

Mauritania Public Financial Management Profile



Introduction

This note presents a series of charts which provide an **overview** of Mauritania's recent public financial management (PFM) performance based on this country's 2014 Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) assessment. Comparisons are made between Mauritania'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 Mauritania's overall score was ranked 19th 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. Mauritania's overall score was 26.5 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 |

Mauritania’s overall PFM performance is classified as “weak”.

PI performance

The graph in Figure 2 below shows the scores for Mauritania’s individual PIs compared with the average score recorded for each PI across the twenty-four PEFA assessments we have studied. Please note that no scores were recorded for the top four indicators in Figure 2 as these PIs (PI-3, PI-6, PI-7 and PI-23) received D scores.

Figure 2: Mauritania PI score comparisons




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

Twenty-eight PIs were assessed. Seven PIs had scores above the country average whilst twenty-one 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: Mauritania key PFM activity comparisons



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

PEFA ASSESSMENT

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

Burkina Faso Public Financial Management Profile



Introduction

This note presents a series of charts which provide an **overview** of Burkina Faso’s recent public financial management (PFM) performance based on this country’s 2014 Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) assessment. Comparisons are made between Burkina Faso’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 Burkina Faso's overall score was ranked 4th 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. Burkina Faso's overall score was 58 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 |

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

PI performance

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

Figure 2: Burkina Faso PI score comparisons



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


Twenty-eight PIs were assessed. Twenty-three PIs had scores above the country average whilst five 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: Burkina Faso key PFM activity comparisons



Five key PFM activities recorded scores above the country average whilst the remaining key PFM activity recorded a score below the country average.

PEFA ASSESSMENT

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

Papua New Guinea Public Financial Management Profile



Introduction

This note presents a series of charts which provide an **overview** of the Papua New Guinea's recent public financial management (PFM) performance based on this country's 2015 Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) assessment. Comparisons are made between Papua New Guinea'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 Papua New Guinea’s overall score was ranked 21st 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. Papua New Guinea’s overall score was 21.5 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 |

Papua New Guinea’s overall PFM performance is classified as “weak”.

PI performance

The graph in Figure 2 below shows the scores for Papua New Guinea’s individual PIs compared with the average score recorded for each PI across the twenty-four PEFA assessments we have studied. Please note that no scores were recorded for the top eight indicators in Figure 2 as seven PIs (PI-4, PI-9, PI-19, PI-22, PI-23, PI-24, PI-25) received D scores whilst one PI could not be scored (PI-7) because of insufficient information.

Figure 2: Papua New Guinea PI score comparisons




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

Twenty PIs were assessed. Five PIs had scores above the country average, one PI had a score equal to the country average whilst fourteen 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: Papua New Guinea key PFM activity comparisons



One key PFM activity recorded a score equal to the country average whilst five remaining key PFM activities recorded scores below the country average (one of the latter activities recorded a zero score).

PEFA ASSESSMENT

You can download the 2015 PEFA assessment for Papua New Guinea [here](#).

Nepal Public Financial Management Profile



Introduction

This note presents a series of charts which provide an **overview** of the Nepal’s recent public financial management (PFM) performance based on this country’s 2015 Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) assessment. Comparisons are made between Nepal’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 Nepal’s overall score was ranked 6th 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. Nepal’s overall score was 50.5 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 |

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

PI performance

The graph in Figure 2 below shows the scores for Nepal’s individual PIs compared with the average score recorded for each PI across the twenty-four PEFA assessments we have studied. Please note that no scores were recorded for the top two indicators in Figure 2 as these PIs (PI-27, PI-28) received D scores (because Parliament did not meet during the period reviewed for the PEFA assessment).

Figure 2: Nepal PI score comparisons




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

All twenty-eight PIs were assessed. Seventeen PIs had scores above the country average whilst eleven 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: Nepal key PFM activity comparisons



Five key PFM activities recorded scores above the country average whilst the remaining one key PFM activity recorded a score below the country average.

PEFA ASSESSMENT

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