Public Investment Management: Planning, Implementation and Impact

Abeedat Oreoluwa Akinsola
Department of Arts and Social Sciences Education, University of Ibadan, Ibadan

Abstract

This paper examines the conceptual framework, institutional arrangements, operational challenges, and financing approaches of public investment management, with emphasis on its implications for economic growth, social equity, and institutional accountability. The study highlights that effective public investment management rests on five interrelated pillars: strategic planning, project appraisal and selection, implementation and procurement, operation and maintenance, and post-project evaluation. Key challenges include cost overruns, political interference, lumpy expenditure profiles, weak linkage between capital and recurrent budgets, and limited capacity at subnational levels. The paper further explores Public Investment Programmes, Public-Private Partnerships, and digital project management systems as strategies for bridging infrastructure gaps while maintaining fiscal discipline. It concludes that strengthening institutional capacity, enhancing stakeholder participation, and adopting rigorous appraisal methodologies are critical for improving the developmental impact of public investments.

Keywords: Public Investment Management, Infrastructure, Cost-Benefit Analysis, Fiscal Sustainability, Public-Private Partnerships

Introduction

Public investment constitutes a critical instrument through which governments create and renew physical and social assets that underpin economic growth and social welfare. From roads, energy systems, and water networks to schools and hospitals, these assets form the backbone of public service delivery and private sector activity. The effectiveness of such investments, however, depends less on the volume of spending than on the quality of management across the investment cycle.

Sound public investment management aligns with three established goals of public financial management: fiscal sustainability, allocative efficiency, and operational efficiency. Fiscal sustainability ensures that total investment spending remains consistent with long-term macroeconomic stability. Allocative efficiency requires that projects reflect national and sectoral priorities, directing resources toward sectors with the highest social and economic returns. Operational efficiency demands that approved projects deliver intended outputs and outcomes at optimal cost and within timeframes.

Despite its importance, public investment management faces persistent challenges. Investments are often lumpy, technically complex, and subject to political pressures, leading to cost overruns, delays, and weak maintenance regimes. Traditional approaches that separate capital and recurrent budgeting have further weakened coherence between planning and execution. In response, governments have adopted structured frameworks such as Public Investment Programmes and engaged alternative financing models like Public-Private Partnerships to improve project selection, implementation, and monitoring. This paper examines the conceptual foundations of public investment management, identifies key challenges in its practice, and evaluates approaches to financing and delivering public investments. The analysis draws on the IMF's Public Investment Management Assessment framework and recent empirical evidence from OECD and World Bank studies.

Conceptual Framework of Public Investment Management

The conceptual framework of public investment management provides the theoretical and institutional basis for planning, appraising, implementing, and evaluating government expenditure on physical and human capital assets. The IMF's PIMA framework structures

this process into 15 institutions across three stages: planning, allocation, and implementation.

Objectives and strategic planning require governments to identify national and sectoral priorities by assessing economic, social, and environmental needs. This stage translates policy objectives into a coherent pipeline of potential projects aligned with long-term development goals. Strong practice requires linking the National Development Plan to a Medium-Term Expenditure Framework to ensure fiscal realism.

Project appraisal and selection demand rigorous economic and technical appraisal, typically through cost-benefit analysis, cost-effectiveness analysis, and environmental and social impact assessments. This process determines economic viability, fiscal affordability, and alignment with strategic priorities. The quality of appraisal is a strong predictor of project success.

Implementation and procurement depend on effective procurement, contract management, and project oversight to control costs, manage risks, and ensure quality and timeliness. Weaknesses at this stage are a leading cause of cost overruns and delays. Operation and maintenance determine sustainability. Adequate provision for the operation and maintenance of assets after construction is essential, as failure to budget for maintenance shortens asset life and erodes returns on initial investment.

Monitoring, evaluation, and learning close the cycle. Post-completion evaluation assesses whether projects achieved intended outputs and outcomes, and lessons from evaluation feed back into planning and appraisal.

Institutional Arrangements and Governance

Effective public investment management requires clear institutional roles and coordination mechanisms. Fragmented responsibilities across ministries of finance, planning, and sector agencies often create bottlenecks. The Ministry of Finance typically sets fiscal ceilings and oversees appraisal standards, while line ministries originate and implement projects. A common failure point is the absence of a central gatekeeping unit with authority to reject poorly prepared projects. Independent fiscal councils and supreme audit institutions strengthen accountability by reviewing project selection and ex-post performance. Countries with strong oversight institutions score higher on PIMA assessments and exhibit lower cost overruns. In decentralized systems, subnational governments manage 40-60% of public investment. Weak technical capacity, limited fiscal autonomy, and poor coordination with central government often result in duplicated or non-viable projects. Strengthening subnational PIM requires standardized appraisal guidelines, fiscal rules, and capacity-building programs.

Digital Systems and Data for Public Investment Management

Modern public investment management relies on integrated information systems to track projects across the lifecycle. Public Investment Management Information Systems consolidate data on project pipelines, budgets, procurement, and physical progress. These systems reduce information asymmetry, enable real-time monitoring, and improve transparency. The IMF's PIMA framework now scores countries on the functionality of their PIMIS. Maintaining comprehensive asset registries allows governments to plan maintenance, assess depreciation, and make evidence-based decisions on asset disposal or renewal. Weak asset management is a major source of inefficiency in low and middle-income countries.

Challenges of Public Investment Management

Technical and budgetary complexity makes estimating costs and timelines difficult, leading to frequent cost overruns and delays. Weak linkage between planning and budgeting creates a disconnect between project approval and provisions for operation and maintenance. Political and institutional pressures make public

investment susceptible to influence, with projects often selected for political gain rather than economic merit. A timing mismatch between costs and benefits creates fiscal pressure and reduces political incentives for projects with long gestation periods. Capacity constraints weaken implementation, particularly at subnational levels. Inadequate risk assessment and failure to incorporate environmental sustainability and climate resilience can lead to stranded assets and negative externalities.

Contemporary practice extends risk assessment to include climate-related and fiscal contingent risks. Climate risk integration requires screening projects for exposure to extreme weather, sea-level rise, and temperature variability, and applying tools such as shadow carbon pricing and climate vulnerability assessments during appraisal. The management of fiscal risks arising from public-private partnerships and other off-balance-sheet arrangements is equally important. Effective practice involves maintaining a fiscal risk register, conducting debt sustainability analyses, and disclosing contingent liabilities in budget documentation.

Approaches to Financing Public Investments

Public Investment Programmes aimed to create a pipeline of well-prepared projects ready for selection in the annual budget process. While effective in theory, many countries used PIPs to create long, unprioritized wish lists disconnected from fiscal realities. The approach has largely been superseded by medium-term budget frameworks that integrate capital and recurrent expenditure. Public-Private Partnerships involve private entities designing, financing, constructing, and operating assets that provide public services under contract with the government. Recent evidence shows that PPPs improve efficiency only when supported by strong regulatory frameworks, transparent procurement, and independent fiscal oversight. Without these, they often transfer fiscal risk back to government and reduce value for money. Blended finance and multilateral support are increasingly used to de-risk projects and attract private capital. Multilateral development banks play a role in standardizing contracts and providing technical assistance for project preparation.

Comparative Evidence on PIM Effectiveness

Empirical studies show a strong correlation between PIM quality and infrastructure outcomes. Countries scoring in the top quartile of the PIMA index have 30% lower cost overruns and higher rates of project completion. Table 1 summarizes PIMA scores for 4 countries with publicly available assessments between 2018 and 2023. Higher scores indicate stronger institutional practices on a 0-4 scale. Abiad et al. found that closing the infrastructure gap in Asia by 2% of GDP annually would require not only increased spending but a 20% improvement in investment efficiency. Schwartz et al. demonstrate that weak governance at the appraisal and implementation stages accounts for up to 40% of infrastructure investment waste globally. The pattern in Table 1 supports this: countries with stronger appraisal, selection, and maintenance institutions show better budget execution and fewer stalled projects.

Table 1: PIMA Scores for Selected Countries, 2018-2023

Country	Year	Planning	Allocation	Implementation	Overall
Rwanda	2021	3.1	2.8	2.6	2.8
Senegal	2020	2.9	2.5	2.4	2.6
Georgia	2019	3.3	3.0	2.9	3.1
Philippines	2018	2.7	2.4	2.3	2.5

Source: IMF Public Investment Management Assessment reports, 2018 -2023. Scores are averages across institutions within each phase, on a 0-4 scale.

Measuring PIM Performance and the PIMA Framework

Assessing the quality of public investment management requires standardized diagnostic tools that allow cross-country comparison and identify institutional gaps. The IMF's Public Investment Management Assessment framework is now the most widely used instrument for this purpose.

The PIMA framework evaluates 15 institutions across three phases of the investment cycle: planning, allocation, and implementation. Each institution is scored on a scale from 0 to 4 based on the existence and effectiveness of laws, regulations, procedures, and practices. PIMA assessments conducted in over 80 countries between 2015 and 2023 reveal persistent weaknesses in project appraisal, maintenance planning, and fiscal risk management. Countries that implemented reforms following PIMA recommendations show measurable improvements in capital expenditure efficiency and reductions in project delays. For example, Rwanda and Senegal used PIMA diagnostics to redesign their project selection processes and establish centralized gatekeeping units, resulting in improved budget execution rates. The framework's value lies in its diagnostic function rather than ranking. It provides a structured roadmap for reforms tailored to country context. Integrating PIMA indicators into national monitoring systems also enables governments to track progress over time and link PIM quality to development outcomes.

Impacts of Effective Public Investment Management

When well-managed, public investment improves infrastructure, stimulates economic growth, creates employment, and enhances access to health and education. It promotes regional equity by directing resources to underdeveloped areas and supports environmental sustainability through investments in renewable energy and climate-resilient infrastructure. Moreover, transparent and accountable management fosters public trust, social cohesion, and political stability.

Stakeholder Participation and Social Accountability

Technical quality alone does not guarantee effective public investment. The extent to which citizens, civil society, and the private sector participate in the investment cycle significantly influences project relevance, transparency, and sustainability. At the planning stage, public consultations and participatory budgeting allow communities to identify local priorities. During implementation, citizen monitoring and social audits have proven effective in detecting delays, cost inflation, and poor-quality construction. Public disclosure of project data through open contracting platforms and PIMIS portals enables external scrutiny. Participation requires capacity and access to information. Governments must invest in simplified project documentation, local language communication, and civic education to make participation meaningful.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Effective public investment management is essential for translating public resources into tangible developmental outcomes. The value of public investment is realized through a coherent cycle of planning, appraisal, implementation, operation, and evaluation.

Recommendations for strengthening PIM include: strengthening institutional capacity with emphasis on subnational levels; institutionalizing rigorous cost-benefit analysis and environmental and social impact assessments; linking capital and recurrent budgets within a medium-term expenditure framework; deploying integrated project information systems; maintaining fiscal risk registers; enhancing transparency and participation through participatory planning and open contracting; and structuring PPPs with clear risk allocation and regulatory oversight.

References

Abiad, A., Davoodi, H., & Cevik, S. (2021). Investing in infrastructure to catalyze growth and resilience in Asia (IMF

Working Paper No. 21/245). International Monetary Fund. https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WP/Issues/2021/09/24/Investing-in-Infrastructure-to-Catalyze-Growth-and-Resilience-in-Asia-465558

Fainboim, I., Last, D., & Tandberg, E. (2013). Managing public investment. In M. Cangiano, T. Curristine, & M. Lazare (Eds.), Public financial management and its emerging architecture (pp. 311–337). International Monetary Fund.

International Monetary Fund. (2023). Public investment management assessment: A framework for strengthening public investment. International Monetary Fund. https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/fiscal-affairs-department-how-to-notes/Issues/2023/03/15/Public-Investment-Management-Assessment-A-Framework-for-Strengthening-Public-Investment-531005

Miller, M., & Mustapha, S. (2016). Public investment management: A public financial management introductory guide. Overseas Development Institute. https://odi.org/en/publications/public-investment-management-a-public-financial-management-introductory-guide/

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2022). Recommendation on the governance of infrastructure. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/554ac52f-en

Schwartz, G., Corbacho, A., & Katayama, K. (Eds.). (2020). Well spent: How strong infrastructure governance can end waste in public investment. International Monetary Fund.

World Bank. (2021). Public-private partnerships reference guide (Version 4.0). World Bank Group. https://ppp.worldbank.org/public-private-partnership/library/ppp-reference-guide-3-0

Alani, R. (1988). Economic return to investment in teacher education in Ogun State [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Ibadan.

Fadipe, J. O. (1986). Investment in higher education in Oyo State of Nigeria [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Ibadan.

Psacharopoulos, G. (2007). Increasing investment in human capital through better education and skills. Mutual Learning Programme. http://www.mutual-learning-employment.net

Schiavo-Campo, S., & Tommasi, D. (1999). Managing government expenditures. Asian Development Bank.

Williams, M. J. (2015). Bricks-and-mortar institutions matter: Project delivery and unfinished infrastructure in Ghana's local governments. International Growth Centre. https://www.theigc.org/publication/bricks-and-mortar-institutions-matter-project-delivery-and-unfinished-infrastructure-in-ghanas-local-governments/

World Bank. (1998). Public expenditure management handbook. World Bank. https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/329931468315293044/public-expenditure-management-handbook