

What can budget transparency and participation do for health?

Health spending does not always increase as fiscal space grows

- ...according to a RESYST study in Kenya, South Africa and Lagos State (Nigeria) over past 15 years. Why?
 - MoH can lack macro-economic know-how or political influence to make a convincing case to MoF
 - MoF may not trust the health sector to deliver results or value for money
 - Process for developing the budget can erode the final health sector allocation

How can budget transparency and participation remedy this situation?

- Transparency helps to build MoF trust in health sector by:
 - Linking public funds to results
 - Empowering non-state actors to track whether value for money is delivered and if not, why
- Public participation in budget process helps MoH make its case to MoF by:
 - Bringing additional expertise
 - Bringing more voices to the table in support of health services

Other advantages

- Better internal awareness of how much is allocated and spent may lead to better prioritisation of health spending
- Allows politicians to get politically rewarded for making health investments
- Civil society is able to contribute information on the public's health needs and priorities



The evidence

- Greater budget transparency is associated with a higher likelihood that the health budget is implemented as planned
- Countries that have improved budget transparency most have increased MDG spending more on average.
- Participatory budgeting has increased the share of municipal budgets allocated to health in Brazil
- ...and decreased local corruption in Indonesia



Transparency example from South Africa: Treatment Action Campaign

- In the late 1990s, the South African government was refusing to implement HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment programmes, esp. PMTCT.
- TAC filed papers with the high court claiming that govt's position was unconstitutional and that PMTCT would save the govt \$90,000.
- Government countered that a full roll-out would cost \$33.3 Mill.
- TAC, using publically available documents, showed that provincial departments of health underspent their budgets by about US\$63.1 million
- High Court ruled in favour of TAC

Participation example from Nigeria Community Health Research Initiatives

- Training of CSOs & media to participate in budget process in 4 states of Northern Nigeria
 - Increased the number of indigenous CSOs and Media participating in 2016 budget process
 - Proposed Routine Immunization budget for 2016 increased by + 25%
 - Secured a separate budget line for Routine Immunization



Budget transparency and participation for health – a scorecard

- Components
 - Transparent allocation to health
 - Transparent spending on health
 - Spending linked to health outcomes
 - Budget information clearly communicated to the public
 - Public participation in the budget process
- Source: 2015 Open Budget Index (IBP) adapted by AHBN



The scorecard

	TRANSPARENT ALLOCATION TO HEALTH	TRANSPARENT SPENDING ON HEALTH	SPENDING LINKED TO HEALTH OUTCOMES	BUDGET INFORMATION CLEARLY COMMUNICATED TO THE PUBLIC	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN THE BUDGET PROCESS
ANGOLA:					
BENIN:					
BOTSWANA:					
BURKINA FASO:					
CAMEROON:					
CHAD:					
DEM. REP. OF CONGO:					
EQUATORIAL GUINEA:					
GHANA:					
KENYA:					
LIBERIA:					
MALAWI:					
MALI:					
MOZAMBIQUE:					
NAMIBIA:					
NIGER:					
NIGERIA:					
RWANDA:					
SENEGAL:					
SIERRA LEONE:					
SOUTH AFRICA:					
SUDAN:					
S. TOME AND PRINCIPE:					
TANZANIA:					
UGANDA:					
ZAMBIA:					
ZIMBABWE:					

1. Transparent allocation to health

- = How are allocations classified?
 Administrative, economic, functional, programmatic....
- Results
 - This is the indicator with highest scores 25 out of 30 score green or yellow
 - More detail for current budget year than future budget years
 - Top performers: Malawi, Namibia, south Africa, Uganda
 - Bottom performers: Sudan, Equatorial Guinea, Chad



2. Transparent spending on health

- = How is end of year, actual spending classified? Administrative, economic, functional, programmatic....
- Results
 - Poorer performance than transparent
 allocation 10 out of 30 score green or yellow
 - Top performers: Malawi, South Africa,
 Uganda, Sierra Leone, Botswana, Zambia,
 Sudan
 - Bottom performers: too many to list



3. Spending linked to health outcomes

 = Budget illustrates financial impact of policies on different groups of citizens; how the budget is linked to government goals; non-financial data on results is included

Results

- Linking to policy goals is most common form others quite rare – nine out of 10 score green or yellow
- Top performers: Malawi, Namibia, Cameroon, Mozambique
- Bottom performers: Equatorial Guinea, Chad,
 Burkina Faso, Sudan

4. Budget information clearly communicated to the public

- = What information is in the Citizens Budget and how is it communicated to the public?
- Results
 - Half score either green or yellow
 - Top performers: Mali and Tanzania
 - Bottom performers: too many to list



5. Public participation in the budget process

- = Budget timetable is released; executive is formally required to engage with the public during the budget process and legislative committees hold public budget hearings
- Results
 - Only six out of 30 score green or yellow
 - Timetable released and public legislative hearings of the executive are most common
 - Top performers: South Africa, Rwanda, Kenya
 - Bottom performers: Equatorial Guinea,
 Sudan, Mozambique