



# Public Management – AII Findings

August 2015

The Public Management subcategory assesses the transparency of public procurement, state-owned companies and natural resource allocation, and the budgeting process. The first five of these indicators (24 - 28) focus on public procurement. Indicators 29 and 30 assess whether citizens have access to the financial records of state-owned companies and natural resource exploitation, respectively. The remaining four indicators (31 - 34) assess the budget process. Public Management makes up one of the six components of the Transparency and Accountability category.

## Public Procurement Findings

- Laws requiring competitive bidding in public procurement are common, but not universal.** Only Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, South Sudan and Somalia lack a law requiring competitive bidding for major public procurements. For example, in South Sudan a Public Procurement bill went before the National Assembly in 2012, but by 2014 it had yet to be enacted. Likewise, while the Somali Constitution calls for a law to provide a framework for public procurement, no specific law has yet been passed regarding competitive bidding.
- Public procurement documents are frequently not easily accessible to requesting citizens.** Almost half (43%) of the assessed countries scored a 0 on this indicator with extremely low or no transparency. For instance, in Angola the research notes that “requests for public consultation of such documentation often go unanswered or are plagued by multiple bureaucratic obstacles that render the process slow and onerous.” Some countries scored slightly higher with a 25 with limited information being shared publicly, but still fell short of procurement transparency. For instance, in Cape Verde, the results of tenders are published in local newspapers, but there is no citizen accessible archive that contains the contracts details. Only four (7.4%) countries scored a 75 or higher. As an example, in Zambia, the Public Procurement Authority (ZPPA) responds to citizen requests, and makes available all documentation submitted with tenders, which usually includes full contracts, proposals and execution reports, among other elements.

Public Management Indicators
24. In law, major public procurements require competitive bidding.
25. In practice, major public procurements involve competitive bidding.
26. In practice, citizens can access the results and documents associated with procurement contracts (full contract, proposals, execution reports, financial audits, etc.).
27. In law, companies found guilty of violations of procurement regulations are prohibited from participating in future bids.
28. In practice, companies found guilty of violating procurement regulations are prohibited from participating in future bids
29. In practice, citizens can access the financial records of state-owned companies.
30. In practice, citizens can access the financial records associated with natural resources exploitation (gas, oil and mining), whether they involve the participation of public or private corporations.
31. In practice, significant public expenditure receives legislative approval on an annual basis.
32. In law, both the executive's budget proposal and the approved budget must be published in full every year.
33. In practice, citizens can provide input for budget decisions.
34. In practice, a legislative committee exercises oversight of public funds.



- **Not all countries have laws prohibiting procurement violators from participating in future bids.** Nine (17%) countries fail to legally restrict such participation. In practice, 29 countries (54%) either don't keep and enforce any list of violators, or do not make it accessible to the public. For instance, in Lesotho the research found that procurement violators were not barred from future bidding. On the other hand, several countries showed an improvement in this indicator. For example, in Kenya at least two firms were debarred, and the enforced list was made available to the public on the authority's website, while formerly no such information was shared with the public.

### State-Owned Companies and Natural Resource Allocation findings

- **In the majority of countries (32 of 54), citizens are not able to access the financial records of state-owned companies.** In this indicator, no country earned a 100 (earned in cases of full publication on a quarterly basis) where such information was available, as it was generally annual publication.
- **The financial records related to natural resources were slightly more accessible to citizens.** Half (27) of the assessed countries earned a 0 due to lack of public accessibility. For example, in Liberia, neither the government, nor the companies have published this information. The researcher notes that while the Liberia Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (LEITI) initially published some of this information, nothing has been made publicly available for the past two years. There were, however, several examples of public accessibility. For instance, in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the research notes significant improvement in financial transparency, with the government publishing revenues related to oil and mining contracts and the majority of mining companies themselves making their own records available on a quarterly basis.

### Budget Process Findings

- **Only 12 (22%) countries require the proposed budget as well as the approved budget to be published.** In most countries only the approved budget is published. Liberia is an example of the opposite: Section 14 of the Public Financial Management Act requires that the proposed budget be made available to the public immediately following its submission to the Legislature, as well as requiring the approved budget to be made publicly available.
- **Only a third of the countries score high on whether significant public expenditures receive legislative approval (#31).** There were a number of improvements over the past two research periods, but there was also some significant deterioration. For instance, in Benin, which had formerly scored well here, the 2014 budget was rejected by the legislature, and then passed by executive decree, thus lowering the scoring for the most recent round. Some countries scored low because their approved budgets can be amended significantly without any legislative oversight. This is for example the case noted by the researcher in Cameroon. However, in higher scoring countries, changes are



proposed by the government and the legislative branch is empowered to approve or reject these proposals – such as in Cape Verde.

- **Regular legislative oversight of public funds is less common.** Twenty-three 23 (43%) of the countries either have no legislative committee responsible for budget oversight, or it exists but in practice it takes no action. For instance, in Sudan there is a committee that has such a mandate (the Committee on Economic and Financial Affairs), but it does not meet regularly and it hasn't conducted any investigations in the last five years due to other priorities, such as taxation and customs. On the other hand, the research provides details of some positive examples – for instance, the in Lesotho the Public Accounts Committee meets regularly and is one of the 'relatively effective' oversight committees, having conducted investigations into several irregularities, publishing a report in February 2014.
- **In most countries, there is no effective mechanism for citizens to provide input for budget decisions.** Here, 29 (54%) countries lack meaningful citizen engagement in the budget process and earned a 0 score. However, there are a few examples of effective systems designed to facilitate citizen participation in the public budget. For instance, the research for Rwanda notes a proactive, detailed mechanism supporting citizen engagement in the budget process through the promotion of discussion groups, an online platform, SMS platform, and toll-free line.

## Observations

- All three *de jure* indicators held constant, and all scoring movements occurred in the *de facto* indicators. Of the eight *de facto* indicators, three deteriorated (#25, 31 and 34) while the remaining showed some improvement.
- In 2015, the highest scoring countries in this category were Kenya, Zambia, Mauritius, Liberia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and South Africa. Of this group, four exhibited improvements, with Liberia showing a very substantial improvement (+27.3): a formerly disorganized Public Procurement and Concession Commission (PPCC) is increasingly effective – for example, by maintaining a list of debarred countries and making it accessible to requesting citizens. South Africa showed a slight deterioration in this subcategory, with Mauritius exhibiting a larger (-15.9) deterioration.
- In 2015, the lowest scoring countries were Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Somalia, Angola and South Sudan. The bottom three countries exhibited a minor improvement, with the remaining three holding constant.



## Regional Trends<sup>1</sup>

- West Africa showed an improvement between 2014 and 2015, attaining the highest average scores among regions as Southern Africa’s average scores declined.
- As West Africa’s *de jure* indicators retained the same scoring between rounds, the improvement is found solely from *de facto* improvements – several small, yet significant improvements along with a much more substantial improvement in Liberia.

1.4 Public Management	2014 Ave	2015 Ave	Change
<b>Overall</b>	40.15	40.78	0.63
<b>East Africa</b>	36.36	38.45	2.08
<b>Central Africa</b>	37.37	36.36	-1.01
<b>North Africa</b>	27.56	27.84	0.28
<b>Southern Africa</b>	47.73	44.70	-3.03
<b>West Africa</b>	43.48	46.82	3.33

- As with most of the six Transparency & Accountability subcategories, Public Management exhibits a substantial gap between the highest and lowest performing regions. Here, the difference between the highest scoring region (West Africa) and the lowest scoring region (North Africa) is 18.98.
- North Africa continued to earn the lowest score among regions. Outside of Morocco, which earned a relatively robust 61.4 here, no other country in the region earned a score of over 32.

It is important to note that aggregate scores mask very substantial - and very informative – country-level differences that can be found in the disaggregated data. An interested user benefits from exploring the data in detail, focusing on individual indicators and the country context described in the researcher’s comment and sources. The indicators are designed to be granular in order to provide actionable information for each country covered, so should be viewed individually for the clearest view of each country’s performance - and opportunities for improvement.

Global Integrity is dedicated not only to producing high quality data, but ensuring that it is as useful as possible for reformers (both inside and outside of government) around the world. If you’re interested in working with this data to identify such opportunities in your country, contact us at [aii@globalintegrity.org](mailto:aii@globalintegrity.org).

<sup>1</sup> Regions are here defined as:

- **Central Africa:** Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Republic of Congo, Democratic Republic of Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Sao Tome and Principe
- **East Africa:** Burundi, Comoros, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Seychelles, Somalia, South Sudan, Tanzania, and Uganda
- **North Africa:** Algeria, Egypt, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Sudan, and Tunisia
- **Southern Africa:** Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland, Zambia, and Zimbabwe
- **West Africa:** Benin, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Cote d’Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, and Togo



1.4 Public Management	2014 Score		2015 Score		2014-15 Change	
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score Change	Rank Change
Zambia	72.7	2	75.0	1	+2.3	+1
Kenya	61.4	5	75.0	1	+13.6	+4
Mauritius	86.4	1	70.5	3	-15.9	-2
Liberia	38.6	25	65.9	4	+27.3	+21
South Africa	65.9	3	63.6	5	-2.3	-2
Congo DRC	59.1	8	63.6	5	+4.5	+3
Morocco	52.3	13	61.4	7	+9.1	+6
Rwanda	59.1	8	59.1	8	+0.0	+0
Burkina Faso	54.5	11	59.1	8	+4.5	+3
Ghana	65.9	3	56.8	10	-9.1	-7
Benin	61.4	5	54.5	11	-6.8	-6
Senegal	52.3	13	54.5	11	+2.3	+2
Nigeria	47.7	18	54.5	11	+6.8	+7
Botswana	54.5	11	54.5	11	+0.0	+0
Lesotho	61.4	5	52.3	15	-9.1	-10
Seychelles	47.7	18	52.3	15	+4.5	+3
Tanzania	52.3	13	52.3	15	+0.0	-2
Ethiopia	38.6	25	50.0	18	+11.4	+7
Niger	31.8	34	47.7	19	+15.9	+15
Republic of Cote d'Ivoire	50.0	16	47.7	19	-2.3	-3
Congo Brazzaville	59.1	8	47.7	19	-11.4	-11
Sao Tome and Principe	45.5	20	45.5	22	+0.0	-2
Uganda	50.0	16	45.5	22	-4.5	-6
Namibia	36.4	31	43.2	24	+6.8	+7
Cape Verde	40.9	23	43.2	24	+2.3	-1
Sierra Leone	38.6	25	43.2	24	+4.5	+1
Togo	34.1	32	38.6	27	+4.5	+5
Comoros	27.3	43	36.4	28	+9.1	+15
Chad	29.5	40	36.4	28	+6.8	+12
Malawi	38.6	25	36.4	28	-2.3	-3
Burundi	45.5	20	36.4	28	-9.1	-8
Guinea	43.2	22	36.4	28	-6.8	-6
Guinea-Bissau	27.3	43	34.1	33	+6.8	+10
Cameroon	31.8	34	34.1	33	+2.3	+1
Mauritania	31.8	34	34.1	33	+2.3	+1
The Gambia	31.8	34	34.1	33	+2.3	+1
Tunisia	29.5	40	31.8	37	+2.3	+3
Mali	34.1	32	31.8	37	-2.3	-5
Zimbabwe	40.9	23	31.8	37	-9.1	-14
Swaziland	31.8	34	31.8	37	+0.0	-3
Gabon	38.6	25	29.5	41	-9.1	-16
Algeria	38.6	25	29.5	41	-9.1	-16
Mozambique	31.8	34	27.3	43	-4.5	-9
Madagascar	27.3	43	25.0	44	-2.3	-1
Angola	25.0	46	25.0	44	+0.0	+2
Djibouti	29.5	40	25.0	44	-4.5	-4
Libya	25.0	46	22.7	47	-2.3	-1
Sudan	22.7	48	22.7	47	+0.0	+1
Egypt	20.5	50	20.5	49	+0.0	+1
CAR	22.7	48	20.5	49	-2.3	-1
South Sudan	18.2	51	18.2	51	+0.0	+0
Somalia	4.5	52	6.8	52	+2.3	+0
Eritrea	2.3	53	4.5	53	+2.3	+0
Equatorial Guinea	0.0	54	2.3	54	+2.3	+0

