Malaysia’s score of 46 out of 100 is a little higher than the global average score of 45.

Change in Transparency Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Average</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Usefulness of Budget Information Throughout the Budget Cycle

- Budget Formulation
  - Pre-Budget Statement: Not produced
  - Executive’s Budget Proposal: Limited

- Budget Approval
  - Enacted Budget: Extensive
  - Citizens Budget: Not produced
  - Mid-Year Review: Not Produced
  - In-Year Reports: Limited

- Budget Oversight
  - Audit Report: Extensive
  - Year-End Report: Limited

- Budget Execution

By Audit
- Budget oversight by the supreme audit institution in Malaysia is adequate.

By Legislature
- Budget oversight by the legislature in Malaysia is weak.

Transparency (Open Budget Index)

- The Government of Malaysia provides the public with limited budget information.

- The Government of Malaysia is weak in providing the public with opportunities to engage in the budget process.

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.

Note: The following categories are used to report the usefulness of each document:
- Not produced
- Published Late
- Internal Use
- Scant
- Minimal
- Limited
- Substantial
- Extensive
However, the Government of Malaysia has failed to make progress in the following ways:

- Not producing a Pre-Budget Statement, a Citizens Budget, and a Mid-Year Review.

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.

Malaysia’s score of 12 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 weak oversight during the planning stage of the budget cycle and no oversight during the implementation stage of the budget cycle. The legislature does not have a specialized budget research office, 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 the virement of funds in the Enacted Budget, spending any unanticipated revenue, and 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 significant 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
Malaysia should prioritize the following actions to improve budget transparency:
- Produce and publish a Pre-Budget Statement, a Citizens Budget, and a Mid-Year Review.
- Increase the comprehensiveness of the Executive’s Budget Proposal by, for example, presenting more information on issues beyond the core budget, such as extra-budgetary funds, contingent liabilities, and future liabilities.
- Increase the comprehensiveness of the Year-End Report.

Improving Participation
Malaysia 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.
- 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
Malaysia should prioritize the following actions to strengthen budget oversight:
- Establish a specialized budget research office for the legislature.
- 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 virement of funds in the Enacted Budget, 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.

Despite repeated efforts, IBP was unable to get comments on the draft Open Budget Questionnaire results from the Government of Malaysia.

Research to complete this country’s Open Budget Survey was undertaken by:
Sri Murniati  
Institute for Democracy and Economic Affairs  
F4 Taman Tunku Bukit Tunku 50480  
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia  
unie@ideas.org.my

Further Information
Visit [www.openbudgetsurvey.org](http://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.