DAY 1:
GROUPS 5 AND 6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>Group 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>Montenegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Reporter: Halis Kiral</td>
<td>Volunteer reporter: Nina Blecic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator: Deanna Aubrey</td>
<td>Facilitator: Ljerka Crnkovic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert: Kay Brown South Africa</td>
<td>Expert: Lewis Hawke and Sandy Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Treasury</td>
<td>(World Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer: Irene Frei - SECO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Summary of Outcomes for Question 1  
  Group-5
• Romania and Turkey demonstrated portals  
  • Transparency – even individual salaries for staff in Romania and salary bands in Turkey  
• Information must be used by somebody, cost vs benefits. Lack of IT infrastructure, staff, skills, capacity in some countries  
• Transparency often driven by international requirements.  
• Importance of exchange of information between different levels of government-centralized information, many issues are at local level in several countries.
• Summary of Outcomes for Question 1 (Group 6)

• Presentation on portals in Croatia
• Presentation by World Bank (Sandy Min) on different portals taken from FMIS and OBD study

• All countries have websites.

• Montenegro, Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina – MoF web pages.
  • Public procurement information published outside MoF – Public Procurement Administration (Serbia, Montenegro), Agency (BiH), Ministry of Economy (Croatia).

Good practice examples
• Information on arrears with due dates (SRB)

• Benefits
  • Transparency
  • Increased Government accountability
  • Better use of funds
  • Compliance with laws and bylaws
Suggestions for Improvement

- Enable the citizens to provide their inputs in the process of budget preparation.

- Citizens should have the option to take part in budget development (good examples of some cities).

- Web portals should present more information that citizens need.

- Citizens should get involved in budget development prior to its adoption by the Government, in the process of public debate.
Summary of Outcomes for Question 2&3 Group-5

- Assessments very useful (PEFA) for benchmarking, recommendations.
- Conflicting results! (EU does not accept PEFA)
- Results must be accurate and verified before released and, conducted by competent people but tools, surveys, interviews are not very perfect.
- International organizations should clarify their results with respective MoF. Sometimes out of date when released.
- OECD, WB, EC - multiple reports & multiple recommendations. Country prioritization of recommendations important.
- Inappropriate benchmarking. No one size fits all. Policy space
- Lost in translation, concept, terminology. Importance of glossary, quality of interpreters.
• Summary of Outcomes for Question 2 (Group 6)

• All countries are familiar with these assessments.

• These assessments have pointed out some weaknesses and helped address them and thus contribute to improving of efficiency.

• Most countries have established Fiscal Councils.
• Summary of Outcomes for Question 3 (Group 6)

• Assessments can indicate the areas that need improvement and increase efficiency of use of public funds.

• Encourage citizen participation, either through applications and/or round tables or debates.
Thank you!