BCOP PEMPAL Pre-event Survey

2019 Annual BCOP Plenary Meeting

The survey was prepared and conducted at the the initiative of the Budget Community of Practice (BCOP) Executive Committee and was designed to collect compatible information from all BCOP member countries.

Results of the survey will provide multiple inputs to the BCOP Executive Committee and Resource Team, as well as PEMPAL Steering Committee:

a) Countries’ approaches and challenges related to capital budgeting/public investment, which will be presented on Day 1 of the BCOP 2019 plenary meeting, to set the scene for discussion on this topic;

b) Countries’ plans and challenges related to spending reviews, which will serve to supplement data on spending reviews in PEMPAL countries from the OECD Performance Budgeting Survey and will be presented on Day 3;

c) Inputs on questions for the small group discussions, which will take place in the afternoon of Day 3 of the 2019 plenary meeting, focusing on spending reviews;

d) Inputs for BCOP 2019-20 Action Plan;

e) Inputs on potential cooperation of BCOP with other two PEMPAL COPs; and

f) Data for monitoring of the 2017-2022 PEMPAL Strategy, including questions on usefulness of knowledge products and questions to demonstrate and track impact of BCOP on country level reforms and staff capacity.

The survey online tool collected responses between February 10 and March 6, 2019.

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

Links to online version of the survey

ENG — https://ru.surveymonkey.com/r/WDZBFDT

RUS — <https://ru.surveymonkey.com/r/C5M8QQX>

BCS — <https://ru.surveymonkey.com/r/V6HYZP7>

The survey consisted of 41 questions.

1. ***What country are you from (please note that this survey should be filled out only once for each country):***

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

Representatives of 13 countries (out of a total of 21 BCOP members) filled out the questionnaire in electronic format: Armenia, Belarus, Bulgaria, Bosnia & Herzegovina (BiH), Croatia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Russia, and Serbia.

#### PART I: CAPITAL BUDGETING/PUBLIC INVESTMENT

1. ***Is there terminology in the existing legislation in your country which separately identified capital expenditures and public investments? If yes, please, quote the existing terminology (both capital expenditures and public investments, if exists) and refer a law or a sub-law which adopted that terminology:***
* 100% of countries (13) responded.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Yes/No** | **Comment** |
| ***Armenia*** | No  |  |
| ***Belarus*** | Yes | The Budget Code of the Republic of Belarus. Article 40. Budget Capital Expenditures. 1. Budget capital expenditures constitute a portion of budget expenditures that support innovations and investment activity, including under public-private partnership contracts, and comprise expenditures for investing in existing or new firms, expenditures to support modernization and reconstruction, as well as other expenditures related to the fixed assets, intangible assets, and inventory value gains, and expenditures that result in a creation or increase of assets.2. Budget capital expenditures also include expenditures to build government stocks and reserves, acquire land plots and property rights for intellectual property items |
| ***Bulgaria*** | No |  |
| ***BiH*** | Yes | Decision on capital budgeting and defining and evaluating criteria for capital project selection"At the level of B&H Institutions, annual and multi-annual capital expenditures are defined by the Act on Financing of B&H Institutions, Budget Act, and Ordinance on Accounting with Accounting Policies for Budget Users in B&H Institutions. In this regard, within the framework of capital expenditures, the following is documented: land and forest procurement with multi-annually planted trees, facility and infrastructure procurement, procurement of other fixed assets, rights, reconstruction and investment maintenance. Reconstruction entails investments, i.e. construction and other works on specific fixed assets (facilities) where constructive elements, outer appearance, stability, safety, and functionality elements are being changed. Reconstruction increases the projected life span of fixed assets or the expected effects of their use, and changes their purpose. Investment maintenance entails all major work on fixed assets that extends their functional capability. Public investments are defined by the Decision on the Method and Criteria for the Preparation, Development and Monitoring of the Implementation of the Public Investment Program / Development Investment Program of B&H Institutions. This decision refers to: a) public investments financed or co-financed from the budget of B&H Institutions; and b) public investments funded or co-financed from loans, donor and other funds. Investments in socioeconomic development are investments that contribute to improving the economic status of the population or affect their social status. Investment projects as regards socioeconomic development can be capital or institutional. Definitions for the purpose of this decision are as follows: - Investments in building administrative and technical capacity represent investments in immovable property and investments in building administrative capacity in non-development areas. Such projects can also be capital or institutional. - A capital project is a project within which resources are predominantly invested in capital goods such as facilities, equipment, work resources, etc., which does not include one-off capital expenditures. - An institutional project is a project within which resources are predominantly invested in the capacity-building of institutions." |
| ***Croatia*** | Yes | The Budget Act (Official Gazette, 87/08, 136/12 and 15/15) Article 3 (15): Investments or capital expenditure are investments made to increase and preserve asset value, investments in land, buildings, equipment and other long-term tangible and non-tangible assets, including investments in education and training, new technology development, improvements to quality of life and other investments generating benefits.Article 70. Paragraph 1: Funds from the sale and exchange of non-financial assets of the State or local and regional governments and from insurance-based compensation shall be used for the capital expenditure of the State or local and regional governments, for investment in shares and capital interests, and for repaying principal on long-term borrowing. Paragraph 2: The capital expenditure referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article shall be expenditure for the procurement of non-financial assets, expenditure for the maintenance of non-financial assets, and capital aid granted to companies in which the State or local and regional governments have a decisive influence on management for the procurement of non-financial assets and additional investment in non-financial assets. Article 89 (3): The capital revenues referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article shall be revenues from the sale of non-financial assets, receipts from the sales of securities and receipts from the sale of shares and capital interests.  |
| ***Georgia*** | Yes | Capital Expenditure - is a notion related to economic classification of Expenses and Classification of Non-Financial Assets; GFSM 2014 Public Investment - is defined according to the Guidelines approved by the government (Decree #191 22.04.16) and manual approved by order of the Minister of Finance (Order #385): Investment Project is defined (short summary) as a set of activities with clearly predefined goals and objectives, implemented according to predefined schedule in order to deliver an asset which will bring benefit/solution to the predefined group of beneficiaries. The output delivered as a result of the implementation of the project should be an asset (tangible or intangible) which becomes economic actor or strongly supports economic development. In most cases it is creation of a new asset or significant improvement of an asset which increase the value/role of the asset in the economy. Regular rehabilitation or maintenance of assets is not counted as an Investment Project; Capital Budget - defined by the Budget Code is annex to an annual state budget which shows selection of only capital projects from the overall program budget. Capital budget annex includes financial as well as non-financial data about all programs/subprograms which include capital project financing. |
| ***Kazakhstan*** | Yes | The Budget Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan.Article 37. Budget programs for public investments. Public investments are made by means of implementing public investment projects and participation of legal persons in authorized capital. Article 38. Budget programs for capital expenditures. Capital expenditures include expenditures intended to build or enhance physical infrastructure, perform capital repairs (refurbishment) and other capital expenditures as per economic classification of expenditures except public investments  |
| ***Kosovo*** | No  |   |
| ***Macedonia*** | No  |   |
| ***Moldova*** | Yes | Public capital investment - budget expenditure for the creation of fixed assets, including the construction and / or renovation, reconstruction or extension of existing fixed assets; Government decree nr. 1029/2013  |
| ***Montenegro*** | Yes | Regulations on the Method and Criteria for the Preparation, Development and Monitoring of the Implementation of the Public Investment Program |
| ***Russia*** | Yes | In the Russian Federation, the situation is different: state investments are not singled out separately; there is a general legislation on investment activity in the form of capital investments. The Federal Law of 25.02.1999 No. 39-FZ “On Investment Activity in the Russian Federation Pursued in the Form of Capital Investments” contains the following definitions: investments are monetary resources, securities, other property, including property rights, other rights which have cash value that are invested in objects of entrepreneurial and/or other activities with the aim of generating profits and/or achieving other useful results; investment activity is the act of making investments and pursuance of practical measures with the aim of generating profits and and/or achieving other useful results; capital investments are investments in fixed capital (fixed assets), including the outlays for new construction projects, enlargement, reconstruction and technical re-equipment of operating enterprises, purchase of machinery, equipment, tools, accessories, survey and prospecting projects and other expenses |
| ***Serbia*** | No  |   |
| ***Total*** | **Yes - 8****No - 5** |  |

1. ***Which law has a primary role for public investment management in your country?***

100% of countries (13) responded.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Organic Law on Public finances** | **Specific Law on Public Investments** | **Organic Law on investments** | **There is no legislation**  | **Other** |
| **Armenia** | x |  |  |  |   |
| **Belarus** | x |  | x |  | Decrees of the President of the Republic of Belarus that approve the government investment program |
| **Bulgaria** | x |  |  |  |  |
| **BiH** |   |  |  |  | Public investments are defined by the Decision on the Method and Criteria for the Preparation, Development and Monitoring of the Implementation of the Public Investment Program / Development Investment Program of B&H Institutions |
| **Croatia** | x |  | x |  | The Budget Act (OG 87/08, 136/12 and 15/15) Act on the Strategic Investment Projects of the Republic of Croatia (OG 29/18) |
| **Georgia** | x |  |  |  | Capital Budget is defined by the Budget Code; PIM is regulated by the Government Decree #191 22.04.16 |
| **Kazakhstan** | x |  |  |  |   |
| **Kosovo** | x |  |  |  |   |
| **Macedonia** |   |  |  |  | There is no single legislation which regulates public investment management, but there are separate laws that regulates different areas of public investments (roads, railways, etc) |
| **Moldova** | x |  |  |  |   |
| **Montenegro** | x |  |  |  |   |
| **Russia** |  |  | x |  | Federal Law of February 25, 1999 No. 39-FZ "On Investment Activity in the Russian Federation Pursued in the Form of Capital Investments" |
| **Serbia** |   |   |   | x |   |
| **Total** | **9** | **0** | **3** | **1** | **5** |

**4. Which ministry/agency is responsible for the decision making in following areas?** 100% of countries (13) responded.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Review and analyzing of public investment project proposals received from the sectorial ministries and/or subnational governments** | **Assessment of possible fiscal risks for proposed projects in mid-term perspective** | **Assessment of the potential contribution of investments to current competitiveness, sustainable development and regional & national well-being** | **Selection of projects for financing from the central budget  (including direct expenditures and transfers)** | **Regular (monthly,  quarterly or semi-annual basis) monitoring of project implementation from capital spending point of view** | **Regular monitoring of public investment project implementation for achievement of expected intermediate results and project objectives** | **Evaluation** **of completed projects** (whether planned results were achieved) | **Maintaining a unified data about all public investment projects (if such a data doesn’t exists, please mark as doesn’t exists in the last line)** |
| Ministry of Finance | BIH, GEO, KOSOVO, MDA, MNE, SRB, BGR | BIH, GEO, KOSOVO, MDA, MNE, SRB, BGR | BIH, KOSOVO | GEO, KAZ, KOSOVO, MDA | BLR, BIH, KAZ, KOSOVO | KAZ, KOSOVO |  | BIH, GEO, KOSOVO |
| Ministry of Economy (or Planning)  | BLR, KAZ, RUS | BLR, KAZ, RUS | BLR, KAZ, BGR, RUS | BLR, RUS | RUS | BLR, RUS | BLR, RUS | BLR, KAZ, RUS |
| Ministry/State Agency of Regional Development  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Line ministries | ARM | ARM, MCD | ARM, GEO, KAZ, MCD, MDA, MNE, SRB | ARM | ARM, GEO, MDA, MNE, SRB, BGR | ARM, GEO, MCD, MDA, BGR | ARM, GEO, KOSOVO, MCD, MDA, MNE, SRB, BGR |  |
| Accounting Chamber (State Audit Institution) |  |  |  |  |  |  | KAZ |  |
| Other *(please describe)* | HRV, MCD | HRV | HRV | BIH, HRV, GEO, MCD, MNE, SRB, BGR | HRV, MCD | BIH, HRV, MNE, SRB | BIH, HRV | HRV, MDA, MNE, SRB, BGR |

Comments

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Review and analyzing of public investment project proposals received from the sectorial ministries and/or subnational governments** | **Assessment of possible fiscal risks for proposed projects in mid-term perspective** | **Assessment of the potential contribution of investments to current competitiveness, sustainable development and regional & national well-being** | **Selection of projects for financing from the central budget  (including direct expenditures and transfers)** | **Regular (monthly,  quarterly or semi-annual basis) monitoring of project implementation from capital spending point of view** | **Regular monitoring of public investment project implementation for achievement of expected intermediate results and project objectives** | **Evaluation** **of completed projects** (whether planned results were achieved) | **Maintaining a unified data about all public investment projects (if such a data doesn’t exists, please mark as doesn’t exists in the last line)** |
| **Armenia** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Does not exist |
| **BiH** |  |  |  | The Council of Ministers of B&H / the Government issues individual decisions on multi-annual projects, and, by approving the annual budget, selects and approves funding for capital investments within the budget. |  | There is still no systematic comprehensive monitoring of the implementation of public investment projects for the purpose of achieving expected mid-term results and goals of the project because the budget is still regularly adopted in the line item form, while the program structure is provided as an integral part of the budget execution explanations | No systematic project evaluation process has been established yet |   |
| **Bulgaria**  |  |  |  | The Council of Ministers |  |  |  | Does not exist |
| **Croatia** | Ministry of Economy for strategic projects, and line ministries for other projects. | The Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Finance, line ministries, and at the subnational level local and regional self-government units. | The body carrying out the investment. | Line ministries in cooperation with the Ministry of Finance, within the budget limits set by the Government of the Republic of Croatia. | The investing body monitors the implementation of investment projects. The financial aspect is monitored within the framework of (quarterly) financial reports and (semi-annual and annual) reports on budget execution, with detailed explanations of the budget execution process. | The achievement of expected mid-term results and project goals is monitored through the detailed explanations of the government budget execution. | The evaluation of finished projects is done through the detailed explanations of the government budget execution. | There is no single database for all public institutions. |
| **Georgia** |  |  |  | Government level decision as part will be needed (after the methodology is fully implemented) and will become part of the MTEF document. |  |  |  |   |
| **Macedonia** | Government review public investment project proposals from sectorial ministries. | When proposing investment project ministries are obliged to make assessment on fiscal implication for each project during the period of realization. Before Government approve some investment MoF give opinion for proposed fiscal implication. | Line ministries should make assessments | Government decide about potential investments according proposed fiscal implication if they are planned in the budget | Government on regular basis (usually monthly) monitor capital expenditures realization from the Budget. | Line ministries are responsible for regular monitoring of the phases and level of realization of the project and achieving its objectives | Line ministries are responsible for evaluation of completed projects. Usually they regular inform the Government about the project realization |   |
| **Moldova** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Partially. There is database regarding some projects financed from state budget.  |
| **Montenegro** | The Ministry of Finance with the Directorate of Public Works and the Directorate for Transport realize the capital budget, while for the realization of projects (tender, execution of works ...) the above mentioned administrations are responsible |  |  | The final decision is made by the Government of Montenegro and by the Parliament of Montenegro | The administrative bodies responsible for the implementation of capital projects submit quarterly reports to the Ministry of Finance |  | The Ministry of Finance / the Project Evaluation Commission evaluates the projects for financing, while the administrative bodies evaluate the completed projects | A methodology and model for setting up a public investment registry are being developed |
| **Serbia** |  |  |   | The Capital Investment Commission formed by the Government |  | MoF and line ministries  |  | None |

1. ***Which type of budget classifications reflects capital expenditures and public investments (Select all that apply and for those selected please add explanations, as asked):***

12 (92.3%) countries respond.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country**  | **Economic classification** | **Program classification** |
| **Belarus** | Article 40. “Investments in Fixed Assets”; article 50 “Building Government Stocks and Reserves”; article 60 “Acquisition of Land and Intangible Assets”’; article 70 “Capital Budget Transfers” | Some government programs contain a separate segment of investment projects, some - not |
| **BiH** | Within the framework of capital expenditures, the following is documented: land and forest procurement with multi-annually planted trees, facility and infrastructure procurement, procurement of other fixed assets, rights, reconstruction and investment maintenance | Public investment projects are included in the program classification as (lower-rank) program projects |
| **Bulgaria** | Unified Budget Classification - Capital expenditures and Capital transfers | Public investment is included as a segment within programs/subprograms |
| **Croatia** | 421 Construction facilities (which includes roads, railways, other traffic facilities, gas pipelines, the water supply system, etc.), 451 Additional investment into construction facilities, 382 Capital donations, 386 Capital assistance (for credit and other financial institutions, companies, cooperatives, farmers and trades); the Chart of Accounts is stipulated by the Regulations on Budget Accounting and the COA (OG, 124/14, 115/15, 87/16 and 3/18) | All larger projects are planned as individual projects (subprograms) within the program. The types, contents and implementation of budget classifications is stipulated by the Regulations on Budget Classifications (OG 26/10 and 120/13). Article 8 of the Regulations: (1) Program classification is done by defining programs, activities and projects, and by defining main programs within the government budget. (2) The main program is composed of programs designed to achieve the goals of the Government Program Strategy for a three-year period. (3) The program is a set of independent, closely connected activities and projects that share common goals. (4) The program is composed of one or more activities and/or projects, and the project and activity belong to a single program. (5) An activity is a part of a program which has no set time frame and its planned expenditure and expenses for goal achievement have been determined by the program. (6) A project is a part of a program with a set time frame, where expenses and expenditure for goal achievement have been determined by the program. Projects are planned as one-off, and they can be current or capital projects. (7) Current project implementation does not increase assets, and capital projects entail investments in asset increase  |
| **Georgia** | Other capital expenditure, capital transfers under grants; increase of non-financial assets; in certain cases increase of financial assets if lending is given to a loss making SOE | They are part of the Programs/subprograms and part of the program budget annex and they also separately show under capital budget annex |
| **Kazakhstan** | Ordinance issued by the Ministry of Finance. Economic classification for current expenditures - CapEx. For development programs expenditures – public investments | Paragraph 5-7 of Article 32 of the Budget Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan, legally enshrines the way to reflect budget investments |
| **Kosovo** | Economic classification of public investments are included in code 30  | The public investments are included as a segment of programm an subprogramm |
| **Macedonia** | 48- Capital expenditures | Some of the capital investments/project (biggest projects) are presented in the budget as a separate program/subprogram and they have different codes. There are cases when group of capital projects are presented under one subprogram. |
| **Moldova** | 319 - capital investments in assets under construction. For capital expenditures there is no only one code of the economy classification | Public investments are included as a segment within programs/subprograms. |
| **Montenegro** | Current expenditure and capital expenditure  | Program and subprogram |
| **Russia** | The structure of the codes of types of expenses in the classification of budget expenditures includes: 400 Capital investments in the state (municipal) property; 406 Acquisition of immovable property by the state (municipal) budget and autonomous institution; 407 Construction (reconstruction) of real estate objects by the state (municipal) budget and autonomous institutions; 410 Budget investments; 411 Budget investments for the purchase of real estate objects in federal ownership as part of the state defense order; 412 Budget investments for the purchase of real estate objects in state (municipal) property; 413 Budget investments for capital construction objects as part of the state defense order; 414 Budget investments for capital construction objects of the state (municipal) property; 415 Budget investments in accordance with the concession agreements; 450 Budget investments to other legal entities; 451 Budget investments to other legal entities in capital construction objects; 452 Budget investments to other legal entities, except for budget investments in capital construction objects; 453 Budget investments to other legal entities for capital construction projects of subsidiaries; 454 Budget investments to other legal entities for capital construction projects within the state defense order; 455 Budget investments to other legal entities for capital construction facilities of subsidiaries within the framework of the state defense order; 460 Subsidies to the budgetary and autonomous institutions, state (municipal) unitary enterprises for implementation of capital investments in capital construction objects of the state (municipal) property or for acquisition of immovable property in state (municipal) ownership; 461 Subsidies for acquisition of immovable property in state (municipal) ownership for budget institutions; 462 Subsidies for acquisition of immovable property in state (municipal) ownership for autonomous institutions; 463 Subsidies for acquisition of immovable property in state (municipal) ownership for the state (municipal) unitary enterprises; 464 Subsidies for capital investments to state-owned (municipal) capital construction projects for budget institutions; 465 Subsidies for capital investments to state-owned (municipal) capital construction projects for autonomous institutions; 466 Subsidies for capital investments to state-owned (municipal) capital construction projects for the state (municipal) unitary enterprises |  |
| **Serbia** | Class 5 – Expenses for non-financial assets | Projects (which could also be capital projects) are specifically indicated in the program classification, as part of the program. Capital expenditures can also be part of program activities.  |

1. ***Is there a clear and authoritative statement of public investment priorities at national and regional levels?***

13 (100%) countries respond.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Yes/No** | **Yes. Please explain:** |
| **Armenia** | No |   |
| **Belarus** | Yes | Provision of quality and affordable housing in the course of implementing the Government Program “Housing Construction” for 2016-2020 |
| **BiH** | No |   |
| **Bulgaria** | Yes | Medium-term budget forecast |
| **Croatia** | No |   |
| **Georgia** | Yes | Government Strategy clearly defines Infrastructure as key priority for the Government; |
| **Kazakhstan** | Yes | Government programs, national-level sectoral programs. Subnational-level territorial development programs |
| **Kosovo** | Yes | Yes, government priority |
| **Macedonia** | No |   |
| **Moldova** | No |   |
| **Montenegro** | Yes | A Priority List of Projects has been defined. |
| **Russia** | Yes | By the decision of the Government of July 12, 2018, there was approved the Action Plan on accelerating the growth rate of investments in fixed assets and increasing their share in GDP to 25% proposed by the Ministry of Economic Development of Russia. Source: http://government.ru/meetings/33229/decisions/ The text of the plan is on the website of the Ministry of Economic Development of Russia: http://economy.gov.ru/wps/wcm/connect/d8ec2401-af12-40be-80be -ee4986139f19 / plan25.pdf? MOD = AJPERES & CACHEID = d8ec2401-af12-40be-80be-ee4986139f19 |
| **Serbia** | No |   |
| **Total** | Yes – **7**No – 6 |  |

1. ***Is there a clear mandatory request to reflect the national development goals in subnational (regional) investment plans? If yes, please describe***

13 (100%) countries respond.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Yes/No** | **Yes** |
| **Armenia** | No |   |
| **Belarus** | No |  |
| **BiH** | No |  |
| **Bulgaria** | Yes | The regional development plans contain goals which are reflected in subnational investment plans. |
| **Croatia** | Yes | Pursuant to the Act on the Regional Development of the Republic of Croatia (OG 147/14, 123/17, 118/18), plan documents of the regional development policy include the Regional Development Strategy of the Republic of Croatia, the county development strategy, i.e. the development strategy of the City of Zagreb and the urban development strategy |
| **Georgia** | Yes | Government Program Priorities are used as umbrella for any strategy and plan |
| **Kazakhstan** | Yes | Goals of the Kazakhstan Development Strategy are aligned with government programs objectives. The programs goals must be cascaded down |
| **Kosovo** | Yes | Yes, government priority |
| **Macedonia** | No  |  |
| **Moldova** | No  |   |
| **Montenegro** | Yes | Projects are eligible to compete if they are in accordance with the Development Plan adopted by the Government and/or the Assembly |
| **Serbia** | Yes | Strategic relevance is one of the basic criteria for selecting capital projects. |
| **Russia** | No |  |
| **Total** | Yes - **7**No - 6 |  |

1. ***What is the share of total capital expenditures and public investments in GDP in your country (%)?*** 10 countries responded (76.9%).
* **Capital expenditures**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| **Consolidated general government budget (– social security funds)** | **Central budget**  | **Sub-national budgets**  | **Social security funds** | **Consolidated general government budget (– social security funds)** | **Central budget**  | **Sub-national budgets**  | **Social security funds** | **Consolidated general government budget (– social security funds)** | **Central budget**  | **Sub-national budgets**  | **Social security funds** |
| **Armenia** | 3,7 | 3,4 | 0,3 |   | 3,7 | 3,4 | 0,3 |   | 4,5 | 4,3 | 0,2 |   |
| **Belarus** | 4,2 | 1,8 | 2,7 | 0,01 | 3,7 | 1,9 | 2,3 | 0,002 | 4,1 | 1,9 | 2,6 | - |
| **BiH** | 0,74% GDP |  | 0,48% GDP | 0,74% GDP | 1,06% |  | 0,6% | 0,76% | 0,98% |  | 0,56% | 1,03% |
| **Bulgaria** | 4,08 | 3,25 | 0,83 | 0,01 | 3,68 | 3,01 | 0,67 | 0,01 | 4,08 | 3,25 | 0,83 | 0,01 |
| **Croatia** | 2,57% | 1,73% | 0,84% | 0,000018% | 2,72% | 1,78% | 0,94% | 0,000085% | 2,64% | 1,64% | 0,89% | 0,000187% |
| **Georgia** | 7.2% | 4.5% | 2.7% |  | 6.7% | 4.3% | 2.4% |  | 8.7% | 6.1% | 2.6% |  |
| **Kosovo** |   | 8% |  |  |  | 7.5% |  |  |  | 7.3% |  |  |
| **Macedonia** | 4,2% | 3,3% | 0,9% | 0,01% | 3,8% | 2,8% | 1% | 0,01% | 4,2% | 3,2% | 1% | 0,01% |
| **Moldova** | 4,3 | 3,4 | 0,9 | 0,01 | 3,4 | 2,3 | 1,1 | 0,01 | 3,1 | 1,9 | 1,2 | 0,004 |
| **Serbia** | 2,6 | 1,8 | 0,8 | 0 | 3,1 | 2,2 | 0,9 | 0 | 2,8 | 2,0 | 0,8 | 0 |

* **Public investments**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **Comment**  | **Reason for non-existence of the data on public investments**  |
| **Consolidated general government budget (–social security funds)**  | **Central budget**  | **Subnational budgets**  | **Social security funds**  | **Consolidated general government budget (– social security funds)** | **Central budget**  | **Subnational budgets**  | **Social security funds**  | **Consolidated general government budget (– social security funds)** | **Central budget**  | **Subnational budgets**  | **Social security funds**  |
| **Armenia** |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | No clear definition |
| **Belarus** | 2,3 | 0,4 | 2,0 | - | 2,0 | 0,3 | 1,7 | - | 2,1 | 0,3 | 1,8 | - | Consolidated budget of the extended government includes central (national) budget, local budgets, budgets of state off-budget funds (state off-budget Universal Service Fund of the Ministry of Communications and IT, state off-budget fund of the Department of Corrections of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, state off-budget fund of civil aviation) |   |
| **BiH** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | There are no consolidated data on public investments in B&H. | There is no legal basis for public investment, there is no single definition and/or category of budget classification for determining public investments for budget planning and reporting purposes, there is no consolidation of data related to public investments |
| **Bulgaria** | 7,76 | 6,9 | 0,86 | 0,01 | 4,08 | 3,25 | 0,82 | 0,01 | 3,68 | 3,01 | 0,67 | 0,01 |  |  |
| **Croatia** | 1,45% | 0,87% | 0,57% | 0,000000 | 1,26% | 0,57% | 0,45% | 0,000083% | 1,11% | 0,43% | 0,67% | 0,000180% |  | Public investments have not been clearly defined in budget regulations for the purposes of budget planning and execution. So for this survey we have used information from financial reports, i.e. data from the subsection 421 Construction facilities which, apart from buildings, includes roads, railways, other traffic facilities, gas pipelines and the water supply system |
| **Georgia** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No clear definition |
| **Kazakhstan** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | The required definitions and budget classification codes are specified in relevant regulations |
| **Kosovo** |  | 8% |  |  |  | 7.5% |  |  |  | 7.3% |  |  |  |   |
| **Moldova** | 2,3 | 1,9 | 0,4 | 0,004 | 1,1 | 0,7 | 0,4 | 0,004 | 0,74 | 0,47 | 0,27 | 0,001 |  |   |
| **Montenegro** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No clear definition |

1. ***On average, what was the structure of capital expenditures in the consolidated general government budget (%) in 2015 – 2017?***

7 countries responded (53.8%).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Capital expenditures. Central budget (without capital transfers to subnational budgets)** |
| **Healthcare** | **Education** | **Social assistance and protection** | **Recreation, culture and religion** | **General Services** | **Communal services infrastructure**  | **Environmental protection** | **Economic affairs** | **Public order, safety and defense** | **Total** |
| **Armenia** | 95,9 | 75 | 99,8 | 68,4 | 85,7 | 91,3 |  | 100 | 100 | 93,3 |
| **Belarus** | 23,7 | 20,0 | 38,8 | 34,6 | 68 | 6,8 | 43,8 | 55,0 | 96,4 | 42,8 |
| **BiH** | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| **Bulgaria** | 88 | 65,1 | 70,3 | 61,1 | 85,9 | 84,2 | 82 | 98,2 | 88,3 |   |
| **Georgia** | 95% | 69% | 88% | 35% | 52% | 46% | 34% | 75% | 100% | 67% |
| **Kosovo** | 5% | 10% |  | 3% | 2% | 60% | 5% | 5% | 10% |  |
| **Moldova** | 91,3 | 20,5 | 64,6 | 20,8 | 73,9 | 29,5 | 63 | 91,9 | 98,9 | 69,6 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Capital expenditures. Subnational budgets** |
| **Healthcare** | **Education** | **Social assistance and protection** | **Recreation, culture and religion** | **General Services** | **Communal services infrastructure**  | **Environmental protection** | **Economic affairs** | **Public order, safety and defense** | **Total** |
| **Armenia** | 4,1 | 25 | 0,2 | 31,6 | 14,3 | 8,7 |  |  |  | 6,7 |
| **Belarus** | 76,3 | 80,0 | 61,2 | 65,4 | 31,5 | 93,2 | 56,2 | 45 | 3,6 | 57,2 |
| **BiH** | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| **Bulgaria** | 12 | 34,9 | 29,7 | 38,9 | 14,1 | 15,8 | 18 | 1,8 | 11,7 |  |
| **Georgia** | 5% | 31% | 12% | 65% | 48% | 54% | 66% | 25% | 0 | 33% |
| **Kosovo** | 5% | 10% |  | 3% | 2% | 60% | 5% | 5% | 10% |  |
| **Moldova** | 8,7 | 79,5 | 35,4 | 79,2 | 26,1 | 70,5 | 37 | 8,1 | 1,1 | 30,4 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Share of capital inter-budgetary transfers to subnational budgets in the central budget (%)**  |
| **Belarus** | 2,2 |
| **Bulgaria** | 0.59 |
| **Georgia** | 3.5% |
| **Georgia** | 2015 - 3.6%, 2016 - 2.7%, 2017- 3.6% |
| **Moldova** | 2015 - 1.5%; 2016 - 0.9%; 2017 - 1.2% |

1. ***What were shares of inter-budgetary capital transfers in total capital expenditures of subnational budgets in 2015-2017?***

7 countries responded (53.8%).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| **Armenia** | 0,3 | do not exist | 0,05 |
| **Belarus** | 12,1 | 17,1 | 11,5 |
| **BiH** | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| **Bulgaria** | 0,52 | 0,62 | 0,64 |
| **Georgia** | 40,5 | 33,4 | 41,9 |
| **Moldova** | 41,9 | 20,5 | 20,9 |
| **Montenegro** | n/a | n/a | n/a |

1. ***Is there a formula-based approach or clearly and legally established criteria to calculate capital inter-budgetary transfers in your country?*** 100% countries (13) responded.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Yes/No** | **Yes** | **% of total capital inter-budg. transf. …** |
| **Armenia** | No |  |   |
| **Belarus** | No |  |   |
| **BiH** | No |  |   |
| **Bulgaria** | Yes | With the annual state budget law the amounts of the target subsidies from the state budget to municipalities as well as the mechanism for their calculation are determined.  | More than 50% |
| **Croatia** | No |  |   |
| **Georgia** | Yes | According to Budget Code, annual state budget defines Fund for Regional Projects. Government of Georgia has approved a special commission and rule for distributing funds to municipalities from the fund. Government of Georgia defines the total amount (around 85% of the fund) to be distributed for projects submitted by the municipalities to the commission. The rest of the fund is mostly used for natural disaster mitigation or other municipal emergencies. | More than 50%  |
| **Kazakhstan** | Yes | Ordinance of the Ministry of Economy “Guidelines for Calculating General Transfers”. The transfers are calculated for three fiscal years and may not be adjusted during this period. The transfer is provided to local budgets so that their budgets could be formed with guaranteed transfer amount from the national budget | More than 50%  |
| **Kosovo** | No  |  |   |
| **Macedonia** | No  |  |   |
| **Moldova** | No  |  |   |
| **Montenegro** | No |  |   |
| **Russia** | No |  |  |
| **Serbia** | No |   |   |
| **Total** | Yes - 3No - **10** |  |  |

1. ***Is budgetary information regarding public investments publicly available to stakeholders at all levels of government in a timely and user-friendly format?*** 12 countries (92.3%) responded.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| **Belarus** | Yes | On a quarterly basis the Ministry of Finance publishes budget execution information on its website; information on budget capital expenditures can be found there as well |
| **BiH** | No |   |
| **Bulgaria** | No |  |
| **Croatia** | Yes | Investments are planned in a special section of the budget, and the budget is published in the Official Gazette and online. |
| **Georgia** | Yes | Capital Budget Annex of the State budget is a publicly available document; Investment projects of local governments are public as part of the budget; All the investment projects implemented by the Municipalities through capital transfers of central government is decided by Government decrees and they are public.  |
| **Kazakhstan** | Yes | Articles 153-154 of the Budget Code. Article 67-1 “Citizens’ Budget” of the Budget Code |
| **Kosovo** | Yes | We publish every year the Budget Law with tables on MoF website |
| **Macedonia** | No  |   |
| **Moldova** | Yes  | The IT system is in place and every budget authority/institution have access to the needed information, according to its role in the budget process. Morepver, there is a reporting system in place and every budget beneficiary has to present implementation reports according to the time frame set. The list of capital investments projects is an annex to the annual budget law |
| **Montenegro** | No |   |
| **Russia** | No |  |
| **Serbia** | Yes | Information in the Budget Act |
| **Total** | Yes - **7**No - 5 |  |

1. ***What are the key challenges in planning and executing the capital expenditures, including public investments from the methodological, institutional, administrative including an adequate IT support, financial or any other points of view?*** 11 countries (84.5%) responded.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Key challenge** |
| **Belarus** | Absence of strict rules and transparent criteria for pre-identification of investment projects and their selection for financing; a need to amend the investment programs design and approval procedure and their implementation reporting, as well as the procedure for developing mid-term investment programs based on the investment budget availability |
| **BiH** | Adopting a single legal framework and by-laws to establish the criteria for the definition of public investment at all government levels, as well as the criteria related to the planning, monitoring, reporting and evaluation of public investment projects. An IT system that would be able to respond to the needs of consolidated monitoring of public investment programs |
| **Bulgaria** | Public procurement, lack of IT systems for monitoring of the execution of projects, estimation of expenditures on cash and accrual basis |
| **Georgia** | PIM methodology though adopted in 2016 is not yet fully operational. Capacity of institutions, IT support, ad-hoc decisions of investment projects makes it a very time consuming exercise. Stakeholders are large in numbers and full scale training is also challenging. |
| **Kazakhstan** | The key challenge: achieving direct and ultimate outcomes vis-a-vis budget resources allocated to quasi-public sector entities (as defined in subparagraph 31 of article 3 of the Budget Code) |
| **Kosovo** | Weak planning, key point procurement procedures |
| **Macedonia** | To improve and establish proper investment planning and monitoring with adequate IT support |
| **Moldova** | 1.The institutional dispersion of decision making points on capital investments from various funds (Regional Development Fund, Ecological Fund, etc.); 2. Lack of clear definition and delimitation between capital expenditures and capital investments. |
| **Montenegro** | Methodology and IT support |
| **Russia** | Complex administrative procedures |
| **Serbia** | The key challenges are related to selection criteria, evaluation, preparation, and prioritization of capital projects |

**PART II: SPENDING REVIEWS**

1. ***Does your country conduct spending reviews in line with the definitions above?***

12 countries responded (92.3%).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Response** | **Specific plans** |
| **Armenia** | No and there are currently no plans |   |
| **Belarus** | Yes |   |
| **BiH** | Yes |   |
| **Bulgaria** | Yes |  |
| **Croatia** | Yes |   |
| **Georgia** | No, but there are plans | PEFA, IMF Fiscal Transparency, WB PER, IMF PIMA and analysis of selected programs by SAO are all common practice but no public spending review has been done yet. Georgia is planning to start distinguishing in public planning documents new and existing policies and upgrade further program based budgeting. One of the basis of future success of the reform will be regular monitoring systems for the programs which are long term and public spending reviews will be one the most important instruments for that |
| **Kazakhstan** | No, but there are plans  | In the past two years the World Bank has performed spending reviews for the Ministry of Labor and Social protection, Ministry of Investment and Development, and Ministry of Health. PEFA review was completed in 2018. |
| **Kosovo** | No and there are currently no plans |  |
| **Moldova** | Yes  |   |
| **Montenegro** | No, but there are plans  | The plan of the Ministry of Finance and the administrative bodies that carry out capital projects is based on the involvement of all line ministries, primarily by introducing program budgeting, and therefore it is necessary to determine the effects of programs and performance indicators. |
| **Russia** | Yes |  |
| **Serbia** | Yes |   |
| **Total** | Yes – **7**No+plans 3No- plans – 2 |  |

**Please note that If an answer to Q14 was “No” respondents were redirected to Q23**

1. ***Please explain what is the regulatory and methodological basis that establishes spending reviews in your country (select all that apply):***
* 9 countries responded (69.2%).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **There is a separate law on spending reviews**  | **Provisions for spending reviews included in the basic/organic budget law**  | **Authority for spending reviews gives by an executive order/decisions**  | **General guidelines/methodology for spending reviews**  | **There are no established guidelines/methodology, each spending review has its separate terms of references** | **Other** | **The name of documents**  | **Online links (if they are available online)**  |
| **Belarus** |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |
| **BiH** |  |  |  |  |  | The practice so far has been to carry out spending reviews (which were carried out in 2009, 2011, 2012) related to employee wage bill and material costs within the public spending of B&H institutions, resulting from stand-by arrangements with the IMF and other operational measures related to the material costs of the Council of Ministers of B&H | n/a | n/a |
| **Bulgaria** |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | not public/mandatory |
| **Croatia** |  |  | x | x |  | The Ministry of Finance has developed instructions for conducting government budget spending reviews. The instructions define the spending review methodology for the government budget and the contents of reports on spending review results | Decision on the Implementation of the Government Budget Spending Review for the Republic of Croatia (Official Gazette, no. 124/14); Final Report on the Results of the Government Budget Spending Review | https://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2014\_10\_124\_2373.html; http://www.mfin.hr/hr/dubinska-analiza-rashoda; http://www.mfin.hr/hr/analiza-materijalnih-rashoda |
| **Macedonia** |   |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |
| **Moldova** |   |  | x | x |  |  | Government decizion nr.107-D | Not published |
| **Russia** |  |  |  | x |  | By the statutory legal act of the Government of the Russian Federation the task of organizing spending reviews is entrusted to the special steering committee of the Government of the Russian Federation (the Government commission concerning optimization and increase in efficiency of budgeted expenses) | Order of the Government of the Russian Federation of August 26, 2014 No. 855 About Government commission concerning optimization and increase in efficiency of budgeted expenses | clc.am/VSVItA |
| **Serbia** |   |   | x |   | x |   |   |   |
| **Total** | 0 | 0 | **3** | **3** | **3** | 2 |  |  |

1. ***Please list all spending reviews conducted in your country, including i) the subject of the spending review (i.e. spending that was reviewed), ii) the year in which the spending review was conducted, and iii) objective of the spending review.***

7 countries (53.8%) responded.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Spending reviews** |
| **Belarus** | 2011 - Ensuring the pension system sustainability, enhancing social assistance targeting, streamlining energy and agriculture subsidies. 2013 - Intergovernmental fiscal relations; public spending on education and health |
| **BiH** | 2009 – reduction of wage bill and material costs2011 – operational measures to reduce material costs2012 – reduction of wage bill 2015 – reduction of material costs due to spending limits for certain types of costs |
| **Bulgaria** | Improving Efficiency and Effectiveness of Waste Management - 2018, Spending Review on Policing and Firefighting - 2018, Judicial Performance, Caseload and Expenditure Review - 2015, Review for Agriculture and Rural Development -2015 |
| **Croatia** | i) 1. compensation of employees paid from the government budget, 2. subsidies, apart from agriculture, 3. healthcare, 4. operation of agencies, institutes, funds and other legal persons with public authority, 5.tax expenditures; ii) 2014; iii) goal: achieving public finance sustainability by reducing total public spending |
| **Moldova** | In 2018 Moldova performed the first spending review exercise (as pilot). This was done in Education Sector, covering next areas: (i) Higher education and (ii) Vocational education. The objective was to identify potential savings to be used for other priorities in the sector |
| **Russia** | 1.1) a review of spending for the international obligations and events (projects) (pilot mode); 1.2) 2018; 1.3) analysis of the spendings of the federal government agencies for the international obligations and events (projects) from the standpoint of their relevance, appropriateness, and necessity; 2.1) a review of spending for acquisition of communication services by government agencies (pilot mode); 2.2) 2018; 2.3) analysis of the federal government agency spendings for purchase of local, long-distance and international telephone services (public telecommunications), mobile communications, development of dedicated communication networks in order to analyze current practices and develop uniform cost standards |
| **Serbia** | Spending review of salaries and pensions, for fiscal consolidation, in 2014–2018 |

1. ***Are performance indicators used in budgetary planning process examined and used in spending reviews?***

8 countries responded (61.5%).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Country | Response | Explaination |
| Belarus | Sometimes, to some extent |  |
| BiH | No, we do not have performance indicators in budgetary planning process | Program budgeting is not used |
| Bulgaria | Sometimes, to some extent | In some cases they are used |
| Croatia | No, we have performance indicators in budgetary planning process, but they are not used in spending reviews  | The spending review has been carried out for the explicit purpose of identifying savings or funds for reallocation |
| Macedonia | No, we have performance indicators in budgetary planning process, but they are not used in spending reviews  |  |
| Moldova | Yes, always  |  |
| Russia | Sometimes, to some extent | When carrying out spending reviews, indicators of the budget allocation justifications generated during the federal budget drafting, indicators of actual (cash) execution of the federal budget (budgets of state extra-budgetary funds) are analyzed. In addition, when conducting reviews of budget expenditures for implementation of the state programs, relevant targets (indicators) are subject to analysis. |
| Serbia | No, we have performance indicators in budgetary planning process, but they are not used in spending reviews  |   |

1. ***Are spending review reports published?***

7 countries (53.8%) responded.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Response** | **Online links** |
| **Belarus** | Yes | docplayer.ru/26049380-Obzor-gosudarstvennyh-rashodov-v-respublike-belarus.html |
| **BiH** | No |  |
| **Bulgaria** | Yes |  |
| **Croatia** | Yes | http://www.mfin.hr/hr/dubinska-analiza-rashoda; http://www.mfin.hr/hr/analiza-materijalnih-rashoda |
| **Moldova** | Yes  | They have to be published after approval (still are not approved) |
| **Russia** | Yes | In accordance with the Regulation for spending reviews, the relevant reports are subject to publication on the Central Budget System Portal of the Russian Federation (www.budget.gov.ru) no later than July 1 of the year they are conducted. Due to the fact that full-fledged (not in the pilot mode) spending reviews are conducted for the first time in 2019, their reports will be available on July 1, 2019. Publication of the reports on the pilot spending review results is not provided |
| **Serbia** | No |   |

1. ***Please indicate which government actors are primarily responsible for the following spending review procedures:***

7 countries (53.8%) responded.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Government actor** | **Determining methodology** | **Determining the scope – what spending will be the subject of a spending review** | **Providing guidance/steering** | **Conducting the spending review and preparing reports** | **Supervision and review of reports** | **Final decision making**  | **Monitoring and follow up** |
| President/ Prime Minister’s Office | BIH, RUS | MDA, RUS |  |  | SRB, BGR, RUS | BIH, MDA, SRB, BGR, RUS | BIH, SRB, BGR |
| Ministry of Finance/ CBA | HRV, MDA, SRB, BGR, RUS | BLR, BIH, HRV, SRB, BGR | BIH, HRV, MDA, SRB, BGR, RUS | HRV, MDA, SRB, BGR, RUS | BIH, HRV |  | BIH, HRV, SRB, RUS |
| Line ministries |  | HRV, SRB, BGR | BLR | HRV, MDA, SRB, BGR |  |  | HRV, RUS |
| Committee/Commission | BLR, RUS |  |  | BIH, HRV, BGR, RUS | MDA |  | HRV, MDA |

1 comment was left by the respondent from Russia: *By “President /Prime Minister's Office” we refer to a special steering committee of the Government of the Russian Federation (the Government commission concerning optimization and increase in efficiency of budgeted expenses); “Committee / Commission” refers to the temporary Working Groups on conducting specific spending reviews created (creating) under the Government commission concerning optimization and increase in efficiency of budgeted expenses.*

1. ***Please describe the composition of teams/bodies/working groups/committees that conduct spending reviews in your country***

5 countries (53.8%) responded.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Composition of teams/bodies/working groups/committees** |
| **Belarus** | The spending review was performed by a World Bank team comprising representatives of the Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Taxation and Collections, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Health, National Statistics Committee, National Bank, executive authorities of the Minsk Region and the City of Minsk etc. |
| **BiH** | Working teams are formed as necessary and depending on the subject of the spending review. The Ministry of Finance is usually in charge, while representatives of other institutions are called in if necessary. |
| **Bulgaria** | Not applicable |
| **Croatia** | The Croatian Government has appointed a Central Committee for Government Budget Spending Reviews for each of the five expenditure areas. This body coordinates and monitors the work of committees responsible for conducting spending reviews. The Government of the Republic of Croatia has appointed a president and six members from senior civil service positions to work in the Central Committee. The members come from the Ministry of Public Administration, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Maritime Affairs, Transport and Infrastructure, Ministry of Science and Education, and two members from the Ministry of Finance, one of whom is also the president of the Central Committee. |
| **Moldova** | Spending review team is chaired by the Ministry of finance and includes also representatives of other line ministries that have institutions in education sector: Ministry of Education; Ministry os Helth and social protection; Ministry of Agricuture. |
| **Russia** | The procedure for formation of the temporary working groups for spending reviews is established by the Regulation on spending reviews. The composition of the Working Groups is approved by the Government commission concerning optimization and increase in efficiency of budgeted expenses as proposed by the Ministry of Finance of the Russian Federation. The Head of the Working Group is the Deputy Minister of Finance of the Russian Federation; the Deputy Head of the Working group is the head of the structural unit of the Ministry of Finance of the Russian Federation, whose activities correspond to the object of the condacted spending review. Organizational support for the Working Group is provided by an executive secretary. From each interested state body, governing body of state extra-budgetary funds and other organization at least 1 representative shall be included in the Working Group in a position not lower than a deputy head. Representatives of other state bodies, independent experts may be invited to meetings of the Working Groups. For example, the Working Group on the spending reviews of budgetary expenditures for maintenance activities and exercising of authority of the Federal Bailiff Service in 2019 includes: the head of the Working Group (MoF of the Russian Federation), deputy head of the Working Group (MoF of the Russian Federation), executive secretary (MoF of the Russian Federation), other representatives of the Ministry of Finance, representatives of the Federal Bailiff Service, representatives of the Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation, representatives of the Federal Treasury, representatives of the scientific community. |
| **Serbia** | The Ministry of Finance, line ministries, IMF |

1. ***To what extent are spending recommendations from the spending reviews usually adopted and implemented in the following budgets:***

7 countries (53.8%) responded.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Response** | **Explaination** |
| **Belarus** | Most recommendations are implemented |   |
| **BiH** | Most recommendations are implemented | So far recommendations have been implemented immediately after the adoption of the Council of Ministers’ implementing acts |
| **BulgariA** | Some recommendations are implemented |  |
| **Croatia** | Most recommendations are implemented | Most recommendations have been implemented during the budgeting process in 2016 |
| **Moldova** | Recommendations are implemented in a very small part only | They are still with the status of draft, but after approval it is supposed to be implemented. Of course this will depend of many factors like how sensitive politically they are; election cycle and so on.  |
| **Russia** |  | At present, it is difficult to give an appropriate assessment, since the last spending reviews were conducted in a pilot mode and not much time passed after their completion. |
| **Serbia** | Most recommendations are implemented |   |

1. ***Please share main lessons learnt from the spending reviews your country conducted so far:***

6 countries responded (46.2%).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Main lessons** |
| **Belarus** | The spending review helped to identify possible reforms aimed to improve quality of key public services under budget constraint |
| **BiH** | We have maintained the macroeconomic stability of the country |
| **Bulgaria** | The results are not always related to optimization of expenditures and administrative structures but to increase efficiency. |
| **Moldova** | The existence of sufficient capacities and staff is crucial. There is a need for a dedicated subdivision in the Ministry of finance, responsible for co-ordination of the process. The motivation of the authorities involved is important for an objective analysis. A realistic calendar and methodology must exist to produce a qualitative analysis. |
| **Russia** | Representatives of interested state bodies, governing bodies of state extrabudgetary funds and other organizations that are part of the Working Groups are often not active, provide formal participation in the meetings of the relevant Working Groups and sometimes can counteract their activities. Qualitative spending reviews are a very time-consuming process, requiring sufficient labor and time resources |
| **Serbia** | Prior to their implementation, recommendations should be aligned with the legal framework |

1. **What are the main challenges your country faces/would face in regards to spending reviews:**

11 countries responded (84.6%).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Challenges** | **Low challenge** | **Medium challenge**  | **High challenge** | **Total** |
| Lack of available staff |  | BIH, HRV, GEO, KOSOVO, BGR | BLR, MDA, MNE, SRB, RUS | L – 0M – 5H – 5 |
| Lack of capability – e.g. technical expertise in terms of analysis or methodological skills |  | BIH, HRV, GEO, KOSOVO, MDA | BLR, MNE, SRB, BGR, RUS | L – 0M – 5H – 5 |
| Lack of performance information/data | BLR, MDA, BGR, RUS | GEO, KOSOVO, SRB | BIH, HRV, MNE | L – **4**M – 3H – 3  |
| Poor quality of performance information/data | BLR, MDA, RUS | GEO, KOSOVO, MNE, SRB, BGR | BIH, HRV | L – 3M – **5**H – 2 |
| Lack of time | MNE | BLR, BIH, KAZ, KOSOVO, SRB, BGR, RUS | HRV, GEO, MDA | L – 1M – **7**H – 3 |
| Lack of political support - executive | BIH, HRV, MNE | BLR, GEO, MDA, BGR, RUS | KOSOVO, SRB | L – 3M – **5**H – 2 |
| Lack of political support - legislative | HRV, MDA, MNE, BGR, RUS | BLR, BIH, GEO, KOSOVO | SRB | L – **5**M – 4H – 1 |
| Lack of management support – senior civil service | BLR, GEO, MDA, MNE, RUS | BIH, HRV, KOSOVO, SRB, BGR |  | L – 5M – 5H – 0 |
| Lack of framework/standardized guidelines and methodology | BIH, MDA, SRB, RUS | HRV, GEO, KOSOVO | BLR, MNE, BGR | L – **4**M – 3H – 3 |
| Lack of attention on implementation/execution of recommendations from spending reviews | BIH | BLR, HRV, SRB, BGR | GEO, KOSOVO, MNE, RUS | L – 1M – **4**H – **4** |
| ICT | GEO, KAZ, MDA, RUS | BLR, KOSOVO, SRB | BIH, MNE, BGR | L – **4**M – 3H – 3 |
| Gaming  | BLR, HRV, MDA, SRB, BGR, RUS | BIH, GEO, KOSOVO, MNE |  | L – **6**M – 4H – 0 |

1. ***Please explain more detai the challenge you believe is the most important one:***
2. ***Please describe your country's plan sin regards to spending reviews, if any:***

10 countries (76.9%) responded.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Challenge**  | **Country's plan sin regards to spending reviews** |
| **Belarus** | Lack of professionals with required analytical and methodological skills; understaffing | Currently the World Bank team prepares a spending review regarding fiscal expenditures and debt as well as social sectors spending |
| **BiH** | Lack of a methodological framework and standardized guidelines |   |
| **Bulgaria** | the lack of technical expertise - analysis and methodological skills | The budget procedure sets spending review of the Ministry of External Affairs. |
| **Croatia** | The biggest challenge was the lack of time allocated for gathering and analyzing data, and the fact that this information was collected at the end of the year when legal persons are obliged to prepare other reports and employees are on vacation. Information was collected using an online survey, however, deadlines were not kept and there were problems with data accuracy | Currently we have no new plans |
| **Kazakhstan** | Lack of time | The reviews are not only initiated by international organizations, but also are done upon our requests; they are performed by our academia and NGOs |
| **Kosovo** | Political suport  |   |
| **Moldova** | The imlementation of the results it seems to be the bigest chalange. | The objective is to integrate into the budget calendar and to institutionalize as a permanent tool for reviewing spendings aiming to consolidate efectiveness and eficiency of programes. |
| **Montenegro** | Lack of staff and lack of performance information | Involvement of line ministries |
| **Russia** | Problem of establishing need to take into account the spending review results in budget planning framework (installability of spending reviews into the budgeting) | Until April 15, 2019, a list of objects (topics) of spending reviews until 2024 will be defined - it is assumed that 6 objects will be reviewed annually (at least 2 - by main budget holders (ministries, departments), at least 2 - by government programs, at least 2 - for individual “cross-cutting” types of expenses (areas of activity)). It is also planned to carry out work to improve the spending review methodology, their information support and provision, to reinforce need to take into account results of spending reviews on a regular basis in existing regulatory legal acts |
| **Serbia** | Political support in the implementation of recommendations, because often measures taken to reduce expenditures are not politically popular (e.g. salary and pension cuts) |   |

**PART III: Developing the Questions for the Discussion Groups planned for the March 2019 BCOP Plenary**

1. ***To assist the BCOP Program and Performance Budgeting Working Group prepare the questions for small group discussions on the topic of spending reviews during the plenary meeting, please note specific challenges/problems/issues within the topic of spending reviews that you would like discussed during the plenary:***

9 countries (69.2%) responded.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Questions** |
| **Belarus** | - designing regulations and guidelines to ensure high efficiency and impact of spending reviews and their integration in the budget process; - frequency of spending reviews; - spending reviews in government programs |
| **BiH** | A practical example of a spending review, examples of good practice and methodological frameworks and guidelines that proved to be a good basis for spending reviews. Examples of good allocation of tasks/responsibilities as regards spending reviews |
| **Croatia** | Should we conduct spending reviews every year and focus on only one area in its scope? Who appoints the committee for conducting spending reviews, who should be included in the committee? Should we invite representatives of ministries and agencies where spending reviews are being conducted? What are the tasks of the committee? (after the spending review has been completed, they prepare a report outlining recommendations and suggestions, along with a proposed set of measures for achieving set targets) |
| **Georgia** | Optimal size and structure of the review team; Enforcement mechanisms to have adequate feedback on recommendations; |
| **Kazakhstan** | One specific challenge: assessment of long-term public finance sustainability |
| **Kosovo** | Information regarding to the budget spending  |
| **Macedonia** | If some of the countries produce spending reviews, how did they establishe the system of spending reviews? |
| **Moldova** | Presenting and discussing the most efficient options for organizing/conducting spending reviews: (i) a dedicated subdivision / authority with exclusive responsibility; or (ii) ad hoc mixed groups of representatives from different institutions. Advantages and disadvantages |
| **Serbia** | The challenges of implementing the recommendations of spending reviews in practice |

**PART IV: INPUTS FOR Developing the BCOP Action Plan**

1. ***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***

11 countries (84.6%) responded.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Priority 1** | **Priority 2** | **Priority 3** | **Explanation of why these are important to your country:** |
| Belarus | Shifting the focus of budgeting from “budget expenditures management” to “managing outcomes”; this will require introducing standard cost budgeting approaches that look at the cost of service per user instead of itemized costs of maintaining personnel and property of organizations (this is relevant for designing the best arrangements that would fully meet efficiency and effectiveness criteria and also give more authority to line ministries regarding resource allocation) | Implementation of MTEF to enhance budget discipline, make the budget process more predictable and stabilize the economy | Incentives for municipal authorities to build up own revenues base and enhance their self-sufficiency |   |
| BiH | Defining and monitoring the indicators of the legislative and executive authorities and supporting IT systems | Budget classifications and integration into a single system |  | A reform process is under way to introduce program budgeting. Currently, the biggest challenge is to define quality indicators that can be monitored |
| Bulgaria | Performance Budgeting for Supervision, Control and Regulatory Organs |  |  | Currently we are introducing performance budgeting for supervision, control and regulatory organs |
| Croatia | Funds for primary and secondary education (state or local level?) | Research funding | Healthcare funding | Investing in children and education means investing for a better future. Investments in healthcare are expected to yield improvements in healthcare service which will result in healthier citizens, fewer sick leaves and better work efficiency. Healthcare funding is a problem even in developed countries |
| Georgia | PIM | Costing methodologies | Midterm reconciliations |   |
| Kazakhstan | Performance-Based Budgeting | Citizens’ budgets | Gender budgeting | These issues are on the agenda, some legislative action has been taken but implementation mechanisms reflecting possible risks and global experience are needed |
| Kosovo | Spending rewiev | Programm budgeting | Capital budget | Because we still doesnt make spending rewiev and we didnt put in place programmm budgeting |
| Macedonia | Fiscal rules | Fiscal risks | Gender budgeting | We are in the phase of preparation of the new organic budget law determining these topics with law and secondary legislation. It is important for us to gain more knowledge on these topics |
| Moldova | Intergation of gender responsive budget in the planing methodology and process. |  |  | This fashionable topic puts a lot of pressure on the authorities to devote space in the methodology and budget planning process. |
| Russia | Methodological and practical aspects of spending review | Modernization of the program budget using the project approach | Building a system of citizen participation in budget planning |  |
| Serbia | Monitoring and reporting on program performance | A comparative review of the budget of PEMPAL countries | Estimation of the cost of new policies | As regards program budgeting, we have reached the stage of reporting on program performance and we need examples from other countries to see how they use and deliver performance information |

1. ***If your country is a member of the BCOP Budget Transparency and Literacy Working Group please provide details of sub-topics that should be considered within those groups:***
2. ***If your country is a member of the BCOP Program and Performance Budgeting Working Group please provide details of sub-topics that should be considered within those groups:***

7 countries (53.8%) responded.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **28** | **29** |
| Belarus | Designing a strategy to improve budget literacy. Citizens' engagement in the budget process: formats, mechanisms, influence on decision-making | Budgeting expenditures to maintain central administrative offices of government bodies (KPI).Budgeting based on unit cost per beneficiary and(or) in the sector |
| BiH |   | Performance indicators/measures and budget classifications |
| Croatia | How do citizens get information on the budget in PEMPAL countries? Are students in schools and universities taught about the budget? Does the Ministry of Finance participate in the education of citizens? How can citizens participate in budgeting? Which budget information is published? | Program budgeting at the local level focused on education and healthcare |
| Kazakhstan | Budget literacy, participatory budgeting, new formats for interaction between the government and civil society | [Our country] is not a member |
| Kosovo | Involve of citizens doring preparing the budget | Performance indicators |
| Russia | Practical issues of introducing proactive (participatory) budgeting; "Restarting" public hearings on draft budgets and reports | Integration of spending review tools into the budget process; formats for the work of the spending review working groups (practical examples); approaches to the analysis of individual objects (topics) of spending reviews (practical examples). Development of a unified methodology for assessing the effectiveness of government programs, certain types of expenditures; possibility of creating a mechanism of "continuous" assessment of the quality, effectiveness and efficiency of budget expenditures at all stages of the budget cycle |
| Serbia | The level of detail for expressed budget expenditures | Monitoring and reporting on program performance |

1. ***Is your country willing to host the next BCOP plenary meeting in 2020:***

9 countries respond to this question. Responses “Yes” – 0; “Maybe” – 4 (Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, Serbia); “No” - **7** (Belarus, BiH, Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, and Russia).

**PART V: COOPERATION OF BCOP WITH OTHER TWO PEMPAL COPS**

1. ***What thematic PFM areas would be most preferable for discussion in potential joint events/activities of BCOP with Treasury COP (TCOP)?***

8 countries (66.6%) responded.

1. ***What thematic PFM areas would be most preferable for discussion in potential joint events/activities of BCOP with Internal Audit COP (IACOP)?***

6 countries (46.2%) responded.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **thematic PFM areas would be most preferable for discussion in potential joint events/activities of BCOP with TCOP** | **thematic PFM areas would be most preferable for discussion in potential joint events/activities of BCOP with IACOP** |
| **Belarus** | Relations between budget classification, Unified Chart of Accounts and financial reporting standards | Revising the system of financial control and audit so that it contributes to higher efficiency of public expenditures |
| **BiH** | International accounting standards in the public sector |   |
| **Croatia** | Budget execution reports (contents, deadlines) Budget classifications |   |
| **Georgia** | Planning and accounting for Assets | Internal Financial Management and Control |
| **Kazakhstan** | 1. Unified chart of accounts. 2. Designing new budget documentation formats for accrual budgeting | Preliminary opinion of the Audit Committee regarding the budget proposal – new ways to assess risks related to budget decisions and new audit criteria |
| **Kosovo** | Eficiency of alocation  | Perfomance auditing |
| **Macedonia** | Linking budget and treasury systems and arrears | Spending control and strategic planing |
| **Serbia** | Transition from cash accounting to accrual accounting | Managerial accountability – accountability of managers for performance |

**PART VI: Data for monitoring of the 2017-2022 PEMPAL Strategy**

1. ***Has the knowledge gained through PEMPAL BCOP activities been used to design, recommend, and/or implement PFM practices in your country?*** 12 countries responded (92.3%).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Yes/No** | **Explaination and/ or an example of what knowledge gained through BCOP was used and how** |
| **Belarus** | Yes | - implementation of programmatic and performance budgeting in the budget process; - in order to engage citizens on the budget process and enhance their knowledge on budget issues, the Ministry of Finance in 2017 for the first time developed and published on its website the “Citizens’ Budget of the Republic of Belarus for 2018”. It contained information on the budget development and budget resources use presented in simple and easy-to-understand manner; - comprehensive efforts to assess fiscal risks and constant monitoring of such risks |
| **BiH** | Yes  | Based on the knowledge gained in previous working groups, a rationalization of the established programs has been carried out – program integration and generalization, and the integration of indicators (identification of significant indicators that should be included in the budget documentation, and identification of indicators that institutions can/should monitor internally) |
| **Bulgaria** | Yes | Key indicators |
| **Croatia** | Yes | The study visit to Ireland where we learned about spending reviews which helped us prepare instructions on how to conduct spending reviews. Experience shared by experts from developed countries, and the experience of other PEMPAL countries, is used when drafting budget regulations |
| **Georgia** | Yes  | The meeting touches the aspects of PFM Georgia has been dealing with as part of its reform. Experience sharing during meetings adds to the accuracy of reform developments. |
| **Kazakhstan** | Yes | Participation in BCOP activities helped to justify the need to include provisions on citizens’ budgets in the Budget Code. The provisions became effective from January 1, 2018.Trends toward adjusting the approved budget during fiscal year informed additional provisions in the current budget legislation. Arrangements to support efficient operation of the planning function (simplification of budget requests, consolidation of budget programs, alignment of strategic plans with the budget envelope) |
| **Kosovo** | Yes  | In the next budget preparation(for budget 2020) we are planing to ad performance measure by the sector |
| **Macedonia** | Yes  | Now we are using gained knowledge while writing new budget law and knowledge gained in the field of fiscal transparency |
| **Moldova** | Yes  | Knoowlwdges and experiences regarding Citizen Budget were used in produsing this docoment in Moldova |
| **Montenegro** | Yes | The colleagues who attended BCOP events were happy to share the acquired knowledge and experience of other countries with regard to the area of public finances |
| **Russia** | Yes |  |
| **Serbia** | Yes  | The introduction and improvement of the program budget was largely based on the knowledge and experience of other countries obtained at BCOP plenary sessions. Also, during the preparation of the citizens’ budget, the information and presentations provided at the BCOP meeting were used as an example |

1. ***In your opinion, to what extent is participation in PEMPAL BCOP useful for member countries in the following reform aspects:*** 12 countries responded (92.3%).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Aspects** | **Very useful** | **Moderately useful** | **Some-what useful** | **Not useful** | **Total** |
| Identifying and/or benchmarking good practices **inside** the PEMPAL region | BLR, BIH, HRV, KAZ, KOSOVO, MCD, MNE, SRB, RUS | GEO, MDA, BGR |  |  | VU – **9**MU – 3SU - 0 |
| Identifying and/or benchmarking good practices **outside** the PEMPAL region | BLR, HRV, KAZ, KOSOVO, MCD, MDA, SRB, BGR | BIH, MNE, RUS | GEO |  | VU – **8**MU – 3SU - 1 |
| Providing access to technical information and knowledge resources in understandable languages  | HRV, GEO, KAZ, MCD, MDA, MNE, SRB, RUS | BLR, BIH, KOSOVO, BGR |  |  | VU – **8**MU – 4SU - 0 |
| Providing opportunities to **discuss budget reform challenges/issues** with my peers in other Ministries of Finance | BLR, BIH, HRV, GEO, KAZ, KOSOVO, MCD, MDA, MNE, SRB, BGR, RUS |  |  |  | VU – **12**MU – 0SU - 0 |
| Providing opportunities to **discuss potential options/solutions to PFM problems** with my peers in other Ministries of Finance | BLR, HRV, KAZ, MCD, MDA, MNE, SRB, BGR, RUS | BIH, KOSOVO | GEO |  | VU – **9**MU – 2SU - 1 |
| Providing opportunities to present my country’s progress and achievements | HRV, KAZ, MCD, MDA, SRB, RUS | BLR, BIH, GEO, KOSOVO, MNE, BGR |  |  | VU – 6MU – 6SU - 0 |
| Strengthening capacities and/or confidence in leading/managing reforms | HRV, GEO, KAZ, MCD, MDA, SRB | BLR, BIH, KOSOVO, MNE, BGR, RUS |  |  | VU – 6MU – 6SU - 0 |
| Strengthening budget related policy/legislative framework through examining frameworks in other countries shared during PEMPAL events. | BLR, HRV, KAZ, MCD, MDA, SRB | BIH, GEO, KOSOVO, MNE, RUS | BGR |  | VU – **6**MU – 5SU - 1 |
| Enabling creation of knowledge from PEMPAL region to inform other regions | HRV, GEO, KAZ, MCD, MDA, MNE, SRB, BGR | BLR, BIH, KOSOVO, RUS |  |  | VU – **8**MU – 4SU - 0 |

1. ***How would you rate the quality of knowledge materials you encountered in your engagement with the BCOP by type of materials:***

12 countries responded (92.3%).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Materials** | **Excellent quality** | **Good quality** | **Poor quality** | **Total** |
| Presentations from BCOP events | BLR, BIH, HRV, GEO, KAZ, KOSOVO, MCD, MDA, MNE  | BGR, RUS |  | EQ – **9**GQ – 2 |
| Additional secondary documents/papers on specific topics distributed and translated for BCOP events – for example, reports from international organizations such as OECD, GIFT, IBP, or World Bank  | BIH, HRV, GEO, KAZ, MCD, MDA, SRB, BGR, RUS | BLR, KOSOVO, MNE |  | EQ – **9**GQ – 3 |
| Knowledge products developed by the BCOP working groups since 2017:products developed by the Budget Literacy and Transparency Working Group: *Breaking Challenges in Constructing Citizens’ Budgets for PEMPAL Countries* and *Background Paper on Public Participation in Fiscal Policy and Budget Process*products developed by the Program and Performance Budgeting Working Group:*OECD-PEMPAL 2016 Performance Budgeting Survey* and*Performance Indicators in PEMPAL Countries: Trends and Challenges*  | BLR, BIH, HRV, KAZ, MCD, MDA, MNE, SRB, BGR, RUS | GEO, KOSOVO |  | EQ – **10**GQ – 2 |
| Specific documents and examples from individual countries made available through BCOP – for example, specific lists of programs and indicators used in different PEMPAL countries, specific regulations related to budget transparency or other topics in in different PEMPAL countries, specific regulatory or methodological documents governing spefic topics in specific countries (from or outside of PEMPAL region) | BIH, KAZ, MCD, MDA, SRB, RUS | BLR, HRV, GEO, KOSOVO, MNE, BGR |  | EQ – 6GQ – 6 |

1. ***What among these types of materials are most useful and important in your view? (answer options are very useful, moderately usefuly, somewhat useful, and not useful)***

11 countries (84.6%) responded. All answers are very useful or moderately useful, no answers of somewhat useful and not useful.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Presentations from BCOP events** | **Additional secondary documents/papers on specific topics distributed and translated for BCOP events – for example, reports from international organizations such as OECD, GIFT, IBP, or World Bank** | **Knowledge products developed by the BCOP working groups since 2017:****i) products developed by the Budget Literacy and Transparency Working Group: *Breaking Challenges in Constructing Citizens’ Budgets for PEMPAL Countries* and*Background Paper on Public Participation in Fiscal Policy and Budget Process*****ii)products developed by the Program and Performance Budgeting Working Group: *OECD-PEMPAL 2016 Performance Budgeting Survey*and*Performance Indicators in PEMPAL Countries: Trends and Challenges*** | **Specific documents and examples from individual countries made available through BCOP – for example,****specific lists of programs and indicators used in different PEMPAL countries, specific regulations related to budget transparency or other topics in in different PEMPAL countries, specific regulatory or methodological documents governing spefic topics in specific countries (from or outside of PEMPAL region)** | **On what type of knowledge products should we mostly focus in future?** |
| **Belarus** | Useful  | Very useful  | Very useful  | Very useful  |   |
| **BiH** | Useful  | Useful  | Useful  | Very useful  | Practical examples and documentation |
| **Bulgaria** | Useful  | Useful  | Useful  | Useful |  |
| **Croatia** | Very useful  | Very useful  | Very useful  | Useful | Knowledge products developed by BCOP |
| **Georgia** | Useful | Useful | Useful | Useful |   |
| **Kazakhstan** | Very useful  | Very useful  | Very useful  | Very useful  | Practitioners need actual budget information since policy decisions and reform stages happen in different points of time |
| **Kosovo** | Very useful  | Useful | Very useful  | Very useful  | specific documents and examples from individual countries made available through BCOP |
| **Moldova** | Very useful  | Very useful  | Very useful  | Very useful  |   |
| **Montenegro** | Very useful  | Very useful  | Useful  | Very useful  |   |
| **Russia** | Useful | Very useful  | Very useful  | Very useful  |  |
| **Serbia** | Very useful  | Useful  | Very useful  | Useful  | Specific examples from other countries. |
| **Total** | U - 5VU - **6** | U - 5VU - **6** | U - 4VU - **7** | U - 4VU - **7** |  |

1. ***What is the level of quality of BCOP activities, events, and knowledge resources and materials in the following main thematic areas in your opinion:***

***(answer options are excellent quality, good quality, and poor quality).***

11 countries (84.6%) responded.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Activities, events, and knowledge resources and materials related to the BCOP Budget Literacy and Transparency Working Group topics** | **Activities, events, and knowledge resources and materials related to the BCOP Program and Performance Budgeting Working Group topics** |
| **Belarus** | Excellent quality | Excellent quality |
| **BiH** | Excellent quality | Excellent quality |
| **Bulgaria** | \_ | Excellent quality |
| **Croatia** | Excellent quality | Excellent quality |
| **Georgia** | Good quality  | Good quality  |
| **Kazakhstan** | Excellent quality |  \_ |
| **Kosovo** | Good quality  | Excellent quality  |
| **Moldova** | Excellent quality  | Excellent quality  |
| **Montenegro** | Excellent quality | Excellent quality |
| **Russia** | Excellent quality | Excellent quality |
| **Serbia** | Excellent quality | Excellent quality |
| **Total** | GQ – 2: EQ - **8** | GQ – 1; EQ - **9** |

1. ***Overall, in your opinion, what impact or influence has PEMPAL BCOP had on your country's budget practices and reforms:***
2. ***Overall, in your opinion, what impact or influence has PEMPAL BCOP had on capacity of staff from your Ministry/Department that participate in BCOP activities (including yourself):***

***Answer options are no impact, low impact, medium impact, and significant impact.***

12 countries responded (92.3%).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Impact or influence has PEMPAL BCOP had on your country's budget practices and reforms?** | **Impact or influence has PEMPAL BCOP had on capacity of staff from your Ministry/Department** |
| **Belarus** | Significant impact | Significant impact |
| **BiH** | Medium impact  | Medium impact  |
| **Bulgaria** | Medium impact  | Medium impact  |
| **Croatia** | Medium impact  | Significant impact |
| **Georgia** | Low impact | Medium impact  |
| **Kazakhstan** | Significant impact | Significant impact |
| **Kosovo** | Low impact | Low impact  |
| **Macedonia** | Medium impact  | Medium impact  |
| **Moldova** | Significant impact  | Significant impact |
| **Montenegro** | Medium impact  | Medium impact  |
| **Russia** | Medium impact  | Medium impact  |
| **Serbia** | Medium impact  | Significant impact |
| **Total** | SI – 3; MI - **7**LI - 2 | SI – 5;MI - **6**LI - 1 |

1. ***Please provide any suggestions on how your country could benefit more from participating in PEMPAL activities?***
2. ***Please provide any suggestions/improvements you would like the BCOP Executive Committee to consider for future work of BCOP:***

4 countries responded (30.8%).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Suggestions on how your country could benefit more from participating in PEMPAL activities:** | **Suggestions/improvements you would like the BCOP Executive Committee to consider for future work of BCOP:** |
| **Kazakhstan** |  | Trends towards cross-cutting interrelated budgeting and treasury budget compliance in our country are mandated by the budget legislation. The budget process is about interrelated procedures seeking to achieve a common outcome. Strengthening analysis during budgeting.Budget quality assessment based on its execution outcomes. |
| **Kosovo** | If PEMPAL can translate the material to language of the participating country | More focus on countries in transision and problems they face  |
| **Moldova** |   | More activities, more time per activity. |
| **Serbia** | More activities in the first half of the year, prior to the budget preparation process. |   |