

**Table 1. PIMA Summary Assessment for Tajikistan**

Phase/Institution		Institutional Strength	Effectiveness	Reform priority	
A. Planning	1	<b>Fiscal targets and rules</b>	MEDIUM. Fiscal targets and rules covering most of the budget exist, but do not distinguish new and ongoing projects.	MEDIUM. Fiscal balances and budget allocations have deviated somewhat from fiscal rules and MTFE forecasts.	Low
	2	<b>National and sectoral planning</b>	MEDIUM. Plans guiding national and major sector decisions exist but, at project level, cover only externally funded projects.	MEDIUM. Plans exist and are regularly updated but are not prepared with financial constraints and not costed accurately.	High
	3	<b>Coordination between entities</b>	MEDIUM. SNGs discuss their projects with central government. Financial transfers to SNGs are not rule-based.	MEDIUM. Financial transfers to SNGs are unpredictable, and there are gaps in reporting of contingent liabilities.	Low
	4	<b>Project appraisal</b>	MEDIUM. Appraisal requires rigorous assessments and risk assessment but no risk mitigation.	LOW. Rigorous appraisal is conducted of externally financed projects but not internally financed projects.	High
	5	<b>Alternative infrastructure financing</b>	LOW. The legal framework does not support private investment in most infrastructure markets, or coordination with SOEs or PPPs.	MEDIUM. Private investment is occurring in some sectors. Informal coordination with SOE investment plans is effective.	Medium
B. Allocation	6	<b>Multi-year budgeting</b>	MEDIUM. Medium-term indicative capital spending ceilings are issued but individual project costs are not published.	MEDIUM. Approved capital budgets resemble the previously published ceilings but changes in project costs are not explained.	Low
	7	<b>Budget comprehensiveness and unity</b>	MEDIUM. No extra-budgetary entities. The budget includes externally financed projects but not PPPs or SOE projects.	MEDIUM. Legal requirements are adhered to. SOE quasi-fiscal activities remove public interest spending from the budget.	Low
	8	<b>Budgeting for investment</b>	MEDIUM. Project funding is generally protected, but total project costs are not published.	MEDIUM. Ongoing projects are prioritized over new ones, but the public investment plan is not aligned with the MTEF.	Medium
	9	<b>Maintenance funding</b>	MEDIUM. Standard methodologies exist for roads but not buildings. Some maintenance spending can be identified in the budget.	LOW. Funding for routine maintenance and major improvements is low compared to need.	High
	10	<b>Project selection</b>	MEDIUM. Central review is required using published selection criteria but is applied only to externally financed projects.	LOW. Externally financed projects are selected from the PIP, internally financed projects and PPPs are not.	High
C. Implementation	11	<b>Procurement</b>	MEDIUM. Procurement law supports competition. A procurement database exists but there is no active independent complaints review.	MEDIUM. Processes are mostly open and competitive. Most internally financed projects are entered into the database.	Low
	12	<b>Availability of funding</b>	MEDIUM. Cash forecasting supports good planning for funding availability, but only for internally financed projects.	MEDIUM. Cash flow projections align closely with actual spending. Little evidence of cash rationing and levels of arrears are low.	Low
	13	<b>Portfolio management and oversight</b>	LOW. Inadequate regulatory framework for systematic monitoring of projects. Absence of guidelines for funds reallocation and ex-post review requirements.	LOW. Ineffective portfolio oversight due to lack of data, unproven reallocation benefits, and no ex-post reviews for major projects.	High
	14	<b>Management of project implementation</b>	MEDIUM. Clear project management responsibilities exist for externally financed projects but are lacking for internally financed ones.	MEDIUM. Major externally financed projects have implementation plans but lack adjustment data. No evidence for use of audit reports for systemic improvements.	Medium
	15	<b>Monitoring of public assets</b>	MEDIUM. A legally required asset register is not easily accessible. Depreciated non-financial assets are not regularly revalued.	MEDIUM. The information in the asset register is incomplete. Revaluation procedures are not enforced.	Medium

**Table 2. C-PIMA Summary Assessment for Tajikistan**

Phase/Institution			Institutional Strength	Reform priority
<b>PIMA Climate Change</b>	<b>C1</b>	<b>Climate-aware planning</b>	MEDIUM. NDC Implementation Plan is in place, but climate is not integrated into spatial and urban planning and construction regulations or public investment guidance.	<b>Medium</b>
	<b>C2</b>	<b>Coordination between entities</b>	MEDIUM. Decision-making on public investment is coordinated from a climate change perspective, but guidance for SNGs and integration of SOEs is limited.	<b>Low</b>
	<b>C3</b>	<b>Project appraisal and selection</b>	LOW. Climate change is not included in the appraisal process or in selection criteria. Exposure of PPPs to climate change is not an element in PPP regulation.	<b>High</b>
	<b>C4</b>	<b>Budgeting and portfolio management</b>	LOW. Budget documents do not identify climate-related investment expenditures. Ex-post audits and asset management policies inadequately reference climate.	<b>High</b>
	<b>C5</b>	<b>Risk management</b>	MEDIUM. Disaster risk strategy provides qualitative analysis of climate risks, and contingencies exist, but the statement of fiscal risks does not address climate.	<b>Medium</b>