## Transparency (Open Budget Index)

The Government of Afghanistan provides the public with **limited** budget information. Afghanistan’s score of 42 out of 100 is a little lower than the global average score of 45.

### Regional Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Transparency Score (Out of 100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Average</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

### Usefulness of Budget Information Throughout the Budget Cycle

- **Budget Formulation**
  - Pre-Budget Statement
  - Executive’s Budget Proposal
- **Budget Oversight**
  - Audit Report
  - Year-End Report
- **Budget Approval**
  - Enacted Budget
  - Citizens Budget
- **Budget Execution**
  - Mid-Year Review
  - In-Year Reports

### Change in Transparency Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Scant or None</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>Substantial</th>
<th>Extensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Afghanistan’s score of 42 out of 100 is a little lower than the global average score of 45.
The Availability of Budget Documents Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Budget Statement</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive’s Budget Proposal</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enacted Budget</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Budget</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Year Reports</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Year Review</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-End Report</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Report</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ☐ Not produced/published late
- ☐ Produced for internal use
- ☐ Published

Since 2012, the Government of Afghanistan has increased the availability of budget information by:
- Publishing the Audit Report.

However, the Government of Afghanistan has decreased the availability of budget information by:
- Reducing the comprehensiveness of the Executive’s Budget Proposal.

Moreover, the Government of Afghanistan has failed to make progress in the following ways:
- Not producing a Mid-Year Review.

Afghanistan’s score of 42 on the 2015 Open Budget Index is substantially lower than its score in 2012.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

Afghanistan’s score of 27 out of 100 indicates that the provision of opportunities for the public to engage in the budget process is weak. This is slightly 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 *weak* oversight during the planning stage of the budget cycle and *adequate* oversight during the implementation stage of the budget cycle. The legislature does not have a specialized budget research office, and the Executive’s Budget Proposal is not approved by legislators at least one month before the start of the budget year. Moreover, in both law and practice, the legislature is not consulted prior to the virement of funds in the Enacted Budget or the spending of contingency funds that were not identified in the Enacted Budget.

**Oversight by the Supreme Audit Institution**

The supreme audit institution provides limited budget oversight. Under the law, it has full discretion to undertake audits as it sees fit and has a limited quality assurance system in place. However, the supreme audit institution is provided with insufficient resources to fulfill its mandate, and the head of the institution can be removed without legislative or judicial approval, which undermines its independence.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Improving Transparency**

Afghanistan 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 details on the classification of revenues for prior and future years, as well as presenting more details on debt and interest for the budget year.
- Increase the comprehensiveness of the Year-End Report by presenting more details on planned versus actual performance.

**Improving Participation**

Afghanistan 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 participate in audit investigations.

**Improving Oversight**

Afghanistan should prioritize the following actions to strengthen budget oversight:

- Establish a specialized budget research office for the legislature.
- In both law and practice, ensure the legislature is consulted prior to the virement of funds in the Enacted Budget and the spending of contingency funds that were not identified in the Enacted Budget.
- Require legislative or judicial approval to remove the head of the supreme audit institution.
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 Afghanistan provided comments on the draft Open Budget Questionnaire results.

Research to complete this country’s Open Budget Survey was undertaken by:
Samirullah Popalzai
Integrity Watch Afghanistan
House 61, Commandan Gada Street,
Kulula Pushta District 4
Kabul, Afghanistan
samirullah.popalzai@iwaweb.org

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.