Change in Transparency Over Time

Regional Comparison

Bangladesh’s score of 56 out of 100 is the highest in South Asia and is substantially higher than the global average score of 45.

Usefulness of Budget Information Throughout the Budget Cycle

TRANSPARENCY (OPEN BUDGET INDEX)

Drawing on internationally accepted criteria developed by multilateral organizations, the Open Budget Survey uses 109 indicators to measure budget transparency. These indicators are used to assess whether the central government makes eight key budget documents available to the public in a timely manner and whether the data contained in these documents are comprehensive and useful.

Each country is given a score out of 100 which determines its ranking on the Open Budget Index – the world’s only independent and comparative measure of budget transparency.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Government of Bangladesh is weak in providing the public with opportunities to engage in the budget process.
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Budget oversight by the legislature in Bangladesh is limited.
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By Audit

Budget oversight by the supreme audit institution in Bangladesh is adequate.
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Note: The following categories are used to report the usefulness of each document:
Not Produced, Published Late, Internal Use, Scant, Minimal, Limited, Substantial, or Extensive.
The Availability of Budget Documents Over Time

Bangladesh’s score of 56 on the 2015 Open Budget Index is largely the same as its score in 2012. Since the 2012 Survey, Bangladesh has published two new budget documents – the Citizens Budget and the Year-End Report. However, due to refinements made to the 2015 questionnaire, which include new and improved questions that aim to better measure transparency (see the Technical Note for details), Bangladesh’s 2015 Open Budget Index score is largely the same as its score in 2012.

Since 2012, while the Government of Bangladesh has increased the availability of budget information by publishing the Year-End Report and Citizens Budget; it has failed to make progress in the following ways:

■ Producing a Pre-Budget Statement but failing to make it publicly available.
■ Not producing an Audit Report.

Evidence suggests that transparency alone is insufficient for improving governance, and that public participation in budgeting can maximize the positive outcomes associated with greater budget transparency.

To measure public participation, the Open Budget Survey assesses the degree to which the government provides opportunities for the public to engage in budget processes. Such opportunities should be provided throughout the budget cycle by the executive, the legislature, and the supreme audit institution.

Regional Comparison

Bangladesh’s score of 23 out of 100 indicates that the provision of opportunities for the public to engage in the budget process is weak. This is lower than the global average score of 25.
The Open Budget Survey examines the extent to which legislatures and supreme audit institutions are able to provide effective oversight of the budget. These institutions play a critical role – often enshrined in national constitutions – in planning budgets and overseeing their implementation.

**Oversight by the Legislature**

The legislature provides **adequate** oversight during the planning stage of the budget cycle and **weak** oversight during the implementation stage of the budget cycle. The Executive’s Budget Proposal is not provided to legislators at least three months before the start of the budget year, and the executive does not receive prior approval by the legislature before implementing a supplemental budget. Moreover, in both law and practice, the legislature is not consulted prior to spending any unanticipated revenue or spending contingency funds that were not identified in the Enacted Budget.

**Oversight by the Supreme Audit Institution**

The supreme audit institution provides **adequate** budget oversight. Under the law, it has full discretion to undertake audits as it sees fit. Moreover, the head of the supreme audit institution cannot be removed without legislative or judicial approval, which bolsters its independence. Finally, the supreme audit institution is provided with sufficient resources to fulfill its mandate but has a weak quality assurance system in place.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Improving Transparency**
Bangladesh should prioritize the following actions to improve budget transparency:

- Publish a Pre-Budget Statement.
- Produce and publish an Audit Report in a timely manner.
- Increase the comprehensiveness of the Year-End Report.

**Improving Participation**
Bangladesh should prioritize the following actions to improve budget participation:

- Provide detailed feedback on how public perspectives have been captured and taken into account.
- Hold legislative hearings on the budgets of specific ministries, departments, and agencies at which testimony from the public is heard.
- Establish formal mechanisms for the public to assist the supreme audit institution to formulate its audit program and to participate in audit investigations.

**Improving Oversight**
Bangladesh should prioritize the following actions to strengthen budget oversight:

- Ensure the Executive’s Budget Proposal is provided to legislators at least three months before the start of the budget year.
- Ensure the executive receives prior approval by the legislature before implementing a supplemental budget.
- In both law and practice, ensure the legislature is consulted prior to the spending of any unanticipated revenue and the spending of contingency funds that were not identified in the Enacted Budget.
The Open Budget Survey uses internationally accepted criteria developed by multilateral organizations such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), and the International Organisation of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI). It is a fact-based research instrument that assesses what occurs in practice through readily observable phenomena. The entire research process took approximately 18 months between March 2014 and September 2015 and involved about 300 experts in 102 countries. The Survey was revised somewhat from the 2012 version to reflect emerging developments in accepted good practice and to strengthen individual questions. A full discussion of these changes can be found in a technical note on the comparability of the Open Budget Index over time (see below).

Survey responses are typically supported by citations and comments. This may include a reference to a public document, an official statement by the government, 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 an anonymous expert who also has no association to government. In addition, IBP invites national governments to comment on the draft results from the Survey and considers these comments before finalizing the Survey results.

The Government of Bangladesh provided comments on the draft Open Budget Questionnaire results.

Research to complete this country’s Open Budget Survey was undertaken by:
Dr. Mohammed Abu Eusuf
Director, Centre on Budget and Policy,
Professor & Chairman, Department of Development Studies, University of Dhaka
Arts Building (4th Floor), University of Dhaka
Dhaka-1000, Bangladesh
eusuf101@yahoo.com

Further Information
Visit www.openbudgetsurvey.org for more information, including:
- The Open Budget Survey 2015: Global Report
- Individual datasets for each of the 102 countries surveyed.
- A technical note on the comparability of the Open Budget Index over time.