

# Kyrgyzstan Public Financial Management Profile



## Introduction

This note presents a series of charts which provide an **overview** of Kyrgyzstan's recent public financial management (PFM) performance based on this country's 2015 Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) assessment. Comparisons are made between Kyrgyzstan's performance and the performance of the other twenty-three countries that had PEFA assessments published in 2014-2015. All analyses have been prepared using results reported from using the 2011 PEFA methodology.

## Overall PFM performance


Individual country PFM performance has been determined by applying the following points scale to reported individual performance indicator (PI) scores as presented in Table 1. No points were allocated to PIs that were not scored because either data was unavailable, a D score was given or the PI was not applicable.

**Table 1: PI scoring methodology**

PEFA PI score	Points allocated
A	3
B+	2.5
B	2
C+	1.5
C	1
D+	.5
D	0

The graph in Figure 1 below shows Kyrgyzstan's overall score was ranked ninth out of the twenty-four countries.

**Figure 1: Aggregate PEFA scores for 24 countries**



Details of the distribution of overall country scores across PFM performance categories, as determined by PFMConnect, are presented in Table 2. Kyrgyzstan's overall score was 49.5 points.

**Table 2: Distribution of country PFM performance levels**

PFM performance	Overall Scores	Number of countries
Very strong	66.37-84	0


Strong	49.57-66.36	8
Moderate	32.77-49.56	7
Weak	15.97-32.76	8
Very weak	0-15.96	1
Total		24

Kyrgyzstan’s overall PFM performance is classified as “moderate”.

## PI performance

The graph in Figure 2 below shows the scores for Kyrgyzstan individual PIs compared with the average score recorded for each PI across the twenty-four PEFA assessments we have studied.

**Figure 2: Kyrgyzstan PI score comparisons**




Download a pdf version of Figure 2 [here](#) (Kyrgyzstan PIs) to review individual PI scores in more detail.

Twenty-eight PIs were assessed. Nineteen PIs had scores above the country average, one PI had a score equal to the country average whilst eight PIs had scores below the country average.

## Performance across key PFM activities

The graph in Figure 3 below shows the average scores for the six key PFM activities compared with the average score recorded for these activities across the twenty-four country PEFA assessments we have studied.

**Figure 3: Kyrgyzstan key PFM activity comparisons**



All six key PFM activities recorded scores above the country average.

#### **PEFA ASSESSMENT**

You can download the 2015 PEFA assessment for Kyrgyzstan [here](#).

---

# **Armenia Public Financial Management Profile**



# Introduction

This note presents a series of charts which provide an **overview** of Armenia’s recent public financial management (PFM) performance based on this country’s 2014 Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) assessment. Comparisons are made between Armenia’s performance and the performance of the other twenty-three countries that had PEFA assessments published in 2014-2015. All analyses have been prepared using results reported from using the 2011 PEFA methodology.

## Overall PFM performance

Individual country PFM performance has been determined by applying the following points scale to reported individual performance indicator (PI) scores as presented in Table 1. No points were allocated to PIs that were not scored because either data was unavailable, a D score was given or the PI was not applicable.


**Table 1: PI scoring methodology**

PEFA PI score	Points allocated
---------------	------------------

A	3
B+	2.5
B	2
C+	1.5
C	1
D+	.5
D	0

The graph in Figure 1 below shows Armenia's overall score was ranked 3rd out of the twenty-four countries.

**Figure 1: Aggregate PEFA scores for 24 countries**



Details of the distribution of overall country scores across PFM performance categories, as determined by PFMConnect, are presented in Table 2. Armenia's overall score was 60 points.

**Table 2: Distribution of country PFM performance levels**

PFM performance	Overall Scores	Number of countries
Very strong	66.37-84	0
Strong	49.57-66.36	8
Moderate	32.77-49.56	7


Weak	15.97-32.76	8
Very weak	0-15.96	1
Total		24

Armenia’s overall PFM performance is classified as “strong”.

## PI performance

The graph in Figure 2 below shows the scores for Armenia’s individual PIs compared with the average score recorded for each PI across the twenty-four PEFA assessments we have studied.

**Figure 2: Armenia PI score comparisons**




Download a pdf version of Figure 2 [here](#) (Armenia PIs) to review individual PI scores in more detail.

Twenty-eight PIs were assessed. Twenty-two PIs had scores above the country average whilst six PIs had scores below the country average.

## Performance across key PFM activities

The graph in Figure 3 below shows the average scores for the six key PFM activities compared with the average score recorded for these activities across the twenty-four country PEFA assessments we have studied.

**Figure 3: Armenia key PFM activity comparisons**



All six key PFM activities recorded scores above the country average.

### PEFA ASSESSMENT

You can download the 2014 PEFA assessment for Armenia [here](#).

# Macedonia Public Financial Management Profile





# Introduction

This note presents a series of charts which provide an **overview** of Macedonia's recent public financial management (PFM) performance based on this country's 2015 Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) assessment. Comparisons are made between Macedonia's performance and the performance of the other twenty-three countries that had PEFA assessments published in 2014-2015. All analyses have been prepared using results reported from using the 2011 PEFA methodology.

## Overall PFM performance

Individual country PFM performance has been determined by applying the following points scale to reported individual performance indicator (PI) scores as presented in Table 1. No points were allocated to PIs that were not scored because either data was unavailable, a D score was given or the PI was not applicable.


**Table 1: PI scoring methodology**

PEFA PI score	Points allocated
---------------	------------------

A	3
B+	2.5
B	2
C+	1.5
C	1
D+	.5
D	0

The graph in Figure 1 below shows Macedonia's overall score was ranked tenth out of the twenty-four countries.

**Figure 1: Aggregate PEFA scores for 24 countries**



Details of the distribution of overall country scores across PFM performance categories, as determined by PFMConnect, are presented in Table 2. Macedonia's overall score was 44.5 points.

**Table 2: Distribution of country PFM performance levels**

PFM performance	Overall Scores	Number of countries
Very strong	66.37-84	0
Strong	49.57-66.36	8


Moderate	32.77-49.56	7
Weak	15.97-32.76	8
Very weak	0-15.96	1
Total		24

Macedonia’s overall PFM performance is classified as “moderate”.

## PI performance

The graph in Figure 2 below shows the scores for Macedonia individual PIs compared with the average score recorded for each PI across the twenty-four PEFA assessments we have studied. Please note that no score was recorded for the top two indicators in Figure 2 as these indicators (PI-3 and PI-23) were given D scores.

**Figure 2: Macedonia PI score comparisons**



Download a pdf version of Figure 2 [here](#) (Macedonia PIs) to review individual PI scores in more detail.


Twenty-eight PIs were assessed. Fifteen PIs had scores above the country average, one PI had a score equal to the country average whilst twelve PIs had scores below the country average.

## Performance across key PFM activities

The graph in Figure 3 below shows the average scores for the six key PFM activities compared with the average score recorded for these activities across the twenty-four country

PEFA assessments we have studied.

**Figure 3: Macedonia key PFM activity comparisons**



Three key PFM activities recorded scores above the country average whilst three key PFM activities recorded scores below the country average.

## PEFA ASSESSMENT

You can download the 2015 PEFA assessment for Macedonia [here](#).

---

# Belarus Public Financial Management Profile



# Introduction

This note presents a series of charts which provide an **overview** of Belarus’s recent public financial management (PFM) performance based on this country’s 2014 Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) assessment. Comparisons are made between Belarus’s performance and the performance of the other twenty-three countries that had PEFA assessments published in 2014-2015. All analyses have been prepared using results reported from using the 2011 PEFA methodology.

## Overall PFM performance

Individual country PFM performance has been determined by applying the following points scale to reported individual performance indicator (PI) scores as presented in Table 1. No points were allocated to PIs that were not scored because either data was unavailable, a D score was given or the PI was not applicable.


**Table 1: PI scoring methodology**

PEFA PI score	Points allocated
---------------	------------------

A	3
B+	2.5
B	2
C+	1.5
C	1
D+	.5
D	0

The graph in Figure 1 below shows Belarus's overall score was ranked tenth out of the twenty-four countries.

**Figure 1: Aggregate PEFA scores for 24 countries**



Details of the distribution of overall country scores across PFM performance categories, as determined by PFMConnect, are presented in Table 2. Belarus's overall score was 49 points.

**Table 2: Distribution of country PFM performance levels**

PFM performance	Overall Scores	Number of countries
Very strong	66.37-84	0
Strong	49.57-66.36	8
Moderate	32.77-49.56	7


Weak	15.97-32.76	8
Very weak	0-15.96	1
Total		24

Belarus’s overall PFM performance is classified as “moderate”.

## PI performance

The graph in Figure 2 below shows the scores for Belarus individual PIs compared with the average score recorded for each PI across the twenty-four PEFA assessments we have studied. Please note that no score was recorded for the top two indicators in Figure 2 as these indicators (PI-19 and PI-21) were given D scores.

**Figure 2: Belarus PI score comparisons**




Download a pdf version of Figure 2 [here](#) (Belarus PIs) to review individual PI scores in more detail.

Twenty-eight PIs were assessed. Nineteen PIs had scores above the country average whilst nine PIs had scores below the country average.

## Performance across key PFM activities

The graph in Figure 3 below shows the average scores for the six key PFM activities compared with the average score recorded for these activities across the twenty-four country PEFA assessments we have studied.

**Figure 3: Belarus key PFM activity comparisons**



Four key PFM activities recorded scores above the country average whilst two key PFM activities recorded scores below the country average.

## PEFA ASSESSMENT

You can download the 2014 PEFA assessment for Belarus [here.](#)