The Government of Hungary provides the public with limited budget information.

Hungary is weak in providing the public with opportunities to engage in the budget process.

Budget oversight by the legislature in Hungary is limited.

Budget oversight by the supreme audit institution in Hungary is adequate.

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.

Hungary’s score of 49 out of 100 is a little higher than the global average score of 45.
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**

Hungary's score of 31 out of 100 indicates that the provision of opportunities for the public to engage in the budget process is weak. This is higher than the global average score of 25.

**Budget Oversight**

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 limited oversight during the planning stage of the budget cycle and limited oversight during the implementation stage of the budget cycle. A pre-budget debate by the legislature does not take place, and 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 weak quality assurance system in place.
**Improving Transparency**

Hungary 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 data on debt, including its composition and interest rates.
- Increase the comprehensiveness of the Year-End Report by presenting, for example, a detailed narrative discussion explaining differences between planned versus actual outcomes.
- Publish the tables and data in budget documents in a machine-readable format.

**Improving Participation**

Hungary 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 participate in audit investigations.

**Improving Oversight**

Hungary should prioritize the following actions to strengthen budget oversight:

- Ensure the legislature holds a pre-budget debate and the outcome is reflected in the Enacted Budget.
- Establish regular consultations on budget matters between the executive and the legislature.

---

**METHODOLOGY**

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 Hungary provided comments on the draft Open Budget Questionnaire results.

Research to complete this country’s Open Budget Survey was undertaken by:

Balázs Romhányi
Költségvetési Felelősségi Intézet Budapest
Csatárka út 42-50, Budapest, 1025, Hungary
balazs.romhanyi@kfib.hu

**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.