

Strengthening Infrastructure Governance

Sailendra Pattanayak


Fiscal Affairs Department, IMF

7th African Fiscal Forum, February 2019



Physical infrastructure needs are massive – and human capital needs are also large

Needed annual increase in physical assets and human capital ¹



- **6 % of GDP increase needed in EMEs**
- **14% of GDP increase needed in LIDC**



Data source:

1/ IMF estimates for LIDC and EMEs countries in five sectors: human capital in education and health, and physical capital in roads, electricity and water.

Meeting these needs in a fiscally sustainable way is not easy

Global debt a record \$182 trillion in 2017


Sub-Saharan African debt a record \$558 billion in 2017



Sources: IMF World Economic Outlook (2018) ; IMF Global Debt Database (2018), preliminary estimates. * Total debt is the sum of public and private debts.

Growth in public-private partnerships

Sub-Saharan African PPPs: total investment and number of projects ¹




Source: World Bank Private Participation in Infrastructure Database as at January 2019 (includes data for H1 2018).

Challenges/issues in managing PPPs and related risks


- **Ensuring fiscal affordability of the PPP project**
 - No gate keeping role for the MoF in assessing the risks related to PPPs and fiscal sustainability
 - PPP liabilities are not tracked and reported
 - No specific limits on PPP related fiscal exposures
- **Treating PPPs as “off balance sheet”**
 - PPPs escape fiscal rules and debt limits
- **PPP contract management challenges**
 - Inadequate PPP procurement and/or poorly qualified private operators
 - Lack of monitoring the performance of the private partner and applying the penalties under the contract

Spending more needs to go hand in hand with spending better

Ways to meet infrastructure needs



Public Investment Efficiency Losses




Source: Making Public Investment More Efficient, 2015, IMF.

Large inefficiencies are reflected in disparities in quality and access to infrastructure

Infrastructure Quality


(Perception Indicators)



Source: World Economic Forum (2017)

Physical Access to Infrastructure

(per 1000 people, most recent year available)




Source: Making Public Investment More Efficient, 2015, IMF. Database updated 2017

IMF's PIMA supports improved infrastructure governance and better investment outcomes

Comprehensive

- Macro-fiscal framework
- Investment planning
- Medium-term budgeting
- Project management



Practical

- Concrete recommendations
- Tailored to country context
- Sequenced prioritized action plan



Public Investment Management Assessment (PIMA)



Accessible

- Effective summary charts
- Peer comparison
- Clear distinction among design, effectiveness and importance



Facilitates coordination

- Catalyst for follow-up support
- Improves coordination among development partners

Comprehensive PIMA framework covers the whole investment process

Comprehensive



PLANNING

1. Fiscal principles or rules
2. National & sectoral plans
3. Coordination between entities
4. Project appraisal
5. Alternative infrastructure provision

ALLOCATION

6. Multi-year budgeting
7. Budget comprehensiveness
8. Maintenance funding
9. Budgeting for investment
10. Project selection

IMPLEMENTATION

11. Procurement
12. Availability of funding
13. Portfolio management & oversight
14. Management of project implementation
15. Monitoring of public assets


CROSS CUTTING ENABLING FACTORS

- Legal and institutional frameworks
- Staff capacity
- IT systems


Accessible and effective communication of findings by stakeholders

Accessible

“Spider charts”:
benchmarking with peers



“Heatmap”:
Design vs Effectiveness
Key priority actions



Phase / Institution		Institutional Strength	Effectiveness
A. Planning	1 Fiscal rules	Strong: Debt rule since 2009, deficit rule in effect since 2014, with an investment clause and automatic adjustment mechanism.	Medium: In 2014, the deficit exceeded the ceiling by 0.4 percent of GDP within the margin, despite under execution of capital spending.
	2 National and sectoral planning	Good: National development under preparation; multiplicity of sectoral strategies with some performance measures.	Low: Around 80 sectoral strategies are in place, without clear coordination and incomplete costing.
	3 Central-local coordination	Medium: Debt limits constrain debt for municipalities; information for municipalities timely; no rule-based allocation of capital transfers.	Medium: In 2014, optimistic projections of own revenues of 6 million result in corresponding under execution of capital spending for municipalities.
	4 Public-private partnerships	Good: PPPs guided by strategy within strong institutional and legal framework, but not included in MTBF or budget documentation.	High: Existing PPPs capital stock account for 1.2 percent of GDP, but several projects planned. Fiscal risks currently low.
	5 Regulation of infrastructure companies	Good: Regulatory framework supports competition; prices set by independent regulators; weak financial oversight assessment of fiscal risks of POEs.	Medium: Challenges to regulators' independence. Public investment of POEs account for 0.1 percent of GDP, but fiscal risks not assessed.
B. Allocation	6 Multi-year budgeting	Good: Multi-year ceilings of capital spending are published based on not published projections of full cost of capital projects, but not binding.	Low: There are large discrepancies between MTBF ceilings and budget allocations (22 percent for n+2).
	7 Budget comprehensiveness	Medium: Budget incorporates loans and co-financed donor funding, but not externally financed grants and PPPs.	High: Externally financed projects not in the budget less than 3% of total capital spending; extra-budgetary capital spending is insignificant.
	8 Budget unity	Good: Budgets disclose capital and current appropriations in a single document in line with GFS, but project specific information is not disclosed.	Low: Auditor General qualified the 2014 financial statements because of 5 percent misclassifications of current as capital spending.
	9 Project appraisal	Medium: The methodology is comprehensive; but results not published and limited risk analysis.	Medium: MoF and BOs lack resources to undertake the required analysis.
	10 Project selection	Medium: Most project selection carried out by BOs, broadly in line with criteria in PIP Manual; but role of MoF weak and no legal basis.	Low: Weak and fragmented decision making on project prioritization and selection contributes to the 45 percent efficiency gap.
C. Implementation	11 Protection of investment	Low: Projects appropriated on annual basis only, no restrictions on virements, and restricted carryovers.	Medium: Average under execution of the 2014 financial statements was 10 percent, in line with regional average.
	12 Availability of funding	Good: Cash flows planned quarterly and generally released in time, but some grants outside TSA.	Medium: 1.1 percent of capital spending is in arrears, but total arrears are 2 percent of GDP in 2014.
	13 Transparency of execution	Medium: Procurement law in line with internet standards; quarterly monitoring; limited ex post audit of projects.	Low: Court proceedings limit ex post audits of projects to donor-funded projects.
	14 Project management	Medium: Major projects have project managers; adjustment rules generally in place; no ex post reviews.	Medium: In 2012 and 2013, around one fourth of the projects had delays.
	15 Assets accounting	Good: Nonfinancial assets regularly surveyed, depreciated and reported annually.	Medium: Poor data quality, e.g. mismatch of between capital spending and stocks of 33 percent.

Practical recommendations and key priority actions



Practical

A sequenced action plan

Recommendations and Actions		FY16/17	FY17/18	FY18/19	Responsibility	Technical Assistance
A. Sustainable Public Investment Planning						
<i>Recommendation 1: In the near term, improve the quality of strategic planning by enhancing the current documents.</i>						
Expand government long-term strategies and investment priorities.	Provide in the PSIP a clear description of major investment projects together with a detailed reconciliation between investment and the actual spending, and describe the impacts on project				MoFED/Sector Ministries	FAD/AFS or Development Partners
For major projects, include in the PSIP a detailed reconciliation between investment and the actual spending, and describe the impacts on project	Provide in Vision 2030 a consistent overview of the government's main strategies and investment priorities, with clear prioritization and linkages between sectors and projects.				MoFED/Sector Ministries	FAD/AFS or Development Partners
Identify in the National Strategy for Land Use suitable sites for the different initiatives and projects, and provide a basis for the strategic acquisition of land.	Update sector strategies to provide a comprehensive description of priority projects with indicative estimates for costs and expected outputs.				MoFED	FAD/AFS or Development Partners

Recommendations and Actions	FY16/17	FY17/18	FY18/19	Responsibility	Coordination
A. Sustainable Public Investment Planning					
<i>Recommendation 2: Provide a more comprehensive statement of the government's development strategy for public investments in new and updated strategic documents</i>					
Provide in Vision 2030 a consistent overview of the government's main strategies and investment priorities, with clear prioritization and linkages between sectors and projects.				Prime Minister Office	
Identify in the National Strategy for Land Use suitable sites for the different initiatives and projects, and provide a basis for the strategic acquisition of land.				Ministry of Lands	
Update sector strategies to provide a comprehensive description of priority projects with indicative estimates for costs and expected outputs.				Sector Ministries	WB

Recommendations and Actions		FY16/17	FY17/18	FY18/19	Responsibility	Technical Assistance
<i>Recommendation 5: Oversight role of the Minister of Finance in assessing exempted PPP projects strengthened.</i>						
Include in the 2004 PPP Act, or other laws, provisions on the role of the High Powered Committee on PPP contracts signed in the context of bilateral PPP projects.	Compile and report in an annex to the budget documents data on existing PPP contracts, including: investment by PPP companies (regardless of whether they take the form of BOT or other type of PPP, and whether they are classified as public or private); long-term cash flow forecasts of gross costs and revenues of PPP companies and their associated present value; assessment of the risks associated with PPP contracts (e.g., explicit guarantees, traffic risks, force majeure, etc.)				MoFED	FAD/AFS
Update sector strategies to provide a comprehensive description of priority projects with indicative estimates for costs and expected outputs.	Update sector strategies to provide a comprehensive description of priority projects with indicative estimates for costs and expected outputs.				MoFED	FAD/AFS

Catalyst for stronger coordination



Facilitates coordination



Ghana


WB 4-year program with the government to strengthen economic management including PIM

Mozambique

WB/DFID 3-year program with the government to strengthen PIM

Practical implementation (effectiveness) lags behind institutional design

Sub-Saharan Africa: Institutional settings vs. effectiveness



Source: Data prepared for Public Investment Management Assessment: Review And Update, IMF, 2018.

Thank You!

www.imf.org/external/np/fad/publicinvestment/



**INTERNATIONAL
MONETARY FUND**

Search IMF



Send us your feedback

[HOME](#) [ABOUT THE IMF](#) [RESEARCH](#) [COUNTRIES](#) [CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT](#) [NEWS](#) [VIDEOS](#) [DATA](#) [PUBLICATIONS](#) [SOCIAL MEDIA HUB](#) [CONNECT WITH US](#)

THE IMF AND INFRASTRUCTURE GOVERNANCE



www.imf.org/publicinvestment