

Table 2. Map Summarizing the Outcomes of the PIMA in Gabon

Pillars/Institutions		Institutional strength	Effectiveness	Priority of reforms
1	Fiscal targets and rules	High: Standing CEMAC rules and others derived from the program with the IMF govern fiscal policy and debt sustainability. A fiscal framework is drawn up when the annual budget law is being prepared.	Medium: Implementation and observance of fiscal rules varies. The effectiveness of the macro-fiscal framework appears to be weak: there are major discrepancies vis-a-vis the budget proposal.	**
2	National and sectoral planning	Weak: The national strategy does not specify projects or their costs. Sectoral documents contain heterogeneous information with no overall rationale. None of the documents contains performance frameworks.	Weak: Project costs are not appraised in the PSGE. They are estimated by the ministries and then more reliably established after being included in the budget. Performance frameworks are shown in the draft annual performance plans (PAP) appended to the budget proposal.	***
3	Coordination between entities	Weak: Local governments have strategy documents, which include lists of projects but are not published. There is no clearly established system for allocating funding. Contingent liabilities are not identified, tracked or monitored.	Weak: Local government participation in the implementation of public investment projects is very limited and transfers to them are, in practice, scant.	**
4	Project appraisal	Weak: There are rules about conducting project evaluations, but they are not binding. They do not provide for risk analysis or the identification of systematic mitigation measures.	Weak: Prior appraisal of projects is not practiced: projects are usually appraised after being included in the budget. Risk assessments are not systematic.	***
5	Alternative infrastructure financing	Medium: Several independent economic regulators have been in place for a number of years now. The extent to which large infrastructure contracts are open to competition varies. There is no national strategy with regard to PPPs.	Weak: Competition appears to be limited, as is the effective role of regulators. The legal framework for procurement is incomplete. The PPP unit is in place but not yet fully up and running.	**
6	Multiyear budgeting	Medium: The LOLFEB has introduced three-year budgeting covering investment expenditure. It provides for indicative multi-year ceilings, broken down by program. No annual splitting of costs over a three-to-five year period is specified.	Weak: The DOCAMAB, which is not published, contains aggregate multiyear forecasts of capital expenditure. Budget documentation does not include the total cost of projects.	***
7	Budget comprehensiveness and unity	Fiscal comprehensiveness and unity are required by the LOLFEB, with complete publication of investment expenditure. According to the regulations, the Ministry of Finance and the Budget is responsible for drawing up the budget in accordance with rules governing the presentation of operating and investment expenses.	Medium: The budget documents show most internally and externally financed investment expenditures. They do not include investments carried out by autonomous public entities or those financed under PPP contracts.	**
8	Budgeting for investment	Medium: The provisions in the LOLFEB safeguard investment expenditure. Procedures currently in effect accord priority to projects already under way, but they are not formalized in any official documents.	Weak: Budgeting in CA and PA is not practiced effectively and investment expenditure can serve as an adjustment variable in the event of budget constraints.	**
9	Maintenance funding	Weak: There is no standard methodology for estimating and programming current maintenance expenses and those devoted to major improvements.	Weak: The budget does not include routine maintenance outlays. Only road upkeep expenditure is identified, even though estimates for it are not based on any particular methodology.	***
10	Project selection	Weak: The institutional framework for project selection and prioritization is patchy. The Government has no centralized list of already appraised projects.	Weak: The criteria and procedures for effective selection and prioritization of projects are insufficient and not published.	***
11	Procurement	Weak: The legal framework requires openness and transparency in procurement and an equitable and effective process for reviewing complaints, but says too little about monitoring of contracts. The independence of ARMP is not guaranteed by aw.	Weak: Most contracts are private arrangement, direct deals, without enough transparency and monitoring of procurement contracts, and procurement-related complaints are not fairly reviewed.	***
12	Availability of funding	Medium: The regulatory framework does not do enough to correlate programming and management tools and keep track of payment times, but it does require donors'/creditors' funds to be kept in the TSA.	Weak: Commitment ceilings are not notified in good time; expenditures are subject to severe cash flow constraints, and donors' and creditors' accounts are kept outside BEAC.	***
13	Portfolio management and oversight	Weak: The regulatory framework provides for physical and financial monitoring, but falls short when it comes to centralization. Transfers of appropriations do not function and ex post reviews are not conducted in practice.	Weak: Major projects are monitored but the information is not pooled or centralized. Appropriations are not transferred, nor is there any ex post review of domestically financed projects.	***
14	Management of project implementation	Medium: Donors' and creditors' procedures and the national regulatory framework prescribe management rules, but the institutional framework is insufficient for adjustments and external ex post project audits.	Weak: Management of project implementation is effective. Adjustments carried out are not standardized and a posteriori auditing of major projects is not the norm.	**
15	Monitoring of Public Assets	Medium: The institutional framework for asset accounting does not function, even though the general accounting framework is in line with best international practices	Weak: Records of assets are neither complete nor up-to-date. The financial statements showing the value of nonfinancial assets and depreciation are not yet reliable.	**

Note: *** = high priority, ** = medium priority, * = low priority.