Nepal’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 somewhat 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 Nepal 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 difficult to track spending, revenue collection and borrowing during the year. Nepal publishes its in-year reports, but these lack some important details and are not published in a timely manner. The mid-year review is detailed, but it is difficult to compare it with previous mid-year reviews since they are not archived on the relevant ministry’s website. Expanding access to these reports in a timely manner could greatly strengthen public accountability by providing more complete updates on how the budget is being implemented during the year.

It is also difficult to assess budget performance in Nepal once the budget year is over. A year-end report is produced, but it is incomplete, preventing comparisons between what was budgeted and what was actually spent and collected. Also, while Nepal makes its audit report public, the government does not provide any information 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 Nepal has codified the right to access government information into law, through the Right to Information Act 2007.

Public Participation and Institutions of Accountability

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

Opportunities for citizen participation in budget debates could be introduced. For example, the legislature does not hold hearings on the budget in which the public can participate.

The independence of Nepal’s Supreme Audit Institution is somewhat limited. While the SAI has discretion to decide which audits to undertake, it does not have a budget sufficient to fulfill its mandate.
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.

Research to complete the Open Budget Questionnaire was undertaken by:

Satyendra Timilsina and Pramod C. Poudel
The Strategic Group
Kha 10/28, Kopundole, Lalitpur. Nepal
Tel:
Satyendra: +98 510 05 735
Pramod: +98 510 50 493
E-mail: strategic@wlink.com.np

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
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