



Draft PRINCIPLES OF BUDGETARY GOVERNANCE
First orientations for a set of core standards and principles

Initial consultation draft
November 2013

Introductory note

The objective of these draft Principles is to draw together the lessons of a decade and more of work by the OECD Senior Budget Officials (SBO) Working Party and its associated Networks, along with the contributions and insights from other areas of the OECD and of the international budgeting community more generally. The draft Principles provide a concise overview of good practices across the full spectrum of budget activity, taking account in particular of the lessons of the recent economic crisis, and aim to give practical guidance for designing, implementing and improving budget systems to meet the challenges of the future. The overall intention is to provide a useful reference tool for policy-makers and practitioners around the world, and help ensure that public resources are planned, managed and used effectively to make a positive impact on citizens' lives.

As a draft document, these Principles are a work in progress and will benefit from the constructive input and improvements from interested parties around the world, before they are considered and adopted as a formal instrument of the OECD in the future.

For further information or to provide feedback, please contact:

budgetprinciples@oecd.org

Draft PRINCIPLES OF BUDGETARY GOVERNANCE

First orientations for a set of core standards and principles

Introduction: The fundamental national role of the budget and the budgeting process

The budget is a central policy document of government, showing how it will achieve its annual and multi-annual objectives. Apart from financing new and existing programmes, the budget is the primary instrument for implementing fiscal policy. Alongside other instruments of government policy – such as laws, regulation and joint action with other actors in society – the budget aims to turn plans and aspirations into reality. More than this, the budget is a contract between citizens and state, showing how resources are raised and allocated for the delivery of public services. Such a document must be clear, transparent and credible if it is to command trust, and to serve as a basis of accountability.

External stakeholders also look to the quality of the budget document, and of the budgeting process, in assessing the soundness and reliability of a state. The process of shaping the budget is typically led by the Treasury/Ministry of Finance (“central budget authority” or CBA), and draws together the contributions from ministers, parliamentarians, public officials and other trusted advisers, civil society organisations and advocacy groups and, increasingly, from citizens themselves. An *effective* budgetary process is one that takes these contributions, weighs and considers them, and transforms them into a set of proposals for action for the betterment of society. A *sound* budgeting system is one which engenders trust among citizens that the government is listening to their concerns, has a plan for achieving worthwhile objectives, and will use the available resources effectively, efficiently and in a sustainable manner in doing so.

Budgeting is no longer the preserve of central governments: it is a process that encompasses all levels of government, national and subnational. Budget systems and procedures should be coordinated, coherent and consistent across levels of government. These budget principles are therefore relevant, and should be applied as appropriate, to all levels of government.

Moreover, budgeting is not a standalone process, removed from the other channels of government action. Good budgeting is supported by, and in turn supports, the various pillars of modern public governance: integrity, openness, participation, accountability and a strategic approach to planning and achieving national objectives. In this way, budgeting is an essential keystone in the architecture of trust between states and their citizens.

Budgeting practices can vary widely across countries in light of traditional, institutional and cultural factors. However, based on the experience of the Senior Budget Officials (SBO) and the extensive analysis of various aspects of budgeting conducted by the SBO and its networks over recent years and related studies across the OECD (see Bibliography), the common elements of modern budgeting practice can be presented as high-level principles to guide and inform budgetary processes and reforms. Countries that organise their budgetary affairs on the basis of these governance principles are best-placed to meet citizens’ expectations for sound, stable and effective public governance.

These principles deal with the various phases of the budget process, the attributes of the budget document, as well as the wider context within which budgets are formed. The OECD has developed, and is developing, more detailed principles and recommendations for further guidance on specific elements of the overall budgeting framework.

1. Fiscal policy should be managed within clear, credible and predictable limits.

- A sound fiscal policy is one which avoids the build-up of large, unsustainable debts, and which uses favourable economic times to build up resilience and buffers against more difficult times. However, there are a range of political and other factors that can impede governments from effecting such counter-cyclical, or even cyclically neutral, policies.
- At minimum, governments should have a stated commitment to pursue a sound and sustainable fiscal policy. The credibility of this commitment can be enhanced through clear and verifiable fiscal rules or policy guidelines which make it easier for people to understand and to anticipate the government's fiscal policy course throughout the economic cycle, and through other institutional mechanisms (see point 10 below) to provide an independent perspective in this regard.

2. Top-down budgetary management should be applied to align policies with resources.

- The starting point for budgetary management should be the setting of overall budget targets by the CBA which will achieve fiscal policy objectives for each year of a medium-term fiscal horizon. These targets should then be used to ensure that all elements of revenue, expenditure and broader economic policy are consistent and are managed in line with the available resources.
- The accuracy of economic forecasting, and of tax and expenditure baseline projections, is of central importance if top-down budgeting is to be planned and implemented effectively (see also points 4 and 10 below).

3. Budgets should be closely aligned with government-wide strategic priorities.

- To promote alignment with the (multi-year) planning, prioritisation and goal-setting functions of government, the (annual) budgeting process should (a) develop a medium-term perspective, beyond the traditional annual cycle (see point 4 below); and (b) organise and structure the budget allocations in a way that corresponds readily with national objectives.
- The CBA should have a close working relationship with the centre of government (i.e. prime minister's office or cabinet office), given the inter-dependencies between the budget process and the achievement of government-wide policies.
- From time to time, governments may need to revisit or realign their fundamental priorities to take account of developments in the economy or in society. A periodic, comprehensive review of expenditure (see point 9 below) is a useful tool for ensuring that budgetary expectations are managed in line with government-wide developments.

4. Budgets should be forward-looking, giving a clear medium-term outlook.

- A medium-term dimension to budgeting is essential both for managing fiscal policy effectively and for resourcing government plans and priorities (see points 1, 2 and 3 above). Moreover, many structural reform measures – whether relating to expenditure or revenue – take several years to yield their expected benefits, and these effects should be planned and budgeted for across the multi-year horizon.
- A medium-term expenditure framework (MTEF) is accordingly of fundamental importance in setting a basis for the annual budget. To be effective, an MTEF should have real force in setting boundaries for the main categories of expenditure, for each year of the medium-term horizon; should be fully aligned with the top-down budgetary constraints agreed by government; should be grounded upon realistic forecasts for baseline expenditure (i.e. using existing policies), including a clear outline of key assumptions used; should show the correspondence with expenditure objectives and deliverables from national strategic plans; and should include

sufficient institutional incentives and flexibility to ensure that expenditure boundaries are respected.

- Capital investment plans, which by their nature have an impact beyond the annual budget, should be grounded in objective appraisal of economic capacity gaps, infrastructural development needs and sectoral/social priorities. The budgeting process should require a prudent assessment of the costs and benefits of such investments; affordability for users over the long term, including in light of recurrent costs; relative priority among various projects; and of overall value for money. Investment decisions should be evaluated independently of the specific financing mechanism i.e. whether through traditional capital procurement or a private financing model such as public-private partnership (PPP).

5. Budget documents and data should be open, transparent and accessible.

- Clear budget reports should be available to inform all stages of policy formulation, consideration and debate, as well as implementation and review. The annual budget document itself, which shows the allocations for each public service area and revenue policy measures under each tax heading, is of central importance. Budgetary information should also be presented in comparable format in advance of the final budget providing enough time for effective discussion and debate on policy choices (e.g. a draft budget or a pre-budget report), during the implementation phase (e.g. a mid-year budget report) and after the end of the budget year (an end-year report) to promote effective decision making, accountability and oversight.
- All budget reports should be published fully, immediately and routinely, and in a way that is accessible to citizens. In the modern context, “accessibility” requires that budget documents be available on-line, and that all budget data be presented in open data formats which can be readily downloaded, analysed, used and re-presented by citizens, civil society organisations and other stakeholders.
- The budgeting process brings together all financial inflows and outflows of government; the use of open, standardised data sets should therefore allow for the budgeting process to facilitate and support other important government objectives such as open government, integrity and programme evaluation.

6. The budget process should be inclusive, participative and realistic.

- As well as having access to budget documents and data, parliament and citizens should be able to understand and influence the discussion about budgetary policy options, according to their democratic mandate, competencies and perspectives.
- Detailed and technical information should be presented in a simple manner, and the impact of budget measures – whether to do with tax or expenditure – should be clearly explained. A “citizen’s budget” or budget summary, in a standard and user-friendly format, is one way of achieving this.
- The national parliament has a fundamental role in authorising budget decisions and in holding governments to account. The parliament and its committees should have the opportunity to engage with the budget process at all stages of the budget cycle. The clear setting-out of medium-term budgetary envelopes (see point 4 above) should help the parliament to participate in the annual process of budget formulation *ex ante* as well as *ex post*.
- Since governments have finite resources at their disposal, budgeting is concerned with identifying priorities, assessing value for money and making decisions. Parliaments, citizens and civil society organisations can contribute usefully to the budget process when they become engaged in the debate about difficult trade-offs, opportunity costs and value for money. Governments should facilitate this useful engagement by making clear the relative costs and benefits of the wide range of public expenditure programmes and tax expenditures.

7. Budgets should present a true, full and fair picture of the public finances.

- As a contract of trust between citizens and the state, it is expected that the budget document should account truly and faithfully for all expenditures and revenues of the national government, and that no figures should be omitted or hidden (although limited restrictions may apply for certain national security purposes). To underpin trust, this expectation should be made explicit through formal laws, rules or declarations that ensure budget sincerity and constrain the use of “off-budget” fiscal mechanisms.
- Control of the national budget is the responsibility of the central government, and the degree of co-ordination and co-operation with subnational levels of government naturally varies from country to country. The budget documentation should present a full national overview of the public finances – encompassing central and subnational levels of government – as an essential context for a debate on budgetary choices.
- Budget accounting should show the full financial costs and benefits of budget decisions, including the impact upon financial assets and liabilities. Accruals budgeting and reporting, which correspond broadly with private sector accounting norms, routinely show these costs and benefits; where traditional cash budgeting is used, supplementary information is needed. Where accruals methodology is used, a cash statement should also be prepared to show how the national government operations will be funded from year to year.
- Public programmes that are funded through non-traditional means – e.g. PPPs – should be included and explained in the budget reports, even where (for accounting reasons) they may not directly affect the public finances within the time frame of the budget document.

8. Performance, evaluation and value for money should be integral to the budget process

- Parliament and citizens need to understand not just what is being *spent*, but what is being *bought* on behalf of citizens – i.e. what public services are actually being delivered, to what standards of quality and with what levels of efficiency.
- Performance information should be routinely presented alongside the financial allocations in the budget report. It is essential that such information should clarify, and not obscure or impede, accountability and oversight. Accordingly, performance information should be limited to a small number of relevant indicators for each policy programme; should be clear and easily understood; should allow for tracking of results against targets and for comparison with international and other benchmarks; and should make clear the link with government-wide strategic objectives.
- Expenditure programmes (including tax expenditures) should be routinely and regularly subject to objective evaluation and review, to inform resource allocation and re-prioritisation both within line ministries and across government as a whole. High-quality performance and evaluation information should be available to facilitate an evidence-based review.
- In particular, all new policy proposals should be routinely and openly evaluated *ex ante* to assess coherence with national priorities, clarity of objectives, and anticipated costs and benefits.
- Periodically, governments should take stock of overall expenditure and reassess its alignment with fiscal objectives and national priorities, taking account of the results of evaluations. For such a comprehensive review to be effective, it must be aligned with political demand.

9. Longer-term sustainability and other fiscal risks should be identified, assessed and managed prudently

- To promote a stable development of public finances, mechanisms should be applied to promote the resilience of budgetary plans and to mitigate the potential impact of fiscal risks.

- Fiscal risks, including contingent liabilities, should be clearly identified, explained and classified by type: e.g. forecasting assumptions; national and international economic risks and scenarios, including uncertainties relating to the economic cycle and internal and external economic imbalances; liabilities and guarantees in the public sector, including public enterprises; potential liabilities in the broader economy, including any implicit support for strategic industries or private-sector pension schemes; risk-sharing and joint financing arrangements with the private sector, including PPPs; implicit guarantees for sub-national debt; risks from natural disasters and other unpredictable events; and longer-term sustainability risks, including those related to publicly-funded pensions and any implicit support for private-sector pensions.
- Fiscal risks should also be quantified as far as possible, and the mechanisms for managing these risks should be made explicit and reported alongside the annual budget. Such mechanisms should include, as appropriate: adoption of a prudent fiscal stance; adequate fiscal buffers against cyclical volatility; charging market-based fees for the implicit costs associated with liabilities and guarantees; credible repudiation by the government of any perceived responsibility for risks that belong in the private sector; and protected reserve funds for unforeseen events and for longer-term budgetary challenges.
- Longer-term demographic changes and other factors can also give rise to major pressures and challenges for budgetary policy: issues such as social security, health care, care for older people, education, energy policy and the structure of the tax base should be considered under this heading. A report on long-term sustainability of the public finances should be published regularly (at least once every 3 years), and its policy messages – both near-term and longer-term – should be presented and considered in the budgetary context.

10. The integrity and quality of budgetary forecasts, fiscal plans and budgetary implementation should be promoted through rigorous, independent quality assurance.

- The CBA needs to command the confidence of a broad range of stakeholders – across government, within parliament and the public, and internationally – in the quality and integrity of its budgetary forecasts and fiscal plans and in its ability to manage budgetary implementation and delivery.
- In the first instance, governments should invest continually in the skills and capacity of staff to perform their roles effectively – whether in the CBA, line ministries or other institutions – including by reference to current international standards and norms.
- The credibility of national budgeting – including economic forecasting, adherence to fiscal rules, longer-term sustainability and handling of fiscal risks – can also be enhanced through independent fiscal institutions or other structured, institutional processes for allowing objective scrutiny of, and input to, government budgeting. An open, transparent and participative approach to budgeting (see points 4 and 5 above) also promotes the credibility and quality of the budgetary process.
- Independent internal audit is an essential safeguard for the quality of integrity of budget processes and financial management, both within the CBA and within line ministries.
- The supreme audit institution (SAI) has a fundamental role, as a guardian of the public trust, in ensuring that budgeted resources are used properly. A well-functioning SAI should deal authoritatively with all aspects of financial accountability. As regards efficiency and value for money, both the internal and external control systems should have a role in auditing the cost-effectiveness of individual programmes and in assessing the quality of performance accountability and governance frameworks more generally.

Select bibliography

- Anderson, B. and J. Sheppard (2009), "Fiscal futures, institutional budget reforms, and their effects: What can be learned?", *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, 2009/3:7-117, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/budget-9-5kmh6dnl056g>.
- Blöndal, J.R. (2004), "Issues in accrual budgeting", *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, 4(1):103-119, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/budget-v4-art5-en>.
- Burger, P. and I. Hawkesworth (2011), "How to attain value for money: Comparing PPP and traditional infrastructure public procurement", *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, 2011/1:91-146, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/budget-11-5kg9zc0pvq6j>.
- Burger, P. and I. Hawkesworth (2013), "Capital budgeting and procurement practices", *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, 2013/1.
- Jong, M. (de), I. van Beek and R. Posthumus (2012), "Introducing accountable budgeting: Lessons from a decade of performance-based budgeting in the Netherlands", *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, 2012/3:71-104, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/budget-12-5k455r12vs37>.
- Kopits, G. (2011), "Independent fiscal institutions: Developing good practices", *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, 2011/3:35-52, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/budget-11-5kg3pdgcpn42>.
- Marcel, M. (2013), "Budgeting for fiscal space and government performance beyond the great recession", *OECD Journal on Budgeting* (forthcoming)
- OECD (2007), *Performance Budgeting in OECD Countries*, OECD Publishing, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264034051-en>.
- OECD (2009), *Evolutions in Budgetary Practice: Allen Schick and the OECD Senior Budget Officials*, OECD Publishing, www.oecdbookshop.org/oecd/display.asp?sf1=identifiers&st1=9789264060876.
- OECD (2010), "Restoring fiscal sustainability: Lessons for the public sector", Public Governance Committee and Working Party of Senior Budget Officials, OECD, Paris, www.oecd.org/dataoecd/1/60/44473800.pdf.
- OECD (2012a), "Recommendation of the Council on Principles for Public Governance of Public-Private Partnerships", OECD, Paris, www.oecd.org/gov/budget/ppp.
- OECD (2012b), *Restoring Public Finances: 2012 Update*, OECD Publishing, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264179455-en>.
- OECD (2013), "Recommendation of the Council on Principles for Independent Fiscal Institutions" (forthcoming)
- OECD (2013), *Investing Together: Working Effectively Across Levels of Government*, OECD Publishing
- OECD (2013) "Council Recommendations on Principles for Effective Public Investment – A Shared Responsibility across Levels of Government", OECD, Paris (forthcoming)
- OECD (2013), (Results from the 2012-2013 OECD Survey of Budget Practices and Procedures) (forthcoming) = BOOK
- OECD/Korea Institute of Public Finance (2012), *Institutional and Financial Relations across Levels of Government* (OECD Fiscal Federalism Studies), OECD Publishing, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264167001-en>.

- Petrie, M. and J. Shields (2010), "Producing a citizens' guide to the budget: Why, what and how?", *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, 2010/2:75-87, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/budget-10-5km7gkwg2pjh>.
- Robinson, M. (2012), "Aggregate expenditure ceilings and allocative efficiency", *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, 2012/3:127-145, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/budget-12-5k468nqj1f7g>.
- Robinson, M. (2013), "Spending reviews", *OECD Journal on Budgeting* (forthcoming)
- Schick, A. (2007), "Performance budgeting and accrual budgeting: Decision rules or analytic tools?", *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, 7(2):109-138, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/budget-v7-art11-en>.
- Schick, A. (2011), "Repairing the budget contract between citizens and the state", *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, 2011/3:7-33, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/budget-11-5kg3pdgctc8v>.
- Schick, A. (2012), "Lessons from the crisis", *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, 2012/3:9-37, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/budget-12-5k47tb29wn6h>.
- Schilperoort, W. and P. Wierdsma (2012), "Illuminating budgetary risks: The role of stress testing", *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, 2012/3:53-70, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/budget-12-5k46f8g99f7j>.
- Steger, G. (2012), "Redirecting public finance towards a sustainable path", *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, 2012/2:61-67, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/budget-12-5k8zsl7n94s8>.