Change in Transparency Over Time

Regional Comparison

Colombia’s score of 57 out of 100 is substantially higher than the global average score of 45.

Usefulness of Budget Information Throughout the Budget Cycle

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

Colombia’s score of 57 on the 2015 Open Budget Index is largely the same as its score in 2012.

Since 2012, the Government of Colombia has increased the availability of budget information by:
- Publishing the Citizens Budget.

However, the Government of Colombia has decreased the availability of budget information by:
- Reducing the comprehensiveness of the Year-End Report.

Moreover, the Government of Colombia has failed to make progress in the following ways:
- Not producing a Mid-Year Review.
- Publishing a Pre-Budget Statement and an Audit Report that only contain minimal budget information.

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

Colombia’s score of 46 out of 100 indicates that the public is provided with limited opportunities to engage in budget processes. This is higher 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 **adequate** oversight during the implementation stage of the budget cycle. However, regular consultations on budget matters between the executive and the legislature do not take place.

**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 limited quality assurance system in place.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Improving Transparency**

Colombia should prioritize the following actions to improve budget transparency:

- Produce and publish a Mid-Year Review.
- Increase the comprehensiveness of the Executive’s Budget Proposal by presenting more information on the classification of expenditures for future years and on the classification of revenues for future years.
- Increase the comprehensiveness of the Year-End Report by presenting more information on planned versus actual expenditures and on planned versus actual revenues.

**Improving Participation**

Colombia should prioritize the following actions to improve budget participation:

- Establish credible and effective mechanisms (i.e., public hearings, surveys, focus groups) for capturing a range of public perspectives on budget matters.
- Open the hearings on the audit reports to the public so they can testify.
- Publish reports on public budget hearings.

**Improving Oversight**

Colombia should prioritize the following actions to strengthen budget oversight:

- Establish regular consultations on budget matters between the executive and the legislature.
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 Colombia provided comments on the draft Open Budget Questionnaire results.

Research to complete this country’s Open Budget Survey was undertaken by:
Gory Suarez
Grupo de Investigación de Ciudadanía y Finanzas Publicas
Calle 46 no. 27-70, oficina 202, Barrio Belalcázar,
Bogotá
Colombia
gorysuarez@gmail.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.