

OPEN BUDGET INDEX SCORE
— OUT OF 100 —

81-100 Extensive



61-80 Substantial

41-60 Some

21-40 Minimal

0-20 Scant or None


How does China compare to its neighbors in East Asia & the Pacific?




What are each of the eight key budget documents, and does the public have access to them?

Document	Description of Document	Publication Status
PBS	Pre-Budget Statement: Provides information that links government policies and budgets and typically sets forth the broad parameters that will define the budget proposal that is presented to the legislature.	Not Produced
EBP	Executive's Budget Proposal: Presents the government plans to raise revenues through taxes and other sources and spend these monies to support its priorities, thus transforming policy goals into action.	Produced for Internal Use
EB	Enacted Budget: The legal instrument authorizing the executive to raise revenues, make expenditures, and incur debt.	Produced for Internal Use
CB	Citizens Budget: A nontechnical presentation to enable broad public understanding of a government's plans for raising revenues and spending public funds in order to achieve policy goals.	Not Produced
IYR	In-Year Reports: Periodic (monthly or quarterly) measures of the trends in actual revenues, expenditures, and debt, which allow for comparisons with the budget figures and adjustments.	Published
MYR	Mid-Year Review: An overview of the budget's effects at the midpoint of a budget year and discusses any changes in economic assumptions that affect approved budget policies.	Not Produced
YER	Year-End Report: Information comparing the actual budget execution relative to the Enacted Budget.	Published
AR	Audit Report: Independent evaluation of the government's accounts by the country's supreme audit institution. It typically assesses whether the executive has raised revenues and spent monies in line with the authorized budget, and whether the government's accounts of its revenues and expenses are accurate and provide a reliable picture of the fiscal situation.	Published

From Zero to 100: Has China increased the amount of information it makes available in the eight key budget reports?



OBI scores over three Surveys



Open Budget Index

The **Open Budget Survey** assesses whether the central government in each country surveyed makes eight key budget documents available to the public, as well as whether the data contained in these documents is comprehensive, timely, and useful. The Survey uses internationally accepted criteria to assess each country's budget transparency developed by multilateral organizations, such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the Organization for Economic

Co-operation and Development (OECD), and the International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI).

The scores on 95 of the 125 Open Budget Survey questions are used to calculate objective scores and rankings of each surveyed country's relative transparency. These composite scores constitute the Open Budget Index (OBI), the world's only independent and comparative measure of budget transparency.

China's OBI 2012 score is 11 out of 100, which is well below the average score of 43 for all the 100 countries surveyed. It is also lower than the scores of most other countries in the region, including its neighbors New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, and South Korea. China's score indicates that the government provides the public with scant information on the national government's budget and financial activities during the course of the budget year. This makes it challenging for citizens to hold the government accountable for its management of the public's money.

China's OBI 2012 score of 11 has gone down from its score of 13 on the OBI 2010

The Open Budget Index is composed of subscores for each of the eight key budget documents assessed in the Survey. These subscores represent the average of the scores received on a set of questions in the Survey that measure the public availability of and amount of information in the documents. The subscores are comparable across all of the countries included in the Survey.

Recommendations

With a score of 11 out of 100 on the Open Budget Index 2012, the government of China has the potential to greatly expand budget transparency by introducing a number of measures, some of which can be achieved very quickly and at almost no cost to the government.

The International Budget Partnership recommends that China undertake the following steps to improve budget transparency:

- Publish the Executive's Budget Proposal and the Enacted Budget. These documents are currently produced for internal use only (detailed guidance on the contents of these documents can be found in this guidebook: <http://bit.ly/QGzHv8>). As per the Open Budget Survey 2012, 79 countries publish an Executive's Budget Proposal, including China's neighbors New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, and South Korea; 92 countries publish the Enacted Budget, including its

neighbors Fiji, New Zealand, and South Korea. Links to the budget documents published by these countries can be accessed from the IBP's website: <http://bit.ly/P8NPOV>.

- Produce and publish a Pre-Budget Statement, a Citizens Budget, and a Mid-Year Review. Detailed guidance on the contents of the Pre-Budget Statement and the Mid-Year Review can be found in this guidebook: <http://bit.ly/QGzHv8>. Detailed guidance on the contents of the Citizens Budget can be found in this guidebook: <http://bit.ly/QGzFmJ>. As per the Open Budget Survey 2012, 47 countries publish Pre-Budget Statement, including all its neighbors in the region; 26 countries publish a Citizens Budget, including its neighbors New Zealand and South Korea; and 29 countries publish a Mid-Year Review, including its neighbors New Zealand and Papua New Guinea. Links to the budget documents published by these countries can be accessed from the IBP's website: <http://bit.ly/P8NPOV>.
- Increase the comprehensiveness of In-Year Reports by comparing actual year-to-date expenditures with either the original estimate for that period or the same period in the previous year (see question 66 of the Open Budget Questionnaire).
- Increase the comprehensiveness of the Year-End Report by auditing outcomes, providing information on actual outcomes of extra-budgetary funds, and by increasing the level of detail in the explanation of the differences between enacted levels or actual outcomes and the following: original revenue estimates, original macroeconomic forecast, original nonfinancial and performance information, and funds intended to benefit the poor in the country (see questions 78 and 80-86 of the Open Budget Questionnaire).
- Improve the quality and comprehensiveness of the Audit Report by including an executive summary in it, by releasing to the public audits of extra-budgetary funds, by publishing reports listing actions taken by the executive to address audit recommendations, and by providing legislators with detailed audit reports related to the security sector and other secret programs (see questions 89, 91, and 95-96 of the Open Budget Questionnaire).

Strength of Legislatures and Supreme Audit Institutions in Budget Oversight

The Open Budget Survey examines the extent of effective oversight provided by legislatures and supreme audit institutions (SAIs). These institutions play a critical role — often enshrined in national constitutions — in planning and overseeing the implementation of national budgets.

The Open Budget Survey assesses whether legislatures provide effective budget oversight by measuring performance on 11 indicators, including: consultations with the executive prior to the tabling in the legislature of the draft budget, research capacity, formal debate on overall budget policy, time available to discuss and approve the budget, legal authority to amend the budget proposal, approval of shifts in expenditure budget and excess revenues collected, supplemental budget powers, authority to approve use of contingency funds, and scrutiny of audit reports.

The Open Budget Survey assesses whether supreme audit institutions are empowered to provide effective budget oversight by using the following four indicators: authority to remove the head of the supreme audit institution, legal power to audit public finances, financial resources available, and availability of skilled audit personnel.

Recommendations

The International Budget Partnership recommends that China undertake the following actions to improve budget oversight:

- The executive must consult broadly with members of the legislature as part of its process of determining budget priorities. The legislature should have a specialized budget research office to assist it with budget analysis, it should be provided with the Executive’s Budget Proposal at least three months prior to the start of the budget year, and it should have the authority in law to amend the Executive’s Budget Proposal. The executive should also be required to seek approval from the legislature prior to shifting funds between administrative units and between line items, prior to using excess revenues that may become available during budget execution, and prior to using contingency funds; the executive should be required to seek approval from the legislature on supplemental budgets before these funds are expended (see questions 59, 97-100, and 102-106 of the Open Budget Questionnaire).
- Empower the supreme audit institution by the following actions: the final consent of the legislature or judiciary to remove the head of the SAI should be required; the SAI should have full discretion to decide which audits it will undertake; and the SAI should have skilled staff designated to undertake audits of the central government agencies that handle security (see questions 90, 92, and 94 of the Open Budget Questionnaire).

China and Fiji have the weakest budget oversight and engagement in East Asia and the Pacific

Country	Legislative Strength	SAI Strength	Public Engagement
China	Weak	Weak	Weak
Fiji	Weak	Weak	Weak
New Zealand	Moderate	Strong	Moderate
Papua New Guinea	Moderate	Moderate	Weak
South Korea	Strong	Strong	Strong

Strong: average score above 66 of 100; **Moderate:** average score between 34 and 66; **Weak:** average score below 34

Opportunities for Public Participation

Research and advocacy experience of civil society over the past 15 years has demonstrated that transparency by itself is insufficient for improving governance. Transparency along with opportunities for public participation in budgeting can maximize the positive outcomes associated with open budgeting. Therefore, the Open Budget Survey assesses opportunities available to the public to participate in national budget decision-making processes. Such opportunities can be provided throughout the budget cycle by the executive, legislature, and supreme audit institution.

Based on these indicators, the Open Budget Survey 2012 finds that opportunities for public participation in the budget process in China are weak.

Recommendations

The International Budget Partnership recommends that China expand public engagement in budgeting after considering the Open Budget Survey indicators on which the country performs poorly (see table below and questions 114-122 and 125 in the Open Budget Questionnaire).

China has much room to improve public participation

Requirement	Finding
Process Followed Before Consultation	
Formal requirement for public participation (Q114)	Does not exist
Articulation of purposes for public participation (Q115)	Does not exist
Communication by the SAI of audit findings beyond publication of audit reports (Q124)	Exists and is strong
Process of Consultation	
Mechanisms developed by the executive for participation during budget planning (Q116)	Does not exist
Public hearings in the legislature on macroeconomic budget framework (Q119)	Does not exist
Public hearings in the legislature on individual agency budgets (Q120)	Does not exist
Opportunities in the legislature for testimonials by the public during budget hearings (Q121)	Does not exist
Mechanisms developed by the executive for participation during budget execution (Q117)	Does not exist
Mechanisms developed by the SAI for participation in audit agenda (Q123)	Exists but could be improved
Process Followed After Consultation	
Feedback by the executive on use of inputs provided by the public (Q118)	Does not exist
Release by the legislature of reports on budget hearings (Q122)	Does not exist
Feedback by the SAI on use of inputs provided by the public (Q125)	Does not exist

Description of Survey, Methodology, Reliability, and Researcher Contact Information

The Open Budget Survey is a fact-based research instrument that uses easily observable phenomena to assess what occurs in practice. The research conclusions are typically supported by citations and comments, including reference to a budget document, a law, or other public document; a public statement by a government official; or comments from a face-to-face interview with a government official or other knowledgeable party. The Survey is compiled from a questionnaire completed for each country by independent budget experts who are not associated with the national government. Each country's questionnaire is then independently reviewed by two anonymous experts who also have no association with government. In addition, the IBP invites national governments to comment on the draft results from the Survey and considers these comments before finalizing the Survey results. The entire research process for 2012 took over 18 months between July 2011 and December 2012 and involved approximately 400 experts.

The Open Budget Survey provides a reliable source of data on national budget transparency practices for governments, development practitioners, the media, and citizens. Current users of the Survey results include the Open Government Partnership, Collaborative Africa Budget Reform Initiative, INTOSAI, the World Bank in its Worldwide Governance Indicators, and a number of bilateral aid agencies and international and regional multilateral bodies. The publication of the Open Budget Survey 2012 has reinforced the Survey's preeminent position as a global data repository on budget transparency, participation, and accountability.

Research to complete China's Open Budget Survey was undertaken by the Open Budget Initiative, International Budget Partnership, of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 820 First Street NE, Suite 510, Washington DC, 20002, info@internationalbudget.org.