Table 0.1. Georgia: Summary Assessment

Phase/Institution		ase/Institution	Institutional Design	Effectiveness	Reform Priority
A. Planning	1	Fiscal principles or rules	<b>High:</b> There are permanent legal limits for general government fiscal aggregates.	<b>Medium:</b> Fiscal policy is insufficiently predictable. The expenditure ceiling has been breached 3 years out of 4.	Medium
	2	National and sectoral plans	<b>Low:</b> The only national and sectoral strategies are not comprehensive and only cover new initiatives.	<b>Low:</b> The strategies' definitions of public investment objectives are not consistent with efficient investment.	High
	3	Coordination between entities	Medium: Capital transfers from CG to SNGs are on a project-by-project basis, but with a high degree of co-ordination. No formal reporting process of contingent liabilities to central gov.	Medium: Estimated contingent liabilities are disclosed with central gov. budget documents. Contingent liabilities of PCs (20.6% GDP) and PPAs (33.7% GDP).	Low
	4	Project appraisal	<b>Low:</b> Projects not funded by donors are not subject to a standard appraisal process or methodology.	<b>Low:</b> On average, 60% of projects are domestically funded. The new PIM methodology has not yet been implemented.	High
	5	Alternative infrastructure financing	<b>Medium:</b> There is limited or no competition in most infrastructure markets. Monitoring of PCs fragmented.	Medium: PPP law approved, but regulatory framework not completed. PCs monitoring improving, but investment not addressed.	High
B. Allocation	6	Multi-year budgeting	<b>Medium:</b> Multi-year capital ceilings are not identified separately, and total construction costs are not published.	<b>Low:</b> Total construction costs beyond the BDD framework for major projects are not actively provided or updated in the system.	Medium
	7	Budget comprehensivenes s and unity	<b>Medium:</b> Investments undertaken through extra-budgetary entities without disclosure or legislative authorization.	<b>Medium:</b> Investments outside of the budget process are significant, but information reported in FRS.	Low
	8	Budgeting for investment	<b>Medium:</b> There are no mechanisms to give priority to on-going capital projects in the budget process.	Medium: informally, ministries inform MOF of on-going capital project expenditures for future budget years.	Medium
	9	Maintenance funding	<b>Low:</b> No standard methodology for maintenance requirements or to track maintenance funding.	Medium: Maintenance in the roads sector has a methodology, which has led to increased maintenance budgets.	High
	10	Project selection	<b>Low:</b> No standard project selection procedures and there is no project pipeline in place.	Low: there is no evidence that the new PIM selection procedures are getting ready to be implemented soon.	High
C. Implementation	11	Procurement	<b>High</b> : procurement system is open and transparent. E-procurement system enables monitoring and tracking of complaints.	<b>Medium</b> : Complaint review board not independent and analytical reports can be improved.	Medium
	12	Availability of funding	<b>High:</b> Flexible commitment rules and good cash management for domestic and donor funds.	<b>High:</b> No case in recent years of payments being delayed due to lack of funds.	Low
	13	Portfolio management and oversight	<b>Medium</b> : Physical and financial monitoring not performed systematically; no ex post reviews; flexible re-allocation.	<b>Medium</b> : Project reallocations of all types (incl. econ class) were 43 percent of MRDI's capital budget in 2016.	High
	14	Project implementation	<b>Low</b> : No implementation plans prepared; no guidance on project adjustments; ex-post audits irregular.	<b>Low</b> : No individual project audits were completed by SAO during 2015-2017.	High
	15	Management of public assets	<b>Medium</b> : Assets registered but without revaluation; non-financial assets and depreciation in financial statements.	<b>Medium</b> : SAO verifies ministry asset records on sample basis.	Medium