

Independent Fiscal Institutions Database

Survey guidance

Country:	[Insert country name]
Institution name:	[Name of institution in local language]
Preferred English name:	[How the institution should be referred in the OECD's English reports]
Preferred acronym:	[An abbreviation for charts and tables, ideally five characters or fewer]
Website:	[URL to institution's website]
Main legislation:	[Name of main enabling and governing legislation or guidelines, with URL if available]
Date updated:	[Date to which the document should be considered correct]

Unless otherwise indicated, responses should be for the year 2020 (or corporate year most closely matching 2020)

		Response	Guidance
1.	Legal basis and institutional design		
1.1	Was the establishment of the current institution part of a package of reforms? (Yes/No)	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution was established as a monitoring body or service provider to support broader public financial management or institutional reforms introduced at the same time. For example, the monitoring body of a newly introduced fiscal rules framework. In countries where there have been similar institutions in the past, this question refers to the current form of the institution.
1.2	If answering "Yes" to 1.1, how may the broader reforms be characterised? Select all that apply.		If the answer to 1.1 is "Yes", select the classification(s) of broader reforms that apply. Multiple selections are possible. For example, if the institution was created to fulfil the euro area Two Pack obligation for Member States to designate independent bodies to monitor compliance with national fiscal rules, this would be (d) <i>European Union policy coordination</i> . If part of domestic fiscal discipline legislation and rules, it would be (c) <i>National budget management reform</i> . Select "Yes" to (e) <i>Other externally driven reforms</i> if introduced following a market access crisis where reforms were part of the conditions of external loans. If (f) <i>Other</i> is selected, please describe the reforms in the notes. For example, if introduced to fulfil costing of political platforms it may be described as "electoral reform".
1.2.1	(a) Constitutional	Select	
1.2.2	(b) Parliamentary	Select	
1.2.3	(c) National budget management reform	Select	
1.2.4	(d) European Union policy coordination	Select	
1.2.5	(e) Other externally driven reforms	Select	
1.2.6	(f) Other (please describe)	Select	
1.3	Year that legislation for current institution passed	Enter year	List the year that legislation was officially promulgated. If the institution replaced an existing institution but the two are distinct, describe the pre-existing institution in the discussion but record the year of the new institution.
1.4	Year that institution began operating	Enter year	The year that leaders or staff began building capacity under the institution's name, and typically the year the leader was appointed. Not necessarily the year of the first report. It may have begun before or after the institution was put on a statutory basis for Question 1.3.
1.5	Years of significant changes to mandate or other reforms (list all)	Enter years	List all years in which the government or legislature made significant changes to the institution's structure, powers and work plan, separated by a comma. These should be indicated by a change to the institution's governing legislation or agreements (that is, not self-initiated changes in work plan).
1.6	Legal basis for establishment: (a) Constitutional, (b) Primary legislation, (c) Other (please describe)	Select	Select (a) <i>Constitutional</i> if the IFI is prescribed in the jurisdiction's constitution, (b) <i>Primary legislation</i> if not referenced in the constitution but is defined in statutes, or (c) <i>Other</i> and provide details (for example a memorandum of understanding among political parties or subordinate regulations and statutory instruments).
1.7	Institutional model: (a) Parliamentary budget office, (b) Fiscal council, (c) Subsection of existing public body, (d) Other (please describe)	Select	Select appropriate description of the institutional model. <i>Parliamentary budget offices</i> have been established with a governance reporting structure to committees or the plenary of legislatures, typically funded either directly out of the legislature's budget or by a vote directly by the legislature (rather than as part of the national budget). <i>Fiscal councils</i> are typically led by a group of appointed outside experts that report to a branch of the executive government and are supported by a secretariat that is either standalone or receives shared services from another government department or agency. <i>Subsections of existing public bodies</i> are teams within an existing agency such as an audit office or central bank that have been given IFI tasks, with no separately appointed leadership. <i>Other</i> includes public research "think tanks" with broad research programmes to support government and other standalone institutions that cannot be described by the above.

1.8	Leadership model: (a) Individual, (b) Collegial	Select	Select (a) <i>Individual</i> if there is only one head of the organisation under legislation or other agreement. Select (b) <i>collegial</i> if the institution is governed by a council. If the IFI responsibilities are given to a team within a larger public body, the leadership structure of the larger organisation may be used for this question if the team is not independently governed and does not have separately appointed leaders.
2. Leadership and staff appointments			
2.1	Leaders are appointed based on merit and technical competence: (a) Yes, required by legislation, (b) Yes, in practice, (c) No, appointed for political considerations	Select	Select (a) <i>Yes, required by legislation</i> if there are formal terms that appointees must have a relevant economic, fiscal, accounting, or other related professional background. Select (b) <i>Yes, in practice</i> if appointees have come from an appropriate background despite not having formal legislated requirements. Select (c) <i>No, appointed for political considerations</i> if appointees are selected for reasons unrelated to their professional experience. If leadership is chosen from an open competition, select <i>Yes</i> according to whether the competition is formally prescribed in legislation or only in practice. If the institution is part of a larger independent institution such as the supreme audit authority, with no separately appointed leaders, the leadership of the larger independent institution should be assessed for this section, but with supplementary information in the discussion notes for the hiring of the manager of the team responsible for the IFI function.
2.2	From where did current leadership (including all council members) leave to join the IFI (if full time) or where is leadership currently employed (if part time)?		This question provides information on the role and employer that leaders left to join the IFI (if full time) or the current outside role and employer of leaders (if part time). It indicates where the institution recruits leadership from generally under current practice, for example, are most council members from academia, the central bank or government?
2.2.1	(a) Ministry of Finance	Select	If other, please describe. NB: For this question, if the institution is a team within a larger organisation like the audit office or central bank and does not have an appointed head, the immediate director of the team may be used if operating at arm's length and the most relevant to ultimate management decisions; otherwise refer to the appointed head of the larger organisation.
2.2.2	(b) Audit	Select	
2.2.3	(c) Another department	Select	
2.2.4	(d) Central bank	Select	
2.2.5	(e) Academia	Select	
2.2.6	(f) Think tank	Select	
2.2.7	(f) Private sector	Select	
2.2.8	(g) International organisation	Select	
2.2.9	(h) Internal promotion	Select	
2.2.10	(i) IFIs	Select	
2.2.11	(j) Parliament	Select	
2.2.12	(k) Other (please describe)	Select	
2.3	Is there a procedure for creating a nomination list or short list of potential leaders (Yes/No)	Select	Select "Yes" if a nomination list or a list of candidates for the head of institution or council positions is put forward from which an appointment(s) must be made. Used in conjunction with question 2.4. If several stakeholders (for example from parliament, the central bank, and the government) each select a candidate and all candidates are subsequently appointed or approved (by the authority described in Question 2.5 and/or Question 2.6), select "Yes" for Question 2.3 and select (d) <i>Decision by a range of stakeholders</i> for Question 2.4. It is implied that each stakeholder has an internal nomination process for choosing their candidate.
2.4	How is the nomination list or short list of potential leaders decided? (a) Executive nomination, (b) Legislative nomination, (c) Incumbent nomination, (d) Nominated by a range of stakeholders, (e) Open competition, (f) Other (please describe), (g) N/A	Select	If the answer to Question 2.3 is "Yes", who determines the list of candidates from which the appointment must be made? If the initial candidate list is prepared by an independent recruiting firm that engages candidates to assess their qualifications, select (e) <i>Open competition</i> If other, please describe.
2.5	Who appoints the leader(s)? (a) Executive only, (b) Legislature only, (c) Other institution, (d) Range of stakeholders, (e) Other (please describe), (f) N/A	Select	Who ultimately has constitutional, statutory, or memorandum responsibility for choosing the leader(s)? If the answer to Question 2.3 and Question 2.6 is "Yes" this would be who officially picks from the nomination list and presents the name for final collective voted approval.
2.6	Is there secondary approval of the appointment? (a) Yes, (b) No, (c) Other (please describe), (d) N/A	Select	Is there secondary approval of the appointment? This would typically be via a collective decision and vote by the legislature in plenary or a budget committee.

2.7	<p>If collegial leadership, how is the chair decided?</p> <p>(a) Executive decision, (b) Legislative decision, (c) Incumbent decision, (d) Decision by a range of stakeholders, (e) Open competition, (f) Chosen by council/commission themselves, (g) Other (please describe), (h) N/A</p>	Select	<p>If the answer to Question 1.8 is “Collegial” select who chooses the council member that will serve as chair, providing reference to legislation if possible. This does not refer to who ultimately approves the pick, simply who puts the name forward as the choice.</p>
2.8	Clearly defined term lengths for leadership (Yes/No)	Select	Select “Yes” if leaders are prescribed a fixed term (in years) in the institution’s legislation or governing documents.
2.9	Leadership term length (years)	Enter # of years	If “Yes” to Question 2.8, enter the number of years of the term as prescribed in legislation or other governing documents. If initial term lengths were temporary or staggered (e.g. to ensure all council members do not reach the end of their term simultaneously), enter the term length that will be the typical term length going forward. If there are different term lengths depending on whether it is a leader’s first term or a reappointment, enter the length of the first term but describe the length of the subsequent terms in the discussion box.
2.10	Lower house political cycle length (years)	Enter # of years	The statutory or constitutional limit on periods between the jurisdiction’s elections, in number of years.
2.11	<p>If leadership term length is the same as the political cycle length, are they staggered?</p> <p>(a) Yes, staggered, (b) No, aligned to political cycle, (c) N/A</p>	Select	<p>If the answer to Question 2.9 and Question 2.10 are the same (for example, 4 years and 4 years), are the terms offset such that a government does not expect to have the same appointed head of the IFI for its entire term (for example, if they are offset, the government may serve under two years of the former appointment before serving for two years under a new appointment). Select (a) <i>Yes, staggered</i> if the equal lengths are offset, Select (b) <i>No, aligned to political cycle</i> if they coincide. Select (c) <i>N/A</i> if the term length and political cycle are different lengths.</p>
2.12	<p>Is there a term limit?</p> <p>(a) Yes, one—cannot be renewed, (b) Yes, two—can be renewed once, (c) Yes, three—can be renewed twice, (d) No, can be renewed indefinitely, (e) N/A</p>	Select	<p>Select the answer that corresponds to the maximum number of terms a leader can serve. Select (d) <i>No, can be renewed indefinitely</i> if there is no limit on the number of terms a leader can serve.</p> <p>Select (e) <i>N/A</i> if no clear term lengths are specified (that is, if the response to Question 2.8 is “No”).</p>
2.13	Clearly defined criteria for dismissal of leadership (Yes/No)	Select	Are the conditions under which the leadership (chair and council) may be dismissed clearly laid out in legislation or other governance documents? Conditions should go beyond the mechanism (for example, a motion approved by the budget committee) to listing specific instances of conviction of financial fraud, running for political office, etc.
2.14	<p>Leaders are full time, part time, or both</p> <p>(a) Full time (b) Part time (c) Both</p>	Select	Select (a) <i>Full time</i> if the leader of the organisation is a full-time position and commitment. Select (c) <i>Both</i> if there are both full time and part time members of the council and describe. For example, the chair may be full time while other council members are part time.
2.15	<p>Leaders are remunerated:</p> <p>(a) Yes, leader/chair, (b) Yes, leader/chair and all council members, (c) No</p>	Select	This refers to whether council members are remunerated in some way for their time (beyond travel reimbursement). Select “No” if the position is a voluntary position.
2.16	<p>Leaders have control over staff recruitment within budget limits</p> <p>(a) Yes, complete control (b) Yes, within other (non-budget) constraints (c) No (d) N/A</p>	Select	<p>Within the limits of their budget availability, the institution (council members or senior secretariat officials) has flexibility to hire its own staff. Select (a) <i>Yes, complete control</i> if leaders may hire within or outside of the existing public service without constraints on grade structure. Select (b) <i>Yes, within other (non-budget) constraints</i> if leaders are constrained by other requirements such as hiring existing public servants, for example from the staff of the parent organisation in which the IFI is placed, or whether they have a set grade structure (only a certain number of senior and junior analysts). Select (c) <i>No</i> if staff are assigned to the leader or council without input. Select (d) <i>N/A</i> if the IFI has no secretariat or support staff.</p>

2.17	Leaders have control over staff compensation within budget limits (is not bound by framework of public service or parent organisation) (a) Yes, (b) No, (c) Other (please describe) (d) N/A	Select	Select (a) <i>Yes</i> if the leadership (council members or senior secretariat) is not constrained by a broader public service compensation matrix in setting the ranks, salaries and benefits to attract staff, within the limits of their budget availability. Select (c) <i>Other</i> if the institution's compensation cannot be described above, and provide details in the discussion box. Select (d) <i>N/A</i> if the institution has no secretariat or support staff.
3.	Mandate		
3.1	Able to set its own work programme within bounds of its mandate (a) Yes, without approval (b) Yes, approval required (c) No	Select	Select (a) <i>Yes, without approval</i> if the institution has mandated functions but the leadership can use discretion in how to fulfil those requirements. While it may submit an annual work plan to the legislature or higher organisation, it does not require it to be approved. Select (b) <i>Yes, approval required</i> if the institution is able to set its own work plan but it must be approved by an external party (such as a higher level of the organisation—for example, the Auditor General—or speakers of parliament, the Ministry of Finance, etc.) and by convention no consequential changes are made or suggested in granting approval. Select (c) <i>No</i> if the institution is unable to set its own work plan or it is significantly influenced in the process of seeking approval.
3.2	Able to undertake and publish analysis at its own initiative (Yes/No)	Select	The institution is able to undertake and publish research without the approval of a supervising authority (parent organisation, legislature, or executive government), and self-initiated reports do not have to be approved in their final form by a supervising authority before they are published.
3.3	Produces the official macroeconomic forecast underlying the budget (Yes/No)	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution itself produces the assumptions that the government uses for budget planning.
3.4	Formally endorses the official macroeconomic forecast (Yes/No/NA)	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution has a formal responsibility for scrutinising the government's macroeconomic assumptions and providing an official endorsement (typically in an exchange of letters). This requirement should be either legislated or in a memorandum of understanding. Select "N/A" if the institution prepares the government's macro forecast.
3.5	Assesses the reasonableness of the official macroeconomic forecast and provides a public opinion, but there is no legislated requirement for the budget or financial update to receive a formal endorsement (or lack thereof) from the institution (Yes/No/NA)	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution provides an assessment of the reasonableness of the government's macroeconomic planning assumptions (required in the IFI's mandate or is self-initiated—please describe in comments) but the government's fiscal framework does not require an exchange of the institution's official endorsement of planning assumptions in publishing the budget or financial update. Select "N/A" if the institution prepares the government's macro forecast or formally endorses it.
3.6	Publishes ex post evaluations of the government's macroeconomic forecasting performance (Yes/No/NA)	Select	The institution publishes a forecast error analysis of past official macroeconomic forecasts. Must explicitly contain quantitative error statistics, not a general overview and discussion. Select "N/A" if the institution prepares the government's macro forecast.
3.7	Publishes an alternative macroeconomic forecast (Yes/No)	Select	The institution publishes an explicit alternative macroeconomic forecast of its own. Not just separate scenarios it has asked the government to run. Select "N/A" if the institution prepares the government's macro forecast.
3.8	Produces the official fiscal forecast (Yes/No)	Select	The institution itself forecasts the fiscal aggregates that the government uses for budget planning.
3.9	Formally endorses the official fiscal forecast (Yes/No/NA)	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution has a formal responsibility for scrutinising the government's fiscal forecast and providing an official endorsement (typically in an exchange of letters). This requirement should be either legislated or in a memorandum of understanding. Select "N/A" if the institution prepares the government's fiscal forecast.
3.10	Assesses the reasonableness of the official fiscal forecast and provides a public opinion, but there is no legislated requirement for the budget or financial update to receive a formal endorsement (or lack thereof) from the institution (Yes/No/NA)	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution provides an assessment of the reasonableness of the government's fiscal planning assumptions (required in the IFI's mandate or is self-initiated—please describe in comments) but the government does not require an exchange of the institution's official endorsement to proceed with its budget or financial update. Select "N/A" if the institution prepares the government's fiscal forecast or formally endorses it.
3.11	Publishes ex post evaluations of the government's fiscal forecasting performance (Yes/No/NA)	Select	The institution publishes a forecast error analysis of past official forecasts of budget aggregates. Must explicitly contain quantitative error statistics, not a general overview and discussion. Select "N/A" if the institution prepares the government's fiscal forecast.

3.12	Publishes an alternative fiscal forecast (Yes/No/NA)	Select	The institution publishes an explicit alternative fiscal forecast of its own. Not just separate scenarios it has asked the government to run. Select "N/A" if the institution prepares the government's fiscal forecast.
3.13	Approach to scrutinising the government's planning assumptions: (a) Expert scrutiny of assumptions, (b) Expert scrutiny and benchmarking against external forecasts, (c) Expert scrutiny and benchmarking against in-house forecasts, (d) Expert scrutiny and benchmarking against in-house and external forecasts, (e) N/A	Select	IFIs can scrutinise the official outlook in one of several ways: (a) using their expert judgment to scrutinise plans and determine if assumptions are reasonable, (b) using their professional judgment and comparing the government's plans to other forecasters like the IMF, OECD, and commercial banks (or an average of them) to determine if they are optimistic or pessimistic, or (c) using their professional judgment and preparing their own forecasts with in-house models and comparing their results with the government's. Only select (a) if the institution does no further benchmarking against external or in-house forecasts. Select (d) if the IFI does all of the above. Select (e) N/A if the institution provides the government's assumptions directly or if assessing the government's plans are not in the IFI's mandate. If the IFI has different approaches for scrutinising macro and fiscal forecasts, select the category that applies to the most extensive approach, for example (c) or (d), and describe the breakdown in the comments.
3.14	Publishes a report dedicated to fiscal risks (a) Yes, required under mandate, (b) Yes, self-initiated, (c) No	Select	Some institutions have begun producing or are required to produce a separate report assessing and reporting on the size and source of fiscal risks. It should be a dedicated piece of risk analysis that is comprehensive in its assessment (that is, it does not just identify one or two key risks). Certain sections of a larger work may qualify, but it should be a quantitative and comprehensive assessment going beyond a qualitative discussing of risks to the outlook.
3.15	Official role in monitoring compliance with fiscal rules (a) Yes, ex ante, (b) Yes, ex post, (c) Yes, both, (d) No, (e) N/A	Select	The institution has an official role in providing an opinion on the <i>expected</i> compliance with fiscal rules of the government's plans (<i>ex ante</i>), the <i>actual</i> outturn compliance with fiscal rules (<i>ex post</i>), or both. Fiscal rules can be either national or within an international framework (e.g. the EU fiscal surveillance framework as implemented domestically or otherwise). Select "N/A" if the jurisdiction has no fiscal rules to assess.
3.16	Fulfils requests from individual legislators on economic and fiscal issues (Yes/No)	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution is compelled by legislation to fulfil formal requests by individual legislators or does so of its own initiative regularly. Not merely contacted by legislators to suggest areas of interest.
3.17	Fulfils requests from committees on economic and fiscal issues (Yes/No)	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution is compelled by legislation to fulfil requests by committees of the legislature or does so of its own initiative regularly.
3.18	Fulfils requests from political parties directly (a) Yes, during an election, (b) Yes, outside an election, (c) Yes, both, (d) No	Select	The institution provides analysis or cost estimates to political parties, either outside an election period, during an election period, or both. Select the option that applies.
3.19	Requests for analysis (the paperwork submitted to the IFI) may remain confidential (a) Yes, (b) Yes, under certain conditions (please describe), (c) No, (d) N/A	Select	This refers to the request for analysis itself, not the institution's research in response. Is it possible for a legislator, committee, or political party to submit a request without it being made public (including the request and name of the requestor)? Select (a) Yes to indicate that confidentiality of the request is maintained throughout. Select (b) Yes, <i>under certain conditions</i> if, for example, the agreement allows requests to remain confidential if the requestor withdraws the request before completion of the work. Select (c) No if the request is eventually published, even after a delay. Select (d) N/A if the institution does not accept requests.
3.20	Responses to requests (analysis fulfilled by the IFI) may remain confidential (Yes/No/NA)	Select	Select "Yes" if the response the institution provides to a request can be confidential, or "No" if the institution always publishes the response. Select "N/A" if the institution does not accept requests.
3.21	There is a system for prioritising requests (a) Yes, required under legislation or standing order, (b) Yes, self-initiated, (c) No, (d) N/A	Select	If the institution receives multiple requests at the same time, does it have a legislated requirement (or equivalent such as a committee standing order) to fulfill certain requests ahead of others? If not, has it developed its own system for prioritising requests? Describe here if no published link.

3.22	Directly supports the legislature with analysis of the executive's budget bill (a) Yes, overall fiscal position and highlights, (b) Yes, detailed line-item review of appropriation legislation, (c) Yes, both fiscal position and legislation review, (d) No	Select	The institution examines the annual budget bill and provides analysis of the bill to legislators or committees directly (by submitting a report or appearing at committees to respond to questions). The budget bill refers to the voted appropriations mechanism rather than a strategic planning document like a medium-term outlook. Answer (a) if analysts only examine high-level fiscal aggregates. Select (b) if analysts examine and report on detailed spending and revenue estimates at the ministry level or programme level. Select (c) if analysts do all of the above.
3.23	Analysis of long-term fiscal sustainability beyond the medium-term framework (a) Yes, required under mandate, (b) Yes, self-initiated, (c) No, (d) (N/A)	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution publishes a standalone report (or a section of another report) that projects the public finances and borrowing/debt beyond the 5-year medium term framework to capture the future impact of demographics and the long-run trajectory of current policy.
3.24	Official role in costing government policies outside of elections (Yes/No)	Select	The institution has the official task of costing government policies for use in budget planning. Select "No" if the institution costs government policies but is not required to by the official fiscal framework.
3.25	Official role in costing legislative proposals outside of elections (Yes/No)	Select	The institution has the official task (for example it is prescribed by its mandate) of costing proposals initiated by the legislature, or proposed by individual members (private members bills, shadow budget proposals, etc.).
3.26	Independently costs policies as part of broader fiscal or macroeconomic analysis (Yes/No)	Select	The institution does not have an official role in costing policies but does some work to independently cost policies for its own economic and fiscal analysis, rather than taking all policy estimates verbatim from government.
3.27	Costs election platform proposals (Yes/No)	Select	The institution costs party election platforms during election periods (can be either opposition, incumbency, etc., or all of the above).
3.28	Costing methodology:		Select the methodological considerations in the institution's cost estimates, if applicable, as well as considerations that are published beyond the immediate financial implications, such as distributional, gender, and environmental considerations. Dynamic scoring takes the initial policy cost estimate and iterates it back into the government sector of the macroeconomic model to work out the additional revenue or costs of the programme generated by the new macroeconomic outlook, adding the fiscal impact back into the cost estimate and repeating until the additional revenues or costs converge to a steady state. Distributional analysis includes assessment of the resulting change in incomes of the affected population. Gender analysis includes a breakdown of the policy's consequences by gender. Environmental impact analysis assesses changes in emissions, carbon budgets, or other contamination and pollution liabilities and their knock-on fiscal impact. For the baseline used for costing, select (a) <i>Official government baseline</i> if the IFI uses the government's budget forecasts as the benchmark scenario and growth factors. Select (b) <i>IFI's independent baseline</i> if the IFI uses its own forecasts produced with in-house models as the starting point and growth factors. If the IFI uses forecasts and growth factors from outside organisations (IMF, OECD, and private-sector forecasters) select (c) <i>Another baseline</i> and describe. If the institution produces the official government baseline, select (a) <i>Official government baseline</i> .
3.28.1	Behavioural impact considered	Select	
3.28.2	Dynamic scoring (macroeconomic feedback)	Select	
3.28.3	Distributional analysis	Select	
3.28.4	Gender analysis	Select	
3.28.5	Environmental impact analysis	Select	
3.28.6	Baseline used for costing (a) Official government baseline, (b) IFI's independent baseline, (c) Another baseline, (d) N/A	Select	
3.29	Provides normative policy recommendations: (a) Yes, "should" recommendations for broad fiscal stance, Yes, "should" recommendations for individual tax and spend programmes, (b) Yes, both on broad fiscal stance and on individual programmes, (c) No	Select	The IFI provides "should" recommendations to the government. Select (a) if the institution restricts its normative advice to the appropriateness of the overall fiscal stance and whether the government should take action to improve fiscal sustainability or to comply with fiscal rules. Select (b) if the institutions suggests or discourages individual policies to achieve objectives, for example cutting or increasing corporate tax rates.

3.30	Number of recurring analytical reports required by legislation, memorandum or standing order (per year)	Enter # of reports	The number of regular analytical publications explicitly mentioned in legislation (or instructions that carry similar weight such as a committee standing order) that the institution must publish. Does not include governance reports on the institution's annual activities and expenses. If required to publish a report every few years, such as a report before or after elections, the number should be divided by the reporting cycle in years—for example, one election report every five years would be 0.2 if the statutory or constitutional limit on political terms is five years.
3.31	Number of corporate governance reports required by legislation, memorandum or standing order (per year)	Enter # of reports	The number of corporate governance reports (for example, annual reports on activities and financial statements) that the institution must publish under its legislation (or instructions that carry similar weight such as a committee standing order). As above, periodic (but not annual) reports should be recorded as a fraction—for example, a non-rolling three-year work plan would be 0.33.
4.	Resources		
4.1	Budget (total available appropriation if voted, or total expenses, depending on answers to Questions 4.8 to 4.12), in national currency	Enter value	In the local currency, please provide the annual total appropriation available to the institution, even if not entirely taken up, for the financial year corresponding most closely to calendar year 2020. Exclude special top-ups (for example, in election years for costing platforms). If the annual budget is not voted, record the expenses expected to be submitted or budgeted for the year, as appropriate to the institution's financing arrangement (provide details).
4.2	Currency of above	Enter 3-letter currency code	Currency code for local currency above.
4.3	Financial year of above	Enter year	Please list the fiscal year to which the above applies. For example, 2020 or 2020-21 (if March year end).
4.4	Number of secretariat staff	Enter # of staff	Total secretariat staff engaged in supporting the heads of institutions named in legislation.
4.4.1	of which are analytical (FTE)	Enter breakdown of staff (#)	Analytical staff refers to those who are actively engaged in the analysis in the institution's reports. In full-time equivalent (for example, two part-time 50% staff may be counted as one FTE). Fractions permitted. If head of secretariat plays a significant role in analysis, their time can be allocated between corporate and analysis accordingly.
4.4.2	of which are corporate (FTE)	Enter breakdown of staff (#)	Corporate staff refer to executive, administrative and legal staff that are not actively involved in analysis. If senior executives provide only light-touch quality control, they should be listed as corporate. If they draft sections of reports, they should be listed as analytical. Or half (0.5 FTE) as analytical and half (0.5 FTE) as corporate, as the case may be.
4.5	Chair or head of institution	Enter # of leaders	List separately the chair and council members. Consider them full time even if part-time for this question.
4.6	Other council/board members, excluding chair	Enter # of other council members	
4.7	Total (Sum of Question 5.4, Question 5.5, and Question 5.6)	Enter # of staff and leaders	Total should include council/leader plus secretariat staff.
4.8	The IFI is a distinct financial entity in appropriations bills (Yes/No)	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution is a distinct financial entity in the appropriations votes or public accounts or "No" if it receives its funding from an envelope appropriated to another parent organisation that is not parliament. If the parent organisation is parliament, select "Yes" if the office's budget is a distinct category in the plan parliament approves for itself, and if financial statements are presented distinctly in parliament's financial reports. Select "No" if, for example, the office is funded under the broader parliamentary research service.
4.9	The IFI submits its budget to the central budget authority and it is included in the executive government's budget proposal outside of typical negotiation/amendment procedures (Yes/No/NA)	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution is required to submit its budget to the expenditure control authority (finance ministry, treasury board, etc.) but by legislated protections, memorandums or conventions the central budget authority does not push back as they would a line department.
4.10	The IFI is subject to the same budget negotiation/amendment procedures as other government ministries and agencies (Yes/No)	Select	Select "Yes" if there is no special treatment afforded the institution. For example, they must submit their budget to the central budget authority and be prepared to defend their allocation or be constrained by cross-body spending cuts like any other line department.
4.11	The IFI submits its budget directly to the legislature for voted approval (Yes/No/NA)	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution submits its budget directly to the legislature for voted approval. If the funding is instead allocated from a wider parliamentary support budget and the IFI isn't treated as a distinct financial entity in the legislature's appropriations process, choose 4.12 "Other financing arrangements".

4.12	Other financing arrangements (Yes/No)	Select	Select "Yes" if the funding arrangement is not covered by the above and please provide details.
4.13	Has multi-annual funding commitments (a) Yes, secure, (b) Yes, but not guaranteed, (c) No	Select	Select "Yes, secure" if there is certainty in the institution's funding beyond the current year. This may include statutory funding arrangements, where the institution's budget is set concretely in legislation or other governing documents. Select "Yes, but not guaranteed" if there are less stringent medium-term budget commitments that are set in plans but not typically revised. Select "No" if each year the institution must justify its annual budget and if it may be subject to cutbacks, either targeted or as part of cross-government austerity efforts.
5.	Relationship with legislature		
5.1	Key analytical reports officially submitted to the legislative record (Yes/No)	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution's main economic and fiscal research reports are submitted officially to the legislative record. This does not include corporate governance reports (such as the annual report).
5.2	Key governance reports officially submitted to the legislative record (Yes/No)	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution's governance disclosure reports (annual reports, financial statements, expense reports, etc.) are submitted officially in the legislative record.
5.3	Leaders or staff participate in legislative hearings to discuss the institution's economic and fiscal research (Yes/No)	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution appears before committee hearings to provide evidence from their research. This may be at the same committee hearing for discussing the institution's governance reports.
5.4	Leaders or staff participate in legislative hearings to discuss the institution's governance (Yes/No)	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution appears before committee hearings for oversight of the institution, such as to discuss its annual governance report and operations. Some institutions only appear before committee for this reason. Others may appear before committee to discuss the institution's governance but also discuss economic and fiscal research at the same hearing (Select "Yes" to both 5.3 and 5.4 in the latter case).
5.5	Hearings are open, closed door, or both (a) Open, (b) Closed door, (c) Both (d) N/A	Select	If the institution participates in hearings (Questions 5.3 and 5.4) are the hearings open to the view of the public or with published transcripts, or are they always or sometimes in camera (confidential)? Select "Both" if the institution participates in both open and in camera hearings. Select "N/A" if answers to 5.3 and 5.4 are "No".
5.6	Private briefings are provided to legislators and their offices (Yes/No)	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution will meet legislators or their staff for private briefings on the result of analytical reports or for other educational purposes on economic and fiscal topics. This may also be hosted on the premises of the institution. Open invitations for briefings that are provided to all legislators but for which only one or two legislators or staff show up would not be considered a private briefing.
5.7	The legislature plays a role in the appointment or dismissal process for leadership (Yes/No)	Select	Select "Yes" if the legislature has a role in appointing or dismissing leaders that is prescribed in legislation. For example, if the motion to appoint or dismiss a head of institution must pass a majority in the plenary or budget committee.
6.	Access to information		
6.1	Legislated access (a) Yes, with specific procedures (e.g. requests in writing to department head, etc.), (b) Yes, broad powers, (c) No	Select	Select (a) <i>Yes, with specific procedure (e.g. requests in writing to department head, etc.)</i> if the institution's right to information is explicitly defined in legislation through a clearly defined channel (the type of information to which the office is entitled, from which departments, the responsible counterparty, how the request should be submitted, etc.). Select (b) <i>Yes, broad powers</i> if no specifics are defined other than broad rights to information such as "entitled to information to carry out their mandate." Select (c) <i>No</i> if legislation does not refer to access to information. If the institution is intended to use the same freedom of information facilities available to the public, select "No".
6.2	Memoranda of understanding or other non-legislated agreement to exchange information (Yes/No)	Select	Select "Yes" if non-statutory agreements have been signed between the institution and government departments and agencies to provide exchanges of information on an ongoing basis.
6.3	Legislated enforcement or grievance mechanism if requests for information are not fulfilled (a) Yes, legislated, (b) Yes, other, (c) No	Select	Select (a) <i>Yes, legislated</i> if a process is outlined in legislation to resolve access to information disputes if a government department refuses to supply it. For example, by filing a grievance with the speaker of parliament who can take it further using the powers available to members to compel information from government, if appropriate. Select (b) <i>Yes, other</i> if, for example, there is no legislation but a grievance mechanism is outlined in a memorandum. If the institution is intended to use the same freedom of information facilities available to the public, select (c) <i>No</i> .

7.	Transparency		
7.1	Public availability of research reports (excluding responses to requests): (a) All published online, (b) All confidential under mandate, (c) Some confidential	Select	Select appropriate response for whether all publications are published on the institution's website for the public, or whether some or all publications are submitted to stakeholders confidentially. This should exclude requests from legislators or committees, which is tracked elsewhere.
7.2	Proactive methodology transparency:		Select all that apply for the institution's proactive disclosure of the methodology underlying reports.
7.2.1	(a) Model code published	Select	Select "Yes" for (c) <i>Data inputs published</i> if the institution publishes a copy of the specific vintage of dataset underlying a forecast or other analysis, not just the source. Select "Yes" for (h) <i>Fiscal rule calculations published</i> if corresponding spreadsheet or model code is published. Select "Yes" for (e) <i>Equations published</i> if the institution publishes stylised algebraic representations for its models. Select "Yes" for (f) <i>Equations and estimated coefficients published</i> if the institutions publishes stylised algebraic representations along with actual coefficients or estimation tables for exact replication of the analysis. "Yes" responses do not need to be for every product the institution produces, but should be a frequent practice.
7.2.2	(b) Data sources cited	Select	
7.2.3	(c) Data inputs published	Select	
7.2.4	(d) Data outputs published	Select	
7.2.5	(e) Equations published	Select	
7.2.6	(f) Equations and estimated coefficients published	Select	
7.2.7	(g) Broad overview, key assumptions published	Select	
7.2.8	(h) Fiscal rule calculations published	Select	
7.2.9	(i) Forecast performance of own in-house models published	Select	
7.3	All methodology information (model code, etc.) available by request	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution will provide all under methodology if requested by an interested external researcher, for example by email.
7.4	Operational and governance reports:		Select all that apply for the institution's proactive disclosure of operational and governance reports. Provide a link to an example, if possible.
7.4.1	(a) Work plan published	Select	Plans for the upcoming year or for a medium-term horizon.
7.4.2	(b) Annual report published	Select	A narrative report and/or financial statements for the previous financial year that describe the institution's activities, tying together disclosures of expenses and linking them to outputs and performance.
7.4.3	(c) Access to information requests published	Select	The text of letters or forms when an institution requests information from a department, either under the IFI's statutory access to information powers or otherwise.
7.4.4	(d) Access to information statistics published	Select	Typically on an annual basis, figures that describe how many times the IFI requested information from government departments and how many times the government complied with the request, partially complied, or refused the request (often with the average response time, in days).
7.4.5	(e) Travel expenses and other miscellaneous or reimbursable expenses published	Select	Proactive disclosure on expenses related to the travel of Council members to attend annual meetings, spending on external consulting contracts, expenses related to training or annual economics conferences, etc.
7.4.6	(f) Correspondence between IFI and executive or legislature published	Select	Letters or other formal exchanges between the IFI and its stakeholders are disclosed publicly.
8.	Communications		
8.1	Has a communications policy (how IFI and staff will engage with media requests, interact on social media, etc.) (a) Yes, published, (b) Yes, internal, (c) No	Select	Whether the institution has a formal and agreed-upon document describing how leadership and staff will respond to media requests, interact professionally and/or privately on social media, correct disinformation, etc. Select (a) <i>Yes, published</i> if the policy is publicly available, or (b) <i>Yes, internal</i> if it is distributed and discussed within the IFI but is not made public. "Yes..." response should indicate that the IFI itself has ownership of the policy—that is, it is not bound to the policy of a parent organisation.
8.2	Has a communications strategy (how IFI will increase impact and reach) (a) Yes, published, (b) Yes, internal, (c) No	Select	Whether the institution has a formal and agreed-upon strategy to get its message to relevant stakeholders and increase engagement with its research products. Select (a) <i>Yes, published</i> if the strategy is publicly available, or (b) <i>Yes, internal</i> if it is distributed and discussed within the IFI but is not made public. A "Yes" response should indicate that the IFI itself has ownership of the strategy—that is, it is not bound to the policy of a parent organisation.
8.3	Has a dedicated communications staff or agency (Yes/No)	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution has a full-time staff member devoted to communications, where full time is a large majority of their time and reflected in their job title. This may include shared services provided by a parent organisation or consultant, provided they will act at the direction of the IFI and are not subject to the communications policy of a higher organisation.

8.4	<p>Has a website</p> <p>(a) Standalone, off official network,</p> <p>(b) Standalone, on official network,</p> <p>(c) Not standalone, section of another institution's website,</p> <p>(d) No website</p>	Select	<p>This question tries to understand not just whether the IFI has a website, but also whether a supervising authority could ultimately block or unilaterally remove a controversial report from publication on the internet.</p> <p>(a) Is the institution's website hosted independently from the wider government/legislature web environment?</p> <p>(b) Is the institution's website independently operated and updated but must be part of the wider government/legislature environment (that is, there are common standards and even a shared web service)?</p> <p>(c) The institution does not have its own website, but has a page with its info and publications on the site of its parent organisation</p> <p>(d) The institution has no web presence</p>
8.5	Publications accompanied by press release (Yes/No)	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution's main reports are accompanied by a formal press release distributed and addressed as such (that is, not simply a summary blog post) and offers quotes and other information specifically to assist media coverage.
8.6	Holds press conferences for key reports (Yes/No)	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution invites media to a session for major report releases to ask questions and clarify interpretation.
8.7	<p>Holds early access briefings or releases reports under embargo before they are officially published</p> <p>(a) Yes, lockups,</p> <p>(b) Yes, embargo,</p> <p>(c) Yes, both,</p> <p>(d) No</p>	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution hosts sessions that give parliamentary staff, media, and other stakeholders an advanced copy of the report before it is released (such as "lockups") or if it is distributed in advance under embargo.
8.8	Has a blog or newsletter (Yes/No)	Select	The institution has a forum on its website to respond to current developments that may not require a formal report, where time does not permit a formal report, or to provide informal general interest content. Posts should be authored (have a council member or analyst's name attached), rather than be in the name of the institution. This may include the blog of a parent organisation if staff of the organisation post to it regularly. Newsletters should contain narratives not found elsewhere (that is, not simply summaries and links to reports that have been released).
8.9	<p>Distributes research with social media (Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter)</p> <p>(a) Yes, under its own account,</p> <p>(b) Yes, under the account of its parent organisation,</p> <p>(c) No</p>	Select	The institution maintains a social media presence and regularly publishes content and links to reports. If yes, select whether it is in the institution's own name or the social media account of a parent organisation.
8.10	Leadership appears on TV	Select	The leader, chair or council members make television appearances to discuss the institution's work.
8.11	Leadership appears on radio	Select	The leader, chair or council members make radio appearances to discuss the institution's work.
8.12	Leadership or staff present at conferences	Select	Leaders or the secretariat regularly participate in conferences to discuss the institution's work (that is, not in their own research capacity as academics).
8.13	Staff publish in academic journals	Select	The institution allows staff of the secretariat to publish research in academic journals while employed with the institution and they have done so. Research does not have to be associated with institution's work plan.
8.14	Tracks IFI website activity	Select	The institution monitors engagement with its website such as traffic and downloads.
8.15	Tracks IFI media mentions	Select	The institution monitors how many times and in what context it is mentioned in the media.
8.16	Tracks IFI parliamentary mentions	Select	The institution monitors how many times and in what context it is mentioned in the plenary or committees of parliament.
8.17	Has conducted a survey on stakeholder perceptions	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution has conducted (or outsourced) a survey of its stakeholders to determine how they perceive the institution's work and how they can improve engagement.

9.	External evaluation		
9.1	Has an external advisory panel (Yes/No)	Select	Select "Yes" if the institution has created (or there is legislated) a group of experts to provide technical or strategic advice. This does not include the official council itself.
9.2	Solicits external peer review of individual research products before release (a) Always, (b) Often, (c) Sometimes (case by case), (d) No	Select	Select (a) <i>Always</i> if there is a formal step in the institution's workflow that requires all reports to be scrutinised by an external peer (outside of the council). Select (b) <i>Often</i> if it is standard practice to seek peer review for the majority of reports (greater than 50%), but there is no guidance to do so each time. Select (c) <i>Sometimes</i> if external peers are consulted on a case-by-case basis, less than 50% of the time. Select (d) <i>No</i> if external peer review is never or seldom used.
9.3	Has undergone or has firm plans to undergo an external institutional performance evaluation (a) Yes, periodic review required under legislation, (b) Yes, review required under legislation but not periodic, (c) Yes, review self-initiated but not required under legislation, (d) No external review required or self-initiated yet	Select	Select (a) <i>Yes, periodic review required by legislation</i> if there is a formal mechanism in legislation that requires regular external evaluations of the institution's performance. This does not include appearances before the legislature. Select (b) <i>Yes, review required under legislation but not periodic</i> if the institution is required to have a review, but not at regular intervals (for example, three years after it begins but not thereafter). Select (c) <i>Yes, review self-initiated but not required under legislation</i> if the IFI is not required to have external performance evaluations, but has chosen to do so either in the past, or is in the middle of doing so (work may not have started, but an external reviewer has agreed in principle). Select (d) <i>No external evaluation required or self-initiated yet</i> if the institution is not required to have external performance reviews and has not yet sought an external performance evaluation by their own initiative.