

Table 0.1. Summary Assessment

Phase / Institution		Institutional Strength	Effectiveness	Importance Priority	Rec.	
A. Planning	1	Fiscal rules	Medium: Permanent fiscal rules are in place but capital spending is not excluded from the budget balance rule.	Low: The target is not likely to be achieved, and there is not a published path to meet the debt target.	High	1
	2	National and sectoral planning	Low: No national strategy and very few sectoral strategies in place.	Low: No national planning process and plans are costed	Medium	1
	3	Central-local coordination	High: Local council's investment plans are planned together with central government.	High: Local council's do not borrow and their investment plans are mostly coordinated with central government.	NA	NA
	4	Public-private partnerships	Low: There is no PPP framework or PPP strategy or criteria for entering into PPPs.	Low: Information on, and oversight of, PPP liabilities is relatively limited.	High	2
	5	Regulation of infrastructure companies	Medium: semi-autonomous regulators set prices for the main public utilities.	Medium: Some utility markets have private sector companies operating in them.	NA	NA
B. Allocation	6	Multi-year budgeting	Medium: The annual budget documentation contains multi-year projections of capital spending.	Low: Ceilings on capital expenditure are not set during the budget preparation process and full costs of projects are not disclosed.	High	3
	7	Budget comprehensiveness	Medium: The budget presents a relatively comprehensive picture of capital investments.	Medium: Absence of consolidated information on capital investments weakens fiscal analysis.	High	2
	8	Budget unity	Medium: Classification captures current and capital. Capital and recurrent budgets are not prepared together and future recurrent costs are not budgeted for.	Low: Some current expenditure recorded as capital. Lack of funding for operations and maintenance	Medium	4
	9	Project appraisal	Low: Little central guidance on appraisal criteria, and no evidence of systematic cost-benefit analysis	Low: There is limited use of feasibility studies and risk analysis.	High	5
	10	Project selection	Low: There are no published selection criteria or transparent processes for selection	Low: No pipeline of vetted projects for future funding consideration. This can result in lower and less efficient project selection.	High	6
C. Implementation	11	Protection of investment	Medium: Information on total project costs included in the budget. Virements subject to MOFT approval. Carry over not authorized.	Low: No appropriation act. Persistent under-execution of capital expenditure. Significant reallocation of expenditure during the fiscal year penalizing investment.	High	10
	12	Availability of funding	Medium: Most donor funding in TSA. No cash flow forecasts and project outlays are frequently subject to cash rationing resulting in significant delays in project implementation.	Low: Poor cash forecasting and management leading to the unavailability of cash for budget execution, leading to accumulation of arrears.	High	10
	13	Transparency of execution	Low: Many major projects not tendered using the NTB process; limited public access to procurement information. Project monitoring varied at line ministry level, limited external audit.	Low: Fragmented procurement procedures. At central level weak monitoring of physical progress and central monitoring by MOFT, audit findings not systematically analyzed.	High	7
	14	Project management	Low: Project managers formally assigned, project adjustments do not require fundamental review, no ex-post evaluations conducted.	Low: In practice, project management relies on consultants. Significant cost overruns and delays experienced. Limited learning from failed projects.	High	8
	15	Assets accounting	Low: Asset registers record moveable assets but not infrastructures. No reevaluation and depreciation of fixed assets. Surveys not conducted.	Low: Assets are not effectively, recorded, used and maintained.	Low	8