## Transparency (Open Budget Index)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score (Out of 100)</th>
<th>Regional Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Average</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Tomé e Príncipe</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ghana's score of 51 out of 100 is moderately higher than the global average score of 45.

## usefulness of Budget Information Throughout the Budget Cycle

- **Budget Formulation**
  - Pre-Budget Statement
  - Executive’s Budget Proposal
  - Limited

- **Budget Oversight**
  - Audit Report
  - Extensive

- **Budget Approval**
  - Enacted Budget
  - Limited

- **Budget Execution**
  - In-Year Reports
  - Substantial

Ghana’s score of 51 out of 100 is moderately higher than the global average score of 45.

## Change in Transparency Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Extensive</th>
<th>Substantial</th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>Scant or None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Availability of Budget Documents Over Time

Ghana’s score of 51 on the 2015 Open Budget Index is largely the same as its score in 2012. However, the Government of Ghana has been inconsistent in which documents are made publicly available in a given year.

Since 2012, the Government of Ghana has increased the availability of budget information by:
- Publishing the Citizens Budget and Year-End Report.
- Improving the comprehensiveness of the Enacted Budget.

However, the Government of Ghana has decreased the availability of budget information by:
- Failing to produce a Mid-Year Review.

Moreover, the Government of Ghana has failed to make progress in the following ways:
- Not producing a Pre-Budget Statement.

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.

Ghana’s score of 29 out of 100 indicates that the provision of opportunities for the public to engage in the budget process is weak. However, 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 **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. The Executive’s Budget Proposal is not provided to legislators at least three months before the start of the budget year. Finally, in both law and practice, the legislature is not consulted prior to the virement of funds in the Enacted Budget or spending any unanticipated revenue.

**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. However, the supreme audit institution is provided with insufficient resources to fulfill its mandate and has a weak quality assurance system in place.

**Recommendations**

**Improving Transparency**

Ghana should prioritize the following actions to improve budget transparency:

- Produce and publish the Pre-Budget Statement and the Enacted Budget in a timely manner.¹
- Increase the comprehensiveness of the Executive’s Budget Proposal by presenting more information on the classification of expenditures for future years and the classification of expenditures for prior years.
- Increase the comprehensiveness of the Year-End Report by presenting more information on planned versus actual macroeconomic forecasts and planned versus actual performance.

**Improving Participation**

Ghana should prioritize the following actions to improve budget participation:

- Provide detailed feedback on how public perspectives have been captured and taken into account.

**Improving Oversight**

Ghana should prioritize the following actions to strengthen budget oversight:

- 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.
- Ensure the supreme audit institution has adequate funding to perform its duties, as determined by an independent body (e.g., the legislature or judiciary).

¹ According to updated results from the Open Budget Survey Tracker (www.obstracker.org), Ghana failed to publish the 2015 Enacted Budget in a timely manner.
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 Ghana provided comments on the draft Open Budget Questionnaire results.

Research to complete this country’s Open Budget Survey was undertaken by:
Sandra Kwabea Sarkwah
Social Enterprise Development Foundation of West Africa (SEND)-Ghana
A28 Regimanuel Estates
Nungua Barrier
Sakumono, Accra
Ghana
info@sendwestafrica.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.