

Table 0. Public Investment Management Assessment: Summary Heatmap

Phase / Institution		Institutional Strength	Effectiveness	Rec.	
A. Planning	1	Fiscal rules	Strong: Debt rule since 2009, deficit rule in effect since 2014, with an investment clause and automatic adjustment mechanism.	Medium: In 2014, the deficit exceeded the ceiling by 0.4 percent of GDP within the margin, despite under execution of capital spending.	5, 6
	2	National and sectoral planning	Good: National development under preparation; multiplicity of sectoral strategies with some performance measures.	Low: Around 80 sectoral strategies are in place, without clear coordination and incomplete costing.	1, 4
	3	Central-local coordination	Medium: Debt limits constrain debt for municipalities; information for municipalities timely; no rule-based allocation of capital transfers.	Medium: In 2014, optimistic projections of own revenues of 6 million result in corresponding under execution of capital spending for municipalities.	
	4	Public-private partnerships	Good: PPPs guided by strategy within strong institutional and legal framework, but not included in MTBF or budget documentation.	High: Existing PPPs capital stock account for 1.2 percent of GDP, but several projects planned. Fiscal risks currently low.	2
	5	Regulation of infrastructure companies	Good: Regulatory framework supports competition; prices set by independent regulators; weak financial oversight assessment of fiscal risks of POEs.	Medium: Challenges to regulators' independence. Public investment of POEs account for 0.1 percent of GDP, but fiscal risks not assessed.	2
B. Allocation	6	Multi-year budgeting	Good: Multi-year ceilings of capital spending are published based on not published projections of full cost of capital projects, but not binding.	Low: There are large discrepancies between MTBF ceilings and budget allocations (22 percent for n+2).	1, 3
	7	Budget comprehensiveness	Medium: Budget incorporates loans and co-financed donor funding, but not externally financed grants and PPPs.	High: Externally financed projects not in the budget less than 3% of total capital spending; extra-budgetary capital spending is insignificant.	2
	8	Budget unity	Good: Budgets disclose capital and current appropriations in a single document in line with GFS, but project specific information is not disclosed.	Low: Auditor General qualified the 2014 financial statements because of 5 percent misclassifications of current as capital spending.	4
	9	Project appraisal	Medium: The methodology is comprehensive; but results not published and limited risk analysis.	Medium: MoF and BOs lack resources to undertake the required analysis.	5
	10	Project selection	Medium: Most project selection carried out by BOs, broadly in line with criteria in PIP Manual; but role of MoF weak and no legal basis.	Low: Weak and fragmented decision making on project prioritization and selection contributes to the 45 percent efficiency gap.	5, 6
C. Implementation	11	Protection of investment	Low: Projects appropriated on annual basis only, no restrictions on virements, and restricted carryovers.	Medium: Average under execution of the annual budget was 10 percent, in line with regional average.	3
	12	Availability of funding	Good: Cash flows planed quarterly and generally released in time, but some grants outside TSA.	Medium: 1.1 percent of capital spending is in arrears, but total arrears are 2 percent of GDP in 2014.	
	13	Transparency of execution	Medium: Procurement law in line with internet standards; quarterly monitoring; limited ex post audit of projects.	Low: Court proceedings limit ex post audits of projects to donor-funded projects.	8
	14	Project management	Medium: Major projects have project managers; adjustment rules generally in place; no ex post reviews.	Medium: In 2012 and 2013, around one fourth of the projects had delays.	7
	15	Assets accounting	Good: Nonfinancial assets regularly surveyed, depreciated and reported annually.	Medium: Poor data quality, e.g. mismatch of between capital spending and stocks of 33 percent.	