

The Mechanics of the Framework

Asian Development Bank Workshop

October 2014

PEFA Secretariat

This is not an ADB material. The views expressed in this document are the views of the author/s and/or their organizations and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Asian Development Bank, or its Board of Governors, or the governments they represent. ADB does not guarantee the accuracy and/or completeness of the material's contents, and accepts no responsibility for any direct or indirect consequence of their use or reliance, whether wholly or partially. Please feel free to contact the authors directly should you have queries.

Contents

The PEFA Framework

The high-level Indicator Set

Scoring Methodology

The PFM Performance Report

The PEFA Framework

- PFM Performance Measurement Framework
 - Better known as ‘the PEFA Framework’ [Blue Book]
 - The ‘flagship’ product of the PEFA Program
 - Launched in June 2005
- Designed to measure performance of **national** PFM systems
- Application to countries at different stages of development

Purpose of the PEFA Framework

- **Objective:** To determine if a country has tools to deliver 3 main budgetary outcomes
- **It provides:** High level overview of all aspects of a country's PFM systems performance, including revenue, expenditure procurement, financial assets/liabilities

It does **not** provide assessment of:

- Underlying causes of good/poor performance
- Government fiscal/expenditure policies

Components of the Framework

- A standard set of high level PFM indicators to assess performance against 6 critical dimensions of a PFM system
 - 28 government indicators covering all aspects of PFM
 - 3 donor indicators, reflecting donor practices influencing the government's PFM systems
- A concise, **integrated** performance report – the PRM-PR – developed to provide narrative on the indicators and draw a **summary** from the analysis

Focus of the framework

- Focused on central government operations, but links to other parts of the public sector (SNGs, PEs) to the extent these have implications for CG
- Applicable for SNG, but specific guidelines
- Not for public business / state-owned enterprises, as different governance standards
- Sector level PFM assessment? - Not directly applicable (integrate selected sectors into general PEFA assessment)

Contents

The PEFA Framework


The high-level Indicator Set

Scoring Methodology

The PFM Performance Report

Structure of the indicator set

The PEFA performance framework



Standard set of high-level indicators

- A. CREDIBILITY OF THE BUDGET: PFM OUT-TURNS (1- 4)
- B. COMPREHENSIVENESS & TRANSPARENCY (5 - 10)
- C. BUDGET CYCLE
 - C1 POLICY-BASED BUDGETING (11 – 12)*
 - C2 PREDICTABILITY & CONTROL IN BUDGET EXECUTION (13 – 21)*
 - C3 ACCOUNTING, RECORDING & REPORTING (22 – 25)*
- D. EXTERNAL SCRUTINY & AUDIT (26 – 28)
- E. INDICATORS OF DONOR PRACTICES (D1 – D3)

An example: Procurement coverage

Often inadequately covered in PFM-PRs

Why is procurement important:

- 20 to 70% of budget expenditures are managed through the procurement system
- Key area of interest for countries to increase efficiency of expenditure & improve service delivery
- Key area of interest for international agencies to help manage risk of misuse of funds & to achieve development objectives

An example: Procurement coverage

Dedicated indicator PI-19 focuses on unique aspects of procurement system **not** captured in other indicators, ie:

- Degree of competition in the procurement system
- Dispute resolution to enhance controls

Other indicators capture aspects of procurement

- **PI-4** Expenditure arrears typically concern contracts
- **PI-10** Public access to information on contract awards
- **PI-12** Multi-year budgeting should consider multi-year contracts
- **PI-16** Predictability of allocations affect procurement plans
- **PI-20** Internal controls also cover the procurement system
- **PI-21** Internal audit should address procurement issues
- **PI-26** External audit should address procurement issues

Contents

The PEFA Framework

The high-level Indicator Set

Scoring Methodology

The PFM Performance Report

Calibration & scoring

Calibrated on 4 Point Cardinal Scale (A, B, C, D)

- Reflecting internationally accepted ‘good practice’
- Determine score by starting from ‘D’, go upwards
- Do **not** score if evidence is insufficient

Arrow ▲

Can indicate an improvement not reflected in a change of the indicator score

Indicator dimensions

Most indicators have 2, 3 or 4 **dimensions**

- Each dimension **must** be rated separately
- Aggregate dimension scores for indicator; two methods **M1** or **M2**, **specified** for each indicator
- **Intermediate scores** (B+, C+, D+) for multi-dimensional indicators, where dimensions score differently

M1: 'Weakest link' (eg: PI-4 Score = 'D+')

Score	Minimum Requirements (Scoring Method M1)
A	<p>(i) The stock of arrears is low (i.e. is below 2% of total expenditure)</p> <p>(ii) Reliable & complete data on stock of arrears is generated through routine procedures at least at end of each FY(& includes age profile).</p>
B	<p>(i) The stock of arrears constitutes 2-10% of total expenditure; & is evidence has been reduced significantly (i.e. more 25%) in last 2 years.</p> <p>(ii) Data on stock of arrears generated annually, but may not be complete for a few identified expenditure categories or specified budget institutions.</p>
C	<p>(i) The stock of arrears constitutes 2-10% of total expenditure; & there is no evidence it has been reduced significantly in last 2 years.</p> <p>(ii) Data on stock of arrears has been generated by at least 1 comprehensive ad hoc exercise within last 2 years.</p>
D	<p>(i) The stock of arrears exceeds 10% of total expenditure.</p> <p>(ii) There is no reliable data on stock of arrears from last 2 years.</p>

M2: 'Average of dims' (e.g: PI-22 = 'C')

Dimension	Minimum Requirements (Scoring Method M2)
(i) Regularity of bank recs	<p>Score = A: Bank recs for all central government bank accounts take place at least monthly at aggregate & detailed levels, usually within 4 weeks of end of period.</p> <p>Score = B: Bank recs for all Treasury managed bank accounts take place at least monthly, usually within 4 weeks from end of month.</p> <p>Score = C: Bank recs for all Treasury managed bank accounts take place quarterly, usually within 8 weeks of end of quarter.</p> <p>Score = D: Bank recs for all Treasury managed bank accounts take place less frequently than quarterly OR with backlogs of several months.</p>
(ii) Regularity of recs & clearance of suspense accounts & advances	<p>Score = A: Rec & clearance of suspense accounts & advances take place at least quarterly, within a month from end of period & with few balances B/F.</p> <p>Score = B: Rec & clearance of suspense accounts & advances take place at least...</p> <p>Score = C: Rec & clearance of suspense accounts & advances take place annually in general, within 2 months of end of year, but significant number of accounts have uncleared bals B/F.</p> <p>Score = D: Rec & clearance of suspense accounts & advances take place EITHER annually with more than 2 months' delay, OR less frequently.</p>

Contents

The PEFA Framework

The high-level Indicator Set

Scoring Methodology

The PFM Performance Report

Content of the PFM Performance Report

An integrated narrative report including:

- Introduction with the context for the assessment
- Country background information
- Evidence & justification for scoring the indicators
- Country specific issues
- Description of reform progress & factors influencing it
- Summary assessment of PFM system impact

PFM-PR – 1 Introduction

- **Objective** of the assessment – Why being undertaken; what it will contribute
- **Process** of preparing the assessment – Donors involved, assessment team, govt involvement
- **Methodology** of preparing the assessment – Sources of information, use of previous diagnostic reports, extent of original data collection
- **Scope of the assessment**
 - Quantitative data on structure of public sector (organizational units; value of exp at all levels)
 - Which parts of public sector are covered

PFM-PR – 2 Country background info

Country economic situation - Including general country information, macro-economic parameters, aggregate poverty data, economic structure

Budgetary outcomes

- Information on government fiscal & expenditure targets
- Data on aggregate fiscal performance for last 3 years
- Data on allocation of resources (functional & economic)
- To be drawn from existing analysis such as a PER

Legal & institutional framework for PFM

- Legal framework for PFM & its evolution
- Institutions & their responsibilities

PFM-PR – 3 Assessment of PFM system

Indicator led analysis

- Description of actual performance based on **factual** evidence
- Description of sources of & gaps in information
- Scoring of indicator (& its dimensions) with brief justification

Reporting progress (for each indicator)

- Describing recent or on-going reform measures
- Indicating if measures may have changed performance (even if not reflected in evidence available, & in scoring) or if/when measures likely to change performance

Country specific issues

- Description of country characteristics relevant to understanding functioning of PFM systems (SNG; PEs; management of revenue from extractive industries)

PFM-PR – 4 Government reform process

- **Overall summary of recent & on-going reforms** – bringing together an overview of reform measures
- **Institutional factors supporting reform** – forward-looking perspective on institutional factors supporting reform planning & implementation

***Not intended to judge adequacy of reforms
nor to make recommendations***

PFM-PR – Summary Assessment

The summary assessment brings together:

- The assessment under each of the 6 critical dimensions of PFM system performance
- The impact of PFM system performance on budgetary outcomes identified through PER/budget analysis, such as:
 - aggregate fiscal discipline
 - strategic resource allocation
 - efficient service delivery

Thank you for your attention