Turkey's score on the Open Budget Index shows that the government provides the public with some information on the central government’s budget and financial activities during the course of the budget year. This makes it difficult for citizens to hold government accountable for its management of the public’s money.

The Open Budget Index 2008 evaluates the quantity and type of information that governments make available to their publics in the seven key budget documents that should be issued during the budget year. One of the most important documents is the executive’s budget proposal. It should contain the executive’s plans for the upcoming year along with the cost of the proposed activities. The proposal should be available to the public and to the legislature prior to being finalized, at least three months before the start of the budget year to allow for sufficient review and public debate.

In Turkey, the proposal provides some information to the public, meaning citizens have a general, albeit incomplete, picture of the government’s plans for taxing and spending for the upcoming year. Moreover, it is somewhat difficult to track spending, revenue collection and borrowing during the year. Turkey publishes detailed in-year reports but does not release a mid-year review. Publishing this document could strengthen public accountability by providing a more comprehensive update on how the budget is being implemented during the year.

It is also difficult to assess budget performance in Turkey once the budget year is over. A year-end report is produced, allowing comparisons between what was budgeted and what was actually spent and collected, but it lacks an explanation of these differences. Also, Turkey’s audit report is limited in scope, and no information is provided on whether the audit report’s recommendations are successfully implemented.

Access to the highly detailed budget information needed to understand the government’s progress in undertaking a specific project or activity remains limited. This is despite the fact that Turkey has codified the right to access government information into law.

Public Participation and Institutions of Accountability

Beyond improving access to key budget documents, there are other ways in which Turkey’s budget process could be made more open.

Opportunities for citizen participation in budget debates could be increased. For example, the legislature does not hold hearings on the budget in which the public can participate. Citizens may attend the budget debate at the General Assembly but are not allowed to make statements.

The independence of Turkey’s Supreme Audit Institution is somewhat limited. The SAI has limited discretion to decide which audits to undertake and does not have a budget or staff sufficient to fulfill its mandate. This contributes to the fact that less than two-thirds of expenditure is audited.
The Open Budget Index evaluates the quantity and type of information available to the public in a country's budget documents. A country's placement within a performance category was determined by averaging the response to 91 questions on the Open Budget Questionnaire related to information contained in the eight key budget documents that all countries should make available to the public.
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The International Budget Project was established as part of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, a Washington, DC-based non-partisan non-profit research organization, in 1997 to support civil society organizations around the world interested in strengthening public budget processes, institutions and outcomes. For more information on the IBP and the Open Budget Initiative 2008, please visit www.openbudgetindex.org