**BCOP PEMPAL Pre-event Survey**

The survey was organized on the initiative of the Budget Community of Practice (BCOP) Executive Committee and was designed to collect compatible information from all member countries who are participating in BCOP.

As part of the new PEMPAL Strategy, it was decided to collect baseline information on what countries perceive is the overall impact of BCOP on their reforms as a way to demonstrate to donors and other stakeholders the value of the program and whether it is improving over time. It was also decided to document more formally the priorities of member countries, and how they are then prioritized and reflected in the BCOP Action Plan.

The survey collecting responses from the 2nd of March till the 22nd of March, 2017.

The survey was designed in 3 languages: English, Russian, and Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian.

Links to online version of the survey - <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/HDQ2CWN> and <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/YCX79XG>

Invitations to take part in the survey were sent to all BCOP member countries.

Representatives of 18 countries (out of a total possible 21 members) started to fill in the questionnaire in electronic format: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina (BiH), Bulgaria, Croatia, Georgia, Kosovo, Kyrgyz Republic, Moldova, Montenegro, Russian Federation, Romania, Serbia, Turkey, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan.

Only one response per country was requested. However, for the purposes of this survey, we analyzed 19 responses (i.e. two from BiH from Federation (F) and State (S) levels which were combined as one country response where feasible but with both responses included where they differed).

The survey consisted of 11 questions.

**Monitoring the impact of the PEMPAL Strategy 2017-22**

***Q1. What country are you from? (Only one response is required per country)***

***Q2. What areas of reforms has PEMPAL’s BCOP assisted your country?***

All 18 countries responded to this question.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Program and Performance Budgeting** | **Budget Literacy** | **Fiscal and Budget Transparency** | **Fiscal Consolidation** | **Wage Bill management** | **Capital budgeting** | **EU funds management** | **Budget reporting** | **Other** |
| **Albania** | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |  |
| **Armenia** | x | x | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Azerbaijan** |  | x |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |
| **Belarus** | x |  | X | x |  | x |  |  |  |
| **BiH (State and Federal levels)** | X (F) (S) | X (F) | X (F) |  | X (S) |  |  |  | IT systems for preparing the budget. (BiH State) |
| **Bulgaria** | x | x | x | x |  |  |  | x |  |
| **Croatia** | x | x | x |  |  |  |  | x |  |
| **Georgia** | x | x |  |  | x | x |  | x |  |
| **Kosovo** | x | x | x |  |  |  |  | x |  |
| **Kyrgyz Republic** | x |  | x |  | x |  |  |  |  |
| **Moldova** | x | x | x | x | x | x |  |  |  |
| **Montenegro** |  |  | x | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Romania** | x | x | x |  | x | x |  |  |  |
| **Russia** | x | x | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Serbia** | x |  | x | x |  |  |  | x |  |
| **Turkey** | x | x | x |  |  |  |  | x |  |
| **Ukraine** | x | x |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Uzbekistan** | x | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **18** | **16** | 14 | 14 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 1 |

***Q3. Please elaborate on how PEMPAL has affected your reform progress in the areas you have chosen above (for inclusion in a possible success story.)***

17 countries (with the exception of Azerbaijan) responded to this question.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country** |  |
| **Albania** | PFM reform is one of the most important reforms in Albania, and PEMPAL events have almost covered all the issues that we are addressing. |
| **Armenia** | Presented country experience in these fields (with their challenges and advantages) has helped a lot during our reforms.  Thanks to the PEMPAL program, in Armenia the prerequisites were created for implementation of our reform on introduction of program and performance budgetary planning and budgeting. Goal of this reform is to provide our government with more qualified information about those services and immediate results that must be received in return of budgetary allocations. The main components of program and performance budgeting were fixed at the legislative level, in particular by introducing amendments to the RA Law "On the RA Budget System" (amendments to the above mentioned law were adopted by RA National Assembly on 30.04.2013), and program and performance planning and budgeting were fixed, as an obligatory condition for budgeting. In 2015 the Government of Armenia approved a strategy of full implementation of the program and performance budgeting system in the Republic of Armenia. |
| **Belarus** | It is rather difficult to identify the direct influence of the PEMPAL project to the course of reforms in our country (but of course, the methodological assistance is significant). PEMPAL program is useful for the Budget department in terms of reviews with country experience in the relevant spheres, which was used, among other things, in developing a strategy for reforming public finances. In addition, significant influence was rendered within the framework of TCOP (IT group). |
| **BiH (State and Federation levels)** | State level: Program and performance budgeting is a reform process which is currently being implemented and it is one of the key priorities of the B&H Public Institution Management Reform Strategy. Based on the acquired knowledge and experience shared with representatives of other PEMPAL countries (last workshop was held in Paris in 2016), the Ministry of Finance and Treasury of Bosnia and Herzegovina has initiated activities to redefine the program structure of spending units, establish a clear link with strategic/mid-term plans of B&H institutions, and redefine performance indicators. The Ministry of Finance is basing its work with users on PEMPAL recommendations when it comes to simplifying the system, enlarging programs, defining a smaller number of measurable indicators (separating the indicators which institutions need for internal monitoring from those which are representative of the institution in terms of the end user). Following Georgia's example and its IT system for budget management and planning, the B&H Public Institution Management Reform Strategy has now included the goal of improving the IT system and linking the budget planning and execution systems, as well as the system for the Public investment Program.  Federation level: By exchanging the experience and practical examples from PEMPAL countries, we have significantly improved our knowledge and capabilities with the goal of implementing program budgeting first and foremost, but also to simultaneously advance other aspects of public financial management. |
| **Bulgaria** | On the basis of shared experience on good practices and initiatives, decisions affecting the budgetary process have been taken and the quality of budget documents has been increased, including in the area of performance budgeting and fiscal transparency. |
| **Croatia** | Since we joined the PEMPAL network in 2006, the exchange of knowledge with other PEMPAL member countries and the presentations given by experts from more developed countries and international institutions have helped us a lot in the budget reforms which we are implementing in Croatia. This has been particularly evident in the development of budget literacy and fiscal and budget transparency, as well as budget reporting. We benefit greatly from comparisons with other countries, where we can see what we do well and what areas need improvement. We have identified our shortcomings and learned how to resolve them. We have also made great improvements in the areas of program budgeting and performance budgeting, even though there is still a lot to be done. However, we have also seen how more developed countries struggle with performance budgeting and that this is a long-term process which requires a lot of effort and patience. When it comes to the management of EU funds, I believe we have been of help to other countries which are preparing for EU membership. In this aspect we are contributing to achieving PEMPAL's goal, which is mutual learning - we learn from others and they learn from us. We have learned to implement changes gradually, with a gradual development of capacities and engaging local experts, whereby it is very important to communicate with other participants in the process who need to understand the objective of the reform. It is always beneficial to hear other ideas, even if these may not be currently applicable in our country. |
| **Georgia** | International practice and experience of other countries were considered that helped us to create our own normative base |
| **Kosovo** | Unfortunately, Kosovo has still not managed to utilize PEMPAL assistance on the adoption of program and performance budgeting. However, PEMPAL assistance in budget literacy and transparency has prompted the Ministry of Finance, in cooperation with other local donors, to draft the citizen friendly budget from 2017 and onwards. |
| **Kyrgyz Republic** | We were using the knowledge received during the BCOP PEMPAL events in a process of applying knowledge in program budgeting, increasing budget transparency and managing wage bill fund.  PEMPAL helped us expand our knowledge in wage bill management, we realized that we are one of those countries that need an automated human resource and wage bill management system. In addition, PEMPAL assisted us in accessing certain legislations in this field in other countries, which helped us with our own reform |
| **Moldova** | 1.Adopting of fiscal rules; 2. Preparation and publishing of citizen budget as Moldova become part of OBI survey; 3. Consolidation of program budgeting - reviewing the list of performance indicators and training of LPA's on this subject. |
| **Montenegro** | Experiences of other countries have contributed to our better understanding of topics discussed and indicated where we should pay attention. |
| **Romania** | Helping PEMPAL members who are current and candidate members of the European Union to discuss common public finance reform. |
| **Russia** | It was important for us to hear an opinion of the PEMPAL countries about their interest to and support for increasing the openness of budget data and budget literacy. Experience exchange, including the exchange with the Serbo-Croatian speaking countries, showed that Russian Federation occupies a worthy place among the PEMPAL countries and that the practical solutions that we developed independently are successfully applied in other countries (fixing in the budget legislation of norms on provision of budget data clearness by financial authorities; our region rating on budget data openness, and etc.). Also, due to the fact that the budget process in the CIS countries has much in common, certain practices / instruments (for example, citizen participation in the budget process in the Kyrgyz Republic) are applicable in our country. |
| **Serbia** | The Republic of Serbia moved from line-item budgeting to program budgeting in 2015. The Citizens Budget has been prepared and published. The Budget System Act has been amended to increase budget transparency. Fiscal consolidation measures have been successfully implemented. The realization of the aforementioned has been helped by the shared experience from other countries, as well as by direct conversations with representatives of ministries from other countries. |
| **Turkey** | Creating an environment that is conducive to exchanging information, practice and experience |
| **Ukraine** | Information obtained during our participation in the PEMPAL program was used in development of the documents aimed at increasing the transparency of public fund use. |
| **Uzbekistan** | The program let us study the prospective experience of other countries in the sphere of medium-term planning, as well as try to implement issues related to budget literacy at the level of informing the population about implement reforms and their involvement to budget planning. International experience and the study of this experience during study events and visits let us carry out a comparative analysis and inventory of our experience and regulations with the aim of adapting them in accordance with the world requirements and the positive experience of the countries encountered with problems in the course of reforms. Participation of our country in the program influenced the conclusion that it was necessary to accelerate reforms in our budget system. |

***Q4. To what extent has PEMPAL’s BCOP assisted in reforms***

All 18 countries responded to this question. Option “Other” was chosen by only two countries but not specified.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | High impact | Significant impact | Moderate impact | Low impact | N/a | Summary |
| Identifying and/or benchmarking good practices **inside** the PEMPAL region | AZ, BY, BiH(F), BG, KOS, RS, RU, TR | AL, AM, HR, KG, UZ | BiH(S), MD, ME | UA |  | HI - **8**  SI - 5  MI - 3  LI - 1 |
| Identifying and/or benchmarking good practices **outside** the PEMPAL region | GE, AM, KOS, MD, RU, RS, | AL, BG, HR, KG, TR, UZ | BiH(S) (F), RD, | AZ, BY, UA, ME |  | HI - **6**  SI - **6**  MI -2  LI - 4 |
| Providing access to technical information and knowledge resources in understandable languages | AZ, BY, BiH(F), KG, MD, RS, TR, UZ | AL, AM, HR, KOS, RU, ME | BiH(S), BG, | UA, |  | HI - **8**  SI - 6  MI - 2  LI - 1 |
| Providing opportunities to **discuss budget reform challenges/issues** with my peers in other Ministries of Finance | AM, BiH(F), KG, MD, | AL, AZ, BY, BG, HR, KOS, RU, RS, TR, UZ | UA, ME | BiH(S), |  | HI - 4  SI - **10**  MI - 2  LI - 1 |
| Providing opportunities to **discuss potential options/solutions to PFM problems** with my peers in other Ministries of Finance | AM, BiH(F), KG, MD, | AL, BY, BG, HR, KOS, RU, RS, TR, UZ | UA, ME | BiH(S), | AZ | HI - 4  SI - **9**  MI - 2  LI – 1, N/a - 1 |
| Providing opportunities to present my country’s progress and achievements | AM, AZ, BY, BiH(F), BG, MD, RD, UA, | AL, HR, KOS, RU, TR, UZ | BiH(S), KG, RS, ME |  |  | HI - **8**  SI - 6  MI - 4  LI - 0 |
| Strengthening capacities and/or confidence in leading/managing reforms | AM, BG, KOS, KG, RS, | AL, AZ, BiH(F), HR, TR, UZ | BY, BiH(S), MD, RU, ME | UA, |  | HI - 5  SI - **6**  MI - 5  LI - 1 |
| Strengthening my country’s budget related policy/legislative framework through examining frameworks in other countries shared during PEMPAL events. | AM, MD, RU, | AL, HR, KOS, KG, TR, UZ | AZ, BiH(F), BG, RS, UA, | BY, BiH(S), ME |  | HI - 3  SI - **6**  MI - 5  LI - 3 |
| Enabling creation of knowledge from PEMPAL region to inform other regions | AM, AZ, BY, BiH(F), BG, HR, KOS, KG, RS, UA, ME | AL, RU, TR, UZ | BiH(S), MD, |  |  | HI - **11**  SI - 4  MI - 2  LI - 0 |
| Other | TR | AL |  |  |  | HI - **1**  SI - **1** |

AL Albania, AM Armenia, AZ Azerbaijan, BY Belarus, BiH (F) Bosnia and Herzegovina Federation level, BiH (S) Bosnia and Herzegovina State level, BG Bulgaria, HR Croatia, GE Georgia, KOS Kosovo, KG Kyrgyz Republic, MD Moldova, ME Montenegro, RU Russian Federation, RD Romania, RS Serbia, TR Turkey, UA Ukraine, UZ Uzbekistan

***Q5. Please make an assessment of the overall impact that PEMPAL’s BCOP has had on your country’s budget related reforms: If you chose moderate to low impact, if possible, please provide a reason for this, and/or how we may be able to help your country in the future to ensure PEMPAL supports future reform needs.***

All 18 countries responded to this question. No one chose “Low impact”.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Overall impact** | **Reason** |
| **Albania** | Significant |  |
| **Armenia** | High |  |
| **Azerbaijan** | Significant |  |
| **Belarus** | High |  |
| **BiH (State and Federation levels)** | Moderate | State level: Considering the specificities of the country and the achieved reform levels, it would be useful to learn from the experience of the countries in the region, particularly in the areas of budget planning and monitoring, as well as defining and monitoring performance indicators.  Federation level: In order to implement certain reforms, especially in the area of public finances, strong political support is necessary, as well as improving the awareness of the decision maker of the need to implement reforms. |
| **Bulgaria** | Moderate | Part of the budget related reforms in Bulgaria has been conducted due to the requirements of the legislation of the European Union (for example, the adoption of the Public Finance Act - fiscal rules and limitations, medium-term budgetary framework, budgetary transparency, literacy and accountability - was as a result of the transposition of Directive EU/85/2011). |
| **Croatia** | Significant |  |
| **Georgia** | High |  |
| **Kosovo** | High |  |
| **Kyrgyz Republic** | Significant |  |
| **Moldova** | High |  |
| **Montenegro** | Moderate |  |
| **Romania** | High |  |
| **Russia** | High |  |
| **Serbia** | High |  |
| **Turkey** | High |  |
| **Ukraine** | Moderate | In order to increase the impact of PEMPAL BCOP on budget reform, we propose to provide participants with reports that are as close as possible to the presentation made in the related working groups. |
| **Uzbekistan** | High |  |
| **18** | **SI-4. HI- *10*, MI – 4, LI - 0** | |

**Developing the BCOP Action Plan for 2017-18 and Beyond**

***Q6. To assist the BCOP Executive Committee plan the BCOP Action Plan, please provide suggestions for specific topics to be addressed in the future at the annual plenary meetings (please specify two topics and provide an explanation of why these are important to your country).***

All 18 countries made suggestions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Suggestions** |
| **Albania** | 1) increasing value for money in budget process 2) Public Private partnership impact on budget process |
| **Armenia** | Program budgeting, assessment of non-financial indicators.  We propose the following topic for consideration at the next annual plenary meetings: Developing requirements for the format and content of information on indicators of program and performance planning and budgeting according to officially approved and published budget documents. The above topic is important for our country, since the direction of program budgeting was recognized as a priority in the Government Program of the Republic of Armenia for 2017. This direction was recognized as the most promising method for solving the most important state tasks, because this method is ensuring a unified approach to increasing the degree of validity, efficiency and effectiveness of public spending and promoting rational use of funds. |
| **Azerbaijan** | Financial relations between the state and local budgets, transfers |
| **Belarus** | 1.1. Development of main directions of fiscal policy 2. Budget classification 3. Extrabudgetary management system of general government |
| **BiH (State and Federation levels)** | State Level 1. program and performance budgeting with specific examples for planning programs, indicators and budget execution monitoring in the program format. 2. Citizens budget. These two topics have been planned within the framework of the Public Financial Management Reform Strategy, and they will be a priority for B&H in the upcoming period  Federation level 1. Strengthening fiscal coordination and fiscal reporting - for countries which have a complex constitutional or fiscal system, fiscal reporting is especially important because it helps to implement fiscal policy coordination and detect potential risks early. 2. Forming reserve funds which would be "filled" during prosperous times and serve as help in a crisis. Centralization vs. decentralization of the budget system - an issue raised in many countries which try to resolve the question of whether it is better and more efficient for spending units to be a part of the budget and treasury (which would lead to greater control, but also limit the operations of these institutions), or whether it would be more efficient to have many organizational units |
| **Bulgaria** | Role of the sectoral approach in the process of budgetary planning (performance budgeting and spending reviews) Expenditure prioritization process in the context of performance measurement and performance budgeting |
| **Croatia** | Including individual accrual data in the budget which is developed on the cash basis (information on the public debt, liabilities - outstanding and undue payments). The Croatian state budget is based on the cash basis, but we have begun to include information on liabilities in the state budget execution report. Strengthening accountability in public financial management. I believe this is a topic common to all PEMPAL countries, especially SEE countries. Software solution for linking budget planning and budget execution (perhaps a topic for another study visit which Croatia could host) |
| **Georgia** | 1. Long-term (capital) projects, selection criteria, risks and evaluation; 2. role and responsibility of line ministries in program-targeted budgeting |
| **Kosovo** | PEMPAL should focus on the discussion of best international practices for updating the Chart of Accounts used in the budget, as a tool to ensure consistency and transparency during the budget process |
| **Kyrgyz Republic** | 1) Monitoring and evaluation of expenditure effectiveness and the practical use of information on expenditure effectiveness; 2) Program classification of costs: approaches and its practical application. These topics are very relevant for the Kyrgyz Republic at the current stage of program budgeting implementing.  Automation of budget planning in the budget process |
| **Moldova** | 1. Spending reviews - there are very limited countries capacities to implement and perform reviews; 2. Consolidation of PPB, including monitoring and evaluation - the complexity of reform requires an continued development of both - methodology and skills of personnel |
| **Montenegro** | 1.Program budgeting - in Montenegro there is work on the reform program budget. 2. Medium term budget framework (MTBF) |
| **Romania** | - the effectiveness of budget programming; - comparison of budget appropriation (as a percentage of GDP) and the reasons for such allocations |
| **Russia** | 1. Increase the role of citizens in the budget process to develop local government potential and increase the effectiveness of budget expenditures. This topic is relevant for Russia in connection with expansion of the practices of proactive (participatory) budgeting in regions. 2. Implement of project principles / mechanisms in budget formation and execution. The topic is relevant in connection with implementation of certain priority projects in the framework of the overall budgetary consolidation along with the program budget |
| **Serbia** | 1. Spending reviews, 2. Capital budgeting |
| **Turkey** | Public Financial Management information systems |
| **Ukraine** | 1. "Public services as the main category of public expenditure assessment." We are interested in international experience regarding approaches to definition and classification of public services, standards for providing and evaluating the cost of services, displaying information about public services in budget documents. 2. "Fiscal risk management." This is one of the requirements for further cooperation with the IMF. Introduction of a fiscal risk management system in Ukraine will allow to improve the efficiency of public finance management, which is envisaged in the Strategy for Reforming the Public Finance Management System of Ukraine |
| **Uzbekistan** | Interbudgetary relations (effectiveness of local regional budgets at the level of the state budget), consolidated reporting and execution of the revenue part of the state budget |
| **18** |  |

***Q7. If your country is a member of the Budget Literacy and Transparency Working Group please provide details of sub-topics that should be considered for this group within the next BCOP Action Plan. Insert suggestions.***

***Q8. If your country is a member of the Program and Performance Budgeting Working Group please provide details of sub-topics that should be considered for this group within the next BCOP Action Plan. Insert suggestions.***

14 countries (With the exception of Azerbaijan, Georgia, Montenegro, Turkey) responded to these questions.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Budget Literacy and Transparency WG** | **Program and Performance Budgeting WG** |
| **Albania** | Gender budget inclusion | Fiscal risk impact on the budget consolidation |
| **Armenia** | Problems of budgeting for citizens and involving citizens into work with a budget | Advantages and challenges of program-targeted budgeting implementation |
| **Belarus** | Citizen Budget - a calendar training plan and methodical recommendations for it compilation | Defining of state program key indicators |
| **BiH (State and Federation levels)** | Federation Level: New instruments for raising citizen awareness of the need to include them in the budget adoption process (Internet, Facebook). | State level: Indicators (examples of definitions and indicator monitoring, defining key national indicators...) Specific examples of program planning, indicators and budget execution monitoring in the program format, developing the methodology and implementing spending reviews.  Federation level: Analysis of realized programs and projects financed from the budget by monitoring performance measures. |
| **Bulgaria** |  | Methodological framework of policies and program classification Criteria for performance measurement |
| **Croatia** | Publishing the budget execution report: - when: monthly, quarterly, annually - the contents of the report - where (official journal, web page). Budget education (citizens, civil service employees, the media, civil society, politicians, MPs). Including citizens (the public) in budget preparations in times of extensive deficit and high public debt. | Examples of key indicators by sector (health care, education, social welfare...). Performance budgeting at the local level. Evaluations, spending reviews. |
| **Kosovo** | N.A. | Yes. Possible topics could include the inter-relationship between functional and program classification. |
| **Kyrgyz Republic** | Expanding opportunities for citizens to participate in a budget process (mechanisms, approaches, practical application of citizens' comments and suggestions, providing feedback).  Creation of an online training module on budget literacy and transparency | 1) Existing system of incentives and motivation in budgeting on a program basis. 2) Program classification of costs: approaches and its practical application. 3) Evaluation of expenditure effectiveness (approaches, criteria, participants, procedures).  Drawing up the program budget indicators |
| **Moldova** | 1. The structure, content and format of budget documentation in countries with advanced experience. | 1. Analyzing of different program classifications form various countries - identifying of bad and good practices. |
| **Romania** | Analyzing the results of budgetary allocations |  |
| **Russia** | Consolidation of various tools for increasing the budget openness (budget literacy, citizen participation in the budget process, formation of "Budgets for citizens." | Methodology for making reviews of budget expenditures effectiveness (including from the program point of view). |
| **Serbia** |  | Resource allocation during budget preparations based on performance. |
| **Ukraine** |  | Comprehensive assessment of efficiency and expediency of expenses (spending review) to ensure savings and release of resources for new priorities. |
| **Uzbekistan** | Budget Literacy and Transparency Working Group has to help countries developing a real tool (mechanism) for citizens' involvement in the budget process, broader coverage of all sectors of the population, their interest and use of budget data, and develop indicators on how much this knowledge and data affected literacy and transparency in qualitative and quantitative terms and what impact they had on the overall course of reforms. | Efficiency and need to optimize spending in a socially-oriented economy, as well as indicators of the effectiveness of budget programs designed for one or more years. |
| **14** | 10 | 13 |

***Q9. Is your country in a position to host the next plenary meeting in 2018 which includes covering the costs of some dinners and/or a cultural program.***

All 18 countries responded to this question.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country** |  |
| **Albania** | Yes |
| **Armenia** | No |
| **Azerbaijan** | No |
| **Belarus** | Yes |
| **BiH (State and Federal levels)** | No (S) No (F) |
| **Bulgaria** | No |
| **Croatia** | No |
| **Georgia** | No |
| **Kosovo** | No |
| **Kyrgyz Republic** | No |
| **Moldova** | No |
| **Montenegro** | No |
| **Romania** | No |
| **Russia** | No |
| **Serbia** | No |
| **Turkey** | No |
| **Ukraine** | No |
| **Uzbekistan** | No |
| **18** | Yes – 2, No - **16** |

**Developing the Questions for the Discussion Groups planned for the April Plenary**

***Q10. To assist the BCOP Executive Committee prepare the questions for small group discussions planned on program and performance budgeting during the plenary meeting, are there any specific challenges/problems/issues that you would like discussed? If so please provide a brief explanation or phrase the issue in a question. Based on your input, questions will be prepared and emailed to you a few days before the plenary meeting, to assist you to participate in the small group discussions planned on program and performance budgeting. INSERT potential question(s) here.***

11 countries responded to this question.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Questions** |
| **Albania** | Fiscal risk impact on fiscal consolidation |
| **Belarus** | Defining of state program key indicators |
| **Croatia** | Using performance data from implemented programs in budget development for the upcoming period. Accountability in case of failure to implement planned programs and punishment, setting limits for individual ministries. Linking policies, policy priorities and the amount of planned funds per program in the budget, in a multi-annual budget framework. (example: population policy as the basic government priority, which is not reflected in the budget programs). Monitoring program achievement in the budget and explaining the achievements of priority programs. If one program is implemented by more than one body, accountability needs to be clearly defined (who is responsible for implementing the measure). Defining performance indicators. |
| **Georgia** | Problems with program and performance budgeting implementing. Presence and application of responsibility measures for violations in the field of implementation and financing of targeted programs |
| **Kyrgyz Republic** | 1) What kind of mechanisms for citizen participation in a budget process exists in your country? 2) How proposals made by citizens are taken into account and how is feedback from citizens provided? 3) What criteria for assessing the budget program effectiveness are applied in your country? 4) What are procedures for program budget reviewing? 5) What kind of program structure is applied in your country? 6) What is an application of the expenditure economic classification in program budgeting? |
| **Montenegro** | Defining performance indicators. |
| **Romania** | How could you measure the performance measure for budgetary allocation? |
| **Russia** | 1. Problem with choosing(selecting) state program indicators, most fully reflecting the activities of government authorities. 2. Embedding project methods in budget expenditure managing. 3. Issues of evaluation of state program effectiveness during the budget planning. |
| **Turkey** | Roles and Importance of IT systems in performance based program budgeting |
| **Ukraine** | Approaches to defining and classification of state services. Standards for the provision and valuation of services. How information about state services is displayed in budget documents |
| **Uzbekistan** | Need to optimize budget expenditures in socially significant areas, and how effective this process is over the long term; effectiveness of expenditures and their indicators in the reformed economies; risks arise at qualitative and quantitative levels after optimizing the expenditure budget and ways to overcome these risks in the presence of cuts in expenditures. |

**General Feedback**

***Q11. Are there any suggestions/improvements you would like the BCOP Executive Committee to consider?***

All 18 countries responded to this question with two different responses from BIH provided.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** |  |  |
| **Albania** | No |  |
| **Armenia** | No |  |
| **Azerbaijan** | No |  |
| **Belarus** | No |  |
| **BiH (State and Federation levels)** | Yes (S)  No (F) | State level: Practical examples, manuals, guidelines and similar materials which stakeholders can share with their colleagues and use to gain experience and new knowledge in reform implementation. |
| **Bulgaria** | No |  |
| **Croatia** | No |  |
| **Georgia** | No |  |
| **Kosovo** | No |  |
| **Kyrgyz Republic** | No |  |
| **Moldova** | No |  |
| **Montenegro** | No |  |
| **Romania** | No |  |
| **Russia** | No |  |
| **Serbia** | No |  |
| **Turkey** | No |  |
| **Ukraine** | No |  |
| **Uzbekistan** | No |  |
| **18** | Yes – 1  No- **18** |  |