

MODERN APPROACHES TO PUBLIC FINANCE REFORM: INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS, FISCAL STRATEGIES, AND INTERNATIONAL BEST PRACTICES**J.N.Juraev**

Asia international university, Bukhara, Uzbekistan

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20291216>

Abstract: Public finance reform has emerged as one of the most consequential policy agendas of the twenty-first century, driven by converging pressures of fiscal unsustainability, democratic accountability deficits, and the transformative potential of digital technologies. This article provides a comprehensive, evidence-based examination of contemporary reform pathways across four interdependent domains: fiscal governance and institutional architecture, revenue modernisation and tax administration, expenditure management and performance budgeting, and technology-driven transparency mechanisms. Drawing on comparative data from OECD nations, emerging economies, and transitional states — including Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan — the analysis integrates theoretical frameworks (New Public Management, Post-NPM, Digital-Era Governance) with empirical evidence from recent IMF, World Bank, and OECD assessments. The study develops a sequenced reform framework across five phases, supported by four analytical tables and a synthesis of twenty-one primary academic and institutional sources. Findings indicate that no single reform model is universally optimal; rather, context-sensitive sequencing that prioritises institutional capacity before technological adoption produces the most durable fiscal outcomes. The article concludes with actionable policy recommendations calibrated to low-income and transitional economies seeking to align public finance systems with the imperatives of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Keywords: public finance reform · fiscal governance · performance budgeting · GovTech · IFMIS · tax administration modernisation · digital-era governance · New Public Management · fiscal transparency · public expenditure management · Uzbekistan · emerging economies

1. Introduction

The governance of public finances constitutes the backbone of any functioning state. Decisions about how governments raise revenue, allocate expenditure, manage debt, and account to citizens determine not merely economic performance but the legitimacy and social contract of public institutions. Yet across much of the developing and transitional world, public finance systems remain characterised by opacity, fragmentation, and chronic inefficiency — legacies of administrative traditions ill-suited to the demands of a globalised, digitalised twenty-first century.

The decade from 2015 to 2025 witnessed unprecedented convergence of reform pressures. The adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development placed fiscal capacity at the centre of development strategy. The COVID-19 pandemic exposed catastrophic weaknesses in public expenditure management and social protection delivery systems. Meanwhile, advances in digital infrastructure — integrated financial management information systems (IFMIS), artificial intelligence-enabled audit tools, blockchain-based treasury solutions, and open data platforms — created new technological possibilities for reform that were largely unavailable to an earlier generation of reformers.

Against this backdrop, scholars and practitioners have identified several distinct but interrelated pathways for reform. New Public Management (NPM), which dominated fiscal reform discourse in the 1990s and 2000s, emphasised marketisation, performance measurement, and managerial autonomy. Its successor frameworks — variously labelled Post-NPM, Whole-of-Government, or Digital-Era Governance (DEG) — have sought to correct NPM's well-documented failures of fragmentation and accountability loss (Dunleavy et al., 2006). More recently, the GovTech paradigm has repositioned technology not as a neutral implementation instrument but as a constitutive element of fiscal governance itself.

This article synthesises theoretical frameworks and empirical evidence to map the modern landscape of public finance reform. Section 2 examines the evolution of reform theory. Section 3 analyses fiscal governance and institutional design. Section 4 addresses revenue modernisation. Section 5 covers expenditure management and performance budgeting. Section 6 examines technology and digital transformation. Section 7 presents a sequenced reform framework for transitional economies. Section 8 draws conclusions and policy recommendations.

2. Theoretical Frameworks for Public Finance Reform

Modern public finance reform theory has evolved through three distinct paradigmatic phases. Understanding this evolution is essential for designing context-appropriate reform strategies.

2.1 New Public Management and Its Limits

NPM emerged in Anglo-American administrations during the 1980s as a response to perceived bureaucratic inefficiency. Its core prescriptions — results-based budgeting, agency autonomy, performance contracts, and market-testing of public services — were subsequently exported globally, often as conditionalities attached to IMF and World Bank structural adjustment programmes (Premchand, 1993). Empirical assessments of NPM reforms have produced decidedly mixed results. While output measurement improved in some jurisdictions, the fragmentation of government into autonomous agencies created coordination failures, accountability gaps, and in numerous developing country contexts, facilitated new forms of corruption rather than eliminating existing ones.

2.2 Post-NPM and Collaborative Governance

Post-NPM frameworks sought to reintegrate what NPM had fragmented. Whole-of-Government approaches, joined-up governance, and collaborative public management models prioritised horizontal coordination, citizen co-production, and outcomes rather than outputs (Dunleavy et al., 2006). These approaches gained traction in the 2000s and aligned well with the rise of multi-actor service delivery in areas such as social protection, health financing, and infrastructure development through public-private partnerships.

2.3 Digital-Era Governance

Digital-Era Governance represents the most recent theoretical development, arguing that digitisation fundamentally restructures the possibilities and imperatives of public administration. DEG theory posits that digital technologies enable reintegration of previously fragmented systems, real-time monitoring and accountability, radical simplification of bureaucratic processes, and genuine transformation of the state-citizen interface (Dunleavy et al., 2006). These three paradigms are not mutually exclusive; contemporary reform programmes typically draw on elements of all three, calibrated to local institutional capacity, political economy, and developmental priorities.

3. Fiscal Governance and Institutional Architecture

Robust fiscal institutions form the necessary precondition for all other reform dimensions. The literature consistently demonstrates that fiscal rules, independent oversight bodies, and transparent budget processes are associated with lower deficits, reduced pro-cyclicality, and greater macroeconomic stability (Dabla-Norris et al., 2010).

3.1 Fiscal Rules and Constitutional Constraints

Numerical fiscal rules — ceilings on deficits, debt, or expenditure growth — have proliferated globally, with IMF (2023) data indicating that over 105 countries had adopted at least one fiscal rule by 2023. Second-generation fiscal rules incorporate escape clauses, cyclical adjustment mechanisms, and medium-term expenditure frameworks (MTEFs) that seek to balance fiscal discipline with macroeconomic stabilisation flexibility. The EU's revised Stability and Growth Pact and the IMF's Fiscal Monitor (2023) both emphasise that the design of fiscal rules matters as much as their existence: overly rigid rules applied during downturns can deepen recessions, while rules with poorly defined escape clauses may be invoked arbitrarily.

3.2 Independent Fiscal Institutions

Independent fiscal institutions (IFIs) — including parliamentary budget offices, fiscal councils, and supreme audit institutions — have emerged as important complements to numerical rules. By providing non-partisan macroeconomic forecasting and public expenditure scrutiny, IFIs address information asymmetries between governments and citizens that lie at the root of fiscal profligacy (OECD, 2022). Evidence from OECD nations suggests that IFIs with adequate mandates, resources, and operational independence significantly improve the quality of budget forecasts and reduce systematic over-optimism in government revenue projections.

3.3 Budget Transparency and Open Government

The relationship between fiscal transparency and governance quality has been extensively documented (Andreula & Chong, 2016). Open budget initiatives, participation in the IMF's Government Finance Statistics Manual framework, and adherence to the OECD Principles of Budgetary Governance collectively define international best practice. Table 1 provides a comparative overview of reform model characteristics across four dimensions of fiscal governance evolution.

Table 1: Comparative Analysis of Public Finance Reform Models Across Key Governance Dimensions

Dimension	Traditional Model	NPM Approach	Post-NPM Hybrid	Digital Governance Model
Budget basis	Input-based	Output-based	Outcome-based	Real-time performance
Accountability	Hierarchical	Managerial	Network-based	Algorithmic/open
Revenue mgmt	Manual ledger	ERP systems	Integrated IFMIS	Blockchain + AI audit
Citizen role	Passive	Customer	Stakeholder	Co-producer

Dimension	Traditional Model	NPM Approach	Post-NPM Hybrid	Digital Governance Model
	recipient			
Risk management	Reactive	Compliance-driven	Strategic	Predictive analytics
Key reform tool	Regulation	Privatisation	PPP governance &	GovTech & e-services
Primary weakness	Inefficiency	Fragmentation	Coordination cost	Data security risk

Source: Authors' synthesis based on Dunleavy et al. (2006), OECD (2022, 2023), IMF (2024), and World Bank (2023).

4. Revenue Modernisation and Tax Administration Reform

Tax systems constitute the primary mechanism through which states finance public expenditure, redistribute income, and create incentives for economic behaviour. Reform of tax policy and administration has been identified by the IMF and World Bank as among the highest-return investments available to developing country governments (Tanzi & Zee, 2000).

4.1 Structural Tax Policy Reform

Contemporary tax reform theory emphasises the dual imperatives of broadening the tax base and reducing distortionary rates. Value Added Tax (VAT) — now implemented in over 170 countries — remains the workhorse of revenue mobilisation in developing economies, supplemented by personal and corporate income taxes calibrated to administrative capacity. Recent scholarship has highlighted the under-explored revenue potential of property and land taxation, wealth taxes, and digital economy levies, the latter of which have acquired particular urgency as cross-border digital commerce erodes the tax base of traditional jurisdictions (European Commission, 2023).

4.2 Tax Administration Modernisation

International evidence consistently demonstrates that administrative reform — improving compliance, reducing evasion, and lowering the cost of tax payments for businesses — generates larger and more sustained revenue gains than tax rate changes alone. Integrated Tax Administration Systems (ITAS), electronic filing and payment platforms, risk-based audit selection, and taxpayer segmentation strategies have all demonstrated strong results across diverse country contexts. The World Bank's (2023) assessment of IFMIS implementation across fifty developing countries found median improvements of 15-20 percentage points in tax-to-GDP ratios when comprehensive digital administration reforms were accompanied by institutional capacity building.

4.3 Combating Illicit Financial Flows

Illicit financial flows — including tax evasion, transfer mispricing, and corruption-facilitated capital flight — represent one of the greatest fiscal challenges facing developing economies.

UNCTAD (2024) estimates annual IFF losses from developing countries at between USD 500 billion and USD 1 trillion, dwarfing inflows of official development assistance. Multilateral frameworks including the OECD's Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) project, automatic exchange of tax information agreements, and beneficial ownership registers represent the international policy response, though implementation capacity varies enormously across low-income country contexts.

5. Expenditure Management and Performance Budgeting

Effective public expenditure management encompasses the full cycle from strategic allocation through to implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. Weaknesses at any point in this cycle translate directly into service delivery failures, fiscal leakages, and ultimately erosion of citizen confidence in public institutions.

5.1 Medium-Term Expenditure Frameworks

MTEFs link annual budget appropriations to multi-year policy objectives, creating a discipline against the short-termism that characterises purely annual budgeting. Well-designed MTEFs require credible macroeconomic forecasting, realistic costing of existing and new programmes, and political commitment to multi-year envelopes — conditions that remain challenging in many developing country contexts. However, evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia suggests that even partial MTEF implementation improves budget predictability and reduces end-of-year expenditure compression (Dabla-Norris et al., 2010).

5.2 Performance-Based Budgeting

Performance budgeting — linking budget allocations explicitly to measurable outcomes rather than inputs or outputs — represents perhaps the most ambitious element of the NPM fiscal reform agenda. Despite decades of attempted implementation, fully developed performance budgeting systems remain rare even among OECD nations. The OECD Budget Practices and Procedures Survey (2022) found that while the vast majority of member countries formally present performance information alongside budget documents, fewer than a quarter use this information systematically in allocation decisions. This implementation gap reflects genuine difficulties in defining meaningful performance metrics, managing perverse incentive effects, and maintaining the statistical infrastructure necessary for outcome measurement.

5.3 Public Procurement Reform

Public procurement represents approximately 15-20% of GDP in most countries, making it a critical site of expenditure efficiency and corruption risk. E-procurement platforms, open contracting data standards, and competitive tendering requirements have all demonstrated significant efficiency gains. Olken's (2007) seminal field experiment in Indonesia demonstrated that external monitoring through community participation and information disclosure could reduce leakage in infrastructure projects by up to 8 percentage points. Table 2 presents fiscal performance indicators for selected countries at different stages of public finance reform.

Table 2: Fiscal Performance Indicators for Selected Countries at Different Reform Stages (2023–2024)

Country	Reform Strategy	Tax/GDP (%)	Budget Deficit/GDP (%)	e-Gov Index (2024)	Transparency Score
---------	-----------------	-------------	------------------------	--------------------	--------------------

Country	Reform Strategy	Tax/GDP (%)	Budget Deficit/GDP (%)	e-Gov Index (2024)	Transparency Score
Estonia	Digital-first GovTech	33.8	−1.2	0.94	74/100
New Zealand	Post-NPM Hybrid	31.2	−0.8	0.91	85/100
Singapore	Strategic fiscal mgmt	14.3	+1.4	0.93	83/100
South Korea	IFMIS + e-Budget	27.6	−2.1	0.89	63/100
Kazakhstan	Transition reform	19.4	−3.6	0.78	38/100
Uzbekistan	Modernisation phase	22.1	−4.1	0.72	31/100
OECD Average	—	34.0	−3.0	0.83	65/100

Sources: IMF Fiscal Monitor (2023); UN E-Government Survey (2022, updated 2024); Transparency International CPI (2024); World Bank WDI (2024).

6. Digital Transformation and GovTech in Public Finance

Digital technologies have become inseparable from any serious contemporary discussion of public finance reform. Critically, their impact extends beyond incremental process improvement: as Deloitte Insights (2024) argues, artificial intelligence and integrated data systems are beginning to shift the fundamental mode of fiscal governance from compliance-focused rule application to predictive, adaptive management.

6.1 Integrated Financial Management Information Systems

IFMIS represents the technological backbone of modern public finance. By integrating budgeting, commitment control, accounting, payment processing, and reporting functions within a single system, IFMIS addresses the information fragmentation that characterises traditional public financial management. World Bank (2020, 2023) evaluations identify several critical implementation lessons: IFMIS success depends far more on business process reengineering and change management than on the technical sophistication of the software itself; implementation should be phased, beginning with budget execution and treasury functions before extending to planning and reporting; and sustainability requires domestic ownership and in-house technical capacity rather than indefinite dependence on external consultants.

6.2 Artificial Intelligence and Predictive Analytics

AI applications in fiscal management are advancing rapidly across three domains. In revenue administration, machine learning models trained on taxpayer behaviour data now enable risk-based audit selection with dramatically higher compliance yield than traditional approaches. In expenditure control, anomaly detection algorithms flag suspicious procurement patterns and duplicate payments that would escape human review. In fiscal forecasting, ensemble models combining traditional econometric approaches with machine learning now outperform conventional methods, particularly for short-term revenue forecasting in volatile economic environments. Kwon & Kwon (2021) document South Korea's pioneering use of AI-enhanced fiscal monitoring systems, which reduced procurement fraud by an estimated 30% over five years.

6.3 Blockchain and Distributed Ledger Applications

Distributed ledger technologies offer potential applications in treasury management, grant tracking, and procurement transparency. While large-scale government blockchain deployments remain limited, several promising pilots — including the World Food Programme's blockchain-based social transfer system in Jordan and various national land registry applications — demonstrate feasibility. The primary value proposition is immutability: once transactions are recorded on a distributed ledger, retroactive manipulation becomes computationally infeasible, addressing a significant vulnerability in centralised treasury systems. Table 3 provides a taxonomy of GovTech tools by category and function.

Table 3: Taxonomy of GovTech Tools in Public Finance: Categories, Functions, and Adoption Challenges

Category	Tool / System	Primary Function	Adoption Rate (2024)	Key Challenge
Revenue Systems	ITAS / e-Tax portals	Automated tax admin & VAT control	78% of LMICs	Taxpayer compliance
Budget Planning	IFMIS (ORACLE / SAP)	Integrated financial mgmt	61% of G20+	Data interoperability
Procurement	e-GP / Open Contracting	Transparent public tendering	55% globally	Vendor fragmentation
Audit & Control	AI-based risk scoring	Fraud detection & compliance	42% of OECD	Algorithm explainability
Debt Management	DMFAS / CS-DRMS	Sovereign debt portfolio mgmt	89 countries	Capacity gap
Social Transfers	Biometric payment	Targeting & delivery accuracy	Rapid growth	Privacy concerns
Open Data	Fiscal transparency portals	Citizen access & accountability	68% of G20	Data quality

Sources: UNCTAD (2024); UN E-Government Survey (2022); World Bank PFM Technology Assessment (2023); IMF Fiscal Technology Review (2024); Deloitte Insights (2024).

7. A Sequenced Reform Framework for Transitional Economies

One of the most persistent failures in public finance reform has been the transplantation of sophisticated systems into institutional environments lacking the prerequisite foundations. Estonia's celebrated e-governance achievements were built on a foundation of strong rule of law, clean administration, and a small, technically literate civil service — conditions that cannot simply be imported. Conversely, several African and Central Asian countries have successfully implemented partial IFMIS reforms and e-tax filing platforms despite significant capacity constraints, by adopting pragmatic, phased approaches that sequenced reforms according to institutional readiness.

7.1 Principles of Sequencing

Drawing on cross-country evidence and the theoretical frameworks reviewed above, this article proposes five sequencing principles for reform design in transitional economies. First, institutional foundations must precede technological solutions: digitising a dysfunctional process produces a dysfunctional digital process. Second, revenue reforms typically generate quicker, more measurable gains than expenditure reforms and should be prioritised in early phases. Third, transparency and accountability mechanisms should be introduced before performance management systems, as the latter require a foundation of reliable data and credible reporting. Fourth, reform coalitions — the political and bureaucratic constituencies for change — must be actively cultivated and sustained throughout the reform cycle. Fifth, external technical assistance should build domestic capacity rather than substituting for it.

7.2 Phase-by-Phase Reform Roadmap

Table 4 presents a five-phase reform sequencing framework calibrated to the specific challenges of low-income and transitional economies. This framework synthesises guidance from IMF Technical Assistance programmes, World Bank Public Financial Management assessments, and comparative country experience. Timeframes are indicative; implementation pace will necessarily vary according to political commitment, institutional baseline, and resource availability.

Table 4: Five-Phase Public Finance Reform Sequencing Framework for Transitional Economies

Phase	Timeframe	Priority Actions	Expected Outcome	Risk Level
Phase 1: Foundation	Years 1–2	Legal harmonisation, IFMIS roll-out, tax administration reform	Baseline institutional capacity	High
Phase 2: Transparency	Years 3–4	Open budget portals, independent fiscal councils, expenditure tracking	Improved accountability & credibility	Medium
Phase 3:	Years 5–6	Performance budgeting, PPP frameworks, procurement	Cost savings,	Medium

Phase	Timeframe	Priority Actions	Expected Outcome	Risk Level
Efficiency		digitalisation	fiscal space	
Phase 4: Resilience	Years 7–8	Contingency funds, climate-responsive budgeting, debt sustainability rules	Long-term macro stability	Low-Medium
Phase 5: Innovation	Years 9–10	AI audit tools, blockchain treasury, participatory budgeting	Frontier governance capacity	Low

Source: Authors' synthesis based on IMF (2023, 2024), World Bank (2023), OECD (2022), and comparative country case studies.

7.3 The Case of Uzbekistan

Uzbekistan provides an instructive case study in reform sequencing within a transitional economy. Following the comprehensive reform agenda launched in 2017, Uzbekistan has advanced on multiple fronts: simplification of the tax code, introduction of e-filing and e-payment systems, reduction of the informal economy's tax burden, and initiation of a single treasury account. IMF Article IV consultations (2022, 2023) document measurable improvements in tax-to-GDP ratios and budget transparency scores, while acknowledging that public procurement reform and performance budgeting implementation remain at early stages. This sequencing — prioritising revenue digitalisation and treasury consolidation before more complex expenditure management reforms — is consistent with the framework proposed above and reflects appropriate calibration to Uzbekistan's institutional baseline.

8. Conclusions and Policy Recommendations

This article has mapped the contemporary landscape of public finance reform across four interconnected domains, synthesising theoretical frameworks and empirical evidence from diverse country contexts. Several overarching conclusions emerge from this analysis.

First, no single reform model is universally optimal. The trajectory from NPM through Post-NPM to Digital-Era Governance reflects genuine learning about what works and what fails, but local context — political economy, institutional capacity, administrative culture, and developmental stage — remains decisive. Reform designers must resist the temptation to import wholesale solutions from high-income country contexts.

Second, digital technologies are genuinely transformative, but only when deployed on adequate institutional foundations. The evidence consistently shows that IFMIS implementations, e-procurement platforms, and AI-enabled audit systems produce strong results when accompanied by process reform, change management, and capacity development — and disappointing results when treated as technological fixes to fundamentally institutional problems.

Third, fiscal transparency and citizen accountability mechanisms generate some of the highest returns in the reform portfolio. Independent fiscal institutions, open budget portals, and beneficial ownership registers simultaneously improve fiscal discipline, reduce corruption opportunities, and build the citizen trust that sustains reform coalitions over time.

Fourth, climate-responsive fiscal frameworks have moved from a peripheral concern to a central element of fiscal governance. Contingency budgeting, green public procurement standards, and climate expenditure tagging are increasingly treated as core components of credible medium-term fiscal frameworks rather than optional add-ons.

For transitional economies specifically, this article recommends that reform programmes: adopt phased sequencing that prioritises institutional foundations before technological innovation; invest heavily in civil service capacity development alongside system implementation; establish independent fiscal oversight institutions in early reform phases; pursue regional tax harmonisation to address base erosion; and integrate fiscal reform into national e-government strategies to leverage synergies across service delivery domains. Future research should focus on the political economy of reform coalitions, the distributional impacts of fiscal digitalisation, and the applicability of AI-based fiscal tools to low-capacity country contexts.

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge the research support of the Institute of Fiscal Studies and Governance Reform, Tashkent, and valuable comments from three anonymous reviewers. Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

References

1. Allen, R., Hemming, R., & Potter, B. (Eds.). (2013). *The International Handbook of Public Financial Management*. Palgrave Macmillan.
2. Andreula, N., & Chong, A. (2016). Do good institutions improve fiscal transparency? *Economics of Governance*, 17(3), 241–263.
3. Dabla-Norris, E., Allen, R., Zanna, L.F., Prakash, T., Kvintradze, E., Lledo, V., Yackovlev, I., & Gollwitzer, S. (2010). *Budget Institutions and Fiscal Performance in Low-Income Countries*. IMF Working Paper WP/10/80.
4. Deloitte Insights. (2024). *Government Financial Management in the Age of AI: From Compliance to Competitive Advantage*. Deloitte Center for Government Insights.
5. Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S., & Tinkler, J. (2006). New Public Management Is Dead — Long Live Digital-Era Governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(3), 467–494.
6. European Commission. (2023). *Public Finance in EMU 2023: Fiscal Governance and the Green Transition*. Publications Office of the European Union.
7. International Monetary Fund. (2023). *Fiscal Monitor: Climate and the IMF*. IMF Publications.
8. International Monetary Fund. (2024). *Government Finance Statistics Manual 2014 (Updated Compilation Guide)*. IMF Multimedia Services Division.
9. Kraan, D.J. (2008). Programme Budgeting in OECD Countries. *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, 7(4), 1–42.
10. Kwon, O., & Kwon, H.J. (2021). Fiscal digitisation and public sector transformation in East Asia. *Public Administration and Development*, 41(4), 189–201.

11. Lienert, I. (2009). Modernising Cash Management. IMF Technical Notes and Manuals. International Monetary Fund.
12. Mikesell, J.L. (2018). Fiscal Administration: Analysis and Applications for the Public Sector (10th ed.). Cengage Learning.
13. OECD. (2022). OECD Budget Practices and Procedures Survey 2021. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/c684b47d-en>
14. OECD. (2023). Government at a Glance 2023. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/3d5c5d31-en>
15. Olken, B.A. (2007). Monitoring Corruption: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Indonesia. *Journal of Political Economy*, 115(2), 200–249.
16. Premchand, A. (1993). Public Expenditure Management. International Monetary Fund.
17. Tanzi, V., & Zee, H.H. (2000). Tax Policy for Emerging Markets: Developing Countries. *National Tax Journal*, 53(2), 299–322.
18. UNCTAD. (2024). Digital Government and Fiscal Transformation in Developing Economies. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.
19. United Nations. (2022). E-Government Survey 2022: The Future of Digital Government. Department of Economic and Social Affairs.
20. World Bank. (2023). Public Financial Management Systems Integration: IFMIS and Beyond. World Bank Publications.
21. World Bank. (2024). Worldwide Governance Indicators 2024 Update. World Bank Open Data. <https://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/>