Drawing on internationally accepted criteria developed by multilateral organizations, the Open Budget Survey uses 109 equally weighted indicators to measure budget transparency. These indicators assess whether the central government makes eight key budget documents available to the public online in a timely manner and whether these documents present budget information in a comprehensive and useful way.

Each country receives a composite score (out of 100) that determines its ranking on the Open Budget Index – the world’s only independent and comparative measure of budget transparency.

How has the OBI score for Fiji changed over time?

Fiji’s score of 41 out of 100 is near the global average score of 42.
Transparency alone is insufficient for improving governance. Public participation in budgeting is vital to realize 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.

The questions assessing participation in the Open Budget Survey 2017 were revised to align them with the Global Initiative for Fiscal Transparency’s new principles on public participation, which now serve as the basis for widely accepted norms on public participation in national budget processes. Therefore, data on the extent of public participation in budgeting in the Open Budget Survey 2017 cannot be compared directly to data from earlier editions.

How does public participation in Fiji compare to other countries in the region?

Fiji’s score of 15 out of 100 indicates that it provides few opportunities for the public to engage in the budget process. This is higher than the global average score of 12.

To what extent do different institutions in Fiji provide opportunities for public participation?

Fiji has decreased the availability of budget information by:
■ Failing to produce the Year-End Report and Pre-Budget Statement.

Moreover, Fiji has failed to make progress in the following ways:
■ Not making the Audit Report and Mid-Year Review available to the public.
■ Not making the In-Year Reports available to the public in a timely manner.
■ Not producing a Citizens Budget. (Subsequently, after the OBS 2017 research period, a Citizens Budget for Fiscal Year 2017-2018 was published online.)

Key Budget Documents

**Pre-Budget Statement**: discloses the broad parameters of fiscal policies in advance of the Executive’s Budget Proposal; outlines the government’s economic forecast, anticipated revenue, expenditures, and debt.

**Executive’s Budget Proposal**: submitted by the executive to the legislature for approval; details the sources of revenue, the allocations to ministries, proposed policy changes, and other information important for understanding the country’s fiscal situation.

**Enacted Budget**: the budget that has been approved by the legislature.

**Citizens Budget**: a simpler and less technical version of the government’s Executive’s Budget Proposal or Enacted Budget, designed to convey key information to the public.

**In-Year Reports**: include information on actual revenues collected, actual expenditures made, and debt incurred at different intervals; issued quarterly or monthly.

**Mid-Year Review**: contains a comprehensive update on the implementation of the budget as of the middle of the fiscal year; includes a review of economic assumptions and an updated forecast of budget outcomes.

**Year-End Report**: describes the situation of the government’s accounts at the end of the fiscal year and, ideally, an evaluation of the progress made toward achieving the budget’s policy goals.

**Audit Report**: issued by the supreme audit institution, this document examines the soundness and completeness of the government’s year-end accounts.
The Open Budget Survey examines the role that legislatures, supreme audit institutions, and independent fiscal institutions play in the budget process and the extent to which they are able to provide effective oversight of the budget. These institutions play a critical role — often enshrined in national constitutions or laws — in planning budgets and overseeing their implementation.

These indicators were revised to better assess the role of formal oversight institutions in ensuring integrity and accountability in the use of public resources. Therefore, data on the role and effectiveness of oversight institutions in the Open Budget Survey 2017 should not be compared directly to data from earlier editions.

**To what extent does the legislature in Fiji provide budget oversight?**

The legislature provides **weak** oversight during the budget cycle. This score reflects that the legislature provides weak oversight during the planning stage of the budget cycle and no oversight during the implementation stage of the budget cycle.

**Oversight by an Independent Fiscal Institution**

Fiji does not have an independent fiscal institution (IFI). While IFIs are not yet widespread globally, they are increasingly recognized as an important source of independent, nonpartisan information. IFIs take a variety of different institutional forms. Common examples include parliamentary budget offices and fiscal councils.


**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**How can Fiji improve transparency?**

Fiji should prioritize the following actions to improve budget transparency:

- Publish the Mid-Year Review, the Pre-Budget Statement, and the In-Year Reports online in a timely manner.
- Produce a Year-End Report.

The main barriers to effective legislative oversight are:

- A debate on budget policy by the legislature does not take place prior to the tabling of the Executive’s Budget Proposal.
- Legislative committees do not examine and publish reports on their analyses of the Executive’s Budget Proposal online.
- In practice, as the budget is implemented, the legislature is not consulted prior to the government shifting funds between administrative units in the Enacted Budget, spending unanticipated revenue, or reducing spending due to revenue shortfalls.

**To what extent does the supreme audit institution in Fiji provide budget oversight?**

The supreme audit institution provides **weak** budget oversight.

- Under the law, it has significant discretion to undertake audits as it sees fit.
- However, the head of the institution is not appointed by the legislature or judiciary and can be removed without legislative or judicial approval, which undermines its independence.
- Finally, the supreme audit institution is provided with insufficient resources to fulfill its mandate, and its audit processes are not reviewed by an independent agency.

For more detailed information on the survey findings for Fiji, please see the Open Budget Survey Data Explorer at [survey.internationalbudget.org](http://survey.internationalbudget.org).
How can Fiji improve participation?
Fiji should prioritize the following actions to improve public participation in its budget process:

- Pilot mechanisms for members of the public and executive branch officials to exchange views on national budget matters during the monitoring of the implementation of the national budget. These mechanisms could build on innovations, such as participatory budgeting and social audits. See [www.fiscaltransparency.net/mechanisms/](http://www.fiscaltransparency.net/mechanisms/) for examples of such mechanisms.
- Hold legislative hearings on the formulation of the annual budget, during which members of the public or civil society organizations can testify.
- Establish formal mechanisms for the public to assist the supreme audit institution in formulating its audit program and to participate in relevant audit investigations.

How can Fiji improve oversight?
Fiji should prioritize the following actions to make budget oversight more effective:

- Ensure legislative committees examine and publish reports on their analysis of the Executive's Budget Proposal online.
- In practice, ensure the legislature is consulted prior to shifting funds between administrative units away from what is specified in the Enacted Budget during the budget year, spending of any unanticipated revenue, or reducing spending due to revenue shortfalls.
- Require legislative or judicial approval to appoint and remove the head of the supreme audit institution.
- Consider setting up an independent fiscal institution.

The Open Budget Survey uses internationally accepted criteria developed by multilateral organizations from sources such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the International Organisation of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI) and the Global Initiative for Fiscal Transparency (GIFT).

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 August 2016 and January 2018 and involved about 300 experts in 115 countries. The Open Budget Survey 2017 assesses only events, activities, or developments that occurred up to 31 December 2016. The survey was revised somewhat from the 2015 version to reflect evolving methods for disseminating budget information and to strengthen individual questions on public participation and budget oversight. A discussion of these changes can be found in the Open Budget Survey Global Report (see link 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 parties.

Further Information
Visit [openbudgetsurvey.org](http://openbudgetsurvey.org) for more information, including:

- The Open Budget Survey 2017: Global report
- Data explorer
- Methodology report
- Full questionnaire