



**Roskilde
University**

Independent Reporting Mechanism Denmark: Progress Report 2012–13
Open Government Partnership

Eberholst, Mads Kæmsgaard

Publication date:
2014

Document Version
Early version, also known as pre-print

Citation for published version (APA):
Eberholst, M. K. (2014). Independent Reporting Mechanism Denmark: Progress Report 2012–13: Open Government Partnership. Open Government in Denmark.
<http://www.opengovpartnership.org/country/denmark/progress-report/report>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact rucforsk@kb.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Independent Reporting Mechanism Denmark: Progress Report 2012–13

Mads Kæmgaard Eberholst, Independent Researcher

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Executive Summary: Denmark | 3 |
| I. Background | 14 |
| II. Process: Development of Action Plan | 17 |
| III. Process: Consultation during Implementation | 20 |
| IV. Implementation of Commitments | 21 |
| 1. <i>Online OGP Community</i> | 24 |
| 2. <i>Online OGP Handbook for Public Authorities and Institutions</i> | 26 |
| 3. <i>Management Labs and New Forms of Co-operation</i> | 28 |
| 4 & 27. <i>Consultation and Transparency of Development Aid Programmes</i> | 30 |
| 5: <i>Innovate with Aarhus</i> | 33 |
| 6, 11, 12, 13 & 14. <i>Citizen Self-services</i> | 35 |
| 7. <i>Open Government Camp</i> | 41 |
| 8. <i>Renewed Effort for Open Government Data</i> | 43 |
| 9. <i>Regional Initiative on Open Data</i> | 46 |
| 10. <i>Re-use of Open Source Software in the Public Sector</i> | 48 |
| 15. <i>Less Reporting through Increased Re-use of Key Data</i> | 50 |
| 16 & 17. <i>Improved Public Services for the Business Sector</i> | 52 |
| 18. <i>Creation of a Mediation and Complaints Institution for Responsible Business Behaviour</i> | 55 |
| 19. <i>International Human Rights Conference</i> | 57 |
| 20. <i>Promotion of Social Responsibility in the Fashion Business</i> | 59 |
| 21. <i>Reporting on Human Rights and the Climate</i> | 61 |
| 22: <i>Country-by-country Reporting in the Extractive and Forestry Industries</i> | 63 |
| 23. <i>Legislative Principles for the Digital Age</i> | 65 |
| 24. <i>Consolidated Key Data</i> | 67 |
| 25. <i>App Store for Digital Learning Resources</i> | 69 |
| 26. <i>Preparation for Digital Reform of the Public Welfare Areas</i> | 71 |
| 28: <i>Tracking of Universities' Transition to Digital-only Administrative Communication</i> | 73 |
| 29. <i>Disclosure of Status Reporting from the National IT Project Council</i> | 75 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| <i>30. Overview of Public ICT Architecture</i> | <i>77</i> |
| <i>31. Publication of Educational Materials on the Government's ICT Project Model.....</i> | <i>79</i> |
| <i>32 & 33. Smart Aarhus and Smart Region</i> | <i>81</i> |
| V. Self-Assessment | 83 |
| VI: Moving Forward..... | 84 |
| Annex: Methodology | 87 |



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: DENMARK

Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) Progress Report 2012–13

The Government of Denmark made significant progress on its OGP commitments. Many of these commitments explored ways to use technology creatively to foster open government. However, only one agency in Denmark's government is active in the OGP, while the rest of the government remains indifferent.

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) is a voluntary international initiative that aims to secure commitments from governments to their citizenry to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance. The Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) carries out a biannual review of the activities of each OGP participating country.

Denmark officially began participating in the OGP in November 2011, when Prime Minister Lars Løkke Rasmussen declared the government's intent to join.

In September 2011, the newly elected Prime Minister, Helle Thorning-Schmidt, formally took over the OGP in Denmark and placed it in the newly created Agency for Digitisation (AFD) under the Ministry of Finance. Other agencies and ministries in Denmark have not focused as much on OGP, nor has there been mention in the Danish media of the OGP in conjunction with any other Danish agencies or ministries besides the AFD.

Many of government's OGP commitments are linked to its 2011–2015 e-Government Strategy. While not a problem in itself, this has led to some confusion in Denmark between "e-Government" and "open government."

OGP PROCESS

Countries participating in the OGP follow a process for consultation during development of their OGP action plan and during implementation.

The AFD held a public hearing on OGP in February 2012. Around 470 stakeholders were invited, including from civil society and the private sector, but only a few comments were received.

Nevertheless, stakeholders found this input to be satisfying and representative of the views in society. The AFD also reached out to the public using an existing online forum Web site (digitaliser.dk) and social media.

During implementation of the action plan, a Web page was created on digitaliser.dk to discuss the OGP, but online participation was very sparse. Rather, the most robust participation took place through in-person forums, such as the Open Government Camp and Smart Aarhus.

While the government sought feedback on its self-assessment report, no comments were received. In general, stakeholders indicated that they agreed with the findings in the government's self-assessment.

At a glance

Member since: 2011
Number of commitments: 33

Level of Completion

Completed: 17 of 33
Substantial: 5 of 33
Limited: 10 of 33
Not started: 1 of 33

Timing

On schedule: 17 of 33

Commitment emphasis:

Access to information: 11 of 33
Civic participation: 12 of 33
Accountability: 6 of 33
Tech & innovation for transparency & accountability: 13 of 33
Unclear: 12 of 33

Number of Commitments with:

Clear relevance to an OGP value: 21 of 33
Moderate or transformative potential impact: 12 of 33
Substantial or complete implementation: 22 of 33
All three (★): 8 of 33

Commitment Implementation

As part of the OGP, countries are required to make commitments in a two-year action plan. Table 1 summarizes each commitment, its level of completion, its ambition and whether it falls within Denmark's planned schedule, and the key next steps for the commitment in future OGP action plans. Table 2 summarizes the IRM assessment of progress on each commitment. Denmark completed 17 of its commitments, as described in Table 2.

Table 1: Assessment of Progress by Commitment

| COMMITMENT SHORT NAME | POTENTIAL IMPACT | | | | LEVEL OF COMPLETION | | | | TIMING | NEXT STEPS |
|--|------------------|-------|----------|----------------|---------------------|---------|-------------|----------|-----------------|--|
| | NONE | MINOR | MODERATE | TRANSFORMATIVE | NOT STARTED | LIMITED | SUBSTANTIAL | COMPLETE | | |
| <p>✦ COMMITMENT IS CLEARLY RELEVANT TO OGP VALUES AS WRITTEN, HAS SIGNIFICANT POTENTIAL IMPACT, AND IS SUBSTANTIALLY OR COMPLETELY IMPLEMENTED.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>1. Online OGP Community—Create an online OGP forum for knowledge sharing, documentation, and engagement with civil society.</p> | | | | | | | | | Behind schedule | New commitment building on existing implementation |
| <p>2. Online OGP Handbook for Public Authorities and Institutions—Provide guidelines and information for launching open government projects.</p> | | | | | | | | | On schedule | Further work on basic implementation |
| <p>✦ 3. Management Labs and New Forms of Co-operation—Collaborate on new ways to involve citizens and employees in decisionmaking.</p> | | | | | | | | | On schedule | New commitment building on existing implementation |
| <p>4. Consultation and Transparency of Development Aid Programmes—Conduct public hearings on the design of future foreign aid programmes.</p> | | | | | | | | | On schedule | Further work on basic implementation |
| <p>✦ 5. Innovate with Aarhus—Launch programme to increase the innovative capacity of Aarhus Municipality in developing new services for citizens.</p> | | | | | | | | | On schedule | Maintenance and monitoring of completed implementation |
| <p>6. Citizen Self-services—Use user inputs to support the continuous improvement of the public citizens' portal borger.dk.</p> | | | | | | | | | Behind schedule | Further work on basic implementation |
| <p>7. Open Government Camp—Create a multi-stakeholder forum to explore how digital technologies can make public welfare systems more open.</p> | | | | | | | | | On schedule | New commitment building on existing implementation |

| COMMITMENT SHORT NAME | POTENTIAL IMPACT | | | | LEVEL OF COMPLETION | | | | TIMING | NEXT STEPS |
|---|------------------|-------|----------|----------------|---------------------|---------|-------------|----------|-----------------|--|
| | NONE | MINOR | MODERATE | TRANSFORMATIVE | NOT STARTED | LIMITED | SUBSTANTIAL | COMPLETE | | |
| <p>⊕ COMMITMENT IS CLEARLY RELEVANT TO OGP VALUES AS WRITTEN, HAS SIGNIFICANT POTENTIAL IMPACT, AND IS SUBSTANTIALLY OR COMPLETELY IMPLEMENTED.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>8. Renewed Effort for Open Government Data—Provide guidelines and assistance to help public authorities make their data available for re-use.</p> | | | | | | | | | Behind schedule | New commitment building on existing implementation |
| <p>⊕ 9. Regional Initiative on Open Data—Establish a regional public-private initiative with the Central Denmark Regional Authority to promote re-usability of data.</p> | | | | | | | | | On schedule | New commitment building on existing implementation |
| <p>10. Re-use of Open Source Software in the Public Sector—Expand co-operation with industry associations using the public portal for sharing and re-using open source software.</p> | | | | | | | | | Behind schedule | Further work on basic implementation |
| <p>11. Citizen Self-services—Publish guidelines to improve the usability, accessibility, language, design, security, and re-use of public-sector data.</p> | | | | | | | | | On schedule | Maintenance and monitoring of completed implementation |
| <p>12. Citizen Self-services—Provide guidance to public authorities to improve digital services for persons with disabilities.</p> | | | | | | | | | Behind schedule | New commitment building on existing implementation |
| <p>13. Citizen Self-services—Implement programmes to help citizens obtain basic computer skills.</p> | | | | | | | | | Behind schedule | New commitment building on existing implementation |
| <p>14. Citizen Self-services—Enhance the public citizens portal borger.dk to provide more personalized information on services based on each citizen’s location.</p> | | | | | | | | | Behind schedule | None: abandon commitment |
| <p>15. Less Reporting through Increased Re-use of Key Data—Launch a cross-governmental programme to reduce the need for repeated reporting of key data.</p> | | | | | | | | | Behind schedule | Further work on basic implementation |
| <p>16. Improved Public Services for the Business Sector—Develop a personalised “MyPage” that provides each company with an overview of its basic registration data, employee information, rights, and reporting obligations.</p> | | | | | | | | | Behind schedule | New commitment building on existing implementation |

| COMMITMENT SHORT NAME | POTENTIAL IMPACT | | | | LEVEL OF COMPLETION | | | | TIMING | NEXT STEPS |
|--|------------------|-------|----------|----------------|---------------------|---------|-------------|----------|-----------------|--|
| | NONE | MINOR | MODERATE | TRANSFORMATIVE | NOT STARTED | LIMITED | SUBSTANTIAL | COMPLETE | | |
| <p>⊛ COMMITMENT IS CLEARLY RELEVANT TO OGP VALUES AS WRITTEN, HAS SIGNIFICANT POTENTIAL IMPACT, AND IS SUBSTANTIALLY OR COMPLETELY IMPLEMENTED.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>17. Improved Public Services for the Business Sector—Provide more digital tools on the business portal “My Page” to help companies be “born digitally.”</p> | | | | | | | | | Behind schedule | New commitment building on existing implementation |
| <p>⊛ 18. Creation of a Mediation and Complaints Institution for Responsible Business Behavior—Propose legislation to create a mechanism for managing complaints against Danish companies for violations of international human rights and corporate responsibility standards.</p> | | | | | | | | | On schedule | New commitment building on existing implementation |
| <p>19. International Human Rights Conference—Increase awareness among companies and the public of the government’s commitments under the UN Guiding Principles for Business and Human Rights.</p> | | | | | | | | | On schedule | New commitment building on existing implementation |
| <p>20. Promotion of Social Responsibility in the Fashion Business—Launch guidelines on social responsibility for the fashion business.</p> | | | | | | | | | On schedule | Maintenance and monitoring of completed implementation |
| <p>⊛ 21. Reporting on Human Rights and the Climate—Propose legislative amendments to ensure that Danish companies report on their efforts to respect human rights and reduce climate-change impacts.</p> | | | | | | | | | On schedule | New commitment building on existing implementation |
| <p>⊛ 22. Country-by-country Reporting in the Extractive and Forestry Industries—Require extractive and forestry companies to disclose payments made to foreign governments.</p> | | | | | | | | | On schedule | New commitment building on existing implementation |
| <p>23. Legislative Principles for the Digital Age—Establish principles for drafting legislation that takes into account increasing use of digital technology in the public sector.</p> | | | | | | | | | Behind schedule | Revision of the commitment to be more achievable or measurable |
| <p>24. Consolidated Key Data—Implement a programme to consolidate key data registers on citizens’ and businesses’ legal rights.</p> | | | | | | | | | Behind schedule | None: abandon commitment |

| COMMITMENT SHORT NAME | POTENTIAL IMPACT | | | | LEVEL OF COMPLETION | | | TIMING | NEXT STEPS |
|---|------------------|-------|----------|----------------|---------------------|---------|-------------|-----------------|--|
| | NONE | MINOR | MODERATE | TRANSFORMATIVE | NOT STARTED | LIMITED | SUBSTANTIAL | | |
| <p>⊕ COMMITMENT IS CLEARLY RELEVANT TO OGP VALUES AS WRITTEN, HAS SIGNIFICANT POTENTIAL IMPACT, AND IS SUBSTANTIALLY OR COMPLETELY IMPLEMENTED.</p> | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>25. App Store for Digital Learning Resources—Create market-based distribution platforms to facilitate easy access to digital learning resources among teachers and pupils.</p> | | | | | | | | Behind schedule | None: abandon commitment |
| <p>⊕ 26. Preparation for Digital Reform of the Public Welfare Areas—Conduct a comprehensive analysis of areas where welfare technological solutions can be improved.</p> | | | | | | | | On schedule | New commitment building on existing implementation |
| <p>⊕ 27. Consultation and Transparency of Development Aid Programmes—Launch initiative to provide citizens and partner countries with detailed information on development assistance.</p> | | | | | | | | On schedule | Maintenance and monitoring of completed implementation |
| <p>28. Tracking of Universities' Transition to Digital-only Administrative Communication—Monitor and publicise reports on the activities and progress of all Danish universities in their transition to fully digital written communication.</p> | | | | | | | | On schedule | None: abandon commitment |
| <p>29. Disclosure of Status Reporting from the National IT Project Council—Publish status reports on public ICT projects.</p> | | | | | | | | On schedule | Maintenance and monitoring of completed implementation |
| <p>30. Overview of Public ICT Architecture—Establish a comprehensive overview of the government's ICT architecture as part of the common public sector e-Government strategy.</p> | | | | | | | | Behind schedule | New commitment building on existing implementation |
| <p>31. Publication of Educational Materials on the Government's ICT Project Model—Publish open source materials about the government's ICT project model and good practice cases.</p> | | | | | | | | On schedule | Maintenance and monitoring of completed implementation |
| <p>32. Smart Aarhus and Smart Region—Establish an initiative in the Aarhus Municipality that uses an open digital platform to support the re-use of government data, citizen engagement, co-creation, and public-private co-operation.</p> | | | | | | | | Behind schedule | Revision of the commitment to be more achievable or measurable |
| <p>33. Smart Aarhus and Smart Region—Establish an initiative in the Central Denmark Regional Authority that encourages co-operation with the public in developing creative ICT-based solutions to societal challenges.</p> | | | | | | | | ehind schedule | Revision of the commitment to be more achievable or measurable |

Table 2: Summary of Progress by Commitment

| NAME OF COMMITMENT | SUMMARY OF RESULTS |
|---|--|
| <p>★ COMMITMENT IS CLEARLY RELEVANT TO OGP VALUES AS WRITTEN, HAS SIGNIFICANT POTENTIAL IMPACT, AND IS SUBSTANTIALLY OR COMPLETELY IMPLEMENTED.</p> | |
| <p>1. Online OGP Community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Substantial | <p>The AFD used the pre-existing Web site digitaliser.dk to set up an online forum where it is possible to engage in debates and download information about the OGP. The online forum was not used very frequently, partly due to poor layout and a troublesome process of logging in. Many stakeholders indicated to the IRM researcher that they had never heard of the forum. Moving forward, the IRM researcher recommends that greater efforts be made to make stakeholders aware of the forum's existence. Furthermore, social media forums such as LinkedIn and Facebook might be more effective in reaching out to the Danish public.</p> |
| <p>2. Online OGP Handbook for Public Authorities and Institutions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Complete | <p>The AFD created a handbook, which is available online at digitaliser.dk. The handbook serves as a valuable resource for all offices wishing to engage in open data and access to information for the public. According to the government's self-assessment, there are no statistics regarding the use of the handbook itself. Stakeholders critiqued the handbook as being too difficult to find online and too difficult to use through its static Web page. The IRM researcher recommends that the government track use of the handbook and make it more of a living tool that allows people engaged in OGP to share their experiences.</p> |
| <p>★ 3. Management Labs and New Forms of Co-operation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Transformative • Completion: Complete | <p>According to the government's self-assessment, a management lab was held during the Open Government Camp 2012 (see commitment #7). The lab appears to be a good way of prototyping ideas on a small scale for how to engage the public in the OGP. Participants identified a number of new ways to involve the public. The IRM researcher recommends that the government focus future labs on specific topics such as health, employment, or social services. The government should also pay special attention to making the outcomes of labs usable.</p> |
| <p>4. Consultation and Transparency of Development Aid Programmes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Complete | <p>Public hearings by ministries are mandatory in Denmark. A public hearing portal exists for this purpose, but the portal is only available in Danish. Therefore, it is not accessible to foreign stakeholders who might wish to comment on Danish aid programmes. In January 2013, the government launched the Danida Transparency portal (described in commitment #27). Among other features, the new portal provides an opportunity for public input from both domestic and international stakeholders on the design of aid programmes. The IRM researcher recommends that the government provide more transparency in how it uses the public input received through this portal in its decision-making process.</p> |
| <p>★ 5. Innovate with Aarhus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Moderate • Completion: Complete | <p>In Spring 2012, Aarhus Municipality committed to provide 40 million DKK annually for innovation projects on one of seven strategic themes: inclusion and citizenship, technology for welfare, digitization, mobility, innovation culture, health care, and absence due to illness. According to the government self-assessment, as of November 2013, 15 projects have received support from the innovation pool, and a new round of applications for the pool is being processed. However, it is unclear if the innovation projects relate directly to OGP grand values. The IRM researcher recommends making the link between OGP and these projects more explicit.</p> |
| <p>6. Citizen Self-services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Limited | <p>Using the Borger.dk Web site, citizens are able to perform most public-services tasks online. In July 2012, a pilot project called "Your opinion counts" was launched to collect feedback on the Web site. During the pilot phase, 7,583 users reviewed the public portal, and 3,657 proposals were received. Prior to this, there was no measure of user satisfaction and no easy way to propose new features on borger.dk. As the government moves towards a permanent way of seeking user feedback on Borger.dk, the IRM researcher recommends simplifying the feedback process to encourage more users to participate.</p> |
| <p>7. Open Government Camp</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Complete | <p>An Open Government Camp was held on 25 September 2012. Around 175 representatives of the public sector, private sector, and civil society participated. Participants indicated that this event fostered a sense of the OGP as a common project. In contrast, some stakeholders told the IRM researcher that they were unaware of the camp being held. The camp is returning as a part of the next Danish action plan. To encourage wide participation, the government should ensure that the outcomes of workshops are highly measurable and of value not only to public bodies, but also to the private sector.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>8. Renewed Effort for Open Government Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Moderate • Completion: Limited | <p>Stakeholders indicated to the IRM researcher that this basic data programme is of high importance. The use and re-use of public data has been an ongoing issue in the Danish government. In 2012, the Danish government entered into an agreement with local administrations to provide basic data for free that had previously been fee-based. The Danish government and local administrations should ideally commit to opening data by default. Current governance practice is to open specific sets of data only after a decision is made to do so.</p> |
| <p>9. Regional Initiative on Open Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Moderate • Completion: Complete | <p>A regional open data platform was established and released on 9 April 2013. Data are presented in open format at a regional scale. The platform also contains a forum where users can present ideas about what data they would like to see on the site. However, much of the data made available are not perceived as valuable or relevant. The IRM researcher recommends creating a joint regional data catalogue, perhaps as part of a national data catalogue, and focusing on data that stakeholders have identified as relevant.</p> |
| <p>10. Re-use of Open Source Software in the Public Sector</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Limited | <p>Prior to the OGP, an initiative called <i>Kod i ferien</i> (“Holiday Coding”) was launched. The purpose was to bring together students, software companies, and the public sector to create open source software for the public administration. A workshop was held as part of the Open Government Camp (see commitment #7). Many of the participants and stakeholders praised this event as being very productive. Steps should be taken to ensure that public awareness of this initiative is broadened and that forums outside of the “Holiday Coding” project are created to involve other stakeholders in the use of open source software.</p> |
| <p>11. Citizen Self-services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: None • Completion: Complete | <p>A government report from 2012 shows that 90 percent of Danes know about borger.dk, and around 80 percent use it for specific digital self-service purposes. Therefore, it is important that borger.dk not be perceived as confusing or difficult to use. On 30 April 2013, the government published its first version of guidelines on design requirements for self-service applications. Stakeholders considered these guidelines to be useful but stressed that more attention should be brought to the existence of the guidelines, as some were concerned that not everybody in the public sector knew about them.</p> |
| <p>12. Citizen Self-services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Unclear • Potential impact: None • Completion: Substantial | <p>During the OGP reporting period, AFD assured that public authority Web sites complied with the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.0 standard for people with disabilities. Furthermore, the government reports that mapping of accessibility on public Web sites is carried out every second year. The latest of these was performed in 2012. In its self-assessment, the government also reports that accessibility has improved, although some challenges persist. While it is crucial to enhance e-Government services for Danish citizens with disabilities, the relevance of this commitment to OGP values remains unclear.</p> |
| <p>13. Citizen Self-services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Unclear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Substantial | <p>In 2009, the government established a network called “Learn more about it,” which helps citizens to obtain basic computer skills. The government self-assessment reports that the network has given assistance to approximately 525,000 citizens since its creation. In 2012, the network also launched its annual campaign “Senior surf day,” when more than 8,200 elderly people learned to use the internet. While this initiative can help senior citizens to access government services online, the direct relevance of this commitment to OGP values remains unclear.</p> |
| <p>14. Citizen Self-services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Unclear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Limited | <p>According to the government self-assessment, by August 2013 the number of municipalities with location specific content was 52 out of 98, or roughly half of the municipalities. The self-assessment also mentions that there is a growing interest in using location-based services on borger.dk, although no further clarification on this is provided. However, the relevance of this commitment to OGP values is unclear. Furthermore, it is important that the government remain compliant with EU legislation that makes it illegal to automatically track IP addresses without the user first logging in to borger.dk.</p> |
| <p>15. Less Reporting through Increased Re-Use of Key Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Unclear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Limited | <p>In October 2012, the government and municipalities entered into an agreement to set up a basic data programme. The initiative seeks to ensure that “public and businesses are provided a better and more efficient service, when data that has already been recorded is shared across institutions and is included directly in case processing.” While important, this commitment as currently phrased has questionable relevance to OGP and seems more like a strictly e-Government commitment. The IRM researcher recommends that the next action plan focus on allowing users to control with whom they share their key data (recognising that there are limitations to citizen control over census data and some other types of information).</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>16. Improved Public Services for the Business Sector</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Unclear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Substantial | <p>This commitment is closely linked to #17. In December 2012, the government launched the first version of “My Page” and an updated version in 2013. Through this Web page, a company should be able to conduct all communications with public offices. While stakeholders found this initiative to be important, as currently written, it is not clear how it relates to OGP values.</p> |
| <p>17. Improved Public Services for the Business Sector</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Unclear • Potential impact: None • Completion: Limited | <p>This commitment is closely linked to #16. A first version of the initiative was launched in 2012. Under this concept, companies would be “digitally born,” meaning that papers or visits to government offices would no longer be required to start a new company. Technical issues emerged, but work is being done to overcome these challenges. As with commitment #16, stakeholders found this initiative to be important but unclear in how it relates to OGP values. To make this commitment more relevant to OGP values, the IRM researcher recommends that the government takes additional steps in ensuring transparency of businesses through the creation of a public register of companies’ beneficial ownership.</p> |
| <p>★ 18. Creation of a Mediation and Complaints Institution for Responsible Business Behaviour</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Moderate • Completion: Complete | <p>The Danish “National Contact Point” (NCP) was established in November 2012. This mechanism handles cases where the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises may have been violated. The government self-assessment indicates that several complaints have been filed but that the NCP has not yet considered any cases. Concluded cases will be available at on the NCP’s Web page, while a list of rejected complaints is already available online. The IRM researcher recommends that government takes steps to make processed cases available without the need for using the freedom of information act.</p> |
| <p>19. International Human Rights Conference</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Unclear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Complete | <p>The conference was held in May 2012 and brought together 200 representatives of the business community, civil society, and academia to discuss human rights. The outcome of the conference was included in the European Commission’s 2011–2014 action plan for corporate social responsibility (CSR). While stakeholders remarked that CSR is important, as currently worded, is it unclear how this commitment relates directly to OGP values. The focus of the work so far is on the EU level, rather than the Danish level. The IRM researcher recommends that government works to gather relevant stakeholders in Denmark’s country-specific context.</p> |
| <p>20. Promotion of Social Responsibility in the Fashion Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Complete | <p>In recent years, the Danish press has uncovered many examples of the fashion industry’s low pay for workers and use of child labour. According to the government’s self-assessment, CSR was discussed in several seminars during the Copenhagen Fashion Summit. The commitment is part of the Danish Business Agency’s action plan for CSR 2012–2015. The Copenhagen Fashion Summit returns in 2014. During this event, the fashion business should pay attention to foster CSR discussions and projects at a student or entrepreneur level.</p> |
| <p>★ 21. Reporting on Human Rights and the Climate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Moderate • Completion: Complete | <p>The expansion of the Danish Financial Statements Act was passed in 2012. However, it is still too early to evaluate the effects of this legislation. When reviewing future reporting from the companies, the IRM researcher recommends that government takes steps to make the data public as a way to foster greater accountability.</p> |
| <p>★ 22. Country-by-country Reporting in the Extractive and Forestry Industries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Moderate • Completion: Complete | <p>Country-by-country reporting is an important step in the international fight against corruption and tax evasion. It improves transparency, thereby enabling local populations and others to hold their authorities accountable for received funds. With Denmark’s support, the rules were adopted in the summer of 2013 in Directive 2013/34/EU and will take effect in 2016. Stakeholders agreed that this is a positive step towards fighting corruption in Europe, but also stressed that it could be expanded to other sectors and business areas as well as on a global scale.</p> |
| <p>23. Legislative Principles for the Digital Age</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Not started | <p>Expanding e-Government in Denmark requires ensuring that legislation is up to date on issues related to access to information. However, the government’s presentation of the new legislative principles has been postponed until 2014. The government’s self-assessment does not go into details about what preparatory work and consultations have already been done. The IRM researcher recommends that legislation should include standards for the use of metadata and assurances that data released by the government can be re-used by citizens.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>24. Consolidated Key Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Unclear • Potential impact: Moderate • Completion: Limited | <p>The scope of this commitment overlaps with commitment #15. As a result, the IRM researcher suggests abandoning this as a separate commitment in the next action plan.</p> |
| <p>25. App Store for Digital Learning Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Unclear • Potential impact: None • Completion: Limited | <p>The government has created an app store, as promised by this commitment. However, most stakeholders indicated that this commitment was unfulfilled, because of the lack of purchasing options on the site. Furthermore, the link with OGP values is unclear. Therefore, the IRM researcher recommends that this commitment be removed from future action plans.</p> |
| <p>✦ 26. Preparation for Digital Reform of the Public Welfare Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Transformative • Completion: Complete | <p>On 30 September 2013, the government officially launched its 2013–2020 Digital Welfare Strategy. According to the government's self-assessment, the strategy has been developed in dialogue with citizens after the publication of a debate paper on digital welfare. The digital welfare strategy is largely welcomed among stakeholders. The IRM researcher recommends that the future use of digital welfare systems could specifically include more of a focus on a feedback loop from the users, thereby fostering greater public participation.</p> |
| <p>✦ 27. Consultation and Transparency of Development Aid Programmes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Moderate • Completion: Complete | <p>In January 2013, the government launched a Web portal called Danida Transparency. The portal aims to open up the hearing process on new grants and new strategies in the preparatory phase of foreign aid programmes. It also contains a corruption hotline, as well as access to a database where information on foreign aid projects can be accessed. The portal is open for input from both national and international stakeholders. Work is ongoing and ahead of schedule to provide public access to more information and to make the portal more searchable. It is noted, however, that most users of the portal are Danish. Moving forward, stakeholders recommended that the government take steps to ensure that foreign stakeholders are made aware of the portal's existence.</p> |
| <p>28. Tracking of Universities' Transition to Digital-only Administrative Communication</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Unclear • Potential impact: None • Completion: Complete | <p>As part of the e-Government Strategy, communication with students and applicants of Danish universities are to become completely digitalised. To track progress towards this goal, reports on each of the universities were published on www.fivu.dk in March and April 2013. The government self-assessment indicates that between 85 and 100 percent of universities' communications with students is now digital. As currently written, however, this commitment's relation to OGP values is unclear. Therefore, the IRM researcher recommends removing this commitment from future OGP action plans.</p> |
| <p>29. Disclosure of Status Reporting from the National IT Project Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Minor • Completion: Complete | <p>Public ICT projects in Denmark are numerous, and an overview of the full range of projects is a valuable asset in monitoring the status of these projects. In March 2013, the government disclosed its first half annual report of all Danish public ICT projects that have budget in excess of more than 10 million DKK. Another report was projected for release in September 2013 but was not released by the time of this report. The government should take steps to ensure the timely publishing of these reports.</p> |
| <p>30. Overview of Public ICT Architecture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Unclear • Potential impact: None • Completion: Substantial | <p>Work on the online one-stop shop for common public sector architecture has been ongoing since 2006 with a new version arriving in 2013. However, the Web site makes no clear reference to a public interface for transparency, participation, and accountability. Furthermore, stakeholders observed that the reference cases for the successful use of the platform are not numerous, with just seven examples available online. Stakeholders agreed that more work could be put into sharing case studies, so that potential users can see the added value of using the platform.</p> |
| <p>31. Publication of Educational Materials on the Government's ICT Project Model</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Unclear • Potential impact: None • Completion: Complete | <p>The AFD has created and published educational materials on the public ICT model. These materials have been used to create and hold courses in public ICT. At the time of writing, 17 private suppliers are using the materials in 35 educational courses. However, this commitment as currently written is not directly relevant to OGP values. More work could be put into gathering evaluations of the courses with a direct feedback loop to the ICT model.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>32. Smart Aarhus and Smart Region</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Transformative • Completion: Limited | <p>According to the government's self-assessment, Smart Aarhus has initiated a number of concrete projects (e.g., the portal oadaa.dk). Stakeholders found the projects to be both ambitious and interesting, but they were unclear as to how many of the projects have been completed. The remainder of the activities for Smart Aarhus is yet to be completed and is therefore not reviewable. Moving forward, the Smart initiatives would benefit from more verifiable milestones and indicators of progress. These milestones could also become an integrated part of the next action plan for the Danish OGP.</p> |
| <p>33. Smart Aarhus and Smart Region</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OGP value relevance: Clear • Potential impact: Transformative • Completion: Limited | <p>Commitments #32 and #33 are reviewed as one in both the IRM report and in the government's self-assessment. The reason for this is that the main activities of the Smart Region programme have so far been a part of Smart Aarhus. A review of Smart Region itself is therefore redundant.</p> |

Recommendations

Stakeholders widely agreed that the most important commitments in Denmark's first OGP action plan related to open data. Stakeholders believed that public administrations in Denmark do not always see the value of opening data and their value in creating transparency in their work. In many cases, the opening of datasets is determined through the discretion of individual officials rather than through an established process. At the same time, stakeholders also expressed concern about how the opening of datasets would affect the privacy of citizens. This issue should continue to be a central part of Denmark's future OGP action plans.

Limited government support for the OGP

The AFD is tasked with implementing the OGP in Denmark but has a very limited political mandate. This limits the effectiveness of the OGP in Denmark. The AFD is formally under the Ministry of Finance, but the ministry has not taken much ownership over the OGP. Therefore, it is very much up to the AFD government officials to foster and nurse the OGP through other administrations. Stakeholders described this as a battle from office chief to office chief. While stakeholders acknowledged that the AFD official responsible for the OGP has been very successful, wider support is needed to spread open government values across the entire government.

Ideally, the AFD will obtain high-level support and collaboration from ministries outside the AFD. Support should ideally come from the prime minister's office. The IRM researcher recommends that the government as a whole take more ownership of the OGP, using the initiative to foster further openness and accountability.

Design of the OGP national action plan

Moving forward, the IRM researcher recommends that the government also consider ways to improve the design and implementation of its OGP commitments.

- **Timing.** At the time of writing this report (December 2013), Denmark's next action plan has already been completed. As a result, feedback from the IRM plays little or no role in the government's OGP planning for the next several years. Better co-ordination of timelines is needed between the government and the OGP Support Unit to ensure that the IRM's feedback is taken into account.
- **Ambition and relevance.** Very few of the commitments stretched existing government practice far beyond the status quo. Furthermore, a large percentage of the commitments had little or no connection with OGP values of accountability, public participation, and access to information. It is clear that much of the strategy was taken from the e-Government Strategy of Denmark. While this is not a problem in itself, many aspects of the e-Government Strategy do not relate directly to open government. Ideally, the government will strive in the future only to include commitments that are directly relevant to the OGP.
- **Consultations.** More work could be done to include civil society in the creation of the OGP action plan. The Open Government Camp provides an important opportunity to involve more

stakeholders in the development of the plan, but the camp must be well advertised to serve this purpose.

- **Specificity in commitments.** Many of the government's commitments lacked specific milestones and timelines. Designating an office or individual to be responsible for implementation of each commitment would increase the action plan's specificity by a large margin.
- **OGP forum.** The current OGP forum on digitaliser.dk is difficult to find and is perceived as ineffective. There is a need for a dedicated Web page for OGP in Denmark.
- **Strategic focus.** Stakeholders and the IRM researcher noted the wide diversity and large number of commitments. In future action plans, the IRM researcher recommends fewer but more ambitious commitments.

Eligibility Requirements, 2012: To participate in OGP, governments must demonstrate commitment to open government by meeting minimum criteria on key dimensions of open government. Third-party indicators are used to determine country progress on each of the dimensions. The OGP Support Unit converts the raw data into a four-point scale, listed in parentheses below. For more information, visit <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/how-it-works/how-join/eligibility-criteria>. Raw data has been recoded by OGP staff into a four-point scale, listed in parentheses below.

| | |
|---|---|
| Budget Transparency: (Not applicable) | Access to Information: Law Enacted (4 out of 4) |
| Asset Disclosure: Requirements for senior officials(3 out of 4) | Civic Participation: 9.71 of 10 (4 out of 4) |

Mads Kæmsgaard Eberholst is a journalist and teaching associate professor in the Department of Communication, Business and Information Technologies of Roskilde University.

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) aims to secure concrete commitments from governments to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance. OGP's Independent Reporting Mechanism assesses development and implementation of national action plans to foster dialogue among stakeholders and improve accountability.



I. BACKGROUND

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) is a voluntary, multi-stakeholder international initiative that aims to secure concrete commitments from governments to their citizenry to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance. In pursuit of these goals, OGP provides an international forum for dialogue and sharing among governments, civil society organisations, and the private sector, all of which contribute to a common pursuit of open government. OGP stakeholders include participating governments as well as civil society and private-sector entities that support the principles and mission of OGP.

Introduction

Denmark officially began participating in OGP in November 2011 when Lars Frelle-Petersen declared the government's intent to join.¹

To participate in OGP, governments must exhibit a demonstrated commitment to open government by meeting a set of minimum performance criteria on key dimensions of open government that are particularly consequential for increasing government responsiveness, strengthening citizen engagement, and fighting corruption. Indicators produced by organisations other than OGP to determine the extent of country progress on each of the dimensions, with points awarded as described below. Denmark entered into the partnership exceeding the minimal requirements for eligibility, with a high score in each of the criteria. At the time of joining, the country had an access to information law,² Asset Disclosure for Senior Officials,³ and a score of 9.71 out of a possible 10 on the Economist Intelligence Unit's Democracy Index Civil Liberties subscore.⁴ Because it is not part of the Open Budget Index review conducted by the International Budget Partnership, Denmark did not receive a score in this area.

All OGP participating governments must develop OGP country action plans that elaborate concrete commitments over an initial two-year period. Governments should begin their action plans by sharing existing efforts related to a set of five "grand challenges," including specific open government strategies and ongoing programs. (See Section 4 for a list of grand challenge areas.) Action plans should then set out each government's OGP commitments, which stretch government practice beyond its current baseline with respect to the relevant grand challenge. These commitments may build on existing efforts, identify new steps to complete ongoing reforms, or initiate action in an entirely new area.

Along with the other cohort 2 OGP countries, Denmark developed its national action plan from January through April 2012. The effective start date for the action plan submitted in April was officially never set but was meant to be for the span of 2012.⁵ Denmark published its self-assessment in September 2013. According to the OGP schedule,⁶ officials and civil society members are to revise the first plan or develop a new plan by April 2014, with consultation beginning January 2014. At the time of writing (November 2013), the second national action plan had been published⁷ after an open hearing on the public hearing portal. The government specified that the action plan was to be a one-year plan, so it does not include specific deadlines for individual commitments; but all commitments are to be seen as having a deadline following the expiration of the first action plan.

Pursuant to OGP requirements, the Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) of OGP partnered with an experienced, independent local researcher to carry out an evaluation of the development and implementation of the country's first action plan. In Denmark, the IRM partnered with Mads Kæmsgaard Eberholst, a journalist and teaching associate professor at Roskilde University, who authored this progress report. It is the aim of the IRM to inform ongoing dialogue around development and implementation of future commitments in each OGP participating country.

Institutional Context

Lars Løkke Rasmussen, Danish prime minister from 2009 to 2011, declared Denmark's intent to join the OGP.⁸ After the general election in September 2011, newly elected Prime Minister Helle Thorning-Schmidt formally took over the OGP and placed it in the newly created Agency for Digitisation (AFD) under the Ministry of Finance (MOF).⁹

The AFD has been the leading office with Cathrine Lippert as the lead official for OGP. Work on the action plan itself did not commence until January 2012¹⁰ with a public hearing in February.¹¹ According to the government, this delay was due to a major reorganisation of key government agencies and their fields of responsibility. The action plan was done on schedule by April 2012. The input to the hearing was mostly from public offices that proposed existing projects to be included in the action plan. This is also reflected in many of the commitments as they, according to the action plan, are taken from the Danish e-Government Strategy for 2011–2015.¹² In the action plan, it is also noted that all of the commitments are based on existing efforts that pre-dated entry in the OGP. The IRM researcher agrees, except where otherwise noted in this report.

There has been little focus on the OGP work from other agencies and ministries in Denmark. Although the Ministry of Economic Affairs does take ownership of the OGP on its Web site,¹³ there has been no mention in the Danish media or elsewhere of the OGP in conjunction with any of the other Danish agencies or ministries besides the AFD.

Methodological Note

IRM researchers review two key documents provided by the national governments: the first national action plan¹⁴ and the government's draft self-assessment of the first action plan process.¹⁵ To gather the voices of multiple stakeholders, the IRM researcher organized two stakeholder forums, in Copenhagen and Aarhus, which were conducted with an organizing agenda but without a specified research model. For those sources invited that were unable to attend the meetings, phone interviews were conducted in many cases. The IRM researcher also reviewed two key documents prepared by the government: a report on Denmark's first action plan¹⁶ and the self-assessment published by the government in September 2013.¹⁷ Numerous references are made to these documents throughout this report. To widen the research even further, a total of 628 people or organisations were invited to participate in an online survey. In this survey, all of the Danish commitments were reviewed.

Summaries of the stakeholder meetings and the frequency of responses to the online survey, as well as a list of organisations consulted, are given in the Annex.

For additional documentation, please visit the document library at <http://bit.ly/1cbFi3b>

¹ Interview with Cathrine Lippert.

² <http://www.right2info.org/laws/constitutional-provisions-laws-and-regulations#section-33>

³ Simeon Djankov, Rafael La Porta, Florencio Lopez-de-Silanes, and Andrei Shleifer, "Disclosure by Politicians," (working paper 2009-60, 2009, Tuck School of Business): <http://bit.ly/19nDEfK>; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), "Types of Information Decision Makers Are Required to Formally Disclose, and Level Of Transparency," in *Government at a Glance 2009*, (OECD, 2009). <http://bit.ly/13vGtqS>; Ricard Messick, "Income and Asset Disclosure by World Bank Client Countries" (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2009). <http://bit.ly/1clokyf>

⁴ Economist Intelligence Unit, "Democracy Index 2010: Democracy in Retreat" *Economist*, 2010).

Available at: <http://bit.ly/eLC1rE>

⁵ Interview with Cathrine Lippert.

⁶ <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/attachments/OGP%20Calendar%20For%20All%20Countries.docx>

⁷ http://www.digst.dk/Styring/~media/Files/Styring/Danmark_Open%20Government%20Handlingsplan%202013-2014_DA_1-sidet%20print.pdf

⁸ <http://www.ft.dk/Folketinget/findMedlem/VLALR.aspx>

⁹ Interview with Cathrine Lippert.

¹⁰ Interview with Cathrine Lippert.

¹¹ <http://hoeringsportalen.dk/Hearing/Details/16324>

¹² <http://www.digst.dk/ServiceMenu/English/Policy-and-Strategy/eGOV-strategy>

¹³ <http://oim.dk/arbejdsomraader/offentlig-fornyelse-og-velfaerdspolitik/open-government.aspx>

¹⁴ <http://bit.ly/17mdRFp>

¹⁵ <http://bit.ly/1c6Iq1U>

¹⁶ <http://bit.ly/18TBQwB>

¹⁷ <http://bit.ly/1gvUwXR>

II. PROCESS: DEVELOPMENT OF ACTION PLAN

While an extensive list of stakeholders was invited to participate in the public hearing regarding the development of the OGP action plan, it is unclear how the comments received were taken into consideration.

Countries participating in OGP follow a set process for consultation during development of their OGP action plan. According to the OGP Articles of Governance, countries must:

- Make the details of their public consultation process and timeline available (online at minimum) prior to the consultation
- Consult widely with the national community, including civil society and the private sector; seek out a diverse range of views and; make a summary of the public consultation and all individual written comment submissions available online
- Undertake OGP awareness raising activities to enhance public participation in the consultation
- Consult the population with sufficient forewarning and through a variety of mechanisms—including online and through in-person meetings—to ensure the accessibility of opportunities for citizens to engage.

A fifth requirement, during consultation, is set out in the OGP Articles of Governance. This requirement is dealt with in the section “III: Consultation during implementation”:

- Countries are to identify a forum to enable regular multi-stakeholder consultation on OGP implementation—this can be an existing entity or a new one.

This is dealt with in the next section, but evidence for consultation both before and during implementation is included here and in Table 1 for ease of reference.

Table 1: Action Plan Consultation Process

| Phase of Action Plan | OGP Process Requirement (Articles of Governance Section) | Did the government meet this requirement? |
|----------------------|--|---|
| During Development | Timeline and process: Prior availability | Yes |
| | Timeline: Online | Yes |
| | Timeline: other channels | No |
| | Timeline: Links | http://hoeringsportalen.dk/Hearing/Details/15407 |
| | Advance notice | Yes |
| | Advance notice: Days | 26 |
| | Advance notice: Adequacy | Yes |
| | Awareness-raising activities | Yes |

| | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| | Online consultations | Yes |
| | Online consultations: Link | http://hoeringsportalen.dk/Hearing/Details/15407 |
| | In-person consultations | No |
| | Summary of comments | Yes |
| | Summary of comments: Link | http://digitaliser.dk/resource/2289079 |
| During Implementation | Regular forum | Yes |

Advance Notice of Consultation

Public consultation of the OGP was conducted at the official hearing portal of Denmark (hoeringsportalen.dk), where all hearing materials can still be downloaded. Invited stakeholders included nongovernmental organisations (NGOs), agencies, and ministries as well as private-sector companies and private persons. Although there were only a few hearing answers from NGOs and private-sector companies, responses from the online survey and stakeholders at meetings found the level of answers satisfying and representative of the society's views.

The Agency for Digitisation (AFD) also used the pre-existing online forum Web site digitaliser.dk in the OGP. The public consultation comments are available on a section of the Web site that was set up for the OGP. For development of the action plan, the government also used social media responses.

A forum allowing direct contact with government officials and other stakeholders in the OGP is also available on digitaliser.dk.

Quality and Breadth of Consultation

The government invited around 470 people to participate in the original consultation hearing of the action plan. The list of invitees included all municipalities, regions, agencies, ministries, private companies, NGOs, and private persons. The hearing list was compounded using previous hearing lists the subject matter of which somewhat matched OGP values. As a result, the hearing list was very long. Internally at the AFD, it is sometimes referred to as "the longest hearing list ever." The hearing list is available online.¹

The government also announced the hearing via social media as well as digitaliser.dk, where many people interested in openness and transparency were already present.

The comments received represented a wide and diverse array of the invited people from the hearing list, even though only 27 responses (5 percent) were received. The low response rate was expected, as the hearing list was very long. Hearing answers were perceived by the government not so much as inputs to a broad plan but, rather as suggestions for inclusion of existing projects in the action plan.²

The action plan was developed by the AFD without including stakeholders directly but with some contact over social media, according to the self-assessment report. There was no dialogue directly with stakeholders. The development of the plan in such a manner after an open hearing is customary in Denmark.

According to interviewed stakeholders, one of the positive outcomes of the consultation was that it showed people working with open government issues in one part of the country that other people and indeed the country as a whole were engaged in the same issues. When the action plan went into open hearing, it became clear for stakeholders from different municipalities and regions of the country that other officials were working on plans similar to theirs.

As noted above, while the list of consulted stakeholders was extensive, there was no dialogue between government and civil society during development of the action plan. The IRM researcher would recommend a more meaningful dialogue for the development of future action plans.

¹ <http://prodstoragehoeringspo.blob.core.windows.net/ae321723-d10f-45fb-a42f-5ee1563370bb/H%C3%B8ringsliste.pdf>

² Interview with Cathrine Lippert.

III. PROCESS: CONSULTATION DURING IMPLEMENTATION

Although an online forum was created to discuss implementation of the action plan in Denmark, stakeholders saw it as insufficient and with little uptake.

As part of their participation in OGP, governments commit to identify a forum to enable regular multi-stakeholder consultation on OGP implementation—this can be an existing entity or a new one. This section summarizes that information.

Consultation Process

During the implementation of the action plan, the Web page digitaliser.dk was used to openly discuss OGP and share thoughts and ideas as well as documents and software.¹ Given the online nature of the forum, there have been no geographical or scheduling issues, but participation in the forum has been very sparse.² In the course of the action plan, stakeholders had the chance to gather at the Open Government Camp, an open participation conference on open government (reviewed as commitment #7), although not all stakeholders present at stakeholder meetings were aware of the existence of the Open Government Camp.

In addition, many local forums and working groups were created. Some of these are mentioned in the self-assessment (for instance, the Smart Aarhus commitment).

Some of the interviewed stakeholders indicated that the online forum was not seen as a viable solution for keeping contact with each other although they did not provide a reason for wanting to do so. They did, however, use the forum to communicate with government officials. Others indicated that contact between the people working on each commitment was not necessary, the reason for the latter being that many of the commitments are driven by public offices concentrating on their own part of the action plan and not caring about the scope of the entire OGP.

¹ Interview with Cathrine Lippert.

² <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/OGP%20Self-Assessment%202012.pdf>

IV. IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITMENTS

All OGP participating governments develop OGP country action plans that elaborate concrete commitments over an initial two-year period. Governments begin their OGP country action plans by sharing existing efforts related to their chosen grand challenge(s), including specific open government strategies and ongoing programs. Action plans then set out governments' OGP commitments, which stretch government practice beyond its current baseline with respect to the relevant policy area. These commitments may build on existing efforts, identify new steps to complete ongoing reforms, or initiate action in an entirely new area.

OGP commitments are to be structured around a set of five “grand challenges” that governments face. OGP recognizes that all countries are starting from different baselines. Countries are charged with selecting the grand challenges and related concrete commitments that most relate to their unique country contexts. No action plan, standard, or specific commitments are to be forced on any country.

The five OGP grand challenges are

Improving Public Services—measures that address the full spectrum of citizen services including health, education, criminal justice, water, electricity, telecommunications, and any other relevant service areas by fostering public service improvement or private-sector innovation.

Increasing Public Integrity—measures that address corruption and public ethics, access to information, campaign finance reform, and media and civil society freedom.

More Effectively Managing Public Resources—measures that address budgets, procurement, natural resources, and foreign assistance.

Creating Safer Communities—measures that address public safety, the security sector, disaster and crisis response, and environmental threats.

Increasing Corporate Accountability—measures that address corporate responsibility on issues such as the environment, anti-corruption, consumer protection, and community engagement.

While the nature of concrete commitments under any grand challenge area should be flexible and allow for each country's unique circumstances, OGP commitments should be relevant to OGP values laid out in the OGP Articles of Governance and Open Government Declaration signed by all OGP participating countries. The IRM uses the following guidance to evaluate relevance to core open government values:

- **Access to information**—these commitments
 - pertain to government-held information;
 - are not restricted to data but pertain to all information;
 - may cover proactive or reactive releases of information;
 - may pertain to strengthening the right to information; and
 - must provide open access to information (it should not be privileged or internal only to government).

- **Citizen Participation**—governments seek to mobilise citizens to engage in public debate, provide input, and make contributions that lead to more responsive, innovative, and effective governance. Commitments around access to information
 - open up decision making to all interested members of the public; such forums are usually “top-down” in that they are created by government (or actors empowered by government) to inform decision making;
 - often include elements of access to information to ensure meaningful input of interested members of the public into decisions;
 - often include the enhancing citizens' right to be heard, but do not necessarily include the right to be heeded.
- **Accountability**—there are rules, regulations, and mechanisms in place that call upon government actors to justify their actions, act upon criticisms or requirements made of them, and accept responsibility for failure to perform with respect to laws or commitments.
 - As part of open government, such commitments have an "open" element, meaning that they are not purely internal systems of accountability without a public face.
- **Technology and Innovation**—commitments for technology and innovation
 - promote new technologies offer opportunities for information sharing, public participation, and collaboration;
 - should make more information public in ways that enable people to both understand what their governments do and to influence decisions;
 - may commit to supporting the ability of governments and citizens to use technology for openness and accountability; and
 - may support the use of technology by government employees and citizens alike.

Countries may focus their commitments at the national, local and/or subnational level—wherever they believe their open government efforts are to have the greatest impact.

Recognizing that achieving open government commitments often involves a multi-year process, governments should attach time frames and benchmarks to their commitments that indicate what is to be accomplished each year, wherever possible.

This section details each of the commitments Denmark included in its initial action plan.

A number of the commitments have a single milestone, while others have multiple milestones. In the latter cases, the milestones have been evaluated together in a single fact sheet in order to avoid repetition and to make the reading of the text easier for OGP stakeholders.

While most indicators given on each commitment fact sheet are self-explanatory, a number of indicators for each commitment deserve further explanation.

- **Relevance:** The IRM researcher evaluated each commitment for its relevance to OGP values and OGP grand challenges.
 - **OGP values:** Some OGP commitments are unclear in their relationship to OGP values. In order to identify such cases, the IRM researcher made a judgment based on a close reading of the commitment text. This identifies commitments that can better articulate their relationship to fundamental issues of openness.

- Grand challenges: While some commitments may be relevant to more than one grand challenge, the reviewer only marked those that had been identified by government (as almost all commitments address a grand challenge).
- Ambition:
 - *Potential impact*: OGP countries are expected to make ambitious commitments (with new or pre-existing activities) that stretch government practice beyond an existing baseline. To contribute to a broad definition of ambition, the IRM researcher judged how potentially transformative a commitment might be in the policy area. This is based on researcher's findings and experience as a public policy expert.
 - *New or pre-existing*: The IRM researcher also recorded, in a non-judgmental fashion whether a commitment was based on an action that predated the action plan.
- Timing:
 - *Projected completion*: The OGP Articles of Governance encourage countries to put forth commitments with clear deliverables with suggested annual milestones. In cases where this information is not available, the IRM researcher makes a best judgment, based on the evidence of how far the commitment could possibly be at the end of the period assessed.

1. Online OGP Community

To support the overall OGP work, an online community forum will be created as a meeting place for civil servants and others engaged in open government activities. The forum will support knowledge sharing and collaboration, the documentation and continued development of the Danish OGP portfolio of initiatives, and it will provide a platform for engaging civil society as a whole.

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| Answerability | Lead institution | Agency for Digitisation (AFD) | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | None | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | No | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | High (commitment language provides clear, measurable, verifiable milestones for achievement of the goal) | | | | |
| Relevance | OGP grand challenges | Improving public services, more effectively managing public resources | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | | | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| Pre-existing | | Minor (the commitment is an incremental but positive step in the relevant policy area) | | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Substantial |
| April 2012 | | April 2013 | | Projected completion | | Complete |
| Next steps | | | | | | |
| New commitment building on existing implementation | | | | | | |

What happened?

The AFD used part of the pre-existing Web site digitaliser.dk to set up an online forum where it is possible to engage in debates, download relevant material, and discuss the OGP.

The online forum was not used very frequently and was not used by many people, mainly due to the reasons listed below. The government self-assessment indicates that much of the discussion on OGP has been on social media using hashtags suggested by the AFD.¹

The stakeholders pointed out that the forum is not visited enough, and they lack interest in doing so due to its poor layout, the troublesome process of logging in, and an outdated forum style.

Did it matter?

The online forum is a first step in creating a platform for participants in open government in Denmark. The value of openly discussing OGP issues and allowing a broad spectrum of people to participate in the discussion is valuable.

It is noted on the forum that an open dialogue is not always preferred because it can prevent people from critiquing superiors, etc.² This was, however, not the opinion of the of stakeholders at meetings; they did not see this as an issue.

At the stakeholder meetings, many indicated that they had not heard of the forum and never had visited it. It is vital for the existence of such a forum that stakeholders and other interested parties are aware of its existence.

Moving forward

Interviewed stakeholders suggested expanding the government online forum with a forum elsewhere. For instance, it could be some pre-existing social network like LinkedIn or Facebook, accompanied by an IM channel on Skype, Lync, or Google.³

Government should widely advertise the existence of the forum to relevant stakeholders, and the stakeholders should see the benefits of using the forum to both share and gather information about the OGP in Denmark. For now, there is no real reason to use the forum to share experiences. Therefore, the use of the forum and the content on the forum are limited and of little value to stakeholders. A spirit and feeling of a thriving online community could change this.

¹ <http://digitaliser.dk/news/2505601>

² <http://bit.ly/1bqYujk>

³ <http://bit.ly/1bIRa1D>

2. Online OGP Handbook for Public Authorities and Institutions

Information and guidelines on how to develop and implement OGP initiatives and activities will be provided in an online format to help public authorities and institutions launch open government projects and successfully integrate open government practices into their routines. Ultimately, this material will constitute a handbook or “toolkit” for open government related work.

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Answerability | Lead institution | Agency for Digitisation (AFD) | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | None | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | No | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | Medium (commitment language describes an activity that is objectively verifiable but does not contain specific milestones or deliverables) | | | | |
| Relevance | OGP grand challenges | Improving public services; more effectively managing public resources | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| New | | Minor (the commitment is an incremental but positive step in the relevant policy area) | | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Complete |
| April 2012 | | April 2013 | | Projected completion | | Complete |
| Next steps | | | | | | |
| Further work on basic implementation | | | | | | |

What happened?

The handbook is online at digitaliser.dk.¹ This Web page is not specifically designed for the handbook or the OGP forum reviewed in commitment 1. The handbook itself contains information relevant to those agencies or other public offices that wish to work with OGP.

According to the government’s self-assessment, all material in the handbook was created by the AFD.

Did it matter?

The existence of an online handbook is valuable to all offices wishing to engage in OGP. In the Danish context it is very relevant, containing short and precise information about how to engage in providing open data and access to information for the public.

An online handbook seems a good method for easily distributing vital information to interested parties. The government's self-assessment states that there are no statistics regarding the use of the handbook itself. Therefore, it is hard to determine whether the handbook is a tool that is widely used.

Stakeholders at the meetings did not know about the handbook. Many did not know the URL for the page and were unable to find it even after trying to do a Web search for it. The online survey suggests that many believe the information in the handbook is somewhat outdated and also indicates that the use of a static Web page with too much information flow seems to be the wrong way to engage people in the OGP.

Moving forward

One of the problems with the online handbook seems to be its static nature. It is provided as a manual; but, as with many manuals, it is not something that seems to be read from top to bottom. Therefore, the AFD could make the handbook a more living tool, giving people engaged in OGP a way to share their stories and include references about their OGP work. This would also support commitment #1.

The handbook itself is too hard to find. A specific Web page with its own domain name could be a way to make the handbook and the forum more useful and easier to find. It would seem that a basic statistic on the use of this Web site would also be something that would be useful in future measurements of its use.

¹ <http://digitaliser.dk/news/2289414>

3. Management Labs and New Forms of Co-operation

The Central Denmark Regional Authority in partnership with municipalities and businesses will collaborate on new ways to involve citizens, employees and other stakeholders through “management labs” where stakeholders will participate in decision-making and the development of prototypes and large scale experiments.

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Answerability | Lead institution | Central Denmark Regional Authority | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | None | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | Yes | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | Medium (commitment language describes an activity that is objectively verifiable but does not contain specific milestones or deliverables) | | | | |
| Relevance | OGP grand challenges | Improving public services | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | | | | ✓ | | |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| Pre-existing | | Transformative (the commitment entails a reform that could potentially transform business as usual in the relevant policy area) | | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Complete |
| April 2012 | | April 2013 | | Projected completion | | Complete |
| Next steps | | | | | | |
| New commitment building on existing implementation | | | | | | |

What happened?

The commitment relates to identifying new ways to involve citizens and other stakeholders in the decision-making process. It will do so in management labs. Such a lab was, according to the self-assessment, held at Open Government Camp in 2012 (see commitment #7).

During the lab, participants identified a number of new ways to involve the public in the health, employment, and social areas. This included two main ideas regarding collaboration with socio-economic businesses and creating a “citizen dashboard.” More information is

available in the report for the lab itself.¹ These areas were selected because the lead institutions experienced that this is a hard area for the public to navigate.

Did it matter?

Engaging the public in the OGP is vital. Prototyping ways of doing this is through labs as this is a good way of testing out ideas on a small scale.

The online survey² shows broad confusion about the relevance of the lab specifically aimed at the health, employment, and social services area. The survey results indicated that it would be more relevant to split these up into smaller, more targeted areas. The survey also revealed that it was hard to gather enough relevant people to actually hold the lab on the Open Government Camp.

Moving forward

The lab held at Open Government Camp revealed opportunities. It would be interesting to see these opportunities used in a relevant real-world context. These opportunities should also be shareable in the forum and handbook reviewed in commitments #1 and #2. In this regard, government should pay special attention to making outcomes of specific labs usable in different contexts.

¹ Full Danish report: <http://bit.ly/18S5P7Y> English summary: <http://bit.ly/1hXI4AI>

² <http://bit.ly/1bIRa1D>

4 & 27. Consultation and Transparency of Development Aid Programmes

Public consultations regarding the design of development aid programmes

In connection with the forthcoming new law on foreign aid and development assistance, the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs will conduct public hearings on the design of future foreign aid programmes, allowing citizens and civil society to contribute input and suggestions to key development assistance issues and budgets of a certain size.

Transparency in foreign aid programmes

In 2012, the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs will launch a comprehensive transparency initiative that will present to Danish citizens as well as to partner countries detailed information about all foreign aid and development assistance projects and programmes

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|----------------|-------------------------------------|------|
| Answerability | Lead institution | Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | None | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | Yes | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | High (commitment language provides clear, measurable, verifiable milestones for achievement of the goal) | | | | |
| Relevance | OGP grand challenges | More effectively managing public resources | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | Design aid programmes | | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| | Transparency in aid | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| Milestone | New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | |
| Design aid programmes | Pre-existing | | Minor (the commitment is an incremental but positive step in the relevant policy area) | | | |
| Transparency in aid | Pre-existing | | Moderate (the commitment is a major step forward in the relevant policy area but remains limited in scale or scope) | | | |

| Level of completion | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------|
| Design aid programmes | | | |
| Start date: April 2012 | End date: None | Actual completion | Complete |
| | | Projected completion | Complete |
| Level of completion | | | |
| Transparency in aid | | | |
| Start date: April 2012 | End date: April 2013 | Actual completion | Complete |
| | | Projected completion | Complete |
| Next steps | | | |
| Design aid programmes | Further work on basic implementation | | |
| Transparency in aid | Maintenance and monitoring of completed implementation | | |

What happened?

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs launched a portal, Danida Transparency, on the Internet in January 2013.¹ The portal aims to open up the hearing process on new grants and new strategies in the preparatory phase of foreign aid programs. The portal also contains a corruption hotline as well as access to a database² where information on foreign aid projects can be accessed.

The portal is open for input from both national and international parties. In contrast to the Danish hearing portal, which is only in Danish, this portal allows for answers from international parties because it is in English. Answers received are public and viewable. Prior to the opening of the portal, no public hearing was performed on the distribution of the grants from Danida. The government self-assessment indicates that the use of the portal primarily has been by Danes.

Work is ongoing and ahead of schedule to give the public access to more information and to make the portal more searchable

Did it matter?

Stakeholders view as positive any steps to give access to government-held information.

Public hearings by ministries are mandatory in Denmark.³ For this purpose, the public hearing⁴ portal was created. The public portal is accessible from abroad. However, using a special portal for foreign hearings seems like a good step as the public hearing portal is in Danish and does not offer English translation.

A common problem with both the hearing portal and the foreign aid portal is that it is not clear how the answers collected are used, although these are not visible on the public hearing portal.

Moving forward

The government self-assessment indicates that the visitors to the portal primarily have been Danish. This is backed up by findings in the online survey. As the portal mainly

differentiates itself from the public hearing portal by wanting to involve the receiving end of the aid, it is problematic that that end does not participate. Therefore stakeholders recommend that the government take steps to ensure that foreign actors are made aware of the existence of the foreign aid portal.

The publication of hearing responses is a positive step, but more transparency on how these are used in the decision-making process would be valuable. This would apply to all public hearings on the hearing portal of Denmark. This could be achieved by publishing both the hearing answers and information on their use.

The implementation of a more searchable database and the future addendum of even more information to “Danida transparency” seems promising. The IRM researcher recommends that work be done to ensure that initiatives like this are brought to more offices in government, perhaps to all offices and organisations receiving public funds.

¹ <http://um.dk/en/danida-en/about-danida/danida-transparency/public-consultations/>

² <http://um.dk/da/danida/det-goer-vi/program-og-projektorientering-ppo/>

³ <http://hoeringsportalen.dk/About>

⁴ <http://hoeringsportalen.dk/>

5: Innovate with Aarhus

Aarhus Municipality will launch the innovation programme “Innovate With Aarhus” to encourage new approaches to public services provision by creating good conditions for broad collaboration, by earmarking funds for innovation and by highlighting best cases. This initiative aims to increase the innovative capacity and efficiency of Aarhus Municipality and to help develop new services for citizens.

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Answerability | Lead institution | Aarhus Municipality | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | None | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | Yes | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | Medium (commitment language describes an activity that is objectively verifiable but does not contain specific milestones or deliverables) | | | | |
| Relevance | OGP grand challenges | Improving public services | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | | | ✓ | | | |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| Pre-existing | | Moderate (the commitment is a major step forward in the relevant policy area but remains limited in scale or scope) | | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Complete |
| April 2012 | | April 2013 | | Projected completion | | Complete |
| Next steps | | | | | | |
| Maintenance and monitoring of completed implementation | | | | | | |

What happened?

In Spring 2012, Aarhus Municipality committed to make available 40 million DKK annually¹ for innovation projects on one of seven strategic themes: inclusion and citizenship, technology for welfare, digitization, mobility, innovation culture, health care, and absence due to illness.² The goal of the commitment was to inspire new projects and collaborations with the municipality from both public offices and civil society.

The government self-assessment states that, so far, 15 projects have received support from the innovation pool; and at the time of writing (November 2013) a new round of applications for the pool is being processed. The innovation pool is expected to persist for years to come.³

Did it matter?

As currently written, it is not clear if the innovation projects are directly relevant to OGP grand challenges and/or values. Aarhus Municipality has decided to “stop thinking business as usual” and believe and support out-of-the-box solutions.⁴ This is a promising step when trying to support innovation and new ways of thinking about public service and participation. The online survey also points out that it can be hard to re-use innovation from this pool in a national or other local context.

Moving forward

Maintaining the innovation pool could include a direct connection to OGP values and challenges. It is also vital to ensure that innovation projects that are already running are not abandoned if the innovation pool should stop supporting this project.

¹ <http://bit.ly/1eQ6wj9>

² <http://www.innovationiaarhus.dk/da/Information.aspx>

³ Stakeholder meeting and self-assessment.

⁴ <http://www.innovationiaarhus.dk/da/Information.aspx>

6, 11, 12, 13 & 14. Citizen Self-services

Increasing the use of user ratings in the citizen's portal borger.dk

The public citizens' portal borger.dk will implement user assessment and comment functionality on self-service solutions and other content in the portal. The goal is to utilise user inputs as a support for the continuous improvement of borger.dk and related services, including services provided by third parties. Ratings and comments will be made available for public authorities, ICT developers and citizens to drive and support innovation.

Binding guidelines for self-service solutions

The public sector must exploit digital technologies to provide citizens with easy-to-use and efficient self-service solutions. To support the improvement of existing solutions and the development of new user-friendly solutions a set of guidelines on usability, accessibility, language, design, security, and the re-use of data will be published in 2012.

Guidance and information on accessibility to digital solutions

To ensure that digital content and services are useable for all citizens, accessibility for persons with various disabilities must be addressed. The Danish Agency for Digitisation will provide information and guidance to public authorities on relevant guidelines and standards for ICT accessibility.

Peer-to-peer learning programmes to help citizens use digital self-service

In collaboration with public libraries, community groups and volunteers, e.g., under the auspices of the Senior Citizens Association, information and peer-to-peer learning programmes will be implemented to help citizens and businesses obtain basic computer skills and learn to use digital self-service. Supporting the government's goal of "full digitisation" for citizens in 2015 and for businesses in 2013, new target groups can be reached, and information and guidance can be provided in various ways which match those groups' needs through a broad collaborative effort.

Location-based content and re-use of content in borger.dk

The citizen's portal borger.dk will be further developed to become the citizens' secure and easy access to public self-service solutions and to personalised information on housing, health, taxation, rights and duties, etc. Functionality will be added to support location-specific content which provides citizens with information that is specifically relevant to each individual user's location (i.e. in a municipality). A content export feature will also be implemented to make possible re-use of portal content in other public Web sites across the public sector.

| Commitment Description | | |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| A n s w e r a b i l i t y | Lead institution | Agency for Digitisation (AFD) |
| | Supporting institutions | Borger.dk |
| | Point of contact specified? | Yes |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|--|-------------|
| Specificity and measurability | | High (commitment language provides clear, measurable, verifiable milestones for achievement of the goal) | | | | |
| R e l e v a n c e | OGP grand challenges | Improving public services, more effectively managing public resources | | | | |
| | OGP values | | | | | |
| | Milestones | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | User rating | | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| | Binding guidelines | ✓ | | | | |
| | Accessibility | | | | | ✓ |
| | Peer learning | | | | | ✓ |
| | Location-based content | | | | | ✓ |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| Milestones | New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | |
| 1. User rating | Pre-existing | | Minor (the commitment is an incremental but positive step in the relevant policy area) | | | |
| 2. Binding guidelines | Pre-existing | | None (the commitment maintains the status quo) | | | |
| 3. Accessibility | Pre-existing | | None (the commitment maintains the status quo) | | | |
| 4. Peer learning | Pre-existing | | Minor (the commitment is an incremental but positive step in the relevant policy area) | | | |
| 5. Location-based content | Pre-existing | | Minor (the commitment is an incremental but positive step in the relevant policy area) | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| User rating | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Limited |
| April 2012 | | 28 August 2013 | | Projected completion | | Complete |

| Binding guidelines | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Start date: April 2012 | End date: April 2013 | Actual completion | Complete |
| | | Projected completion | Complete |
| Accessibility | | | |
| Start date: April 2012 | End date: April 2013 | Actual completion | Substantial |
| | | Projected completion | Complete |
| Peer learning | | | |
| Start date: April 2012 | End date: April 2013 | Actual completion | Substantial |
| | | Projected completion | Complete |
| Location-based content | | | |
| Start date: April 2012 | End date: Ongoing | Actual completion | Limited |
| | | Projected completion | Complete |
| Next steps | | | |
| 1. User rating | Further work on basic implementation | | |
| 2. Binding guidelines | Maintenance and monitoring of completed implementation | | |
| 3. Accessibility | New commitment building on existing implementation | | |
| 4. Peer learning | New commitment building on existing implementation | | |
| 5. Location-based content | None: abandon commitment | | |

What happened?

Self-service solutions are a big part of the e-Government strategy for 2011–2015¹ when they will be made mandatory for a variety of public services.² A complete list of services and dates for implementation of mandatory services is available online.³

Borger.dk is referred to as the entrance to public administration. From this Web site, Danes are able to perform most of public services tasks in digital form. The user has a personal page and from here it is possible to navigate further into specific public services such as tax, day care, school etc. For many of these services and according to the e-Government strategy of Denmark,⁴ it is now mandatory to use digital tools.

In order to facilitate citizens' use of Borger.dk, the pilot project "Your opinion counts"⁵ was launched on 1 July 2012 and is in the review period. During this period, 7,583 users reviewed the public portal, and 3,657 proposals were received. The government self-assessment states that proposals tended to focus on user-specific issues rather than on general issues with borger.dk.

Prior to the OGP action plan, there was no measure of user satisfaction and no easy way to propose new features on borger.dk. An initiative like this was highly welcomed by stakeholders and respondents of the online survey. The government self-assessment states that it expects to try out and put in place a permanent way of implementing user ratings in 2014.

To ensure easy access by citizens to these new mandatory online digital tools, on 30 April 2013, and not in 2012 as indicated in the action plan, government published the first version of a guideline for self-service solutions.⁶ The guide is available both online and in print format.⁷ It contains 24 requirements that self-service applications must fulfill. These requirements are primarily directed at the front end of applications to ensure that they do not vary too much in standard and function from one another.

Two additional initiatives were started by government to ensure that all citizens can easily make the transition to self-service by the 2015 deadline:

1. The AFD made sure that public authority Web sites complied with the WCAG 2.0⁸ standard for accessibility for people with disabilities. Furthermore, the government self-assessment states that mappings of accessibility on public Web sites are carried out every second year. The latest of these was performed in 2012. According to the government self-assessment, it appears that accessibility has improved on an ongoing basis although some challenges still persist.

The AFD has also started networks with representatives from both local and government offices to discuss how to improve accessibility on a local level. The AFD also worked with various organisations for the disabled in Denmark.

Stakeholders in the online survey did not mention any large-scale problems for the disabled in using public Web sites.

2. A network called “Learn more about it” was established in 2009.⁹ The network is about helping citizens obtain basic computer skills so that they can make use of the online services.

In 2013, the network comprised approximately 20 organisations, covering the spectrum of organisations with activities or an interest in the population’s computer skills and use of public digital self-service solutions.

The government self-assessment states that the network has given assistance to approximately 525,000 citizens since its creation. In 2012, the network also launched the annual campaign “Senior Surf Day” where more than 8,200 elderly people learned to use the internet.

Stakeholders in the online survey found that the network is a well functioning entity and also noted that a regional initiative by the union of municipalities called “Digital Ambassadors”¹⁰ is supporting its use.

Lastly, the government self-assessment states that by August 2013 the number of municipalities with location-specific content was 52 out of 98 or roughly half of the municipalities. This feature allows users to choose information relevant to their municipality upon logging into the Web site.

The government self-assessment also states that an API (Application Programming Interface) for access and export of information on borger.dk has been developed. It also mentions that there is a growing interest in using the location-based services on borger.dk, although no further clarification on this was provided.

Did it matter?

A government report from 2012¹¹ shows that 90 percent of Danes know about borger.dk and around 80 percent would use it for specific digital self service purposes. Therefore, it is important that borger.dk not be perceived as confusing or difficult to use.

However, while these commitments are viewed as important by the majority of stakeholders, as currently worded it is unclear how these initiatives relate to core OGP values of access to information, participation, and accountability. The core function of borger.dk seems to be in providing basic social services. In this regard, its key accountability function has been to centralise and simplify only the most basic contact information for each of the government services. While commendable, this may not be as transformative in terms of affecting governance on a practical level.

Even if this criticism is accurate, the work carried out under these commitments can still serve an important bridging function. In particular, the elderly and poor are prone to being left behind. In this regard, a solution like the network “Learn more about it” is a good way of reaching people who would otherwise be left behind and potentially unable to use mandatory self-service solutions. In turn, familiarity with self-service solutions might lead to the use of technologies for civic engagement, more clearly inline with OGP values, such as online participation and identifying public meetings.

While stakeholders praised the government for soliciting user feedback on the Web site, the survey was viewed as too long and confusing.

The binding guidelines were of particular interest to stakeholders in the online survey. Stakeholders pointed out that these standards would relieve administrative work in public offices as well as private-sector companies developing public Web sites in that they take the guesswork out of the development process. However, stakeholders also stressed that more attention should be brought to the existence of the guidelines, as some stakeholders were concerned that not everybody in the public sector knew about them.

With regard to the location-based content on borger.dk, one respondent in the online survey noted that the growing interest in using the location-based content is not always correct because some municipalities are developing solutions that can be found on borger.dk but in reality are kept with regional actors.

Stakeholders also noted that the regional-based content must be selected manually with a drop-down box when accessing borger.dk and that it could be done automatically instead. According to government, the Web page will select content automatically when the user is logged in. Due to the EU ‘Cookie Directive’¹² and data protection legislation¹³ the automatic tracking of IP addresses, such as suggested by stakeholders, would be illegal without the user logging in to borger.dk first.

Moving forward

In preparing for the transition to online public services, the IRM researcher recommends that the government take advantage of this opportunity to help citizens gain access to other types of services that would more closely match OGP values of access to information, public participation, and accountability. This would include

- Simplification of the user feedback process on Borger.dk. A small “post a message to developers” in a highly visible place on the Web site would be a more convenient solution. This recommendation also includes a more specific evaluation of the services included on borger.dk to make clear what citizens are providing feedback for.
- Setting-up social media monitoring and engaging in user dialogue on relevant social platforms.

- The binding guidelines should be reviewed periodically, so as to be up to date, embracing new standards for re-use of data and accessing self-service solutions. The Danish government has planned an update of the guidelines for 2014. According to the government, this update will also focus on input from stakeholders, thus advertising the self-service guideline further within both the public and private sectors.
- Inclusion of feedback from volunteers and pupils engaged in peer-to-peer learning. Their experiences are key to educating more people in a society with ever rising complexity in ICT.
- Expansion of the topics covered during peer-to-peer learning to ensure that citizens can access hearing portals and other tools to allow them to be more fully engaged in decision-making processes. They could also be shown how to make use of open data platforms provided by public offices.
- The “demand bank,” a Web page providing guidance and checklists regarding self-service solutions,¹⁴ could also include small code snippets related to specific guidelines. These could actually, but not per se, be a part of the reuse of open source software that is previously reviewed as commitment #10.

¹ <http://www.digst.dk/ServiceMenu/English/Policy-and-Strategy/eGOV-strategy>

² <https://www.borger.dk/Sider/Obligatorisk-selvbetjening.aspx>

³ <http://www.digst.dk/Digitaliseringsstrategi/Den-faellesoffentlig-digitaliseringsstrategi-2011-15/Overblik-over-boelgerne>

⁴ <http://www.digst.dk/ServiceMenu/English/Policy-and-Strategy/eGOV-strategy>

⁵ <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/PGGLJY2>

⁶ <http://bit.ly/1gaxdCX>

⁷ Guide, <http://bit.ly/1cdefnZ>

⁸ <http://www.w3.org/TR/2008/REC-WCAG20-20081211/>

⁹ <http://www.laermereomit.dk/omlaermereomit>

¹⁰ <http://www.digamb.dk/>

¹¹ Megafon, 2012, “Evaluering af Den fællesoffentlige kampagne vedr. digitale selvbetjeningsløsninger”, <http://bit.ly/1kf522N>

¹² <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32002L0058:EN:NOT>

¹³ <http://erhvervsstyrelsen.dk/lovgivning-og-vejledning>

¹⁴ <http://arkitekturguiden.digitaliser.dk/godselvbetjening/kravbanken>

7. Open Government Camp

Based on previous experience with similar initiatives, an “Open Government Camp” event will be organized where citizens, businesses and NGOs may collaborate with public authorities and institutions on developing ideas, concepts and functional solutions based on government data, open source software, digital tools and new methods of collaboration. The camp will explore how civil society and public authorities can work together on problem-solving in new ways and together exploit digital technologies to make public welfare services more open, efficient and innovative. At the same time, the camp will serve as inspiration for public bodies to organize their own similar events or, in other ways, initiate co-creation and citizen involvement projects and practices.

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| A n s w e r a b i l i t y | Lead institution | Agency for Digitisation (AFD) | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | None | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | No | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | High (commitment language provides clear, measurable, verifiable milestones for achievement of the goal) | | | | |
| R e l e v a n c e | OGP grand challenges | Improving public services | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | | | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| Pre-existing | | Minor (the commitment is an incremental but positive step in the relevant policy area) | | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Complete |
| April 2012 | | April 2013 | | Projected completion | | Complete |
| Next steps | | | | | | |
| New commitment building on existing implementation | | | | | | |

What happened?

An Open Government Camp was held on 25 September 2012.¹ Around 175 representatives of public-sector, private-sector and civil society organisations participated. A complete list

of attendees is available online.² A number of workshops were held,³ including some workshops with direct connection to other parts of this report, including many parts of the grouping on open data and also specifically on commitment #3 and commitment #10. These will be individually reviewed later.

The government self-assessment describes the camp as a work in progress and a “do-it-yourself” event. This is in harmony with the view of the stakeholders both online and in the online survey.

The Open Government Camp is returning as a part of the next Danish action plan.⁴

Did it matter?

Gathering of all interested people is valuable to creating a team spirit in a common project such as the OGP. Stakeholders pointed out that this camp was the only time that many of them were gathered in one place, which fostered a sense of the OGP as a common project.

Some stakeholders pointed out that they were unaware that the Open Government Camp was being held. Had they been aware, the majority would have liked to participate. The function of a real world forum is something that 73 percent of the respondents of the online survey find “important” or “very important.”

The camp also offered a way to bring together parts of both civil and public society as well as the private sector. The latter had difficulties seeing what the camp provided that could be of direct economical value to them. However, both NGOs and public- and private-sector participants did agree in the online survey that the camp was interesting and relevant.

Moving forward

The idea of the camp is a good way of gathering people and creating a vibrant OGP community in Denmark. The scope of this gathering should, however, extend beyond the camp itself. A possibility could be to make the camp a bit smaller but hold it two or more times per year. Another possibility would be to create follow-up discussion groups more locally.

It is important for all participants to be able to see the value of attending such a camp. Therefore, the outcome of workshops should be highly measurable and of value not only to public bodies but also to the private sector.

¹ <http://bit.ly/1eQ6wj9>

² Participants in Open Government Camp 2012, <http://bit.ly/193pLp1>

³ List of workshops, <http://digitaliser.dk/resource/2375999>

⁴ <http://bit.ly/1eQ6wj9>

8. Renewed Effort for Open Government Data

The government's 'Open Data Innovation Strategy' (ODIS) initiative will be continued as part of the common public sector e-government strategy 2011-2015 to allow the public easier access to more re-useable public data. Guidelines and assistance will be provided to help public authorities make their data available for re-use, the public "Data Catalogue" will be maintained, knowledge sharing and collaboration will be facilitated, and examples of re-use of open data will be documented and shared.

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Answerability | Lead institution | Agency for Digitisation (AFD) | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | None | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | No | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | Low (commitment language describes an activity that can be construed as measurable with some interpretation on the part of the reader) | | | | |
| Relevance | OGP grand challenges | | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| Pre-existing | | Moderate (the commitment is a major step forward in the relevant policy area but remains limited in scale or scope) | | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Limited |
| April 2012 | | April 2013 | | Projected completion | | Complete |
| Next steps | | | | | | |
| New commitment building on existing implementation | | | | | | |

What happened?

The Open Data Innovation Strategy (ODIS) lays out the basics for this commitment.¹ The ODIS is about opening, presenting, and structuring open government data. The AFD is using the Public Sector Information Directive² in its work with opening data. A revision thereof was done in 2013,³ and a revised Danish act is expected in 2014.

In the autumn of 2012, the Danish government entered into an agreement with local governments in Denmark and the Danish regions. This agreement made available for free basic data that was previously subject to a charge.⁴ This data included geodata, data on housing and water management, and corporate data.⁵

The stakeholders at both meetings pointed out that the basic data programme is of very high importance. This is supported in the online survey, where 92 percent of respondents answered that this is “important” or “very important” to the OGP work in Denmark.

The use and re-use of public data has been an issue in the Danish administration prior to this commitment, mainly because Danish offices in local administration and government bought the data from relevant offices. This practice meant that offices in administration sometimes did not buy new data⁶ but used older versions that they had already bought.

In terms of using basic data in the private sector, a report from the EU values the market for reuse of government data at around 27 billion euros.⁷ The Danish market value is not known but is thought to be substantial.

Stakeholders welcomed the free, open data. But they pointed out that a lot of data is still government-held. Especially that held by the Danish Statistics Agency where requesting simple data can be quite costly. It is worth noting that much data, though often not the newest datasets, are freely available on the agencies’ Web sites. Stakeholders also noted that much of the data still held by government are data that would be really valuable and interesting. This includes topographic sea charts, tax information, and environmental data.

The data catalogue is available online and contains links and descriptions of many public datasets.⁸

Did it matter?

Opening data and making data available for free is not a typical governing practice in Denmark. Therefore, transforming public data to open data is a work in progress. The ODIS and the public data catalogue are steps in the right direction.

Stakeholders described the basic data made available as a positive thing, and they value that some data are now free of charge. However, they also pointed out that the opened data are the low-hanging fruit; they are easy to open up, and most are of limited value and interest to stakeholders.

The data catalogue is described as problematic by the stakeholders, mainly because it is not maintained, and the data linked to in the catalogue often are missing (dead links) or in PDF or other locked formats. Therefore, much of the data in the catalogue does not comply with several definitions of open data, which, as in the definition from Open Gov Data,⁹ stresses that “data should be machine processable.”

Moving forward

The Danish Government and local administrations should ideally commit to opening data by default. Current governance practice is to open data only after a decision is made to do so. Obviously data should not be opened if the data do not comply with the PSI directive in terms of data containing personal information.

Furthermore, the AFD should create a platform for distributing data. This platform could be located on a Web site using a common distribution system like the CKAN. This platform is already used as a pan-European data catalogue and federation mechanism, developed as

part of the FP7-funded LOD2 project.¹⁰ The FP7 program supplies EU funding for the research-education-innovation triangle.¹¹

¹ <http://www.digst.dk/ServiceMenu/English/Policy-and-Strategy/Open-Data-Innovation-Strategy-ODIS>

² <https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=29235>

³ <http://bit.ly/1bKnAIY>

⁴ <http://bit.ly/18obAXR>

⁵ <http://www.digst.dk/Styring/PSI-loven>

⁶ Interview with Cathrine Lippert

⁷ MEPSIR, 2006, <http://www.epsiplatform.eu/reports/mepsir-measuring-european-public-sector-resources-report>

⁸ <http://data.digitaliser.dk/>

⁹ <http://www.opengovdata.org/home/8principles>

¹⁰ <http://ckan.org/case-studies/publicdata-eu/>

¹¹ http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/understand_en.html

9. Regional Initiative on Open Data

In partnership with municipalities and businesses, the Central Denmark Regional Authority will establish a regional public-private initiative to help realise the potentials associated with the re-use of data and better use of data. The initiative will be integrated with the regional authority's work on geographic information systems (GIS) and digital self-service solutions.

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Answerability | Lead institution | Central Denmark Regional Authority | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | Municipalities and businesses | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | Yes | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | Low (commitment language describes an activity that can be construed as measurable with some interpretation on the part of the reader) | | | | |
| Relevance | OGP grand challenges | Improving public services | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| New | | Moderate (the commitment is a major step forward in the relevant policy area but remains limited in scale or scope) | | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Complete |
| April 2012 | | April 2013 | | Projected completion | | Complete |
| Next steps | | | | | | |
| New commitment building on existing implementation | | | | | | |

What happened?

A regional open data platform was established and released on 9 April 2013.¹ Behind the Web site-initiative is a 30-person working group where around one-third of the members are from private-sector companies.²

At the time of writing, the platform contained 55 datasets made freely available. The platform is built on a combination of Drupal and CKAN (see commitment #8). Data are

regionalized and presented in open format, along with information about the publishing authority. However, in all but four cases,³ the data on the site are from public offices. The site also contains a forum and a Web form⁴ where users can present ideas about what data they want to see on the site.

Did it matter?

Open regional data is part of the open data mind-set. Therefore, many of the same problems exist here as in the previous commitment. Many of the data made available are not perceived as valuable, although much is noted as being interesting by the stakeholders.

The stakeholders at both meetings found that regional initiatives like this are of limited value because many datasets are not interesting nor relevant in regional form.

Moving forward

Stakeholders agreed that open data are valuable and would like to see more initiatives like this. However, they also noted that data in regionalised form are not valuable per se. Therefore, it might be possible to create a joint regional data catalogue, perhaps as part of a national data catalogue.

¹ <http://www.odaadk.dk/om-adaa>

² Interview with Bo Fristed.

³ Data provided by Hack4DK <http://www.odaadk.dk/dataset?organisation=hack4dk>

⁴ <http://www.odaadk.dk/community/idebank>

10. Re-use of Open Source Software in the Public Sector

The Public portal, "Software Exchange," where authorities can publish, share, and re-use open source software, will expand co-operation with the ICT industry associations to stimulate the development of open source software for the "Software Exchange" and support the re-use of existing open source software in the public sector.

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Answerability | Lead institution | Agency for Digitisation (AFD) | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | Municipality of Gribskov Municipality of Syddjurs Municipality of Ballerup Municipality of Ikast-Brande Danish Maritime Authority The 'Tagger' Project (tagger.dk) Municipality of Lyngby-Taarbæk Ministry of Science, Innovation and Higher Education Danish Geodata Agency Agency for Digitisation | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | No | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | Low (commitment language describes an activity that can be construed as measurable with some interpretation on the part of the reader) | | | | |
| Relevance | OGP grand challenges | More effectively managing public resources | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| Pre-existing | | Minor (the commitment is an incremental but positive step in the relevant policy area) | | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Limited |
| April 2012 | | April 2013 | | Projected completion | | Complete |

Next steps

Further work on basic implementation

What happened?

Prior to the OGP, an initiative called “Kod i ferien” (“Holiday Coding”) was launched. The purpose of this was to bring together students, software companies, and the public sector with the goal of creating open source software for public administration. A workshop centered around this initiative was held as part of the Open Government Camp reviewed in commitment #7.

The results of the workshop as well as other materials are available on the Web site created by the AFD.¹

Many participants and stakeholders praised this event as being very productive. However, many stakeholders in the online survey questioned the large-scale impact of it. In the online survey, 58 percent of the respondents stated that this commitment is less than 50 percent fulfilled, mainly because the holiday coding workshop is very limited in scope and because the software exchange is seen as limited.

Did it matter?

The use of open source software in the public sector can be a good solution to some problems in ICT but is not always the best.

Stakeholders from both the public and private sector responded in the online survey that the focus should be on the problem and not on open source software as a solution to the problem. That being said, open source software can potentially be a viable way of creating digital platforms because, as noted in a government paper prior to the OGP, it is highly re-usable.² Furthermore, Garner Group (a technology research and advisory company) noted that the use of open source software is a keystone in future IT projects.³

The Holiday Coding project is perceived as one of many ways to expose future developers of ICT to public offices and the ICT projects that they have in mind. Stakeholders at both meetings and on the online survey did, however, state that Holiday Coding is not enough as it only reaches out to students. Neither the Software Exchange or the Holiday Coding project see the use and re-use of open source software and the interest in creating open source software applications as enough⁴.

Moving forward

The Software Exchange and the Holiday Coding projects are both good and viable ways of going about the use and reuse of open source software. Government should take steps to ensure that the knowledge of the Software Exchange is given broader exposure and that forums outside of Holiday Coding should be created for more direct and more frequent contact between future and current developers and other stakeholders in the use of open source software.

¹ <http://digitaliser.dk/network/389444>

² <http://bit.ly/1eZA7ax>

³ <https://www.gartner.com/doc/2264715>

⁴ <https://www.gartner.com/doc/2264715>

15. Less Reporting through Increased Re-use of Key Data

Many citizens and businesses expect that public authorities can share key data so that information need only be reported once. As part of the common public sector e-government strategy, a cross-governmental programme has been launched to improve re-use of key data in the public sector in order to reduce the need for repeated reporting of key data.

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Answerability | Lead institution | Agency for Digitisation (AFD) | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | None | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | No | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | Low (commitment language describes an activity that can be construed as measurable with some interpretation on the part of the reader) | | | | |
| Relevance | OGP grand challenges | Improving public services | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | | | | | | ✓ |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| Pre-existing | | Minor (the commitment is an incremental but positive step in the relevant policy area) | | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Limited |
| April 2012 | | Ongoing and part of next action plan | | Projected completion | | Complete |
| Next steps | | | | | | |
| Further work on basic implementation | | | | | | |

What happened?

In October 2012, the government and Danish municipalities entered into an agreement on “Good basic data for everyone,”¹ and the public-sector initiative Basic Data Programme was set up. In June 2013, the Danish regions were also added to the programme.² The initiative is to ensure that the “public and businesses are provided a better and more efficient service, when data that has already been recorded is shared across institutions and is included directly in case processing.”³

Stakeholders find that the re-use of key data is important when using and developing solutions for both the public and private sector. Examples of key data could be housing information, employment status, and also personal information on, for instance, tax and income.⁴ Other data could be business addresses, registration numbers, and so on. Work is ongoing, and there are issues that are reviewed later in commitment #24. This latter category can facilitate later re-use of data by the public, for example on business reporting, by ensuring uniformity in reporting for regulations. However, as phrased, this commitment makes no indication that this is the goal of this exercise. As such, it is of questionable relevance to OGP and seems more like a strictly e-Government commitment.

The government self-assessment states that the key data are also part of the next Danish action plan.

Did it matter?

The need for the user not to provide this information more than once is obviously good for the user (which can be both a private citizen or a business), but also good for the public and private sector as data should only be maintained in a centralised location. If, for instance, a user changes an address, he or she will not need to change this information for all the services that the user uses. Key data are by default highly re-usable; but steps must also be taken to ensure that key data are of the highest quality.

Many stakeholders in the online survey pointed out that it is important for the government to be able to use and re-use key data (94 percent answered that this issue was “important” or “very important”), but a majority of stakeholders (56 percent) also thought that this commitment is less than 50 percent fulfilled. The reason for this shortcoming is that the work on reusing key data has only just begun.

Moving forward

As this is a complex area, the slow and steady pace of progress is encouraging, and it is important to remember that the work is ongoing. The inclusion of this commitment in the next Danish action plan could focus on user control and verification of key data. Ideally, users could control with whom they would prefer to share their key data, thus allowing for different levels of access to both personal and other key data. This would, of course, not apply for all key data. For instance, data for census and age would need to be excluded from personal control.

¹ <http://uk.fm.dk/publications/2012/good-basic-data-for-everyone/>

² <http://bit.ly/IKZ0v8>

³ <http://uk.fm.dk/publications/2012/good-basic-data-for-everyone/>

⁴ http://erhvervsstyrelsen.dk/file/280160/basicData-uk-web-2012-10_08.pdf

16 & 17. Improved Public Services for the Business Sector

Commitment 16: "MyPage" for businesses

A personalised "MyPage" for businesses will be developed in 2012 and 2013 for the national business portal virk.dk as part of the common public sector digitisation strategy. The objective is to provide each company with an overview of its basic registration data, active employee signatures, rights, and reporting.

Commitment 17: Companies to be "born digitally"

A new service will be developed for the business portal virk.dk and on the "MyPage" for businesses that will ensure that new businesses "are born digitally." The companies will get the most important digital tools such as digital signatures for employees and a digital company letter box as part of their registration in the national company register.

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|------|
| A n s w e r a b i l i t y | Lead institution | Danish Business Authority | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | Agency for Digitisation (AFD) | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | No | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | High (commitment language provides clear, measurable, verifiable milestones for achievement of the goal) | | | | |
| R e l e v a n c e | OGP grand challenges | | | | | |
| | OGP values | | | | | |
| | Milestones | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | "My Page" | | | | | ✓ |
| | "born digitally" | | | | | ✓ |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| Milestones | New vs. pre-existing | Potential impact | | | | |
| "My Page" | Pre-existing | Minor (the commitment is an incremental but positive step in the relevant policy area) | | | | |
| "born digitally" | Pre-existing | None (the commitment maintains the status quo) | | | | |

| Level of completion | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-------------|
| “My Page” | | | |
| Start date: April 2012 | End date: Ongoing | Actual completion | Substantial |
| | | Projected completion | Complete |
| “born digitally” | | | |
| Start date: April 2012 | End date: April 2013 | Actual completion | Limited |
| | | Projected completion | Complete |
| Next steps | | | |
| “My page” | New commitment building on existing implementation | | |
| “born digitally” | New commitment building on existing implementation | | |

What happened?

The first version of “Mit Virk” (MyPage) was launched in December 2012, and an updated version was launched in the spring of 2013.¹ On this Web page, a company can manage users, see basic information, provide directions for registration, etc.² In essence, all communications with public offices are meant to be possible on the Web page. Several updates and new functions for “Mit Virk” are planned for 2014. The personalised page “Mit Virk” is only available in Danish.³

The solution of “digitally born” companies is integrated into “Mit Virk.” Under this concept, companies would be “digitally born,” meaning that papers or visits to government offices would no longer be required to start a new company.

A first version of the initiative was launched in 2012, allowing companies registering at the Central Company Registry to order a digital signature, register a bank account for the company to use in transactions with public offices, and create a digital mailbox.⁴ Technical issues emerged, but work is being done to overcome these challenges.

Stakeholders in the online survey pointed out that the technical challenges could be due to using proprietary solutions and are asking for a more detailed report on issues to overcome. Furthermore, at the time of writing government made mandatory to receive digital letters from public offices⁵ by means of a digital mailbox.

All respondents of the online survey for this commitment agree with the government self-assessment.

Did it matter?

While stakeholders found this initiative to be important, given that it will conserve public offices and business resources and address companies’ needs, as currently written it is not clear how it relates to OGP values.

Access to government-held information about a company can be valuable to gather in one place for the company itself. However, this commitment does not give a company control over nor access to information it hands over to government.

The government self-assessment states that there is a potential risk with select offices in government refusing to participate in the service. Work is being done to ensure broad participation.

Moving forward

To make this commitment more relevant to OGP values, the IRM researcher recommends that the government take additional steps in ensuring the transparency of businesses through the creation of a public register of companies' beneficial ownership.

Future steps could be taken to ensure levels of control with data entered on "Mit Virk" so that the Web page could be the central hub for reporting information to various government bodies. This would require that the company be able to control whether given information is to be shared with all or just select offices.

Stakeholders suggested that government should take steps to ensure that "Mit Virk" is available in a language other than Danish, thereby allowing non-Danish-speaking citizens to use it. However, this is not something for which the Danish Business Agency has received many requests.⁶

¹ Government self-assessment report <http://bit.ly/1eQ6wj9>

² <http://www.virk.dk/home/om-virkdk/om-virkdk/om-mit-virkdk.html>

³ Interview with Ditte-Lene Sørensen

⁴ Government self-assessment report <http://bit.ly/1eQ6wj9>

⁵ <https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=142234>

⁶ Interview with Ditte-Lene Sørensen.

18. Creation of a Mediation and Complaints Institution for Responsible Business Behaviour

The Danish government will propose legislation for creating a mediation and complaints institution for responsible business behaviour where issues regarding Danish companies' violation of international principles for social responsibilities, including human rights, can be investigated. The mediation and complaints institution shall comply with the UN recommendations on human rights and business, and with OECD's guidelines on multi-national enterprises.

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Answerability | Lead institution | Danish Business Authority | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | None | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | No | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | High (commitment language provides clear, measurable, verifiable milestones for achievement of the goal) | | | | |
| Relevance | OGP grand challenges | Increasing corporate accountability | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | | | | ✓ | | |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| Pre-existing | | Moderate (the commitment is a major step forward in the relevant policy area but remains limited in scale or scope) | | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Complete |
| April 2012 | | April 2013 | | Projected completion | | Complete |
| Next steps | | | | | | |
| New commitment building on existing implementation | | | | | | |

What happened?

The Mediation and Complaints-Handling Institution for Responsible Business Conduct (Danish National Contact Point, or NCP) was set up by law and established in November 2012. The Danish NCP handles cases where the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises may have been violated.

The government self-assessment states that the Danish NCP has been contacted a number of times but has not yet considered any cases. Concluded cases will be available on the Web page of the Danish NCP (www.businessconduct.dk),¹ while a list of rejected complaints is already available online.²

Did it matter?

The effect of the NCP is hard to measure, but the idea of such an entity is a very good one. Stakeholders in the online survey are very sparse in their comments about this commitment, and only five respondents gave answers, rating it as being “important” or “very important” in 60 percent of the cases.

Moving forward

The IRM researcher recommends that government takes steps to make processed cases available without the need for using the freedom of information act. This would be beneficial for the further work of the NCP, because more awareness could be driven by instantly making decisions available for both public and press. Such a mechanism already exists in the Danish Press Council where all verdicts are available online.³

¹ Government self-assessment report <http://bit.ly/1eQ6wj9>

² http://businessconduct.dk/rejected_complaints

³ <http://www.pressenaevnet.dk/Kendelser.aspx>

19. International Human Rights Conference

In order to increase awareness in companies and broadly in the public of the new UN Guiding Principles for Business and Human Rights, an international conference on human rights is planned to take place on 7–8 May 2012 under the auspices of the Danish EU Presidency.

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Answerability | Lead institution | Danish Business Authority | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | None | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | No | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | High (commitment language provides clear, measurable, verifiable milestones for achievement of the goal) | | | | |
| Relevance | OGP grand challenges | Increasing corporate accountability | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | | | | | | ✓ |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| Pre-existing | | Minor (the commitment is an incremental but positive step in the relevant policy area) | | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Complete |
| 7 May 2012 | | 8 May 2012 | | Projected completion | | Complete |
| Next steps | | | | | | |
| New commitment building on existing implementation | | | | | | |

What happened?

The conference was held in May 2012.¹ The conference brought together 200 representatives of the business community, civil society, and academia to discuss human rights. The outcome of the conference was included in the European Commission's 2011–2014 action plan for Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR).²

Did it matter?

While stakeholders remarked that CSR is an important factor and guiding principles for the area are important, as currently worded, is it unclear how this commitment relates to OGP

values. Furthermore, the commitment itself is EU-specific and has little connection to the Danish CSR area. It is also noted in the government self-assessment, and stakeholders agree, that it is up to the member states to decide how to follow up on these guidelines.

Arguably, the aim could be to introduce accountability measures similar to the OECD Guidelines on Multinational Enterprises (see Commitment #18) at the European level. But, based on available documentation, this is unlikely to be the explicit focus at this time.³

Moving forward

As recommendations are already developed, government could work to regionalize these to a country-specific context, gathering the relevant stakeholders in a forum, continually discussing human rights and CSR, and closely monitoring violations thereof.

¹ Government self-assessment report <http://bit.ly/1eQ6wj9>

² <http://bit.ly/18ofCPK>

³ <http://bit.ly/1d549aD>

20. Promotion of Social Responsibility in the Fashion Business

The Danish Government will take the lead in the first UN initiative for social responsibility in the fashion business. The Danish Fashion Institute has partnered with the UN on the development of a new “code of conduct” that will set guidelines for social responsibility in the fashion business. The objective of the guidelines is to promote responsibility throughout the fashion business. The guidelines will be launched 3 May 2012 during the Copenhagen Fashion Summit.

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| A n s w e r a b i l i t y | Lead institution | Danish Business Authority | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | None | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | No | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | Medium (commitment language describes an activity that is objectively verifiable but does not contain specific milestones or deliverables) | | | | |
| R e l e v a n c e | OGP grand challenges | Increasing corporate accountability | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | | | | ✓ | | |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| Pre-existing | | Minor (the commitment is an incremental but positive step in the relevant policy area) | | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Complete |
| April 2012 | | April 2013 | | Projected completion | | Complete |
| Next steps | | | | | | |
| Maintenance and monitoring of completed implementation | | | | | | |

What happened?

During the Copenhagen Fashion Summit, and according to the government self-assessment, corporate social responsibility (CSR) issues were discussed in several seminars that gathered both industry stakeholders and students from design and business schools. The commitment is part of the Danish Business Authority’s action plan for CSR 2012–2015.¹

Did it matter?

Many examples of the fashion industry's low pay for workers and use of child labour have been uncovered by the Danish press in the last few years. But the industry has a large focus on this area. The CSR focus on the Copenhagen Fashion Summit persists and is also included for the summit of 2014. The industry itself has focused on this area. A good indicator of how important these issues are for the industry is that one of the Web sites delivering news for the Danish fashion industry has a whole section dedicated to CSR.²

Moving forward

The Copenhagen Fashion Summit returns in 2014. The fashion industry should pay attention to foster CSR discussions and projects at the student or entrepreneurial level. At a more idealistic level, experiences from these events could also be brought to other industries perhaps coordinated by the Danish Business Authority.

¹ http://erhvervsstyrelsen.dk/file/318420/uk_responsible_growth_2012.pdf

² <http://fashionforum.dk/category/csr/>

21. Reporting on Human Rights and the Climate

The Danish government will propose an expansion of the Danish Financial Statements Act, §99a to ensure that the largest Danish enterprises in their reporting on social responsibility have to explicitly consider their work on respecting human rights and on reducing their climate impact. In order to ensure that the enterprises have the right tools and the necessary guidance to respond to the new demands, the government will strengthen its guidance through e.g. the Web sites *csr-kompasset.dk* (“The Corporate Social Responsibility Compass”) and *klimakompasset.dk* (“The Climate Compass”).

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Answerability | Lead institution | Danish Business Authority | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | None | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | No | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | High (commitment language provides clear, measurable, verifiable milestones for achievement of the goal) | | | | |
| Relevance | OGP grand challenges | Increasing corporate accountability | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | | | | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| Pre-existing | | Moderate (the commitment is a major step forward in the relevant policy area but remains limited in scale or scope) | | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Complete |
| April 2012 | | April 2013 | | Projected completion | | Complete |
| Next steps | | | | | | |
| New commitment building on existing implementation | | | | | | |

What happened?

The proposed expansion of the Danish Financial Statements Act was passed in the summer of 2012.¹ However, it only took effect from the reporting year commencing on 1 January 2013 and later. Therefore, any effects of this are still to be seen.

One stakeholder pointed out that it is important to ensure that companies do not see this as an extra burden but, rather, are made aware of the positive effects of the reporting. The two Web sites are good ways of communicating the positive sides of this extra reporting, and good guidance is available from them both.

Did it matter?

As we are still awaiting the first reporting year to conclude, the reach of this commitment is hard to assess. The amendment to the act is, however, fully implemented.

Moving forward

When reviewing future reporting from the companies, the IRM researcher recommends that government takes steps to make the data publicly available. Openness can then foster attention that can gain momentum in civil society and thus provide feedback to the relevant companies.

¹ Government self-assessment report <http://bit.ly/1eQ6wj9>

22: Country-by-country Reporting in the Extractive and Forestry Industries

The government will work for the introduction of country-by-country reporting in the EU as an important step in the international fight against corruption and tax evasion. Country-by-country reporting would oblige companies in the mining and forestry industries to openly declare any payments made to authorities in which they operate.

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Answerability | Lead institution | Danish Business Authority | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | None | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | No | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | Low (commitment language describes an activity that can be construed as measurable with some interpretation on the part of the reader) | | | | |
| Relevance | OGP grand challenges | Increasing corporate accountability | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | | ✓ | | ✓ | | |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| Pre-existing | | Moderate (the commitment is a major step forward in the relevant policy area but remains limited in scale or scope) | | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Complete |
| April 2012 | | April 2013 | | Projected completion | | Complete |
| Next steps | | | | | | |
| New commitment building on existing implementation | | | | | | |

What happened?

The rules were adopted in the summer of 2013 in Directive 2013/34/EU¹ and will take effect in 2016.

The objective of the initiative was to introduce country-by-country reporting in the EU as an important step in the international fight against corruption and tax evasion by improving

transparency and thereby enabling local populations and others to hold their authorities accountable for received funds. The reporting is for amounts higher than 100,000 euros.

Did it matter?

Stakeholders in the online survey agreed that this is a positive step towards fighting corruption in Europe but also stressed that it could be expanded to other sectors and business areas, as well as on a global scale.

The rules are expected to take effect for reporting in 2016. Therefore, results are yet to be seen.

Moving forward

Stakeholders recommend that the commitment be made more ambitious by expanding the mechanism from this commitment to include other relevant business areas, as well as expanding the scope from European to global.

¹ <http://bit.ly/1cZNPYL>

23. Legislative Principles for the Digital Age

The use of digital technologies is now applicable to all areas of public sector administration. We need to ensure that new legislation takes into account and allows for the utilisation of those technologies. This applies to mandatory digital communication, re-use of data and the use of the common digital infrastructure in the public sector, to mention just a few examples. In 2012, the government will establish principles for the drafting of legislation that takes into account the increasing use of digital means and technologies in the public sector.

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| Answerability | Lead institution | Agency for Digitisation (AFD) | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | None | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | Yes | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | Low (commitment language describes an activity that can be construed as measurable with some interpretation on the part of the reader) | | | | |
| Relevance | OGP grand challenges | Improving public services, more effectively managing public resources | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| Pre-existing | | Minor (the commitment is an incremental but positive step in the relevant policy area) | | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Not started |
| April 2012 | | April 2013 | | Projected completion | | Complete |
| Next steps | | | | | | |
| Revision of the commitment to be more achievable or measurable | | | | | | |

What happened?

A broad working group has been set up to ensure the necessary stakeholder involvement. This group has drafted new principles on how to include digitization in forthcoming legislative work. It has also consulted external stakeholders.¹ However, the presentation of

the new legislative principles has been postponed until 2014. The self assessment does not go into detail about who is included in the working group or with whom they have consulted.

Did it matter?

Many of the coming e-Government solutions potentially allowing for access to government-held information require legislation that is up to date so that access can be given to the right people on a lawful basis. This goes for other areas as well. Stakeholders agreed that this is an important area. A majority (92 percent in the online survey) indicated that this is “very important” (54 percent), “important” (23 percent), or “low importance” (15 percent). The stakeholders are looking forward to seeing the principles.

Moving forward

As currently worded, the commitment’s relevance to OGP values is difficult to assess. In future iterations of the action, the IRM researcher recommends making sure the legislation includes language ensuring that data released by government can be re-used by citizens and defining standards for the use of metadata.

¹ Government self-assessment report <http://bit.ly/1eQ6wj9>

24. Consolidated Key Data

Key data is the foundation on which public authorities provide services in a correct manner which is crucial with regards to citizens' and businesses' legal rights, and the efficiency and effectiveness of society as a whole. As part of the implementation of the common public-sector e-government, a programme will be implemented to consolidate key data registers.

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Answerability | Lead institution | Agency for Digitisation (AFD) | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | None | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | No | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | Medium (commitment language describes an activity that is objectively verifiable but does not contain specific milestones or deliverables) | | | | |
| Relevance | OGP grand challenges | More effectively managing public resources | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | | | | | | ✓ |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| Pre-existing | | Moderate (the commitment is a major step forward in the relevant policy area but remains limited in scale or scope) | | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Limited |
| April 2012 | | April 2013 | | Projected completion | | Complete |
| Next steps | | | | | | |
| None. Abandon commitment | | | | | | |

What happened?

The scope of this commitment overlaps with commitment #15.

Did it matter?

This commitment is reviewed as a part of commitment #15.

Moving forward

The IRM researcher suggests abandoning the commitment, as it is part of commitment #15.

25. App Store for Digital Learning Resources

The central government and the municipalities will prepare the creation of one or more market-based distribution platforms for digital learning resources, e.g. a kind of “app store”, to facilitate easy access to digital learning resources for teachers and pupils.

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| A n s w e r a b i l i t y | Lead institution | Uni-C (Part of the Agency for IT and Learning under the Ministry of Education) | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | None | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | No | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | Medium (commitment language describes an activity that is objectively verifiable but does not contain specific milestones or deliverables) | | | | |
| R e l e v a n c e | OGP grand challenges | | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | | | | | | ✓ |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| Pre-existing | | None (the commitment maintains the status quo) | | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Limited |
| April 2012 | | April 2013 | | Projected completion | | Complete |
| Next steps | | | | | | |
| None: abandon commitment | | | | | | |

What happened?

A Web platform allowing access for teachers and students has been created.¹ The Ministry of Education announced in January 2013 the framework for a market-based platform for digital learning resources.² This was developed, according to the government self-assessment, after a number of dialogue meetings with potential suppliers, to gain insight into the area.

From this tool, suppliers can use a REST API to access the platform.³ Due to resistance from the producers of digital learning resources, however, a purchasing function is not available

directly from the government platform; but those wishing to make a purchase are redirected to the publisher of the learning resources own Web store.

According to the government self-assessment, an evaluation of the app store will be made by the end of 2013.

Did it matter?

As the commitment itself was to prepare an app store, the commitment could be rated as completed. However an app store is not much of a store without the possibility to buy. Eighty percent of stakeholders who participated in the online survey responded that this commitment is less than 50 percent fulfilled, likely because of the lack of purchasing options on the site

The app store for now is limited to a sort of “list and view” for digital learning resources. Stakeholders also point out that using open source software for such an app store could be positive and mention that local Web sites with digital learning resources exist.⁴

The implementation of an API for publishers is a good way of introducing self-reporting into a tool, and work should be done to ensure that this self reporting is combined with the possibility to buy digital resources that are not free of charge.

Moving forward

While the majority of stakeholders consider access to information and digital resources as important, the learning platform is a repository of learning material for pupils, and its link with OGP values is unclear. Therefore, the IRM researcher recommends the commitment be removed from future action plans.

¹ <http://materialeplatform.emu.dk/materialer/index.jsp>

² Government self-assessment report <http://bit.ly/1eQ6wj9>

³ <http://materialeplatform.emu.dk/xml/webservice.html>

⁴ <http://fremtidslaboriet.dk/>

26. Preparation for Digital Reform of the Public Welfare Areas

The government is preparing a reform of the welfare areas with a special focus on social security, health and education. The reform shall create a better framework for the use of existing welfare technological solutions, and recommend areas where the need and the potential for the use of welfare technological solutions are largest. As part of the preparations for such a reform, a comprehensive analysis will be made to assess how welfare technological solutions can increase productivity in the public sector and strengthen citizen engagement and empowerment.

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Answerability | Lead institution | Agency for Digitisation (AFD) | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | None | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | No | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | High (commitment language provides clear, measurable, verifiable milestones for achievement of the goal) | | | | |
| Relevance | OGP grand challenges | Improving public services | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | | | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| Pre-existing | | Transformative (the commitment entails a reform that could potentially transform business as usual in the relevant policy area) | | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Complete |
| April 2012 | | April 2013 | | Projected completion | | Complete |
| Next steps | | | | | | |
| New commitment building on existing implementation | | | | | | |

What happened?

The digital welfare reform was prepared and will be carried out from 2013 to 2020 under the title “Digital Welfare Strategy.” The strategy was officially launched on 30 September 2013.¹ The strategy is built on seven focus areas in digital welfare;² and according to the

government self-assessment, it has been developed in dialogue with citizens after the publication of a debate paper on digital welfare.³

The majority of stakeholders (56 percent) in the online survey found this commitment “very important” to OGP. However, the IRM researcher finds this to be mainly an e-Government commitment with an unclear relationship to improving governance in the country.

Additionally, as written in the action plan and the self-assessment, the link to citizen engagement is not spelled out; and it’s unclear how the strategy will improve governance.

The strategy has been prepared and is being implemented over the coming years. Some stakeholders in meetings and online survey pointed out that the focus in this strategy seems to be on cost savings rather than real improvements in welfare.

Did it matter?

Digital welfare and e-Government solutions are a key to the future of welfare in Denmark. The digital welfare strategy and the e-Government strategy clearly show the government’s dedication to these areas. The digital welfare strategy has been subject to some turmoil, such as the use of robots to clean the homes of the elderly. However, the digital welfare strategy is largely welcomed among stakeholders. A report from April 2012 from the Danish Senior Citizens association also confirmed that the elderly are welcoming and are curious as to the use of digital welfare tools.⁴

Moving forward

The IRM researcher recommends that the future use of digital welfare systems could specifically include more of a focus on a feedback loop to the users, thereby fostering public participation. This is something that could foster an even more positive relationship to the use of digital welfare.

¹ http://www.digst.dk/Digital-velfaerd/Strategi-for-digital-velfaerd_30sep

In English: <http://www.digst.dk/ServiceMenu/English/Policy-and-Strategy/Strategy-for-Digital-Welfare>

² <http://www.digst.dk/Digital-velfaerd/Initiativer-i-strategien>

³ <http://bit.ly/IuwxKb>

⁴ <http://bit.ly/18IBQFI>

28: Tracking of Universities' Transition to Digital-only Administrative Communication

To create transparency about the process and to support sharing of experience, the government will monitor and publicise reports on the activities and progress of all Danish universities in their transition to fully digital written communication.

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Answerability | Lead institution | Danish Agency for Higher Education | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | None | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | No | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | High (commitment language provides clear, measurable, verifiable milestones for achievement of the goal) | | | | |
| Relevance | OGP grand challenges | More effectively managing public resources | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | | | | | | ✓ |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| Pre-existing | | None (the commitment maintains the status quo) | | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Complete |
| April 2012 | | April 2013 | | Projected completion | | Complete |
| Next steps | | | | | | |
| None: abandon the commitment | | | | | | |

What happened?

The tracking of progress is ongoing and published online. As part of the e-Government strategy, communication with students and applicants of Danish universities are to be completely digital.¹ To track progress towards this goal, reports on each of the universities were published on www.fivu.dk in March and April 2013.² Numbers from the individual reports are gathered and published in a section of the Web site as well.³ The government self-assessment states that from 85 to 100 percent of the universities' communications with students are now digital. However, this number applies only to communication with the

current students and not to applicants to the universities. The government self-assessment states that only 37 unique visitors have visited the Web site in a six month period.

Did it matter?

The e-Government strategy and the goals for digitization of communication are well on their way and are close to being 100 percent complete. Universities state that they still are struggling with legislative issues, where some forms of communication still require the use of paper.⁴

Stakeholders in the online survey all agree with the progress reported in the government self-assessment, but one pointed out that it is hard to find relevant information on the fivu-Web site. This is potentially not good for the knowledge-sharing part of the commitment.

Moving forward

As it is currently written, the commitment's relation to OGP values is unclear. Therefore, the IRM researcher recommends removing the commitments from future OGP action plans.

¹ <http://bit.ly/18FSiTz>

² http://fivu.dk/publikationer/publikationer?b_size:int=60

³ <http://bit.ly/1dSRZ9R>

⁴ <http://bit.ly/1dSRZ9R>

29. Disclosure of Status Reporting from the National IT Project Council

In order to support open government and increase the sharing of knowledge and experience as a basis for improving public ICT solutions and services, status reports from the National IT Projects Council on public ICT projects will be published.

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Answerability | Lead institution | National IT Project Council | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | Agency for Digitisation (AFD) | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | No | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | High (commitment language provides clear, measurable, verifiable milestones for achievement of the goal) | | | | |
| Relevance | OGP grand challenges | Improving public services, more effectively managing public resources | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | | ✓ | | | | |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| Pre-existing | | Minor (the commitment is an incremental but positive step in the relevant policy area) | | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Complete |
| April 2012 | | April 2013 | | Projected completion | | Complete |
| Next steps | | | | | | |
| Maintenance and monitoring of completed implementation | | | | | | |

What happened?

In March 2013¹ the National IT Project Council disclosed the first half annual report of all Danish public ICT projects with a budget of more than 10 million DKK.² The report was generated from status reports collected in the second half of 2012. The reports assigns traffic light colors—red, yellow, or green—to the projects on four core parameters: costs, time, efficiency gains, and quality gains.³

All stakeholders in the online survey agreed with the government self-assessment, and one stakeholder indicated that the traffic light color scheme gave a good overview of the status of projects.

Did it matter?

Public ICT projects in Denmark are numerous, and a common overview is a valuable asset in determining the status of these projects. At the time of the government self-assessment, only one report had come out, but another was projected for release in September 2013. It was not released online at the time of writing (December 2013).

Moving forward

The bi-annual progress of these reports is important for those interested in monitoring the progress of ICT projects. Government should take steps to ensure the timely publishing of these reports, as, at the time of writing (November 2013), the report scheduled for September was not yet released.

In an online survey, a stakeholder did, however, point out that the reporting is looking back at past failures and successes instead of looking forward at solutions to problems identified in reporting. The stakeholders also requested transparency in the guiding group for digitisation, along with scrutiny of its work.

¹ Government self-assessment report <http://bit.ly/1eQ6wj9>

² <http://bit.ly/18FSQIX>

³ <http://bit.ly/lux7aL>

30. Overview of Public ICT Architecture

In order to create a more coherent public-sector ICT and to strengthen the re-use of existing solutions, standards, data, applications and infrastructure, a comprehensive overview of public ICT architecture will be established as part of the implementation of the common public sector e-government strategy. The initiative supports professional decision-making, management of the strategy's initiatives, and financial management. The structure of the architectural overview will consist of a collection of documentation on the ICT architecture structured on the basis of public architecture tools (OIOEA, FORM, and STORM).

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| Answerability | Lead institution | Agency for Digitisation (AFD) | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | None | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | No | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | Low (commitment language describes an activity that can be construed as measurable with some interpretation on the part of the reader) | | | | |
| Relevance | OGP grand challenges | More effectively managing public resources | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Accountability | Tech & Innovation for Trans. & Acc. | None |
| | | | | | | ✓ |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| Pre-existing | | None (the commitment maintains the status quo) | | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Substantial |
| April 2012 | | April 2013 | | Projected completion | | Complete |
| Next steps | | | | | | |
| New commitment building on existing implementation | | | | | | |

What happened?

The commitment is substantially on its way. The work on the online one-stop shop for common public-sector architecture is ongoing and has been since 2006¹ with a new version arriving in 2013. The Public Information Online Enterprise Architecture is driven by the AFD and is about fostering collaboration, re-use, interoperability, and common solutions in

public ICT.² The use of this architecture is free of charge and gives a reference model for the development and control of public ICT projects.

In the assessment period, the focus had been on creating the architecture guide and specific overviews and reference models. In the coming period, the focus will be on the exchange and sharing of data.

According to the government self-assessment, the Web site is warmly welcomed by the target group, which is both public- and private-sector organisations working with public ICT. Stakeholders responding to an online survey all agree with the government's self-assessment, and the majority (91 percent) rate the commitment as "more than 50 percent fulfilled." (The remaining 9 percent rate the commitment "completely fulfilled".)

Did it matter?

Based on the <http://arkitekturguiden.digitaliser.dk/> Web site, the collaboration, re-use, and interoperability approaches of the public-sector architecture refers to cross-governmental communications and makes no clear reference to a public interface for transparency, participation, and accountability. Arguably, the architecture could be instrumental to strengthening core OGP values, but, as written, it is unclear how it will do that.

The ever upward-spiraling complexity of ICT projects, including public ICT, demands a common language and reference point. The creation of a free and common public ICT structure is a good idea, as stakeholders in the online survey indicated. However, stakeholders did point out that the reference cases for the successful use of the architecture are not numerous, with just seven examples available online.³

Moving forward

Stakeholders agree that work could be put into more user cases being displayed so that potential users could see the added value of using the platform. The upcoming challenges from previously reviewed commitments on basic data and key data and the exchange and sharing of these are also a good additions to the common guide.

¹ <http://arkitekturguiden.digitaliser.dk/om-oio-arkitekturguiden>

² <http://www.digst.dk/Arkitektur-og-standarder/It-arkitektur/Tvaeroffentligt-samarbejde>

³ <http://arkitekturguiden.digitaliser.dk/cases>

31. Publication of Educational Materials on the Government's ICT Project Model

With a view to improve public sector ICT projects through the dissemination of information on the government's ICT project model and good practice cases, educational materials about the model will be published under an open public license.

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Answerability | Lead institution | Agency for Digitisation (AFD) | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | None | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | No | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | High (commitment language provides clear, measurable, verifiable milestones for achievement of the goal) | | | | |
| Relevance | OGP grand challenges | | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | | | | | | ✓ |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| Pre-existing | | None (the commitment maintains the status quo) | | | | |
| Level of completion | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | End date: | | Actual completion | | Complete |
| April 2012 | | April 2013 | | Projected completion | | Complete |
| Next steps | | | | | | |
| Maintenance and monitoring of completed implementation | | | | | | |

What happened?

The AFD published educational material on the public ICT model on an open license. The material is not available for download but can be requested from AFD. At the time of writing, 17 private suppliers of courses are using the material. The government self-assessment states that 35 courses have been held, and this is satisfactory. All respondents to the online survey agree with the government's self-assessment.

Did it matter?

The ability to develop public ICT using a common model is valuable. And the need for educating developers of public ICT is also important.

Stakeholders in the online survey indicate the need to make the project model easier to approach.

Moving forward

The AFD has created the materials, and, since then, the materials have been used to create and hold courses in public ICT. However, the AFD will not update the course materials in the future.¹ This can potentially cause fragmentation of best practices. Therefore, the AFD could work at gathering evaluations of the courses with a direct feedback loop to the ICT model.

¹ Interview with Sarah Kirkeby Danneskiold-Samøe, 02/12/13.

32 & 33. Smart Aarhus and Smart Region

Commitment 32. Smart Aarhus

Aarhus Municipality, in partnership with the Alexandra Institute, Aarhus University and Central Denmark Regional Authority, will carry out a large-scale initiative called “Smart Aarhus”. Based on collaboration between citizens, public sector and the private operators, the initiative aims to transform the city into an open digital platform which will support re-use of government data, citizen engagement, co-creation, and public-private co-operation. The initiative will be allowed to evolve through an ongoing and open process in which all businesses, citizens and NGOs are invited to take part. The “Smart Aarhus” initiative will also contribute to making Denmark an international pioneer of openness, democracy, and innovation by participating in knowledge sharing and the exchange of case studies.

Commitment 33. Smart Region

The Central Denmark Regional Authority will establish a broad regional initiative, “Smart Region,” as a way to organise public services more efficiently and create a more open and participative public sector as a driver for innovation. The initiative aims to create new ways of co-operation between companies, knowledge institutions, the public administration, and the citizens in order to support the development of creative ICT-based solutions to solve societal challenges and turn them into tomorrow’s business opportunities for the region’s companies, and new opportunities for citizens.

| Commitment Description | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|------|
| Answers ability | Lead institution | Aarhus Municipality and Central Denmark Regional Authority | | | | |
| | Supporting institutions | None | | | | |
| | Point of contact specified? | Yes | | | | |
| Specificity and measurability | | Low (commitment language describes an activity that can be construed as measurable with some interpretation on the part of the reader) | | | | |
| Relevance | OGP grand challenges | Improving public services, more effectively managing public resources | | | | |
| | OGP values | Access to information | Civic participation | Accountability | Tech & innovation for trans. & acc. | None |
| | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| Ambition | | | | | | |
| New vs. pre-existing | | Potential impact | | | | |
| Pre-existing | | Transformative (the commitment entails a reform that could potentially transform business as usual in the relevant policy area) | | | | |

| Level of completion | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|
| Start date: April 2012 | End date: April 2013 | Actual completion | Limited |
| | | Projected completion | Complete |
| Next steps | | | |
| Revision of the commitment to be more achievable or measurable | | | |

What happened?

The two regional initiatives are reviewed as one in the IRM report and in the government self-assessment. The reason for this is that the main activity of Smart Region for now has been Smart Aarhus. A review of Smart Region itself is therefore redundant.

According to the government self-assessment, Smart Aarhus initiated a number of concrete projects (e.g., the portal oadaa.dk) after a process with working groups recommending various topics. All publications from the working groups are available online.¹ The government self-assessment also mentions other projects as well as an Internet festival.

Stakeholders all agreed with the government's self-assessment regarding the level of implementation for both commitments. They also found the projects both ambitious and interesting.

Did it matter?

The Smart Region and Smart Aarhus commitments are both good examples of regional initiatives where much effort is put into projects. The project aimed for broad collaboration among NGOs, private-sector companies, and public offices. However, stakeholders viewed the projects as a bit confusing in terms of completion rates. Stakeholder answers are diffuse in terms of the completion of the commitment, and one stakeholder also indicated that information on real results of the commitments has been sparse.

The activity of oadaa.dk was previously discussed in commitment #9. The rest of the activities for Smart Aarhus are yet to be completed and are therefore not reviewable.

Moving forward

For the next action plan, work of the working groups behind the Smart initiatives could focus on creating verifiable milestones such as the creation of the oadaa.dk-portal. These milestones could also be an integrated part of the next action plan for the Danish OGP, as the Smart initiatives seem fully founded in the local community. Government could focus on expanding regional initiatives to a nationwide context.

¹ <http://issuu.com/smartaarhus/docs/smart-aarhus-a-scandinavian-third-w>

V. SELF-ASSESSMENT

While public comments on the government self-assessment report were sought on the public hearing portal, none were received. The self-assessment report was subsequently published on time.

Table 2 summarizes Denmark's conformity to the self-assessment guidelines. The online survey shows that stakeholders in general agreed with the findings in the government self-assessment.

Table 2: Self-Assessment Checklist

| | |
|---|-----|
| Was annual progress report published? | Yes |
| Was it done according to schedule? | Yes |
| Is the report available in the local language? | Yes |
| According to stakeholders, was this adequate? | Yes |
| Is the report available in English? | Yes |
| Did the government provide a two-week public comment period on draft self-assessment reports? | Yes |
| Were any public comments received? | No |
| Is the report deposited in the OGP portal? | Yes |
| Did the self-assessment report include review of the consultation efforts? | Yes |
| Did the report cover all of the commitments? | Yes |
| Did it assess completion according to schedule? | No |
| Did the report reaffirm responsibility for openness? | Yes |
| Does the report describe the relationship of the action plan with grand challenge areas? | Yes |

VI: MOVING FORWARD

This section puts the OGP action plan into a broader context and highlights potential next steps, as reflected in the preceding sections, as well as stakeholder-identified priorities.

Country Context

In the span of the action plan, much focus has been on the new freedom of information act. This is covered in the next section. Another issue not included in the action plan is a whistle-blower agreement for employees in the public sector. Currently, no such general agreement exists. In the course of the action plan and the IRM reporting, there has been discussion on this, but for now no act has been passed. Meanwhile many private-sector companies have created their own whistle-blower policies¹ with permission from the Data Protection Agency. In October 2013 a working group with representatives from, among others, universities, media, local authorities, and the ombudsman of the Danish Parliament, was created to discuss the subject.²

Both the freedom of information act and whistle-blower policy discussion could easily be used in the next action plan, as they conform very well to OGP values.

Stakeholder Priorities

The commitments on Open Data and especially the commitments on basic data made available for free were widely perceived as the most significant commitments. This was true at stakeholder meetings as well as with the people interviewed by phone.

The 26 stakeholders who reviewed the online survey of the commitments regarding renewed efforts for open public data thought it was either “very important” or “important. The government also sees the commitment as a milestone, as it is transforming the way data are created, used, and perceived by government officials. Stakeholders at meetings agreed, by a large margin, that the basic data initiatives are valuable but also made a series of suggestions for improvement. These are included in the review of the individual commitments.

Although stakeholders found that making basic data available for free was a milestone, they still thought that many types of data were missing. Some of these data types include topographical maps of the sea, tax information, and so on. The data made available were described as “low-hanging fruits,” and most of the now free data is of limited value to stakeholders. The explanation for this is that stakeholders thought that administrations in Denmark do not always see the value of opening data and its value in creating transparency in administration. In many cases, the opening of datasets is decided by individual officials, and not all officials see the added value. Stakeholders described this as “a battle from official to official” where one administration can be subject to one or more officials in different offices with different opinions on openness. Privacy issues regarding opening of datasets were also something that concerned stakeholders at the Copenhagen meeting as the opening of datasets in many cases could be problematic for the individual privacy of citizens. Work on this subject could be included in future action plans.

The online survey also indicated that several key issues were missing from the plan. Excluded from the action plan is, for instance, any discussion on the newly updated freedom of information act in Denmark. Many stakeholders viewed this as limiting access to

information, as it closes access to certain types of information regarding the ministerial service as well as data produced for statistical purposes. Debate in the Danish media has also reflected this. In April 2013, a number of chief executive editors wrote an open letter to Danish politicians informing them of their views of the new act.³ A series of protests and demonstrations were organized as well as a gathering of signatures against the new freedom of information act.⁴ At the time of writing, 87,903 signatures against the new act were gathered. However, in June 2013, the act was passed with a large majority of votes in parliament.

The online survey also revealed that stakeholders would have liked the inclusion of the selection of Danish board members in both public and private companies in the OGP action plan. In recent years an ongoing discussion on the nepotism in these boards has flourished in the Danish media, and there has been talk of creating gender quotas like they exist in other countries. However, this has not been realized.

Recommendations

Ownership of the OGP

Stakeholders at both meetings as well as the interviews with SKAT and Syddjurs Kommune pointed out that it was a problem that the AFD has very little political mandate. The AFD is formally under the Ministry of Finance, and this ministry does not take much ownership over the OGP. Therefore, it is very much up to the government official at the AFD to foster and nurse the OGP through other administrations.

While stakeholders acknowledged that the government official responsible for OGP has been very successful, they also mentioned that an office with more oversight would be key to OGP's success in the country. As previously described, many office chiefs in the administration embrace the values in OGP, but others are reluctant. With little or no mandate, the persuasion of opposing officials can be hard. Stakeholders described this as a battle from office chief to office chief. Ideally, stakeholders remarked, the AFD will need support and collaboration from ministries outside the AFD. Support should then ideally come from the Prime Minister's office. The IRM researcher recommends that the government as a whole take more ownership of the OGP, using the project to further foster openness and accountability in its administration.

Timeline

In future action plans attention should be given to conforming to OGP set timelines and deadlines. This issue, though, is not only the government's responsibility; it is also shared with the OGP Support Unit. With more conformed timelines, a better process could be achieved when factoring in the government self-assessment and IRM reporting as valuable tools for the process. Both reports should ideally be a learning tool for the next action plan. At the time of writing (December 2013), the next action plan for Denmark is already completed.

Forum and Web page

Stakeholders at meetings and during interviews were primarily concerned with their own priorities. Although excited by the idea and values of the OGP, the stakeholders felt there was no OGP team spirit. Although a forum on the portal digitaliser.dk is already set up and functioning, the forum is hard to find and is also perceived as somewhat old fashioned by many. A government information page that can also serve as inspiration for coming OGP commitment stakeholders could be set up and the forum from digitaliser.dk could possibly

be integrated into this. At the moment, there is no dedicated Web page for the OGP in Denmark.

Consultation

Although it is business as usual in Denmark to do an open hearing and after this create specific plans like the OGP action plan, government should renew efforts to include civil society organisations in creating the action plan itself. A golden opportunity is to use the Open Government Camp to achieve just this. This, in turn, then requires the Open Government Camp to be more widely advertised; indeed, some stakeholders were not aware of the existence of the camp. Greater consultation could probably also yield more ambitious commitments.

Specificity in commitments

As this report has repeatedly noted, many of the commitments were unclearly formulated, lacking specific milestones or timelines. Although it is a laudable ambition to complete all commitments under the plan by the end of the period, the OGP plan would be more effective if it specified desired outcomes and deadlines for each commitment. Designating an office or individual responsible for the implementation of each commitment will also raise the specificity by a large margin.

“A thousand flowers”

Stakeholders and the IRM researcher were amazed by the diversity and amount of Danish commitments. A stakeholder described this as “a thousand flowers.” In future action plans, the IRM researcher recommends making fewer but more ambitious commitments with a more direct connection among them.

Ambitious commitments

Very few of the commitments in the action plan stretch existing government practice to any significant degree, and many of the commitments have little or no real connection with the values and challenges of OGP. Government should ensure that commitments, by a large margin, stretch current practice and conform to OGP values and grand challenges. A main strategy for the OGP could also be developed.

For the first action plan, it is clear that much of the strategy is taken from the e-Government strategy of Denmark. Although this is not a problem in itself, it is a problem that the e-Government strategy isn't a project for opening up government and creating more accountability. Rather, the strategy aims at cost saving and effectiveness. Ideally commitments that only are e-Government and without direct connection to OGP values should not be included in future action plans unless they are adapted to include more OGP values.

¹ <http://politiken.dk/oekonomi/virksomheder/ECE2087240/lego-maersk-arla-iss--vild-vaekst-i-virksomheders-whistleblower-ordninger/>

² <http://www.justitsministeriet.dk/nyt-og-presse/pressemeddelelser/2013/regeringen-neds%C3%A6tter-udvalg-om-offentligt-ansattes>

³ <http://www.bt.dk/danmark/redaktoerer-derfor-er-den-nye-offentlighedslov-et-problem>

⁴ http://www.skrivunder.net/nej_tak_til_den_nye_offentlighedslov

ANNEX: METHODOLOGY

As a complement to the government self-assessment, an independent assessment report is written by well-respected governance researchers, preferably from each OGP participating country.

These experts use a common OGP independent report questionnaire and guidelines,¹ based on a combination of interviews with local OGP stakeholders as well as desk-based analysis. This report is shared with a small International Expert Panel (appointed by the OGP Steering Committee) for peer review to ensure that the highest standards of research and due diligence have been applied.

Analysis of progress on OGP action plans is a combination of interviews, desk research, and feedback from nongovernmental stakeholder meetings. The IRM report builds on the findings of the government's own self-assessment report and any other assessments of progress put out by civil society, the private sector, or international organisations.

Each local researcher carries out stakeholder meetings to ensure an accurate portrayal of events. Given budgetary and calendar constraints, the IRM cannot consult all interested or affected parties. Consequently, the IRM strives for methodological transparency, and therefore where possible, makes public the process of stakeholder engagement in research (detailed later in this section.) In those national contexts where anonymity of informants—governmental or nongovernmental—is required, the IRM reserves the ability to protect the anonymity of informants. Additionally, because of the necessary limitations of the method, the IRM strongly encourages commentary on public drafts of each national document.

Introduction

Early in the research process in August 2013, it became clear that interest in the OGP within civil society in general was very low. The IRM researcher set up a Web page,² and this was distributed on both Twitter and Facebook as well as on the government portal digitaliser.dk, where a direct message was sent to all members of the relevant groups. Only a couple of stakeholders identified themselves this way.

Stakeholder Selection

The remainder of stakeholder selection was done via consulting with the main OGP contacts within the government and cross checking with stakeholders who were perceived as the most important to talk to. In the end, the IRM researcher decided to invite a mix of scientists, NGOs, and people from the private sector, as well as public sector and journalists. Focus was put on the data and e-Government area, as this is the area that is most evident and tangible in the action plan. For purposes of broader research, an extensive online survey was conducted. A total of 27 people were invited to participate in stakeholder meetings held in either Copenhagen or Aarhus, two big cities in each part of the country. A complete list of consulted people is accessible through a pdf available online.³

Stakeholder Meeting One

The first stakeholder meeting was held on 5 November in Copenhagen. It was initially planned to be held in Roskilde, but attendance was low. In an effort to get more people to come, the meeting was moved to the capital. Only three people showed up at this meeting. The remainder of the 15 invitees were unable to attend. Three of these were subsequently

interviewed. The attendees at the Copenhagen meeting were primarily interested in open data. No government officials or employees of public offices were present. The meeting was held at the office of one of the stakeholders and took two hours. A loose agenda⁴ on the large aspects of the OGP was handed out prior to the meeting. Discussions centred primarily on the quality of the data now opened by commitments in the action plan and on wishes for a more open administration of both government and local municipal offices.

Stakeholder Meeting Two

The second stakeholder meeting was held on 6 November in Aarhus at Aarhus City Hall. Eight of the twelve people invited attended the meeting. Subsequently, one of the invited people was interviewed. Attendees at the Aarhus meeting were primarily engaged in local and regional activities around the commitments of the action plan. Therefore, much of the talk was on the challenges of the regional initiatives. A loose agenda similar to that for the first stakeholder meeting was followed. The meeting took two hours.

Questionnaire

A broad survey was conducted among 628 people. All survey frequencies are included in a PDF file⁵ that can be viewed alongside reading the assessment of the commitments. Reference to commitment numbers is made in parentheses.

In the online survey, 54 percent of the respondents were from public offices, 25 percent were from private companies, 7 percent were from NGO's, 7 percent were responding in their capacity as private persons, and 6 percent indicated that they were in the category labelled "other."

The response rate for the online survey was not high (13 percent). However, a low answer percentage was anticipated because the survey was distributed using a widely cast net that included everyone on the original hearing list, stakeholders mentioned in the action plan, stakeholders revealed by document research, stakeholders who contacted the IRM researcher after visiting the Web page set up for this purpose,⁶ and the participants in Open Government Camp 2012 (one of the action plan commitments) that provided their e-mail addresses.

All respondents had the chance to review all commitments, but as the commitments cover a variety of topics, most respondents only reviewed a few. The average response rate per commitment was 12.8 reviews. But the variance in review rate for individual commitments is high. The lowest scoring commitments received only 4 reviews and the highest scoring 34 reviews. This survey also served as preparation for the stakeholder forums in Copenhagen and Aarhus, freeing up face-to-face time to discuss more thoroughly the various aspects of the OGP in Denmark. More than 80 people and organisations were consulted for this report.

The main section (apart from the statistical questions viewable in the frequencies)⁷ of the online survey was basically four qualitative questions per commitment. The first asked for comments on the government's self-assessment. After this followed a section where each respondent was asked to say something positive and something negative and to comment on a future approach for each commitment. This yielded a lot of qualitative data that are very different from commitment to commitment. Where relevant, the data are mentioned in the reviews for specific commitments.

Sources

An overview of participants, interviews and invitees is available at <http://bit.ly/1dAn2Aq>

The full survey can be found at <http://bit.ly/1cYz74a>

About the Independent Reporting Mechanism

The IRM is a key means by which government, civil society, and the private sector can track government development and implementation of OGP action plans on a bi-annual basis. The design of research and quality control of such reports is carried out by the International Experts' Panel, comprised of experts in transparency, participation, accountability, and social science research methods.

The current membership of the International Experts' Panel is:

- Yamini Aiyar
- Debbie Budlender
- Jonathan Fox
- Rosemary McGee
- Gerardo Munck

A small staff based in Washington, DC, shepherds reports through the IRM process in close coordination with the researcher. Questions and comments about this report can be directed to the staff at irm@opengovpartnership.org

¹ Full research guidance can be found at <http://bit.ly/1jkisPj>

² <http://makaeb.dk/blog/ogp-research-danmark/>

³ <http://bit.ly/1dAn2Aq>

⁴ <http://bit.ly/1bIRa1D>

⁵ <http://bit.ly/1bIRa1D>

⁶ <http://makaeb.dk/blog/ogp-research-danmark/>

⁷ <http://bit.ly/1bIRa1D>