WHAT DOES PETS MEAN?

PETS is an English expression meaning "Public Expenditure Tracking Survey ("Enquête sur la Traçabilité des Dépenses Publiques" in French).

WHAT IS THE OBJECTIVE OF PETS?

PETS makes it possible to gradually track, the flow of resources at all levels of administration (central, devolved and decentralised) in order to quantify the share of budgetary resources that actually reach the final providers.

WHAT EXPERIENCE FOR CAMEROON?

PETS I: 2003/2004

One of the triggers for reaching the completion point of the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) public debt relief initiative. Two areas concerned: Health and Education.

PETS II: 2010

Prescribed for the monitoring of the implementation of Law No. 2007/006 of December 26, 2007 on the State's financial system. Two areas concerned: Health and Education.

PETS III: 2018/2019

Upon recommendation of PETS II, four areas concerned: Health, Education, Nutrition, Water-Hygiene-Sanitation.

METHODOLOGICAL ELEMENTS

The study covers the entire national territory. The information collected relates to the 2017 financial year.

The study made it possible to collect information on the (i) operating and investment budget allocation; ii) system through which these resources are channelled from the central level to health care and providers; iii) management of these resources; iv) management of drugs and vaccines, as well as v) regular attendance of staff on duty in the HFs.

SOME KEY FINDINGS

Over a quarter of health facility managers said they had no information on the management of the operating budget allocated to their structure in 2017.

36% of managers said they had no documents that track budget expenditure. For those who had these, they were either poorly kept or incomplete.

SOME KEY FINDINGS

33% of HF managers who withdrew their expenditure authorisations for the operating budget did not commit it. In the opinion of 61.3% of HF managers, Financial Controllers are still primarily responsible for delays in the withdrawal, commitment and scheduling of expenditure authorisations.

80% of managers said they had been forced to pay bribes when executing their expenditure authorisation for the acquisition of goods and provision of services (taking possession of their EAs, committing and/or receiving payment).

83% of HF managers reported that good distribution practices and drug management/storage standards at central and intermediate levels are respected.