DAY 1:
GROUPS 7 AND 8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 7</th>
<th>Group 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings of discussions on Question 1

- Russia, Moldova, Armenia, Kyrgyzstan (other countries are planning to develop tools to ensure higher accessibility of budget information in the nearest future)

- Benefits:
  - More trust to authorities
  - Better development of information society and electronic interaction
    - Less bureaucracy and corruption
    - Citizens’ participation in decision-making

- Challenges:
  - low internet coverage
  - low level of financial literacy
  - difficulties in application of respective resources
  - abuse of data is probable
  - wrong interpretation of information
• Findings of discussions on Question 2

• Every country underwent assessments, mainly PEFA and OBI.

  Benefits:
  - Competition between and inside countries supports efforts aimed at increasing transparency
  - They promote PFM reforms in the interest of citizens
    - They share best practices
    - They trigger changes in other areas

  Challenges:
  - Not all indicators are representative
  - Assessment methods lag behind
  - Impact of consultants’ subjective attitude
Thank you!