

**Table 1. Sierra Leone: Summary Assessment**

Phase/Institution		Design	Effectiveness	Rec. #	Reform Priority	
A. Planning	1	<b>Fiscal principles or rules</b>	<b>Low:</b> Medium-term debt targets exist, but not permanent rule codified in the law; FSS is published after a Budget Call Circular is issued.	<b>Medium:</b> The targets under the IMF program effectively provide operational guidance to fiscal policy.		<b>Medium</b>
	2	<b>National and sectoral plans</b>	<b>Medium:</b> A master plan of road sector does not exist; sectoral strategies do not always include project costs or outcome targets.	<b>Low:</b> Sectoral plans prepared before the MTNDP are yet to be reviewed to ensure consistencies	1	<b>High</b>
	3	<b>Coordination between entities</b>	<b>Medium:</b> Capital projects of local budgets are discussed with central government but not published; LGDG is not rule-based; disclosure of contingent liabilities is limited to guarantees.	<b>Medium:</b> The absence of a consolidated pipeline of all local projects may reduce the effectiveness of the central-local coordination.		<b>Medium</b>
	4	<b>Project appraisal</b>	<b>Low:</b> Some domestically financed major projects bypassed appraisal requirements; the capacity to centrally challenge project appraisals is limited.	<b>Low:</b> Some appraisals did not fully appreciate inherent risks; the lack of publication of appraisals weakens accountability.	2	<b>High</b>
	5	<b>Alternative infrastructure financing</b>	<b>Low:</b> Some infra. markets are opened to competition; the PPP policy to implement the PPP Act is yet to be published; SOEs' investment plans are not reviewed by the MoF.	<b>Low:</b> Financial analysis of investments through PPPs and SOEs has not captured in full implicit contingent liabilities, which are affecting viability of e.g. energy SOEs.	2	<b>High</b>
B. Allocation	6	<b>Multi-year budgeting</b>	<b>Medium:</b> Three-year projections of individual projects exist, but not a MDA-level ceiling on capital spending; total costs are not published.	<b>Low:</b> The lack of publication of total costs, multiyear contracts, and paid and unpaid invoices reduces the budget credibility.	3	<b>High</b>
	7	<b>Budget comprehensiveness and unity</b>	<b>Medium:</b> All capital projects are presented in the budget document, except for some projects of local gov't and SOEs.	<b>Medium:</b> Amount of capital projects not presented in the budget document is generally small.		<b>Low</b>
	8	<b>Budgeting for investment</b>	<b>Medium:</b> Multiyear contracts are not shown in the budget document; reallocation from capital to recurrent exp. is prohibited; there is a policy to prioritize ongoing projects in the budget.	<b>Low:</b> Prioritization of ongoing projects has been hindered by new projects being implemented as changes in ongoing projects	3	<b>High</b>
	9	<b>Maintenance funding</b>	<b>Low:</b> Maintenance standards and plans do not exist in all sectors; routine maintenance is not systemically identified in the budget.	<b>Low:</b> Inadequate funding for routine maintenance reduces infrastructure sustainability; funds for road maintenance were diverted to capital projects, until the new policy in 2019.	4	<b>High</b>
	10	<b>Project selection</b>	<b>Low:</b> Some domestically financed major projects have been selected without appraisal; the selection criteria are not published; there is no prioritized pipeline of all appraised projects.	<b>Low:</b> The absence of published criteria created a perception of projects being selected by political motivations. The absence of a prioritized pipeline increases risks of selecting non-viable projects.	5	<b>High</b>
C. Implementation	11	<b>Procurement</b>	<b>Low:</b> Projects are not always tendered through open competitive bidding; public has limited access to procurement information; there is insufficient database and scrappy information; IPRP exist but has heard only few complaints.	<b>Low:</b> Invitations for bids are poorly prepared; NPPA has no information on tendering; procuring entities do not publish contract award; reporting by most entities is inconsistent and untimely; rules on contract amendments are flouted; IPRP decisions are delayed and not publicized.	6	<b>High</b>
	12	<b>Availability of funding</b>	<b>Low:</b> Commitment ceilings are issued with significant delay; capital spending is subject to cash rationing; external financing is largely held in commercial bank accounts	<b>Low:</b> Significantly delayed and unpredictable payments for capital projects have been a major cause of project delay and arrears accumulation.	7	<b>High</b>
	13	<b>Portfolio management and oversight</b>	<b>Low:</b> Monitoring and evaluation of capital projects by central agencies is limited; there is no systemic ex-spot review of domestically financed major projects.	<b>Low:</b> In the absence of an ex-post review, several projects have been abandoned or ceased to generate outputs.	8	<b>High</b>
	14	<b>Project implementation</b>	<b>Medium:</b> Reliable project implementation plans are not always available; there is no rule on project adjustments; the recent technical audit of road projects was a one-off exercise.	<b>Low:</b> The absence of re-appraisal requirements leads to significant project changes and allows a new project to bypass the appraisal; little follow up was made on the recent technical audit.	8, 9	<b>High</b>
	15	<b>Management of public assets</b>	<b>Low:</b> There is no comprehensive asset register and no statistics on public capital stock	<b>Medium:</b> Some sectors maintain the asset register for maintenance purposes.		<b>Medium</b>