 against an independent, reproducible July baseline

Ireland's first National Public Procurement Strategy published on 5 August 2026. Seventeen days earlier, we took an independent, reproducible measurement of the State's procurement disclosure — before the Strategy or its 51 actions were public. This briefing reads the actions against that baseline: what has moved, what has not, and the one commitment the Strategy does not contain.

Daryll Collins · Silviu Preoteasa

Founders & Principals · Amata Consulting · Dublin, Ireland · August 2026

The bottom line

On 5 August 2026 the Government published *Procuring for our Future: National Public Procurement Strategy 2026–2030* — 15 objectives, 51 actions, five pillars, running to a mid-term review in 2028. It is Ireland's first national procurement strategy and its transparency pillar is substantive: a publicly accessible data-analytics website by Q4 2026, membership of the European Commission's Public Procurement Data Space by Q2 2028, and an aim to capture roughly 80% of State procurement spend through data-sharing agreements.

Seventeen days earlier, on 19 July 2026, we measured what the State's purchase-order disclosure actually looked like. That measurement was published before the Strategy, with the computation preserved unchanged and its input fingerprinted by a published SHA-256 — and the input file itself is redistributed in the methods package, available on request. It is a pre-commitment baseline, and this briefing reads the 51 actions against it.

Three findings.

Things have moved, and the Strategy is not starting from zero. Re-running our own computation against the OGP dataset released on 7 August: awarded records carrying a named supplier rose from 82.6% to 83.1% across the file, and to **95.2% for records published since the end of March**. On the current eTenders platform, every awarded record in the extract carries an awarded value — at every threshold level. And three of the 25 bodies we audited had already converted from PDF to structured formats mid-series, before the Strategy existed.

One thing has not moved, and none of the 51 actions explicitly commits to fixing it. The Strategy does not contain the word "identifier". It does not contain the phrase "purchase order". Not in its published text, not in its consolidated table of 51 actions, not anywhere in the full document. There is no commitment — not to mandate one, not to specify one, not even to study one — to a supplier identifier that resolves the same company across different public bodies. Without that, an analytics website assembling 80% of State spend produces a larger dataset without a reliable cross-body entity key.

We are not the only ones saying this, and that is the point. Deputy Albert Dolan's StateSpend.ie, an independent database of Irish public procurement spending, publishes **42,727 supplier labels** under a caption that reads *labels, not verified legal entities*. Our own July audit of 25 bodies found **no file carrying a resolvable supplier identifier**. And the Strategy itself concedes, in its own words, that tendering and contract-award data do not give a complete picture of actual public expenditure. Three parties, three methods, one missing primitive.

01 · What the Strategy commits to

Sourced to the published text; the plain-text edition on gov.ie was read in a rendered browser on 10 August 2026. **[verified]**

Pillar 3, *Safeguarding public trust*, carries ten of the 51 actions across three objectives: enhance transparency and expenditure management across the procurement lifecycle; improve the quality and utility of tender data; and publish every Corporate Procurement Plan centrally.

The transparency commitments with dates attached are:

Action	Commitment	Date
A3.2	Pilot analytics platform, specified for internal consultation	end Q3 2026

Action	Commitment	Date
A3.2	Publicly accessible website, visual metrics of procurement trends, using eTenders data	Q4 2026
A3.2	Spend-data capture begins	Q1 2027
A3.2	Spend metrics live on the website	Q2 2027
A3.1	Ireland joins the EU Public Procurement Data Space	Q2 2028
A3.9	All departments and aegis bodies publish Corporate Procurement Plans	end Q2 2028
A3.8	Report to the Public Procurement Advisory Council on eForms efficacy	end 2027

The ~80% figure attaches to none of these. In the Strategy it reads as an **aim** of the ongoing expansion of data-sharing agreements between the OGP and public service bodies — no date, no KPI. That distinction is not pedantry: it is the difference between something the mid-term review can test and something it cannot.

Two features of the architecture matter more than any single action. First, the transparency work is built on **eTenders data plus data-sharing agreements**, not on obligations placed on individual bodies. Second, the Strategy says so itself: its own context text acknowledges that the planned measures relate to tendering and contract-award data and do not provide a complete picture of actual public expenditure, and answers that by establishing data-sharing arrangements with key public bodies.

This is the Strategy's central move, and it deserves to be named plainly rather than criticised.

The unit of transparency shifts from *what each body publishes* to *what the centre aggregates*. That is a defensible choice. It is arguably the right one. It also means that none of the 51 actions explicitly requires individual bodies to make their published files easier to use — and it makes the join key on which central aggregation depends the single load-bearing component of the design.

02 · Where it starts from

Our July study was a stratified purposive audit of 25 public bodies plus a computation over the OGP tender dataset. Its limits are stated on its face and are restated here because they bound everything that follows: the sample is purposive, it generalises to itself and not to the State, and **freshness is not compliance** — observing that a body's latest file covers Q4 2025 says nothing about whether that body has met an obligation.

Observation date: 19 July 2026. Publication of the Strategy: 5 August 2026. On 19 July the Strategy had not been published and its 51 actions were not publicly available.

The measured position, all reproducible: 24 of 25 bodies published data covering Q4 2025 or later; 13 of 25 were PDF-only; one body in the sample had no purchase-order series that could be located by browser-grade inspection. On the tender side, the OGP dataset held 84,480 records across 80,326 unique tender IDs, with a supplier named on 82.6% of 44,266 awarded records. **[verified — reruns from a hashed input file]**

03 · What has moved since

On 7 August 2026 the OGP updated its open-data collection page; the dataset now covers to 30 June 2026, a quarter further than our July input. We downloaded it on 10 August, hashed it, and ran **the same notebook, unmodified** — the file whose SHA-256 was published with the July study. Both input hashes are in the appendix.

Measure	19 July 2026	10 August 2026	Movement
Records	84,480	87,427	+2,947
Unique tender IDs	80,326	83,273	+2,947
Awarded records	44,266	45,945	+1,679
— supplier named	82.6%	83.1%	+0.5 pp
Distinct supplier strings †	16,738	17,048	+310
Distinct contracting-authority strings	5,624	5,931	+307

† Counted with the corrected atomisation rule, not the published notebook's. The notebook splits the awarded-supplier field on ";"; the field's primary delimiter is in fact "|", and many ";" characters occur inside HTML entities. Our July entity-resolution work established the corrected count for the July file as **16,738**, and that figure is reproduced exactly here before the same rule is applied to the new snapshot. The notebook's own output for that field is left unchanged and unpublished.

Three readings, and the first two are good news.

Supplier naming is improving, and faster than the headline suggests. Restricting to records published after 31 March 2026 — the quarter added since our July snapshot — there are 2,710 records, of which 642 are awarded, with a supplier named on **611, or 95.2%**. The whole-file figure of 83.1% is dragged down by thirteen years of history. Current practice is materially better than the average of the record.

On the current platform, awarded value is present throughout. Splitting awarded records on the current eTenders platform by threshold level: Direct Invite 2,802 of 2,802, National 5,621 of 5,621, and above-EU- threshold 4,671 of 4,671 carry a parseable awarded value. One hundred per cent at every level. **We flag the interpretation rather than overstate it:** a clean 100% is as consistent with the extract containing only records that carry a value as with universal disclosure, and the file alone cannot distinguish those. What can be said is that in this extract, on the current platform, every awarded record carries a value. **[verified as a property of the extract; mechanism not established]**

The corollary is that our most-quoted July figure needs restating. The finding that 93.6% of below-threshold awarded records disclosed no value belongs to the **pre-2023 platform**, and every figure in that partition is byte-identical across the two snapshots. That platform is closed. The number is a historical measurement of a system that no longer accepts new records — not a current failure rate. We restate it that way from here on. **[correction to the framing, not the arithmetic]**

The format shift predates the Strategy. Three of the 25 audited bodies converted mid-series before the Strategy existed, as recorded in the July annex table: the Department of Public Expenditure moved from PDF to spreadsheet from Q3 2025, Justice did the same from Q3 2025, and Health added CSV from Q1 2026. No Strategy action required it; the cheapest fix was already happening, body by body, uncoordinated.

One measure is going the wrong way. Distinct supplier strings rose by 310 in a single quarter, to 17,048. That is not a count of suppliers. It is a count of strings that nothing in the data resolves to a company.

One further observation, minor but instructive: the dataset's schema changed between the two snapshots — 30 columns became 31, with a Source field added — with no note on the collection page. A silent schema change inside three weeks is exactly what breaks a downstream pipeline, and it is the ordinary argument for keeping dated, hashed, independent snapshots.

04 · The one thing that has not moved

There are two distinct problems that the word "identifier" gets used for, and conflating them is the fastest way to talk past the actual gap.

Problem A — chain linkage. Connecting the stages of a single item of expenditure: tender, award, contract, purchase order, invoice, payment. The join key is a contract or transaction reference.

Problem B — entity resolution. Establishing that a supplier named on one body's file is the same legal entity as a similarly-named supplier on another body's file. The join key is a scheme-tagged, externally resolvable **supplier** identifier — a company registration number, a VAT number, a Legal Entity Identifier, or an EU-scheme organisation identifier.

Solving A does not solve B. A perfectly linked chain inside every public body still leaves the State unable to say what it spent with a given supplier in total.

Neither is specified anywhere in the Strategy. The terms identifier, purchase order, tax reference and registration number occur **zero times** across all three published surfaces: the thirteen-page plain-text edition, rendered in a browser on 10 August 2026 with per-page character counts recorded; the consolidated All Actions PDF, extracted and swept with ligature-broken variants included; and the full design-edition PDF, verified by manual search of the complete document on the same date. The nearest objects are A3.1 (join the EU Public Procurement Data Space), A3.7 (help buyers complete notices more accurately) and A3.8 (evaluate eForms). None specifies, mandates, or names an identifier. This is not the weaker case of a commitment to *explore* or *consider* one. There is no commitment to inspect. **[verified — browser-grade plus manual full-document search, 10 August 2026; method per surface recorded in Appendix A]**

The strongest counter-argument deserves stating, because an official will state it. eForms — the EU's structured notice standard, mandatory since October 2023 and the object of A3.8 — carries organisation-identifier fields by design, and the Public Procurement Data Space Ireland joins under A3.1 is built on them. On this view the identifier arrives through the EU regime whether or not the national document uses the word. Two facts sit against it. The OGP's own open dataset — the declared eTenders source for the analytics website's metrics — publishes thirty-one columns and **no scheme-tagged, externally resolvable supplier-identifier field**; suppliers appear as free text. And A3.2's spend layer is to be assembled through data-sharing agreements over bodies' finance systems, a layer the eForms notice standard never touches. Structured notices upstream do not put a resolvable key into either the published dataset or the spend records, and nothing in the 51 actions commits to carrying one through. Whether Irish notices currently populate the eForms organisation-identifier fields is checkable, and we will publish that reading with the Q4 2026 measurement.

Three independent measurements of the same gap:

Ours, on the disclosure layer. No file among the 25 bodies we audited in July contains a scheme-tagged, externally resolvable supplier identifier: suppliers appear as free-text names, one body carries a supplier code local to its own system, and others print internal transaction numbers that resolve nowhere else. **[verified — published methods annex]** We have since built that finding into a five-dimension readiness score for the disclosure layer, measured against the data regime European procurement law is moving toward; the full scoresheet, body by body, follows in a separate instalment.

Ours, on the tender layer. 17,048 distinct supplier strings, growing. We then tried to resolve them ourselves, deterministically and precision-first, and got 16,738 raw strings down to 16,011 canonical clusters — a 4.3% reduction — with zero false merges observed across 100 fully inspected multi-variant clusters, and 4,672 pairs left in a review queue that a machine should not decide. String matching cannot close the gap: PwC and PricewaterhouseCoopers remain apart, and trading-name chains queue rather than merge, because the information needed to join them is not in the data. **[verified — deterministic, rerunnable, byte-identical across consecutive runs]**

Deputy Dolan's, on the payments layer. StateSpend.ie — €106.5bn of reported value across 600,951 published records from 217 bodies — states that there is no common supplier identifier used across Irish public bodies when suppliers are registered, purchase orders are raised, or payments are recorded; that body-local supplier numbers cannot identify the same supplier across the State; and that published reports therefore rely on free-text names. It reports over 1,500 supplier labels mapped by hand to underlying organisations in a single entity-resolution pass, and cases of **one supplier appearing under more than 85 different names**. [Tier 2 — self-reported by the publisher; captured 10 August 2026]

And the gap is already on the parliamentary record. Asked in a parliamentary question of **22 January 2025** whether suppliers awarded public contracts carry a universal identifier allowing payments to be tracked across State bodies, the Minister did not identify one, replying that payment processes and financial systems belong to individual contracting authorities. In grouped answers of **25 February 2025** the Department confirmed that it does not centrally monitor publication compliance, that the regime is complaint-driven, and that no penalty is specified. [verified — primary record]

What this means for A3.2. The analytics website is to be built on eTenders data from Q4 2026 and extended with spend data from Q1 2027, with the aim of capturing roughly 80% of State spend through data-sharing agreements. Unless the data-sharing agreements specify a common, resolvable supplier key, central aggregation inherits the entity-resolution problem rather than solving it — and the Strategy does not currently commit to such a key. The State could aggregate expenditure while remaining unable to determine reliably how much went to the same legal supplier across different bodies.

The specification for fixing this is not new and is not ours alone — we set out a standards-based design in our July briefing, *The Procurement Map Is an Engineering Problem*, and Deputy Dolan's tracker carries a worked demonstration of the same argument. **The single constructive recommendation of this briefing is that the State specify one — a scheme-tagged, externally resolvable supplier identifier, adopted on the record before the spend layer's data-sharing agreements are specified in Q1 2027, not after. That makes it a 2026 decision. The 2028 mid-term review is the fallback checkpoint, not the venue: by then the spend layer will already be live on whatever key it was built with.**

A statutory vehicle may already be in motion. Deputy Dolan states that he has introduced the Public Spending Ledger Bill, currently before the Bills Office, to establish a "Golden Thread" linking every stage of public expenditure — tender, contract award, contract, purchase order, invoice, payment. As at 10 August 2026 no matching bill yet appears on the Oireachtas legislation record, which is consistent with a bill at pre-presentation stage; its text is not public, so what it specifies cannot yet be read.

[public-signal — sponsor's description] As described, the Bill addresses the chain-linkage problem; whether it also mandates a resolvable supplier identifier will be knowable only when the text publishes — though the sponsor's own tracker argues for exactly that. If it does, the Bill could provide the statutory vehicle for the recommendation above, and we would welcome it as such. If it does not, the gap this briefing identifies stands open on both the executive and the legislative track. Either way, legislation and independent measurement are complements, not rivals: a statute can create the obligation; only a dated, independent baseline shows whether it changed what is actually published.

05 · Which commitments are measurable as drafted

Every one of the 51 actions carries a KPI. Reading them as an instrument rather than as prose, one is a quantified outcome target: contracts incorporating social considerations rising toward 10% by the end of the Strategy, with an evaluation in 2029. The rest are outputs and activities — sessions held, guidance published, groups established, reviews completed, plans redesigned.

Some are not testable as drafted. A3.7's KPI, in full, is that the Department will *observe an increase in the quality of data over the lifetime of the Strategy*. There is no baseline, no metric, no target and no method. It cannot be objectively assessed as passed or failed. The same applies to the KPIs for A2.2, A2.12, A5.1, A5.7 and A5.8.

Two of the 51 are conditional on a date the State does not control: A5.2 and A5.3 both commit to acting *within six months of publication of the legal text* of the revised EU regime. The European Parliament's legislative tracker records that proposal as announced, indicatively Q2 2026, updated to Q3, with the Commission's own indicated date of 1 July having **slipped to 9 September 2026**; the roadmap signed in April sets Q4 2027 as the target for concluding negotiations. **[verified — EP tracker last updated 20 June 2026; checked 10 August 2026]**

There is a precedent worth stating carefully, because the Strategy itself relies on it: Pillar 5 grounds Ireland's EU negotiating position in Action 25 of the Accelerating Infrastructure Report and Action Plan. That taskforce publishes its minutes. The most recent published set is dated 2 March 2026, and the only status statement in the published record is that all actions required under Q4 2025 had been *commenced or completed*, with Q1 2026 actions on track. Commenced and completed are reported as one category. The same minutes record a commitment to move to action-by-action reporting. **[verified — minutes read 10 August 2026; completion percentages circulating elsewhere do not appear in the published record and are not cited here]**

An action-completion rate is not an outcome measure. A strategy can report that everything required has been commenced or completed while publishing nothing about whether anything got better. Section 06 is our answer to that, applied to ourselves as much as to anyone.

Section III of the Strategy states that the need for baseline data to test progress and KPIs against was integral to its development. We agree, and note that no baseline figures appear in the document. **[verified]**

06 · What we will measure, and when

We are not proposing an independent measurement. One is running.

Since July we have maintained a catalogue of Irish public bodies and their disclosure surfaces, with a weekly automated check across those in scope, a retention ledger that records when published files disappear or get replaced, and a byte-level capture layer so that what a body published on a given date can still be produced afterwards. The instrument was built to answer our own questions. The Strategy has now given it a set of dated commitments to test.

Against A3.2's own timetable, we will publish:

1. **End Q3 2026** — whether the pilot platform exists, and what it contains.
2. **Q4 2026** — whether the publicly accessible website is live, whether its metrics are downloadable, and whether the underlying data is machine-readable.
3. **Q2 2027** — whether spend metrics are present, how much of State spend the data-sharing agreements actually cover against the ~80% aim, and **whether any supplier field in it resolves**.
4. **Annually to 2030** — a re-score of the disclosure layer on the same five dimensions, from the same fixed, already-published sample, extended to the wider publisher population as inspection capacity allows.

The rubric is fixed and published in advance, before the first of those dates. That is deliberate: a metric invented after the result is known is not a measurement.

We will publish what improves as prominently as what does not. This briefing is the first demonstration of that: three of our July findings have moved in the right direction and the movement leads the piece.

One commitment we deliberately leave aside here: Pillar 5's feasibility study, due by end Q4 2026, for a central procurement arrangement for AI supporting the National Digital and AI Strategy 2030, with a stated intention to embed transparency, ethics, sustainability and data protection from the outset. That deserves its own treatment, and we will return to it against its own deadline.

07 · Disclosure

Amata Consulting builds procurement intelligence commercially, and it builds it out of exactly the fragmented disclosures this briefing describes. The harder that data is to assemble, the more a firm that has already assembled it is worth. We have said before that the State should make that part of our job unnecessary, and we repeat it.

The Strategy sharpens the conflict, because it commits to building a public analytics platform. So we are electing, on the record and before advocating anything about that platform's design:

Amata will not tender for the A3.2 analytics platform, or for work arising from the Strategy's transparency actions, during the Strategy period to 2030. That undertaking covers prime contracts, subcontracts and paid advisory roles to bidders alike. We are taking the auditor's role in this, not the supplier's.

Every finding generated by our own analysis is reproducible from the stated inputs; externally reported claims are identified and sourced separately. The notebook is unchanged from the July study, both input files are hashed below, and the methods package is available on request. Where we have named a body, it was named in already-published work. Any body or individual described here may exercise a right of reply and we will publish corrections in the same place as the original.

Appendix A · Method and verification

Label key. **[verified]** — confirmed by us against a primary source, with the method and date stated. **[public-signal]** — publicly asserted by a party and not independently audited. **Tier 2** — self-reported by the publisher of the source. **[inference]** — reasoned from evidence, not directly confirmed.

Strategy text. Three surfaces were verified. (1) The 13 plain-text collection pages on gov.ie, rendered in a browser and read from the live DOM on 10 August 2026, not fetched programmatically; per-page character counts and the full keyword sweep are held in the verification record. (2) The Strategy's consolidated All Actions PDF, opened in-browser on 10 August 2026 and swept after text extraction, with ligature-broken variants included as search patterns; positive controls (the full KPI set, pillar labels, the Data Space references) confirmed the extraction before any absence was recorded. (3) The full design-edition PDF: its front sections extract cleanly by machine, its designed body pages do not, and it contains at least one statistics page absent from the plain-text edition — so it was verified by **manual search of the complete document** on 10 August 2026: seven terms (identifier, unique, purchase order, tax reference, registration number, OCDS, Spend and Tendering), **zero occurrences across the full file**. The zero-occurrence findings therefore hold across all three surfaces; surfaces (1) and (2) between them carry every action, lead body, timeline and KPI. Structure confirmed against the Department's press release of 5 August 2026: 15 objectives, 51 actions.

Absence claims. Every statement in this briefing that something does not appear in the Strategy rests on browser-grade rendering with the method and date recorded, never on an automated fetch.

Other sources rendered and dated 10 August 2026: the OGP's Spend and Tendering Analysis reports page (latest edition covers 2019; page last updated 28 June 2022); the Accelerating Infrastructure Taskforce collection and its three most recent published minutes; StateSpend.ie overview, methodology and supplier-name pages; the European Parliament's legislative tracker for the Public Procurement Act; and the Oireachtas legislation record.

Appendix B · Computation

Notebook: `po_transparency_notebook.py`, unchanged from the July study. SHA-256 3201c834f3674fdea793857a0ec64f4174b6bcea31b8f310279083c00ca19ab1.

Input	Retrieved	SHA-256
Public_Procurement_Opendata_Dataset.csv	19 July 2026	ab6905ca668b9c91950385870e940189dd4eff2b051f74b3c1fc2d489c01b37c
Public_Procurement_Opendata_Dataset_2026-08-10.csv	10 August 2026	0c7a52980d381ad82f7e52f1b0e21bed78a2e9ad1f22db09881e6d7c786f8cbc

The notebook was first run against the July input and reproduced every published figure exactly before being run against the new snapshot. Filters are printed in the notebook: an awarded record is one whose Award Published field is non-blank after whitespace strip; a supplier is named where Awarded Suppliers is non-blank; the threshold split uses the dataset's own Platform and Threshold Level fields. The quarter-restricted and current-platform analyses in section 03 are supplementary to the notebook and their filters are stated in the accompanying script.

One departure from the notebook, stated. The notebook's distinct-supplier-string count splits the "Awarded Suppliers" field on ";". That under-atomises: the field's primary delimiter is "|", and a large number of ";" characters occur inside HTML entities rather than as separators. The corrected rule — entity-unescape, remove the ";;;" artefact, split on "|" and on ";", strip whitespace — yields 16,738 distinct strings for the July file against the notebook's 16,597, and is the rule used for both columns of that row in section 03. The correction was established in our July entity-resolution work and is applied here for consistency, not introduced for this briefing.

Source: Office of Government Procurement, Public Procurement Opendata Dataset, redistributed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0.

Sources

- [01] Procuring for our Future: National Public Procurement Strategy 2026–2030 — landing page and the 13 plain-text collection pages — <https://www.gov.ie/en/office-of-government-procurement/publications/procuring-for-our-future-national-public-procurement-strategy-2026-2030/>
- [02] All Actions PDF — https://assets.gov.ie/static/documents/f4d7ecca/20260804_National_Public_Procurement_Strategy_2026-2030_Actions_PDF.pdf
- [03] Full Strategy PDF — https://assets.gov.ie/static/documents/621ffc7d/20260805_National_Public_Procurement_Strategy_2026-2030_WEB_3.pdf
- [04] DPER press release, 5 August 2026 — <https://www.gov.ie/en/departments-of-public-expenditure-infrastructure-public-service-reform-and-digitalisation/press-releases/government-publishes-irelands-first-national-public-procurement-strategy/>
- [05] OGP Public Procurement Opendata Dataset, collection page (last updated 7 August 2026) — <https://www.gov.ie/en/office-of-government-procurement/collections/opendata/>
- [06] Dáil PQ No. 404, 22 January 2025 (universal supplier identifier) — <https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/question/2025-01-22/404/>

- [07] Dáil grouped answers, 25 February 2025 (publication-compliance monitoring) — <https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/question/2025-02-25/336/>
- [08] StateSpend.ie — overview, methodology and supplier-names pages, captured 10 August 2026 — <https://statespend.ie/> · <https://statespend.ie/methodology> · <https://statespend.ie/supplier-names>
- [09] EU Public Procurement Data Space — <https://www.public-procurement-data-space.europa.eu/en/about> · eForms — <https://ted.europa.eu/en/simap/eforms>
- [10] European Parliament Legislative Train Schedule, Public Procurement Act (tracker last updated 20 June 2026; checked 10 August 2026) — <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/legislative-train/theme-a-new-plan-for-europe-s-sustainable-prosperity-and-competitiveness/file-public-procurement-act>
- [11] Accelerating Infrastructure Taskforce — collection and published minutes (2 March 2026, 29 January 2026, 27 November 2025; read 10 August 2026) — <https://www.gov.ie/en/department-of-public-expenditure-infrastructure-public-service-reform-and-digitalisation/collections/accelerating-infrastructure-taskforce-meetings/>
- [12] OGP Spend and Tendering Analysis Reports (page last updated 28 June 2022) — <https://www.gov.ie/en/office-of-government-procurement/publications/ogp-spend-and-tendering-analysis-reports/>
- [13] Oireachtas legislation record, bill-title check (2025: 85 bills; 2026: 82 bills; queried 10 August 2026) — <https://api.oireachtas.ie/v1/legislation>
- [14] Amata July study, methods annex, reproduction notebook and hashed inputs — available on request: hello@aifactor.ie

Produced with AI assistance under the editorial review and responsibility of the authors · hello@aifactor.ie